

1600 Pacific Highway, Room 203 San Diego, CA 92101-2942 www.sdstatusofwomenandgirls.org CSWG@sdcounty.ca.gov

Chairwoman: Kristine Custodio Suero

Vice Chair Mary Davis Idara Ogunsaju Vernita Gutierrez

**District 4, Montgomery** Steppe

Idara Ogunsaju Melinda Vásquez District 1, Vargas

Vacant Monica Martinez

District 5, Desmond Rohida Khan

Amy Nantkes

District 2, Anderson

Mary Davis Lauren Welty

**Members At Large** Vacant

Vernita Gutierrez Vacant

District 3, Lawson-Remer

Vacant

Kristine Custodio Suero

**Staff Assistant** Cristina Garcia

**Senior Deputy County** 

Counsel

Heather Murray

**MINUTES** March 7, 2025 **Hybrid Regular Meeting** 12:00 PM - 1:00 PM

Chair Kristine Custodio Suero: Meeting was called to order at 12:05 PM.

### Agenda item #1 – Commissioner Roll Call:

**Members Present In-person:** 

Kristine Custodio Suero	Vernita Gutierrez	
Mary Davis	Idara Ogunsaju	
Rohida Khan	Lauren Welty	
Monica Martinez – Attended virtually (just cause)		
M		

#### Members Absents

Wiemberg Hosent.		
	Melinda Vásquez	Amy Nantkes

### Agenda item #2 – Approval of February 7, 2025 Meeting Minutes:

Vice Chair Gutierrez made a motion to approve the February 7, 2025 meeting minutes. Commissioner Welty seconded the motion. During discussion Chair Custodio Suero mentioned her name needed to be corrected on page 1. Motion passed unanimously with proposed amendments.

### Agenda item #3 – Public Comments:

None

### Agenda item #4 – Committee Reports:

- a. Civic Engagement: Human Trafficking webinar in April 2025 (Khan)
- b. Policy: Committee met on February 28<sup>th</sup> and will continue to meet on the 4<sup>th</sup> Friday of the month. Committee to continue Comm. Nantkes' work on paid family leave and CEDAW. Kelly Jenkins connecting commission with County Super Saturday's. Possible collaboration for a webinar; Civic Engagement Committee to explore.
- c. Governance: Committee creating a "How to guide" and using local town counsel as a template. Will provide a draft copy during the next committee meeting. Funding concerns since most grants require

- applicant to be a 501(c)(3). Would like support from County on any funding opportunity.
- d. Executive: During the eboard meeting, there was discussion regarding appointments and vacancies and how to fill vacancies.

### **Old Business:**

**Agenda item #5** – Initiative Updates and Liaison Reports

- a. CEDAW Advisor: Vice Chair Ogunsaju share the update regarding CEDAW which was prepared by CEDAW advisor Parisa Ijadi-Maghsoodi (see attachment A & B)
- b. Women's Hall of Fame: Event will be held in November 2025.
- c. Association of California Commissions of Women: Comm. Welty received the link for the ACCW monthly meetings. Only 4 people attended the last meeting which lasted 1.5 hours. More of a discussion group; discussed funding and retaining people on Commissions. She also shared the Sacramento CSWG received grant funds and donations. It was determined Sacramento CSWG is an entity of Sacramento County.

### **New Business**

**Agenda item # 6** – Guest Speaker: Dr. Hei-ock (Hay-o) Kim, Executive Director at Kim Center for Social Balance (see attachment C)

Agenda item # 7 — Discussion and appointment recommendation of Commissioners to fill vacancies: There are two at-large vacancies to be filled. Ms. Kelly Jenkins voluntarily stepped out of the room to allow the commission to speak regarding her application to serve on the Commission. Vice Chair Davis made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisor (BOS) the appointment of Ms. Jenkins to fill one of the at-large vacancies. Vice Chair Ogunsaju seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Chair Custodio Suero will write a letter in support of the motion and attach Ms. Jenkins resume to the letter which will be sent to the BOS. There was further discussion regarding the criteria to be considered when review applications to fill vacancies. Each commissioner to prioritize their top 3 and bring to April meeting. The Civic Engagement committee will reach out to the applicants received over the last 3 years to ask if they are still interest in serving on the commission and invite them to attend future meetings.

