

1 COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

2 Grady L. Pettigrew, President
3 Larry Price
4 Jennifer Lynch

5 PRESENTERS:

6 Beth Dyke
7 Carol Lagemann
8 Charday Litzy-Taylor
9 Tammy Rollins

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 Amy DeLong, Director
12 Wendy Brinnon
13 Jaasiel Rubeck
14 Brittany Price

15 - - -

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION
June 28, 2021
2 12:35 p.m.

3 - - -

4 P R O C E E D I N G S

5 - - -

6 BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, on the 28th day of
7 June, 2021, the Municipal Civil Service Commission
8 came for a regular meeting, Grady L. Pettigrew,
9 President. And, the parties appearing in person
10 and/or by counsel, as hereinafter set forth, the
11 following proceedings were had:

12 - - -

13 MS. RUBECK: Good afternoon. The Civil
14 Service Commission Regular Meeting is a public
15 meeting and is being held virtually. In order to
16 comply with guidelines regarding virtual public
17 meetings, any person who is speaking must also be
18 visible on video.

19 To our three commissioners, please leave
20 your video on during the entire meeting.

21 To those presenting, you may leave your
22 video off until it is your turn to present.

23 To all others attending the meeting,
24 please turn your video off and leave it off during

1 the duration of the meeting.

2 If a technical issue should occur where
3 either audio or video is not available when needed,
4 the meeting will be stopped in order to resolve the
5 issue.

6 In addition, this meeting is being
7 recorded for the record.

8 Thank you.

9 Commissioner Pettigrew, you may begin.

10 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All right. Thank
11 you.

12 I will call to order the City of
13 Columbus, Ohio, Municipal Civil Service Regular
14 Meeting for June 2021.

15 We'll be following the printed agenda.

16 The first item on the agenda is review
17 and approval of the minutes of the May 24, 2021,
18 regular meeting.

19 MR. PRICE: I move for approval of the
20 minutes from the May 24, 2021, regular meeting.

21 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

22 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
23 "aye."

24 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

1 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

2 There are no prehearing conference
3 reviews or trial board recommendations.

4 The next two items are the request of the
5 Civil Service Commission staff to approve the
6 specification review for the classification Labor
7 Relations Specialist, with no revisions; and,

8 No. 5 is the request to approve the
9 specification review for the classification Labor
10 Relations Manager, with no revisions.

11 Who is presenting that?

12 MS. RUBECK: Beth, we can't hear you.

13 MS. BRINNON: That should be Beth Dyke.

14 MS. DYKE: How is that?

15 MS. RUBECK: Yes.

16 MS. DYKE: This is Beth Dyke, Personnel
17 Analyst with the Civil Service staff. The review of
18 the classifications for Items 4 and 5 is part of the
19 Civil Service Commission's effort to review all
20 classifications every five years.

21 Based on feedback received, it was
22 determined that the current specification still
23 accurately reflects the work being performed. It is
24 recommended that the specifications be approved with

1 no revisions.

2 MR. PRICE: Am I to understand we're
3 doing both of these together?

4 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Yes.

5 MR. PRICE: Okay. I move to approve the
6 specification review for the classification Labor
7 Relations Specialist, with no revisions.

8 I also move to approve the specification
9 review for the classification Labor Relations
10 Manager, with no revisions.

11 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Second,
12 Commissioner Lynch?

13 MR. PRICE: You're muted, I think.

14 MS. LYNCH: I was.

15 I second the motion.

16 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
17 "aye."

18 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

19 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

20 Items No. 6 and 7 will be presented
21 together.

22 No. 6 is a request of the Civil Service
23 Commission staff to revise the specification for the
24 classification Network Manager; and,

1 No. 7 is for the -- specification for the
2 classification Network Engineer.

3 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke, Personnel Analyst.

4 Both classifications were last reviewed
5 in November of 2019, with an additional final
6 revision made to the Network Engineer classification
7 in April 2021.

8 It has been discovered that the
9 certification pathway to employment within the
10 "Minimum Qualifications" section of both the
11 classifications was inadvertently omitted during the
12 last formal review. The proposed revisions are to
13 return the certification as a viable path to being
14 qualified and to ensure a broader applicant pool to
15 meet the department's hiring needs.

