



Office of Human Resources

201 W. Colfax Ave., Dept. 412

Denver, CO 80202

p: 720.913.5751

f: 720.913.5720

www.denvergov.org/humanresources

Career Service Board Meeting #2423

Minutes

Tuesday, February 21, 2023, 8:30am

201 W. Colfax Ave, First Floor, Career Service Hearings Office

**Erin Brown
Patricia Barela Rivera
Michelle Devoe**

I. Opening: *The public meeting was called to order at 8:33am by Board member Erin Brown. Members of the Career Service Board were present, as listed above. In addition to Bob Wolf, Sr. Assistant City Attorney to the Board, and Kathy Nesbitt, Executive Director, Office of Human Resources (“OHR”).*

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 21, 2023 Board Meeting.

Board Member Erin Brown made a motion, seconded by Board Member Michelle Devoe, to approve the agenda for the February 21, 2023 meeting, which was approved unanimously by the Board.

2. Approval of the Minutes for the January 19, 2023 Board Meeting.

Board member Patricia Barela Rivera made a motion, seconded by Board Member Michelle Devoe, to approve the minutes for the January 19, 2023 meeting, which was approved unanimously by the Board.

3. Approval of the Minutes for the January 30, 2023 Executive Session.

Board member Erin Brown made a motion, seconded by Board Member Patricia Barela-Rivera, to approve the minutes for the January 30, 2023 meeting, which was approved unanimously by the Board.

II. Board Comments: *None*

III. Public Comments: *Board member Erin Brown presented and announced potential speakers that submitted written comments to the Board regarding Classification Notice No. 1757, Public Notices 680 and 681:*

1. *Alyson Arvites (Legal Secretary, Denver District Attorney’s Office), on Classification Notice No. 1757 was introduced by Board member Erin Brown but was absent at the meeting.*

2. *Mike Jackson (President, Denver Sheriff Lodge 27 FOP) on Public Notice No. 680 & 681- was present. Mr. Jackson introduced himself to discuss their concerns about the proposed rule changes that negatively affect equality, equity, and transparency in the City of Denver. Mr. Jackson commented that these changes would allow managers to give employee evaluations that are subjective versus objective, therefore permitting managers that are inclined to discriminate against certain employees with no way for the employee to refute an unfair or improper evaluation. Mr. Jackson further stated that eliminating dispute resolution was a “bad idea” and that will result in the city facing more litigation through the courts because of the elimination of a dispute process in the Career Service System. Mr. Jackson stated that the Equal Pay for Equal Work Act in Colorado was enacted in 209 and was designed to provide redress through the courts for employees for pay discrimination. These rule changes will lead to more of this type of litigation. Mr. Jackson stated that all employees should have a basic right to representation and the ability to dispute any performance review. This right creates a culture of fairness and employee confidence. Mr. Jackson also mentioned that everyone knows that during evaluations every year, the mayor may say, “we are going to have a 3% raise”, but this does not mean that employees will receive a 3% raise. The evaluation would dictate the increase they will receive, such as a 3%, 2% raise, etc. For employees not to be able to have a say would affect the city and every employee. In addition, Mr. Jackson commented that transparency on how the process works is*

what is the purpose of his written comments to the Board. Board member Erin Brown asked Mr. Jackson to define what he meant by transparency. Mr. Jackson responded that transparency meant employees could see their evaluation and dispute why they did not get a specific rating. After no further questions were asked, board member Erin Brown proceeded to the next potential speakers.

3. Amy Williams (DPD, Forensic Scientist Supervisor) on Public Hearing Notice No. 681- joined via Teams- Ms. Williams mentioned that in 2009-2010 the City of Denver created a task force to evaluate the performance rating scale as well as the performance review scale. Based on employee and supervisor feedback, they determined that the three-point rating scale was inappropriate and ineffective. In Ms. William’s written comments to the Board, she acknowledged that the state of Colorado has recently, as of 2022, moved from a three- point scale to a five- point scale specifically for the reasons determined by the city as well. Mrs. Williams then questioned why the city was going back to what was previously determined to be ineffective and inappropriate for an appropriate performance review of the city personnel. Board member Erin Brown thanked Ms. Williams and mentioned that her written comments would be taken into consideration.
4. Annette J. Ortiz (DPD, Forensic Scientist Supervisor), on Public Hearing Notice No. 681 was introduced by Board member Erin Brown but was absent at the meeting.
5. Lindsey Wallick (DPD, Evidence & Property Section Manager), on Public Hearing Notice No. 681 was introduced by Board member Erin Brown but was absent at the meeting.
6. Charles Reno (DPD, Forensic Scientist Supervisor), on Public Hearing No. 681 was introduced by Board member Erin Brown but was absent at the meeting.
7. Shawn O’Toole (DPD, Forensic Supervisor), on Public Hearing Notice No. 681, was introduced by Board member Erin Brown but was absent at the meeting.
8. Molly Wink (Deputy Director, Denver Arts & Venues), on Public Hearing Notice No. 681 was introduced by Board member Erin Brown but was absent at the meeting.

