

MF POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

August 23, 2022

Members Present: Council Member Gardner – Chair, Council Member Murillo, Council Member Zvonek

Others present: Mayor Pro Tem Bergan, R. Venegas, T. Velasquez, G. Hays, N. Wishmeyer, K. Rodriguez, B. Levine, M. Bryant, H. Hanosky, D. Lathers, R. Allen, R. Lantz, P. Koonce, G. Koumantakis, T. Sedmak, S. Newman, T. Vaughn, J. Bajorek, J. Culotti, J. Rustad, N. Wishmeyer, S. Shanks, K. Rodriguez, B. Bell, F. Aranda, C. Atkinson, K. Stuart, J. Schneebeck, S. Vanburen, M. Crawford, M. Wassenberger, J. Ehmann, K. Stafford, C. Zapata, W. Sommer, D. Krzyzanowski, M. Stamp, E. Watson, A. Rdonett, M. Parnes, R. Goggins, J. Edwards, P. Koonce, and D. Sisneros

INTRODUCTIONS AND MINUTES

July 26, 2022 minutes were approved.

JULY 2022 SALES TAX CHARTSummary of Issue and Discussion

Bill Levine presented the July 2022 Sales Tax Chart. The sales tax in July grew by 5.4% compared to 2021 which continues the trend that the economy is slowing down. This is the smallest amount of growth seen in 2022. A large sale was received from an IT company in July 2021. Should this one-time payment not be taken into account, July 2022's growth would have been 8.4%. The city is \$20 million in sales tax over the projected budget.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: All right. Appreciate that. Are there any questions from the committee?

CM Murillo: None for me.

CM Zvonek: No questions.

CM Gardner: All right. Thanks, Bill, for the update. Appreciate it.

CM Murillo: Thank you.

Outcome

Information only.

Follow-up Action

No follow-up needed.

NON-PROFIT REVIEW SCOPE OF WORKSummary of Issue and Discussion

Nancy Wishmeyer presented the non-profit review proposed scope of work for the audit. The procedures were compiled by staff and reviewed by the external auditors who confirmed that they will be able to perform them. The procedures must be specific to ensure that auditors will make objective calls whether the nonprofits met the requirements. Once the procedures are finalized, a price quote will be requested before moving forward with the review.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: So why don't we start with Council Member Murillo. Any thoughts, feedback, comments or anything on the proposed scope that was included in our packet?

CM Murillo: Yes. I guess on a high level it looks right and just to be very clear. The scope looks like it's mostly focusing on an audit as it relates to federal grant dollars or is it more robust? I saw a specific sort of carve-out there so could you clarify that a little bit?

N. Wishmeyer: Yes, so the carve-out was really, we're excluding all of the dollars that are coming to the city that are either federal or federal pass through. And the issue with the federal money would be that since those moneys are already under the single audit, they do that single audit and they would basically be conflicted and reviewing their own work. So, we're excluding all federal dollars. So, it would be everything other than federal and it would be any kind of money. It would be other grants, other donations, it could be general fund money, or other types of city money that would be reviewed

CM Murillo: Okay. Sorry I missed the operative word being removed. In that, first that makes a lot of sense. So, as part of the audit, are we going to also audit let's say which departments are being funded by. We're going to keep track and obviously we'll have the part of the budget there, but I just want to be sure as they pass through, we are clear on when people ask us about city spending and where the dollars go.

N. Wishmeyer: We would definitely have the transaction detail that would show the various departments that are basically taking that money and then spending it in whatever way with the nonprofits.

CM Murillo: Okay, and are we letting folks know that we're going through this process? I'm thinking of the smaller organizations that might need some time to prepare for an audit for that

can be a very time-consuming process so I just want to make sure that folks have enough time to prepare to give us the information that we need from them.

N. Wishmeyer: I don't think we'll know until they are started which nonprofits would be selected. But I would imagine that some sort of a memo or a letter from the city would go out to let them know that they are expected to comply and provide information back.

