



City of Pflugerville

Minutes - Final

Equity Commission

Monday, July 12, 2021

6:30 PM

1008 W. Pfluger Street, Pflugerville, TX

Regular Meeting (Telephone/Video Conference)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN in accordance with order of the Office of the Governor issued

March 16, 2020, the Equity Commission will conduct this Meeting by telephone/video conference in order to advance the public health goal of limiting face-to-face meetings to slow

the spread of the COVID-19. There will be no public access to the location described above.

This Meeting Agenda, and the Agenda Packet, are posted online at <https://pflugerville.legistar.com>

This telephonic/video meeting will be hosted through WebEx. Meeting Public

URL: <https://pflugervilletx.webex.com/pflugervilletx/onstage/g.php?>

MTID=ec8303c54d6c3fc50da8c8889d8203689

Meeting Number / Code: 146 841 9075

Dial-in Number: +1-408-418-9388 (US toll)

Citizens Communication will only be allowed via telephone/video conference. All speakers

must register to speak at least 2 hours in advance of the meeting. All comments will occur at

the beginning of the meeting under the Citizens Communication item. Speakers must call in at

least 15 minutes prior to the meeting start in order to speak. Written comments may also be

submitted 2 hours in advance of the meeting.

To register to speak or to submit written comments, please email

JenniferC@pflugervilletx.gov at least 2 hours in advance of the meeting. A recording of the

telephone/video meeting will be made, and will be available to the public upon written request.

Equity Commission Members:**James Matlock - Chair****Shawn Douglas - Vice-Chair****Autumn Arnett - Secretary****Donald Scott II****Elizabeth Guillory-Medina****Daisy Delgado Castillo****1. Call to Order**

James Matlock, Chair; Shawn Douglas, Vice-Chair; Donald Scott, III; Daisy Delgado-Castillo

Dr. Elizabeth Guillory-Medina joined at 6:37 p.m.

Dr. T. Bowman joined at 6:55 p.m.

Staff: Trey Fletcher, Deputy City Manager; Jennifer Griswold, Library Director.

2. Citizen Communication

None

In accordance with the Texas Attorney General's Opinion, any public comment that is made on an item that is not on the published final agenda will only be heard by the Equity Commission.

No formal action, discussion, deliberation, or comment will be made.

3. Approval of Minutes

- 3A. [2021-0680](#) Approval of the June 14, 2021 minutes (approx. 5 min.)
Jennifer Griswold, Library Director

Vice-Chair Douglas moved to approve. Ms. Castillo approved, Mr. Scott approved, Mr. Matlock approved. Minutes passed as written.

4. Discuss Only

- 4A. [2021-0692](#) Police Chief search survey results
Dr. T. Bowman, The Bowman Group

Dr. Bowman apologized for being late to join. It was due to technical difficulties.

Chair Matlock introduced and welcomed Dr. Bowman. He asked Ms. Griswold to bring up the survey results. He asked Dr. Bowman to give insight on the process and development of the survey and into the results.

Dr. Bowman thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present. He

explained his company, The Bowman Group, had been working with the City for several months. Dr. Bowman explained a little bit about his group. He stated they are experts in police practices and their active portfolio includes working with agencies in several states including Texas. Their portfolio also includes police chief searches. He stated the scope of work on the Pflugerville project involves five primary steps although there are a couple of different tasks, they are engaged in to get into the process. The process began with interviewing stakeholders including the City Manager and management team. He stated it was important to have the community heavily involved. The community was involved in so they understand what the community expectations are and in formulating the job description, search materials and recruitment it is important to know what the community wants.

Dr. Bowman stated they looked at several previously conducted surveys in order to create their survey. Some feedback from the public was incorporated as well as employee input. As a result of the survey research, input and feedback and the briefings of the stakeholders, they worked with the city to refine the job descriptions and the search materials around this stakeholder input and from there launched the recruitment process where they've engaged in consensus building with the city and vetting of the applicants.

The survey itself consists of eight questions, five are fixed choice and three open ended questions. All were available and distributed to people online. They felt it was the most efficient way because they are working from a remote place and due to the pandemic. The process was designed to be almost all virtual. The survey was made available through the city website and social media. There were 699 respondents and one internal City Council member. The questions dealt with key traits, top priorities, neighborhood needs, experience with the police, residency, and neighborhood, what they want the candidate to know about the City of Pflugerville and if there was anything else they wanted the candidates to know.

Dr. Bowman went through the survey questions with the Commission.

