



City of Phoenix

General Information Packet

Thursday, December 5, 2019

phoenix.gov

- | | | |
|---|--|---------|
| 1 | Response to Council Members' Requests from
Nov. 12, 2019 Policy Meeting | Page 3 |
| 2 | For Transmittal, Minutes of the Policy Session on
Nov. 19, 2019 | Page 11 |



Response to Council Members' Requests from Nov. 12, 2019 Policy Meeting

At the Nov. 12, 2019 City Council Policy meeting, Council members requested staff to follow up on several questions regarding the presentation on Solid Waste Rate options. This report provides a response to a number of questions asked during the meeting. Staff continues to research answers to other questions asked by Council members and will submit that information as it becomes available in the future.

Summary

This report responds to four sets of questions asked by Council members during the Council Policy meeting.

1. During the Policy meeting, Councilman Sal DiCiccio requested information about the average replacement cycle for side-load collection vehicles for the department as well as the cost of replacement for an automated side-load arm for a refuse or recycle truck.

Answer: To achieve a healthy replacement schedule, the Public Works Department recommends a seven-year average replacement cycle for side-load collection vehicles and a 10-year average replacement cycle for other solid waste vehicles. Current cost schedules indicate the cost to replace an arm for an automated side-load refuse or recycle truck the City currently uses is between \$30,000 and \$40,000.

2. While discussing the different rate options, Vice Mayor Betty Guardado, Councilwoman Laura Pastor, and Councilman Sal DiCiccio asked several questions about staff reductions that will occur given the recommended solid waste rate options proposed, as well as the staff reductions for the "no rate increase" scenario.

Answer: The numbers referenced below are based on the number of vacant positions in the Public Works Department as of Nov. 26, 2019. As of this date, the Public Works Department's Solid Waste program has a vacancy rate of seven percent or 42 positions. A service reduction description as well as the required staff reductions is described below for each option, along with the "no rate increase" scenario:

Option 1

Maintains current service levels and has no position eliminations.

Option 2

Suspends the City's compost program by eliminating curbside green organics collection and operations of the compost facility. This option would result in elimination of 16 positions, of which three are currently vacant. The employees in the eliminated positions listed below would be able to be absorbed through department vacancies and result in no staff reductions.

Potential eliminated positions:

- Six Solid Waste Equipment Operators
- Three Solid Waste Workers
- Two Equipment Operator IVs
- One Solid Waste Supervisor
- One Solid Waste Foreman
- One vacant Equipment Operator IV
- One vacant Solid Waste Worker
- One vacant Support Services Aide

Option 3

Adjusts the collection frequency of recycling containers to every other week, which more closely aligns with current service demand. This option would result in elimination of 16 positions, of which six are currently vacant. The employees in the eliminated positions listed below would be able to be absorbed through department vacancies and result in no staff reductions.

Potential eliminated positions:

- Ten Solid Waste Equipment Operators
- Six vacant Solid Waste Equipment Operators

Option 4

Suspends the City's recycle program and suspends the City's compost program by eliminating both curbside green organics collection operations of the compost facility. All refuse would be collected as trash and sent to the landfill for disposal. This option would result in elimination of 26 positions, of which three are currently vacant. The employees in the eliminated positions listed below would be able to be absorbed through department vacancies and result in no staff reductions.

- Sixteen Solid Waste Equipment Operators

- Three Solid Waste Workers
- Two Equipment Operator IVs
- One Solid Waste Supervisor
- One Solid Waste Foreman
- One vacant Equipment Operator IV
- One vacant Solid Waste Worker
- One vacant Support Services Aide

No Rate Increase

Maintaining the current monthly residential solid waste rate of \$26.80 and not increasing the monthly fee would result in an average shortfall of \$36.5 million annually and would require major service reductions and program eliminations. This option would result in elimination of approximately 135 positions, of which 13 are currently vacant. Of the approximately 135 eliminated positions to be eliminated, approximately 93 positions would not be absorbed through department vacancies, resulting in staff reductions. The positions listed below represent the entire list of positions to be eliminated in this scenario.

