

**Blue Ribbon Commission – Phase II (BRC II)**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**January 28, 2010**

---

Members Present: Susan Graf, Tom Hagerty, Suzanne Jones, Dan King, Michelle Krezek, Beth Pommer, Dorothy Rupert, Jeff Wingert

Members Absent: Michael Leccese, Rich Wobbekind

Staff Present: Peggy Bunzli, Paul Fetherston, Kathy McGuire, Jim Reasor, Patrick Von Keyserling

---

Public Participation

- none

Welcome by Paul Fetherston

- Paul introduced the evening's agenda
  - Discuss Specific BRC II Report Questions and General Discussion/Review of BRC II Draft Report
  - Update on 2010 State of Colorado ballot initiatives

Draft Report Discussion

- Report is too overarching and wordy and does not have enough examples to help guide and to explain what recommendations are. Needs to be more direct. Use bullets rather than narrative. Or have summary in bullet form and narrative.
- Intro with headline message – what is most important? \$\$ have to align with current values and should be periodically reviewed. Need for prioritization. Is “value” the right word?
- New normal – limited resources from here on out, need for cultural change, understanding of trade-offs, change in how we do business.
- Better way to word recommendations rather than using “should”
- Conclusion should be called something else.
- Note difference between annual budgeting process and what BRC II is trying to say – dealing with long term issues ongoing.
- Need to clarify that review of something doesn't mean that something is wrong and needs to be fixed. Perhaps state this in overview.
- Have feel be down to earth and practical (like Jane)
- Need for glossary (“structural gap”, “community values”). Appendix – where additional info can be found, e.g. BRC I report.
- City goals and definitions, mission, vision, where employees fit in to this.
- p.1 – charge of BRC II needs to be stated more clearly or even quoted.
- p.2 – all bullets relate to inflation; health care needs more emphasis

- p.3 – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – edit out - too much re BRC I, change to what of BRC I has been done, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is repetitive; include timeline graph, but not in each paragraph; paragraphs are too long; explain that department presentations were also useful to departments.
- p. 4 – “the” basket, not “a” basket; “recognize” is awkward (accounting term – needs to be said for the lay person)
- p. 5 – explain why BRC II is not making specific recommendations, not role of BRC II, role of voters, Council and City Manager. Phrase this in a positive way. Specific recommendations about how to id what might be; basket developed over time – need for comprehensive review, made sense at the time, may still make sense, may not.
- p.6 – put “squeaky wheel” discussion in more positive light – looking for broad spectrum, give an example. People that participate – that’s good. Discussions can’t be in isolation, need to take place in context of trade-offs. But, be direct, this is what happens right now. Use “special interest” instead of “interest groups”. Have a plan of action for dealing with “hot topics” that come up with public participation. Need to do away with piecemeal budget process. For both budgeting and decision making process. How to address issues within context of big picture. Allows community to respond appropriately and with greater understanding of context. Empowers community; rework “best approach...” phrase;
- p.7 - include other agencies, non-profits, non-governmental entities as well as private sector or replace “private sector” with more encompassing term, throughout document; include “comparable quality and continuity” (better definition of “adequate”); eliminate; change “the Commission agreed”; change “conclude” to “determine”; services and programs; “corresponding action steps”; “achieve city goals...” and what the funding source is; consistent within and across departments; need for forced ranking;
- p.8 – define “regular”, scheduled, consistent? Minimally...every three years; include opportunity costs (define); opportunity costs should be stand alone point under costs; conscious choice with regard to subsidies; need for more context in report; split 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph under “how should...”; put examples in bullet points; importance of partnerships; use sub-headings
- p.9 – remove “for instance”; don’t define by Wikipedia – Commission has defined...; follow this with we recommend modification...make general statement about equity in compensation across all employee groups, in context of different markets
- p.10 - has commission ruled out inflationary increases? Use “primarily” instead of “strictly”; put more about rigorous training and oversight for performance management evaluation; cultural change – need for commitment over time; addendum of proposed compensation changes; under asset management, properties not property; replace “specific” with “certain”; highlight “should not be deferred”; routinely... and no less than every 5 years; in final bullet point, include estimate of current market value
- p.11 – budgeting process moves to beginning of report (headline points); include bullet point about organizational culture, acknowledge that this will take time and

state recommended action for the interim (staff come up with steps); clarify “these funds” in 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet of action points; in budgeting process section, recommend that this is where commission wants to reinforce city manager’s responsibility to determine recommended budget (work on wording); add section regarding pros and cons of earmarking and trade-offs, make a statement in anticipation of initiatives and how to approach these

- p.12 – 1. replace “four percent” with “sufficient”; 4. source not sources; explain that new tax funding last dollar spent, new funds raised for lowest priority; 6. be more precise with term “earmark” or list more general concepts from BRC I in BRC II’s own terms or put it in an appendix and state that BRC II supports these generally and wants to highlight these ... important concepts. Need to focus on big topics.
- Subcommittee to meet twice in advance of Feb meeting to review/work on updated drafts – some sections may be sent to whole group for review.

Legislative Issues:

- See powerpoint

Other:

- Date for study session – 3/31 to be proposed to Council

Adjournment.