CM Murillo: Thank you. That's it for me, Council Member Gardner.

CM Gardner: Okay. Council Member Zvonek any questions or feedback?

CM Zvonek: Just one question. I know that and it came up when we were talking about your files that sometimes we get requests from newer nonprofits that might not have been around for all that long. And so, I know there's a requirement for an annual 990, lot of nonprofits will do that every 18 months as opposed to 12. Are there things that we can request if it's one of the newer nonprofits that might not have filed the 990, that we can request for them with that same information. Because I don't want it to get into a position and I believe Council Member Murillo mentioned this last time. Is that some of the smaller newer ones, I don't want to exclude them in the future from being eligible for grants or be a part of this audit process simply because they haven't yet filed the 990.

N. Wishmeyer: I believe we would be able to make some calls as city government and the committee regarding that. What it's doing is just going through that list and saying in a way "yay or nay, did they have it or did they not?" And then we will take that information, city management and the committee and determine what does this mean and where do we want to take this from here?

CM Zvonek: Okay. Thank you. That's all I had.

CM Gardner: All right. Marcy, is there anything you wanted to add?

M. Ardan: No.

CM Gardner: Okay. So, with that, are both Council Members okay with moving this forward?

CM Zvonek: Yes.

CM Murillo: Yes.

CM Gardner: All right. This will move forward. Thanks, Nancy. And thanks, Marcy, for your work on this. Appreciate it.

N. Wishmeyer: Sure.

Outcome

The Committee supported the review and its procedures as outlined.

Follow-up Action

Staff will move forward with the review.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT PLAN OPTIONSSummary of Issue and Discussion

Nancy Wishmeyer presented the employee retirement plan options. The cost estimate provided by Milliman for the actuary study to explore possible options for employee retirement plans is between \$22,000 to \$27,000. This is operating under the assumption that only new employees will be provided the option between GERP or a DC plan. The study would look at various scenarios assuming a percentage of employees would choose DC over GERP. Staff will bring the results forward to the M&F Committee for review.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: All right, Council Member Zvonek, any comments?

CM Zvonek: Yes. I support the idea of doing the study. I believe that having that flexibility of choice between a DC or a DB plan is beneficial. I do assume having worked on this issue with PERA, that there's always some concern that the more people to opt-out, there's fewer people paying in. And I believe especially if there's an unfunded liability, which there is but small. I know there's a transition cost. So, that's a part of that analysis, understanding what it would take to make sure that we fulfill the obligation to those who we've already committed to, but still allow that transition to happen. So, I think long term, that transition is an important one to be able to make.

CM Gardner: Council Member Murillo, any feedback?

CM Murillo: No. I still support this moving forward. I want to know more about the cost to be able to offer both options to our employees.

CM Gardner: Okay. Well, it sounds like will move forward. Nancy, appreciate your work so far on this and keep us posted.

N. Wishmeyer: Okay. Will do. Thank you.

Outcome: The Committee supported moving the study forward.

Follow-up Action: Staff will move the study forward.

PROPOSED 2023 CHANGES TO SERVICE FEESSummary of Issue and Discussion

Greg Hays presented the proposed 2023 changes to service fees. As part of the annual budget process, departments review service fees to determine any necessary adjustments or eliminations. The process continues with the use of fee indexing. The 2023 fees are indexed using a 3.2 percent inflation factor, derived from the Employment Cost Index for State and Local Government Compensation. The city worked with Willdan as a consultant to have a detailed look at cost of fees. Most of the fees were already close to Willdan's recommendations. City departments chose whether to follow the recommendations or not, which a lot of them did.

The changes in service fees that came out of the Red Tape Reduction Committee are part of this version of service fees. This includes the amusement device vendor fees. In addition to this, Aurora now has a fine-free library.