First question, Key traits: Dr. Bowman explained the graphical description of the responses. They number one priorities was Integrity and Accountability at 68.81%. The second was Experience working with diverse populations at 49%. Third, Leadership at 37.91% and fourth Experience with community-oriented policing at 27.4%. Dr. Bowman said most of the top form involve some type of community, diversity component and leadership, integrity, and accountability. Things continues throughout the survey.

The second question on the survey was name the top three priorities the new chief need to accomplish. Respondents listed number one, maintain over all community safety at 69.1%. Number two, Improve/ enhance training for officers and staff at 46.35%. Number three, Expand community trust at 42.20%.

Question number three asked What are the most important public safety needs in your neighborhood? Property crime ranked number one at 69.81%. Speeding on neighborhood roadways ranked 43.49%. Police presence at 36.77%. Community outreach ranked 34.33%.

The next question was What is your experience with the Pflugerville Police Department? Respondents rated their experiences along the temperature

scale, extremely negative to extremely positive. Answers showed that 85.69% of respondents had positive or neutral experiences. Those responses broken out are: Extremely positive, 29.9%, Positive, 35.05%. and neutral 20.74%. Dr. Bowman said those numbers were excellent for any community in the U.S.

The next questions was, Is there anything else the City of Pflugerville should consider when selecting the next Chief of Police? Respondents stated diversity, community, oriented and transparent.

Questions six was What would you like candidates for Chief of Police to know about our community? Respondents stated diverse, friendly, growing and that it is not Austin.

Question seven asks if the respondent is a resident, 95.42% answered yes.

Question eight asked What neighborhood are you from? The results were from all over Pflugerville.

Dr. Bowman further stated that these responses helped to develop a multitude of exercises to vet the candidates. There were eighty-eight applicants for the position compared to Austin at 44, Fort Worth at 56, Dallas had 39. He also stated the applicants are diverse and from all over the United States. Dr. Bowman said the process should be completed by next month. He then opened the conversation up for questions.

Chair Matlock asked who would be participating in the interview process. Dr. Bowman said one is an internal panel and the second a city panel, consisting of stakeholders. He said they were still in the process of compiling and composing the panel. The panel also involves the City Manager and her staff and the school board.

Vice-Chair Douglas asked Dr. Bowman what the typical response rate for a survey of this type was. He also pointed out that some people did not have access to the internet. He also acknowledged that the pandemic had made alternatives difficult.

Dr. Bowman said for a city the size of Pflugerville they are happy to get 300-400 responses. He said it is important to extend the opportunity and that some do not answer. Sometimes they need to go door to door or call. Given the limited time and circumstances, online allowed them to reach the greatest number of people in the shortest amount of time. He also stated that in many communities they conduct surveys and the community is not given any opportunity for input. He said he felt that was unacceptable.

Mr. Scott thanked Dr. Bowman for his work. Mr. Scott asked about the search for the Police of Chief and if there was oversight of the Pflugerville Independent School District (PflISD) police. He asked if there was a separate leader for PflISD, who is it, and do they work closely with the Pflugerville police.

Deputy City Manager (DCM) Fletcher explained that initially the PflISD police was a subset of the Pflugerville Police Department (PDD) but as of 2018 they have been solely under the operation of the PflISD. The PPD has no purview over the PflISD police.

Vice-Chair Douglas asked what the next step was in the process. Dr. Bowman stated that they would be using their assessment tools to reduce the field to 6-8 finalists who will interview with the two panels, the employee and the city panel. They will go through different exercises and be weighted. At the end of the day the findings will be compiled and presented to the City Manager. Once the CM accepts 2-3 candidates who will spend time in the city and will meet for personal interviews and the final decision will be the City Manager's.

Vice-Chair Douglas asked if the questions asked was something that Dr. Bowman's team was providing. Dr. Bowman stated that his group was in the process of designing the interview. It will be a structured interview and everyone will be asked the same questions. He said he could not discuss those questions in order to maintain integrity but that they would relate to critical job function, what the community demands and they are designed to allow candidates demonstrate those characteristics the community demands.

Dr. Medina asked about the opportunity to interact with community members (via chat). Dr. Bowman said his group suggested the community have some involvement and they believed the best way to get the most participation was through the survey. As far as additional community involvement they have not designed a process to bring in any more community members other than the panel. If any additional community members are to be brought in it is the City Manager's prerogative but it is not part of the process they designed or recommended. They did not include large gatherings of the community in the process largely because of Covid. It was designed to be virtual and the only non-virtual piece is when the final candidates come into town, meet with the City Manager, and do a tour.