- Eighty-nine Solid Waste Equipment Operators
- Twenty Solid Waste Environmental Specialists
- Five Solid Waste Foremen
- Three Solid Waste Workers
- Two Equipment Operator IVs
- Two Support Service Aides
- One Solid Waste Supervisor
- Six vacant Solid Waste Equipment Operators
- Three vacant Solid Waste Foremen
- One vacant Equipment Operator IV
- One vacant Solid Waste Environmental Specialist
- One vacant Solid Waste Worker
- One vacant Support Services Aide

3. During a discussion on cost saving measures and cost increases for solid waste collection, Councilman Michael Nowakowski asked about the savings realized by the concessions made by employees.

Answer: The Public Works Department's Solid Waste program saved approximately \$4 million as a result of the concessions taken by employees for the three labor contracts between 2010 and 2016.

4. During the presentation Councilman Sal DiCiccio requested that a report be provided detailing services and rates provided by other municipalities throughout the region, including but not limited to, the City of Chandler. Councilwoman Debra Stark also requested to know whether recycling services were offered by the other municipalities included in the comparison report.

Answer:

Below is a list of local city rates and services compiled from the Cost of Service study completed by the solid waste rate consultant, NewGen Strategies & Solutions, as well as a survey conducted by Public Works staff:

Chandler

The City of Chandler has a population of 262,500, with approximately 76,000 living units serviced. The solid waste rate for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$16.93 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Household hazardous waste (HHW) disposal at City-owned facility via scheduled appointment
- On-call bulk trash collection 1x every six weeks
- Christmas tree collection

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- Additional collection of bulk trash \$30.00 per visit

Glendale

The City of Glendale has a population of 241,543, with approximately 59,956 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$21.80 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Monthly scheduled bulk trash collection
- Fee waiver at the landfill for loads of 2,000 pounds or less 1x per month
- HHW Disposal pick up 2x per year
- Free electronics recycling at the landfill
- Christmas tree drop-off sites

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- Additional collection of bulk trash \$99.00 for the first 30 minutes every requested pickup

Glendale also provides commercial service.

Goodyear

The City of Goodyear has a population of 84,659, with approximately 23,066 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$22.80 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Monthly scheduled bulk trash collection
- HHW disposal, once in Goodyear and second event hosted by neighboring city

Mesa

The City of Mesa has a population of 508,958, with approximately 119,929 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 35/48-gallon curbside container is \$23.74 per month, 65-gallon curbside container is \$26.19 per month and a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$29.34 per month. Mesa also charges a combined environmental fee of \$0.84 per month for neighborhood clean-up and HHW services, bringing the total monthly fee to \$30.18. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Christmas tree collection
- Moving box pick-up service
- Neighborhood Cleanup Program (.43 cents added to standard monthly bill for neighborhood cleanups)
- HHW disposal at facility (.41 cents added to standard monthly bill for HHW)

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- Bulk trash collection by appointment, "Pay as You Throw" \$23.04 per load (load size is approximately 4'x8'x4')
- Dump 1x month up to 2,000 pounds for \$13.00 per visit
- Weekly yard waste collection monthly fee of \$6.93 per month

Mesa also provides commercial service.

Peoria

The City of Peoria has a population of 168,181, with approximately 58,875 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$15.29 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection (recycle is taken to Phoenix transfer stations as part of IGA)
- Brush and bulky materials collection scheduled 2x per year

- HHW disposal - 3x per year pick-up
- Christmas tree drop-off sites

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- Bulk trash collection special hauls \$50 for every 30 minutes, with an additional \$50.00 if a tractor is used
- Prorated rates for landfill dumps range from \$16.73-\$27.00 for the first 2,000 pounds depending on location

Peoria also provides commercial service.

Phoenix

The City of Phoenix has a population of 1.6 million, with approximately 402,000 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 65-gallon curbside container is \$23.80 per month and for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$26.80 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Bulk trash collection - Quarterly pick-up
- HHW disposal - 9 Scheduled Events
- Dump 1x month up to 2,000 pounds for free
- Curbside Textiles Program
- Christmas tree drop-off sites
- Moving box pickup service
- Neighborhood Cleanup Program
- Eco Stations - 8 Locations
- Compost Facility for Residents, no Fee for Direct Delivery

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- Weekly green organics collection in selected areas \$5.00 monthly fee
- Specialized collection of bulk trash - \$36.74 per 15 minutes
- Appliance collection - \$20.00 per appliance with refrigerant

Scottsdale

The City of Scottsdale has a population of 255,000, with approximately 83,000 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$18.75 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Brush and bulky materials collection scheduled 1x per month
- HHW disposal, 1 event at facility and up to 3x per year pick-up collections (only 200

- collections scheduled city wide per month)
- Christmas tree drop-off sites

Scottsdale also provides commercial service.