In sum, most of the fees were indexed. There were 15 bullets noting fees that were less than the index and 8 bullets that were greater. More fees were eliminated than added.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: I appreciate that, Greg. I want to thank you for pointing out the libraries. I know Council previously looked at that, but just exciting to see it in writing. Two questions, one is on the great lawn use fee. Can you tell me what that's for? Are there First Amendment issues around allowing or making people pay a fee to basically use the public space?

G. Hays: What department is that?

CM Zvonek: Parks and Rec.

G. Hays: Do I have somebody from Parks and Rec?

T. Tully: Hi. Tom Tully with PROS business services. That is a fee that we've always charged, we just never memorialized it. So that's what this is.

CM Gardner: Okay.

CM Gardner: Do we charge the city for global fests, for example? Or is that the type of event that we would charge this for?

T. Tully: Not necessarily global fest because that's a city event. But if it was a non-city event, yes, we would charge.

CM Gardner: And then my other question is on greens fees for golf courses. Is that purely based upon an index or do we take into account competition from other courses and that sort of thing?

T. Tully: Yes. We've surveyed the Denver courses in particular and our prices are competitive with theirs and we do have increased cost. So, we indexed with them a little bit and then try to cover our costs.

CM Gardner: It stood out to me because, the 18-hole rate for Saddle Rock is pushing almost 100 bucks for one round. So it's getting pricey, but I guess golf is expensive. Council Member Murillo, any questions, or comments?

CM Murillo: No questions. But I did similarly prior conversations, the fees for pit bulls and restricted breeds, I saw that that was removed as well. I know that impound fees as well. Just some observations, but no questions.

CM Gardner: Council Member Zvonek?

CM Zvonek: So many lines of fees. Overall, Greg, because you've been doing this for a long time, and I trust your judgment on a lot of this. When you look at the fee increases that we're looking at in some of these -- and I'm sensitive to them because as Council Member Gardner, you talked about golf and I know that golf is a luxury sport, I get that. But there are fees that real people are paying or complying with here that are going to impact their life. So, as you look at the increases that we are making, are they in line with what we've seen historically. What is the net increase of all of these fees? This is one of the things, again, that's unique to Colorado is the way we use fees as a way to avoid TABOR. And I'm not suggesting that these are all of that, but it's just, it's a reality. And so, I just, I'm curious, like, what is the net increase of fees here?

G. Hays: I know anecdotally over time, the increase that we saw, the 3.2% increase with the employment cost index for state and local government compensation is probably, a little bit low. Because if you think about it, it's government compensation, it's people costs. That's what most of our fees cover is the service that whatever person is providing. I would guess that a lot of places are going to go up and we're probably going to maybe see that next year in terms of an increase. But I would say that for the most part, this is right in the ballpark of what we've seen every year. Everything's in that 2 to 3% range. I would say that the impact fees were higher, but the story is all out there. The impact fees are based on construction cost indexes, and those construction cost indexes over the last 12 months were higher than the 12 months previous. So, I would say that that's right. In terms of a net increase, I would say that we've increased the general fund probably 3%. At least in the general fund, all of the revenue that comes from this is about \$6 million. And that we probably got about a 3% factor built into growth for that. Now, I will say, like the Golf Fund lives off of these fees. So, they need that increase. If you read that, their fertilizer, everything that they've got is going up because everything is going up. So, I was not surprised at all by these numbers. And I thought they made a lot of sense. Nor was I

surprised by the ones who didn't want to index their fees. Municipal courts, keeping municipal court fees similar to other area places is normal for the city.

CM Zvonek: Okay. And you said this will be part of a future conversation around the budget too, right?

G. Hays: Well, what's going on is, this is more just informative telling you how the fees are working on. And at the end of this, I'm going to ask if I can go and do the same song and dance to full Council, and it'll be in the Saturday workshop packet. I'll try to get different jokes for that time with that group, if you're okay with me coming forward then.

