

AGENDA

CITIZENS CHARTER REVIEW TASK FORCE

Microsoft Teams Meeting

Thursday, May 18, 2023, 4:30 p.m.
Aspen Room, 2nd Floor, Aurora Municipal Center

-
- I. CALL TO ORDER**
 - II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 9, 2023**
 - III. ANNOUNCEMENTS (5 min.)**
 - IV. NEW ITEMS**
 - Final Report Compilation
 - V. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**
 - VI. ADJOURNMENT**

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

CITIZENS CHARTER REVIEW TASK FORCE MEETING
May 9, 2023

Members Present: Mike Ciletti, Julie Marie Shepherd Macklin, Becky Hogan, Dr. H. Malcolm Newton, Alexandra Jackson, Dennis Lyon, Katrina Zerilli, Ed Tauer, Zach Heaton, Jan Wilson, Dr. Anne Keke

Others Present: Division Chief Allen Robnett, Division Chief Chris Juul, Alia Gonzales, Kadee Rodriguez, Kendall Koca

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair J. Shepherd Macklin called the May 9, 2023, meeting to order.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Outcome

The April 26, 2023, meeting minutes are approved.

The approval of the May 2, 2023, meeting minutes is moved to the next meeting.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Shepherd Macklin announced the agenda for the meeting with three ordinances for consideration and a discussion about CM Lawson's proposal regarding the Full-Time Council. Also mentioned was the need for discussion on how to conclude their work and deliver the final product.

A. Gonzales confirmed the additional change that might be by petition, which involves the introduction of a "Strong Mayor" and mentioned that CM Marcano had shared this information with A. Gonzales earlier that afternoon.

4. NEW ITEMS

4.a. Ordinance for Ballot - AFR and APD Elimination of Limits on Lateral Hires

Summary of Issue and Discussion:

J. Shepherd Macklin initiated the discussion on the ordinance concerning the elimination of term limits on lateral hires for the police and fire departments.

C. Juul, the Division Chief of the Police Department for professional standards and training, explained that the ordinance would allow lateral entry candidates with at least five years of experience, including two years in Aurora, to be eligible for promotion. This change would recognize the experience of lateral hires and help with recruitment. M. Ciletti asked for clarification on what constituted 'good standing.'

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

C. Juul explained that 'good standing' referred to lateral candidates who had passed a background check and hadn't had disciplinary issues in their previous departments or within Aurora Police Department in the recent past.

- E. Tauer raised concerns about the potential lowering of standards in hiring due to the pressure to recruit more officers. He questioned if the lack of a prohibition against hiring individuals who had falsely testified in court or falsified reports was an area where standards might be compromised. C. Juul reassured him that integrity and honesty were non-negotiable traits, and candidates with such issues wouldn't be hired. E. Tauer emphasized the need for clarity on what constituted 'good standing,' and C. Juul agreed that it was a subjective term. C. Juul reassured E. Tauer that they currently disqualified more lateral entry candidates than they hired, and he personally reviewed every lateral. He acknowledged the potential for future issues but couldn't predict what might happen in five years.
- Z. Heaton had several questions about the policy and the charter review process. He questioned why the standard was originally set at five years, and how that decision was made. Z. Heaton also asked about the types of systems in place across the state and multiple cities, wondering if there was a common system to track an officer's record as they move between locations. He wanted to know if there was a formal process for this and how the Charter played into these issues. C. Juul explained that in Colorado, there is a database within Colorado Post that all agencies are required to report certain types of conduct, such as Brady letters. He noted that there were safeguards in place and that he believed the system was robust and being used appropriately. Z. Heaton followed up by asking if the system was trusted and valued within the law enforcement community. C. Juul responded that he believed it was, though it depended on agencies accurately reporting information. D. Lyon asked about the prevalence of Brady Letters in the Aurora police department, but C. Juul couldn't provide an estimate.
- Dr. A. Keke asked about the nature of actions that might result in a Brady Letter. C. Juul explained that Brady Letters can be issued for a broad spectrum of conduct, including deliberate omissions, false declarations, and even patterns of losing things. They both agreed that any action that puts an officer's credibility into question could result in a Brady Letter. B. Hogan asked if an officer could be fired without receiving a Brady Letter, and C. Juul affirmed that it was possible, depending on the reason for the termination.
- J. Shepherd Macklin inquired about the percentage of lateral hires and new hires in a typical hiring cycle. She also asked about the proposed changes that would affect both agencies and why they were being packaged together. C. Juul explained that there are many more basic applicants compared to lateral ones, with a ratio of approximately 1,000 to 30 in the current cycle. He further clarified that the changes are intended to help in hiring more lateral applicants and to avoid turning away qualified applicants due to limitations. A. Robnett added that the changes are meant to free the fire department from having to hold simultaneous lateral and entry-level fire academies. By aligning with the police department, it would streamline the process and reduce strain on academy staff.
- K. Zerilli inquired about the specific changes that would appear on the ballot and why these changes were being made if there were no significant differences from the current system.
- A. Gonzales brought up the topic of Brady Letter disclosures, pointing out their serious consequences for the prosecuting legal team if not disclosed, including potential criminal charges.
- B. Hogan questioned whether the changes would give the police and fire chiefs more authority over hiring, to which C. Juul confirmed that they would have more control over the lateral hiring

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

- process. M. Ciletti clarified the language in the Charter related to the eligibility of lateral hires for promotional examinations, explaining that it was essentially stating that laterals must have been peace officers for a total of five years for the promotional process. A. Robnett and D. Lyon further discussed the implications of the changes, particularly in relation to hiring military medics.
- B. Hogan asked if there is continuity in experience if someone retired for ten years and then returned. C. Juul responded that the requirement is three years of related experience within the last four years. Dr. A. Keke asked about the presence of a statute, to which C. Juul confirmed and clarified the requirements for experience. D. Lyon then asked about hiring laterals, which C. Juul confirmed is relevant.
 - K. Zerilli discussed the implications for promotion and potential confusion for the ballot question. C. Juul agreed, saying that the complexities may need further explanation, like in blue books.
 - J. Shepherd Macklin questioned the logic behind the requirements, expressing confusion over how both conditions could be true. C. Juul explained that it is possible because it's an "or" statement and provided examples of how the system works. E. Tauer made a distinction between the accelerated promotion for laterals and the ability for people to understand the language of the ballot question. He suggested that the language might need to be rewritten for clarity, even if that means changing more words. M. Ciletti agreed, suggesting the language could be misinterpreted because it's being added to existing criteria.
 - K. Zerilli expressed uncertainty over what exactly is going on the ballot, stating it doesn't seem to touch on the five years, two years condition. C. Juul accepted the feedback and offered to request the attorneys to revisit the language for potential improvements. D. Lyon agreed to this proposal, suggesting that a summary would be beneficial. K. Zerilli emphasized the need for clarification on probationary, disciplinary, and promotional procedures.
 - C. Juul explained that the proposal was initially one large vote, which was then broken down into three sections to avoid the risk of one contentious issue torpedoing the entire proposal. J. Shepherd Macklin and E. Tauer speculated that the language of the proposal might have been affected by the decision to break it up into sections. M. Ciletti pointed out that the amendments were specific to different sections of the existing rules.
 - M. Ciletti explained that the part likely to face problems is the section two amendment. This amendment clarifies the powers and duties of police and fire departments and the probationary, disciplinary, and promotional procedures.