IV. Public Hearing:

1. Public Hearing Notice No. 682 – Prevailing Wage: Custodian I & Custodian II

Alena Duran, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, joined via Teams and presented Public Hearing Notice No. 682 to adopt a change in the pay and fringe benefits of the prevailing wage “Custodian I & Custodian II” in accordance with section 20-76(c)(3) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code. Information was obtained reflecting a change in the pay and fringe benefits for this prevailing wage classification of workers. The proposed changes were submitted to the Career Service Board for approval.

REVISED PREVAILING WAGE BENEFITS

Classification	Current Wage Per Hour			Proposed Wage Per Hour			Increase
	Base Wage	Fringes	Total	Base Wage	Fringes	Total	
Custodian I	\$19.53	\$6.99 (Employee)	\$26.52	\$20.28	\$9.25 (Employee)	\$29.53	\$3.01
		\$8.83 (EE + Spouse)	\$28.36		\$10.07 (EE + Spouse)	\$30.35	\$1.99
		\$10.97 (Family)	\$30.50		\$11.69 (Family)	\$31.97	\$1.47
Custodian II	\$19.88	\$7.05(Employee)	\$26.93	\$20.63	\$9.34 (Employee)	\$29.97	\$3.04
		\$8.89 (EE + Spouse)	\$28.77		\$10.16 (EE + Spouse)	\$30.79	\$2.02
		\$11.03 (Family)	\$30.91		\$11.78 (Family)	\$32.41	\$1.50

The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) wage rates were used to determine base wages and fringe benefits.

Board member Patricia Barela- Rivera asked how many people would affect this proposed change. Ms. Duran responded that she did not have the exact number but estimated about 500 employees. Ms. Duran also indicated that these positions are throughout the Denver International Airport and city buildings.

Board member Erin Brown asked Ms. Duran to repeat the revised prevailing wage benefits per the audience's request.

Board member Erin Brown made a motion, which was seconded by Board member Patricia Barela Rivera, to approve Public Hearing Notice No. 682, which was unanimously approved by the Board.

2. Public Hearing Notice No. 683 – Prevailing Wage: DEN Glycol System

Alena Duran, Sr. Classification & Compensation Analyst, joined via Teams and presented Public Hearing Notice No. 683 to adopt a change in the pay and fringe benefits of the prevailing wage classifications, "DEN Glycol System" in accordance with the Denver Revised Municipal Code, Section 20-76 (c) (3), a yearly review was conducted concerning the pay and fringe benefits for this prevailing wage classification series.

The proposed increase(s) are not for City employees, they are for contractors and subcontractors who have contracts with the City that are over \$2,000. Also, the new rate of pay is not effective until the contract renewal date.

The proposed changes were submitted to the Career Service Board for approval.

REVISED PREVAILING WAGE BENEFITS

Classification	Current Base Wage	Current Fringes	Total	Proposed Base Wage	Proposed Fringes	Total	Increase
Deicing Facility Operator	\$29.08	\$7.96	\$37.04	\$29.12	\$8.16	\$37.28	\$0.24
Maintenance Mechanic	\$28.57	\$7.90	\$36.47	\$29.33	\$8.18	\$37.51	\$1.04
Glycol Plant Specialist	\$17.36	\$6.60	\$23.96	\$18.36	\$6.92	\$25.28	\$1.32

The Service Contract Act was used to determine the base wage and fringe benefits for the above classifications.

Board member Erin Brown made a motion, which was seconded by Board Member Patricia Barela-Rivera, to approve Public Hearing Notice No. 683, which was unanimously approved by the Board.

