



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

Thursday, May 27, 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, May 27, 2021. 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 April 22, 2021 Community Task Force Meeting**

The Task Force will consider the approval of the minutes from the April 22, 2021 Community Task Force meeting.

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

The Task Force will consider the approval of the minutes from the April 29, 2021 Community Task Force meeting.

## **4. REPORTS**

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

Seed Collaborative will facilitate a review draft citywide DEI recommendation. Ad Hoc Groups will present their respective draft recommendations.

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

Seed Collaborative will facilitate a review of the outstanding draft recommendations. Ad Hoc Groups will present their amended policing recommendations.

### **4.3 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 10, 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 – April 22, 2021

A regular meeting of the Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity & Inclusion was held on April 22nd, 2021, via Zoom telecommunications. The meeting commenced at 5:36 PM.

#### Roll Call

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

ABSENT: Dyrell Foster

#### 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. No comments were made.

#### 3. Action Items

##### **3.1 Approval of Minutes from April 8, 2021, Community Task Force Meeting**

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

#### 4. Reports

##### **4.1 Presentation by Assistant to the City Manager Stefanski – Citywide DEI Initiatives (Inclusive, Equitable, and Accessible Programming and Events, and Community Agency Funding and Support)**

Member Kohli asked about the City's initial review of the Policing recommendations. Mr. Stefanski reported that they would be on the agenda for the next meeting for review and discussion by the Task Force.

Mr. Stefanski reported on Citywide DEI Initiatives beginning with Inclusive, Equitable, and Accessible Programming and Events. The presentation provided an overview of the City's different types of programming, events and how the City manages programs and events. The presentation included a discussion on the use of contract instructors to provide recreational programming.

Member David asked about information regarding community events and multicultural events in the City of Dublin. Member David indicated the Splatter Event was originally intended to be multicultural festival and wanted to know what changes have been made to address this. Mr. Stefanski shared that he would get more information on this event to report back at the next meeting. Member Tripplett shared that her daughter, Acacia

Tripplett, and her had conversations with former Mayor Haubert on working together to rebrand Splatter and make it a more multi-cultural event to honor more people in the community. Member Tripplett then indicated that she wanted to work in this area (programming and events) in the community. Mr. Stefanski indicated that he would get more information on the Splatter event and report back to the group.

Member Brown asked about how the recruiting of contract instructors is done and if there is a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. Mr. Stefanski reported on the recruitment process of contract instructors in the community. Member Brown asked about recruiting with a diversity lens. Mr. Stefanski reported that the City will recruit diverse contract instructors for culturally specialized programming. He also reported that there is not a set RFP process for hiring contract instructors. Member Brown asked if there are diversity guidelines for recruiting. Mr. Stefanski reported that with culturally specific programming, staff will recruit folks with a track record in that specific area (e.g., Tai Chi).

Member Jacobs requested an exhaustive list of the holiday related programs organized by the City that are not currently represented. Mr. Stefanski shared that he would pull the list of annual events, including holiday related programs, to report back at the next meeting.

Member Kohli asked about the criteria utilized for selecting independent contractors, particularly, women, veteran, or minority owned businesses. Mr. Stefanski commented on this and reported that Parks staff looks to ensure that the City is providing safe and quality programming first and foremost. There is no specific DEI lens applied when selecting contractors.

Member Tripplett asked about the number of programs offered and whether the City was at capacity or had room for additional programs. Mr. Stefanski commented on some enrollment data shared that he would report back at the next meeting from the Parks and Community Services department. Mr. Hudson commented on the DEI and the city's interest in ensuring equitable participation in programming.

Member Ballesteros-Kogan asked about the communication to residents in multiple languages. Mr. Stefanski reported on the information not being translated on physical documents, but online would be translatable.

Member Kohli asked about a breakdown of contractors with a DEI lens. Mr. Stefanski reported that the city does not track demographic data on contractors outside of their names and basic contact information. Member Kohli asked if this has just not been done to date or if the City of Dublin is not allowed to. Mr. Stefanski commented that he would double check on this and provide an answer at the next meeting.

Member Jacobs asked about demographic data on enrolled participants. Mr. Stefanski reported that age and gender of program participants is collected. Member Avanzino then commented on wanting to know the geographic information on the participants in the programs. Mr. Stefanski reported that he would speak to Parks staff to see what kind of reports they could run to show this information.

Member Tripplett asked about how contract instructors were paid and if there was a DEI lens focused on that. Mr. Stefanski reported on the methodology based on the cost per person of each program. Member Brown asked about data on how instructors/contractors are paid. Mr. Stefanski reported that he would report back on this data.

Member Tripplett asked about the demographic information on the parks and recreation employees. Mr. Stefanski reported that the City has this information but not for the meeting.

Member Tai asked about the diversity of the offerings in the recreation programming. Is there a way to find out if there are different ways of asking the community what programming they would like to see offered. Mr. Stefanski reported on the Parks and Community Services Department surveys issued after each program/class and that there is an opportunity for individuals to provide feedback on potential programs there.

Mr. Stefanski then reported on the Community Agency Funding and Support. Mr. Stefanski provided an overview of the City's Human Services Grants program, reporting requirements, and available data.

Member Avanzino asked about the process of determining funding for Human Service Grant applicants. Mr. Stefanski provided further detail in the process used by Human Services Staff and the Human Services Commission to determine funding amounts. Member David asked about if there were levels of priority for each category identified in the 2012 Tri-Valley Needs Assessment and if that was captured in the ranking by the Human Services Commission. Mr. Stefanski presented on the Human Services Grant Ranking Sheet and the criteria they use when reviewing and ranking applications. Mr. Stefanski reported that a new Tri-Valley Needs Assessment would likely be done in the near future. Mr. Hudson commented on the criteria and Tri-Valley Needs Assessment and that it would likely not change given the identified categories. Mr. Stefanski concurred but shared that the context and supporting information in the Assessment would be updated to capture changes from the last ten years.

#### **4.2 Task Force Discussion on City-Wide DEI Presentations and Approach to Work**

Mr. Hudson led a discussion on how the Task Force would like to approach their work around Citywide DEI Initiatives. Mr. Hudson asked about upcoming meetings. Mr. Stefanski reported that the next meeting will be a special meeting on April 29 and then a meeting following May 27.

