

MINUTES

Winter Workshop of the Aurora City Council

Saturday, February 7, 2026

COUNCIL	Mayor Coffman	Gianina Horton
MEMBERS	Robert Andrews	Alli Jackson
ABSENT:	Françoise Bergan	Angela Lawson
	Alison Coombs	Ruben Medina
	Curtis Gardner	Amy Wiles
	Stephanie Hancock	

1. **Team Builder / Ice Breaker**

J. Burne started a leadership ice breaker asking the council members to reflect on a leader they have known in their lifetime who inspired them.

2. **Rules Committee Discussion**

Sponsor: Alison Coombs, Mayor Pro Tem

MPT Coombs explained that she, CM Medina, CM Jackson, and Mayor Coffman are members on the Rules Committee, and are asking to add one or more members to join. She said they plan to look through the entire set of rules, but would be starting with the conduct of meetings, decorum, and the how to conduct themselves and the public component.

CM Bergan expressed displeasure with rules being on the agenda, as the normal process is the Rules Committee coming to full Council at Study Session.

P. Schulte stated they wanted to set up the parameters of what it is going to look like moving forward. The thought process was to have robust discussion in several committee meetings, bring it to Study Session to discuss, and then get a final package to vote on at a regular meeting via resolution.

J. Batchelor added today would be a good time to bring up anything in the rules they would like to see addressed.

P. Schulte added he has been making a list of all the ideas from members that have been provided to him to bring back to the committee.

CM Lawson asked if they need to say which rule they want to look at and provide the rationale for it.

MPT Coombs answered it would be helpful to have the rationale in case someone could not attend to explain where they were coming from.

J. Burne expressed there is a subset topic within the rules that a number of council members have requested to discuss, which is norms. He pointed out the relationship between norms and the existing city charter, as norms that are decided on by the Council are intended to reinforce and clarify standards already imbedded in the Aurora Council Rules of Order and Procedure, which outlines meeting conduct and professional behavior expectations. He said they would be having a facilitated conversation on Council's preferences around norms and what they feel would be helpful to have as a focus for a future conversation to dive in deeper. He shared some ground rules to help them be productive in the discussion, including sharing the mic, ensuring everyone is heard and not going back in time. He suggested starting off with norms as they pertain the interactions between council members.

CM Lawson thought this was a rules discussion and discussing norms is totally off base of what the agenda is.

Mayor Coffman understood they would be getting into debates on the floor that will get heated, but in the past there would be situations where people would be upset with something someone said and just interrupt them without being recognized and then start going back and forth, where he would lose control of the meeting. He asked that people be conscious of letting people have the floor when it is their turn, and he admitted he could do a better job of listening. He reiterated it is important to be recognized before speaking.

J. Burne expressed a potential norm be the ability to wait for other council members to finish before speaking, as well as active listening.

CM Horton suggested another norm to consider be genuine curiosity, including asking questions, understanding why someone has a certain position, willing to sit in any discomfort and have the ability to take a step back and have a deeper understanding.

CM Bergan asked if they are supposed to also be talking about parliamentary procedure and how they handle disruptions in the council meetings as well.

MPT Coombs commented the focus is on what they do as a council today, as the Rules Committee will take time to discuss and process rules. She said they would benefit from being able to understand how they interact with each other well and set that example for the public.

Mayor Coffman added they should not engage with public in Public Invited to be Heard, and he would recognize a member after Public Invited to be Heard if they have comments on something that was said.

P. Schulte explained how that would work, which is to do a point of personal privilege and then wait to be acknowledged by the mayor. He mentioned the only consequence they currently have in the Council rules is censure, and they are missing consequences of the body in their rules. He encouraged them to think about something as a group regarding that, and recommended it be something like a three-fourths majority. He suggested things to talk about where they could hold themselves accountable that could be evenly applied across the board regardless of political affiliation.

CM Wiles added the willingness to be adaptable, listening to ideas, and being brave enough to accept change.

MPT Coombs shared some other important items people have mentioned to her, which include making sure people have enough information ahead of time before a discussion happens and questions around if the decorum statement read at the beginning of the meeting is accessible to the public, more focused on the legal aspect, and if there is a way to present it to get more community buy-in.

Mayor Coffman expressed there should be a discussion of decorum for the public attending the meetings and for council members to understand his limitations as the mayor, as well as a discussion around capabilities and limitations in terms of disruptions.

CM Jackson stated that as the City Council, they are constantly under a lot of high stress and deal with traumatic topics, where emotional dysregulation can happen, and group norms just help people check back in.

CM Bergan voiced she did not want to read the decorum statement, because she gets booed by certain people in the audience.

J. Burne asked what they felt it would take to be genuinely curious in one another's thoughts even if they disagree.

Mayor Coffman answered that by understanding someone's position and the logic surrounding around their beliefs, even if you are opposed to it, will help you discover another way to get something done that bridges both sides.

J. Burne noted that would require open-mindedness towards different types of rationales or views.

CM Horton agreed open-mindedness is important in fostering curiosity, but the root is the willingness to be in relationship with one another.

CM Wiles stated another important one is to assume positive intent and give people the benefit of the doubt. She stated that every interaction should be the opportunity for a new interaction.

J. Burne voiced it is hard to be curious about one another if they are thinking of negative intent.

CM Lawson commented it is easy to do this when they are in their committee meetings, but it is sometimes very difficult when they are on the dais and trying to give their perspective with interruptions from the audience and colleagues on the dais who are with the group causing interruptions, so it is not just cut and dry.

CM Jackson agreed it is hard when anybody is getting attacked and interrupted when trying to speak. She shared the reason she decided to join the Rule Committee is because she believes if Council can model the behavior themselves, it can then inspire or ripple out to others. She said there definitely has to be accountability and there are boundaries and lines that should not be crossed by community members or council members.

J. Burne asked CM Lawson how she would frame that issue and recommend addressing that issue going forward in terms of what would be useful.

CM Lawson responded she did not have a problem with being booed and talked about, but it is very difficult to hear her other colleagues speaking because of the interruptions from the public. She suggested the mayor try to address that, but there has to be something to help so they can actually be able to listen to each other. She come to terms with the fact she is going to be talked about regardless, but was not sure how to fix the issue.

Mayor Coffman stated that is something the Rules Committee could look at.

CM Bergan agreed they do not have those issues when they are in committees, as they are polite, respectful, and listen to each other; it is only on the dais. She said it has to do with the environment. She noted they used to have very respectful council meetings, but that changed 6 or 7 years ago.