3. Classification Notice No. 1757 – Legal Secretary

John Hoffman, Classification & Compensation Analyst, joined via Teams and stepped in on behalf of Gregg Thress due to technical and connectivity issues. The proposed change amends the Classification and Pay Plan by changing the current job title from Legal Secretary to Legal Administrative Assistant. The City Attorney's Office requested that the Office of Human Resources Classification and Compensation Division modernize the title of Legal Secretary. The District Attorney's Office and the Office of Municipal Public Defenders are also in agreement with the requested title revision. Pay grades are not affected by this title revision.

PROPOSED NEW CLASSIFICATION TITLE

Current Classification Code/Title	Proposed Classification Title
CC0271 Legal Secretary	Legal Administrative Assistant
DC1161 Legal Secretary	Legal Administrative Assistant

Title revision does not impact classification pay grade/pay range. This classification title revision will impact 45 employees. There is no budget impact.

Mr. Hoffman mentioned that this classification notice was a simple change from Legal Secretary to Legal Assistant. Mr. Hoffman stated that this was changed at the request of the City Attorney's Office as they felt the term secretary was outdated. Mrs. Kathy Nesbitt, OHR Executive Director, corrected that the change was to Legal Administrative Assistant. Ms. Nicole de Gioia-Keane, Director of Classification and Compensation, clarified and confirmed that the City Attorney's office requested to change the title to Legal Administrative Assistant. Ms. de Gioia-Keane further indicated that whether the decision was to change to Legal Administrative Assistant vs. Legal Assistant was a topic for discussion during this meeting, to which Mr. Hoffman indicated he was aware of that but reiterated he was under the impression that the City Attorney's office wanted to remove the "Administrative" part of the title.

Ms. De Gioia-Keane asked if any written comments were received for Classification Notice No. 1757 to which Board member Erin Brown confirmed the Board received written comments. Ms. de Gioia-Keane asked if a City's Attorney's Office representative would like to opine on the title change. Snezhanna Singleton, Director of Finance of Operations for the City's Attorney's Office, introduced herself and indicated that the City Attorney's Office conducted a survey of their entire agency, in which 75% of individuals said the title was outdated and demeaning. Ms. Singleton indicated that the legal assistant is used interchangeably with the paralegal role in the private sector, and they might research that more. Ms. Singleton commented that when they talk about legal secretaries with many assistants would reflect that substantive legal work and clerical work.

Mr. Bob Wolf asked if this change put people in a legal administrator and why. Ms. de Gioia-Keane clarified that there is a classification called a legal administrator. However, that was not the classification they were referring to, but a nonexempt hourly classification called Legal Secretary. Ms. DeGioia-Keane also stated that Classification & Compensation received the request from City Attorney's Office to modernize the title by removing the work secretary and replacing it with either "administrative assistant" or potentially "assistant".

Nicole de-Gioia asked Ms. Singleton to reconfirm City's Attorney's Office preference on which title, to which Ms. Singleton reconfirmed Legal Administrative Assistant.

Board member Erin Brown made a motion, seconded by Board member Patricia Barela-Rivera, which the Board unanimously approved.

4. Public Notice No. – 680 Proposed Adoption of Revisions to Career Service Rule 9- Pay Administration

Jessica Allen, Senior Assistant City Attorney, who also introduced, Helena Rothenberg, and Matthew Fuller, both from the Department of Safety 911; Stephen Lee, Director of Emergency Communications at the Denver International Airport; Paul Donaldson, Randall Rayback from the 911 Emergency Center at the Denver International Airport.

Ms. Allen indicated the proposed rule change was under Career Service Rule 9-69; the regular 911 Department of Safety dispatchers had already received a training stipend and a communication officer. This is to ensure that the city retains as many folks as possible. Ms. Allen reminded the Board from previous board meetings, that the city has terrible staffing numbers and attrition problems. Ms. Allen commented that this rule change would allow this stipend to go to the same segment of individuals who do a very similar job, if not more, a difficult job at DIA. Ms. Allen indicated that the airport has similar challenges with retaining and recruiting individuals.

Mr. Paul Donaldson indicated a 56% effective rate and 37% of individuals in training. Board member Patricia Barela-Rivera asked how many employees the department has, to which Mr. Donaldson indicated 42 employees. Ms. Allen explained that this is the first portion of the rule change that will affect only the airport, which is to give them the same stipend that regular 911 officers and the second proposed change would affect both 911 communication dispatchers and those out of the airport. This is to increase the stipend they already receive.

