



Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda

Wednesday, May 20, 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**
- 2. Approve Agenda**
- 3. Receive Public Comment**
- 4. Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - a. Review and approve April meeting minutes
- 5. Business Items**
 - a. Commission Elections
 - b. Joint Council Meeting Date
 - c. Rosefest Parade
- 6. Commission Direction on Member Initiated Agenda Items**
 - a. Discuss and Finalize Constituent Outreach Email
 - b. Discuss and Finalize New Commissioner Guide
 - c. 2026 EIC Work Plan Priorities and Policy Review Topics
- 7. Other Business**
- 8. Adjourn**

1 **Equity and Inclusion Commission**
2 **Meeting Minutes**
3 **DRAFT – April 15, 2026 - DRAFT**
4

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

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

12 **Commissioners Absent:** Gwen Goedken (excused)
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 Commissioner LaGrange moved, and Commissioner Filip-Crawford seconded a motion to
23 approve the April 15, 2026, Equity and Inclusion Commission agenda as presented. Motion
24 passed unanimously.
25

26 **Receive Public Comment**
27

28 None.
29

30 **Business Items**
31

32 **a. Approve Minutes**
33

34 Commissioner Taylor moved, and Commissioner LaGrange seconded a motion to approve the
35 March 18, 2026, Equity and Inclusion Commission meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed
36 unanimously.
37

38 The commission went through an icebreaker activity before moving on to regular business items.
39

40 **b. Commissioner Onboarding Guide**
41

42 The Commission discussed the development of the onboarding guide, with Chair Vemireddy
43 explaining that the document was created based on prior meetings and feedback, focusing on
44 clarity, usability, and relevance to commission work. He noted the intent to refine the guide
45 further and potentially share it with other commissions or present it to the city council.
46

47 The Commission spent time refining the tone and language of the welcome section.

48

49 Commissioner Stanley supported simplifying the wording to make it more direct and user-
50 friendly, while Commissioner LaGrange emphasized the importance of maintaining a welcoming
51 and human tone. The group generally agreed that the document should feel approachable without
52 becoming overly informal.

53

54 Discussion then focused on clarifying roles within the city government.

55

56 Commissioner Filip-Crawford suggested removing redundant language and focusing more
57 clearly on the relationship between the commission and the city council.

58

59 Commissioner LaGrange supported restructuring the section to clarify roles, while Mr. Montez
60 emphasized the importance of explicitly stating that the city council makes final policy decisions.

61

62 The Commission agreed to streamline this section and improve its organization by adding clearer
63 headings, such as “your job” and “roles.”

64

65 The Commission reviewed the “first 30 days” section and agreed that it should remain concise
66 and focused on essential onboarding steps.

67

68 Commissioner Stanley and Commissioner Taylor noted that some items function more as
69 ongoing expectations than as first-month tasks, and suggested relocating them to avoid
70 confusion.

71

72 Mr. Montez supported simplifying the section, while Chair Vemireddy highlighted the need to
73 clarify processes such as how commissioners bring forward agenda items.

74

75 The Commission also discussed onboarding logistics, including email use, training requirements,
76 and conflict-of-interest forms.

77

78 Mr. Montez clarified that commissioners are not required to use city email accounts and that
79 training timelines depend on the timing of appointments.

80

81 Commissioner LaGrange and Commissioner Filip-Crawford emphasized keeping the onboarding
82 guidance simple so it does not feel overwhelming to new members.

83

84 In reviewing the “common mistakes” section, the Commission agreed to revise the title to
85 “common new commissioner mistakes to avoid” for clarity.

86

87 Commissioner Filip-Crawford recommended removing an item related to misuse of influence,
88 noting it did not reflect a typical or unintentional mistake.

89

90 The group also clarified expectations around communication with staff, emphasizing the role of
91 the staff liaison and the importance of not speaking on behalf of the commission or city without
92 authorization.