CM Gardner: I Appreciate it. So, I guess, Greg, then the ask is just to forward this to full council?

G. Hays: Correct.

CM Gardner: Okay. Are both committee members okay with that?

CM Zvonek: Yes.

CM Murillo: Yes

Outcome

The Committee recommended the item move forward to be presented in the Budget Workshop.

Follow-up Action

Staff will move the item forward to the Budget Workshop.

GERP UPDATE

Summary of Issue and Discussion

Steve Shanks presented an update. The General Employees' Retirement Plan (GERP) was established in 1967 for the exclusive benefit of participating City employees and their beneficiaries. It covers general employees excluding APD, AFR, and elected officials. It's designed to provide a steady monthly income in retirement. Based on the actuarial valuation done on January 1, 2022, the plan assets increased by \$76 million. Prior to 2012, there was an equal contribution of 5.5% each for employee and city. Since 2017, the employee and city both put in 7%, which is 2.1% more than the plan would need based on Plan assets as of December 31, 2021 and the current actuarial assumptions. This is due to a higher-than-expected investment gain in 2021 which offset the increased cost of living due to inflation and salary increases. It is expected to be fully funded next year including a 7% return on investments.

The unfunded actuarial decreased by over 71%. A big piece of this was due to the investment performance which would have gotten the city 100% funded if not for an increase in employee

salaries and the cost of living. Due to this, the city remains 98% funded. The gross of fees return for 2021 was 20.03%, and the net of fees return was 19.9% compared to the 17.14% target. The median for public funds was 12.69%. According to Callan, the outside consultant, all periods presented, including the last one, three, five, seven, ten, fifteen and twenty-five years were above the 7% estimated return used in assumptions with actuaries. Compared to other Colorado plans, Aurora is the best in the one year and second best in the three and five-year numbers.

At the end of the first quarter, the latest 12-month return for Aurora is down to 10.86%. By the end of May, the 12-month return was down to 2.87% and the year-to-date return was -6.2%. The normal assumptions would be 3.25% for salary increase and 2.5% for COLA. The salary increase starting in October 2022 is going to be 5% and cost-of-living increase is capped at 5%. If Aurora has a bad year, a loss of 6% and then returns to assumptions the following year, the funded ratio will fall to 94% the lowest as of January 1, 2025. It would be back to 100% by January 1, 2037.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: All right. Appreciate that, Steve. Council Member Zvonek, any questions?

CM Zvonek: Yes, a couple. You said there's a 5% cap on COLA. Is there a floor?

S. Shank: We go along with the same as Social Security uses for the increase. This is for Tier 1 participants. Cost of living is discretionary for Tier 2 participants, which is anybody hired 2012 and after. But those hired before 2012, there's an automatic COLA based on the CPI – CPI-W. There is a floor. There is a floor now. There wasn't a floor at one point, we went negative one year and that wasn't popular. So, zero is a floor at this point and five is the cap.

CM Zvonek: Okay. And one other question. Are GERP members outside of Social Security? I assume they are.

S. Shank: No, they pay in with the city.

CM Zvonek: So, we pay both. So, it's unlike PERA where you're just one. We do both.

S. Shank: Correct.

CM Gardner: Council Member Murillo, any questions?

CM Murillo: No questions at this time.

CM Gardner: All right. Thank you, Steve. Appreciate the presentation.

S. Shank: All right. Thank you.

Outcome

Information only.

Follow-up Action

No follow-up needed.

2023 CITY BENEFITS PROGRAMSummary of Issue and Discussion

Ryan Lantz presented the 2023 City Benefits Program. Benefits are categorized into core benefits, which include medical, dental, vision, and FSA; employer-paid benefits, and voluntary benefits. Partners and providers include Kaiser for Medical, Delta Dental, and VSP for vision. Medical insurance is the largest cost driver. In 2023, a 6.5% cost increase is anticipated nationally. Kaiser usually applies a 3.4% annual increase as a baseline for all clients. The city's loss ratio is 80.4%. This determines the amount that the city pays for Kaiser to administer and pay claims. Through negotiations, the final renewal rate was brought down to 1.4% from 1.5%, which is lower than the Kaiser and national trend increase. This includes a \$150,000 fund to supplement the city's wellness program. Colorado plans now include infertility coverage which has been included in renewal rates.

