



## Regular Meeting of the **COMMUNITY TASK FORCE ON EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION**

Thursday, June 10, 2021

Location: Electronic Methods

### **Meeting Procedure During Coronavirus (COVID-19) Outbreak:**

In keeping with the guidelines provided by the State of California and Alameda County Department of Public Health regarding gatherings during the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak, and recommendations to follow social distancing procedures, the following practices are adopted during the Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Meeting.

- The meeting will be held remotely via Zoom Video Communications:  
<https://dublinca.zoom.us/j/85325083459?pwd=dWNpRnFTVFVXaFpXZEhhZjh2cnNOdz09>  
Passcode: 9hdQJ6CW  
For audio only, you can join the meeting by telephone: (669) 900-9128  
Webinar ID: 853 2508 3459  
Passcode: 56858499
- Individuals wanting to make public comment may email [John.Stefanski@dublin.ca.gov](mailto:John.Stefanski@dublin.ca.gov) starting at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 10, 2021. Public Comment request must be made by 4:30 p.m. Please provide your name and the agenda item you would like to speak on.
- When the agenda item upon which the individual would like to comment is addressed, the speaker will be announced in the meeting when it is his/her time to speak to the Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. The speaker will then be unmuted for comment.

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

### **2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time, members of the public are encouraged to address the Task Force on any items of interest that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Task Force and not already included on the Agenda. Comments should not exceed three (3) minutes.

### **3. ACTION ITEMS**

#### **3.1 Approval of Minutes from May 27, 2021 Community Task Force Meeting**

The Task Force will consider the approval of the minutes from the May 27, 2021 Community Task Force meeting.

## **4. REPORTS**

### **4.1 Review Draft Final Report of Policing Recommendations**

Seed Collaborative will lead the Task Force through a review of the Draft Final Report section covering Policing Recommendations. The Task Force members will collectively edit and make comments on the draft report.

### **4.2 Review of Draft Other Recommendations**

Seed Collaborative will facilitate a discussion on the Draft Other Recommendations developed at the June 3 Special Meeting. The Task Force will provide feedback on these draft recommendations.

### **4.3 Review of Draft Introductory Language for the Final Report**

The Task Force will review, comment, and revise draft introduction language for the Final Report.

### **4.4 Review and Comment on the Proposed Agenda Planning Calendar**

The Task Force will review and comment on the Proposed Agenda Planning Calendar.

## **5. OTHER BUSINESS**

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Next Regular Meeting: June 24, 2021, at 5:30pm

This AGENDA is posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a). If requested, pursuant to Government Code Section 54953.2, this agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Section 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. To make a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, please contact the City Clerk's Office (925) 833-6650 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

### *Mission*

*The City of Dublin promotes and supports a high quality of life, ensures a safe and secure environment, fosters new opportunities, provides equity across all programs, and champions a culture of diversity and inclusion.*



## SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY TASK FORCE ON EQUITY, DIVERSITY & INCLUSION

### REGULAR MEETING – May 27, 2021

A regular meeting of the Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity & Inclusion was held on May 27th, 2021, via Zoom telecommunications. The meeting commenced at 5:36 PM.

#### Roll Call

PRESENT: Natasha Tripplett, Rameet Kohli, Isabella Helene David, Kathy Avanzino, Eman Tai, Clifford Brown Jr., Matthew Aini, Beatriz Ballesteros-Kogan, Dyrrell Foster, Martha Orozco (alt.), Brittany Jacobs (alt.), John Stefanski, Paul Hudson, Rodas Hailu.

ABSENT:

#### 1. Call to Order

Assistant to the City Manager, John Stefanski called the meeting to order at 5:36 PM.

#### 2. Public Comment

Mr. Stefanski called for Public Comments. Mr. Stefanski reported that there were three public comments.

Sruthi Veeragandham, Dublin Resident, and member of the Dublin Inclusion Project provided public comment on the Dublin Inclusion Project and the recommendations they would like the Task Force to review and adopt. Veeragandham stated that she would like the Task Force's recommendations to go further. Veeragandham provided public comment about the Task Force's recommendation 15, which would provide more money into community services and outside of police services. Veeragandham indicated the action of the City Council to provide an additional school resource officer for tobacco enforcement was the incorrect way to allocate funds. Veeragandham cited lawsuits against ACSO (Alameda County Sheriff's Office) and police brutality. Veeragandham would like the Task Force to adopt the recommendation on Dublin becoming a Sanctuary City.