Mr. Hudson recommended the Task Force frame questions as also recommendations. Since the Task Force only has a few more weeks to complete this work, they may not have enough time for all of their questions to be answered.

Members Kohli, Tai, Tripplett, Avanzino, Aini, and David all commented and shared their desire to utilize ad-hoc groups to complete this work and that using the same groups as were used for the policing recommendations was preferred. Member Kohli also recommended Members conduct individual research and then coming up with recommendations individually as an alternative option but that he still prefers the ad-hoc

group option. Member Tripplett commented on the agreement of holding the ad-hoc groups.

Mr. Hudson asked if there was a topic preference of the Task Force Members. Following a discussion among the Members, the following was determined:

Members Tripplett, David, Ballesteros-Kogan, and Foster would be responsible for Inclusive, Equitable, and Accessible Programming and Events.

Members Aini, Tai, Orozco, and Jacobs would be responsible for Community Agency Funding and Support.

Members Kohli, Avanzino, and Brown would be responsible for Boards and Commission Recruitment.

Following further discussion among the members, it was determined that each group would also work on recommendations pertaining to Communications. This arrangement was unanimously agreed amongst the Members.

Mr. Hudson recommended that the ad-hoc groups focus in on questions and provide them ahead of time to Mr. Stefanski. Mr. Hudson also recommended the ad-hoc groups separate the work by categories to target specific questions and recommendations. Mr. Stefanski recommended keeping the ad-hoc meetings at different times so that Mr. Hudson, Ms. Hailu, and Mr. Stefanski could support the groups.

Member Kohli asked about Brown Act Requirements for email messages. Mr. Stefanski commented on the question about emailing ad-hoc group members stating that Ad Hoc members may communicate with themselves but may not discuss their work with the other Ad Hoc groups unless at a full meeting of the Task Force.

Member Orozco asked about who the City hires for security at events. Mr. Hudson recommended all the Task Force members add their questions now. Mr. Stefanski shared that he would get an answer to Member Orozco's question for the next meeting.

Member David asked about the APAPA town hall video link not working on the Website. Mr. Stefanski stated that he would get the link fixed.

Member Tripplett asked who decides City statements? (e.g., APAPA Town Hall meeting or press releases). Mr. Stefanski reported that this is done by Shari Jackman, Communications Manager and Mr. Hudson commented that the City Manager may also request to send out statements.

Member Jacobs asked if the Communications Manager and the Social Media Manager are the same person. Mr. Stefanski reported that the Communications Manager oversees the Communications Analyst, who is more responsible for managing the City's Social Media channels. Member Tripplett asked to see additional information on the information distributed to the community and the job description for the Communications Manager. Mr. Stefanski reported that he would be able to get this information for the next meeting.

Mr. Hudson commented on the lack of participation from the public at the Community Task Force meetings. Mr. Hudson recommended that there should be outreach to the

community. Member David commented on the accessibility of the meeting recordings after the meetings and that it would be easier to share the link with folks to see what the Task Force is working on. Member Jacobs asked about the minutes and adding additional information to be more descriptive. Mr. Stefanski reported on providing more detail in the minutes moving forward.

Member Avanzino commented on the lack of public comment even though there were 76 applicants who applied to be on the Task Force and asked if there was an opportunity to outreach to these applicants to get them involved.

Mr. Hudson recommended that each ad-hoc include this in their Communications recommendations since all the ad-hoc committees can touch on this. Mr. Hudson asked Mr. Stefanski about the other commissions and committee meetings and if they had public comment at their meetings. Mr. Stefanski reported that most commission and committee meetings did not have much in terms of public comments, unless it is a controversial project. Mr. Hudson commented on governments functioning more smoothly when there is no public comment. Mr. Hudson recommended considering how the Task Force could help get the information out to the public to give comment on recommendations provided to City Council.

Member Orozco commented on asked about promoting on social media platforms about meetings of commissions and committee meetings.

Member Kohli commented on the planning commission and other commission meetings and asked about setting up notifications of Task Force meetings. Mr. Stefanski reported that this could be set up but that individuals would have to opt-in to receive the notifications. Member Kohli commented on the community reaction and then engagement once the recommendations are announced at City Council. Member Kohli asked about asked posting on social media the Task Force meetings. Mr. Stefanski commented on the liking of other Task Force members posts and sharing their posts would be a violation of Brown Act requirements.

Member Avanzino commented on seeing this Task Force publicized on next door from Stephen Wright on the planning commission. Member Avanzino recommended using NextDoor to engage the community. Mr. Hudson recommended the Task Force agree on the language and strategies to outreach to the community so that Mr. Stefanski could get this cleared from the City Council and the City Attorney. Mr. Stefanski shared that he would work to push more information out on the meetings of the Task Force.

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

The Task Force reviewed the Proposed Agenda Planning Calendar, noting that the month of May will be utilized primarily for the work of the Ad Hoc Committees.

Member Brown left the meeting at 6:37 PM.

#### **5. Other Business**

Mr. Stefanski shared with the Task Force about the Volunteer Recognition Event on Wednesday, April 28 from 6-8 PM.

Mr. Stefanski shared information from Member Foster about an event at Las Positas Community College District.

**6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:01PM.



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

### **SPECIAL MEETING – April 29, 2021**

A special meeting of the Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity & Inclusion was held on April 29th, 2021, via Zoom telecommunications. The meeting commenced at 5:37 PM.

#### **Roll Call**

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

**ABSENT:** Eman Tai, Dyrell Foster

#### **1. Call to Order**

Assistant to the City Manager John Stefanski called the meeting to order at 5:37 PM.

#### **2. Public Comment**

Mr. Stefanski called for Public Comments. No comments were made.

#### **3. Reports**

##### **3.1 Reviewing of Policing Recommendations**

Mr. Stefanski began a review of the Task Force's policing recommendations including providing an overview of the City identified areas of concern and recommended changes to address the concerns. A copy of the Recommendations, Concerns, and Recommended Changes to Address Concerns is attached to these minutes.

