



Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

6:30 PM

City Council Chambers

In accordance with [Minnesota Statutes §13D.02](#) and City policy, Council and Commission members may attend meetings remotely up to three times per calendar year.

(Times listed are approximate – please note that items may be earlier or later than listed on the agenda)

1. Roll Call

6:02 p.m. **2. Approve Agenda**

3. Receive Public Comment

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. Review and approve March meeting minutes

5. Business Items

a. Commissioner onboarding guide

6. Commission Direction on Member Initiated Agenda Items

a. EIC Response Template to Community Inquiries

b. EIC Commission Next steps

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn

1 **Equity and Inclusion Commission**
2 **Meeting Minutes**
3 **DRAFT – March 18, 2026 - DRAFT**
4

5
6 **Commissioners Present:** Amanda LaGrange, Gabrielle Filip-Crawford, Nicole Singaram,
7 Paul Stanley, Chris Taylor, Narayan Dhakal, and Prajwal
8 Vemireddy
9

10 **Youth Commissioners:** Gwen Goedken, Sophia Salinas-Ruiz
11

12 **Commissioners Absent:** None
13

14 **Staff Present:** Equity and Inclusion Manager Antonio Montez
15

16 **Call to Order/Roll Call**
17

18 The Equity and Inclusion Commission (EIC) meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.
19

20 **Approve Agenda**
21

22 Chair Vemireddy requested Item a. (EIC Response to Community Support Needs Resulting from
23 Federal Immigration Enforcement) under the Commission Direction on Member-Initiated
24 Agenda Items be moved up to after the Staff Update, and he also wanted it renamed in the future
25 to something like “EIC Response Strategy.”
26

27 Commissioner Filip-Crawford moved, and Commissioner LaGrange seconded a motion to
28 approve the March 18, 2026, Equity and Inclusion Commission agenda as presented. Motion
29 passed unanimously.
30

31 **Receive Public Comment**
32

33 None.
34

35 **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
36

37 **a. Approve Minutes**
38

39 Commissioner LaGrange moved, and Commissioner Goedken seconded a motion to approve the
40 February 18, 2026, Equity and Inclusion Commission meeting minutes as presented. Motion
41 passed unanimously.
42

43 The commission went through an icebreaker activity before moving on to regular business items.
44

45 **Business Items**
46

47 **a. Commissioner Swearing In**

48
49 Mr. Marayan Dhakal provided his background and the reason why he applied to be on the EIC.

50
51 Mr. Montez performed the Oath of Office on new Commissioner Narayan Dhakal.

52
53 **b. Staff Update on City’s Response to Federal Immigration Enforcement**

54
55 Equity and Inclusion Manager Montez explained that the city is working to keep its strategic
56 plan visible and actively integrated into daily operations. He noted that the “values wheel,”
57 developed through the strategic planning process, is being incorporated into presentations and
58 decision-making to keep priorities front and center. He also provided updates related to the city’s
59 response to federal immigration enforcement efforts tied to Operation Metro Surge. He shared
60 that the City Council unanimously approved joining the Cities for Safe and Stable Communities
61 coalition.

62
63 Mr. Montez observed that the coalition is still developing and will continue to grow in real time.
64 Participating cities plan to work together, communicate regularly, and use their collective voice
65 to influence outcomes related to Operation Metro Surge and broader community support efforts.
66 He stressed that although there is no definitive plan yet, the partnership is likely to strengthen
67 cities’ ability to support residents and pursue shared initiatives in the upcoming months and
68 years.

69
70 Chair Vemireddy asked for clarification on what is meant by “city agencies,” specifically
71 whether the collaboration involves city managers communicating with each other or if it includes
72 specific departments within the cities.

73
74 Mr. Montez confirmed that city managers are in regular contact as part of the coalition’s work,
75 and that some elected officials are also involved. He noted that the effort is still developing and
76 that specific results are not yet clear, but emphasized the importance of collaboration and
77 “strength in numbers.” He added that he would follow up on any questions he couldn’t answer
78 immediately.

79
80 Commissioner Dhakal inquired about Operation Metro Surge.

81
82 Mr. Montez explained that over the past few months, the federal government has deployed
83 around 3,000 agents to the Twin Cities area, including Minneapolis and St. Paul, to enforce
84 immigration policies as part of Operation Metro Surge.

85
86 Mr. Montez explained that federal agents were conducting immigration enforcement under the
87 guidance of the Department of Homeland Security and ICE, which resulted in many arrests of
88 community members and, in his view, caused significant harm. He said that the situation
89 escalated to violence, noting that two individuals were killed during these enforcement efforts in
90 the Minneapolis area. This matches reports during Operation Metro Surge, where two people
91 were fatally shot by federal agents, heightening community concern and response.

92

93 Mr. Montez explained that, in response to the enforcement actions, the City of Roseville, along
94 with other agencies, worked to support community members in various ways. He expressed pride
95 in the local response, noting that many grassroots and hyper-local groups came together to stay
96 in close communication and provide support. He emphasized that the impacts on residents were
97 significant, with some individuals afraid to leave their homes. As a result, people were unable to
98 go to work, shop for groceries, or meet their basic daily needs due to fear of arrest.

99

100 Commissioner Dhakal said that the community feels a lot of fear, pointing out that this fear has a
101 serious and deeply harmful psychological impact.

102

103 Mr. Montez explained that, in response to community impacts from Operation Metro Surge, the
104 city's Economic Development Authority approved funding to provide emergency housing
105 assistance to affected Roseville residents. He noted that the total funding amount has not yet
106 been finalized, and staff are working to identify a qualified community partner to distribute the
107 funds, as the city lacks the internal capacity and must follow strict eligibility and distribution
108 requirements. He added that many organizations are currently managing similar efforts, making
109 it more challenging to identify a partner.

110

111 Mr. Montez mentioned that the funding details and partnership are expected to be finalized
112 within the next month, allowing the program to proceed quickly. He also highlighted that
113 outreach will focus on trusted community connections to ensure assistance reaches those most
114 affected, utilizing both existing city communication channels and a more community-based,
115 relationship-driven approach to build trust and deliver support effectively.