MPT Coombs thanked everyone for sharing and agreed the issues on the dais with heckling and interrupting are a problem she has tried to discourage, and they definitely will address that in the Rules Committee. She welcomed people to come and have that discussion, and said they as council members do not control the people who show up even if they share their ideas.

3. Strategic Planning Overview

Leticia Callanen, Strategy and Performance Manager, General Management

L. Callanen shared some of the collective work they have been doing around strategic planning. She expressed that Aurora started working on their strategic planning a few years ago. She stated their strategic planning process provides clarity of their mission and priorities, and it helps their organizations, actions, achieving shared goals and objectives, and it is a dynamic model. She went over the strategic planning vision and mission, core values, and bedrock practices. She displayed a diagram illustrating their strategic and operational planning model and explained how it works. She talked about the five strategic outcomes, which include being well-managed, healthy, safe, economically strong, and connected and engaged, and they developed initiatives and departmental actions that have those shared priorities. She shared this year their focus is developing KPIs to track progress and ensure transparency, which will be a collaborative effort with City Council to set and refine priorities.

J. Batchelor thanked L. Callanen for her work on this. He stated this is the City's first strategic plan they have done. He stated in addition to continuing to work on the citywide stuff, they are trying to make sure their departments understand their part in the larger goal and that we have a small handful of major priorities they are going to be working on. He explained they want to get buy-in and understanding across their elected leaders and the organization so they all know where they are going.

CM Bergan shared they have done strategic planning most of the years she has been there and is happy to hear they are going to focus on four to five priorities, as in the past a lot of priorities could not all be addressed.

MPT Coombs expressed a principle they hear a lot from the community is about accountability. She suggested finding a way to have that be part of the Plan, Act, Learn framework or build it into each of them.

J. Batchelor responded they will look at that and communicate that out.

4. Break

5. Budget Overview

Greg Hays, Budget Officer, Finance

G. Hays gave an overview of the budget, including the budget process, principles, where they get their money, how they spend their money, and budget future. He stated departments needs budget to spend anything in their department and the Council approves every dollar spent. He talked about the budget book and recommended sections to read.

Mayor Coffman stated in every echelon of American government, the executive puts forward a proposed budget, which in our case is the city manager, and then it is up to the legislative branch to opine on the budget and finalize it.

G. Hays explained how they adopt a budget, including creating a base budget, and if they do not have enough money to do the base budget, they do cuts, and if they have more money, they do adds and create a balanced budget. He stated they will come to the Council around October for feedback on what they liked and did not like about the proposed budget, which will help them create a roadmap and adopt the budget for the next year. He shared they are very conservative in the city and use Leeds School of Business to do the econometric modeling. He shared they want to have a middle ground and then react to the adjustments in the economy. In regard to expenditures, they fully fund their FTE. He noted they say no a lot, as there are always more ideas than money in the city. He said they spend all of their money, and he talked about ongoing money versus one-time money.

CM Jackson asked about finding new money.

G. Hays responded there are options and ways to find new money. He noted it is hard to find big time new money, but it is great when it happens and he loves using grants and federal money.

G. Hays shared they follow a calendar and come back to the Council a lot, as they tell them how their revenues are doing every month. They come to them around March with Public Invited to be Heard, where they give citizens a chance to say what they want to see in the budget, and at the Spring Workshop to tell them what the revenues and expenses are looking like. In July, they will come to Council and have Council 101, a precursor of the next year's budget in a small time basis. He said the Citizens Advisory Budget Committee will also go through this process, and the 2027 proposed budget will be delivered to Council by August 31st, which they will later approve.

G. Hays expressed they focus on principles when doing a budget, including maintaining a balanced budget, providing the best possible services within the resources available, and using one time funds for one time uses. He shared that when they give Council the 2027 proposed budget, it is balanced, and the 2028 projection has to be pretty close. He explained they do fund accounting, meaning they have different funds that serve different purposes. He said the General Fund is the main operating fund of the city, and the Water Fund is the main fund that handles water billing and payments. He voiced that around 39% of their sources come in the form of taxes, mostly sales taxes in the General Fund and 32% in charges per service, which is

mostly water bill payments. He expressed that 58% of the General Fund revenue is sales tax and two-thirds of the revenue of the city is based on somebody buying something, so the economy is very important to them. He noted only 11% of the revenue of the city is property tax. G. Hays voiced the last time sales tax was increased was in 1993 and the last time property tax was increased was in 2000.

CM Jackson asked G. Hays for his expert opinion on inflation impacting the economy and people having less money to spend in a city being over 50% sales tax revenue generated.

G. Hays expressed inflation is good for the City of Aurora in revenue, but it is bad for the city in terms of everything they need costing more.

CM Jackson asked about recreational spending, as she assumed that goes down for people and there are less transactions.

G. Hays responded Aurora does not charge sales tax on groceries, have an occupational privilege tax, and are a low cost city in comparison to a lot of other cities. He agreed that if people's spending dollar becomes weaker, they still have to buy their groceries so they will spend less on wants.

J. Batchelor added they give a breakdown of the General Fund sales tax by sector in the monthly report.

Mayor Coffman added the city does a good job of raising fees relative to cost.

G. Hays stated they have a rule where all of their service fees are increased every year so they do not get behind.

G. Hays continued with his report, stating they track sales tax like a hawk, watch all the sectors, and watch the top 250 companies and track them monthly, so they know if something is falling off or growing stronger.

J. Batchelor explained V-shaped and U-shaped recessions.

G. Hays discussed recessions and the recession reserve they built.

CM Jackson asked if there has been a predicted next recession.

G. Hays answered that Leeds School of Business does not predict a recession, but give optimistic, baseline, and pessimistic baselines.

G. Hayes then talked about property taxes, which is about 11% of their revenue. He said they are Taber limited, meaning they cannot grow as much as they want to. He said they are above the Taber limit, so they have to return the rest of the money every year in terms of a temporary mill levy reduction. He noted that last year they returned \$13.1 million. He went over

where they spend their money, which consists of capital spending and operating spending. In terms of operating spending, it is the typical annual budget and where they get things done for the city, including day to day business, staff supplies, day to day maintenance, upkeep of building, roads, and parks, etc. He noted that if a department does not spend their annual budget, it goes back to funds available. He explained the capital side is multi-year spending, including things like multi-year projects, major infrastructure replacements, fixing water pipes, roads, and buildings. He mentioned the vast majority of their capital is in the Water Fund. He talked about where the money comes from for capital, which mainly comes from the General Fund.