Mr. Stefanski began a review of the Task Force's Policies and Procedures recommendations, with clarifying commentary and counsel from Assistant City Attorney Jordyn Bishop.

For recommendation #1 on the Dublin City Council establishing a permanent commission to review law enforcement and community safety in Dublin, Ms. Bishop clarified that Dublin is a general law city, and as such, has limitations in the creation of a policing commission as defined by state law. Any commission created would be only in an advisory capacity to the City Council and could not exert any "control" over Dublin Police Services.

Mr. Stefanski reviewed recommendation #2 on the City Manager hiring a consultant to enhance collaboration amongst the Dublin community, City Council, city staff, and Dublin Police Services, and shared adjusted language to be inclusive of Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) staff.

For recommendation #3 regarding data collection and transparency on non-violent police interactions from DPS, Ms. Bishop stated that the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA) already requires that state law enforcement agencies collect and report this data. Mr. Stefanski shared that DPS would not have the ability to track the amount of time they spend on responding to noncriminal activity vs. minor and violent crime.

Mr. Stefanski moved onto recommendation #4 on the enhancing of de-escalation data collection and reporting, and shared adjusted language. De-escalation data is not readily available and quantifiable for the purposes of analysis and publication, which would complicate the City's ability to complete this recommendation. Furthermore, the City would not have the authority to set goals regarding de-escalation under the current ACSO contract.

In reviewing recommendation #5 on requiring DPS to provide comprehensive reporting on incidents involving Use of Force, Ms. Bishop clarified that AB 71 and SB 1421 are laws which have already established data collection and reporting requirements for law enforcement agencies. Mr. Stefanski added that some of the suggestions within recommendation #5 are already covered by AB 71 and SB 1421.

Member Kohli asked a clarifying question on reviewing the Task Force's recommendations with legal counsel. Mr. Stefanski stated that it was important to examine recommendations with the City Attorney before presenting them to Dublin City Council. Member Kohli asked if there will be another opportunity to review the recommendations and edits. Mr. Stefanski said that recommendations can be further discussed in the ad-hoc groups. Alternate Member Jacobs posed a question on creating a community advocacy body. Ms. Bishop clarified the legality of creating advisory bodies.

Member Brown asked how the recommendation could be modified to include information on publicizing data for Dublin specifically. Mr. Stefanski clarified that the data would be able to be published through the City's data platform. Member Tripplett made a comment on the City's comments and recommended changes to the recommendations. Mr. Stefanski clarified that there are limitations to what Dublin can and cannot do due to the City's contract with ACSO, as well as the limitations of being a general law city. Member Aini commented and clarified on the de-escalation target portion of recommendation #5.

Mr. Stefanski and Ms. Bishop continued to Staff, Management and Accountability recommendations. On recommendation #6 regarding criteria to guide the Chief of DPS when hiring law enforcement personnel, Ms. Bishop stated that AB 846 provides some regulatory language and context on minimum standards in hiring evaluation processes.

Mr. Stefanski reviewed recommendations #7-13, which discussed police procedures, communications, public engagement, and community relations, and provided any adjusted language.

Regarding recommendation #14 on releasing to the public civilian complains against DPS, Ms. Bishop clarified that some complaint data is collected and sent over the Department of Justice, which is published annually. Ms. Bishop noted, however, there is some employee information that is considered confidential within their personnel file. Alternate Member Jacobs asked if there is anything that could made public in the file.

Ms. Bishop explained the process of requesting access of a personnel file through filing a Pitchess motion. Mr. Stefanski commented on how to release general, unidentifiable information on complaints.

Member Kohli posed a clarifying question for recommendation #10 on the City hosting annual DPS study session, and if the City can ask ACSO to attend. Mr. Stefanski stated that the City could ask ACSO to attend or participate in the study session.

Mr. Stefanski reviewed the last set of recommendations on Training, Mental Health and Budget. Mr. Stefanski spoke on the minor changes to recommendations #15 and #16, and shared adjusted language. Regarding recommendations #17 and #18 on training and curriculum topics for DPS, Mr. Stefanski requested that the ad-hoc provide clarifying language, particularly around the frequency and modes of training. In reviewing recommendation #19 regarding forming a working group to determine training topics, Member Jacobs commented on considering a community commission in the conversations.

Member Tripplett commented on the composition of recommendation #18. Member Ballesteros-Kogan asked about how to present recommendations at county level. Mr. Stefanski described the process and available options of presenting recommendation to county. Member Kohli commented on the inclusion of curriculum topics in the recommendation. Mr. Stefanski specified that the frequency of the trainings in the recommendation should be reevaluated by the ad-hoc groups.

At the conclusion of the policing recommendations review, recommendations #1, #6, #17, and #18 were identified to be revisited, modified, or edited by the respective ad-hoc groups. The remaining recommendations would be incorporated into the draft final report.

### **3.2 City-wide DEI Initiative Discussion, Questions, and Data Requests**

Mr. Hudson introduced a discussion on city-wide DEI initiatives. Member Kohli asked a clarifying question on city commission demographics. Mr. Stefanski referred Member Kohli back to the presentation on City Boards and Commissions. Member David asked where to find racial demographics of Dublin voters. Mr. Stefanski shared that the Alameda County Registrar of Voters would maintain information tied to voter registration and requested languages for ballots. Member David asked about city officials making communications with inmates at the women's prison in Dublin. Mr. Stefanski discussed the City's engagement with FCI Dublin pre-COVID. Member Tripplett presented an idea about establishing a DEI liaison within DPS and the City. Mr. Stefanski shared that the City had recently established a similar role for LGBTQ+ members of the community.

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

Mr. Stefanski reviewed the agenda calendar. Alternate Member Jacobs asked about how the Task Force will preset final Task Force recommendations. Mr. Stefanski responded that he will find out more information on the official presentation. Mr. Hudson provided advice, counsel, and framing for the Task Force as they work through revising policing recommendations and drafting DEI recommendations. Member Tripplett commented on potential implementation strategies for the DEI proposals and

recommendations. Mr. Stefanski clarified that final Task Force recommendations will go to the City sometime in July or August.