Outcome

The Committee approved the following goals:

- 1- The proposal has been divided into three sections.

Follow-Up Action

The Citizens Charter Review Task Force will adopt the proposed mission.

4.b. Ordinance for Ballot - APD Probation & PromotionSummary of Issue and Discussion:

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

C. Juul discussed the issue of probationary employment grades for police officers and firefighters. He brought up the problem of officers being promoted, then going on modified duty for extended periods, which doesn't provide an accurate measure of their capability in their promoted role. He used the example of someone getting injured and going on light duty for months, and how the current system doesn't pause the probationary period during this time.

- Dr. A. Keke suggested that the probationary period should be paused until the person returns to duty. C. Juul further explained that the probationary period should be frozen during any kind of leave so that an accurate evaluation of a person's performance in a new role can be made once they return. He also pointed out that this applies not just to those who have been promoted, but also to people who are new to the organization.
- Z. Heaton proposed the idea of a panel of managers reviewing these cases on a case-by-case basis, to prevent potential misuse of the rule and ensure fair treatment for all parties involved. M. Ciletti clarified that the proposed rule change means the probationary period would be paused whenever a person's duties change, and that this would be a protection for everyone, preventing misuse of the system. C. Juul agreed with M. Ciletti's interpretation of the proposed rule change, stating that it's not intended to be punitive, but to ensure a fair evaluation period.
- E. Tauer then raised a concern that the rule change could be used to undo promotions or terminate people. Z. Heaton confirmed E. Tauer's interpretation of his statement, expressing concern about the potential negative impacts of the rule change on employees. C. Juul responded to Z. Heaton's concerns, stating that the rule change wouldn't create extra administrative work or red tape, but would simply pause the monthly performance reviews for employees on leave, until they return to their regular duties.
- D. Lyon questioned the effects of probation on an employee's role and the potential demotion or termination that could occur if an individual is unable to meet the role's criteria upon return. E. Tauer confirmed that the probationary period would essentially restart once the individual returned to the role. C. Juul explained that while employees can't refuse reassignment, the organization does consider factors such as schedule changes, impacts on hours, etc., before reassigning them. C. Juul also mentioned that they will attempt to align the reassignments with people's interests when possible.
- J. Shepherd Macklin raised a hypothetical scenario in which an employee is promoted but can't start their new role due to reassignment. They wondered if such a situation could impact the employee's performance or review when they finally start their new role.
- A. Robnett shared their recent experience with this issue, explaining that they've implemented a policy where newly promoted individuals can't be reassigned for a full year. This ensures they gain experience in their new role before they're considered for special assignments. D. Lyon clarified A. Robnett's point, confirming that a probationary period allows new employees to learn their position before taking on additional tasks. A. Robnett added that while they don't know the exact details of the policy, they're aware that it's intended to ensure a fair evaluation period for newly promoted individuals. C. Juul concluded by acknowledging that occasionally, people are asked to take on different roles due to organizational needs. However, they also emphasized the importance of a reintegration process for those returning from extended leaves to ensure they're up to speed and able to perform their roles effectively.
- B. Hogan raised a concern about the origin of the documents and whether there was buy-in from relevant parties such as the FOP (Fraternal Order of Police) and the Civil Service Commission. C. Juul acknowledged that they didn't have an answer yet but mentioned that the legal advisors for the Aurora Police and Fire Department were the authors of the documents. C. Juul also stated that

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

they would follow up on the issue of union feedback. B. Hogan expressed concerns about potential objections from the FOP or other parties and emphasized the importance of having buy-in to avoid surprises later on. A. Robnett mentioned that the documents were presented in a subcommittee meeting and that they didn't have information regarding the FOP's response. E. Tauer expressed the likelihood of the unions having objections but also suggested considering the perspective that some individuals may not be suitable for leadership positions. C. Juul agreed with E. Tauer's statement and emphasized the importance of the appeals process as a safeguard for employees who feel they've been wronged. They also addressed concerns about disliking a person by explaining that not meeting the threshold for promotion is a separate issue.

- K. Zerilli asked about the eligibility list and its criteria, to which C. Juul explained that the list is determined through a process that considers work experience, evaluations, tests, and assessments. B. Hogan commented on the involvement of the Civil Service Commission in both certifying the list and hearing appeals, expressing reservations about their credibility in such cases. A. Robnett clarified that the promotional process involves points-based evaluation, and while negative work history may not prevent someone from being on the promotion list, the chief can still consider it as a significant factor. M. Ciletti further discussed the role of the Civil Service Commission in serving up the list and whether it can be questioned during an appeal. A. Robnett explained that the assessments and rankings are conducted by an outside vendor approved by the Civil Service Commission, and the chief's decision is evaluated based on that.
- B. Hogan mentioned the Citizens Advisory Council and the concept of police policing the police. E. Tauer confirmed that they understood B. Hogan's point, which emphasized the role of the Civil Service Commission in certifying the criterion and process, while an outside firm actually scores and ranks the candidates based on that process. A. Robnett interjected with additional information, stating that the civil service process is responsible for the promotion and appeals process, and any change to that structure would require a significant Charter change. C. Juul commented on the involvement of the civil service in observing the process but not actively participating, indicating that the process is primarily managed by an outside assessment company hired by the civil service.
- Dr. A. Keke asked who ultimately makes the decision for officers' promotion. C. Juul explained that the promotion is based on the certified list provided by the civil service, and the chief's role is to select the next candidate on that list for promotion.
- M. Ciletti raised a question regarding the chief's ability to bypass the list and leave a position unfilled, which would require additional budgetary approval to create a new staff member. C. Juul confirmed M. Ciletti's interpretation and explained that the list determines the order of promotion. Dr. A. Keke sought clarification on the entity responsible for creating the list, to which C. Juul explained that an outside assessment company scores the candidates, while the civil service certifies the list based on those scores. A. Robnett added that once the list is certified, it cannot be altered.
- Dr. A. Keke asked about the process for appealing if bypassed by the chief, to which C. Juul confirmed that the appeal would go through the civil service. Dr. A. Keke drew a parallel between the civil service's role as both the judge and the lawyer in the appeal process. C. Juul disagreed with that characterization, explaining that the civil service's role is mainly to compile and check the math of the scores provided by the outside assessment company. A. Robnett added that the vendor conducts the calculations and ensures a fair and accurate process.