The 1.4% unblended rate is spread out over five different plans. The plans with higher utilization and higher coverage and costs are seeing an increase. Triple option, HMO, and DHMO increased by more than 1.3%. The HDHP and DHMO750 are essentially at a 0% increase. The total increase of 1.4% equates to \$560,000. Cost-share, which is the amount that the employer and employee pay, is changing. For DHMO200, there will be a 0.5% increase for employees only and employee and spouse plans. There will be a 0.5% decrease for Family. The DHMO will have the employee pay 12% while the city pays the remaining amount. There is a similar 0.5% increase for three tiers of the Triple Option and a 0.4% decrease for Family. There will be no changes to HSA, DHMO750, and HMO plans. The IRS is increasing the deductible for the high-deductible health plan (HDHP) from \$1,400 to \$1,500 for the individual health savings account and from \$2,800 to \$3,000 for family. Due to this, the city will increase the Health Savings Account (HSA) that it pays for. This HAS can also turn into a retirement savings account besides medical upon retirement. Aurora has low out-of-pocket max amounts compared to others. Three out of five plans are above 90% in actuarial value. Based on data, the impact of the new benefits on the employees is negligible.

For dental, Delta Dental guaranteed rates through the end of 2023. 97% of all claims are within the Delta Dental Network which shows great utilization. The maximum benefit provided is \$1,500 and only 3.8% of members have exceeded this. Despite no potential increase in the maximum benefit, the base plan benefits will be increased at no cost to the employees. Preventive and diagnostic services will now be covered 100% from 90%. Major services

coverage will increase to 50% from 25%. For vision, rate guarantees are through 2025. There will be no changes to cost and coverage and will still remain 100% employee paid. For short-term disability, staff members are fully insured. However, there is a 27% decrease in renewal rates. Due to this, premium savings are estimated to be \$370,000. This will be used to potentially outsource the leave of absence administration. There is a recommendation to go advice-to-pay, meaning self-funded, for short-term disability. There are no significant cost increases with other lines of coverage.

Staff went to bid out the employee assistance program and went through an RFP. Based on the analysis, the decision was to not change vendors. There will be two new benefits. The Introduce Mental Health Resource Program, which is similar to the City of Aurora Addiction Rehabilitation Services (CAARS) Program will provide employees with in and outpatient treatment, job protection, and a continuation of wages. It will remain 100% confidential with no direct cost impact. A referral and approval from Kaiser would be needed. The other benefit will be the Free Recreation Center Membership for Employees and Families. It provides free membership and would require opting in and annual renewal.

The staff works with the Benefit Committee monthly for the renewal process. Final presentations were made to Executive Management and the Benefits Committee in July. This was also presented to the PACE Committee. After the presentation to the M&F Committee, there will be passive open enrollment, with the exception of FSA and HAS, from October 1 through 16.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: Ryan, one question. You might have touched on it, but I didn't catch it if you did. When is the last time we shopped for a different health insurance provider or what does that process look like?

R. Lantz: Yes, we did that in 2020 for the 2021 plan year and we got some competitive bids out there. It was decided to stick with Kaiser and that was, we consulted both the unions, we had the Benefit Committee, we had a lot of people involved and it was pretty unanimous that we were staying with Kaiser. And then best practices to do that, for government you would want to do it every about four or five years. So, we're probably up for it in another couple of years.

CM Gardner: Thank you. All right. Council Member Zvonek, any questions?

CM Zvonek: None for me.