During round table Vice Chair Gutierrez asked for a status update on the bylaw revisions. Staff Assistant Garcia mentioned that the Office of Finance and General Government Group is spearheading the project going forward. No further updates at this time but would have something for April's meeting.

### Adjourn

**Agenda item #8:** This meeting closed at 1:02 PM.

### **Information Items:**

• **2025 Meetings:** April 4<sup>th</sup>, May 2<sup>nd</sup>, June 6<sup>th</sup>, July 11<sup>th</sup> (tentative), August 1<sup>st</sup>, September 5<sup>th</sup>, October 3<sup>rd</sup>, November 7<sup>th</sup>, December 5<sup>th</sup>

**NOTE:** The Commission on the Status of Women and Girls jurisdiction is established by action of the Board of Supervisors as follows: The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego declares that it is the policy of the County to take action to identify needs and problems of women in the County that are affected by public policy decisions; and furthermore, to eliminate the practice of discrimination and prejudice on the basis of sex within the County. In order to promote this policy and to provide an open forum for discussion and action, there is hereby established a San Diego County Commission on the Status of Women in the Chief Administrative Office. County Code of Administrative Ordinances, Section 85.

### Attachment A

### CEDAW Advisor Report (03.05.2025)

First, we don't have an answer yet for the two questions we posed in our Jan. 20 letter (the Commissioners should have a copy and if they do not, I will ask that the letter be included in today's meeting minutes -- it is attached to this email). A reminder that it would be helpful for the Supervisors, particularly Supervisors Lawson-Remer and Montgomery Steppe, to hear directly from the Commissioners and the community on the importance of these two outstanding asks.

Second, OERJ just announced their points of contact with the consultant "are transitioning". It seems this is what they are currently using to delay the regularly scheduled meetings, which we have been attending.

Third, it would be great to have a strong San Diego presence at the remote portion of CSW next week. I encourage you to attend the panel that spotlights our San Diego's CEDAW efforts. I am serving on it in my capacity as a Cities for CEDAW Committee Co-chair (along with my colleague Co-Chair international human rights attorney Mary Hansel) at 930am on Tues. March 11, 2025.

Registration link for virtual CSW NGO: <a href="https://ngocsw.org/ngocsw69/">https://ngocsw.org/ngocsw69/</a>.

Panel link: <a href="https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81703875085?pwd=h1BCRYug5TwAHe82v21BGG8zntaa62.1">https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81703875085?pwd=h1BCRYug5TwAHe82v21BGG8zntaa62.1</a>.



January 20, 2025

Chair Lawson-Remer and Supervisor Montgomery Steppe County of San Diego Board of Supervisors County Administration Center 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92101 Terra.Lawson-Remer@sdcounty.ca.gov Monica.MontgomerySteppe@sdcounty.ca.gov

### Re: Status of CEDAW Baseline Intersectional Data Analysis Methodology

Dear Chair Lawson-Remer and Supervisor Montgomery Steppe:

We write to commend the County for the significant progress made in refining the methodology for the intersectional baseline analysis mandated by the CEDAW ordinance. It is clear that there has been a focused effort to incorporate the vast majority of the recommendations we have made, and we want to acknowledge the hard work that has gone into advancing this process. The improvements made so far are promising, and it is evident that the County is committed to ensuring the analysis aligns with—rather than deviates from—global best practices on implementing this data-driven, evidence-based human rights framework.

However, as we continue this important work, it is essential that we ensure we are conducting the baseline analysis with full adherence to the ordinance, as its full potential can only be realized when all aspects are diligently implemented. There are a few areas that still require attention to ensure complete fidelity to the intent and purpose of the ordinance, as well as to ensure fiscal responsibility given the \$500,000 allotted to this important stage of implementation. These issues, while perhaps minor in appearance, are critical to ensuring an effective baseline analysis.

**Area 1**: The focus must be on inequities in County operations, not on general inequities existing at the resident level

While we applaud the County's recognition that significant inequities exist at the resident level, it is important to clarify that this is not the primary aim of the baseline intersectional data analysis. (The ordinance itself already recognizes these inequities, and we extensively outlined their scope when drafting the board letter that urged its adoption.) Instead, the purpose of this baseline data analysis is to identify inequities stemming from the County's role as a service provider, employer, and community partner. This data-driven approach is designed to reveal inequities in operations that would otherwise remain unnoticed and, consequently, go unaddressed. Only *after* we identify these inequities can we take affirmative steps to address and remedy their discriminatory impacts, specifically through the mandated Action Plans. Accordingly, while the resident-level demographic data is important, its role is to serve as a comparator group for the granular data analysis conducted on a unit-by-unit and program-by-program level.