Outcome

The Committee unanimously approved moving this item forward to Study Session.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

Follow-Up Action

Staff will add this item to the agenda for the next study session.

4.c. Ordinance for Ballot - APD Division and Deputy ChiefsSummary of Issue and Discussion:

C. Juul explained that it is not a change but a clarification of the historical interpretation of the Charter. The section states that commanders and higher ranks are appointed and not protected by civil service. C. Juul provided an example of his own position, stating that if he is unappointed as a division chief, he would fall back to his last civil service rank, which is captain. The purpose of this clarification is to align with the historical interpretation of the Charter. C. Juul asked if there were any questions on this matter.

- D. Lyon asked about the frequency of the chief changing personnel. C. Juul confirmed that such changes do occur.
- B. Hogan asked a question regarding the possibility of adding more positions instead of demoting individuals when chief changes out a deputy chief. C. Juul explained that there are mathematical considerations involved and that creating additional appointed positions is not possible. C. Juul mentioned that the upcoming sections would address the mathematical aspects and address some of the issues that have arisen over time as the organization has grown. C. Juul proceeded to discuss the next section, which relates to the establishment of the number of commanders. Currently, the Charter specifies the number of commanders, but this proposed change would allow for the determination of the number of commanders based on organizational growth without needing to amend the Charter. C. Juul further explained that the proposed changes would also account for the growth of division chiefs and deputy chiefs based on authorized staffing and organizational size. C. Juul emphasized that these changes would enable the Charter to keep pace with organizational growth and span of control within the police department.
- J. Shepherd Macklin expressed a question and a comment regarding the formula-based approach to staffing and the possibility of accomplishing the same goal in a different way. J. Shepherd Macklin inquired about common practices in other law enforcement agencies and stated that their question was not a statement of support or opposition. C. Juul acknowledged J. Shepherd Macklin's question and commented that he was not sure about other agencies' practices, but the proposed formula seemed consistent with the organization's current needs and available resources. He also mentioned his own experience as a deputy chief, indicating that the formula aligned with the organization's requirements.
- Dr. A. Keke raised a question related to civilian officers and their oversight, expressing concerns about fairness and the potential evolution of police departments. C. Juul acknowledged the validity of the point and mentioned that the current Charter did not preclude the inclusion of civilian supervisory positions. He stated that there were equivalent civilian positions to division chiefs within the organization. B. Hogan further discussed the issue of civilian officers and their oversight, questioning whether the proposed formula for staffing only considered sworn officers and not civilians. C. Juul agreed that the point was well-taken and suggested that the Charter could be written to include professional staff as well. He committed to bringing up the topic for further discussion.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

- J. Shepherd Macklin made a comment regarding the formula and stated that it seemed better than the current method, which involved establishing hard numbers that might require future Charter changes.
- E. Tauer expressed concern about the potential need for frequent Charter changes to align with changes made by the Colorado Post. He suggested considering a broader statement that ensures consistency with the Colorado Post's requirements without specifying a specific time frame. C. Juul agreed that the suggestion made sense and indicated that the change was to ensure consistency with the state rules regarding provisional certifications for officers. He clarified that the proposed modification struck out the erroneous 12-month requirement and aimed to align with the state rules.
- D. Lyon asked about a reasonable timeframe for getting back to B. Hogan's original question, and C. Juul mentioned that he could provide feedback within a week or two, ideally before their next meeting on May 18th.

Outcome

The Committee unanimously approved the following goals:

- 1- Ensure that the Charter is up to date to ensure consistency with the city requirements.

Follow-Up Action

The Citizens Charter Review Task Force will adopt the proposed mission.

4.d. Determine the format for final recommendationsSummary of Issue and Discussion:

Determination of format for final recommendations

- J. Shepherd Macklin expressed that it would be helpful to know C. Juul's position before making a recommendation, and C. Juul agreed to provide the necessary information as soon as possible.
- B. Hogan mentioned that it would be helpful to have C. Juul's position before making a decision, but they could proceed without it if necessary. C. Juul acknowledged the request and stated that he would do his best to provide the information and follow up on the remaining points.
- J. Shepherd Macklin mentioned the addition of new items to the agenda, including the Full-Time Council Member and the additional information received from CM Lawson. J. Shepherd Macklin asked if anyone had anything to discuss regarding that matter, noting that they had received the information just before the last meeting.
- A. Jackson stated that she believed not all the questions had been answered and expressed her dissatisfaction with the lack of response to her inquiries about the priority of the Full-Time Council Member proposal and its justification considering budget cuts. A. Gonzales responded by mentioning that CM Lawson had chosen not to answer some questions she deemed subjective rather than data driven. A. Gonzales suggested that those unanswered questions could be sent directly to CM Lawson for her personal viewpoint as a Council Member.
- D. Lyon expressed confusion about the ordinance change and sought clarification about the position of a City Council Member as a full-time officer of the city and the related compensation.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

- E. Tauer shared his perspective that he had no issue with the compensation but was uncertain about the concept of a Full-Time Council Member. He emphasized that supporting one implied supporting the other and questioned if they should support both.
- M. Ciletti suggested separating the discussion into two parts: the statutory requirements of the Council and the job description of a City Council Member. He expressed concerns about paying Council Members for political activities and suggested setting specific stipulations for their job if they were to be paid as full-time employees.
- A. Jackson raised a question about why the Full-Time Council Member proposal was a priority given the growing needs of Aurora and the population, and whether increasing the Council's compensation was the appropriate solution. She expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of an answer to this question.

Outcome

The Committee unanimously approved the following goals:

- 1- Ensure that the new items were added to the agenda, including the Full-Time Council Member topic.

Follow-Up Action

Place other actions required of staff.

5. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Dr. A. Keke voiced her frustration with the lack of answers and emphasized her right as a taxpayer to question how her money would be spent. She stated that if her questions were not answered, she would not consider supporting the request.

J. Shepherd Macklin acknowledged the concerns raised and stated that they would take the lack of information into account when making recommendations. They agreed that the missing information could be a reason for not feeling comfortable moving forward with the proposal.

B. Hogan expressed curiosity about the participants in the meeting and noted that they were unable to see who else was present.