16 There are no other revisions proposed at
17 this time.

18 MR. PRICE: I move to -- I'm sorry.

19 I move to revise the specification for
20 the classification Network Manager.

21 I also move to revise the specification
22 for the classification Network Engineer.

23 MS. LYNCH: I second that motion.

24 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say

1 "aye."

2 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

3 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

4 Items Nos. 8 and 9 are to be presented
5 together.

6 Item No. 8, request of the Civil Service
7 Commission staff to propose a hiring moratorium on
8 the specification for the classification Purchasing
9 Expediter; and,

10 Item No. 9 is to lift the hiring
11 moratorium previously imposed on the specification
12 for the classification Purchasing Coordinator.

13 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke, Personnel Analyst.

14 The Purchasing Coordinator classification
15 was last reviewed in January 2020, with a hiring
16 moratorium imposed in February 2012.

17 The Purchasing Expediter classification
18 was last reviewed in May 2020, with minor revisions.

19 Per discussion with a department
20 representative from the Department of Finance and
21 Management, it has recently been determined that
22 positions assigned to perform specific purchasing
23 work best align with the Purchasing Coordinator
24 classification.

1 It is therefore recommended, with regard
2 to the Purchasing Coordinator classification, to
3 lift the hiring moratorium. As such, it is
4 therefore proposed to impose a hiring moratorium on
5 the Purchasing Expediter classification, as it has
6 been determined that the Fiscal Assistant series
7 also performs this work and allows for a broader use
8 by the department.

9 There are no other revisions proposed at
10 this time.

11 MR. PRICE: I move to impose a hiring
12 moratorium on the specification for the
13 classification Purchasing Expediter.

14 I also move to lift the hiring moratorium
15 previously imposed on the specification for the
16 classification Purchasing Coordinator.

17 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

18 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
19 "aye."

20 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

22 Item No. 10 is a request of the Civil
23 Service Commission staff to revise the specification
24 for the classification City Forester.

10

1 MS. DYKE: Beth Dyke, Personnel Analyst.

2 Civil Service staff received a request
3 from the Recreation and Parks Department to revise
4 the classification for City Forester.

5 Recently, the department had an extensive
6 study completed regarding the Columbus Urban Forest.
7 In response to the findings of the study, the
8 Columbus Urban Forestry Master Plan was drafted as a
9 means to implement the needed improvements and to
10 also establish a long-term forestry plan.

11 The first step in the implementation of
12 the plan is to revise the specification for the City
13 Forester classification and fill the current
14 vacancy. Therefore, many revisions are proposed
15 throughout the specification.

16 Within the "Definitions," it is proposed
17 to add "leading" to the list of responsibilities in
18 which the City Forester is defined.

19 Within the "Examples of Work" section, it
20 is proposed to add several new statements that
21 reflect the duties to be performed. Within the same
22 section, it is also proposed, where applicable, to
23 combine several existing statements with related
24 proposed new statements in order to maximize the use

1 of the existing related duties.

2 There are a few existing "Examples of
3 Work" statements proposed to be deleted, as the
4 duties are no longer expected to be performed.

5 Within the "Minimum Qualifications"
6 section, the revisions proposed are intended to
7 create a larger, more competitive applicant pool by
8 generalizing the education and supervisory
9 requirements and to place more emphasis on the
10 experience requirement. Such recommendations
11 proposed are to remove the specific degree types
12 from the bachelor degree requirement, revise a
13 qualifying experience to forestry management or
14 nursery operation, decrease the number of years
15 experiences required from five to three, and
16 generalize the required supervisory experience and
17 reduce the requirement to two years.

18 The existing substitutions are proposed
19 to be revised so that a master's degree in forestry,
20 urban forestry or a closely related field may be
21 substituted for one year of the required
22 nonsupervisory experience.

23 An arborist certificate or an arborist
24 municipal specialist certificate must be obtained by

1 the completion of the probationary period.

2 There are several new statements proposed
3 to be added within the "Knowledge, Skills and
4 Abilities" section. And two existing statements
5 within the section are proposed to be revised, while
6 one statement is proposed to be deleted.

7 There are no other proposed revisions at
8 this time.

9 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
10 specification for the classification City Forester.