G. Hays went over the General Fund appropriations side. He said the party of the General Fund is public safety and the City of Aurora spending is mostly on personal services, as they are people providing services to the citizens of Aurora. He noted the 2026 adopted budget is balanced and 2027 is off a little bit, as they did not get a SAFER grant they thought they would to do a fire station. He briefly went over some words and terminology they would be using throughout the year.

6. Council Chambers Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Update

Laura Perry, Deputy City Manager

L. Perry gave an update on the Council Chambers Project and gave some recommendations on next steps. She said in 2021, there was a Council Chambers accessibility improvement opportunity, and at that time, ARPA come through the city for consideration and \$750,000 was identified for design and construction of these improvements. She noted the goal of the improvements were to increase accessibility to the Council Chambers from the floor and podium, enhance access to the Council dais from the Chambers, and provide for an inclusive design. The improvements includes ramps and accessible seating on the Chambers floor. She noted the construction of the improvements would have required a full closure for about 8 months. In February 2024, City Council made a determination to defer construction. She mentioned the same project today, with the existing design, would cost around \$975,000. She showed some renderings of what the improvements would look like. L. Perry explained they began updating the city's ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan, which is a phase plan update. They completed phase one of that plan, which focused on their transportation public right-of-way, including curb ramps, sidewalks, and pedestrian push buttons on crossing lights. She said as part of the plan, an ADA consultant is accessing all city facilities and Council Chambers and found the Chambers were out of compliance with current ADA standards and there was need to do

adjustments to the Chambers, including further slope adjustment, handrail adjustments, ramp landings, signage, etc. She explained they were seeking direction from Council on next steps for this project. The first option they could do is find a nominal amount of funding within their existing capital budget to update the design set and have an architect update the plan set to accommodate the ADA needs, or they could wait and see all facility recommendations before updating the design. She stated they could also do both, as they are required by the DOJ to come back to Council after each phase of the transition plan, and the consultant would provide prioritization of the recommendations to be built in the Transition Plan.

CM Bergan asked if they moved ahead with the Chamber design now would it still be around \$975,000.

L. Perry answered that was the construction cost for the original plan set from 2023, and there are ADA needs not addressed in the original design that the consultant identified, so they would need to go back and update those before completing construction.

CM Bergan asked how soon the design could be done to start construction.

Female responded it would depend on if the previous architects were still available or if they would have to bid out for new architects. She estimated three to four months if the previous architects were available and four to six months if they would have to get a new architect.

CM Bergan inquired if construction would still be 8 months.

L. Perry stated 8 months was the original estimate, but the updated design could change that.

J. Batchelor added they have learned a lot over the ADA Transition Plan, the biggest thing being that ADA regulations are incredibly complex and experts are needed in interpreting those regulations.

CM Horton voiced she was for doing both simultaneously. She felt if they were going to do this, they should do it right and as updated as possible so it does not have to be revisited for years to come. She stated if this moves forward with Chambers having to be closed, she would like a cost estimate if there were alternatives for Council to still meet in person.

CM Lawson inquired if they have the funding for this or if they would need to forego some other capital budget funding.

L. Perry responded that for the design update from the existing Capital Projects Fund, they estimate \$100,000 give or take they would need to

identify in the Capital Projects Fund. She expressed they have no funding identified for construction and would come back to Council on that.

CM Jackson supported both moving forward, but wanted to make sure they were effective. She recommended maybe waiting until they know what the actual construction needs are before getting too far down the road. She thanked L. Perry for the background knowledge about ADA phases, as it gave them a lot of information to communicate back to constituents. She expressed that since Chambers is where public is invited to be, it is a pressing matter for it to be ADA compliant.

L. Perry noted that MPT Coombs had to step away, but communicated that she was supportive of identifying funding for design, but also wanted to look at options for phasing construction to see if that is a possibility.

Mayor Coffman asked if it was realistic to phase the construction and not do it all at once.

L. Perry answered they would have to identify that with the architect, but it would still require full closure of the Chambers, and it does raise cost to phase it.

CM Bergan felt they should move forward with the design on Chambers. Referring to the diagram displayed showing where the changes are, she inquired about where staff would go that would be presenting.

L. Perry responded the table where staff presents would still remain.

Mayor Coffman supported going forward with the design.

J. Batchelor said they would move forward with the design and come back to Council later this summer on that, and they will also work on final timing for the Transition Plan. He added they would like to incorporate the Transition Plan into the annual budget process.

7. Break

8. Build Up Aurora Update

Laura Perry, Deputy City Manager

L. Perry talked to Council about Build Up Aurora. She stated the city owns and maintains a lot of assets and they are growing and have to balance maintaining those within their Capital Budget every year. She said there are three things that brought them to this conversation today, which are that they are a growing city, have areas that are undeveloped that require regional infrastructure investments and the need to maintain the

infrastructure they built long term, and the lack of needs for capital funds. She noted the cost estimate on their infrastructure needs exceed what they can afford to do within their annual budget. She explained their building repair for the city is \$3 million a year, and if they have one roof failure to address, that is \$500,000 to \$1 million, which sinks and defers other needs in the city they have to invest in. She gave some education on how they pay for capital projects, including pay as you go, receiving capital impact fees, one-time funding, multiyear financing, and grants and partnerships.

J. Batchelor noted when they talk about debt in the city, it is the equivalent of a mortgage, not deficit spending.

L. Perry commented that a lot of their transportation projects are in design, which is heavily due to the fact they have been so successful in getting grants for design and construction, but they are starting to see these opportunities are very limited and exhausted and there are certain things grants cannot pay for. She talked about the various tools the city has to pay for costly projects, which include GO bonds, revenue bonds, certificates of participation, and special assessment. She talked about the processes a project follows through project development, which include master planning, design, construction cost estimate, and construction. She discussed capital master plans and noted they are typically data driven and community informed. L. Perry shared they have done a lot on the master planning front through dollars identified by Council a couple of years ago. She said they have completed and/or on the precipice of completing a lot of master plans, which identified capital needs and public outreach. She added all of that helped prioritize needs in the draft 10-year Capital Plan. She showed various phases of the ADA Transition Plan they are working through, and shared they are in phase 2 of the plan. They have addressed residential street pavement, which was the number one thing they heard from the public, and have been able to catch up on a lot of that work, pursued a lot of federal and state infrastructure grants, and developed a phased communication and education engagement plan, all of which has led to a plan and financial option to address their long list of needs they cannot afford to do in their annual budget. She shared that in 2024, Council approved the creation of an Infrastructure Task Force, which had the goal to come up with short, midterm, and long term solutions they city can look at to address infrastructure needs while continuing to receive community input and support. She talked about the key principles they installed through this process, which are strategic capital planning, public engagement, transparency, and fiscal responsibility. She voiced they did a lot of public outreach in the last year, including an online survey, citywide in-person events, facilitated community discussions, events and festivals, and social

media. She said the three things the public really cared about was public safety, transportation infrastructure, and parks and recreation.