A. Gonzales provided information about the participants, mentioning the names of individuals who were online or had stepped off temporarily. Z. Heaton expressed his willingness to share his video during the meeting but made a lighthearted comment about not wanting to appear arrogant by being the only one with video enabled. J. Shepherd Macklin and A. Gonzales acknowledged the comments made by the participants, indicating that the lack of information and clarification would be taken into consideration during the decision-making process.

B. Hogan shared her disappointment with the lack of organization and information provided for the meetings. She mentioned feeling frustrated by the difficulty in understanding the ballot initiatives and emphasized the importance of simplifying and clarifying the information for the average resident.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

Z. Heaton supported B. Hogan's sentiments, stating that simplifying, clarifying, and making City Hall more accessible would be a significant step forward for the community. J. Shepherd Macklin acknowledged the shared concerns and mentioned having similar conversations with other participants. They agreed that the process needed improvement and acknowledged the need for more information and clarity. E. Tauer added that an opposing perspective should be presented since they had not been provided with one. A. Gonzales clarified that all indications had been shared with the Council, but E. Tauer reiterated the need for a dissenting perspective to be included.

J. Shepherd Macklin discussed the next steps, suggesting the creation of memos for each proposal with sections on the group's consensus, rationale, considerations, areas that needed improvement, and a dissenting perspective. E. Tauer agreed with the proposed format for the memos.

J. Shepherd Macklin expressed her thoughts on the current state of the process, feeling that it was more of a checkbox exercise rather than an opportunity for thoughtful deliberation. They expressed disappointment and questioned the level of effort that should be invested in the final product, considering the time constraints.

E. Tauer mentioned the need to strike a balance and suggested incorporating questions and considerations raised during previous meetings. Dr. A. Keke shared her uncertainty about the appropriate level of effort and emphasized the importance of meaningful participation. M. Ciletti criticized the process, highlighting the lack of involvement in drafting the original language and feeling that the Commission's input would not change Council's decisions. M. Ciletti expressed frustration with the limited ability to make meaningful changes and mentioned the lack of legal assistance during the drafting process.

J. Wilson expressed the opinion that the focus should be on giving citizens the opportunity to vote on the proposed Charter changes. She suggested that the decision should not be about whether they personally agree with the changes but rather whether they should be presented to the voters.

E. Tauer suggested submitting questions and expressing dissatisfaction with the rushed and incomplete process. They proposed a statement highlighting the need for more time and better presentation of information. Z. Heaton agreed with the idea of a statement reflecting the flawed process and the need for more time to discuss the proposed changes. They also suggested transforming the commission into a broader legislative review committee.

A. Jackson mentioned the possibility of unanimously agreeing on deferring all the proposed changes. M. Ciletti clarified that the commission's feedback is not binding, and the council can still decide whether to put the measures on the ballot without their input. They emphasized that the commission's purpose is to provide feedback to council members, who can then use it to gain support from the community. J. Shepherd Macklin suggested a more general statement and reflection on the process rather than individual votes on each proposal. They encouraged commission members to reach out to their appointed council members to express their thoughts.

D. Lyon requested an update on the proposed changes and expressed the need for more information. B. Hogan proposed providing specific feedback on each proposal, highlighting areas of concern and lack of information. J. Shepherd Macklin agreed with the idea of providing memos or a PowerPoint presentation outlining the commission's concerns and suggestions.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

Dr. A. Keke questioned whether the commission was invited to give a presentation or if submitting a memo would be the best form of communication. J. Shepherd Macklin clarified that they had not been invited to give a presentation and agreed that a memo would be suitable.

J. Shepherd Macklin mentioned the need to review eight ordinance drafts and expressed concerns about incomplete or insufficient information. They discussed dividing the work among team members and presenting succinct responses. They also talked about providing feedback on the process and making recommendations for future improvements. D. Lyon asked how they could help, and J. Shepherd Macklin said they had eight ordinances to review. M. Ciletti suggested making a general statement covering all points instead of addressing them individually. A. Jackson mentioned the possibility of multiple people having different perspectives on certain points. They discussed the structure of the response and the possibility of not commenting on some items. Z. Heaton and K. Rodriguez had audio issues and sought assistance. A. Gonzales confirmed that all council members received invites to provide differing points of view. Dr. H. Malcolm Newton recommended focusing on the points they were clear on and using M. Ciletti and E. Tauer's suggestions for the remaining ones. E. Tauer expressed the need to hear opposing viewpoints and discussed the dilution of their message if they focused on specific points. J. Wilson suggested separating the clear points for decision-making, while M. Ciletti emphasized the need for further discussion and concern over potential long-term implications. The conversation shifted to discussions on party affiliation, elections, and the impact on governance. J. Wilson expressed confusion about the controversy surrounding election years for City Council. M. Ciletti explained their concerns about fewer people deciding financial measures and increased partisanship if City Council elections were moved to even years.

Dr. H. Malcolm Newton expressed his perception that M. Ciletti is against all aspects of the discussion. M. Ciletti clarified that he is not against everything but believes that the committee should engage in more internal debate rather than relying on Council Members' preferences. J. Shepherd Macklin acknowledged the need for time to delve deeper into the issues. A. Gonzales mentioned the need for more structure and time and suggested seeking clarity from the Council. E. Tauer proposed a motion to draft a memorandum to the Council without taking specific positions on the proposed ordinances but offering general comments and the need for more time and resources. K. Zerilli seconded the motion. A. Jackson expressed her opinion that the committee could use more time and clarity from the Council. B. Hogan expressed concerns about the wording on the ballot and the need for simplicity. D. Lyon suggested that the committee's individual positions could be explained as part of a formal resolution. J. Wilson supported the idea of expressing individual positions. J. Shepherd Macklin discussed the motion and the concern about fulfilling the committee's duties. E. Tauer suggested attaching individual opinions as an amendment to the memo. A. Jackson questioned why only individual Council Members would be addressed, and E. Tauer clarified that there would be an opportunity to include opinions for the whole Council. Dr. H. Malcolm Newton cautioned against being overly opinionated and emphasized the need for broader thinking. Dr. A. Keke clarified that the memo would include a collective recommendation. The motion was further discussed, and it was agreed upon to draft a memo with general feedback, recommendations, and a collective recommendation attached.

J. Shepherd Macklin restated the motion for drafting a memo from the Ad Hoc Committee, addressing general feedback about the process and recommendations for enhancement, with the opportunity for individual committee members to include comments. The motion was approved with some opposition and abstentions. B. Hogan suggested submitting written narratives, comments, or recommendations

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

before the next meeting to facilitate discussion. J. Shepherd Macklin agreed and encouraged sending any additional thoughts via email. The issue of correct email addresses was discussed, and A. Gonzales assured that efforts would be made to ensure accurate communication. B. Hogan proposed providing dinner at future meetings, which sparked further discussion.

6. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2023, at 4:30 p.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:29 pm.

APPROVED:

Julie Marie Shepherd Macklin, Chair

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

CITIZENS CHARTER REVIEW TASK FORCE MEETING
May 9, 2023

Members Present: Mike Ciletti, Julie Marie Shepherd Macklin, Becky Hogan, Dr. H. Malcolm Newton, Alexandra Jackson, Dennis Lyon, Katrina Zerilli, Ed Tauer, Zach Heaton, Jan Wilson, Dr. Anne Keke

Others Present: Division Chief Allen Robnett, Division Chief Chris Juul, Alia Gonzales, Kadee Rodriguez, Kendall Koca

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair J. Shepherd Macklin called the May 9, 2023, meeting to order.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Outcome

The April 26, 2023, meeting minutes are approved.

The approval of the May 2, 2023, meeting minutes is moved to the next meeting.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Shepherd Macklin announced the agenda for the meeting with three ordinances for consideration and a discussion about CM Lawson's proposal regarding the Full-Time Council. Also mentioned was the need for discussion on how to conclude their work and deliver the final product.

A. Gonzales confirmed the additional change that might be by petition, which involves the introduction of a "Strong Mayor" and mentioned that CM Marcano had shared this information with A. Gonzales earlier that afternoon.

4. NEW ITEMS

4.a. Ordinance for Ballot - AFR and APD Elimination of Limits on Lateral Hires

Summary of Issue and Discussion:

J. Shepherd Macklin initiated the discussion on the ordinance concerning the elimination of term limits on lateral hires for the police and fire departments.

C. Juul, the Division Chief of the Police Department for professional standards and training, explained that the ordinance would allow lateral entry candidates with at least five years of experience, including two years in Aurora, to be eligible for promotion. This change would recognize the experience of lateral hires and help with recruitment. M. Ciletti asked for clarification on what constituted 'good standing.'

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

C. Juul explained that 'good standing' referred to lateral candidates who had passed a background check and hadn't had disciplinary issues in their previous departments or within Aurora Police Department in the recent past.

- E. Tauer raised concerns about the potential lowering of standards in hiring due to the pressure to recruit more officers. He questioned if the lack of a prohibition against hiring individuals who had falsely testified in court or falsified reports was an area where standards might be compromised. C. Juul reassured him that integrity and honesty were non-negotiable traits, and candidates with such issues wouldn't be hired. E. Tauer emphasized the need for clarity on what constituted 'good standing,' and C. Juul agreed that it was a subjective term. C. Juul reassured E. Tauer that they currently disqualified more lateral entry candidates than they hired, and he personally reviewed every lateral. He acknowledged the potential for future issues but couldn't predict what might happen in five years.
- Z. Heaton had several questions about the policy and the charter review process. He questioned why the standard was originally set at five years, and how that decision was made. Z. Heaton also asked about the types of systems in place across the state and multiple cities, wondering if there was a common system to track an officer's record as they move between locations. He wanted to know if there was a formal process for this and how the Charter played into these issues. C. Juul explained that in Colorado, there is a database within Colorado Post that all agencies are required to report certain types of conduct, such as Brady letters. He noted that there were safeguards in place and that he believed the system was robust and being used appropriately. Z. Heaton followed up by asking if the system was trusted and valued within the law enforcement community. C. Juul responded that he believed it was, though it depended on agencies accurately reporting information. D. Lyon asked about the prevalence of Brady Letters in the Aurora police department, but C. Juul couldn't provide an estimate.
- Dr. A. Keke asked about the nature of actions that might result in a Brady Letter. C. Juul explained that Brady Letters can be issued for a broad spectrum of conduct, including deliberate omissions, false declarations, and even patterns of losing things. They both agreed that any action that puts an officer's credibility into question could result in a Brady Letter. B. Hogan asked if an officer could be fired without receiving a Brady Letter, and C. Juul affirmed that it was possible, depending on the reason for the termination.
- J. Shepherd Macklin inquired about the percentage of lateral hires and new hires in a typical hiring cycle. She also asked about the proposed changes that would affect both agencies and why they were being packaged together. C. Juul explained that there are many more basic applicants compared to lateral ones, with a ratio of approximately 1,000 to 30 in the current cycle. He further clarified that the changes are intended to help in hiring more lateral applicants and to avoid turning away qualified applicants due to limitations. A. Robnett added that the changes are meant to free the fire department from having to hold simultaneous lateral and entry-level fire academies. By aligning with the police department, it would streamline the process and reduce strain on academy staff.
- K. Zerilli inquired about the specific changes that would appear on the ballot and why these changes were being made if there were no significant differences from the current system.
- A. Gonzales brought up the topic of Brady Letter disclosures, pointing out their serious consequences for the prosecuting legal team if not disclosed, including potential criminal charges.
- B. Hogan questioned whether the changes would give the police and fire chiefs more authority over hiring, to which C. Juul confirmed that they would have more control over the lateral hiring process. M. Ciletti clarified the language in the Charter related to the eligibility of lateral hires for

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

- promotional examinations, explaining that it was essentially stating that laterals must have been peace officers for a total of five years for the promotional process. A. Robnett and D. Lyon further discussed the implications of the changes, particularly in relation to hiring military medics.
- B. Hogan asked if there is continuity in experience if someone retired for ten years and then returned. C. Juul responded that the requirement is three years of related experience within the last four years. Dr. A. Keke asked about the presence of a statute, to which C. Juul confirmed and clarified the requirements for experience. D. Lyon then asked about hiring laterals, which C. Juul confirmed is relevant.
 - K. Zerilli discussed the implications for promotion and potential confusion for the ballot question. C. Juul agreed, saying that the complexities may need further explanation, like in blue books.
 - J. Shepherd Macklin questioned the logic behind the requirements, expressing confusion over how both conditions could be true. C. Juul explained that it is possible because it's an "or" statement and provided examples of how the system works. E. Tauer made a distinction between the accelerated promotion for laterals and the ability for people to understand the language of the ballot question. He suggested that the language might need to be rewritten for clarity, even if that means changing more words. M. Ciletti agreed, suggesting the language could be misinterpreted because it's being added to existing criteria.
 - K. Zerilli expressed uncertainty over what exactly is going on the ballot, stating it doesn't seem to touch on the five years, two years condition. C. Juul accepted the feedback and offered to request the attorneys to revisit the language for potential improvements. D. Lyon agreed to this proposal, suggesting that a summary would be beneficial. K. Zerilli emphasized the need for clarification on probationary, disciplinary, and promotional procedures.
 - C. Juul explained that the proposal was initially one large vote, which was then broken down into three sections to avoid the risk of one contentious issue torpedoing the entire proposal. J. Shepherd Macklin and E. Tauer speculated that the language of the proposal might have been affected by the decision to break it up into sections. M. Ciletti pointed out that the amendments were specific to different sections of the existing rules.
 - M. Ciletti explained that the part likely to face problems is the section two amendment. This amendment clarifies the powers and duties of police and fire departments and the probationary, disciplinary, and promotional procedures.