116

117 Commissioner LaGrange noted that although the current efforts focus on responding to
118 Operation Metro Surge, the overall goal is to develop a quick-response system through this
119 partnership. She highlighted that this framework could be used in the future to distribute
120 emergency funds in similar situations swiftly.

121

122 Mr. Montez said that the city will probably sign a multi-year contract with the chosen partner,
123 lasting around two to five years. He clarified that the agreement would include an initial funding
124 amount, with the option to add more funds later if necessary.

125

126 Commissioner LaGrange recognized that establishing the program is a substantial effort and
127 requires time, while also highlighting the urgency of residents' needs, such as rent obligations
128 that started months ago. She noted that the situation is difficult, but appreciated that a long-term
129 system is being developed to offer ongoing support.

130

131 Mr. Montez acknowledged that the city aimed to launch assistance sooner, but it was delayed by
132 regulatory requirements related to public funding. He noted that some community organizations
133 were able to respond more quickly because they had fewer funding restrictions and were already
134 supporting residents. He expressed optimism that once the city's system and partnerships are in
135 place, the infrastructure will allow for a faster, more effective response.

136

137 Commissioner Dhakal inquired whether any eligibility criteria have been established for
138 receiving the emergency housing support, specifically asking how “impacted persons” would be
139 defined and whether the city or another level of government has set those requirements.
140

141 Mr. Montez confirmed that eligibility criteria must be met to receive assistance, noting that
142 applicants will need to qualify. He explained that the city is still working out those details and
143 that a key challenge is finding a partner with the capacity and expertise to run the program. He
144 added that the chosen partner will distribute the funds on behalf of the city and ensure all
145 requirements and regulations related to the funding are properly followed.
146

147 Commissioner LaGrange asked whether the trusted messenger program discussed at the previous
148 meeting depends on the emergency housing initiative being finalized or is waiting for that effort
149 to start before moving forward.
150

151 Mr. Montez explained that he is purposely delaying the launch of the trusted messenger effort
152 until the program is completely prepared. He emphasized that people’s time is valuable and that
153 he wants to make sure that when community members are brought together, they have clear,
154 actionable information they can share right away.
155

156 Mr. Montez observed that although there is a strong community willingness to help, activating
157 the group before the program is ready would not be effective. His aim is for participants to leave
158 those meetings able to connect others to real resources immediately, rather than waiting for a
159 program that is not yet operational.
160

161 Commissioner LaGrange expressed optimism that implementing the trusted messenger approach
162 will offer valuable insights. She mentioned that it could enhance community engagement efforts
163 and support the city’s broader strategic plan moving forward.
164

165 Mr. Montez explained that his goal for the trusted messenger effort is to establish a two-way
166 relationship with community members. He highlighted that it shouldn't be just about sharing
167 information but also about creating open lines of communication where residents can reach out,
168 ask questions, and stay connected. He also mentioned that these conversations will help the city
169 identify gaps in outreach and find better ways to engage with the community moving forward.
170 He envisions bringing together a group of active residents to support immediate needs and offer
171 feedback on how the city can improve.
172

173 In conclusion, Mr. Montez reaffirmed the two main updates: joining the Safe and Stable Cities
174 coalition and establishing an emergency housing assistance program, expecting a community
175 partner to be secured within 30 to 45 days to aid both current and future initiatives.
176

177 **c. EIC Response to Community Support Needs Resulting from Federal Immigration**
178 **Enforcement**
179

180 Chair Vemireddy explained that both the City Council and the commission have been receiving
181 many emails from constituents about the city’s response to Operation Metro Surge. Some

182 messages were sent directly to the city with the commission copied, while others went straight to
183 commission members. He noted that since many members are new, there is uncertainty about
184 how to appropriately respond to federal actions and constituent communications. The aim of the
185 discussion is to consider developing a standardized response strategy, clarifying what is
186 appropriate, how to manage individual versus group emails, and whether responses should be
187 coordinated as a commission or handled separately, especially considering timing.

188
189 Commissioner Stanley explained that since commission members' contact information is public,
190 community members are expected to reach out about issues related to the commission's work.
191 He emphasized that, although the commission serves in an advisory capacity, there is uncertainty
192 about how members should respond when contacted by residents.

193
194 Commissioner Stanley expressed concern that not responding could cause frustration among
195 community members who expect acknowledgment or engagement from their representatives. He
196 emphasized the need for clear guidance on what commissioners can and cannot do when replying
197 to constituent messages, not just on issues like immigration enforcement but also on any future
198 community concerns.

199
200 Commissioner Dhakal asked if there are any guidelines from the state or county that specify how
201 cities should respond in situations like the one being discussed, especially regarding
202 communication and actions related to Operation Metro Surge.

203
204 Mr. Montez said there was no guidance from the state or county on how to respond, noting that
205 cities were figuring out their responses in real time.

206
207 Commissioner LaGrange observed that some emails were sent to multiple groups, including the
208 county, the city, and the commission, which allowed them to see how each entity responded in
209 real time. She recalled that, in at least one instance, a county representative responded on behalf
210 of the entire board of commissioners, highlighting that the response reflected a collective
211 position rather than an individual opinion. She considered this approach noteworthy and
212 suggested it as a possible model, although she did not remember how the city ultimately
213 responded.

214
215 Commissioner Filip-Crawford said that, although the commission was not copied on the city's
216 responses, she believed the city manager responded directly to the emails he received on behalf
217 of the City of Roseville.

218
219 Commissioner LaGrange clarified that she had not realized that not all members were included
220 on the original emails and noted that many messages were coming in. She questioned whether
221 the city manager's responses reflected alignment with the City Council or were issued
222 independently in his administrative role. She emphasized that the key issue for the commission is
223 determining a clear framework for responding, whether members should reply individually,
224 respond as a unified body, or respond at all, highlighting the need for clarity moving forward.

225

226 Commissioner Filip-Crawford recommended that the commission adopt a unified response
227 approach, with the Chair acting as the main responder. She suggested creating a standard
228 message for the full commission to review and endorse. She highlighted that responses should
229 recognize and value community input while clarifying the commission’s advisory role. She
230 pointed out that, although the commission cannot commit the city to specific actions, it can raise
231 concerns to the City Council. She also mentioned that community members primarily want to
232 feel heard and acknowledged.

