



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 Triplett, Rameet Kohli, Isabella Helene David, Kathy Avanzino, Eman Tai, Clifford Brown Jr., Matthew Aini, Beatriz Ballesteros-Kogan, Dyrell 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett reviewed recommendations 13-15. Member Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 logically 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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 Triplett 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.