Outcome

The Committee approved the following goals:

- 1- The proposal has been divided into three sections.

Follow-Up Action

The Citizens Charter Review Task Force will adopt the proposed mission.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

4.b. Ordinance for Ballot - APD Probation & Promotion

Summary of Issue and Discussion:

C. Juul discussed the issue of probationary employment grades for police officers and firefighters. He brought up the problem of officers being promoted, then going on modified duty for extended periods, which doesn't provide an accurate measure of their capability in their promoted role. He used the example of someone getting injured and going on light duty for months, and how the current system doesn't pause the probationary period during this time.

- Dr. A. Keke suggested that the probationary period should be paused until the person returns to duty. C. Juul further explained that the probationary period should be frozen during any kind of leave so that an accurate evaluation of a person's performance in a new role can be made once they return. He also pointed out that this applies not just to those who have been promoted, but also to people who are new to the organization.
- Z. Heaton proposed the idea of a panel of managers reviewing these cases on a case-by-case basis, to prevent potential misuse of the rule and ensure fair treatment for all parties involved. M. Ciletti clarified that the proposed rule change means the probationary period would be paused whenever a person's duties change, and that this would be a protection for everyone, preventing misuse of the system. C. Juul agreed with M. Ciletti's interpretation of the proposed rule change, stating that it's not intended to be punitive, but to ensure a fair evaluation period.
- E. Tauer then raised a concern that the rule change could be used to undo promotions or terminate people. Z. Heaton confirmed E. Tauer's interpretation of his statement, expressing concern about the potential negative impacts of the rule change on employees. C. Juul responded to Z. Heaton's concerns, stating that the rule change wouldn't create extra administrative work or red tape, but would simply pause the monthly performance reviews for employees on leave, until they return to their regular duties.
- D. Lyon questioned the effects of probation on an employee's role and the potential demotion or termination that could occur if an individual is unable to meet the role's criteria upon return. E. Tauer confirmed that the probationary period would essentially restart once the individual returned to the role. C. Juul explained that while employees can't refuse reassignment, the organization does consider factors such as schedule changes, impacts on hours, etc., before reassigning them. C. Juul also mentioned that they will attempt to align the reassignments with people's interests when possible.
- J. Shepherd Macklin raised a hypothetical scenario in which an employee is promoted but can't start their new role due to reassignment. They wondered if such a situation could impact the employee's performance or review when they finally start their new role.
- A. Robnett shared their recent experience with this issue, explaining that they've implemented a policy where newly promoted individuals can't be reassigned for a full year. This ensures they gain experience in their new role before they're considered for special assignments. D. Lyon clarified A. Robnett's point, confirming that a probationary period allows new employees to learn their position before taking on additional tasks. A. Robnett added that while they don't know the exact details of the policy, they're aware that it's intended to ensure a fair evaluation period for newly promoted individuals. C. Juul concluded by acknowledging that occasionally, people are asked to take on different roles due to organizational needs. However, they also emphasized the importance

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

- of a reintegration process for those returning from extended leaves to ensure they're up to speed and able to perform their roles effectively.
- B. Hogan raised a concern about the origin of the documents and whether there was buy-in from relevant parties such as the FOP (Fraternal Order of Police) and the Civil Service Commission. C. Juul acknowledged that they didn't have an answer yet but mentioned that the legal advisors for the Aurora Police and Fire Department were the authors of the documents. C. Juul also stated that they would follow up on the issue of union feedback. B. Hogan expressed concerns about potential objections from the FOP or other parties and emphasized the importance of having buy-in to avoid surprises later on. A. Robnett mentioned that the documents were presented in a subcommittee meeting and that they didn't have information regarding the FOP's response. E. Tauer expressed the likelihood of the unions having objections but also suggested considering the perspective that some individuals may not be suitable for leadership positions. C. Juul agreed with E. Tauer's statement and emphasized the importance of the appeals process as a safeguard for employees who feel they've been wronged. They also addressed concerns about disliking a person by explaining that not meeting the threshold for promotion is a separate issue.
 - K. Zerilli asked about the eligibility list and its criteria, to which C. Juul explained that the list is determined through a process that considers work experience, evaluations, tests, and assessments. B. Hogan commented on the involvement of the Civil Service Commission in both certifying the list and hearing appeals, expressing reservations about their credibility in such cases. A. Robnett clarified that the promotional process involves points-based evaluation, and while negative work history may not prevent someone from being on the promotion list, the chief can still consider it as a significant factor. M. Ciletti further discussed the role of the Civil Service Commission in serving up the list and whether it can be questioned during an appeal. A. Robnett explained that the assessments and rankings are conducted by an outside vendor approved by the Civil Service Commission, and the chief's decision is evaluated based on that.
 - B. Hogan mentioned the Citizens Advisory Council and the concept of police policing the police. E. Tauer confirmed that they understood B. Hogan's point, which emphasized the role of the Civil Service Commission in certifying the criterion and process, while an outside firm actually scores and ranks the candidates based on that process. A. Robnett interjected with additional information, stating that the civil service process is responsible for the promotion and appeals process, and any change to that structure would require a significant Charter change. C. Juul commented on the involvement of the civil service in observing the process but not actively participating, indicating that the process is primarily managed by an outside assessment company hired by the civil service.
 - Dr. A. Keke asked who ultimately makes the decision for officers' promotion. C. Juul explained that the promotion is based on the certified list provided by the civil service, and the chief's role is to select the next candidate on that list for promotion.
 - M. Ciletti raised a question regarding the chief's ability to bypass the list and leave a position unfilled, which would require additional budgetary approval to create a new staff member. C. Juul confirmed M. Ciletti's interpretation and explained that the list determines the order of promotion. Dr. A. Keke sought clarification on the entity responsible for creating the list, to which C. Juul explained that an outside assessment company scores the candidates, while the civil service certifies the list based on those scores. A. Robnett added that once the list is certified, it cannot be altered.
 - Dr. A. Keke asked about the process for appealing if bypassed by the chief, to which C. Juul confirmed that the appeal would go through the civil service. Dr. A. Keke drew a parallel between the civil service's role as both the judge and the lawyer in the appeal process. C. Juul disagreed with that characterization, explaining that the civil service's role is mainly to compile and check

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

the math of the scores provided by the outside assessment company. A. Robnett added that the vendor conducts the calculations and ensures a fair and accurate process.