Surprise

The City of Surprise has a population of 117,517, with approximately 55,000 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$20.70 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection (recycling is currently being diverted to the landfill)
- Dump 1x per year up to 2,000 pounds free
- Bulk trash collection 2x per year, 10 cubic yards per pick-up by appointment
- HHW disposal on-call request during scheduled time picked up 2x per year
- Christmas tree drop-off locations
- Moving box pickup service

Tempe

The City of Tempe has a population of 195,000, with approximately 33,500 living units serviced. The monthly solid waste rate for a 35/48-gallon curbside container is \$20.10 per month, 65-gallon curbside container is \$22.05 per month and a 90/96-gallon curbside container is \$25.60 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly trash & recycling collection
- Dump 1x month up to 1,000 pounds free
- Brush and bulky materials collection scheduled 6x per year
- Household Hazardous Waste Disposal Center open Fridays and Saturdays and Zero Waste days in April and November
- Christmas tree drop-off sites

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- January 2020 Green Organics container in selected areas for \$5.55 per month

Tempe also provides commercial service.

Tucson

The City of Tucson has a population of 575,000, with approximately 142,000 living units serviced. Monthly Solid Waste rate for a 35/48-gallon curbside container is \$15.00 per month, 65-gallon curbside container is \$16.00 per month and a 90/96-

gallon curbside container is \$16.75 per month. Included in the monthly fee are the following services:

- Weekly Trash Collection
- Every-other-week recycling collection
- Brush and bulky materials collection - 2x per year
- Household hazardous waste -first disposal location open Fridays 8 a.m.-2 p.m., second disposal location open first Saturday of every month
- Christmas tree drop-off sites

Additional services are available for separate fees:

- Residents can request additional household hazardous waste pick-ups for \$25.00

Tucson also provides commercial service.

Responsible Department

This item is submitted by Deputy City Manager Karen Peters and the Public Works Department.



City of Phoenix

General Information Packet

City Council Report

Agenda Date: 12/5/2019, Item No. 2

For Transmittal, Minutes of the Policy Session on Nov. 19, 2019

Summary

This item transmits the Minutes of the Policy Session on Nov. 19, 2019.

The Minutes are attached for review as **Attachment A**.

Responsible Department

This item is submitted by the City Manager's Office.



City of Phoenix

Minutes

Meeting Location:
City Council Chambers
200 W. Jefferson St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

City Council Policy Session

Tuesday, November 19, 2019

2:30 PM

phoenix.gov

CALL TO ORDER

The Phoenix City Council convened in Policy Session on Tuesday, Nov. 19, 2019 at 2:41 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Present: 9 - Councilman Sal DiCiccio, Councilmember Carlos Garcia, Councilman Michael Nowakowski, Councilwoman Laura Pastor, Councilwoman Debra Stark, Councilman Jim Waring, Councilwoman Thelda Williams, Vice Mayor Betty Guardado and Mayor Kate Gallego

Councilwoman Thelda Williams participated in the meeting via telephone. She disconnected from the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

Councilman Nowakowski left the Chambers during discussion, but remained part of the body via telephone.

Councilman DiCiccio left the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Councilman Waring left the meeting at 6:27 p.m.

COUNCIL INFORMATION AND FOLLOW-UP REQUESTS

This item is scheduled to give City Council members an opportunity to publicly request information or follow up on issues of interest to the community. If the information is available, staff will immediately provide it to the City Council member. No decisions will be made or action taken.

Councilwoman Stark announced the City of Phoenix received 100 percent on the Human Rights Campaign Municipal Equality Index for the seventh year in a row. She also shared that First Lap Fitness recently held a ribbon cutting at Rose Mofford Park.

CONSENT ACTION

This item is scheduled to allow the City Council to act on the Mayor's recommendations on the Consent Agenda.

There was no Consent Agenda for this meeting.

CALL FOR AN EXECUTIVE SESSION

There was no vote to call an Executive Session.

REPORTS AND BUDGET UPDATES BY THE CITY MANAGER

This item is scheduled to allow the City Manager to provide brief informational reports on topics of interest to the City Council. The City Council may discuss these reports but no action will be taken.