11 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
13 "aye."

14 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

16 Item No. 11 is the request of the Civil
17 Service Commission staff to revise the specification
18 for the classification Software Engineer.

19 MS. LITZY-TAYLOR: Hi, I'm Charday
20 Litzy-Taylor, Personnel Analyst with the Commission.

21 This request was actually sent over to us
22 by the Department of Technology. After discussion
23 with the department, it is recommended that the
24 "Minimum Qualifications" section be revised to allow

1 additional years of experience to substitute for the
2 educational requirement on a year-for-year basis.
3 This proposed change will give applicants an
4 alternative path to qualify, which would broaden the
5 candidate pool.

6 There is also one grammatical correction
7 to a statement within the "Examples of Work"
8 section.

9 No other changes are proposed to the
10 specification at this time.

11 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
12 specification for the classification Software
13 Engineer.

14 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
16 "aye."

17 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

18 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Commissioner Lynch?

19 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Oh, I said "aye." I
20 think I did it in unison with Larry.

21 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All right. It is
22 approved.

23 Item No. 12 is the request of the Civil
24 Service Commission staff to revise the specification

1 for the classification Fiscal Manager.

2 MS. CHARDAY LITZY-TAYLOR: This review
3 was initiated at the request of Recreation and
4 Parks.

5 Fiscal Manager was last reviewed and
6 revised in May 2020. After reviewing the current
7 specification, specification history, and
8 information provided previously by the Department of
9 Development, it is recommended that the "Guidelines
10 for Class Use" section be revised to allow the
11 department to hire more than one fiscal manager per
12 department and/or division.

13 Currently, with the exception of the
14 Division of Police, only one position may be
15 allotted to this classification per department,
16 division, and/or agency. However, as departments
17 reorganize, consolidate fiscal operations, and
18 acquire additional fiscal responsibilities, placing
19 limitations on the number of fiscal managers a
20 department can hire can be an operational hindrance
21 for departments with unique financial
22 responsibilities.

23 Please note that departments will still
24 be required to meet certain budgetary factors in

1 order to use this classification. There are no
2 other changes proposed at this time.

3 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
4 specification for the classification Fiscal Manager.

5 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
7 "aye."

8 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

10 Item Nos. 13 and 14 will be presented
11 together.

12 Item No. 13, request of the Civil Service
13 Commission staff to revise the specification for the
14 classification Power Division Assistant
15 Administrator.

16 And for Item 14, it's for the
17 classification Power Division Administrator.

18 MS. LAGEMANN: Hi. This is Carol
19 Lagemann, Personnel Analyst from the Civil Service
20 Commission.

21 The review of these classifications is
22 part of our efforts to review all classifications
23 every five years.

24 Within the Administrator classification,

1 revisions to the "Minimum Qualifications" are
2 proposed to remove the 20-employee qualifier for
3 supervision through subordinate supervisor. The
4 current requirement removes from contention many of
5 the Division's internal candidate and is
6 unnecessary. It is proposed to simply indicate
7 "direction of staff through subordinate supervisor"
8 as qualifying. Otherwise, an increase in the years
9 of experience to six years of managerial experience
10 is proposed to better differentiate the
11 Administrator level class from the Assistant
12 Administrator level.

13 Within those classifications, there are a
14 large variety of fields that may be job-related, and
15 restricting the type of degree to a specific degree
16 is deemed unnecessary. Therefore, removing specific
17 majors of the "Minimum Qualifications" education and
18 substitution are proposed.

19 It is recommended that these
20 specifications be approved as proposed.

21 MR. PRICE: I move to revise the
22 specification for the classification Power Division
23 Assistant Administrator.

24 I also move to revise the specification

1 for the classification Power Division Administrator.

2 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

3 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
4 "aye."

5 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

7 Item Nos. 15 and 16 will be presented
8 together.

9 Item No. 15, request of the Civil Service
10 Commission staff to create the specification for the
11 classification Utilities Permits Specialist, assign
12 a probationary period of 365 days, designate the
13 examination type as competitive, and amend Rule XI
14 accordingly.