L. Perry discussed Connecting Aurora, Multimodal Transportation Master Plan, and went over the recommended transportation capital project needs and projects for their draft 10-year plan, which consist of 13th Ave Multimodal, ADA Barrier Removal, Alameda Bridge over I-225, Complete Streets Project, Gun Club Road, High Priority Missing Sidewalks, Intersection and Traffic Calming, Montview Boulevard, Northwest Alleys, Sand Creek Bridge, Gun Club Road (State Hwy 30 from Airport to Yale), Signal, Signs, and Markings, Tower Road, Widening Tower Road, and Traffic Safety and Technology.

MPT Coombs asked about the discussion of potential BRT networks in Connecting Aurora in addition to the Colfax one, and where they are at as a city looking into scoping in those projects. She felt that would expand the effectiveness of transit in their city.

L. Perry answered they are looking at BRT next, but they have not developed a concept or cost yet for that.

CM Bergan inquired which projects are eligible for federal grants.

L. Perry responded that for Peoria, there is a bridge investment program the federal governments fund every year, which they have put in an application for but have not heard back on yet. She said they can also apply for Montview, and they are going to put in for a raise grant. She noted since this is a project of merit, it will position them well for reapplying for the grant. She added there is typically Safe Streets funding they have been successful in pursuing, and they received DRCOG money for the design of Alameda Bridge. She stated there is a lot of opportunity and it always becomes a cost benefit analysis on federalization of a project.

CM Lawson voiced they got \$250,000 for Montview with the congressional directed spending. She asked if that was towards this project.

L. Perry answered yes.

L. Perry then discussed PROS. She said PROS completed their master plan three years ago, and they also heard a lot about parks through Build Up Aurora. She stated there is a demand for more and larger parks and open space in the city, more and larger recreation facilities, and expansion. She gave a list of the PROS Capital Projects, including updates and modernization of the Aurora Center for Active Adults Project, Reservoir, a new Sports Park, expansion of the existing sports park, Parks Renovations, Master Plan Parks, new Northeast Aurora Recreation Center, Plants Conservation Center, and all rec center building needs.

Mayor Coffman asked if they would be doing replacement or renovation of the Plains Conservation Center.

Ryan expressed they completed a master plan for the Plains Conservation Center in 2019 to reenvision it to what it could and should be in the future, which identified about \$35 million worth of improvements, as well as moving it into a better location on the site and finishing out all other types of amenities that could be needed there. He noted it is a 1200 acre site that has a lot of potential for the future.

CM Wiles asked about the Sports Park expansion, and if they have looked from an ROI perspective on whether or not building potentially two new fields and a stadium that could be rented out for other things versus four new turf fields. She inquired if the expansion included any more stands where they could sell food, as the area does not provide any sort of food or ability to provide food for all the kids and families at the sports park. She wondered if they were looking at expanding that as a way to bring more revenue in.

L. Perry responded they have not completed the ROI analysis, but that would be a key next step and will incorporate those as the project progresses.

L. Perry moved on to discuss Libraries, Arts, and Culture. She shared that Library and Cultural Services completed two master plans, a Library Master Plan and Cultural Facilities, Cultural Services Master Plan. She noted there was a lot of engagement on the Library Master Plan, and they heard a lot about arts and entertainment venue and more and improved library facilities. She listed all the projects and needs, which include a remodel of Central Library, Hoffman Heights Library expansion of bilingual technology and literacy support, etc., bathroom facility upgrades across most all libraries, as well as public service areas, wayfinding, lighting, site improvements, Mission Viejo renovation, and Tallyn's Reach expansion.

L. Perry expressed Cultural Services Facilities also have their own Master Plan and projects, including the Aurora Fox Courtyard, Bicentennial Arts Center vista renovation and kiln yard, some improvement to all cultural facilities, reconfiguration of the Aurora Fox lobby, Meadowood Gym reenvisioned to be a cultural center for Aurora dance arts or a multipurpose space, and need for a new northeast library.

MPT Coombs stated when they had their capital improvements conversation, it was clear the current museum facility was not going to be efficient to renovate for their needs, but wondered if there were ways to take that history of Aurora and find opportunities to put it in those facilities so the community can see things about our history and what the museum has done.

Mayor Coffman asked if there has ever been an analysis where that could be integrated somewhere like the Central Library. He agreed it would really raise awareness, as being isolated on its own is a little problematic.

L. Perry answered the master plan consultant for the Cultural Facilities Master Plan recommended the city complete a feasibility study to evaluate the current museum and determine options for expansion and ways to carry through with historical programming and collections in the city.

G. White Brunetti added that currently the Aurora History Museum staff does outreach and utilize other branches to showcase programs and installations and exhibits. She said they also partner with Stanley Marketplace and Aurora Town Center and try to get out in the community, but they could amplify that or find other locations. She noted they are talking with Old Station 5 about doing an exhibition there.

CM Wiles inquired if they have looked at partnering with Anythink for the Northeast Aurora Library, as they are the Adams County Libraries, and she felt they should chip in or provide.

J. Batchelor responded he had a conversation with their partners in Adams County and gave him a contact to Anythink, and he will reach out. He stated there is currently a partnership between Anythink and Thornton.

CM Wiles pointed out that on the imagining facilities feature, it said 17% of people want cafes or a community kitchen, and she received a text earlier about the lack of cooking classes. She asked if they thought about using the unused kitchens and turning them into community kitchens to fill that gap.

Male said they have the opportunity to reimagine what is happening there.

CM Gardner voiced the projects are great and needed, but Council will have to put effort into funding them, so they need to give libraries the budget. He noted there are a lot of things libraries can be used for beyond just checking out books, and he promised to hold his colleague accountable in giving them the budget to make sure when these remodels and expansions happen.