CM Gardner: Council Member Murillo?

CM Murillo: Yes, real quick. In that evaluation process, how does mental health which has been a big topic of late so for really a long time in the public awareness. How do conversations around mental health benefits get incorporated into that evaluation process?

R. Lantz: It's on our forefront just outside of benefits, just supporting our employees. It's all in our forefront. So, everything that we do from an HR standpoint, we consider that piece of it. So, we evaluate that across all lines of HR, but with the benefit piece of it's one of our first topics we have with our medical providers just to see what benefits are offering and every year we take a look at it. It was one of the reasons why we looked at our ERP process to see if there were better and enhanced ways to support that. But that's another reason why we are offering this new mental health program for our employees.

CM Murillo: Okay. Thank you.

CM Gardner: Any additional questions? If not, do we need to take action to move it forward?

R. Lantz: This is information only.

CM Gardner: Okay. All right. Appreciate it, Ryan.

R. Lantz: Thank you.

Outcome

Information only.

Follow-up Action

No follow-up needed.

CAREER SERVICE COMMISSION OVERVIEW AND UPDATE

Summary of Issue and Discussion

Phazaria Koonce presented the Career Service Commission Overview and update. The Career Service Commission is comprised of five commissioners that serve a 6-year term. The Commission will hear, and review appeals from career service employees that have been laid off or have been issued discipline through suspensions, demotions, fines, or terminations. The appeal must be submitted in writing and must outline why the order should or should not be reversed or modified. Hearings may be closed or opened to the public. Sexual harassment hearings must be closed hearings. The Assistant City Attorney will serve as counsel, and the employee has the option to represent themselves or secure outside counsel. There have been no hearings for the Commission since 2021.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: Are there any questions from either of the Council Members? No questions. Thank you very much for the presentation.

P. Koonce: Welcome. Thank you.

Outcome: Information only.

Follow-up Action: No follow-up action.

2023 WARD REDISTRICTING REVIEW

Summary of Issue and Discussion

Kadee Rodriguez and Daniel Krzyzanowski presented the 2023 Ward Redistricting Review. Wards are reviewed and altered periodically to ensure they are compact, contiguous, and contain approximately the same number of residents. According to the City Code and Charter:

1. There must be six wards that contain approximately the same number of residents
2. When a common boundary between wards lies in a public street or right of way, the boundary is placed on the center line of the street.
3. Ward boundaries are reviewed prior to election years ending in 3 and 9 using United States census data and community surveys. They may be reviewed or altered at any time due to population shift or changes to county precinct boundaries.
4. Changes to ward boundaries must be made through ordinance, adopted by Council after receiving the Election Commission's recommendation.

Staff conducted public comment meetings in each ward. The public input survey on Engage Aurora closed August 3rd. The interactive maps are still available on Engage Aurora.

The population estimate was calculated using the April 1, 2020 Census Bureau's Redistricting Count and the certificates of occupancy issued by the City from April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2022. The total population estimate for Aurora is 402,961. The target population per ward is 67,160 (1/6 of the total population). Wards II and VI have the largest populations with Ward V being significantly smaller.

Different mapping scenarios were created to achieve balance by moving voting precincts. The Election Commission voted during their August 17th meeting to put forward Scenario 5.

- Scenario 1 - Wards II and VI are slightly smaller than the target population while other wards are closer to the target. Wards II and VI were undersized to compensate for the faster growth.
- Scenario 2 - Has a more even balance between wards and fewer voting precincts were moved compared to Scenario 1.
- Scenario 3 - The Election Commission did not see merit in Scenario 3.
- Scenario 4 - Various precincts were moved from ward to ward. Wards II and VI were undersized with the anticipation that the faster-growing areas will soon grow into the target population.

- Scenario 5 - Various precincts were moved from ward to ward. Wards II and VI are closer to 4% smaller than the target population.