15 Item No. 16 is to revise the
16 specification for the classification Utilities
17 Permits Manager.

18 MS. LAGEMANN: Again, Carol Lagemann,
19 Personnel Analyst with the Civil Service Commission.

20 These two actions arose out of a class
21 action request from the Department of Public
22 Utilities.

23 The only change proposed for the
24 Utilities Permits Manager is to move its location in

1 the class plan to the Protective Services Family and
2 Inspections Group, which is also the proposed
3 location for the new classification.

4 The newly created classification is
5 designed to fill a niche need within the Department
6 of Utilities Permit Office for technical and
7 specialist work. There is a proposed "Guidelines
8 for Class Use" that addresses this will only be used
9 within the Utilities Permit Office.

10 The proposed title will be Utilities
11 Permits Specialist, and it will report to the
12 Utilities Permits Manager.

13 In the past, employees in the Engineering
14 Associate II classification had filled this role.
15 But the need for engineering expertise has not been
16 evident while under the current leadership.
17 Therefore, with no engineers in the chain of
18 command, the Engineering Associate II classification
19 cannot be used, and the new role for this new
20 classification can perform the specialist work for
21 the Permits Office.

22 This classification will be expected to
23 perform work at a more complex level than that
24 performed by the majority of the office, which is

1 mostly work associated with Construction Inspector I
2 and Office Assistant I classifications. Incumbents
3 of this classification will serve as a leader and/or
4 supervisor for the office and be expected to be
5 capable of making decisions in emergency situations
6 and filling in for the Utilities Permits Manager
7 when needed.

8 With these leadership capabilities, it is
9 proposed to have a 365-day probationary period.

10 The "Examples of Work" and KSA section
11 were designed to be to illustrative of the types of
12 work and the knowledge, skills and abilities needed
13 for the job. The minimum qualifications require an
14 associate's degree, although we are allowing an
15 experience substitution to broaden the applicant
16 pool; along with experience in general construction,
17 reviewing constructions plans, or in performing
18 construction center sewer collection maintenance or
19 water distribution maintenance. These are all
20 relevant for the lead role in the Permits Office.

21 It is further recommended the exam type
22 be designated competitive per Commission policy in
23 classifications that are practical tests and the
24 technician job category be assigned.

1 It is therefore recommended that a
2 classification Utilities Permits Specialist be
3 created as proposed, and Rule XI amended according,
4 and that Utilities Permits Manager be revised as
5 proposed.

6 MR. PRICE: I move to create the
7 specification for the classification Utilities
8 Permits Specialist, assign a probationary period of
9 365 days, designate the examination type as
10 competitive, and amend Rule XI accordingly.

11 I also move to revise the specification
12 for the classification Utilities Permits Manager.

13 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

14 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
15 "aye."

16 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

18 The next item we have for action is Item
19 No. 19, and it is approval of the letter concerning
20 the appeal of Deputy Chief Kuebler.

21 Do you have anything, Director DeLong,
22 for the record?

23 MS. DeLONG: Sure. Deputy Chief Kuebler
24 has sent a request for --

1 MR. PRICE: You're muted.

2 DIRECTOR DeLONG: I'm not muted. Can you
3 not hear me?

4 MR. PRICE: I can now.

5 MS. DeLONG: Okay. I show that I'm not
6 muted, so I was hoping you could.

7 Deputy Chief Kuebler has -- did a request
8 for review. That was done probably about 2 1/2
9 weeks ago. We responded to that request for review.
10 And he has the ability to appeal our decision in
11 that request for review. As a part of that, he
12 submitted this 45-page document basically citing
13 five things.

14 The first thing was the selection process
15 and timing of the hiring of Ms. LaShanna Potts.

16 The second thing was that, again, we
17 didn't do the selection appropriately and,
18 therefore, we should do -- the application process
19 should be readministered.

20 Three, the Civil Service Rule XX was
21 violated because Ms. Potts received special
22 treatment.

23 Four was that she was the intended
24 selectee and, therefore, no one else applied.

1 And then, five, that she didn't meet the
2 minimum qualifications of the position.

3 And, like I said, that was a 45-page
4 document with all of that information.

5 I think that the biggest thing that I
6 would like to say is that the Commission's role in a
7 noncompetitive position at that level is kind of
8 really two-fold: One, to make sure that there is
9 notice sent out and that notice was making sure
10 that -- you know, post the position; and, two,
11 making sure that we certify that that person met the
12 minimum qualifications and send that information
13 back to the department.