233
234 Commissioner Taylor agreed that, in the commission’s advisory role, residents' concerns can be
235 forwarded to city staff or a staff liaison for appropriate action. He reiterated that the commission
236 cannot take direct action. He expressed uncertainty about responding individually to emails and
237 supported having the Chair send a unified response on behalf of the commission. He emphasized
238 that establishing a clear, mutually agreed-upon process for handling constituent communications
239 would be beneficial.

240
241 Chair Vemireddy highlighted the importance of clearly defining a response process for the
242 commission. He questioned whether this process should be standardized across all city
243 commissions or if each commission, including theirs, should create its own process tailored to its
244 specific role and responsibilities.

245
246 Commissioner Stanley asked if coordinating or collaborating on responses must follow Open
247 Meeting Law requirements, indicating concern about whether such discussions or approvals
248 would need to happen publicly.

249
250 Mr. Montez pointed out that if commissioners discuss or coordinate responses via email, it could
251 raise concerns under the Open Meeting Law. He clarified that such discussions should instead
252 occur in a properly noticed open meeting to ensure transparency and compliance.

253
254 Commissioner Filip-Crawford proposed developing a standardized response template, noting that
255 the commission’s replies would probably be similar across different issues due to its advisory
256 role. She stressed that responses should stay neutral and avoid taking sides, since community
257 feedback can vary. She suggested using a consistent message that acknowledges input, explains
258 the commission’s role, and details how to share comments with decision-makers. She also
259 supported giving the Chair the ability to make minor adjustments to the language as needed.

260
261 Commissioner Stanley questioned why commissioners’ email addresses are publicly available.
262 He asked why members are asked to give an email for public use and why that contact
263 information is posted on the city’s website, showing confusion about expectations for responding
264 to community outreach.

265
266 Commissioner Stanley questioned the purpose of providing individual public contact information
267 for commissioners if they are not expected to respond personally. He pointed out that if
268 responses are meant to be coordinated or unified, it raises concerns about why community
269 members are directed to contact individual commissioners, which could cause confusion and
270 unmet expectations for engagement.

271
272 Commissioner Filip-Crawford observed that most community members prefer emailing the
273 commission's general address instead of contacting individual commissioners, because it enables
274 them to reach the entire commission at once.

275
276 Commissioner Stanley acknowledged receiving some emails directly to his personal contact
277 address. He reiterated his concern about the purpose of sharing individual contact information if
278 responses are meant to be coordinated.

279
280 Commissioner Stanley proposed that using the commission's general email as the main contact
281 point could be more effective, with responses being sent from that account and managed by the
282 Chair on behalf of the entire commission. He expressed uncertainty about when an individual
283 commissioner's email would be suitable or beneficial under the current expectations.

284
285 Commissioner Singaram mentioned that she has received emails unrelated to the commission's
286 work, which raises questions about why individual contact information is publicly available. She
287 supported having a centralized commission email as the main contact point, believing it would
288 streamline communication, make messages more relevant, and result in more consistent and
289 effective responses to the community.

290
291 Commissioner Stanley questioned whether there is a law or regulation requiring commissioners
292 to provide publicly accessible contact information, noting that this uncertainty is why he raised
293 the question of its purpose.

294
295 Mr. Montez said there is probably a reason for the requirement, likely outlined in the
296 commission's rules or policies.

297
298 Commissioner Filip-Crawford agreed with Commissioner Singaram's point, noting that a single,
299 centralized commission email could feel more accessible and less confusing for community
300 members. She suggested that having multiple individual contacts might overwhelm or discourage
301 people from reaching out. She proposed that, even if individual emails must remain publicly
302 listed, the city could emphasize the commission's general email as the main and preferred way to
303 contact the group, since it ensures the message reaches all members.

304
305 Chair Vemireddy suggested that any standardized response should also include a brief
306 explanation of the commission's role. He noted that many community members might not
307 understand what the Equity and Inclusion Commission does or might assume commissioners are
308 city staff. He recommended adding a simple, boilerplate description, explaining that the
309 commission serves in an advisory capacity, meets regularly, and is made up of volunteers, to
310 help clarify expectations and improve understanding when responding to constituent emails.

311
312 Commissioner Goedken inquired about why some commissions use a contact form to reach the
313 whole commission, while others, like theirs, use a direct email address, and what differentiates
314 those approaches.

315

316 Mr. Montez explained that the difference between contact forms and email listings across
317 commissions likely results from how individual web pages were initially created, rather than
318 from a specific policy or reason. He observed that both methods probably direct messages to all
319 commissioners, just in different formats. He also mentioned that the city is already planning a
320 broader website update, including accessibility improvements required by 2028, which should
321 bring more consistency across commission pages.

322
323 Mr. Montez advised against spending too much time on the issue for now and suggested
324 investigating whether there is a formal requirement to list individual commissioners' emails. He
325 mentioned that this might be related to commission policies that require individual accessibility,
326 but if not, there could be an opportunity to switch to a single, centralized contact method. He
327 committed to looking into the matter, assessing whether changes are possible, and reporting back
328 with recommendations for the commission and city leadership.

329
330 Commissioner Taylor agreed with the approach and expressed concern about the implications of
331 the Open Meeting Law. He pointed out that if emails are sent to all commissioners and members
332 start replying or using “reply all,” it could trigger public meeting requirements.

333
334 Commissioner Taylor proposed that routing communications through the Chair and staff could
335 help prevent those issues. In this model, the Chair and staff would review incoming messages,
336 flag anything needing commission discussion, and respond with a standard reply when
337 appropriate, without involving all commissioners in email chains. He also noted that not all
338 emails need to be shared with the entire commission, as members can already assess community
339 sentiment through other methods.

340
341 Commissioner Stanley expressed concern about transparency if communication is channeled
342 through only one or two people. He noted that having the Chair or staff act as gatekeepers could
343 risk some community input being filtered or not fully shared with the commission. He
344 recognized the challenge of balancing this with Open Meeting Law requirements and agreed that
345 avoiding group email discussions is important, but he emphasized the need to ensure
346 transparency and full visibility of community feedback.