#### **4. Other Business**

Mr. Stefanski noted that he would be out of the office next week but would provide support to the ad-hoc groups as they scheduled their meetings.

#### **5. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 PM.

#	Recommendation	Concerns	Recommended Changes to Address Concerns
<b>Policies and Procedures Ad Hoc Work Group Recommendations</b>			
1	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: the City Council establish a permanent Commission for ongoing review and attention to law enforcement and community safety in Dublin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This Commission would be selected by the City Council using a similar process to the selection of this Task Force and recommendations will be made to the City Council.</li> <li>b) The Commission will not be overseen by or have members chosen by Dublin Police Services, the Alameda County Sheriff's Office, or Dublin city staff.</li> <li>c) The Commission would support the City in taking action and ongoing oversight and implementation of approved recommendations of this Taskforce, as well as play an ongoing role to enhance police-community relations in Dublin.</li> <li>d) The Commission may also consider adopting a harm reduction and/or procedural justice framework for policing. The Taskforce recommends the use of this framework to focus on community experiences with police, not just the final outcomes.</li> <li>e) The Taskforce recommends that the Commission utilize DPS and other data to set benchmarks in reducing traffic stops, minor crimes and traffic violations, and other minor infractions.</li> <li>f) The Commission is in addition to the Civilian Oversight body being considered at the county level.</li> </ul>	<p>California state law creates some limitations on the authority of a policy commission.</p> <p>Control over most aspects of the administration of the City and its employees is assigned to the City Manager. This includes the Chief of police who, under state law, has expressly assigned control over the police department. The City Council does not have the ability to create a commission that exerts "control" over the police department, as such a body would conflict with State Law. "Control" includes any actions related to discipline, or requiring the implementing of policies, procedures, or practices.</p> <p>Under the ACSO contract, the Sheriff has supervision and control over the standards of performance.</p> <p><i>As such recommendation parts 1c, 1d, 1e, should be reviewed with this legal framework in mind. A commission created by the City Council would be advisory because it could not exercise control over the police department (e.g., commission could not mandate that ACSO implement the commission's recommendations, policies, or benchmarks.)</i></p> <p>The Civilian Oversight Body being considered at the County level would be the appropriate body to address the parts 1d and 1e above. Recommending the advocacy for a Dublin specific seat on that body would ensure Dublin related issues are brought to the forefront to a body with the more authority to investigate and make recommendations for changes requested by the Task Force.</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that the City advocate for the creation of a Sheriff Oversight Board and Inspector General and that the City advocate for permanent seat on the Board.</p> <p>The Task Force recommends that the City advocate for the Sheriff Oversight Board and Inspector General position study harm reduction and procedural justice framework for policing and develop recommendations for the implementation of best practices identified from said study.</p>

2	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: the City Manager hire a consultant to provide capacity and expertise in supporting enhanced collaboration between the Dublin community, Dublin City Council, Dublin city staff, and Dublin Police Services. This consultant should bring expertise in law enforcement-community relations and serve as an outside support to the city.</p>	<p>Police Services are performed under contract with the Alameda County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff has supervision and control over the employees providing services including items like standards of performance, training, and discipline. Any changes to the policies under which the Sheriff's department operates would require further discussions with the Sheriff and potentially contract amendments.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 is implementable; however, this work would have to be done in cooperation with the Alameda County Sheriff's Office.</p>	<p>The Task Force Recommends that the City Manager hire a consultant to provide capacity and expertise in supporting enhanced collaboration between the Dublin Community, Dublin City Council, Staff, Dublin Police Services, and the Alameda County Sheriff's Office. This Consultant should bring expertise in law enforcement-community relations and serve as additional support to the City.</p>
3	<p>The Task Force recommends that: data be collected in the following categories to help establish benchmarks in reducing nonviolent police interactions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Number of consent vs. Probable Cause searches</li> <li>b) The amount of time DPS spends on responding to noncriminal activity vs. minor crime activity vs. violent crime.</li> <li>c) Pre-stop perception of race of subject prior to them being charged with minor crime with misdemeanor.</li> <li>d) Police officer's pre-stop perception of the race of individuals they stop.</li> <li>e) Police officer's basis for reasonable suspicion leading to a stop.</li> </ol>	<p>The Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA) requires that, among other things, each California Law enforcement agency collect and annually report their stop data to the Attorney General.</p> <p>ACSO began collecting RIPA-required stop data on 1/1/2021. <u>The State RIPA Board will publish all Stop Data information annually.</u> ACSO data will be available in 2022.</p> <p>RIPA requires that stop data collected include perceived race/ethnicity of a person stopped, as well as the primary basis for the stop, including reasonable suspicion. RIPA also requires that the Basis for a Search be reported including whether consent was given or if there was probable cause. The officer must also provide a brief explanation regarding the basis for the search and must provide additional detail.</p> <p><i>Given these RIPA data collection requirements, items 3a, 3c, 3d, and 3e are generally duplicative with state law.</i></p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that all RIPA required stop data be published on the City's Data Transparency Platform on an annual basis. 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>ACSO does not have the capacity to develop the data and analysis for item 3b. In the case of pre-stop perceptions of race, there would be no consistent way to collect and track such data due to the different circumstances surrounding how individuals are cited for a misdemeanor (I.e., Cite-Release) as well as other scenarios which would contribute to a lack of consistent, reliable data.</i></p>	
4	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: de-escalation data collection and reporting is enhanced to increase de-escalation efforts. Furthermore, this de-escalation data should be made transparent and be shared via annual reporting. The Taskforce suggests a goal of 20% increase of de-escalation by end of 2023. For officers who effectively de-escalate, the Taskforce also recommends that they be recognized for their efforts.</p>	<p>De-escalation data is not readily available and quantifiable for the purposes of analysis and publication.</p> <p>As stated earlier, the Sheriff has supervision over the standard of performance of DPS. The City does not have the authority to set those goals, under the current contract.</p>	<p>The Taskforce recommends that the City and ACSO explore ways to collect and report data regarding de-escalation.</p>
5	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: the City Manager request DPS to provide comprehensive reporting for incidents involving Use of Force. Information in this report should include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The type of force.</li> <li>b) The types and degree of injury to suspect and officer.</li> <li>c) Date and time.</li> <li>d) Location of the incident.</li> <li>e) Officer's assignment.</li> <li>f) Number of officers using force in the incident.</li> <li>g) Officer's activity when force was used (ex. Handcuffing, search warrant, pursuit) Subject's activity allegedly requiring the officer to use force.</li> <li>h) Officer's demographics (age, gender, race/ethnicity, rank, number of years with [Insert Jurisdiction], number of years as a police officer).</li> </ol>	<p>AB 71 and SB 1421 established standards for Use of Force Data and Reporting requirements. Under AB 71, California Law Enforcement agencies are required to collect and annually report data on specified use of force incidents. For each incident reported, the information reported to the California Department of Justice shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The gender, race, and age of each individual who was shot, injured, or killed.</li> <li>• The date, time, and location of the incident.</li> <li>• Whether the civilian was armed, and, if so, the type of weapon.</li> <li>• The type of force used against the officer, the civilian, or both, including the types of weapons used.</li> <li>• The number of officers involved in the incident.</li> </ul>	<p>The Task Force recommends that in instances where there is a DPS officer involved shooting or use of force resulting in great bodily injury or death, DPS will make the AB71 and SB1421 data publicly available on the City's Data Transparency Platform.</p>