93

94 The Commission discussed appropriate communication and public engagement.

95

96 Commissioner Dhakal asked about identifying as a commissioner within the community, and Mr.
97 Montez confirmed that it is appropriate, provided commissioners do not imply authority to make
98 decisions or commitments.

99

100 Commissioner Stanley added that commissioners may share personal views but should not
101 present those views as representing the full commission.

102

103 The “what a meeting is like” section was reviewed, with Commissioner Stanley recommending
104 removal of informal phrasing and Chair Vemireddy agreeing to simplify the language.

105

106 The Commission supported describing meetings as following a general or standard flow, while
107 acknowledging some variation. There was also discussion about aligning the structure with other
108 bodies, such as the city council.

109

110 The Commission expressed support for incorporating human connection into the guide.

111

112 Commissioner LaGrange emphasized that building relationships strengthens team effectiveness,
113 and members discussed including language that encourages connection, such as icebreakers,
114 while keeping the document flexible for use by other commissions.

115

116 The Commission focused on making the onboarding guide clear, concise, and practical, while
117 balancing professionalism with a welcoming tone and ensuring expectations are easy for new
118 commissioners to understand.

119

120 The Commission discussed how member-initiated agenda items should be brought forward, with
121 Mr. Montez explaining that a commissioner would present their idea to the group, provide
122 reasoning, and then the Commission would vote on whether to place it on a future agenda.

123

124 Members clarified that this typically occurs under commission direction or a similar section, and
125 that items are not acted on immediately but are scheduled for a later meeting if supported.

126

127 The Commission considered whether guidance about member-initiated items belonged in the
128 onboarding document.

129

130 Commissioner Filip-Crawford questioned whether it was too detailed for a new commissioner,
131 and the group ultimately leaned toward removing it from that section and potentially placing it
132 elsewhere.

133

134 The discussion shifted toward emphasizing connection among commissioners instead, with
135 members agreeing that a common mistake is failing to build relationships, and that the document
136 should highlight that the team’s function is better when members know each other.
137

138 The Commission then reviewed the section describing what happens during an agenda item
139 discussion. Members suggested rewording the title for clarity and simplifying the layout.
140

141 There was discussion about including a brief explanation of motions and public comments, with
142 Mr. Montez explaining that public comment typically occurs either at the beginning of the
143 meeting for non-agenda items or during the specific agenda item when appropriate.
144

145 The Commission discussed whether to include formal meeting rules such as Rosenberg’s Rules.
146 Members agreed that rather than creating a separate section, it would be more effective to
147 include a hyperlink to a simplified explanation of the rules.
148

149 Commissioner Stanley and others supported combining overlapping sections and keeping the
150 document concise, focusing on a high-level overview rather than detailed procedural instruction.
151

152 The Commission reviewed expectations for commissioners, including attendance, preparation,
153 and communication.
154

155 Mr. Montez emphasized that agenda ideas should be sent through the staff liaison, who can
156 coordinate with leadership. The group agreed that expectations should be written positively and
157 clearly, focusing on what commissioners should do rather than what they should avoid.
158

159 The Commission discussed attendance expectations and quorum. Members agreed that while
160 attendance is important, the goal is not to discourage participation but to ensure engagement.
161

162 Mr. Montez explained that attendance is tracked and reported to the city council, and while
163 missing multiple meetings may prompt review, it does not automatically result in removal.
164

165 The group supported including clear but reasonable language, explaining that consistent absences
166 may result in city council action, while also recognizing that communication and valid reasons
167 for absence are considered.
168

169 The Commission finalized the “items to remember” section, focusing on clarity and
170 accountability. Members agreed to include language on attendance tracking, the role of the staff
171 liaison, and the possibility of city council review if participation remains consistently low. The
172 tone was adjusted to reflect expectations without being overly punitive.
173

174 The Commission briefly discussed the next steps for finalizing the document.
175

176 Chair Vemireddy indicated that revisions would be made and brought back for review, with a
177 final vote anticipated at a future meeting. The group also discussed creating a companion video

178 or e-learning component, with Commissioner Filip-Crawford volunteering to assist with
179 voiceover work.