CM Bergan agreed with CM Gardner on making sure they have the operating budget to assist this. She mentioned the southern part of Aurora is part of the Arapahoe County Taxing Authority for libraries that they pay for out of the budget, as well as a mill levy to those. She shared they have talked about how to get out of that and it is pretty much impossible.

J. Batchelor answered, yes, there is no mechanism in state law to remove themselves from a library district. He said they have two areas of the city like that and there is no legislator that wants to touch it.

Mayor Coffman agreed with CM Wiles to lean on and work with them since we are paying taxes into that. He felt it would be right for a Study Session to show where those boundaries are and the possibilities of working with those.

MPT Coombs stated it could go to the committee that covers libraries to see if they are interested. She said staffing libraries has been a challenge in the budget conversations and they need to continue that conversation.

CM Medina mentioned they thought about doing something next door to the museum since they have a county building there and having conversations with them to see if they could utilize some of the space they have.

L. Perry stated that Public Safety completed a master plan last year, which entailed looking at current facility uses, efficiencies, growth projections, and where additional infrastructure is needed to support safety service. She noted that was prioritized in a 10-year, 15-year, and 25-year horizon. She shared the master plan involved a lot of facility tours, condition assessments, and operational assessments that all fed into recommendations. She went over the safety projects, including a new Fire Station 19 serving the Southshore area, Fire Station 2 remodel, Fire Station 8 new land acquisition and station, fire station facility improvements, Fire Station 3 remodel, APD district stations interior improvements, public interface, and security, new District Station 4 facility, construction of a new APD training complex.

Mayor Coffman asked Chief if it was necessary to have a fourth district.

Chief Chamberlain answered yes, the redistricting occurred as a result of a lot of steps taken over the past 18 months, as they were have problems with response time and crime. He noted right now they are down 23% in crime and 56% in nonfatal shootings, which is the lowest it has been in 5 years. He said calls for service went from 22 minutes in response to a emergency call to now being below 6 minutes after modifying policy and procedure. He shared that District 3, 2, and 1 will go east to west, and they absolutely need 4, as units have been responding all the way from Southland all the way up to almost 48th Street, which is problematic for the community and APD.

MPT Coombs asked if repurposing CAPSTC was for AFR training or response.

J. Batchelor answered they are outgrowing the existing combined facility and have always planned for expansion. He said there was an idea that after expanding it, APD would take their half and AFR would take their half, but they would need to look at their existing CAPSTC infrastructure and look at the needs of fire and police and make sure they have enough facilities for each of them to meet their needs. He said they know there are needs for

APD around an in-door firing range, but AFR has similar needs and they need to figure out enough facilities for both of them on the same site.

L. Perry continued listing the safety projects, including a consolidated property and evidence operations storage facility.

P. Schulte explained they have so many evidence lockers spread across the entire city, and from a liability and safety perspective, it would be nice to have that in one central building.

Chief Chamberlain added they have four buildings that hold all the evidence storage and saved throughout the city and it is liability risk right now.

MPT Coombs asked if they could look at combining land acquisition and capital costs with some of the other large capital and land acquisition costs they are looking at.

J. Batchelor responded when they look at property and evidence, there are other operations that make sense to co-locate with that.

Mayor Coffman asked if they see having their own forensic lab in the future.

Chief Chamberlain felt it was time for that and is a goal. He talked about the Special Operations Building, which would house investigators, K9 operators, and special weapons and tactics team. He stated it is in an old warehouse building right now and is a high risk huge impact as far as litigation issues.

L. Perry stated another project site for public safety is Aurora 911, which is currently in Tallyn's Reach and has architectural deficiencies, needs for investment for interior finishes and enhancements, and is need for a long term solution for Aurora 911 to support the public safety technology ecosystem, ensure continue of operations, and eliminating single points of facility. A couple of other projects for public safety are the city-owned impound lot and support buildings and a real-time operation center.

CM Bergan said they have been talking about the impound lot for several years. She asked if a study had been done to do an analysis of that.

J. Batchelor answered yes, and it is highly dependent on how much they are towing, what is charged for towing, and if people are being charged for storage. He noted they would be doing well to break even on the operations, but capital cost and funding the capital cost would be the biggest thing.

CM Bergan asked about the entire impound lot be strictly for stolen vehicles.

J. Bachelor said they could change the scope and scale, but it would still have a lot of the same things and they would not incur any revenue.

MPT Coombs felt this would be a win-win for operations and for community customer service.

L. Perry discussed other city facilities projects, including improvements to security, sidewalks, and other infrastructure needs at the courthouse, an entrance security upgrade project that would cost \$2.3 million to construct at the courthouse, and needs at the detention center, ADAC facility improvements, future animal shelter, Aurora Day Resource Center decommissioning, Aurora Municipal Center, Navigation Campus facility replacement needs, Central Facility, Northeast Facility, and Southeast Facility, several projects for existing facilities expansions and renovations, and two new maintenance facilities, one in the northeast and expansion of the southeast Aurora Maintenance Campus.

L. Perry stated this is a fiscally unconstrained plan totaling \$1.9 billion, which they city does not have enough money to cover, so they would like to take the list of projects for each of the areas out to the public on what matters most to them. She commented they have ranking roundups scheduled for this month, where they will walk the public through each of the projects and engage with them on what matters most to them. She noted they will bring that back to the Infrastructure Task Force in March to have a conversation about the feedback they got from the public and then go back out again in March and April to ensure they have a community informed and technically sound capital plan for the city. She stated that will come to the Council at the May 9th Spring Workshop with recommendations of a potential bond package and financial resources and recommendations on how they can pay for the top priorities given from the public.

J. Batchelor further explained what goes on the ballot needs to be voter informed and what voters wants. He said they hope to get authorization in November, where they would then implement a bond program with the idea that whatever they are authorized to do, they will construct over the next 6 to 7 years to do those projects.

CM Gardner commented they have not increased sales tax since 1993 and explained how some of the projects on the ballot have failed in the past. He said by the time they are done it will be a two year process of engagement internal and external and polling to get to a point where they can get something to pass with voters. He said they need to be really smart about what the city truly needs and what voters will be open to doing.

CM Lawson felt it was good to go back to the public to get their input, as everyone has a different perspective on what is important. She expressed

they need to be very specific about what the projects are going to be and the marketing for those will be very important.

Mayor Coffman added Aurora voters are tough on tax increases.

CM Bergan agreed with CM Lawson and CM Gardner, and said it is also important that whatever priorities are put on the ballot question represent the entire center. She felt sometimes things fail when they are concentrated on just one area.