Shanna Punzalan, Dublin resident, and member of the Dublin Inclusion Project provided public comment on behalf of the Dublin Inclusion Project and asking the Task Force to consider adding the Dublin Inclusion Project's recommendations to the Task Force recommendations that will be presented to the City Council. Punzalan indicated support of the recommendation to cease school resource officers at Dublin schools. Punzalan indicated the School Resource Officers created anxiety in students instead of preventing bullying. Punzalan suggested School Resource Officer's funding could be reallocated to Mental Health professionals. Punzalan also indicated the Task Force should adopt the recommendation of a hiring freeze.

The third public comment was provided by Regis Harvey, Dublin resident, and member of the Dublin Inclusion Project. Harvey would like the Task Force to continue their work in perpetuity. Regis would like the Task Force to adopt the recommendations on the

School Resource Officer's reallocation of funding as well as reallocation of funding toward a mental health mobile crisis team.

### **3. Action Items**

#### **3.1 Approval of Minutes from April 22, 2021, Community Task Force Meeting**

Motioned by Member Aini and Seconded by Member Ballesteros-Kogan. The Task Force Members unanimously approved the minutes.

#### **3.2 Approval of Minutes from April 29, 2021, Special Community Task Force Meeting**

*Member Tai was added to the meeting at 5:52 PM.*

Motioned by Member Aini and Seconded by Member David. The Task Force Members unanimously approved the minutes.

### **4. Reports**

#### **4.1 Review of Draft Recommendations for Citywide DEI Initiatives**

Mr. Hudson facilitated a review of the draft recommendations for Citywide DEI Initiatives. Mr. Hudson asked Member Kohli to discuss the Boards and Commissions Recruitment recommendations with the Task Force and take any comments or questions from the Task Force to reach a consensus. A copy of the draft recommendations is attached to these minutes.

The recommendations on Boards and Commissions Recruitment were shared and reviewed by the Task Force. Recommendations 1-3 recommended City Council and Staff use different avenues to announce vacancies on boards, commissions, task forces, and other city committees. They also recommended the City Council encourage City Staff, commissioners, task force and committee members, as well as the City Council itself, to actively post, share, engage in social media to share information regarding upcoming vacancies on boards, commissions, task force and other city committees. The third recommendation addressed encouraging City Staff to use publications like the "Backyard Brief" to announce upcoming vacancies. Member Avanzino added these recommendations would allow an increase in communication.

Member Kohli discussed recommendations 4-9. Recommendation four requested the City to collect demographic information on all applications for boards and commissions. Recommendation five asks the City Council to instruct City Staff to add a DEI focused weighted scoring system to evaluate all applications for boards and commissions. Member Kohli shared that this could be accomplished through a DEI commission. Recommendation 7 recommends City Council direct City Staff to review the current process to collect, store and disseminate information of all current, former, and unsuccessful commission applicants, as well as Inside Dublin graduates, and determine if the process needs to be revised to ensure that updated notices about additional commission/board/council/task force/committee opportunities are being shared with all current/former/unsuccessful applicants. Recommendation 8 recommends that City Council instruct City Staff to create a formal certification and mentor program that prepares Dublin residents to serve on commissions and similar bodies.

Recommendation 9 recommends that City Council limit the duration of a term that a commissioner serves on a commission to be no more than a period of four years.

Member Tripplett asked about Recommendation 8 and if there was any additional information about the number of applicants to the Task Force and how many were turned away. Mr. Stefanski reported that there is a list of applicants and that depending on the size of the body, there are two to three spots open per recruitment. Mr. Stefanski further elaborated that there are typically plenty of applicants for commissions.

Mr. Hudson asked Member Kohli about Recommendation 9 and commented on the time it takes to learn about a particular commission and in terminating the term in four years for increased access.

Member Kohli reported on his reasoning behind the rotating terms of members on a commission and the goal of term limits to increase the chances of out of the box thinking instead of rubber stamp thinking that he believes longer serving members typically rely on.

Mr. Stefanski asked about recommendation 5 and clarified that City Staff does not evaluate any applicants for appointments and that all appointments are made by the Mayor in accordance with the State Government Code

Mr. Hudson asked if the Mayor entertains additional information in choosing appointments.

Mr. Stefanski reported that this authority is only vested in the Mayor. Member Kohli reported that his ad-hoc group wanted to create a DEI commission to use the weighted scoring system in reviewing applications.

Member Avanzino asked Mr. Stefanski if there was any prescreening done on behalf of the Mayor. Mr. Stefanski reported on the ad-hoc committee that was appointed by the City Council to review the applications before the Mayor made the appointments. The review of the Task Force Applications was from Councilmember Kumagai and Councilmember Josey.