14 I would like Tammy to talk about the
15 minimum qualifications, since she's online. Because
16 she actually wrote the minimum qualifications and
17 actually certified that Ms. Potts met those
18 qualifications.

19 So, Tammy, can I get you to come on board
20 with me here?

21 MS. ROLLINS: Yes, I'm here.

22 Right. When we were -- When I was
23 writing the minimum qualifications, I mean, the
24 intent was to write a broad qualification of a

1 managerial nature; but also knowing this
2 classification could possibly be used both for a
3 civilian position or for a sworn position, writing
4 the minimum qualifications where we could get good
5 candidates in, whether their experience was within
6 the sworn world or within, you know, a private,
7 civilian world.

8 The minimum qualifications that were
9 drafted were based on some of the
10 administrator-level jobs that we have here at the
11 City. We included a bachelor's degree, seven years
12 of managerial experience that included policy
13 formulation, adoption of best practices,
14 implementation of leadership initiatives and
15 direction of a large staff through subordinate
16 supervisors.

17 This inclusion of some of these critical
18 aspects for the managerial experience was based on
19 conversations that I had with the Department of
20 Public Safety that, you know, was relying on
21 managerial experience, "What are some of the key
22 components that you're looking for one of your
23 managers to have?" and looking at, you know,
24 specifically the police division, what are some of

24

1 those critical aspects that we really want to make
2 sure candidates coming in to this position will
3 possess and have direct experience in these areas.

4 So that is where the policy formulation
5 and the best practices and the leadership
6 initiatives and the supervision component were built
7 in.

8 The motor vehicle operator's license.

9 And then also that some positions,
10 especially if they're one that's been identified as
11 sworn, that they would have the OPOTA certification
12 by completion of the probationary preparation
13 period.

14 Ms. Potts, during the filing process --
15 or during the posting process, she filed an
16 application. She supplied us with a bachelor's
17 degree, meeting the educational requirement. And we
18 have a driver's license from her. Her application
19 that she provided clearly indicated that she --
20 based on information that she specifically provided
21 on the application, that she had seven years and two
22 months of experience meeting these -- the
23 qualifications, as spelled out on the specification.

24 She -- Oh, and the other important thing

1 to note in all of this, you know, with this
2 classification also, it is also incorporating where
3 some of the work could be performed by a civilian,
4 is we really wanted the applicant to describe
5 specifically the experience that they had in the
6 various jobs that they had. And so we weren't
7 relying on just title or just rank. It was
8 whether -- Within a particular title, within a
9 particular rank, tell us the specific work you did
10 and how that work met these minimum qualifications.

11 And Ms. Potts clearly did that in her
12 application. I can -- I mean, I have her
13 application. I can call up some of the things that
14 she included, if you would like. But it definitely
15 hit at all the different levels that we were looking
16 for in the qualifications.

17 MS. DeLONG: In addition to that -- Thank
18 you, Tammy.

19 In addition to all of that information on
20 the minimum qualifications, the only person who
21 wrote the minimum qualifications also reviewed it.
22 So I think, more specifically, she knows best, after
23 being the person who has talked to the department --
24 various departments and writes that level, the

1 minimum qualifications across our City at those
2 levels of jobs.

3 And in addition to that, there was some
4 indication that she provided special or secret
5 information, which is prohibited under our Rule XX.
6 And that special information that she gave her was a
7 link to apply for the position, which we do
8 regularly when people call us and ask us for that
9 information. It's not special or secret. It's on
10 our website.

11 In addition to that, she told -- she sent
12 her an e-mail that asked -- told her if she had any
13 questions to also feel free to give her a call,
14 which we would do to other applicants who are at
15 that level -- or at that level or any level who has
16 problems applying for positions.

17 We actually have Merrari who does that
18 daily, sometimes even helping people put information
19 in, especially when English is their second
20 language. But that did not happen here.

21 But also, she told her that she would
22 attach her bachelor's degree to our NEOGOV, which is
23 not required. It's beneficial to us to have all of
24 that stuff in one place so that we can have it

1 additionally. But we keep that in our personnel
2 files. So having it was all we needed to have. It
3 didn't need to be attached.

