

I cannot agree to this. To me, there are many reasons to not do this... though, the largest reason is that the topic of how commission retreats need to be handled, within a city policy... hasn't even been addressed by us... in our house, under our own authority. Why would we go to an outside entity when we haven't even discussed or handled it in house? Looking for some answer or help from outside before we even look for a resolve in house creates unwarranted division... and I can't agree with that.

I view the result of the resent retreat as a perfect storm. There is not one person responsible for the handling of that retreat, as another charter officer, who like the CM was not in office when the last retreat in 2019 occurred, proceeded with what they felt was correct. Direction was given to a staff member, to allow Directors to listen in, to keep them from having to come to the chambers. To which, an email went out to the email address of 'Directors', which does include other staff members, not just Directors. Again, that was another person who wasn't here in 2019 or handled retreats previously. All of those making decisions, that they felt were correct, did not communicate with the third charter officer. Though, that charter officer, gave a remark during the meeting about an email that stated directors could be listening in. We all heard this remark, and a couple of us had a surprised look on our faces, as we are not included in the Director email list, so did not see the email. We could have questioned things at that point, but we did not. That statement was prompted by the CM making a remark about speaking into the mics or something similar... again, all of us at the table could have questioned the meeting decorum, but no one did. There was NONE of us thinking that there was anything being intentionally handled incorrectly. None of us had any type of alarm go off. Truth is... there was nothing that was legally incorrect, but it was not done with the higher quality of decorum that we tend to utilize in our city and there was a definite lack of communication.

So, to me, we need to have a discussion in a workshop to decide how we want to handle commission retreats and make it a policy. That way everyone understands what is expected and who is responsible for which part. A newbie would have a policy to follow, instead of looking back to see what was done 3 years ago, or simply following the norm. There are a couple of ways a policy could go, so that is why I believe a larger discussion in a workshop would be an appropriate setting to find an agreement of what the policy should be. Besides that, I have read the material in the backup and there are 3-4 different areas that I believe this request is not a legitimate request of the Attorney General. A question can only be posed of 'official duties' of the questioner and the agendas, meeting posting, minutes and such are not commissioner duties. Another section clearly states that the AG does not get involved in disputes. We have an attorney who knows the law along with our codes, policies, and such, who can better aide us in coming to a more personalized policy than an impersonal AG. So, to me, we handle this on our own and create unity, not division.