**Area 2:** It is imperative that no unit, program, or service—particularly those serving women in poverty—be omitted from the baseline data analysis

We acknowledge that earlier in this process, the County was unwilling to provide us with the list of all County units, programs, and services from which it was obtaining disaggregated data

and releasing that data to the consultant. However, given where we are now, it is crucial that we receive this list to ensure that this resource-intensive analysis is comprehensive. A review of the County's updated methodology memo solidifies the importance of our review of this list. For instance, the memo identifies services provided by one department but omits the department's largest program, which is required to serve the County's lowest-income residents, including a significant number of women-led households.

Given the CEDAW's focus on women in poverty combined with our ordinance's centering of women in poverty and prioritization of the County's role as a service provider, it is both essential and fiscally responsible to ensure no program or service—especially a program serving women in poverty—be excluded from the baseline analysis. This analysis will serve as the foundation for comparing the future analyses mandated by the ordinance and for measuring progress under the subsequent Action Plans.

As Commissioner Dr. Nantkes illustrated through her detailed presentation at the December 2024 Commission meeting, Project 100% was not ancient history. This ordinance is a tool for the County to use to avoid again administering any program or service in a manner that perpetuates—rather than mitigates—discrimination, including on the basis of gender, race, and ethnicity. However, its effectiveness will be compromised if all units, programs, and services, particularly those serving women in poverty, are not included.

By addressing these areas, we are confident the baseline analysis will be implemented with full adherence to the ordinance, align with best practices in the global human rights arena, and lay the foundation by which we will be able to effectively measure future progress. Accordingly, the County's efforts in ensuring the baseline analysis is conducted effectively and transparently will exceed the expectations of its residents, ensuring long-term success and community trust.

While I offer my continued support in working together to resolve these concerns and to create the most effective and sustainable implementation of this ordinance, moving forward, joining me in these efforts of support will be Chair Custodio Suero and Commissioner Dr. Nantkes, who are not only committed to gender equity but have also served as delegates at the UN Commission on the Status of Women, which centers the CEDAW.

At an upcoming in-person meeting, we look forward to discussing the resolution of the aforementioned issues. At that time, we will also circle back on two additional unresolved but critical issues: the importance of ensuring the County's use of language aligns with—rather than contradicts—the CEDAW; and ensuring the Commission's continued involvement in all stages of implementation given the ordinance's clear mandate.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. We look forward to seeing the continued progress, and to discussing in person in the near future at a time that works for all stakeholders.

Warmly,

Parisa Ijadi-Maghsoodi

Janot Myh.

CEDAW Advisor, Commission on the Status of Women and Girls

Cc: Kristine Custodio Suero, Chair, Commission on the Status of Women and Girls Dr. Amy Nantkes, Commissioner, Commission on the Status of Women and Girls Taryell Simmons, Interim Director, Office of Equity and Racial Justice Melissa Bartolome, Deputy Director, Office of Equity and Racial Justice Chiara Leroy, Equity Impact Manager, Office of Equity and Racial Justice

### Attachment C



# Dr. Hei-ock Kim, Executive Director heiock@kimcenter.org

. . . . . . . . .





# **LEAPS San Diego Alliance**



























































# Top LEAPS San Diego findings

- 1. Women 40% of biz owners, 10% of capital and hiring
- 2. 32% of workers experiences sexual harassment
  - a. 40% Latinas and 56% of workers with disabilities
- 3. 9% employers offer childcare benefits.
  - a. 30% of workers may quit.



## **Elevate Small Businesses**



## **City Heights Case Study**















Staff from Port of San Diego & UCSD Rady School of Management



## **Eliminate Sexual Harassment**



### **Universal Employer Toolkit**













## **Increase Childcare**



## **Discovery Report for County Blueprint**

























# **Questions?**



Small Businesses: City Heights case study



2. **Sexual Harassment:** Universal employer toolkit



Childcare: Discovery Report for County Blueprint

# Thank you!



Dr. Hei-ock Kim, Executive Director heiock@kimcenter.org