Outcome

The Committee unanimously approved moving this item forward to Study Session.

Follow-Up Action

Staff will add this item to the agenda for the next study session.

4.c. Ordinance for Ballot - APD Division and Deputy Chiefs

Summary of Issue and Discussion:

C. Juul explained that it is not a change but a clarification of the historical interpretation of the Charter. The section states that commanders and higher ranks are appointed and not protected by civil service. C. Juul provided an example of his own position, stating that if he is unappointed as a division chief, he would fall back to his last civil service rank, which is captain. The purpose of this clarification is to align with the historical interpretation of the Charter. C. Juul asked if there were any questions on this matter.

- D. Lyon asked about the frequency of the chief changing personnel. C. Juul confirmed that such changes do occur.
- B. Hogan asked a question regarding the possibility of adding more positions instead of demoting individuals when chief changes out a deputy chief. C. Juul explained that there are mathematical considerations involved and that creating additional appointed positions is not possible. C. Juul mentioned that the upcoming sections would address the mathematical aspects and address some of the issues that have arisen over time as the organization has grown. C. Juul proceeded to discuss the next section, which relates to the establishment of the number of commanders. Currently, the Charter specifies the number of commanders, but this proposed change would allow for the determination of the number of commanders based on organizational growth without needing to amend the Charter. C. Juul further explained that the proposed changes would also account for the growth of division chiefs and deputy chiefs based on authorized staffing and organizational size. C. Juul emphasized that these changes would enable the Charter to keep pace with organizational growth and span of control within the police department.
- J. Shepherd Macklin expressed a question and a comment regarding the formula-based approach to staffing and the possibility of accomplishing the same goal in a different way. J. Shepherd Macklin inquired about common practices in other law enforcement agencies and stated that their question was not a statement of support or opposition. C. Juul acknowledged J. Shepherd Macklin's question and commented that he was not sure about other agencies' practices, but the proposed formula seemed consistent with the organization's current needs and available resources. He also mentioned his own experience as a deputy chief, indicating that the formula aligned with the organization's requirements.
- Dr. A. Keke raised a question related to civilian officers and their oversight, expressing concerns about fairness and the potential evolution of police departments. C. Juul acknowledged the validity of the point and mentioned that the current Charter did not preclude the inclusion of civilian supervisory positions. He stated that there were equivalent civilian positions to division chiefs within the organization. B. Hogan further discussed the issue of civilian officers and their oversight, questioning whether the proposed formula for staffing only considered sworn officers

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

and not civilians. C. Juul agreed that the point was well-taken and suggested that the Charter could be written to include professional staff as well. He committed to bringing up the topic for further discussion.

- J. Shepherd Macklin made a comment regarding the formula and stated that it seemed better than the current method, which involved establishing hard numbers that might require future Charter changes.
- E. Tauer expressed concern about the potential need for frequent Charter changes to align with changes made by the Colorado Post. He suggested considering a broader statement that ensures consistency with the Colorado Post's requirements without specifying a specific time frame. C. Juul agreed that the suggestion made sense and indicated that the change was to ensure consistency with the state rules regarding provisional certifications for officers. He clarified that the proposed modification struck out the erroneous 12-month requirement and aimed to align with the state rules.
- D. Lyon asked about a reasonable timeframe for getting back to B. Hogan's original question, and C. Juul mentioned that he could provide feedback within a week or two, ideally before their next meeting on May 18th.

Outcome

The Committee unanimously approved the following goals:

- 1- Ensure that the Charter is up to date to ensure consistency with the city requirements.

Follow-Up Action

The Citizens Charter Review Task Force will adopt the proposed mission.

4.d. Determine the format for final recommendations

Summary of Issue and Discussion:

Determination of format for final recommendations

- J. Shepherd Macklin expressed that it would be helpful to know C. Juul's position before making a recommendation, and C. Juul agreed to provide the necessary information as soon as possible.
- B. Hogan mentioned that it would be helpful to have C. Juul's position before making a decision, but they could proceed without it if necessary. C. Juul acknowledged the request and stated that he would do his best to provide the information and follow up on the remaining points.
- J. Shepherd Macklin mentioned the addition of new items to the agenda, including the Full-Time Council Member and the additional information received from CM Lawson. J. Shepherd Macklin asked if anyone had anything to discuss regarding that matter, noting that they had received the information just before the last meeting.
- A. Jackson stated that she believed not all the questions had been answered and expressed her dissatisfaction with the lack of response to her inquiries about the priority of the Full-Time Council Member proposal and its justification considering budget cuts. A. Gonzales responded by mentioning that CM Lawson had chosen not to answer some questions she deemed subjective rather than data driven. A. Gonzales suggested that those unanswered questions could be sent directly to CM Lawson for her personal viewpoint as a Council Member.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

- D. Lyon expressed confusion about the ordinance change and sought clarification about the position of a City Council Member as a full-time officer of the city and the related compensation.
- E. Tauer shared his perspective that he had no issue with the compensation but was uncertain about the concept of a Full-Time Council Member. He emphasized that supporting one implied supporting the other and questioned if they should support both.
- M. Ciletti suggested separating the discussion into two parts: the statutory requirements of the Council and the job description of a City Council Member. He expressed concerns about paying Council Members for political activities and suggested setting specific stipulations for their job if they were to be paid as full-time employees.
- A. Jackson raised a question about why the Full-Time Council Member proposal was a priority given the growing needs of Aurora and the population, and whether increasing the Council's compensation was the appropriate solution. She expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of an answer to this question.

Outcome

The Committee unanimously approved the following goals:

- 1- Ensure that the new items were added to the agenda, including the Full-Time Council Member topic.

Follow-Up Action

Place other actions required of staff.

5. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Dr. A. Keke voiced her frustration with the lack of answers and emphasized her right as a taxpayer to question how her money would be spent. She stated that if her questions were not answered, she would not consider supporting the request.

J. Shepherd Macklin acknowledged the concerns raised and stated that they would take the lack of information into account when making recommendations. They agreed that the missing information could be a reason for not feeling comfortable moving forward with the proposal.

B. Hogan expressed curiosity about the participants in the meeting and noted that they were unable to see who else was present.