Dr. Medina thanked him for a thorough response. Chair Matlock thanked Dr. Bowman again and stated he looked forward to the process and that he was hopeful someone from the committee would have an opportunity to sit on one of the panels.

5. Discuss and Consider Action

5A. [2021-0681](#)

Process for moving forward with pillars
James Matlock, Chair

Vice-Douglas suggest they put to a vote yes or no on sub-committees. Mr. Scott clarified the two points for a vote (centralized or decentralized).

Chair Matlock asked if he was voting for centralization. Mr. Scott said yes.

Chair Matlock asked for a Vice-Chair Douglas' vote. Vice-Chair Douglas said he was confused and clarified that it was a yes or no vote for sub-committees. There was agreement.

Vice-Chair Douglas voted for centralized. Ms. Castillo voted for centralized. Dr. Medina voted centralized and the Chair voted for Centralized.

Chair Matlock asked Ms. Griswold to display the homework assignment from May 24th. Chair Matlock reviewed each item in the homework. The homework question and answers were:

How do you foresee the operation and the sub-committees as defined by the pillars?

We develop sub committees around each pillar. We then elect a commission member to head each of the pillars identified in the charter, no member can head more than two sub committees. In addition, every member must be a part of three sub committees. Each sub-committee takes on a goal in the charter (some sub-committees can take on the same goal). The subcommittee then identifies initiatives in which they will work on to achieve the goals in which they select. Sub committees meet outside of our regular commission meetings and report to the committee once a month.

If we cannot get the participation in sub committees that we need. We will need to construct a bi-monthly agenda based around each pillar in which relevant data is pulled and discussed real time. Then actions can be assigned and recommendations can be written. This will bring most of the work into the meeting and put more onus on this committee to work with staff to pull relevant information

I think we should have a formal outline of how a pillar will be addressed / managed. What are the common goals, actions, themes, and expectations so that the effort afforded to each pillar can be compared and judged properly? We for sure will see that some pillars get more focus due to the time available to the person who owns it. If we can have a structure that articulates what topics or bullet points should be addressed then we'll be able to know how far along some are versus the others, and where people may be able to step in and assist. Definitions of 'done' and 'success' are probably needed, along with how we communicate the need for assistance.

A committee to be formed around the focus of the pillar- identification of goals (must be achievable/measurable to gauge progress) for said pillar can be identified by the Equity Commission as a whole. Given that the number of pillars may outnumber the committee members and time allotment/appointment of members it may be best to give focus to those pillars that may be more pressing/urgent. As Equity Commission grows, attention can then expand to focus on multiple pillars at a time. There also needs to be identified meeting times designated to set expectations for members of each pillar

Chair Matlock stated that it appeared they had a decentralized approach, a centralized approach, and a hybrid to choose from. Chair Matlock said he was leaning more towards a centralized approach since the number of Commission members has dwindled. He opened the floor for discussion.

Vice-Chair Douglas stated that there is a lot of upheaval with returning to in-person meetings and it is a concern of trying to do more work outside of the meeting. He said he felt the best work was to do the work within the meeting. He suggested several options including tackling one to three pillars per week as a committee. That way there is better understanding on what people are doing and working on.

Dr. Medina expressed her agreement with Vice-Chair Douglas and said she would like to see the Commission maximize the meetings.

Mr. Scott asked if there was a cap on the number of people who could be on the Commission or was it based on the number of applicants. He further asked if membership was open for those in the ETJ or if they had to live within the city limits.

Vice-Chair Douglas stated that in the ordinance it states seven members and even to add an alternate there must be two meetings. Additionally, there are two people who have applied to the Commission.

DCM Trey Fletcher, said that the change to the ordinance was in the works.

Vice-Chair Douglas asked if they must wait for the ordinance.

DCM Fletcher stated that Vice-Chair Douglas correct that it was put in the ordinances at seven which is consistent with other boards and commission. However, if they Commission wanted to increase the numbers, they can let them know.

Chair Matlock said right now adding the two additional members is the correct process. He cautioned against too many people on a Commission.

DCM Fletcher stated that if the meeting date needs to adjust, they can evaluate that. Chair Matlock stated that they should evaluate bringing the meeting dates and times back to the floor.

DCM Fletcher cautioned they might wait until the new members are on-board. Once it is set, it needs to be set going forward.

Dr. Medina stated that she appreciated DCM Fletcher's point but reminded the Commission that the Commission was formed during a pandemic. She asked DCM Fletcher if a hybrid model of meetings was an option because schedule-wise it would allow for more flexibility and it was an equity issue.