347
348 Mr. Montez clarified that if the commission adopts a standard response method at an open
349 meeting, using that approved language in replies would not violate the Open Meeting Law. He
350 added that a response focusing on acknowledging receipt, showing appreciation, and outlining
351 next steps within the commission’s advisory role would be suitable.

352
353 Mr. Montez stated that even if the Chair sends the response and copies others, it would not count
354 as conducting business outside a public meeting, as long as it isn’t a discussion or decision-
355 making exchange. He stressed that the main point is to avoid back-and-forth deliberation via
356 email and to stick with a consistent, pre-approved response.

357
358 Mr. Montez clarified that concerns about the Open Meeting Law arise when commissioners
359 engage in back-and-forth discussion or decision-making outside a public meeting. However,
360 simply sending a standard, pre-approved response does not count as conducting business. He

361 suggested that the commission could agree on a consistent response framework in which the
362 Chair acknowledges receipt, explains the commission’s advisory role, gives a brief description of
363 its scope, and notes that the matter will be discussed at a future meeting with staff. He
364 emphasized that any deeper discussion or action should then take place at a properly noticed
365 public meeting.

366
367 Chair Vemireddy suggested adding an upcoming agenda item to create a standardized response
368 and boilerplate language for the commission. He recommended that one person prepare an initial
369 draft based on the discussion, which the commission could review and improve together before
370 finalizing.

371
372 Commissioner Stanley agreed with developing a standardized response but stressed the
373 importance of first understanding any constraints from staff or city policies. He mentioned he
374 wouldn't want the commission to spend time drafting something that can't be used or approved.
375 He supported moving forward with creating a response framework, as originally proposed, while
376 making sure it aligns with what is permitted.

377
378 Mr. Montez expressed support for the commission’s goal of establishing a standard response and
379 suggested that both efforts could move forward at the same time. He mentioned that he can look
380 into why individual commissioners' emails are publicly listed and whether it’s possible to change
381 that to a single, centralized contact. However, he also stressed that fixing the contact method
382 alone would not fully resolve the original issue, which is the need for a consistent, approved
383 response to community inquiries. He indicated that work on developing that response language
384 should continue alongside his follow-up.

385
386 Commissioner Stanley supported the idea of creating a standard response but expressed concern
387 about whether the City Council would be comfortable with the commission developing and using
388 its own messaging. He mentioned that while he believes the commission should do so, he wants
389 to prevent a situation where the commission spends time drafting a response only to have the
390 Council later object or prefer to control the messaging.

391
392 Mr. Montez said that using neutral, informational language in a standard response is likely
393 appropriate and won't cause issues with the City Council. He stressed that as long as the response
394 doesn't take a position or commit the city to action, it should be okay. He outlined a possible
395 framework for the response: acknowledging receipt, noting that the commission has heard the
396 concern, clarifying the commission’s advisory role and briefly describing its scope, and inviting
397 the individual to participate in a future meeting or provide public comment. He repeated that this
398 type of response aligns with the commission’s role and avoids making policy statements, helping
399 to keep it appropriate.

400
401 Commissioner Stanley said he wants to discuss the issue with the staff liaison for more guidance
402 and clarification.

403
404 Chair Vemireddy agreed to lead the effort in drafting a standardized response. He mentioned that
405 although Commissioner Stanley also supported the idea, he would handle the initial drafting,

406 review it, and then present it to the commission for discussion. He reiterated his support for
407 maintaining a consistent response going forward.

408
409 Commissioner Stanley noted he would give the Chair material to work with, because he has
410 received a significant number of emails related to immigration issues.

411
412 Mr. Montez summarized his main takeaway as investigating why individual commissioners'
413 email addresses are listed on the website. He also acknowledged that the idea of routing
414 communications solely through the Chair or staff was not preferred by the commission and
415 should be set aside.

416
417 Chair Vemireddy told Mr. Montez that he plans to have a draft ready by the next meeting of the
418 Chair and Vice Chair. He suggested that if it is ready, it can be added to a future agenda; if not, it
419 can be postponed.

420
421 Mr. Montez confirmed that he expects the information to be ready soon and said he would have
422 it by the next day. He checked in with the group to ensure the timeline worked for everyone.

423
424 Commissioner Stanley agreed with the plan and noted that having a standardized response will
425 enable the commission to reply more quickly. He expressed concern about delays, such as taking
426 weeks to respond, and emphasized that a clear process will help ensure timely acknowledgment
427 of community emails.

428
429 Mr. Montez mentioned that he also received emails directly and faced delays in responding while
430 the city was still figuring out how to navigate its role and relationship with federal actions. He
431 explained that his responses followed a similar approach to what the commission is discussing:
432 confirming receipt, thanking the sender, and stating that the city is working with leadership to
433 find appropriate ways to support the community in this situation.

434
435 Chair Vemireddy noted that developing this standardized response process could also be
436 documented and included in onboarding materials for new commissioners, helping provide
437 clarity and consistency from the beginning.

438
439 Commissioner Dhakal asked about the structure of the city staff.

440
441 Mr. Montez described the structure of city leadership, noting that the Mayor and City Council
442 are part-time elected officials who set policy and define the city's vision. He explained that the
443 city manager is responsible for executing that vision, managing daily operations, and carrying
444 out the goals set by the City Council and Mayor.

445
446 The commission recessed at 7:27 p.m. and reconvened at 7:31 p.m.

447
448 **d. Commissioner Handbook/Onboarding Update**

449

450 Chair Vemireddy explained that he is creating a more user-friendly “new commissioner quick
451 guide” to supplement, not replace, the existing handbook. He mentioned that the current
452 handbook can seem overly technical and lacks clarity, and his goal is to develop a shorter, plain-
453 language resource that helps new commissioners quickly understand their roles, the purpose of
454 commissions, and how the city functions.

455
456 Chair Vemireddy described the guide as a practical onboarding resource that would include a
457 welcome section, an overview of what commissions do, a straightforward explanation of city
458 structure, and a first 30-day checklist. He emphasized keeping it concise and easy to understand,
459 rather than long like the handbook. He invited feedback from newer members on what would
460 have been helpful to know before their first meeting, highlighting topics such as Open Meeting
461 Law, meeting procedures, and general expectations. He also suggested using the guide as part of
462 initial communication when onboarding new commissioners so they feel prepared before
463 attending their first meeting.