MPT Coombs thanked CM Gardner and CM Bergan for dedicating a lot of extra time to make this a successful effort.

9. Lunch

10. Aurora Regional Navigation Center (ARNC) Overview

Roberto Venegas, Deputy City Manager / Jessica Prosser, Director, Housing and Community Services

J. Prosser gave an update on the Navigation Campus, which has been opened now for around 9 weeks. She gave the new council members background of how the Navigation Campus came to be what it is today. She said they are almost done with renovations. She gave some highlights of the current operator agreement. She stated their application panel included their county and state partners and Metro Denver Homeless Initiative, where they selected Advance. She said the document includes responsibilities related to daily maintenance, physical maintenance of the facility, breakdowns of thresholds, and is a 3-year agreement with options for two renewals. She noted the city is responsible for repairs above \$10,000 and Advance is responsible for repairs under \$10,000 up to \$200,000. She added Advance has an on-site maintenance person with quite a bit of experience. She talked about reporting and accountability for Advance and the Good Neighbor Agreement they signed to maintain cleanliness and impact the surrounding neighborhood. She shared the major plumbing issue has been fixed and Tier 1 and Tier 2 bathrooms are available, and all construction is planned to be done by the end of February. J. Prosser stated they are looking at the outdoor recreation area long term, as people experiencing homelessness want to spend time outside.

Stephanie stated that as of December 31, Advance had 10 guests enrolled in their Work Bridge affiliate program, where guests can help keep the inside and outside of the facility clean and work towards maintenance skills for later job opportunities. She said 94 guests have been engaged in case management services at the ARNC, 258 programming groups, over 1000

different individuals have checked into the day center since opening, and Advance served over 55,000 meals. She talked about the current partners on site for Advance Pathways they have current MOUs with and are looking for additional healthcare providers to come onsite. She explained the sheltering, which is a three tier shelter. The first tier is a congregate low barrier shelter, the second is semi-congregate, and the third is a transitional living program. She gave some of the numbers they are seeing come out of the ARNC. In November, they had an average of 159 people staying the night in tier 1, with tier 2 and tier 3 being closed at that time. In December, they had 264 on average for tier 1, 10 people on average for Tier 2, and 5 people on average for Tier 3. She stated preliminary numbers for January show 280 people a night in Tier 1, 46 in Tier 2, and 4 in Tier 3. Stephanie discussed how Advance gets feedback and how community give the feedback, which is through Advance grievance forms, good neighbor email, and nightly town halls. She talked about some of the negative feedback they have heard so far, which consists of security using a wand at entry, stolen medication, food allergies accommodations, greater need for case management, and senior specific resources requests. The positive feedback they have received included guests being able to finally sleep at night and having consistent medical treatment. She voiced that Advance and the City of Aurora meet weekly to discuss issues and concerns and problem solve how to work through them, and they also meet with APD, Denver PD, and nearby business owners. She noted that Advance is responsible for following up on all client and guest grievances and the nightly town hall feedback received. She expressed to Council and Mayor Coffman that if they are receiving concerns from constituents to reach out to her directly as well. Stephanie went over some of the operational changes they have made since receiving the feedback, including sending staff and case managers to talk to guests outside of the gate to encourage them to come inside for services, cleaning up the debris and trash outside, looking to get additional medical support, weekly trash abatements along 40th, and analyzing calls for service and looking at possible policies to integrate to help with call trends over to the campus. She shared operations they still expect to be implemented, including continuing to hire staff, offering transportation and planned stops throughout Aurora, opening pet kennels, and continuing to implement MOUs to get more service providers onsite with clients. She voiced that Advanced leadership will attend the Housing Neighborhood Service and Redevelopment Policy once a quarter, attend Study Session at least twice this year, and work with the City to design a communication plan.

CM Horton asked for numbers on how many grievances have been received and how it correlates with the amount of people coming through the doors.

Stephanie responded that the Good Neighborhood Agreement email received about 8 emails so far.

J. Prosser added that the grievance forms received were less than 10 according to Advance.

CM Horton inquired if they were available in multiple languages.

J. Prosser answered people can write the emails in a different language and they would be able to translate that. She said she would ask if the forms come in different languages, as she was not sure about that.

MPT Coombs asked if the grievance forms were available in paper and online.

J. Prosser explained the email is the online form of making complaints and the grievance forms are in physical paper form.

Mayor Coffman commented this building was not in good condition and he did not know to what extent they analyzed the building prior to purchasing it, as it has major problems and has hurt the program, as well as the agreement with the operator, in terms of maintaining the building at a certain level. He stated they were expected to have certain levels of expertise on site and do not have that capability. He mentioned the hiring of the two case management process has been delayed because of their maintenance responsibilities and the resources and time they allocated toward that. He expressed the contract they had with operators when they were at the Aurora Day Resource Center and their predecessors, was they were responsible for the cost associated with cleaning the building and no other maintenance responsibilities and now they have had maintenance responsibilities put on them they are not capable of. He added there are too many people in Tier 1 and they have not progressed to Tier 2 because of the lack of case management. He felt that in order to get this program where it needs to be they need to look at the agreement and align it with what they historically had with operators dealing with homelessness issues, and we will have to take over responsibility for the condition for the building outside of cleanliness. He mentioned APD being concerned about lighting issues in the back of the building.

Chief Chamberlain explained they are looking at environmental issues there. He gave a snapshot of their call log for a month period, where they had 141 calls, a 2-minute response time, 45 minutes average time on scene, and of those calls, 30 were mental health, 15 were suicidal, 11 were alcohol/drugs, 15 fire needs police, and 12 welfare checks threatening suicide. He stated the biggest issue they are having now is bringing stability in there, so they have putting officers in there more to mentor security and staff. He discussed the

issue with a lot of people coming in and around the yards, which they are focused on. He shared they are meeting with the hotel staff on the southside of 40 next week to discuss that. He felt the biggest thing is understanding they are dealing with a complex community and there are things they will have to navigate and get better at.

Mayor Coffman commented the two issues he'll be working on is the immediate maintenance concerns with staff and the operator and looking at the agreement and potential revisions.

CM Bergan thanked Advance Pathways and Aurora staff, as this is pretty remarkable coming from where they were. She was also thankful for the quarterly reports and the data being gathered. She was concerned with spending over \$2 million taxpayer dollars per year on operating cost. She asked if they have tripled the amount of people using the facility why is all the burden on Aurora to do the operating part of it. She noted that not all 300 of the people staying there on average are probably all from Aurora. She inquired if anybody else besides Aurora is contributing to operations.