Jessica Allen commented that individuals enrolled in this program currently get a certain amount. Still, this rule change would allow increasing the amount they already receive as a retention incentive for the communication 911 dispatchers in the City and County of Denver. The rule change will be from \$250 to \$450 a month.

Board member Erin Brown asked if this stipend is a retention bonus for communication 911 dispatchers working at both the City & County of Denver and DIA, to which Ms. Allen clarified that it was different than retention. Still, it is a bonus that it's already given to them. Still, the rule change will allow an increasing amount.

Mr. Paul Donaldson explained that individuals who have gone through the emergency 911 training program are losing institutional knowledge, as 60% of individuals in the 911 center have been in that position for one year or less. Board member Erin Brown asked if an employee has degree knowledge and is eligible for this stipend, to which Mr. Donaldson clarified that the stipend is for trainers. This stipend increase is an incentive to pass on their institutional knowledge to others.

Board member Michelle Devoe indicated that one of the potential speakers, Mr. Mike Jackson submitted a written comment on this subject, to which Ms. Allen clarified that Mr. Jackson's comments were only for Public Notice No. 681.

Board member Erin Brown made a motion, which was seconded by Board member Patricia Barela-Rivera, to approve Public Hearing Notice No. 680, which was unanimously approved by the Board.

Ms. Allen commented that the Board may see them again because now Public Notice No. 681 regarding performing ratings would affect the language of Public Notice No.680 as the language of the performance standards change.

5. *Public Notice No. – 681 Proposed Adoption of Revisions to Career Service to the following Career Service Rules:*

- *Career Service Rule 9-69 – Communications Training Officer Stipend*
- *Career Service Rule 9-101 – Retention Bonus*
- *Career Service Rule 13-23 – Performance Reviews*
- *Career Service Rule 13-31 – Performance Ratings*
- *Career Service Rule 13-39 – Grievance and Appeals Relating to Performance Reviews*
- *Career Service Rule 16-26 – Employee Organizations & Representation*
- *Career Service Rule 16-28 – Grounds for Discipline*
- *Career Service Rule 19-20 – Actions Subject to Appeal*
- *Career Service Rule 13-21 – Performance Reviews*

Ms. Patricia Rowe, Learning & Development Director, and Ms. Karla Pierce, Senior Assistant Attorney's Office presented the proposed changes on Public Notice No. 681 under the following topics:

OHR Strategic priorities

Ms. Rowe noted the presentation was to simplify the understanding of what OHR is accomplishing or strategically working towards in the next three years around culture, recruitment & retention, and technology. Ms. Rowe indicated that OHR knows they need to reduce turnover, particularly first-year turnover. OHR data shows that employees leave because they need to be sufficiently developed, and their managers are not involved in their development. They need a process to do this mindfully. The performance review process has been a top-down approach where managers provide their employees with their goals. Employees have a limited amount of involvement in the process, so you lose empowerment. Professional development is critical to retention and the performance management system. Ms. Rowe emphasized that performance management must align with their culture.

Collected Data

Ms. Rowe commented that the collected data for years and surveys indicated that employees are unsatisfied with the current process. They feel it's subjective, and their managers do not actively participate in employee development. Successful employees do not reflect on doing jobs well. They are not satisfied with their professional product and leave city jobs. Through focus groups among leaders, it was determined the current performance management process is subjective. The leaders who write those goals acknowledge that they're subjective. Leaders also expressed that the process

takes a long time. Starting in January and writing goals until March, then completing self-reviews in October. Ms. Rowe indicated that OHR needs to condense the process to make it meaningful for leadership to communicate the organization's strategy and cascade them so that employees are involved in the metrics and are clear about those expectations. Ms. Rowe also mentioned an issue with the merit dollar allocation under-recognized "Successful" employees, which was not the intention.

Strategies for Change

- Condense the city's annual Performance Management process timeline- leaders have time to discuss what their strategy is, and it does not come later in the year but rather at the beginning of the year so they can determine and cascade goals to their organizations. So that in February, when employees are asked to write their goals, they know what they are and can be involved in the metrics. The issue often is a lack of clarity. Employees who understand this is the job I'm expected to do, this is what it looks like, and they will know how to perform better.
- Write and cascade metric-driven goals, including employees throughout OHR, which has prepared a two-hour metric-driven goal session, in which they have conducted about 20 sessions with the major agencies. The feedback has been very positive. These sessions have allowed being able to communicate goals and objectives clearly throughout their organizations.
- Reduce our rating scale to three ratings with new labels.