464
465 Mr. Montez asked commissioners to reflect on their experience and identify which aspects of the
466 role might be confusing for someone serving as a commissioner for the first time, using that as a
467 starting point to improve onboarding materials.

468
469 Commissioner Stanley agreed with keeping the new guide simple and emphasized that it should
470 not include an appendix. He suggested that any detailed or supplemental information should
471 remain in the full handbook, while the quick guide should stay concise, approachable, and easy
472 to review before a first meeting.

473
474 Commissioner Filip-Crawford suggested including a “what to expect in a meeting” section in the
475 guide, outlining what new commissioners should know before attending their first meeting and
476 giving a general overview of how meetings are structured and run.

477
478 Chair Vemireddy advised that the guide include a simple overview of how meetings are
479 organized, such as starting with roll call, approving the agenda, taking public comments, and
480 then proceeding to business items. He emphasized the importance of explaining how issues
481 actually get onto the agenda. He pointed out that new commissioners might not understand how
482 topics like Operation Metro Surge move from community concerns to commission meetings and
483 recommended adding a clear explanation of the process and communication flow.

484
485 Commissioner Filip-Crawford explained that business items on the agenda originate from
486 various sources. Some are submitted by staff, such as updates or requests for input on strategic
487 planning, while others are initiated by commissioners in response to community concerns or
488 ideas. She noted that situations like Operation Metro Surge are more unique, but overall, agenda
489 items reflect both staff-driven efforts and commissioner-initiated topics.

490
491 Commissioner Dhakal expressed concerns about cybersecurity and inquired about how the city
492 safeguards email communications. He asked whether resident emails could be monitored,
493 filtered, or compromised, and whether measures are in place to prevent fraud. He specifically

494 requested information on the city's cybersecurity protocols for both residents communicating
495 with the city and for city staff systems.

496

497 Mr. Montez requested clarification, indicating he was unsure if he understood the question. He
498 asked Commissioner Dhakal whether he was referring to sending an email to the police.

499

500 Commissioner Dhakal clarified that he was not referring to a specific email to the police but was
501 expressing a general concern that his email could be tampered with, intercepted, or filtered by
502 someone. He also asked about the security of the email address he provided to the city.

503

504 Mr. Montez asked whether Commissioner Dhakal was concerned about the risk of someone
505 gaining unauthorized access to his email.

506

507 Commissioner Dhakal explained that his concern is about overall cybersecurity, not just his
508 personal email. He acknowledged that the city can only support and secure official city email
509 accounts directly, not personal ones. He also noted that this issue relates to the broader
510 onboarding discussion, suggesting that providing an overview of cybersecurity and
511 communication expectations might be helpful for new commissioners.

512

513 Commissioner LaGrange stressed the importance of clearly explaining how community input
514 influences the commission's work. She mentioned that residents might wonder if their voices are
515 truly heard and how their feedback affects the agenda. She pointed out the difficulty of keeping
516 the explanation simple and at a high level, suggesting that the guide should include a clear, brief
517 overview of how agendas are created and how community feedback can impact what the
518 commission discusses.

519

520 Commissioner Filip-Crawford emphasized that the document should remain high-level, focusing
521 on outlining the main parts of an agenda and explaining where agenda items usually originate,
522 rather than getting into too much detail.

523

524 Chair Vemireddy pointed out that the guide should include the swearing-in process, noting that
525 new commissioners will need to stand, take an oath, and sign documents. He acknowledged that
526 this step had not yet been included and recommended adding it.

527

528 Commissioner LaGrange mentioned that the guide already feels comprehensive and covers most
529 of what a new commissioner needs to understand. She observed that it can be hard to think of
530 additional items, but recommended adding a simple agenda example and a brief explanation of
531 how agendas are created.

532

533 Commissioner Stanley asked whether the guide mentions that meetings are recorded and
534 broadcast, noting that commissioners are on camera. He also asked for clarification on whether
535 the guide is meant for individuals before they are officially appointed to the commission.

536

537 Commissioner Goedken asked whether the guide should include a section specific to youth
538 commissioners, noting that their experiences or expectations may differ and could require extra
539 guidance.

540

541 Chair Vemireddy expressed uncertainty about whether the onboarding process is different for
542 youth commissioners, but suggested that if it is, it might be better to create a separate, tailored
543 guide specifically for them so they only get information relevant to their role.

544

545 Commissioner Filip-Crawford stated that the current content of the guide remains suitable for
546 youth commissioners. She mentioned that any process differences probably happen before the
547 appointment, while this guide is meant for individuals already appointed, making it broadly
548 relevant.

549

550 Mr. Montez explained that the guide is meant as a quick training for commissioners after they
551 have been interviewed and officially appointed. He agreed that it would still be relevant to youth
552 commissioners in that situation. He then asked Commissioner Goedken to clarify what she meant
553 by including a section for youth commissioners, seeking more details on what additional
554 information or differences she had in mind.

555

556 Commissioner Goedken clarified that she is unsure when the guide will be provided and initially
557 thought it might also serve as a way to inform people that youth commissioner positions are
558 available.

559

560 Mr. Montez explained that information on becoming a youth commissioner would be better
561 suited to a separate, recruitment-focused document rather than the onboarding guide. He agreed
562 that the current guide is meant for those already appointed. He suggested that creating a
563 recruitment document could be a future agenda item, especially to support outreach efforts in
564 upcoming seasons, such as fall or spring.

565

566 Commissioner Filip-Crawford pointed out that the guide should clearly state that meetings are
567 recorded and broadcast, as she did not see that information included.

568

569 Chair Vemireddy asked whether it would be more effective to create commission-specific
570 onboarding guides rather than a single general guide for all commissions. He noted that a tailored
571 guide for the Equity and Inclusion Commission could include more relevant details about its
572 specific focus and responsibilities, while still keeping the document concise. He raised the
573 challenge of balancing detail with length and questioned whether a general guide might be too
574 broad to fully meet each commission's needs.