	<p>i) Subject demographics including race/ethnicity, age, gender, gender identity, primary. Language and other factors such as mental illness, cognitive impairment, developmental disability, drug and alcohol use/addiction and homeless.</p> <p>j) Outcome of any investigation regarding the use of force including any disciplinary actions that were taken as a result.</p> <p>k) De-escalation reduction targets.</p> <p>l) Recommendations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of civilians involved in the incident.</li> <li>• A brief description regarding the circumstances surrounding the incident, which may include the nature of injuries to officers and civilians and perceptions on behavior or mental disorders.</li> </ul> <p><i>Given these AB 71 reporting requirements in existing law, portions of item 5 are duplicative.</i></p> <p>Under SB 1421, records relating to the report, investigation, or findings for incidents involving either the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer, or the use of force resulting in death or great bodily injury, are subject to disclosure in response to a CPRA request.</p> <p>All other reports regarding use of force incidents, including investigation and disciplinary records, are confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under state law.</p> <p><i>For 5k, see recommendations 1 &amp; 4 above.</i></p>	
--	---	---	--

**Staff, Management, and Accountability Ad Hoc Work Group Recommendations**

6	<p>The Task Force recommends that: in addition to current hiring criteria utilized by the Chief of DPS, the City Manager, in consultation with the City Council, direct the Chief to include the following selection criteria to guide the Chief of DPS when it comes to hiring law enforcement personnel for DPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Residents of Dublin</li> <li>b) Race/gender/ethnicity/sexual orientation representation to reflect the City of Dublin and individuals DPS engages with on a daily basis.</li> <li>c) Community policing engagement experience</li> </ul>	See #7 below	See #7 below
---	---	--------------	--------------

	d) Experience working in diverse communities and/or on diverse teams.		
7	<p>The Task Force recommends that: the City Manager meet with the Chief of DPS annually to review the hiring criteria and DPS demographic data.</p>	<p>Under the current contract, the Sheriff provides personnel and police services in Dublin and the City pays for those services based on actual costs. Under the terms of the agreement, the Sheriff has supervision and control over the employees providing services, including items like standards of performance, training, and discipline. Any changes to the policies under which the Sheriff's department operates would require further discussions with the Sheriff, and potentially contract amendments.</p> <p>State Law expressly assigns control over the police department to the Police Chief (GC 38630). The Sheriff has supervision and control over the employees providing services. Any changes would require further discussions with the Sheriff and potentially contract amendments.</p> <p>Under existing law, peace officers are required to meet certain minimum standards during the hiring evaluation process, including a finding that the applicant is free from any physical, emotional, or mental condition that might adversely affect their duties.</p> <p>AB 846 broadens the minimum standards to specific that a disqualifying condition includes implicit and explicit biases. AB 846 requires that when a law enforcement agency evaluates potential peace officers for hiring, the evaluation must find that the applicant is free from any bias against race or ethnicity, gender, nationality, religion, disability, or sexual orientation that might adversely affect the exercise of the powers of a peace officer. POST must update its screening regulations and</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends the City publish the demographic data of DPS officers on an annual basis on the City's Data Transparency Portal.</p>

		<p>materials to incorporate this new standard by January 1, 2022.</p> <p>AB 846 specifies that law enforcement agencies must review all peace officer job descriptions and make changes that emphasize community-based policing, familiarization between law enforcement and community residents, and collaborative problem solving, while de-emphasizing the paramilitary aspects of the job.</p>	
8	The Taskforce recommends that: the City Manager annually report to the City Council hiring criteria and demographic data.	See #7.	See #7.
9	The Task Force recommends that: DPS issue a press release within 72 hours after every incident involving use of lethal force by DPS.	None	The Task Force recommends that the City enact an administrative policy which states that the City will issue a press release within 72 hours after every incident involving use of lethal force by DPS.
10	<p>The Task Force recommends that: the City Manager in consultation with the City Council engage an independent third-party to convene an annual DPS Study Session for Dublin residents (to include, but not limited to workshops, breakout groups, open comment, etc.). The DPS Study Session to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Report on “best practices” regarding community policing, police disciplinary policies/procedures, law enforcement hiring/recruitment/retention, bias, and other topics that are of interest to all stakeholders involved.</li> <li>b) Issuance of a public report to include findings, recommendations and actions from the DPS Study Session.</li> <li>c) The Task Force recommends that: the City Council direct DPS to provide a public response to Study Session Report findings, recommendations and actions, with such response to include potential revisions and new policies and procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>This kind of public report would be best completed by the Sheriff’s Office Inspector General which is anticipated to be created by the Board of Supervisors. This position will have the resources and the ability to set recommendation and follow up actions for ACSO.</p> <p>Under the City’s current contract, the Sheriff has supervision and control over the employees providing services, including items like standards of performance. Changes to ACSO policies would require further discussions with the Sheriff and potentially contract amendments.</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that the City advocate for the creation of a Sheriff’s Office Inspector General and Sheriff’s Office Oversight Board and that said newly created bodies conduct a public study session to discuss policing best practices and develop a public report which includes findings, recommendations, and actions for the Sheriff’s Office.</p> <p>In addition, the Task Force recommends that the City host a facilitated, community educational workshop on 21<sup>st</sup> century policing and community relations best practices. The workshop will include guided community conversations for those in attendance.</p>