180
181 The Commission also considered how to share the onboarding guide with new commissioners,
182 particularly youth commissioners. Commission Members suggested email as an effective method
183 and discussed options such as QR codes or digital formats. The Commissioners indicated that
184 email would likely be sufficient, especially if shared shortly after application or onboarding.

185
186 Overall, the Commission focused on refining the onboarding guide to ensure it is clear, concise,
187 and practical, while balancing helpful detail with accessibility for new commissioners.

188

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

190

191 **a. EIC Response Template to Community Inquiries**

192

193 The Commission discussed developing a standardized response to member-initiated agenda
194 items and public inquiries.

195

196 Chair Vemireddy explained that the draft email template was intended to clearly communicate
197 the Commission’s role while maintaining a focus on equity and inclusion work. He emphasized
198 that while the Commission applies an equity and inclusion lens broadly, agenda topics must still
199 align with the Commission’s scope and priorities.

200

201 Chair Vemireddy noted that ideas brought forward by commissioners or the public would
202 typically require coordination with staff, such as the staff liaison, to determine whether the topic
203 fits within the Commission’s work plan before being advanced.

204

205 Commissioner Filip-Crawford raised concerns about the tone, structure, and overall effectiveness
206 of the draft response. She noted that portions of the message, particularly where it described the
207 Commission’s work in detail, could come across as dismissive or disconnected from the
208 concerns of residents who had taken the time to reach out. She explained that individuals
209 contacting the Commission are often focused on a specific issue and may be frustrated or seeking
210 action. A generic response about Commission activities could come across as impersonal or
211 confusing.

212

213 Commissioner Filip-Crawford recommended simplifying the response to directly acknowledge
214 the concern, validate the outreach, and clearly guide the individual toward appropriate next steps
215 for engagement.

216

217 Other Commissioners supported this approach and expanded on the importance of clarity and
218 responsiveness.

219

220 Members discussed how a more effective response would focus on thanking the individual,
221 referencing the specific issue they raised, and providing actionable options such as attending a
222 Commission meeting or speaking at a city council meeting.

223

224 There was agreement that including information from both the commission and city council
225 meetings would be helpful, particularly because the city council meets more frequently and may
226 provide a more immediate opportunity for public comment.

227

228 Commissioners emphasized that the response should feel tailored, even if it is based on a
229 template, and should avoid overwhelming the reader with unnecessary or unrelated information.

230

231 The Commission worked collaboratively on revisions, removing sections deemed redundant or
232 potentially confusing.

233

234 Members agreed that the revised version should flow more naturally, transitioning directly from
235 acknowledgment of the concern to guidance on how to engage with the issue.

236

237 There was also discussion about inserting customizable language at the beginning of the
238 response so that commissioners can reference the specific topic the resident raised, ensuring the
239 message feels more personal and relevant.

240

241 The group emphasized that the goal is to strike a balance between consistent communication and
242 a genuine, human tone.

243

244 The discussion then shifted to how responses should be delivered and whether individual
245 commissioner email addresses should continue to be used.

246

247 Commissioner Stanley questioned the purpose of publicly listing individual emails if responses
248 are expected to follow a standardized format. He noted that this could create confusion for
249 residents if they receive identical responses from multiple commissioners or if the response does
250 not appear to come directly from the individual they contacted. He also raised concerns about
251 exposure, noting that providing personal contact information can lead to increased volume of
252 messages or unwanted communication, particularly during high-interest issues.

253

254 Commissioners discussed the potential benefits of using a centralized Commission email address
255 instead. Members noted that a shared email address could help ensure consistent messaging,
256 reduce duplicate responses, and create a clearer point of contact for the public.