J. Prosser answered that Arapahoe County approved \$290,000 of operator funding for Advance last week and the Centennial has provided some money to go to construction and willingness to provide ongoing HUD funding, and Douglas has looked at this related to opioid funding.

J. Batchelor shared they would be approaching a lot of their municipal and county partners in Adams County to see what they can provide in operating funding, and he, Mayor Coffman, and Advance would work on that effort. He added Advance is responsible for doing a lot of fundraising on their own, but they will help them make connections with governmental entities.

CM Bergan asked if Spirit of Aurora helps advertise giving money to the Navigation Center.

J. Prosser responded that it does.

CM Bergan recommended that it needed to be advertised on social media.

Mayor Coffman commented there are private foundations that are all in in a pretty significant way, including Daniel's Fund, Anschutz Family Foundation, and The Dakota Foundation.

MPT Coombs asked if there was an ability to have CRT and/or AMRT be involved in providing training and support for the onsite staff in terms of the mental health and suicide calls. She also asked what other kinds of training and support do the onsite staff have available for addressing that.

J. Prosser answered that Advance is doing trauma informed care training with all their staff, Aurora Mental Health has been engaged for providing services on site, and they have also had conversations with the fire department on ideas for telehealth and things to be available 24/7 onsite. She added they also have their crisis teams that can be requested.

MPT Coombs voiced she has heard concerns about people with disabilities feeling like they are not getting the service they need or unable to access the facility well. She asked how frequently Atlantis is coming out and what kind of advocacy and support they provide people with engagement with the operator to make sure they are getting appropriate access and support.

J. Prosser stated she would get back to them with some information on that.

Mayor Coffman inquired if we have a relationship working with SageRidge.

J. Prosser answered yes, and they have already referred and transported clients there. She mentioned the Potomac Campus is also now open with Aurora Mental Health, so they have another location to transport people experiencing a mental health crisis.

CM Andrews asked if they collect data on where people are coming from when doing intakes.

J. Prosser answered yes, and they are gleaning that about 20% are coming from outside of Aurora right now.

CM Andrews asked Chief Chamberlain if there are peak times when people are calling in regard to mental health.

Chief Chamberlain responded they do not have the data down to the actual times, but it does seem to lull down as the evening comes, so they put up a day watch unit and a mid PM unit.

J. Batchelor thanked T. Bunetta and her team for pulling a lot of call data for the first couple months of operation. He said the entire public safety team and J. Prosser's team went over the data and saw on the Fire side, after they implemented Stride, calls come down during that time, which is 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. He said they are typically seeing calls once the nurse there leaves, so they are working with operators to see if there is a way to address that.

Chief Oughton expressed that J. Prosser has been a great partner and their team has been working directly with the operator to try and find some creative solutions. He stated this is new and brings new and unexpected challenges. He shared that Fire Station 3's call volume has went up about 50% since the facility opened, so they supplemented additional resources in that area to try and help with those. He noted a large of volume of those are

low acuity calls. He was confident they would develop creative approaches to manage some of the challenges and get people where they need to be.

CM Jackson shared that she got a question from a case manager working in public health in Denver who work with the unhoused. She asked if they could refer clients from Denver to this center.

J. Prosser responded it is a regional facility and there is a network of these facilities in the surrounding areas, but they are getting people from Denver and know people in Aurora end up in Denver as well. She stated it is a resource and they could refer them, but if someone is already working with a case manager, they like them to continue with that case manager.

CM Jackson inquired if they turn anyone away based on circumstances.

J. Prosser answered no one is being turned away based on geographic area. She noted they do not allow families or those under 18.

CM Wiles asked if there are any specified security patrols in terms of the good neighbor agreement and operating agreement. She met with them last week and they said they only walk the perimeter twice a day. She felt that was probably not enough and something they should look at.

J. Batchelor stated that is one of the reasons they decided to imbed a couple of operations and try to mentor them on where they are seeing problems.

Chief Chamberlain added that has been the focus and letting them know they have more patrol than what is just inside the gates.

Mayor Coffman voiced it is difficult and they opened it up prematurely due to the cold weather, which was a tradeoff, and it has been a tough path, but the felt they have navigated it very well.

11. Transportation Capital Impact Fee

Sponsor: Amy Wiles, Council Member

Laura Perry, Deputy City Manager

J. Batchelor stated they currently charge impact fees for residential fees, and those fees cover transportation, parks, recreation, libraries, and general government. However, they have not charged transportation to nonresidential fees, which is something they have looked at in the past.

CM Wiles shared that when they first started talking about this, she was shocked they did not charge this fee, as this is a fee they charge to homebuilders who have multiple cars in their driveway versus larger commercial places where they have hundreds of cars on our roads. She said

we already do not have enough money to maintain or improve roads, so this is a way to get some of that and be more in line with other municipalities.

Mayor Coffman stated they are charging a transportation impact fee on the residential side and not the commercial side, which is an issue of fairness and necessity to support transportation development.

L. Perry explained that impact fees are one time fees charged on new development, which pay for the gross share of capital cost and can be used for things like roads, parks, buildings, fleet, and public safety, but cannot use those revenues for operations and maintenance. She said the city's policy is that growth pays its own way, and they charge impact fees in line with this policy. She voiced the fees can be used on anything to accommodate growth and its impact on transportation and local match for grants, but they cannot use them on local and collector roads or reconstructing existing facilities. She shared there is a requirement for the impact fees, that they have to do a nexus study, which satisfies legal requirements and establishes a nexus between the charge and service being delivered. She stated they had a history with impact fees starting in 2008 and updated them in 2019, but transportation was not updated due to forthcoming capital conversations at the time. In 2021, a draft transportation fee study was completed that came to City Council that was in alignment with work city did on the Northeast Aurora Transportation Study. The conversation came back to Council in 2023, with a revised study and scenarios, and now they are here today with more revised and updated scenarios based on the 2023 work.