Mr. Hudson asked Member Kohli if his ad-hoc group was comfortable with Mr. Stefanski's amendment to the recommendation by adding DEI questions to the applications. Member Kohli reported that he could only respond on his behalf. Member Avanzino reported agreement with the amendment. Member Brown asked if there was a way to re-word the recommendation so that they recommend the Mayor considers DEI in making her decision.

Mr. Stefanski reported that the Task Force could make changes to the application, in addition to adding a quantifiable measure to make decisions.

Member Tripplett commented on being unclear of the Mayor's role and who reviews applications. Mr. Stefanski reported that normally the Mayor reviews the applications and chooses the commission members and that the Task Force was a special case in reviewing the applications. Member Tripplett asked if there was a process to attach a weighted scoring process for a DEI lens. Mr. Stefanski reported that this decision is entirely up to the Mayor, again per the California Government Code.

Mr. Hudson discussed recommendation 5 adjusting to recommend the Mayor utilize a DEI weighted scoring system when evaluating all applications.

Member Brown recommended added “as well as include DEI focused questions in the applications” for recommendation 4.

Mr. Hudson asked if everyone was comfortable with the recommendations as amended. Members unanimously agreed.

Mr. Stefanski recommended changing Dublin 101 to Inside Dublin.

Mr. Hudson reviewed recommendations from Inclusive Equitable and Accessible Programming and Events. Member David reviewed recommendation 10, 11 and 12. Recommendation 10 recommends that the City of Dublin host monthly diverse Town Hall meetings, with each meeting aimed at amplifying the voices and concerns of different diverse groups represented in the City of Dublin. Recommendation 11 recommends that the City of Dublin collect the following data sets: disaggregated data on specific languages spoken at home and disaggregate ancestry data on Asian Americans in Dublin. Member David asked about collecting data on voter information in the City of Dublin, and how that is not a viable option currently. Recommendation 12 recommends that the City of Dublin translate local government and City information into multiple languages and post paper copies to be displayed on bulletins at strategic locations (e.g., Sahara Market, Ulferts Center) identified by the City.

Member Tripplett reviewed recommendations 13-15. Member Tripplett reported on the assumption of people’s level of technology comfortability. Access to information outside of a computer and website is needed. Recommendation 13 recommends that the Splatter festival be renamed and rebranded into a multicultural/diversity festival that highlights the diverse cultures represented in Dublin through entertainment, food, and interactive activities. Recommendation 14 recommends that the City of Dublin promote restaurant and small business that are owned and operated by marginalized groups through new and existing local events (e.g., food tour). Recommendation 15 recommends that the City of Dublin is intentional about displaying public art and utilizing the public art fund in a manner that is representative of the diversity within our city. The City should collect data on the array of artist-diversity represented and include it in the annual report.

Member Ballesteros-Kogan reviewed Recommendations 16-18. Recommendation 16 recommends that the City of Dublin proactively recruit instructors and intentionally seek class offerings that represent the diverse culture and ethnicities in Dublin. Recommendation 17 recommends that the City of Dublin enhance efforts to inform residents of Dublin of how they can submit requests for additional classes that are reflective of the City’s diversity. Recommendation 18 recommends that the City of Dublin collaborate with the Alameda County Public Library to encourage the Dublin Branch to increase the selection of books by authors and illustrators who represent the diversity within our community.

Mr. Hudson called for questions. Member Kohli commented on the high quality of recommendations. Mr. Stefanski provided feedback on recommendation 14 to provide more clarity for staff on what is considered “marginalized groups.” Member Orozco

commented on recommendation 12 asking to see specific targeted locations listed to reach certain groups. Member David mentioned this concern as well and has created a list of locations for the recommendations (Ulferts Center, Senior Center, Ranch 99, mosques, Dublin Library, Emerald Glen Park, etc.). Member David asked if there are additional documents that would be presented with the recommendations. Member Tripplett responded to this question that these recommendations would be like the Police recommendations. Mr. Hudson asked why the ad-hoc group wanted to add these documents to stand alone locked boxes. Member Ballesteros-Kogan responded with the intention that these documents could not be removed. Member Tripplett responded that they wanted it to be as accessible as possible to lessen the barrier to get to the information. Member David responded to the question about the idea of accessibility. Member Kohli asked about the word marginalized and replacing with underserved and under-represented group. Member Tai commented on the bulletin and placement and that this may be difficult for the city to place these documents in this location. Member Tai suggested adding a supplemental piece for consideration of distributing the information in different languages. Member David commented on adding supplemental language. Member Tripplett commented on including information in more locations.

Mr. Hudson asked the group if they could change the language on recommendation 12 to include "Commonly Used Spaces and venues."

Member Tai commented on creating as many ways to disseminate the information as possible.