Time for "Up our Game": it is a process of providing positive information to the employee about their performance and conducting one-on-ones on a regular basis.

- Simplify performance ratings by reducing the number of ratings and descriptions from five to three: Ms. Rowe indicated that leaders shared with her that making a distinction between exceeds and exceptional is very difficult. They spent a considerable amount of time trying to determine ratings rather than meeting with their employees. These processes take away from the engagement between employee and leaders on their performance.
- Rename the ratings and revise the definitions: for employees performing in their jobs, it is great to be thriving and successful in the organization.
- Reducing the ratings creates clear distinctions between ratings:
 - **Current ratings** are: Exceptional, Exceeds Expectations, Successful, Development Needed, and Unacceptable.
 - **Proposed Changes:**
 - Excellent (Exceeds Exceptional)- significantly exceeds performance standards and goals on a continuous basis. Frequency delivers superior outcomes. This rating reflects a level of performance that is truly superb throughout the rating period.
 - Thriving (Exceeds/Successful)- Effectively achieves performance standards and goals on a consistent basis. Regularly delivers outcomes that are good or better than expected. This rating reflects a level of performance that is solid or in some respects even stronger than expected.
 - Development Needed: Falls short of performance standards and goals on a consistent basis. Delivers outcomes that are less than expected in terms of quality and/or consistency. This rating reflects a level of performance that needs improvement. It may also reflect that the employee has not spent enough time in the position to develop the knowledge or proficiencies needed to meet established standards.
- Increase satisfaction for performing employees who performance their jobs well
- Make the ratings broader with new names and better decisions

Ms. Rowe indicated that this would allow the process to focus more on the one-one one's conversations with the employees, improving the opportunities for one-on-one conversations.

Ms. Karla Pierce added that one of the real benefits of this change is the clear distinctions between the ratings. Ms. Pierce stated that she speaks as a manager and attorney, and it was hard to determine a rating within the five- rating system. "Successful" in a five-rating system means a "C" to most people. It's average. Employees are unhappy, so supervisors motivate them to give them higher performance ratings, which does not mean they will receive a raise but at least boost morale. But this approach creates an issue as expectation levels change. Ms. Pierce indicated that the language piece is tried to make the language workable for the goals because employees do not receive an overall rating as supervisors rate employees in Workday per specific goal.

Board member Michelle Devoe commented that it was a gap between the middle and the last rating. The top rating is super high, the second is high, and the last is low. Some employees are just doing their jobs. Ms. Devoe indicated she assumes the city has good solid workers meeting expectations. But not exceeding, not underperforming. Ms. Devoe indicated that she is not sure there is a rating on the three-rating system that captures these types of employees. Ms. Karla Pierce stated that these employees would be rated "Thriving," but in the lower numerical tier within that specific category. There are numerical tiers associated with each rating category which will make a difference in their merit increase. Ms. Pierce acknowledged that the three-rating system is not perfect. Still, they tried to combine categories so that an employee doing their jobs and another employee doing some things better than expected, will get the same rating but not the same merit increase.

Mrs. Kathy Nesbitt stated they discussed intensely the rating of "Successful," but concluded the word "Thriving" was appropriate because the word itself was more active and had more intentionality. Ms. Rowe added that data shows only 1.09% on the fail ratings. The intention is to provide employees doing their jobs well to feel good about it. Ms. Rowe emphasized that when an employee is rated "Thriving" indicates the employee is performing at a higher level. Ms. Rowe indicated that the "Thriving" category holds a larger category of greater performance.

Board member Michelle Devoe asked Ms. Rowe what's the concern among employees as the Board received multiple written comments, which two employees spoke about during the meeting. Ms. Devoe also added that some of the written comments received stated that the proposed rule change to three- rating system was not successful in the past, other comments referred that the change was not inclusive or transparent enough. Ms. Kathy Nesbitt responded that OHR does not usually receive feedback from employees challenging a rule. Still, Ms. Nesbitt admitted the city has a workforce of over 10,000 employees, to which only a handful (several from the same department) submitted written comments. Ms. Nesbitt emphasized not cross agencies' feedback or widespread discontent. Ms. Nesbitt acknowledged that every time OHR makes any change, there are going to be employees that are not satisfied with the change. Ms. Nesbitt stated this proposed rule change started before she came as OHR Executive Director, with a small group of HR Business Partners discussing this proposed rule change with different stakeholders. Ms. Nesbitt also added that she discussed with the team the performing rating trends within other organizations to determine what other organizations are moving towards. Ms. Nesbitt indicated that only 4% used the top two ratings and 1% fell under the lower rating, indicating that most employees fall on the terms they are proposing. Ms. Rowe emphasized that transparency has been key in this proposed rule change as it would be clearer what is managers' expectations. The proposed rule changes the goals will be measured metric-based.