L. Perry voiced that residential transportation impact fees are collected at the time of permit. She noted the city does not charge on non-residential development and the fees are collected in zones, and the city also collects impact fees in zones for police and fire. She reiterated the transportation costs for new infrastructure. She expressed they are now proposing to apply the transportation impact fees to nonresidential land uses that align with the 2023 work they did, with the fees to be phased in over 2.5 years, starting July 1, 2026, and apply only to new permit applications. She added they also propose to eliminate the current zone system, as without the zones, they can flexibly invest those funds for regional roadways and transportation infrastructure, which also provides greater flexibility in leveraging grant funds and constructing. She said they index all impact fees every year, increasing them by an amount based on a cost index available. She explained that for the residential transportation impact fees, they currently index them every year to the Colorado Construction Cost Index managed by CDOT, which ensures the fees are growing with the cost of construction. She displayed the chart laying out the proposed phased in plan to Council, showing the 2.5 year

proposal starting at 25% of the maximum rate by land use type, beginning July 1st through the end of 2027, and assessing 50% in 2028. She stated the fee applies to construction of any new nonresidential facilities, addition or expansion of an existing nonresidential facility, and change in intensity of use. It would not apply to rebuilding of existing facility, if there is no change in use, miscellaneous structures, parking garages, and public schools. She noted that they see incentive agreements come through a lot of times for key businesses they want to attract to the city and Council can choose to incentivize a project and waive the impact fee as part of that agreement. L. Perry voiced that CM Wiles wanted to host a hybrid listening session with stakeholders to talk through this proposal and they will work to schedule that if Council moves this forward.

Mayor Coffman strongly supported and deferred to CM Wiles for the specifics.

CM Wiles expressed they are open to feedback and do not have to do the 25% first, as they could jump to 50%. She said her main point was to not be at 100% and not be the most expensive, and to be mindful of this being a change for the development community.

Mayor Coffman asked staff if going to 50% was a deterrent for commercial development versus 25% to 50%.

L. Perry did not know the answer, but felt the listening session might illicit input on if it is a deterrent. She said they looked at neighboring jurisdictions and 50% would put them in the median of what impact fees are charged, but there is a larger cost that comes with new development with other fees.

Jacob agreed they did not know yet, but are crunching numbers on examples projects to see what it might be looking at.

CM Bergan understood the fairness argument that they are charging residential and not nonresidential, but they just changed the paying ARI formula to the city to the first 20 years being 5 mills. She asked how they were able to sell this, as residents are paying a mill levy for regional transportation projects and now there will be a transportation impact fee on commercial. She did not understand how Southeast Aurora only has \$516,000 available. She added her residents are not getting the projects they were promised, as Gun Club Road impact fees had to be pledged to other projects. She asked how they are supposed to attract retail when they are going to charge them a fee. She inquired if the schools being exempt from the impact fees included private schools.

P. Schulte responded they can make the decision on the schools and what they want to be exempt from this fee.

J. Batchelor voiced the capital impact fees were not charged until 15 years ago and the fee gets indexed every year. He said they have collected all of those dollars and spent some for the improvements they did on things like Quincy and Gun Club. He said in terms of the ARI mill levy, they are charging that and it is still not enough to cover the cost of the infrastructure, which is one of the reasons staff is recommending only going to 50%.

CM Bergan asked if the commercial entities would also be charged ARI or will they only have the commercial impact fee.

J. Batchelor answered the ARI is part of their model service plan, so assuming they adopted a model service plan after 2004, yes, they will have the ARI as a component of their service plan, but if it was adopted before that, they will not.

CM Bergan inquired if the impact fee could be used for maintenance.

J. Batchelor responded no.

CM Lawson asked if the warehouses with off-peak shifts would have to pay the total impact fee or places like Amazon who do shuttle service.

J. Batchelor highlighted that in terms of warehouses and those operations, if they are already existing, they will not pay the fee. They will only have to pay it if they go through an expansion or change of use that increases the intensity. He said they calculate the fee through estimates of vehicle trips generated by the type of business, which includes employees and the nature of the business.

CM Lawson asked why they would be getting a fee based on a shuttle service for their employees, as they are trying to help solve the problem of getting their people there to work.

L. Perry responded the nexus is based on vehicle trips and she would need to go back and talk to her consultant on whether a discount was provided for those type of situations.

CM Gardner was in favor of the concept in general, but did not think it was exactly accurate to say it is not fair for residential to pay it and commercial to not, as that was a specific policy decision made to incentivize a certain type of development in the city. He said he would like to see the nexus study and what surrounding communities are doing. He expressed he would not be in favor something that would put them at the top, and it is a misnomer to say impact fees solve growth or make growth pay for its own way, as they clearly do not. He was also strongly against eliminating the zone, because they are there so development in a certain area pays for future development

needs in that area, and he did not think it was fair to collect a lot of impact fees in northeast part of the city, where most growth is going to happen, and reroute those to somewhere else in the city. He said the intention was for the new development to pay for the needs they are going to bring in. He also wanted to see the nexus study where it talks about use types. He agreed with the concept and felt there was something there, but felt there was a lot to work out before he could vote yes for it.

CM Bergan stated they have such a difficult time getting retailers to located to Aurora, so she was concerned about charging an impact fee on retail, as it could disincentivize them from locating here.

Mayor Coffman responded they have the ability to negotiate in terms of an incentive agreement that could be a waiver of this particular fee if it was an entity they truly wanted.

MPT Coombs voiced that any entity that locates within the city is going to impact the broader transportation network, not just the specific area they're located in, so maybe there is a way to split it up so there is still some part of the zone concept. She stated these are all suggested based on the nexus and they can all talk about these things and see what they really want to incentivize. She felt this was long overdue, but they could have nuanced conversation about the how.

CM Bergan pointed out the ARI mill levy is not on the entire city and has only been in place since 2004. She agreed with CM Gardner about the zones and keeping money where it is collected, as those homeowners never had to pay that ARI.

Mayor Coffman said CM Wiles heard the comments and could work with staff on taking a look at some of those. He thanked her for her leadership and felt it was very impressive bringing this forward as a new member.

P. Schulte announced they would have about 15 service plan amendments coming up that they could get done in an afternoon. HE asked if they wanted to do that in a special meeting or a regular meeting.

Mayor Coffman preferred a special meeting for that.

CM Bergan expressed she was over having so many meetings, as she sits on a lot of other boards where they have two meetings per month in addition to all this. She added that said some of the material today should have just been at special orientation.

CM Horton shared that the special meeting would depend on how much notice in advance she could have.

P. Schulte pointed out members could join virtually as well, but the notice would be at least a month out.

MPT Coombs stated the concern is a lot of people have more 9 to 5 jobs right now, so it could be difficult to schedule a special meeting compared to when they have done so in the past. She felt it was simpler to just do it at regular meetings even if it could make for a rough night.

CM Gardner suggested they could also do an evening special meeting.