A. Gonzales provided information about the participants, mentioning the names of individuals who were online or had stepped off temporarily. Z. Heaton expressed his willingness to share his video during the meeting but made a lighthearted comment about not wanting to appear arrogant by being the only one with video enabled. J. Shepherd Macklin and A. Gonzales acknowledged the comments made by the participants, indicating that the lack of information and clarification would be taken into consideration during the decision-making process.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

B. Hogan shared her disappointment with the lack of organization and information provided for the meetings. She mentioned feeling frustrated by the difficulty in understanding the ballot initiatives and emphasized the importance of simplifying and clarifying the information for the average resident. Z. Heaton supported B. Hogan's sentiments, stating that simplifying, clarifying, and making City Hall more accessible would be a significant step forward for the community. J. Shepherd Macklin acknowledged the shared concerns and mentioned having similar conversations with other participants. They agreed that the process needed improvement and acknowledged the need for more information and clarity. E. Tauer added that an opposing perspective should be presented since they had not been provided with one. A. Gonzales clarified that all indications had been shared with the Council, but E. Tauer reiterated the need for a dissenting perspective to be included.

J. Shepherd Macklin discussed the next steps, suggesting the creation of memos for each proposal with sections on the group's consensus, rationale, considerations, areas that needed improvement, and a dissenting perspective. E. Tauer agreed with the proposed format for the memos.

J. Shepherd Macklin expressed her thoughts on the current state of the process, feeling that it was more of a checkbox exercise rather than an opportunity for thoughtful deliberation. They expressed disappointment and questioned the level of effort that should be invested in the final product, considering the time constraints.

E. Tauer mentioned the need to strike a balance and suggested incorporating questions and considerations raised during previous meetings. Dr. A. Keke shared her uncertainty about the appropriate level of effort and emphasized the importance of meaningful participation. M. Ciletti criticized the process, highlighting the lack of involvement in drafting the original language and feeling that the Commission's input would not change Council's decisions. M. Ciletti expressed frustration with the limited ability to make meaningful changes and mentioned the lack of legal assistance during the drafting process.

J. Wilson expressed the opinion that the focus should be on giving citizens the opportunity to vote on the proposed Charter changes. She suggested that the decision should not be about whether they personally agree with the changes but rather whether they should be presented to the voters.

E. Tauer suggested submitting questions and expressing dissatisfaction with the rushed and incomplete process. They proposed a statement highlighting the need for more time and better presentation of information. Z. Heaton agreed with the idea of a statement reflecting the flawed process and the need for more time to discuss the proposed changes. They also suggested transforming the commission into a broader legislative review committee.

A. Jackson mentioned the possibility of unanimously agreeing on deferring all the proposed changes. M. Ciletti clarified that the commission's feedback is not binding, and the council can still decide whether to put the measures on the ballot without their input. They emphasized that the commission's purpose is to provide feedback to council members, who can then use it to gain support from the community. J. Shepherd Macklin suggested a more general statement and reflection on the process rather than individual votes on each proposal. They encouraged commission members to reach out to their appointed council members to express their thoughts.

D. Lyon requested an update on the proposed changes and expressed the need for more information.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

B. Hogan proposed providing specific feedback on each proposal, highlighting areas of concern and lack of information. J. Shepherd Macklin agreed with the idea of providing memos or a PowerPoint presentation outlining the commission's concerns and suggestions.

Dr. A. Keke questioned whether the commission was invited to give a presentation or if submitting a memo would be the best form of communication. J. Shepherd Macklin clarified that they had not been invited to give a presentation and agreed that a memo would be suitable.

J. Shepherd Macklin mentioned the need to review eight ordinance drafts and expressed concerns about incomplete or insufficient information. They discussed dividing the work among team members and presenting succinct responses. They also talked about providing feedback on the process and making recommendations for future improvements. D. Lyon asked how they could help, and J. Shepherd Macklin said they had eight ordinances to review. M. Ciletti suggested making a general statement covering all points instead of addressing them individually. A. Jackson mentioned the possibility of multiple people having different perspectives on certain points. They discussed the structure of the response and the possibility of not commenting on some items. Z. Heaton and K. Rodriguez had audio issues and sought assistance. A. Gonzales confirmed that all council members received invites to provide differing points of view. Dr. H. Malcolm Newton recommended focusing on the points they were clear on and using M. Ciletti and E. Tauer's suggestions for the remaining ones. E. Tauer expressed the need to hear opposing viewpoints and discussed the dilution of their message if they focused on specific points. J. Wilson suggested separating the clear points for decision-making, while M. Ciletti emphasized the need for further discussion and concern over potential long-term implications. The conversation shifted to discussions on party affiliation, elections, and the impact on governance. J. Wilson expressed confusion about the controversy surrounding election years for City Council. M. Ciletti explained their concerns about fewer people deciding financial measures and increased partisanship if City Council elections were moved to even years.

Dr. H. Malcolm Newton expressed his perception that M. Ciletti is against all aspects of the discussion. M. Ciletti clarified that he is not against everything but believes that the committee should engage in more internal debate rather than relying on Council Members' preferences. J. Shepherd Macklin acknowledged the need for time to delve deeper into the issues. A. Gonzales mentioned the need for more structure and time and suggested seeking clarity from the Council. E. Tauer proposed a motion to draft a memorandum to the Council without taking specific positions on the proposed ordinances but offering general comments and the need for more time and resources. K. Zerilli seconded the motion. A. Jackson expressed her opinion that the committee could use more time and clarity from the Council. B. Hogan expressed concerns about the wording on the ballot and the need for simplicity. D. Lyon suggested that the committee's individual positions could be explained as part of a formal resolution. J. Wilson supported the idea of expressing individual positions. J. Shepherd Macklin discussed the motion and the concern about fulfilling the committee's duties. E. Tauer suggested attaching individual opinions as an amendment to the memo. A. Jackson questioned why only individual Council Members would be addressed, and E. Tauer clarified that there would be an opportunity to include opinions for the whole Council. Dr. H. Malcolm Newton cautioned against being overly opinionated and emphasized the need for broader thinking. Dr. A. Keke clarified that the memo would include a collective recommendation. The motion was further discussed, and it was agreed upon to draft a memo with general feedback, recommendations, and a collective recommendation attached.

DRAFT – Subject to Approval

J. Shepherd Macklin restated the motion for drafting a memo from the Ad Hoc Committee, addressing general feedback about the process and recommendations for enhancement, with the opportunity for individual committee members to include comments. The motion was approved with some opposition and abstentions. B. Hogan suggested submitting written narratives, comments, or recommendations before the next meeting to facilitate discussion. J. Shepherd Macklin agreed and encouraged sending any additional thoughts via email. The issue of correct email addresses was discussed, and A. Gonzales assured that efforts would be made to ensure accurate communication. B. Hogan proposed providing dinner at future meetings, which sparked further discussion.

6. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2023, at 4:30 p.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:29 P.M.

APPROVED:

Julie Marie Shepherd Macklin, Chair