DCM Fletcher said it was an excellent point and said they've discussed with City Council the possibility of hybrid meetings but there were some technology problems with meetings broadcast on PflTV but he was not sure about meetings that were not televised.

Vice-Chair Douglas stated that he understood and it should be revisited closer to the September date because what they opted into at the beginning of the Commission was based on availability during a pandemic.

Chair Matlock refocused the Commission on the process for moving forward with the pillars. He asked for a vote on whether they should use a centralized approach or a decentralized approach.

Chair Matlock called for a vote. Mr. Scott asked a question first.

Mr. Scott asked if the Commission was to do a decentralized approach, he may utilize services of people not on the Commission. He asked if that was allowable.

Chair Matlock stated that his understanding that you would have other committee members supporting you as you would support others. Also, city staff may be people you reach out for assistance or information. He said he was unsure about bringing in outside people because that was expanding the committee without Council approval. Mr. Scott asked if bringing in other people to help with pillars would violate the Open Meetings Act. DCM Fletcher said it would not. He said it might be helpful to supplement the ordinance with

rules of procedure that provide these options.

Mr. Scott discuss some the hybrid option. Vice-Chair Douglas reminded the Commission that if you meet with four or more members outside of a posted meeting, it was a violation of the Open Meetings Act.

DCM Fletcher said if members of the Commission want to meet as subcommittees, they cannot have more than three. Mr. Scott asked if people outside the Commission could participate. DCM Fletcher said they could but it would be advisable to put some definition of what that role is.

Chair Matlock said this path would be one that needed to be fleshed out. He said this would be a third option. Mr. Scott stated that one of their goals was to include people in the ETJ. He stated that a way to include those people in the ETJ would be allow them to support the Commission on a pillar, that was a way they could be included.

Chair Matlock reminded the Commission that was in year two goals and they need to take a first things first approach and not get ahead of themselves.

Vice-Douglas suggest they put to a vote yes or no on sub-committees. Mr. Scott clarified the two points for a vote (centralized or decentralized).

Chair Matlock asked if he was voting for centralization. Mr. Scott said yes.

Chair Matlock asked for a Vice-Chair Douglas' vote. Vice-Chair Douglas said he was confused and clarified that it was a yes or no vote for sub-committees. There was agreement.

Vice-Chair Douglas voted for centralized. Ms. Castillo voted for centralized. Dr. Medina voted centralized and the Chair voted for Centralized.

Chair Matlock suggested for the next meeting they look at the pillars of economic equity, health and wellness, and social justice for the next meeting

Vice-Chair Douglas asked about requests for data from city staff. DCM Fletcher stated if it is clear what is needed and the level of effort required, they can try to honor the requests prior to the next meeting.

5B. [2021-0684](#)

Progress Report to the Council
James Matlock, Chair

Chair Matlock went over the presentation of the Equity Commission Charter to the City Council on July 13, 2021. Chair Matlock invited the Commission to join the meeting and encouraged them to attend.

Chair Matlock thanked Breanna Higgins for the graphics for the presentation. He asked Ms. Griswold to bring up the slideshow.

Chair Matlock went through the slides, pointing out the authority, vision statement, membership, organization, requirements of meetings, and dismissal from the commission.

Mr. Scott asked about virtual meetings and whether work was being done to include hybrid meetings (i.e., in-person and virtual), or is it strictly in-person.

Chair Matlock asked Mr. Fletcher to answer. Mr. Fletcher stated that it was a good question and that it is allowed but it is very nuanced and difficult.

Chair Matlock stated beginning with the September meeting, the Commission will be meeting in City Hall. Chair Matlock asked Mr. Fletcher if the meetings would be a hybrid. Mr. Fletcher said they would not.

Chair Matlock encouraged those Commission members who had concerns to wear masks. Chair Matlock thanked the Commission for their hard work on the Charter. He also thanked them for the condolence card sent on behalf of the Commission.

Vice-Chair Douglas extended his condolences as did Dr. Medina.

Chair Matlock continued with the presentation review. He reviewed the vision, membership, and operational goals for years one through three. He reviewed the stakeholders and accountability.

Chair Matlock asked Ms. Griswold to bring up the May homework assignment for review. At this point Dr. T. Bowman joined the meeting.

5C. [2021-0682](#)

Future meetings

James Matlock, Chair

This topic was discussed during item 5A.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Griswold, Library Director

Approved as submitted on July 26, 2021.