Mr. Hudson called for approval of recommendations 10-18 as amended. Member Orozco commented on Recommendation 10 to specify that each month would be a specified targeted group. Mr. Stefanski commented on the understanding of the intent of recommendation 10. Member Orozco asked how the City would determine this list. Mr. Stefanski commented on his role and reaching out to the group for a list of appropriate groups. Member Orozco asked about the possibility of a quarterly meeting. Mr. Stefanski responded to this question, sharing about the challenges with logistically balancing the schedules with the groups.

Mr. Hudson asked for consensus among the Task Force on recommendations 10-18 for the City Council. The Task Force unanimously agreed.

Mr. Hudson asked the Community Agency Funding and Support Ad-hoc group to discuss their recommendations.

Member Aini reviewed recommendation 19-20 regarding data collection and continuous improvement. Member Aini discussed the details of the data collection recommendation: adding a post application survey, sample questions, tracking demographic information, identifying pain points, exploring root causes of pain points, implementing or pilot solutions and examining data, have feedback provided to applicants to improve their application for the next funding cycle. Recommendation 20 recommends specific edits to the Grant Application. Recommendation 21 recommends edits to the Grant scoring rubric.

Member Jacobs asked Member Orozco if she had anything to add for the rubric and grants recommendations. Member Orozco then reviewed recommendations 21-22 and

commented on the need for DEI focused questions in the application process and the rubric to reach organizations that are making efforts to reach specific populations. Member Orozco asked for questions. Member Jacobs commented on recommendation 19 about providing equity and the other recommendations regarding what process should be to ensure equity; identifying the bias in the process and what should the city needs to do about it and what adaptations to the process and rubric are needed.

Mr. Hudson asked if the City collects demographic data on collecting applications. Mr. Stefanski commented on the collection of the recipients of services, but not on the organization side. Mr. Hudson asked about the grants and funds provided each year. Mr. Stefanski reported that he can pull this number. Mr. Hudson asked about applicants and how many awards are given. Mr. Stefanski commented on the organizations who do not receive an award because they did not fall within the areas of the Needs Assessment. Mr. Hudson asked if most applicants get some money. Mr. Stefanski responded that most applicants get some money, however not always what they initially request. Member Jacobs commented on the distribution of funds and the groups discussion around priority to the process to inform making choices. Member Jacobs asked what the purpose of the Human Services Grant program was. Mr. Stefanski commented on the City's ability to support local organizations in the community through program. The CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funds can be used for a narrow set of purposes. The City supplants that funding with General Fund dollars to help cover the cost to serve Dublin residents, filling service gaps that the City does not directly provide.

Mr. Hudson asked the committee about their concerns with the Human Services Grant. Member Orozco commented on the rubric not having a DEI lens as the reason for this focused recommendation and the desire to look at the organizations that are applying. Mr. Hudson clarified that the ad-hoc committee's focus was on the applicants receiving the awards implementing DEI practices and policies. Mr. Hudson asked if the organizations were not reached were aware of the program. Member Jacobs commented on this piece being in their Communications recommendation. Member Tai reviewed recommendation 22 and the grant process access for organizations based on accessibility and translation services.

Mr. Stefanski commented on the budget information for the Human Services Grant for the next grant cycle: 21 total organizations that will receive funding. The City will be funding a total of \$267,000. Requested \$397,000 from the organizations. CDBG funds approximately \$100,000 and the City General Funds \$160,000. Mr. Hudson asked if these were all the applications that were received. Mr. Stefanski reported that these were all the organizations that met the criteria for the program. Mr. Hudson commented on the facts of the organizations who submit their requests and receive some funds. Member Orozco commented on the organizations who come to the workshop and do not necessarily apply asking what the barrier is. Mr. Hudson clarified that there may be a disparity among the number of agencies that attend the workshop and the number agencies who apply. Member Tai commented on the loss of agencies being interested and then not as many applying. Mr. Stefanski clarified that there are agencies that are not coming in the first place and those barriers should be worth exploring further. Mr. Stefanski provided an example an organization not having tax-exempt status and therefore not being able to apply. Member Jacobs commented on recommendation 24

regarding communications to get more applicants. Mr. Hudson asked the ad-hoc group to advise or encourage the city for outreach efforts to track by asking how many organizations in the City of Dublin provide human services.

Member Aini commented on recommendation 19 and the key question of asking applicants how they found out of the application and how current applicants are notified to expand outreach.

Mr. Stefanski asked a clarifying question about recommendation 19 and Member Aini provided clarity around a typo. Mr. Stefanski commented on recommendation 21 sharing that the next East County Needs Assessment was underway. Mr. Hudson asked about recommendation 19 to reword it to "Gather additional data to uplift challenges and barriers to the Grant Application Process". Member Tripplett commented on recommendation 22 and the daunting process of grant applications.