11	The Task Force recommends that: the City Council direct the City Manager in consultation with DPS to develop an online platform to enable civilians to file DPS complaints and commendations through an online form (e.g., ACSO's website/mobile app) and by voicemail to make complaints and commendations easier and safer to report.	ACSO will evaluate the options for this. The quickest way to implement this recommendation would be through an email address. Form functionality on their website and the use of a voice mail option will require further discussion with ACSO.	The Task Force recommends that the City work with ACSO to develop additional methods for residents to file DPS complaints and commendations either through electronic means or voicemail (internal affairs email address).
12	The Taskforce recommends that: non-private DPS complaints and commendations data be available on city websites.	<p>Commendation Data can be uploaded to the City's Data Transparency Portal. ACSO currently reports aggregate complaint data to CalDOJ.</p> <p>The Data is <b>published</b> annually, which could be shared on the City's Data Transparency Portal. Data Categories for these reports are detailed <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>The ability of ACSO to bifurcate complaints tied to DPS will require further conversation with ACSO.</p>	The Task Force recommends that the City work with ACSO to publish information regarding DPS complaints and commendations data on the City's Data Transparency Portal.
13	The Taskforce recommends that: the City Manager request DPS to provide a card with information about how to make a complaint, along with the officer's name and badge number, to all people who they stop.	None.	The Task Force recommends the City develop cards for DPS to provide with information on how to make a complaint or commendation.
14	<p>The Task Force recommends that: the City Manager request DPS to compile and make available to the public on a quarterly basis non-private,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) statistics of all complaints and commendations filed with DPS broken down by race, gender, age, time of day, location, and related data,</li> <li>b) statistics of types of disciplinary actions taken by DPS and for what actions, and</li> <li>c) statistics on how or if complaints were resolved.</li> </ul>	<p>State law requires collection and reporting of specified Civilians' Complaint Against Peace Officers (CCAPO) data to DOJ, which is published annually.</p> <p>Under state law, commendations and complaints (including disciplinary and resolution information) are considered part of an employee's confidential personnel file.</p> <p>Under Penal Code section 832.7, police officer personnel records, including "information obtained from the records" are confidential (unless it falls within a SB 1421 category requiring disclosure under CPRA).</p>	See #12.

15	<p>The Task Force recommends that: the City of Dublin develop and implement a multidisciplinary mobile crisis team for nonviolent situations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The team would consist of a licensed behavioral health provider, an Emergency Medical Technician, and a Social Worker.</li> <li>b) The team would be dispatched through 911 calls and would attend to non-violent situations such as: individuals undergoing mental health crisis who do not pose a threat to others, non-criminal homeless activity, community dispute resolutions, youth intervention, and welfare checks.</li> <li>c) This team would begin by operating Monday through Sunday 11am to 9pm. The hours could expand as deemed necessary and as funding allows.</li> <li>d) The purpose of the mobile crisis would be to assess the situation, provide brief supportive interventions, help stabilize crisis matters and assist in connecting individuals to services as well as resources.</li> <li>e) Additionally, the mobile crisis team would be available to provide scenario-based training and consultation to law enforcement, first responders, schools, community providers, families and other community members.</li> </ul>	<p>The City requests flexibility regarding the “development and implementation” language to read as “implementation.” The City may elect to partner with existing programs available in the County rather than develop a program internally.</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that the City <i>implement</i> a multidisciplinary mobile crisis team for non-violent situations...</p>
16	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: the City of Dublin, in collaboration with DPS. develop and 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. Components of the collaborative response would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Co-responder team would either be first on the scene as dispatched through 911 or be called in by other first responders after initial assessments indicates a necessity of</li> </ul>	<p>The City requests flexibility regarding the “development and implementation” language to read as “implementation.” The City may elect to partner with existing programs available in the County rather than develop a program internally.</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that the City, in collaboration with ACSO, <i>implement</i> co-responder teams consisting of....</p>

	<p>mental health services where there is a threat to safety.</p> <p>b) Co-responder team would provide immediate help to individuals experiencing a severe mental health crisis, deescalate intense situations, provide accurate on-the-scene mental health assessments, if necessary, include family and/or friends in crucial information gathering process, connect individuals to resources, and assist with transportation to care facilities for services needed in 5150 cases.</p> <p>c) Co-responder team should drive an unmarked police car and wear civilian clothing to intentionally and proactively diffuse tense situations.</p>		
17	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: Dublin Police Services amend the Critical Decision-Making Model (CDM) to require self-evaluation and procedural justice during police response, including the assessment of the proportionalism, accountability, necessity, and ethics of police actions. Prompts pertaining to proportionalism can be added for further consideration in the CDM.</p>	<p>Under the City’s current contract, the Sheriff has supervision and control over the employees providing services, including items like standards of performance.</p> <p>Changes to ACSO policies would require further discussions with the Sheriff and potentially contract amendments.</p>	
18	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: Dublin Police Services’ mandatory CPT training for all officers include the following topics, with an emphasis on scenario based, situational decision-making training, specific to the demographics and populations within the City of Dublin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Implicit Bias</li> <li>b) Understanding languages and cultural responsiveness</li> <li>c) Understanding people with disabilities</li> <li>d) Community policing</li> <li>e) Use of Force/De-escalation</li> <li>f) Leadership, professionalism, ethics</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed in the DPS Training Memo, DPS already provides Use of Force/De-escalation training at least three times a year during firearms trainings and daily briefings. DPS Officers already attend a four (4) hour in-person training course on Implicit Bias and Racial Profiling.</p> <p>DPS officers attend training that covers items 18a-f every two years.</p> <p>The City requests clarification on the prioritization of the trainings and to make sure that the amount of training is reasonable in terms of overall hours.</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that DPS identify ways to expand the training offerings in 18a-f either through muster room briefings, independent study/self-paced trainings, or additional training days.</p>
19	<p>The Taskforce recommends that: the above topics shall be in addition to the mandatory 24 hours of</p>	<p>There are impracticalities with the recommendation. Dublin does not have local</p>	<p>The Task Force recommends that DPS identify a staff member to serve as a liaison with advocacy</p>