Committee Discussion:

CM Zvonek: Council Member Gardner, can I ask a question on that last scenario?

CM Gardner: Please go ahead.

CM Zvonek: So, I just noticed and it's on the second line, it says Ward VI to VI on Precinct 317.

D. Krzyzanowski: I'm sorry, that'd be a typo. Trying to find which ward or precinct that is, but we can certainly correct that.

CM Zvonek: It's probably Ward II to something, because it said VI to V, VI to V, VI to V, VI to VI, and II to I.

D. Krzyzanowski: Precinct 317 is down south of Hampden and east of Tower. So that would be moving from Ward VI to Ward V. We'll correct that typo.

CM Gardner: All right. Thank you, Kadee and Daniel, for that presentation. Council Member Murillo, any questions or feedback?

CM Murillo: Thanks, Council Member Gardner. I do have a question. So, my question is, what would be a triggering event or a population threshold that would allow us to revisit. Because I empathize with the wanting to potentially build in some opportunity for growth in some of the areas. But if we're revisiting every three years, I'm wondering how many units. I'm sure there's a lot of units that could potentially come online depending on what part of the city you're in. But that doesn't necessarily mean that that would happen. Are there a certain number of building permits or a number of units that are in the development pipeline that would trigger a review. Is there anything like that that we use?

K. Rodriguez: So, I can let Daniel follow up with some additional detail, but there's no criteria that states what would trigger us to look at these numbers again, outside of the three and nine election years. So that isn't specified in the city code, I believe that is something that would be up to the discretion of the Election Commission and City Council if the numbers start getting out of hand and the wards aren't contiguous anymore. I'll let Daniel chime in about if he wants to add any additional detail to that.

D. Krzyzanowski: Sure. I would just say, Aurora has seen really extraordinary growth, especially in Wards II and VI, but certainly all over the city. Whether that growth continues at that rate over the next two, three, or four years is difficult to anticipate with a lot of specificity. I think we continue to see a lot of developments being approved and building permits being issued for the

eastern parts of the city. But as we've known from previous economic cycles, that can change sometimes quickly. And so, it's really a challenge in thinking too far out ahead in terms of population growth. I think if you're talking about maybe one or two years, we can feel fairly confident that growth will continue, beyond that is a little bit more murky. One of the questions we put to the public through the public meetings, and certainly to this Committee and to City Council, is how much of future growth do we want to anticipate in balancing these wards. Do we want them to be fairly well balanced upon adoption? Or, do we want to anticipate quite a bit of change, in which case we're looking more at will they be balanced two, three, four years from now? Where the communities and the decision makers stand on that question, I think, is really one of the more challenging questions and has had some discussion and will probably have continued discussion.

CM Murillo: Okay. Yes. I hear that and I understand the different approaches. I just wonder because there's a lot of areas in which you could see a quick housing increase. I think of the Ward I area, I know not in this version or this time around, it being one of the higher populated wards. But I always think of the impacts that zoning could potentially have in the future. We up zone the district early on into my term and if I recall correctly, it took Denver about ten-ish years from their up zone to see a boom and that happened rather quickly. So, I think I hear you and I'm clear it's not like an easy answer per se. But I wonder if for the next conversation there some additional thought around that might be. I appreciate the explanation thus far.

CM Gardner: Council Member Zvonek?

CM Zvonek: One question maybe for Kadee and then a comment. This comment, Council Member Murillo, this might help, but I understand we have fluctuating growth. The nice thing about Aurora's re-warding process is that we do it every five years. The state and federal redistricting happens every ten years. So, you see some wildly disproportionate state legislative and congressional districts because of the point you just made where you have rapid, unexpected spikes one way or the other. But thankfully, we do this every five years, and I think it keeps us a little bit more in line. Kadee, question for you is, there is a precinct in one of the scenarios where it talks about separating a precinct, a portion of it, is that possible? From an election standpoint in tracking, separating, and bifurcating a precinct?