Mr. Hudson reviewed recommendations 19-22. Mr. Hudson asked if recommendation 20 is more data collection. Member Jacobs commented on the data on the application. Mr. Hudson recommended that recommendation 20 provide Equitable and Inclusive, DEI Lens applied to application and broader recommendation structure with guidance to give staff specific things they can add to the application. Mr. Hudson asked Member Jacobs the difference between recommendations 20 and 21. Member Jacobs discussed the application, the data, and the rubric used to score the application by adding DEI questions and DEI scoring. Mr. Hudson reviewed recommendation 22. Member Tai commented on adding to recommendation 22 by "recommending the City do more to identify all non-profits/social service organizations within the city and do outreach to them to ensure they are aware of the grant opportunity/Notice of Funding Availability."

Mr. Hudson asked for consensus from the Task Force on Recommendations 19-22. The Task Force confirmed consensus.

Member Jacobs reviewed Recommendation 23, establishing regular touchpoints with diverse cultural and community leaders and local organizations. Mr. Stefanski elaborated on the earlier recommendation on the Town Halls. Mr. Hudson asked if the City Council accepts recommendation 23, who would be responsible for fulfilling this recommendation. Mr. Stefanski reported that the Public Information Officer would push out this information, but regular touchpoints would fall on staff in the City Manager's Office. Member Avanzino asked if there was a community development officer that could engage with the community. Mr. Stefanski commented on the Community Development Director and staff. Mr. Hudson commented on the City Manager delegating this to others. Member Kohli asked about diverse cultural and community leaders narrowing the groups in Recommendation 23 and instead replacing this with "underserved and underrepresented groups." Member Tai recommended changing the wording in Recommendation 23 to "diverse cultural leaders..." Member Jacobs reviewed Recommendation 24 recommending the establishment of additional channel for two-way communication with all city residents. Recommendation 24 addresses outreach in communication and sharing in multiple channels as well as collecting contact information regularly. Member Jacobs reviewed Recommendation 25 around social media and the policies around what gets posted for certain cultural events. The recommendation asks that the policy be revised based on the Dublin community. Member Orozco asked to

change point four of the social media recommendations to September 15-16. Member David commented on the suggestion about changing Chinese New Year to Lunar New Year as well as adding October 25 as Larry Itliong Day. Mr. Hudson asked about how this pertains to social media. Member Jacobs commented on the calendar changes for social media community engagement. Member Orozco commented on this recommendation being a part of community engagement. Member Tripplett commented on recommendation 23 and to add “groups of diverse community leaders”. Member Jacobs recommended changing the wording to “a diverse group of community leaders and local organizations.”

Member Avanzino commented on the addition of the State’s adopted calendar, but also to pair with a campaign to get more followers on City Social Media Accounts.

Member Jacobs reviewed recommendation 26, recommending ongoing DEI training for all city staff and specific for certain roles (e.g., Communications Manager and Communications Analyst). Member Jacobs reviewed recommendation 27, to develop a City DEI process and decision-making process for everything the City does. Member Brown commented on adding the campaign to boost followers on the City’s Official Social Media Accounts. Mr. Hudson commented on adding all the communication in one section. Mr. Hudson asked for consensus on recommendations 23-25. The Task Force unanimously agreed.

Mr. Hudson reviewed recommendations 26-27 and asked for consensus from the group. Mr. Stefanski clarified the goal of recommendation 27. The Task Force unanimously agreed.

#### **4.2 Review of Outstanding Draft Policing Recommendations**

Mr. Stefanski reviewed the outstanding police recommendations. Member Aini reviewed the changes made to recommendations 1-2. Member Kohli reviewed the changes made to recommendations 6-7. Recommendation 7 asks the City Manager to meet annually with the Chief of DDPS to review the hiring criteria and DPS demographic data.

Member Kohli commented he may have to leave video and hop on the phone dial in.

Mr. Hudson asked the Task Force to approve the amendments to the recommendations on Policing. Member Ballesteros-Kogan commented on recommendation 7. The Task Force unanimously agreed.

#### **4.3 Review and Comment on the Proposed Agenda Planning Calendar**

Mr. Stefanski reviewed the proposed calendar.

### **5. Other Business**

Member Tripplett commented on the recommendations and the need for an ongoing DEI commission. Member David commented on the concerns and comments from the Public Comment from the Dublin Inclusion recommendations. Member David asked the Task Force if there was interest in having a special meeting in reviewing the Dublin Inclusion Project’s recommendations. Member Kohli asked a clarifying question about Member David’s comment. Member David clarified suggesting a special meeting to review the recommendations.