575

576 Commissioner Filip-Crawford recommended developing a guide that works well for their
577 commission and then sharing it as a model for others. She pointed out that other commissions
578 could adapt and customize it to meet their own needs, instead of expecting a single universal
579 guide for everyone.

580

581 Commissioner Goedken suggested possibly including practical guidance in the onboarding
582 materials, such as what to wear or other common questions new commissioners might have, even
583 if they seem informal.

584

585 Commissioner Filip-Crawford advocated for including practical, specific guidance in the
586 onboarding guide. She proposed adding a “what is a meeting like” section near the start,
587 addressing topics such as the agenda format, typical attire, what to expect during discussions,
588 and noting that meetings are recorded and broadcast. She highlighted that providing this kind of
589 “social script” would be especially useful in helping new commissioners feel prepared and at
590 ease.

591

592 Chair Vemireddy asked how the group would like to proceed with editing the guide. He
593 suggested taking the feedback discussed, revising the document, and bringing it back as a future
594 agenda item, while also showing openness to whatever process the commission feels would be
595 most effective.

596

597 Commissioner LaGrange recalled a previous discussion that editing the group outside a public
598 meeting could violate the Open Meeting Law. She asked for clarification on whether that
599 concern applies here or if edits should be made during a formal meeting.

600

601 Chair Vemireddy acknowledged the limited time remaining and offered options for how to
602 proceed. He suggested either adding the item to a future agenda for group discussion or taking
603 the current feedback to revise the document and bringing it back for review. He also asked
604 whether the commission preferred to edit the document together as a group at a later meeting.

605

606 Mr. Montez suggested that having a revised draft for the commission to review would be more
607 efficient than editing the document together in real time. He pointed out that group editing can be
608 time-consuming and affected by individual preferences, and that providing a draft to review
609 would help move the process along more effectively.

610

611 Commissioner LaGrange mentioned that including the document in the pre-meeting materials
612 was helpful because it gave her time to review, consider, and understand the content before
613 discussing it.

614

615 Mr. Montez asked if the commission had any additional items that should be included or adjusted
616 in the guide for the next draft. He also suggested that the current version might have too much
617 detail on Open Meeting Law and could be simplified or moved to the full handbook.

618

619 Commissioner Filip-Crawford proposed simplifying the Open Meeting Law section in the guide.
620 She pointed out that new commissioners already get formal training, so the guide shouldn't
621 include too many details.

622

623 Commissioner Filip-Crawford suggested adding a brief, practical explanation to the “what to
624 expect in meetings” section, including key points such as meetings being public and recorded,

625 and that commissioners cannot discuss business or participate in group emails outside of official
626 meetings.

627

628 Chair Vemireddy asked the group whether they agree that the “what a meeting is like” section
629 should be positioned as the second part of the guide.

630

631 Commissioner Filip-Crawford agreed and suggested placing the “what to expect” section at the
632 beginning, noting that even if someone reads only part of the guide, they will still understand
633 how meetings work.

634

635 Commissioner Filip-Crawford highlighted that the main goal of the guide is to address basic,
636 practical questions for new commissioners, such as what to expect at their first meeting, what it
637 will be like, who will attend, and what they will be expected to do.

638

639 Commissioner LaGrange asked if the guide should briefly mention Robert’s Rules of Order,
640 noting that new commissioners might find it unfamiliar to walk into a meeting where initial steps
641 include approving the agenda and minutes. She suggested that, while it doesn't need to be
642 detailed, a simple explanation could help make those procedures less confusing or surprising.

643

644 Commissioner Dhakal mentioned that, after reviewing the onboarding materials, he expected a
645 much more formal oath ceremony, likely with people lined up and responding in a formal
646 manner. He noted that this caused some initial confusion about how official or organized the
647 process would be, but he ultimately said the experience was not awkward once he participated in
648 it.

649

650 Mr. Montez suggested briefly mentioning that meetings follow Robert’s Rules of Order and
651 including a link for those seeking more details. He noted this could provide helpful context
652 without adding too much to the guide.

653

654 Commissioner Taylor advised framing it in a reassuring way, pointing out that new
655 commissioners will learn more about the Rules of Order and public meeting requirements
656 through training. He suggested including hyperlinks for those seeking additional details, while
657 keeping the guide simple and not overwhelming.

658

659 Commissioner Filip-Crawford stressed keeping the guide simple and focused on the essentials.
660 She mentioned that by presenting the basic agenda structure, new commissioners will naturally
661 understand how meetings flow without needing detailed explanations. She also added that many
662 people do not read full handbooks, so the guide should remain straightforward and easy to
663 follow.

664

665 Mr. Montez asked if there are any common “rookie mistakes” or other ideas that could make the
666 guide more welcoming and helpful for new commissioners. He encouraged the group to share
667 any final thoughts now so they can be included in the next draft.

668

669 Commissioner Filip-Crawford emphasized that the guide should focus on providing a clear
670 “social script” for new commissioners, helping them understand what to expect and how to
671 confidently navigate their first meeting.

672

673 Chair Vemireddy mentioned that these expectations are quite common across commissions and
674 suggested including them in the new guide to improve consistency and clarity for new
675 commissioners.

676

677 Commissioner Filip-Crawford recommended including guidance on typical attire, noting that
678 while expectations may seem more formal at first, they are usually more casual in practice. She
679 highlighted that clarifying this can help new commissioners feel more at ease.

680

681 Chair Vemireddy emphasized that he does not want commissioners to feel pressured to dress a
682 certain way, noting that the commission should feel like a welcoming and comfortable space for
683 everyone.

684

685 Mr. Montez noted that the complete handbook probably already includes general guidance on
686 attire. He believed staff and Chair Vemireddy had enough information to proceed with a first
687 draft of the handbook.

688

689 Chair Vemireddy confirmed that his previous email to the City Council about commissioner
690 appointments was successfully sent and received. He highlighted his attention to detail in
691 attaching all relevant documents and information. Due to limited time, he mentioned he would
692 follow up with Mr. Montez and the Vice Chair to draft a standardized response email for the
693 commission, review it, and revise the onboarding guide based on feedback. He also said he
694 would add the email discussion to the agenda for a future meeting.