K. Rodriguez: So that actually would be fixing a problem. That precinct is in two wards right now. Some of the other council members will probably remember in 2019 the split precinct caused some errors with the county sending out ballots. That proposed scenario would put all of that precinct (Precinct 302) into one ward.

CM Zvonek: Making it whole. Got it. That makes more sense than going the other way. Thank you.

CM Gardner: Any other comments or questions from the committee? If not, it looks like Mayor Pro Tem Bergan is on the phone. I don't know if you joined to comment on this item. If so, would you like to say anything?

MPT Bergan: Thank you. Council Member Gardner. No, I was just listening. I think the Election Commission has done a good job, and I'm sure you guys will look at these scenarios and also make a good decision. Good job, everybody.

CM Gardner: So, I hate to defer one more month, but my initial reaction since we just really got these maps today, other than Scenarios 1 and 2, is to take a month to digest them and let other council members digest them as well and then have a final vote or decision at our September M&F meeting. Are there any thoughts on that or does anybody have any issues with that?

CM Zvonek: I don't.

CM Murillo: No. I support holding off for another month.

CM Gardner: All right. Well, let's go ahead and do that. Kadee, I believe you sent the email to all of Council this morning with all the different map versions, and let's just have an agenda item on September. I don't think we need a full presentation like you guys gave today. I think each of us can give our thoughts, pick a scenario, and vote on it. So, let's plan on that for September, if that's all right.

K. Rodriguez: Yes, that works. The large maps are in the Sage Room for Mayor and Council to look at. So that it's a little bit easier than looking online or looking at a PDF. They'll stay up there throughout the whole process, until November.

CM Gardner: Great. Thank you, Kadee and Daniel again for all your work on this. I know it's been a lot of time and energy over the course of the summer, so I appreciate it. And then also thank you to the Election Commission for their work on it. I know it's important for the city, so thank you all. Thank you to everyone involved.

Outcome: The committee voted to postpone the decision on the Ward Redistricting Scenario to the September Committee meeting.

Follow-up Action: Staff will place the Ward Redistricting item on the September meeting.

DEFINE CATALYTIC CONVERTERS AS SECONDHAND PROPERTY

Summary of Issue and Discussion

CM Gardner and Trevor Vaughn presented this item. The ordinance clarifies the definition of catalytic converters as secondhand property and will require buyers to report under the second-hand dealer code. This will deter catalytic converter theft and easy disposals or transactions. This is similar to an ordinance from Denver. Anything under \$30 is not considered secondhand property. An individual that's selling more than one catalytic converter at a time must present a legitimate business license or demonstrate why they have multiple catalytic converters. The major scrap buyer in Aurora was contacted regarding this and the CEO had no major concerns. They stopped buying from walk-ins and only buy from business operations. This ordinance came about from Senate Bill 22-009 which requires record keeping. This proposed ordinance will ensure that reports will be encoded into LeadsOnline, to which the police have access. VINs etched in the catalytic converter will be reported and connected with a specific crime. This ordinance also clarifies that gift cards are secondhand properties because they have identifiable marks.

It is recommended to change the language from “more than \$30” to “a value of \$30 or more” to align with the other part of the existing secondhand dealer ordinance.

Committee Discussion:

CM Gardner: All right. I appreciate that, Trevor. Council Member Murillo, questions, or comments?

CM Murillo: I don't have any questions or comments at this point.

CM Gardner: Council Member Zvonek?

CM Zvonek: No, I'm good.

CM Gardner: All right. And are both of you okay moving this item forward?

CM Murillo: Yes.

CM Zvonek: Yes.

Outcome: The Committee recommended the item move forward to Study Session.

Follow-up Action: Staff will move forward the item to Study Session.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of Issue and Discussion

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, September 27, 2022 at 1:00 PM (WebEx)

THESE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED



Curtis Gardner, Chair

10-21-22

Date