257

258 At the same time, the group acknowledged that some flexibility may still be needed if
259 commissioners are expected to engage individually or provide more personalized responses in
260 certain situations.

261

262 The discussion highlighted uncertainty around current expectations and whether commissioners
263 are intended to respond independently or collectively.

264

265 The Commission recognized that this issue may require additional guidance from the city council
266 or staff. Members noted that questions about whether individual emails must be publicly listed,
267 whether responses should be standardized, and how much discretion commissioners have in

268 communicating with residents are broader policy considerations. While there was general
269 agreement that the template is a useful tool, the group acknowledged that the process
270 surrounding its use should be clarified to avoid inconsistency or confusion.

271

272 **b. EIC Commission Next Steps**

273

274 Chair Vemireddy concluded the discussion by outlining next steps, indicating that he would
275 incorporate the suggested revisions into both the onboarding guide and the email response
276 template. He stated that updated drafts would be shared with the Commission before the next
277 meeting, to review final changes and take formal action to approve the documents. He also
278 encouraged Commissioners to begin thinking beyond the onboarding materials and consider
279 broader priorities for the Commission moving forward.

280

281 **Other Business**

282

283 The Commission briefly discussed future direction, with Chair Vemireddy inviting members to
284 submit ideas for upcoming agenda items. He suggested that commissioners reflect on why they
285 joined the Commission and identify issues that could be addressed through an equity and
286 inclusion lens.

287

288 Members identified potential topics, including city spending practices and engagement with
289 contractors, that could warrant further exploration.

290

291 The discussion emphasized the importance of continuing to evolve the Commission’s work
292 beyond foundational efforts such as onboarding and communication tools.

293

294 **Adjournment**

295

296 Commissioner Stanley moved, and Commissioner Filip-Crawford seconded a motion to adjourn.
297 Motion passed unanimously.

298

299 Chair Vemireddy adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.

300

301 Respectfully submitted,

302

303 Sue Osbeck

304 *TimeSaver Off-Site Secretarial, Inc.*

**Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission
Agenda Item**

DATE: May 20, 2026

ITEM: 5.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Commission Elections

Background

Commissions elect a Chair, Vice Chair, and representative to the Ethics Commission annually. The Equity and Inclusion Commission must elect a chair, vice chair and ethics commission representative for the new year (April 2026 -March 2027)

Recommendation

Nominate and elect a chair, vice chair and ethics commission representative.

Attachments

None

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: May 20, 2026

ITEM: 5.b.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Joint Council Meeting Date

Background

EIC will select a date to host its joint council meeting with City Council to share its progress and updated work plan. City council meets on August 10, 2 days before the EIC meets on Aug 12. Possible date to consider.

Recommendation

Discuss and decide on Joint Council date.

Attachments

None

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: May 20, 2026

ITEM: 5.c.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Rosefest Parade

Background

Rosefest parade will take place on Monday, June 22 at 6:15PM. Commissioners are invited to attend. The parade begins on County Road B2 near Roseville Area High School and end on Civic Center Drive near city hall. We are seeking a commissioner volunteer to drive a city owned golf cart in the parade.

Recommendation

Discuss and determine if any commissioners are able to volunteer to drive the golf cart.

Attachments

None

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: May 20, 2026

ITEM: 6.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Discuss and Finalize Constituent Outreach Email

Background

Discuss and Finalize Constituent Outreach Email template for commissioners to use in response to emails received from constituents.

Recommendation

Review and finalize.

Attachments

1. DRAFT_Commission Response to Community comments

Dear [Constituent Name],

Thank you for reaching out about _____ 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.

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. You can also attend the upcoming city council meeting scheduled on Day, Month, Year and provide public comments.