There was no report for today's meeting.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION (ITEM 1)**1 Police Department Civilian Review Discussion**

This report provides information regarding the examination of civilian oversight of the Phoenix Police Department, including a summary of prior meetings and a framework designed to assist the City Council with their deliberations on this topic.

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION.**Summary**

To date there have been three substantive City Council meetings on the subject of civilian oversight of the Police Department: July 2, 2019, Sept. 17, 2019, and Oct. 15, 2019. The discussion began from initial focus on the three most common categories of oversight - Review, Audit/Monitor, and Investigations. Next, the Council reviewed three sample models derived from those categories, and structured them as if they were to be implemented in Phoenix. The discussion included various staffing levels and budget ranges for each option. Following that meeting, the Oct. 15, 2019, meeting focused on hybrid models where duties associated with a particular model were blended with elements of a second model.

Examples from Tucson and Denver were discussed in-depth with experts from those cities. Liana Perez, Chief Operating Officer of NACOLE (National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement) spoke at the Sept. 17, 2019 session providing both a state and national perspective. She worked for many years in Tucson as the oversight monitor in addition to her work with scores of cities across the country. At the Oct. 15, 2019 meeting, City Council heard presentations from three visitors from Denver - Nicholas Mitchell, Denver Independent Monitor, Nikki Braziel, Vice Chair Civilian Oversight Board, and Chief Ronald Saunier, Division Chief Denver Police Department. They shared information about the model they use, how they came to developing and using this model, and how it works day to day. Outside legal counsel also participated in the past two meetings and provided detailed analysis of the legal implications of the various choices for Council's consideration. At the upcoming Policy meeting on Nov. 19, 2019, the City Council will again review information on potential hybrid options. To help facilitate that discussion, attached to this report are suggested categories of civilian review activities and different options within each category to assign to a civilian review effort (**Attachment A**). If it chooses to create a Phoenix model, the City Council can select specific tasks in each category to help create a civilian oversight program or add other tasks.

Mayor Gallego provided an overview of the previous work studies on the topic of the Police Civilian Review and encouraged the public to review the information from the prior meetings located on the City's website. She shared information about improvements that have been made to the Police Department including the modernization of training, conducting a public safety survey, collecting information for a RFP for an early intervention system and accelerating the rollout of body-worn cameras. She emphasized the City will seek additional community input on civilian oversight over the next few months.

Assistant City Manager Milton Dohoney, Jr. stated five categories have been identified as potential roles of a civilian review board to the Phoenix Police Department. These five categories include: community outreach; complaints and commendations; misconduct investigations to all misconduct or with a narrow focus on officer involved shootings and critical incidents; policy analysis; and reports to the community. He

clarified that the City and County of Denver's police oversight function started with investigating all misconduct but narrowed the focus to officer involved shootings and critical incidents due to an overload of cases.

Mr. Dohoney then provided an overview of what the City of Phoenix currently does for each category and shared potential options for a Phoenix civilian review board model to adopt to fulfill each category as well. He stated the community outreach category is currently conducted by the City's Police Department and conducted on an ad hoc basis by the Police Chief's advisory boards, police officers, committees or task forces. He then provided an overview of additional options for community outreach that could be carried out by a civilian review board. Mr. Dohoney stated that complaints and commendations are currently taken by the Police Chief, the officer's precinct, the City Council or the City Manager and referred to the Professional Standards Bureau. He then shared additional options for receiving complaints and commendations to a civilian review board.

Mr. Dohoney shared a summary of the current process for investigating officer involved shootings and critical incidents in comparison to all other misconduct. He stated the City's current process for investigating officer involved shootings or critical incidents includes a recommendation by the Professional Standards Bureau to the Police Chief, who confers with the Disciplinary Review Board and the Use of Force Board as set forth in policy and union agreements. He then clarified that all other misconduct investigations include a recommendation by the Professional Standards Bureau to the Police Chief, who would confer with the Disciplinary Review Board as set forth in policy and union agreements. Mr. Dohoney continued by sharing additional options for a civilian review board in investigating misconduct. He stated that any changes to disciplinary decisions could require a change to the City Charter.

Mr. Dohoney provided an overview of the current process for policy analysis within the Police Department. He stated policy analysis is currently conducted in the Police Chief's Office then shared additional options for a civilian review board to have in analyzing policies of the department. Mr. Dohoney concluded by providing information on the current process in publishing reports to the community which are primarily

generated in the Police Chief's Office, then shared additional options for a civilian review board to adopt in reporting to the community.