	<p>CPT for every DPS officer every two years. The Task Force encourages DPS to develop a work group that would include a representative(s) from Las Positas College and advocacy groups, including the local chapters of the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the American Civil Liberties Union to determine the number of hours and the content of training for each topic.</p>	<p>chapters for all of these entities and it remains unclear as to whether they would be able to dedicate resources to DPS for this purpose.</p> <p>Any identified or developed trainings and content would need to be certified by CA POST to ensure consistency with the other training DPS officers receive.</p>	<p>groups, including but not limited to Las Positas College, NAMI, NAACP, and ACLU. Identified liaison would reach out to the nearest chapter of these groups annually to see if they have any items they wish to share or discuss. Based on conversations with those groups, that information will be shared with DPS staff through daily muster trainings.</p>
--	---	---	--

**Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion**  
**Draft Recommendations**  
**May 27, 2021**

## Boards and Commission Recruitment

1. Recommends that City Council and City Staff actively engage with local nonprofit organizations, faith-based organizations, DUSD, to announce/apprise citizens of upcoming vacancies on boards, commissions, task forces, and other city committees.
2. Recommends that City Council encourages 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.
3. Recommend that City Council instruct City Staff to ensure that all upcoming vacancies are posted with sufficient notice to apply on the new monthly newsletter, "Backyard Brief" as well as all other City publications.
4. Recommends that City Council instructs City Staff to request demographic information on all applications (e.g., race, gender, income level, etc.)
5. Recommends that City Council instruct City Staff to add a DEI focused weighted scoring system to evaluating all applications (e.g., demographics, underserved communities, etc.)
6. Recommends that City Council expand all commissions to no less than seven members to allow for more opportunities for residents to serve on commissions.
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 past Dublin 101 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.
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. This could include taking the Dublin 101 course and similar training sessions. The certification would "fast track" these individuals through the application process and have them ready to serve as seats open up. The mentor program portion will be voluntary and enlist former/current commissioners and similar appointees to volunteer their time to educate and share experiences with Dublin residents interested serving. All sessions (classes, mentor meetings, etc.) should have a virtual option to attend to make

it more equitable to Dublin residents. The City should focus on recruiting both former applicants and residents from under-served and underrepresented communities within the City to participate in the program.

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. Commissioners will not be allowed to serve successive terms on the same Commission but will have the opportunity to reapply for non-successive terms. Commissioners will also have the opportunity to apply to be placed on another commission once their term ends. This allows for more equity by providing an opportunity for more citizens to be placed on commissions.

## Inclusive Equitable and Accessible Programming and Events

10. DEI Town Hall Meetings: The DEI Task Force recommends that the City of Dublin host monthly diverse Town Hall meetings, each meeting aimed at amplifying the voices and concerns of different diverse groups represented in the City of Dublin.
11. Data Collection: The DEI Task Force recommends that the City of Dublin collect the following data sets: disaggregated data on specific languages spoken at home, and disaggregated ancestry data on Asian Americans in Dublin.
12. Translated Info Bulletins/Paper Resources: The DEI Task Force 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 identified by the City. The Task Force recommends that these bulletin boxes be built as standalone outdoor structures with a lockable display case, maintained, and accessed solely by City staff. The City will assure that the bulletins are in the predominant languages spoken in the specific bulletin box locations.
13. Diversity/Multicultural Festival: The DEI Task Force 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.
14. Farmers Markets/Food Events: The DEI Task Force recommends that the City of Dublin promote restaurants and small businesses that are owned and operated by marginalized groups through new and existing local events.
15. Arts: The DEI Task Force 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. This includes but is not limited to: cultures, abilities,

gender diversity, mediums, styles, and artistic theory. City should collect data on the array of artist-diversity represented and include it in the annual report.

16. Programming: The DEI Task Force recommends that the City of Dublin proactively recruit instructors and intentionally seek class offerings that represent the diverse cultures and ethnicities in Dublin.
17. Programming: The DEI Task Force 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.
18. Library: The DEI Task Force 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 (language, culture, ability, and gender). The Dublin Public Library should highlight and promote a diverse selection of authors and speakers when possible.

## Community Agency Funding and Support

### Grant Process

#### **19. Data Collection & Continuous Improvement**

- a. Increase data collection.
  - i. Surveys after workshop and after decisions are made.
    1. Compare data to identify differences in experiences.
    2. Survey via a question on the application itself, a separate email or a short online survey.
    3. Sample questions:
      - a. Collect feedback about number of hours to go through application process and other ways to improve it, from applicants.
      - b. What did you think of the application process?
      - c. How many hours in total did it take you to complete this application?
      - d. How do you feel about the amount of data asked for in this grant application?
      - e. What is your opinion of assistance provided by CBF staff in completing the application?
      - f. Were the instructions and tips provided in the application helpful?
      - g. Was the grant application workshop for the grant round helpful?
      - h. How did you find out about the grant application?

- i. Please provide us with your suggestions about any improvements to the application process that you think we need to consider.
    - ii. Demographic information tracked at in each point in the process.
  - b. Identify pain points.
  - c. Explore root causes and pain points.
    - i. Survey /focus group with diverse group of potential and actual applicants
    - ii. Provide incentives and flexibility to participate to ensure diversity of perspectives.
  - d. Implement or pilot solutions and examine data.
  - e. Have feedback provided to applicants to improve their application for the next funding cycle.