4 But that was another special treatment
5 that they thought that she got that no other
6 candidate got. If any other candidate would have
7 asked us to assist them in any way like that, if
8 they were having problems or they were out of state
9 and they can't just drop it off to us, we do that,
10 like I said, on a regular basis. They could just --
11 So no special or secret activity was being done with
12 Tammy assisting her by sending her a link.

13 They also thought there was an issue
14 with -- Mr. Kuebler thought there was an issue with
15 other applicants who did not continue to apply
16 because they felt like she was the selected --
17 intended selectee. And, again, what we always say
18 when we are hiring people at that level in the
19 noncompetitive rank, which I did address in the
20 letter -- Sorry. I want to find that exact
21 language.

22 You know, like I said, we go through the
23 process. Departments ask us to post. We post the
24 position. People apply. When we're at that level,

1 we're usually only certifying one name. Whereas, if
2 it's a competitive classification, we're certifying
3 a list of maybe -- sometimes, like in police and
4 fire -- hundreds of names. Right? But when we're
5 at the noncompetitive, usually they say, "Here is
6 the person we want to hire." We certify them if
7 they meet the minimum qualifications. And that's
8 exactly what we did in our department and what we do
9 on a regular basis. Even at the Deputy Chief level,
10 they'll send us one name for the Deputy Chief level.
11 Which the last two Deputy Chiefs we hired, that's
12 exactly what happened. We certified only one name.

13 They were concerned that we didn't
14 certify all of the names of everybody who qualified.
15 And that's just not at this type -- the position is
16 not -- number one, that's not required by us and not
17 how we have performed past practices here at the
18 Civil Service level.

19 We also say "The department, as the
20 appointing authority, had the discretion to recruit,
21 interview, discuss terms and benefits and et cetera
22 with specific candidates in hiring potential hires
23 at any time during the process. Also, when
24 departments are considering candidates from outside

1 our geographical area, especially out of state,
2 scheduling and processing accommodations are made as
3 to minimize travel and expenses associated with the
4 selection process."

5 There is only one requirement in this
6 type of hiring: A public posting that was made and
7 the hiree name was certified for appointment before
8 the person starts their job. That's all that's
9 required.

10 So if they want to talk to somebody --
11 and, like in this case, Mrs. Potts, prior to all of
12 this stuff going on -- and say, "Hey, we need you to
13 apply for this position we're going to post next
14 week. But we want to know what your time schedule
15 is." Especially when we're trying to get her on her
16 first day, which was the 25th, last Friday, in the
17 academy, that -- I'm sorry. I'm trying to think
18 what I'm saying here.

19 The OPOTA standards required us to send
20 all of her previous work experience, which was 24
21 years, if I'm right, of police experience, for them
22 to assess her qualifications in terms of how many
23 classes that she was going to have to take. And so
24 in order for them to even start their process, she

1 had to have a medical exam and all of those things
2 done. So the department asked us about this
3 information in terms of, you know, what could be
4 done.

5 And we're like, "That's on the
6 department. Our job is to have you post the
7 position so that it's public, and have us" -- "you
8 know, our department to certify her minimum
9 qualifications and certify that name back to you."

10 And this is not uncommon that when you're
11 dealing with someone out-of-state or you're dealing
12 with positions at this level, that there are
13 discussions with that person prior to all of the
14 activities that actually happen here with the City
15 in terms of the selection process.

16 I hope I answered anything that you
17 may -- questions you may have on that.

18 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Well, the only
19 thing that I would add is that this was a
20 time-sensitive situation. And also that, for
21 reporting on all of the details, you were
22 participating -- in anticipation of any possible
23 appeal to the Common Pleas Court, that we did not
24 want to have anywhere on the record an opening that

1 would show some omission in following the processes
2 that you've described. So that's the only thing I
3 would add to it. So I'm hoping that the
4 Commissioners will support approval of that letter.

5 If nothing else, then I --

6 COMMISSIONER PRICE: Commissioner, if I
7 may --

8 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER PRICE: -- make just an
10 observation.