695

696 **e. Commissioner Update on Civic Campus Final Design**

697

698 Chair Vemireddy described the stakeholder group for the maintenance center project, noting it
699 includes representatives from various commissions, city staff, community members, and local
700 stakeholders such as the VFW and a local journalist. He emphasized that LHB is leading the
701 design work, and Kraus Anderson will manage construction once the project starts.

702

703 Chair Vemireddy described the current site layout and proposed expansion, explaining that the
704 new maintenance center is planned for areas labeled D, E, and F, while existing uses, such as the
705 VFW, will stay due to strong community support. He mentioned that the license and passport
706 center will be relocated as part of the redesign.

707

708 Chair Vemireddy outlined two main design concepts, explaining that both maintain key
709 community elements, with the main difference being how the new maintenance center and
710 vehicle maneuvering areas are arranged. He mentioned that further refinement will happen as the
711 project moves forward.

712

713 Chair Vemireddy reviewed the project timeline, noting that initial meetings have taken place,
714 with further design work scheduled for the spring and the finalization expected in the summer.
715 He mentioned that construction could start in the fall and might include improvements to the
716 surrounding park, such as potential recreational features.

717
718 Chair Vemireddy discussed funding, stating that up to \$64 million has been approved for the
719 project, financed through a voter-approved sales tax increase. He mentioned that approximately
720 \$500,000 has been raised so far and plans to provide more detailed breakdowns of project costs
721 as additional information becomes available.

722
723 Commissioner LaGrange thanked Chair Vemireddy for representing the commission on the
724 stakeholder group. She acknowledged that she asks many questions and expressed appreciation,
725 noting that he represents the commission well.

726
727 Commissioner Taylor suggested that the project offers an opportunity to deliberately invest in
728 the community by allocating some funds to support diverse businesses. He emphasized the
729 importance of helping women-owned, minority-owned, and local Roseville businesses as part of
730 the project's spending.

731
732 Chair Vemireddy explained that he does not yet have a detailed budget breakdown showing how
733 funds are allocated across the project. He said he intends to obtain that information and share it
734 with the commission, noting that if the current materials are unclear, he would reorganize them
735 into a more understandable format for review.

736
737 Commissioner Taylor noted that companies like Kraus Anderson and other general contractors
738 may already have guidelines on subcontracting or community investment. He emphasized that,
739 given the size of the project budget, it presents a strong opportunity to direct spending toward
740 benefiting the local community and supporting diverse businesses.

741
742 Chair Vemireddy mentioned that the bidding process will occur in the summer and
743 acknowledged that he is not yet familiar with how it functions. He observed that there are some
744 misconceptions about the process, but clarified that he expects it to be well-structured and
745 regulated. He added that he anticipates it will be slow and bureaucratic, and he plans to share
746 more details once he learns more.

747
748 Commissioner Taylor suggested that, as the bidding process is being developed, it should include
749 criteria requiring companies to demonstrate community investment and accountability. He
750 emphasized that the RFP should consider factors beyond just the lowest cost, such as support for
751 diverse businesses and broader community impact.

752
753 Commissioner Filip-Crawford mentioned that the city probably already has procurement policies
754 or language in place that cover considerations like those being discussed, such as evaluation
755 criteria beyond just cost.

756

757 Commissioner Taylor noted that the state has programs and offices dedicated to minority and
758 diverse business participation, and suggested that similar frameworks or resources may also be
759 available at the city level to support inclusive procurement efforts.

760

761 Commissioner Dhakal mentioned that there are likely existing resources or frameworks the
762 commission could examine related to diversity and inclusion in procurement. He recommended
763 that applying an equity and inclusion perspective to city policies, including how contracts are
764 awarded, is a suitable role for the commission.

765

766 Chair Vemireddy agreed that the maintenance center project aligns with the commission’s scope,
767 especially in using an equity and inclusion perspective in city decisions and policies.

768

769 Commissioner Taylor highlighted that the commission’s role is to make recommendations and
770 document those perspectives. He mentioned that even if the city decides not to adopt the
771 suggestion, it remains the commission’s duty to raise and record it.

772

773 Chair Vemireddy mentioned that more details about the bidding process are expected around
774 May or June, and he hopes to provide information for the commission to review by the May
775 meeting.

776

777 **Commission Direction on Member-Initiated Agenda Items**

778

779 **a. EIC Response to Community Support Needs Resulting from Federal Immigration** 780 **Enforcement**

781

782 This item was moved to Business Item Number c.

783

784 **Other Business**

785

786 None.

787

788 **Adjournment**

789

790 Commissioner Goedken moved, and Commissioner Taylor seconded a motion to adjourn.
791 Motion passed unanimously.

792

793 Chair Vemireddy adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

794

795 Respectfully submitted,

796

797 Sue Osbeck

798 *TimeSaver Off-Site Secretarial, Inc.*

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: April 15, 2026

ITEM: 5.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Commissioner onboarding guide

Background

Commissioner Vemireddy will present to the group an edited commissioner guide following the group's feedback for further review and discussion.

Recommendation

Review and discuss as necessary.

Attachments

1. New Commissioner Quick Guide - Revised

New Commissioner Quick Guide

Updated: April 2026

Fill in (optional)

Commission name	
Meeting schedule	
Staff liaison	
Term dates	

1) Welcome - what you are joining

A Roseville commission is a group of residents that helps the City Council make better decisions by learning about issues, listening to residents and staff, discussing options in public, and offering advice and recommendations.

Commissions are advisory. The City Council makes the final policy decisions. **Your job in one sentence:** show up prepared, participate respectfully, and help your commission give clear, well-reasoned advice.

How the structure works: the City Council sets direction and policy, City staff run day-to-day operations, and commissions advise within that structure.

2) Your first 30 days

- Meet your staff liaison. They are your main point of contact and your guide to how the City works.
- Skim recent agendas and minutes so you understand what the commission has been working on.
- Read the agenda packet before each meeting so you are not seeing the issue for the first time in the room.
- Send questions to the staff liaison before the meeting when possible.
- Ask what the commission's current work plan, priorities, and upcoming council touchpoints are.