## **20. Recommended edits to the Grant Application**

- a. Ask about demographics of organization’s beneficiaries, board members, and staff members Applicant? Head of org? Who do they serve? Whole staff demographics?
- b. Ask about DEI lens and training.
- c. #7 Add a request for staff demographics, and number of staff within each job levels (Entry-level, Intermediate, Mid-level, Senior or executive level).
- d. #8 Remove word limit.
- e. #10 Reason why a request for a new Eastern County assessment is needed (old)
- f. # 18 include How is your agency working to ensure hard to reach clients are aware of your services?
- g. “The organization charges a fee and/or produces other income that may be used to support this program” -- There should be a consideration to waive the requirement if the program helps an underserved group in Dublin.

## **21. Recommended edits to the Rubric**

- a. Request to conduct a new Eastern Alameda County broad-based needs assessment of human services. Last assessment was conducted in 2011 and the demographics of the city have changed with the increase of growth within the city.
- b. Add a DEI category and award points for that section. This section should be weighted equally (which requires new DEI questions on application & rubric) Is DEI reflected in their mission? Is the staff diverse? Do they serve diverse set of people within the community, or a part of the community with the most need?
- c. Ask targeted DEI questions in the application.
  - i. For applicant organizations which have staff with limited English proficiency, consider providing language and cultural translation technical assistance with their grant applications. Also consider having at least one grant reviewer who is familiar with that culture / language.
  - ii. Give smaller organizations additional time to submit their applications (e.g., two additional weeks.)

- iii. Offer to review drafts of grant applications from smaller organizations to provide feedback before the submission deadline).
- iv. Ask about demographics of organization’s beneficiaries, board members, and staff members.
- v. Ask about cultural competency of staff, where appropriate.

**22. Recommended edits to the Grant Process**

- a. Establish clear priorities for this grant.
- b. Apply a DEI lens to each component of the process.
- c. Example ways to make process more equitable and inclusive:  
<https://www.ncfp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Incorporating-Diversity-Equity-and-Inclusion-in-your-Grantmaking-Process-A-Checklist-of-Potential-Actions-Arabella-Advisors-2016-a-checklist-of-potential-actions-incorporating-dei-into-your-grantmaking-process-arabella-advisors-1.pdf>
- d. Add: For applicant organizations which have staff with limited English proficiency, consider providing language and cultural translation technical assistance with their grant applications. Also consider having at least one grant reviewer who is familiar with that culture / language.
- e. Give smaller organizations additional time to submit their applications (e.g., two additional
- f. Offer to review drafts of grant applications from smaller organizations to provide feedback before the submission date weeks).

Communications

**23. Establish regular touchpoints with diverse cultural and community leaders and local organizations.**

- a. Frequency
- b. The city goes to them or they can come to the city.
- c. Listening and discussion

**24. Establish additional channels for two-way communication with all city residents.**

- a. Partnering with other organizations and community leaders
- b. Collecting information when people RSVP/register
- c. Ask demographic information.
- d. Ask addresses- Is there a way to understand what parts of Dublin? (East/West Dougherty)

**25. Social Media**

- a. Engage the Dublin community to revise the currently adopted calendar.
  - i. Taskforce recommendations:
    - 1. Lunar New Year- change wording from “Chinese”.
    - 2. Remove Cinco De Mayo, and/or use the opportunity to inform about its true history and discourage stereotyping.

3. Add Cesar Chavez Day March 31
4. Explore adding another holiday that is meaningful to Dublin Latino/a community, e.g. Latin American Independence March 15
5. Establish further criteria for posting/approving with a DEI lens, accompanied by DEI training for the social media decision-makers.

## Other

### **26. Provide ongoing DEI training for all city staff.**

- a. Provide specific to role training, e.g. Social Media Manager.

### **27. Develop a Dublin City DEI process and decision-making checklist to provide:**

- a. Example event planning checklist:  
[https://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/files/Dean\\_DEI%20Checklist\\_FY21.pdf](https://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/files/Dean_DEI%20Checklist_FY21.pdf)
- b. Send post-event surveys that ask about inclusion and accessibility at the event.  
Post-event survey sample questions:
  - i. The event included a diversity of thought.
  - ii. The event speakers/moderators were representative and diverse.
  - iii. When applicable: The event expanded my capacity to think about diversity, equity, and inclusion-related topics.
  - iv. When applicable: My accessibility needs were met during the event.

## **Community Task Force on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Outstanding Draft Policing Recommendations**

1. The Task Force recommends the creation of a city advisory commission for police reform. The commission would support the city in monitoring the implementation of approved recommendations of this Task Force, as well as play an ongoing role to enhance police-community relations in Dublin.

The task force recommends the City of Dublin recommend to DPS and ACSO to adopt a harm reduction and procedural justice framework for policing to focus on improving community experience with police, not just the final outcomes.

The Task Force recommends that the City advocate for the creation of a Sheriff Oversight Board and Inspector General and that the City advocate for a permanent seat on the Board.

Additionally, the task force recommends the creation of a liaison committee between the Dublin city council and the future Alameda County Sheriff Oversight Board.

The Task Force recommends that the City advocate for the Sheriff Oversight Board and Inspector General position study harm reduction and procedural justice framework for policing and develop recommendations for the implementation of best practices identified from said study.

### [Sample Bylaws and Procedures for Advisory Commission](#)

2. The Task Force Recommends that the City Manager hire a consultant to provide capacity and expertise in supporting enhanced collaboration between the Dublin Community, Dublin City Council, Staff, Dublin Police Services, and the Alameda County Sheriff's Office. This Consultant should bring expertise in law enforcement-community relations and serve as additional support to the City.

6. The Task Force recommends that: in addition to current hiring criteria utilized by the Chief of DPS, **the City Council instructs the City Manager to recommend to the Chief to consider** the following selection criteria to guide the Chief of DPS when it comes to hiring law enforcement personnel for DPS: a) Residents of Dublin b) Race/gender/ethnicity/sexual orientation representation to reflect the City of Dublin and individuals DPS engages with on a daily basis. c) Community policing engagement experience d) Experience working in diverse communities and/or on diverse teams. (CHANGE IN BOLD)



## 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)
May 27, 2021	Discuss preliminary citywide recommendations.
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 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*