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: May 20, 2026

ITEM: 6.b.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Discuss and Finalize New Commissioner Guide

Background

Discuss New Commissioner Guide with the modified changes recommended by the commission and vote on Final Draft

Recommendation

Discuss and finalize

Attachments

1. New Commissioner Quick Guide - Revised

New Commissioner Quick Guide

Updated: ~~April~~ May 2026

Fill in (optional)

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Commission name | |
| Meeting schedule | |
| Staff liaison | |
| Term dates | |

1) Welcome - Thank you for joining a commission!

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.

Your job: show up prepared, participate respectfully, and help your commission give clear, well-reasoned advice.

City government roles: the City Council sets direction and makes the final policy decisions, 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. Ask them what the commission's current work plan, priorities, and upcoming council touchpoints are.
- Skim recent [agendas and minutes](#) so you understand what the commission has been working on.

Common new commissioner 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.
- Speaking publicly as if you represent the entire commission or the city when you have not been authorized to do so.
- Not connecting with fellow commissioners – teams work better when commission members know each other.

3) What a meeting is like

Most meetings follow the same basic rhythm. This is the standard flow.

| # | Agenda section | What it means |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| 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 during a discussion of an 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 makes a motion and another commissioner seconds it. |
| 6 | The commission discusses the motion, votes, and the chair announces the result. |

Note: See Rosenberg's Rules resource on the [new commissioner checklist](#)

- 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.

Commented [AM1]: Where does this go? After Item #3? Or here?



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.

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) Final 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 | Staff liaison takes attendance at each meeting. Missing three consecutive meetings and/or 30% of meetings in a rolling 12-month period may will 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. |

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. [You can also find great resources on the City's new commissioner checklist website.](#)

Roseville Equity and Inclusion Commission Agenda Item

DATE: May 20, 2026

ITEM: 6.c.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: 2026 EIC Work Plan Priorities and Policy Review Topics

Background

The Equity and Inclusion Commission was created to advise the City Council and City staff by applying an equity and inclusion lens to City policies, procedures, projects, programs, operations, and initiatives.

At the most recent meeting, the Commission has discussed the importance of moving beyond broad concepts and identifying tangible, practical areas where the EIC can provide useful feedback. The Commission has already completed work on a New Commissioner Guide, which is one example of a concrete project intended to make City government easier to understand and participate in.

The purpose of this agenda item is to discuss and prioritize possible future work plan items for the Commission. These topics are intended to help the EIC focus its time on projects where the Commission can provide meaningful advisory input while staying within its role as an advisory body.

Possible areas for Commission review include:

Digital Access Review

Review whether residents can complete common City tasks without needing a computer or a high comfort level with English. This could include reviewing City webpages, online forms, application processes, payment options, and public notices for clarity and accessibility.

City Communications Accessibility Review

Review whether key City communications are written in plain English, easy to find, and understandable to residents who may be unfamiliar with City government. This could include reviewing webpages related to commissions, permits, utility billing, parks and recreation registration, public meetings, and resident services.

Maintenance Operations Center Equity Review

Review the new Maintenance Operations Center project from an access, service, workforce, construction-impact, and climate perspective. The Commission could provide advisory questions or recommendations related to public access, construction communication, service impacts, accessibility, and community benefit.

The value of LEED certification, electrification of lawnmowers, Bus stop covers?

Climate Equity Action Plan Review

Review the City's Climate Equity Action Plan and discuss whether the Commission can provide feedback on implementation, public engagement, accessibility, and how climate actions affect renters, low-income residents, seniors, people with disabilities, and other residents who may face barriers.

Community Engagement Standards for Major City Projects

Discuss whether the City should have a simple engagement checklist for major projects, asking who may be affected, how residents will be informed, what barriers may exist to participation, and how public feedback will be reported back.

Parks, Recreation, and Program Access Review

Review whether City programs, recreation opportunities, scholarships, fee assistance, registration processes, and public information are easy to understand and accessible to residents across income levels, ages, abilities, and backgrounds.

Recommendation

Discuss and finalize workplan

Attachments

None