Common rookie mistakes to avoid

- Assuming the commission makes the final decision. It does not - it advises.
- Reading the agenda for the first time during the meeting.
- Directing staff directly instead of working through the chair and staff liaison.
- Speaking publicly as if you represent the commission when you have not been authorized to do so.

3) What a meeting is like

Most meetings follow the same basic rhythm. Not every meeting will use every section, but this is the standard flow you will usually see on a Roseville commission agenda.

#	Agenda section	What it means in plain English
1	Roll Call	Confirm who is present and whether the commission can do business.
2	Approve Agenda	Agree on the plan for the meeting.
3	Public Comment	Hear from residents on matters that are not otherwise on the agenda.
4	Approval of Minutes	Approve or correct the record from the last meeting.
5	Business Items	Discuss the main topics of the night. This is where presentations, questions, public comment on the item, discussion, and possible action usually happen.
6	Member-Initiated Agenda Items	Discuss ideas commissioners want the group to consider, refine, or bring back later.
7	Other Business	Share brief updates, reminders, or scheduling notes.
8	Adjourn	Close the meeting.

Note: City Council meetings follow the same general meeting structure.

4) What happens inside one agenda item

1	The chair introduces the item.
2	Staff or a commissioner gives background and explains the question in front of the group.
3	Commissioners ask clarifying questions.
4	Public comment is taken on that item.
5	If action is needed, a commissioner usually makes a motion and another commissioner seconds it.
6	The commission discusses the motion, votes, and the chair announces the result.

5) Rosenberg's Rules in plain English

- The agenda is the roadmap for the meeting.
- The chair runs the meeting and keeps discussion fair, respectful, and moving.
- One person speaks at a time.
- Formal action happens through a motion. Most actions begin with a motion and a second.
- Debate the idea or motion - not the person.
- Most decisions pass by majority vote. A tie vote fails.

6) What the City expects from commissioners

- Attend meetings and let the staff liaison know ahead of time if you will miss one.
- Be prepared. Read the materials, ask questions early, and show up ready to discuss.
- Stay respectful and professional. Your role is public-facing.
- Do not direct staff.
- Do not speak for the City or for your commission unless you have been authorized to do so.
- If you want to share something with the whole group, send it to the staff liaison rather than starting side conversations or email chains among commissioners.
- Help create space for all voices. Use clear language and avoid unnecessary jargon.

7) Who does what?

Chair	Commission members	Staff liaison
Runs the meeting, recognizes speakers, keeps discussion fair, and helps the group reach clear decisions.	Prepare, participate, ask good questions, listen well, and help the commission give thoughtful advice.	Coordinates agendas and packets, helps with process, prepares minutes, and connects the commission to City staff and Council.

8) Good judgment items to remember

Conflicts of interest	If you have a personal conflict on an issue, disclose it and step back from discussion and voting. Ask your staff liaison if you are unsure.
Social media	Your views are personal unless you have been designated to speak for the commission or the City.
Attendance	Missing three consecutive meetings and/or 30% of meetings in a rolling 12-month period may be forwarded to the City Council.
Yearly rhythm	Each commission sets a work plan, reports accomplishments, and has an annual joint meeting with City Council.

Commented [PV1]: Is this accurate Antonio

Where to go for details

This guide is the starting point, not the full rulebook. For full details, ask your staff liaison for the Commissioner's Handbook, ethics materials, rules of order, and the uniform commission code.

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: April 15, 2026

ITEM: 6.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: EIC Response Template to Community Inquiries

Background

Commissioner Vemireddy will present to the group a drafted template response the commission can use when receiving email communication from community members. The commission should review, discuss, and edit as necessary.

Recommendation

Discuss and review.

Attachments

1. EIC Draft Template 4.6.2026

Dear [Constituent Name],

Thank you for reaching out and for taking the time to share your concerns with the Equity and Inclusion Commission. We received your message and appreciate you contacting us.

The Equity and Inclusion Commission is an advisory body to Roseville city staff and the City Council. By Ordinance No. 1676, the Commission was created to apply an equity and inclusion lens to City policies, procedures, projects, programs, operations, and initiatives. That is an important charge, but as a commission, we do not independently set City policy or direct City operations.

With the Council-approved strategic plan, our current work has been more focused around the City's community and civic engagement goals. One recent example is our discussion about improving the New Commissioner Handbook and strengthening how newly appointed commissioners are welcomed and informed.

Community and Civic Engagement objectives:

Create an environment for stakeholder participation in decision making: Create a strategic approach to city-wide community engagement initiatives that better align city resources and leads to more informed residents.

Utilize commissions for residents to represent voice of community to shape decisions: Increase support for staff liaisons by standardizing commissioner onboarding and better aligning scope of work with council priorities so that commissions can effectively advise council.

Utilize commissions for residents to represent voice of community to shape decisions Identify common barriers to participation and create strategies to remove them for increased representation in commissions from residents of all backgrounds.

That said, we do take community input seriously. We will work with our staff liaison to identify an appropriate path forward and to determine whether this issue is one our commission can take up within its scope.

If you would like to share your perspective directly with the commission, you are welcome to attend our next meeting on *Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 6:30 p.m.* in the Council Chambers at Roseville City Hall and provide public comment.

Thank you again for reaching out and for your engagement with the City of Roseville.

Sincerely,

Prajwal Vemireddy

On behalf of the Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: April 15, 2026

ITEM: 6.b.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: EIC Commission Next steps

Background

Talk through the Community and Civic Engagement objectives given by council and brainstorm topics/issues our commission should address in future meetings. As a reminder, the objectives are:

Create an environment for stakeholder participation in decision making:

Create a strategic approach to city-wide community engagement initiatives that better align city resources and leads to more informed residents.

Utilize commissions for residents to represent voice of community to shape decisions:

Increase support for staff liaisons by standardizing commissioner onboarding and better aligning scope of work with council priorities so that commissions can effectively advise council.

Utilize commissions for residents to represent voice of community to shape decisions:

Identify common barriers to participation and create strategies to remove them for increased representation in commissions from residents of all backgrounds

Recommendation

Discuss

Attachments

None