Member Kohli asked what is on the agenda for the June 10 meeting. Mr. Stefanski commented on the agenda for the June 10 meeting. Member Ballesteros-Kogan commented on having a special meeting. Member Orozco agreed. Member David asked if the Task Force can hold an additional special meeting. Mr. Stefanski commented on the Task Force's ability to have a special meeting. Mr. Hudson clarified that this was being added to the June 10 after review of the policing recommendations.

Member Brown commented on the DEI commission. Mr. Hudson asked Mr. Stefanski where this falls within the scope of the Task Force charge. Mr. Stefanski reviewed the charge. Member Tripplett asked if the Task Force can recruit for a new commission. Member Avanzino asked the ad-hoc group if they could add a commission recommendation. Mr. Hudson clarified this could not fit in the scope under recruitment and asked if the Task Force is going to present a recommendation outside of the scope of the Task Force charge. Member Kohli commented on recommending the City Council review and consider the Dublin Inclusion recommendations with the Task Force recommendations. Mr. Hudson asked how the Task Force deal with recommendations outside of the scope. Member Avanzino asked to review them prior to presenting it as a recommendation.

Mr. Hudson asked the group if they could hold a special meeting on June 3. The Task Force agreed they could participate. Mr. Stefanski reviewed agenda items for a potential special meeting. The Task Force agreed to review the Dublin Inclusion recommendations at the special meeting. Member Tripplett asked the recruitment ad-hoc group if they could prepare a recommendation on a DEI commission. Member Kohli commented on the DEI commission and the ad-hoc groups willingness to create a recommendation. Member Aini asked about the possibility of proposing a committee to the City Council. Mr. Stefanski commented on the possibility of a DEI committee versus a commission. Task Force Members discussed the scope and role of a DEI Commission. Mr. Hudson reviewed agenda items for the June 3 Special Meeting.

Mr. Stefanski stated that the June 24 meeting would be the final meeting to review the report for the July 20 City Council meeting.

Task Force members asked questions about the funding and decisions on school resource officers. Mr. Stefanski commented on the ability to pull this information and the ability to speak on it once its agenized.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.

## 1. Final Recommendations—Policing

From January to March 2021, the Taskforce developed and prioritized policing recommendations. The Taskforce began their initial meetings in conversation with Dublin Chief of Police Garrett Holmes. Chief Holmes responded to the Taskforce's questions, presented data and information on Dublin Police Services (DPS), and provided documents. This information has been stored on the Community Task Force's webpage.

At the conclusion of exploratory discussions with Chief Holmes, the Taskforce agreed to create three ad-hoc working groups to divide up the scope of the work and draft of recommendations. Below are the Taskforce policing recommendations grouped according to the parameters set by the Dublin City Council.

### Policing Recommendations

Ref. #	Recommendation
<b>Training Curriculum (TC)</b>	
TC-1	<p><b>Training:</b> DPS identify ways to expand training offerings for officers, either through muster room briefings, independent study/self-paced trainings, additional training days or other appropriate methods of training.</p> <p>These trainings should cover (1) Implicit bias, (2) Understanding languages and cultural responsiveness, (3) Understanding people with disabilities, (4) Community policing, (5) Use of Force/De-escalation, (6) Leadership, professionalism, and ethics. <i>(TF Ref. #18) Members: Ballesteros-Kogan, David, Tripplett</i></p>
<b>Policies and Procedures (P)</b>	
P-1	<p><b>Accountability:</b> The City Council create a Police Reform Advisory Commission. This Commission would support the City in monitoring the implementation of the Task Force's Recommendations, as well as play an ongoing role in advising the City on ways to enhance police-community relations in Dublin.<sup>1</sup> <i>(TF Ref. #1) Members: Aini, Jacobs (Alt), Orozco, Tai</i></p> <p>The Commission should host a facilitated, community educational workshop on 21<sup>st</sup> century policing and community relations best practices. <i>(TF Ref. #10) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli</i></p>
P-2	<p><b>Accountability:</b> The City advocate for the creation of an Alameda County Sheriff Oversight Board (Board) and Inspector General and that Dublin have a permanent seat on the Board.</p> <p><b>The City create a Liaison Committee between the City Council and the Board.</b></p> <p>The City advocate for the Board and Inspector General study harm reduction and procedural justice framework for policing and develop recommendations for the implementation of best practices identified from said study.</p>

<sup>1</sup> [Sample Bylaws and Procedures for Advisory Commission](#)