Mr. Dohoney introduced fellow presenters Mary O'Grady and Kim Friday of Osborn Maledon to assist in answering questions.

Vice Mayor Guardado asked about the possibility of establishing a youth outreach program with a civilian review board.

Mr. Dohoney replied that a civilian review board can establish a youth outreach program or the Council has the option of directing the Police Department to establish a youth outreach program as well.

Councilwoman Pastor stated she would like to see a potential civilian review board have the ability to hold community forums, receive feedback from the public and implement youth outreach programs. She then asked if it is possible to have public comment at a civilian review board meeting.

Mr. Dohoney stated that community feedback is applied differently across different cities. He further stated some models take public comment only on cases being evaluated or the board could conduct normal business then open for general public comment at the end of the meeting.

Councilwoman Pastor asked about the ability of the City Council to specify the public comment function within the civilian review board meetings.

Mr. Dohoney stated the City Council could provide that specificity in the ordinance that creates the review board.

Councilmember Garcia asked what is considered a "critical incident."

Mr. Dohoney stated the term "critical incident" is meant to convey significant situations other than when a shooting is involve such as a severe traffic accident.

Councilmember Garcia then asked whether a civilian review board would

need to wait until internal investigations are complete before moving forward with an investigation by the review board.

Mr. Dohoney stated the Council can establish the functions of the civilian review board to investigate alongside the internal process or to review the investigations once complete. He clarified that a City Charter change would be required if the civilian review board were to conduct its own investigations.

Councilman Nowakowski asked staff to confirm the existence of three boards currently in operation including the Professional Standards Bureau, Disciplinary Review Board and the Civil Service Board and asked about the composition of each entity.

Mr. Dohoney stated this is correct but the Professional Standards Bureau is an internal bureau. He then shared the Civil Service Board is comprised of only citizens and the Disciplinary Review Board and the Use of Force Board are both comprised of sworn officers and citizens.

Councilman Nowakowski then asked if citizens can complain about a situation with an officer to the current boards.

Mr. Dohoney stated citizens can complain to the Professional Standards Bureau, the Police Chief's Office, individual Councilmembers and the City Manager's Office but the investigating of the complaint is conducted by staff within the Professional Standards Bureau.

Councilwoman Pastor expressed preference for her office to send a complaint to a civilian review board as the central place where complaints are held then sent to the appropriate next steps. She then shared she thinks misconduct investigations should be conducted by the Professional Standards Bureau with the civilian review board for review to provide recommendations to the Police Chief who would confer with the Disciplinary Review Board and Use of Force Board as appropriate. Councilwoman Pastor concluded by sharing the civilian review board should be able to request reports to be issued by the Police and have the ability to issue its own reports.

Janelle Wood expressed support to review the current policies of the Police Department to ensure there is no bias and stated civilians should be a part of receiving complaints from the community and involved in the investigative process.

Michael B. London expressed opposition to a civilian review board and requested adding citizens to the current process.

Councilman DiCiccio expressed that accountability could be achieved by adding more civilians to current boards and expanding the current boards. He asked whether the City should consolidate the current boards in place.

Mr. Dohoney stated there was a desire to combine the current boards and entities but one of the challenges is that they serve different functions. He expressed there is a fundamental difference between internal consolidation and the creation of a separate entity that would have a new focus. Mr. Dohoney further shared that consolidation can happen but one aspect that would not necessarily be addressed is the issue of community trust in the Police Department.

Councilmember Garcia expressed the need for an objective and independent entity to review the current process that has led to current issues.

Vice Mayor Guardado stated the goal of establishing a civilian review board would be to regain trust between the Police Department and the community.

Gail Night expressed concern that no option was offered to improve the models that are currently being used and stated the desire for an auditing model of civilian review that is separate from the City where residents can express concerns occurring within the community.

Noll Rosen expressed opposition to civilian oversight.

Rev. Reginald Walton expressed support for a civilian review board and stated the call for the civilian review board is not an attack on the Police

Department.

Dr. Ann Hart expressed support for a civilian review board to build community trust with the Police Department and increase transparency in the disciplinary process.

Tomas Robles express support for a Civilian Review Board.

Thomas Henagar expressed support for an investigative civilian review board with subpoena power to be involved throughout the investigations.