11 Obviously, I've been getting some calls
12 about this because it made it to the paper in terms
13 of this.

14 Obviously, one of the things that they
15 said is that -- the community has said that they
16 wanted the ability of the new police chief to
17 potentially bring in a deputy chief from outside of
18 Columbus. I mean, that is the conversation in the
19 community.

20 So I just wanted to throw that out,
21 because that's what's being said.

22 And the other piece is -- and you did a
23 good job of establishing what the questions were and
24 why they're challenging.

1 I would just add that send me a copy of
2 that. Because some of those same questions are
3 popping up. You know, how did they move so quick?
4 Was she given some kind of special priority in terms
5 of her actually being hired? So you've covered most
6 of that, and I'm fine with that, but I would
7 definitely like a copy of that. Because I
8 definitely want to be cognizant of whatever -- I
9 want to be cognizant because what is being said in
10 the community is that they wanted a police chief --
11 the next police chief to have the ability to hire
12 someone outside of Columbus Police. So I just
13 wanted to put that on the table.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. DeLONG: I just -- The only other
16 thing with all of that -- and I think it's -- I want
17 to make very clear -- is that if we started the
18 process all over today, and we went through posting
19 for the exact five days, waiting until after the
20 five days to certify back to them that she met --
21 which we were not required to do. We're only
22 required to certify once she applies. If we follow
23 the process the way Mr. Kuebler thinks that we
24 should, the result isn't going to change. It's

1 ultimately the decision of our new Police Chief and
2 our appointing authority, which would be Director
3 Pettus. That's not going to change.

4 So to certify all 25 names or all the
5 names of everybody who applied, they're still going
6 to select the person they believe is going to best
7 benefit them in that role, and that is Mrs. Potts --
8 or Ms. Potts. That's not -- I don't see -- You
9 know, even if the process was changed to the way
10 they believe it should have been done, there
11 wouldn't be any different outcome.

12 MR. PRICE: And if I may, Commissioner.

13 Thank you. Because that was my next
14 question, was just simply, the bottom line is the
15 Safety Director and the Police Chief ultimately
16 makes this appointment, so -- at the end of the day.
17 So thank you for that. That was going to be my next
18 question.

19 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: The other
20 consideration here is this wasn't about attempting
21 to deal with the Civil Service Commission procedures
22 or whatever. It was, first, to reach the news
23 media. And the second thing was to attempt to
24 impede the process.

1 Now, if you have a factual basis or a
2 legal basis, that's one thing. But if you'll note,
3 neither one of those were present.

4 So as I said, at this point, I'm just
5 looking for a motion to approve the letter that our
6 director has drafted in the response to the appeal
7 of Mr. Kuebler.

8 MR. PRICE: I move to approve the letter
9 that we have drafted to respond to the letter that
10 was sent to us.

11 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.

12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor, say
13 "aye."

14 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.

16 I guess I --

17 MS. RUBECK: Commissioner Pettigrew, you
18 skipped the background removals.

19 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: That's what I was
20 going to right now.

21 The background removals for this month
22 are as follows:

23 Deon Holder, reinstate;

24 Cameron Evans, reinstate;

1 Elisha Smith, do not reinstate;
2 Percell Gaskins, Jr., reinstate;
3 Rita Castro, do not reinstate;
4 William Allen, do not reinstate;
5 Niguel Summlin, do not reinstate;
6 Matthew Bryson, reinstate;
7 Joseph King, do not reinstate;
8 William Bethel, do not reinstate;
9 Matthew Mitchell, reinstate;
10 Farouk Houssein, reinstate;
11 Tony Mowery, reinstate;
12 Melanie Lilly, do not reinstate;
13 Kyler Durbin, reinstate.

14 Are there any other items for
15 conversation?

16 (No audible response.)

17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: If not, then I
18 think we have completed the agenda for the June 28,
19 2021, regular meeting. And we will next meet in
20 July.

21 MS. DeLONG: In person.

22 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Yes, in person.

23 Thank you so much.

24 - - -

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, correct and complete written transcript of the proceedings in this matter, taken by me on the 28th day of June, 2021, and transcribed from my stenographic notes.

TRACI E. PEOPLES
Professional Reporter and
Notary Public in and for
the State of Ohio

My Commission Expires: July 15, 2024

Grady L. Pettigrew, President

Date