	The City advocate for the Board to conduct a public study session to discuss policing best practices and develop a public report that includes study session findings, recommendations, and actions for the Sheriff's Office. <i>(TF Ref. #1) Members: Aini, Jacobs (Alt), Orozco, Tai</i>
P-3	<p><b>Hiring:</b> The City Manager request that the Police Chief consider the following additional criteria when hiring law enforcement personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents of Dublin.</li> <li>• Race/gender/ethnicity/sexual orientation reflective of the City's demographics.</li> <li>• Community policing experience.</li> <li>• Experience working in diverse communities and/or on diverse teams.</li> </ul> <p>The City Manager meet with the Police Chief to review the hiring criteria and DPS demographic data on an annual basis.</p> <p><i>(TF Ref. #6, #7) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli</i></p>
P-4	<p><b>Non-Violent Response:</b> The City implement a multidisciplinary mobile crisis team for response to non-violent situations. The team should consist of a licensed behavioral health provider, an emergency medical technician, and a social worker, who would be dispatched through 911 calls and would respond to non-violent situations. <i>(TF Ref. #15) Members: Ballesteros-Kogan, David, Tripplett</i></p>
P-5	<p><b>Non-Violent Response:</b> The City, in collaboration with ACSO, implement Co-Responder Teams consisting of one police officer and one Mental Health Professional (licensed LMFT or LCSW) to respond to situations where people are experiencing a severe mental health crisis that could pose a threat to safety. <i>(TF Ref. #16) Members: Ballesteros-Kogan, David, Tripplett</i></p>
<b>Data Transparency and Context (DT)</b>	
DT-1	<p><b>Data Transparency:</b> All Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA)-required stop data be published on the City's Data Transparency Platform on an annual basis to help establish benchmarks in reducing non-violent police interactions. This will include stop data in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived race/ethnicity</li> <li>• Primary basis for the stop</li> <li>• Whether consent was given or if there was probable cause</li> </ul> <p><i>(TF Ref. #3) Members: Aini, Jacobs (Alt), Orozco, Tai</i></p>
DT-2	<p><b>Data Transparency:</b> In instances where there is a DPS officer involved shooting or use of force resulting in great bodily injury or death, DPS make the AB71 and SB1421 data publicly available on the City's Data Transparency Platform.</p> <p><i>(TF Ref. #5) Members: Aini, Jacobs (Alt), Orozco, Tai</i></p>
DT-3	<p><b>Data Transparency:</b> The City publish information regarding DPS complaints and commendations data on the City's Data Transparency Portal. <i>(TF Ref. #12, #14) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli</i></p>
DT-4	<p><b>Data Transparency:</b> The City publish the demographic data of DPS officers on an annual basis on the City's Data Transparency Portal. <i>(TF Ref. #8) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli</i></p>
DT-5	<p><b>Data Collection:</b> The City and ACSO explore ways to collect and report data regarding de-escalation annually to monitor the effectiveness of current de-escalation practices, as well as identify when new practices may be necessary. <i>(TF Ref. #4) Members: Aini, Jacobs (Alt), Orozco, Tai</i></p>

## Communications (C)

C-1	<b>Press Releases:</b> The City enact an Administrative Policy that the City will issue a press release within 72 hours after every incident involving use of lethal force by DPS. <i>(TF Ref. #9) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli</i>
C-2	<b>Filing Complaints &amp; Commendations:</b> The City develop cards for DPS to provide with information on how to make a complaint or commendation and develop additional methods for residents to file DPS complaints and commendations either through electronic means or voicemail. <i>(TF Ref. #11, #13) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli</i>

## Public Relations and Community Engagement (PR)

PR-1	The City hire a police/community liaison to enhance collaboration between the Dublin Community, Dublin City Council, Staff, Dublin Police Services, and the Alameda County Sheriff's Office. The liaison would also work with advocacy groups, including but not limited to Las Positas College, NAMI, NAACP, and ACLU. <i>(TF Ref. #2, #19) Members: Avanzino, Brown, Kohli; Ballesteros-Kogan, David, Tripplett</i>
------	---

**Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Responses to Dublin Inclusion Project Recommendations  
June 10, 2021**

1. **School resource officers:** the City Council direct the Police Reform Advisory Commission to initiate public hearings, to include the Dublin Unified School District, Dublin Police Services, parents, and community members, to evaluate and discuss the purpose and success of School Resource Officers (SROs) and the appropriate allocation of SROs.
2. **Tobacco enforcement grant:** the City of Dublin explore grant opportunities and apply for grant funding from the California Department of Justice (DOJ) Tobacco Grant Program and other funders for community-based organizations to provide services and programs to reduce tobacco use, including retailer training programs, public education outreach, parent engagement and education, or tobacco retail license inspections.
3. **End ACSO contract:** The City Council direct the Police Reform Advisory Commission to conduct a study to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the City of Dublin ceasing to contract with the Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) for police services and establishing an independent Dublin Police Department.
4. **Sanctuary City:** No Recommendation.
5. **Hiring Freeze: Further Clarification Needed.**
  - a. *From DIP: The taskforce recommends that: the City of Dublin makes a commitment to a freeze on the hiring of new personnel in Dublin PD, and that any increase in public safety personnel in the coming years come from the hiring of unarmed, trauma-informed personnel, such as licensed clinical social workers (LCSWs), or alternatives to police such as unarmed traffic enforcement officials.*