AJ Marsden expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board that is comprised of people that participate in block watch, have gone through the citizen police academy, volunteer for the Police Department or have served on the Chief's advisory boards.

Katie Gipson McLean expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Elizabeth Venable expressed support for a civilian review board comprised of members that have had direct experience with the police.

Phil Martinez express support for a civilian review board with a youth outreach program.

Bishop Tyron Ivy expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Michelle Ponce, expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Adam Melder expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Claire McLonne expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Tremikus Muhammed expressed support for a civilian review board that

is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Laura Terech expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Caroline Davies expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

D. L. White expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Shawn Severud expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven with subpoena power.

Raji Ganesan expressed support for a community driven civilian review board.

Maria Castro expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Isabella Garcia expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board that is independent from the Police Department and requested that future meetings be more accessible to the public.

Michelle Rose expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Councilwoman Pastor clarified that the Council will not be taking a vote today.

At 4:22 p.m. the City Council took a recess then reconvened at 4:35 p.m.

Bryan Mohammed expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Carl Chase expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Chris Love expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Rev. Christine Dance expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Jean Boucher expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Yolanda Bejarano expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Alexandra Rodriguez expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Reyna Lopez shared information about her family's previous and ongoing issues with the Phoenix Police Department and requested further assistance in addressing the negative experiences.

Councilman Nowakowski requested the Council receive a full report of the incident Ms. Lopez shared with the Council.

Councilwoman Pastor requested staff work with Maricopa County to provide the medical records to Ms. Lopez.

Eduardo Rym expressed support for a civilian review board.

Luke Tarr expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Chris Abraham expressed support for a civilian review board.

Luke Black expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Emily Kirkland expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Amira Wari expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Note: Councilman Nowakowski left the Chambers and remained part of the body telephonically.

Patricia Peluka expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Cecalie Fort expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Uriel Diaz expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Jamar Williams expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

David Khalaj expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Jewel Valenzuela supports the creation of a community driven and independent civilian review board.

Sophia Dancel stated the meeting should be more accessible and expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Mickey Joner expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Paris Wallace stated the meeting should be more accessible and expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Marti Winkler expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Shelby-Lynn Dunkel expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Beatris Garcia expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Juan Rita expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Noenei Garcia expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Ben Lockland expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board that is adequately funded, independent, transparent, driven by the community and has investigative powers.

Jennie Hernandez expressed support for the creation of a civilian review board.

Chimene Hawes expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Joseph Larios expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Heather Hamel expressed support for a civilian review board that is independent, investigative, transparent and community driven.

Councilman DiCiccio stated his opposition to the creation of a civilian review board.

Councilmember Garcia requested staff evaluate future meetings to be held during a more accessible time.

Councilwoman Pastor asked what information the City Council should provide to build a model for a civilian review board and where the community's perspective aligns with the models presented.

Councilwoman Stark asked for more information regarding how a civilian review board would be appointed and data on different options from other cities.

Note: Councilman DiCiccio left the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Councilman Nowakowski expressed the desire to bring different ideas of a civilian review board to the community for more input.

Councilwoman Williams asked what would happen if Charter changes were presented to the voters and the voters didn't approve the changes.

Ms. O'Grady stated the change would not take affect and status quo would remain if a Charter change was voted down.

Mayor Gallego asked for two examples of the Charter change requiring voter approval.

Ms. O'Grady stated changes to disciplinary decisions or a change to the Civil Service Board or anything that takes the staffing decisions out of the City Manager's chain of command.

Note: Councilwoman Williams left the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

Councilwoman Pastor asked if all changes would require voter approval or if there are other aspects that need to be considered. Mr. Zuercher clarified that in addition to voter approval for Charter changes, other aspects to consider include labor negotiations.

Councilwoman Pastor then asked members of the public what "community driven" meant.

Jamar Williams stated the community driven aspect of a civilian review board would be the majority of the board being comprised of citizens to override police decisions and having independence through a separate investigation process that involved the community.

Note: Councilman Waring left the meeting at 6:27 p.m.

Councilmember Garcia stated the community driven aspect includes participation of people that are most affected by police.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Council, Mayor Gallego

declared the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

For further information, please call the Management Intern, City Manager's Office, at 602-262-4449.