Board member Erin Brown commented that a performance review should not be a "gotcha" moment. Therefore, Ms. Brown asked what would shift in the system when they already knew there was a gap. Ms. Rowe responded that currently does not have the functionality to include regular one-on-ones. Ms. Rowe added that the mid-year review is not a functionality formally working yet in Workday. The goal is to have four check-ins throughout the year to review the progress of the metrics-driven goals.

Ms. Rowe and Ms. Pierce discussed the proposed rule change's impact on the following Career Service Rules:

- *CS Rule 9-69 – Communication Training Officer Stipend: This revision reflects the changes to the performance ratings proposed in Rule 13-31.A that include having three ratings rather than five and renaming the middle rating from "Successful" to "Thriving". This has no impact on the application of the rule.*

- *CS Rule 13-9 - Grievances and Appeals Relating to Performance Reviews: The intention behind the revision is to eliminate the appeal right associated with a grievance of a rating no longer exists- "Unacceptable". Employees who receive the lowest rating will not be allowed to appeal grievances of those ratings.*
- *CS Rule 19-20A., B1b & 4.a – Actions Subject to Appeal: The intention behind the addition of the title for Rule 19 – 20.A is that it is believed to have been inadvertently left off in 2018 when the rules were last revised.*
- *CS Rule 19-20 – Actions Subject to Appeal: The intention and impact of the revision to rule 19-20B has been addressed in correlation with the revisions to Rule 13-39B – Grievance and Appeals Relating to Performance Reviews.*
- *CS Rule 16-28 – Grounds for Discipline: The intention behind this revision is to eliminate a disciplinary rule that allows appointing authorities to dismiss employees who receive "Unacceptable". Since this rating no longer exists, this rule is no longer needed.*
- *CS Rule 16-26 – Employee Organizations and Representation: The intention behind the revisions to Rule 16-26 is to eliminate the right of representation at a meeting to discuss "Unacceptable" ratings, which no longer exist.*
- *CS Rule 9-101- Retention Bonus: This revision has no impact on the application of the rule.*
- *CS Rule 13-23A.2 – Performance Reviews: This revision has no impact on the application of the rule (Changing rating from "Successful" to "Thriving").*
- *CS Rule 13-31A-B- Performance Ratings: The intention behind the proposed revision to the number of performance ratings utilized is to simplify the ratings system by using fewer ratings. The new ratings are broader and more distinguishable. This revision is also intended to increase the level of satisfaction among employees who perform their duties well by blending the three highest ratings into the two highest ratings.*

Board member Erin Brown asked that since the process is moving from a subjective evaluation to a more metric driven, how would they account for that. Ms. Brown stated that even when OHR would have metric-driven goals, evaluations will have some degree of subjectivity. Ms. Brown further asked what are OHR is doing to work with managers, so they are driving the process in an objective manner? Ms. Rowe responded that by scheduling two-hour metric-driven goals sessions, all supervisors are expected to participate in one of these 2-hour sessions.

Board member Erin Brown clarified the Board statement earlier made of their intention to defer the decision of this proposed rule change until March, but after hearing the presentation and taking into consideration the statements heard and the balance of the rule changes, Mrs. Brown stated the Board reconciled some of the unknowing and asked if the Board wanted to move forward with a motion, which Board agreed.

Board member Erin Brown made a motion, which was seconded by Board member Michelle Devoe, to approve Public Hearing Notice No. 681, which was unanimously approved by the Board.

V. Director's Briefing:

VI. Executive Session:

The Board entered their executive session at 9:40am. Kathy Nesbitt provided a preliminary draft of the OHR 2023 Goals & Objectives. The Board also discussed some personnel matter.

VII. Adjournment: *Adjournment was at 10:13am.*