## Preamble Planning

### Goals of the Preamble:

- Communicate context through which to better understand recommendations
- Address topics important to the task force that fall outside of current recommendations
- Clarify our intent/end goals, and how far these recommendations get us toward that

### Values/Priorities of the Taskforce:

- Inclusion and belonging for all community members
- Reducing police, increasing supports and services

### Key Points:

- Big picture-
  - Overall, we found that there is very little currently in place within both city operations and the police department that recognize, promote or sustain diversity, equity, or inclusion.
  - Dublin is becoming increasingly large and more diverse.
  - Ways of operating need to adapt
  - We need an ongoing community body to support these ongoing efforts
- City operations need to adapt
  - <summary of recommendations>
- Public safety needs to adapt
  - ACSO contract was very restricting. Took two approaches: short term within the current contract and long term
  - With the short term recs, took into account challenges and barriers. Those remaining should not be used as reasons to not implement
  - Long term, we have recommended that Dublin explore an alternative approach to public safety instead of contracting with ACSO.

### Draft Preamble:

Dublin is becoming increasingly large and more diverse. <Highlight the amazing diversity and assets>

Our ways of operating need to adapt to ensure alignment with the city mission: “The City of Dublin promotes and supports a high quality of life, ensures a safe and secure environment, fosters new opportunities, provides equity across all programs, and champions a culture of diversity and inclusion.” Overall, we found that there is very little currently in place within both city operations and the police department that recognize, promote or sustain diversity, equity, or

inclusion. The city is truly in its infancy and has a long way to go. After the City Council adopted the updated mission in <date>, this was a logical next step in the process to understand the current state and identify initial opportunities.

Today we have the opportunity to present to you our recommendations under two headlines: policing and, more broadly, diversity, racial equity and inclusion. We know there is so much work left to do, and that our community is willing to support these changes. This is why we are also recommending <a continuing community body> to support this city council and the city staff.

As you listen to and review our recommendations, keep in mind our collective intent: to bring about inclusion and belonging for all members of our community, and to make choices that center equity. More specifically, we looked for ways to increase supports and services that do not include policing. You will see again and again this intent in each of our recommendations.

The taskforce committed many many volunteer hours over the past seven months working to deeply understand city operations and be able to identify ways to bring the city more in line with its mission. We are grateful for the opportunity to present these recommendations to you, which we believe will put the city on a different trajectory toward truly prioritizing DEI and, more importantly, resulting in a more inclusive community for us all to live together in.

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force believes that our city would be best served by decreasing our community policing and increasing police support. This will allow our police force to have the correct tools to do their job while ensuring that our community members are safe and have the support needed to thrive. As Dublin looks to the future, this Task Force recommends that efforts be made to increase community interaction and mental health support. Our recommendations reflect the values of integrating our dynamic community, providing equitable access for all residents, and promoting diversity in all aspects of Dublin life.



**Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Proposed Agenda Planning Calendar**

**Meeting Location:** Electronic Methods (Zoom Telecommunications)  
**Meeting Time:** 5:30-7:30 p.m.  
**Meeting Dates:** The Community Task Force will meet on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of each month from January to June 2021.

Date	Proposed Agenda Topics (subject to change)
June 10, 2021	Approval of Minutes from the May 27, 2021 Meeting. Review of Draft Final Report (Police Recommendation Section).
June 24, 2021	Approval of Minutes from the June 3, 2021 Special Meeting Approval of Minutes from the June 10, 2021 Meeting. Review of Draft Final Report (Citywide DEI Initiatives Sections). Approval of Final Report and Recommendations.

**Community Task Force Charge**

*The Community Task Force is charged with reviewing and developing recommendations on items within the City’s purview, specifically the following:*

- *Policing*
  - *Training Curriculum*
  - *Policies and Procedures*
  - *Data Transparency and Context*
  - *Communications*
  - *Public Engagement and Community Relations*
- *Diversity, Racial Equity, and Inclusion*
  - *Boards and Commissions Recruitment*
  - *Inclusive, Equitable, and Accessible Programming and Events*
  - *Community Agency Funding and Support*
  - *Communications*