

CEDAR RAPIDS CIVIL SERVICE

COMMISSION MEETING

HELD:

Wednesday, August 5, 2020

7:30 a.m.

Via Zoom Webinar

Commission Members Present
via Zoom Webinar:

Nancy Evans
Greg Reed
Kory Kazimour
Stefanie Munsterman-Scriven

Other Attendees Present
via Zoom Webinar:

Rachelle Stewart
Mo Sheronick
Danny Franks
Aaron Hilligas
Jason Craig
Skylar Linkemann

Reported by:

Karrie D. Truitt, CSR, RPR
Carson Reporting, Inc.
118 - 3rd Avenue, Southeast, Suite 311,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401
(319) 366-7450

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR EVANS: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to convene the appeal hearing for Lucas Jones at this time, and one of the first items of business is a motion filed by Skylar Limkemann and Jason Craig. Would those gentlemen like to speak to the motion?

Skylar, can you hear me?

MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: I can. Yes, we filed a joint motion to continue the hearing in light of the concerns about conducting the hearing virtually. Some of the issues that we discussed between Jason and myself included some logistical, practical and then legal concerns. So we filed a joint motion to try to push this back about 50 days to September.

In looking at the dates that we had available on our calendars, we had September 22nd through the 25th available. I have spoken with a number of my witnesses, including my polygraph expert who is anticipated to testify. He is on military leave from the 24th through the 27th. So the only days that he would be available to testify would be September 22nd or 23rd, and I communicated this to Mr. Craig yesterday. So we would prefer one of those two days for the start of the hearing. That way I can get him in to testify before the Commission.

I think the motion in and of itself is pretty self-explanatory. I don't really have anything else to add.

CHAIR EVANS: Mr. Craig, did you want to add anything?

MR. JASON CRAIG: Just that we share Mr. Limkemann's concerns about a non in-person hearing. Our preference would be to conduct the hearing in person. That was the driving force behind the motion, we thought, to push it back, the hearing date, a bit to see if the COVID situation improves as well as give us time to make arrangements to conduct this hearing in the safest way possible. I've spoken to the City and my understanding is the City is committed to doing whatever they need to do to make an in-person hearing possible and safe for everyone involved.

In regard to the -- I'm sorry, in regard to the dates, the 22nd and 23rd would work for us. I do understand that there may be a -- if we're going to do the hearing in the city council chamber I have an understanding that there may be a city council meeting on the 23rd at 4:00 that we would need to make sure we were done in advance of that.

Is that right, Rachelle?

MS. RACHELLE STEWART: I don't have their

schedule pulled out.

MR. JASON CRAIG: Okay.

MS. RACHELLE STEWART: Yeah, I believe there would be one the 22nd.

CHAIR EVANS: The 22nd, not the 23rd?

MS. RACHELLE STEWART: Tuesday, the 22nd.

CHAIR EVANS: Do you gentlemen anticipate a fully public open hearing?

MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: I'll speak to that first. I guess that depends on the COVID situation, what the governor does with her proclamation. Obviously her proclamation currently I believe expires the 23rd this month, of August. So depending on what the governor and how the COVID situation happens, I guess we're going to have to play that by ear.

But if the governor extends the proclamation through the time of the hearing and the COVID situation improves, perhaps we could accommodate the public in person. But if not and the governor leaves the proclamation the same, particularly Section 116 of the proclamation, there's always the opportunity to contemporaneously broadcast the hearing to the public via the internet.

I did contact the Iowa Public Information Board and confirmed with Margaret that that is

appropriate and complies with the governor's proclamation and the Iowa Code. I also spoke with Mr. Sheronick on Monday about this plan and course of action. Some of this stuff obviously we're not going to know because we can't predict what's going to happen with the COVID pandemic. However, I do believe there will be ways to accommodate and make it safe for an in-person hearing in the next 50 days or so. Whether that's at the city council chamber or it's at the DoubleTree Convention Center, certainly there should be opportunities to work with city staff to make that happen.

CHAIR EVANS: Thank you. I think, as you said, it's difficult to know what kind of situation we'll be facing that week in September, and so my response would be that there's no problem continuing the hearing, but I'm not willing to stipulate at this time that it would be anything than the way we have currently set it up, which is all virtual.

So to the extent we adjourn and re- -- and set a date to reconvene for that week in September, I at this time would say that we leave it all virtual. We can always revisit that closer to the time. But to agree to the motion to continue does not include a decision that the format will be all public.

1 And we continue to have some concerns about
 2 saying that the meeting is safe enough for the
 3 participants to take part in but not safe for the public
 4 to take part in other than online. So, Mr. Limkemann,
 5 if you have authority that that does not violate the
 6 spirit or the -- of Chapter 400, which clearly states
 7 that the meetings be public. Because I do think that
 8 adds to the safety questions from the Commission's point
 9 of view. It's hard for me to picture that September
 10 will be better. I'm not saying it won't, but it could
 11 in fact have cases uptick once schools open up.

12 So I'd like to hear from the other
 13 commissioners on the issue of postponing 'til September
 14 and whether or not they agree that at this time we
 15 should stay all virtual with the understanding that we
 16 could revisit the format closer to the September date.

17 COMMISSIONER REED: I'm in complete agreement
 18 with what you're saying, Nancy. I think the move to
 19 continue is fine, but I don't think we should be setting
 20 the meeting criteria at this time as far as in-person or
 21 virtual until we get closer to know exactly what the
 22 situation is.

23 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: I would concur.

24 CHAIR EVANS: Stefanie, do you have anything
 25 to add?

1 COMMISSIONER MUNSTERMAN-SCRIVEN: I'm in
 2 agreement. I don't think it's a good idea for us to
 3 determine that it be in person at this point. We
 4 don't -- I agree with the other commissioners.

5 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: May I add something?
 6 This is Skylar.

7 CHAIR EVANS: Sure.

8 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: With regard to the
 9 hearing format, some of the concerns that Jason and I
 10 have raised and expressed to Mr. Sheronick on Monday is
 11 that for us as attorneys to prepare our case, I mean
 12 obviously 50 days provides additional time to do that.
 13 However, one of the concerns for both parties is the
 14 cost, time, expenses, but particularly for Lucas because
 15 he has a limited amount of resources to appeal this
 16 action.

17 So if this is going to be a virtual versus an
 18 in-person hearing, how he presents his appeal to the
 19 Commission is going to differ. And to prepare the case
 20 both ways, just out of a simple matter of fairness, is
 21 going to cost him an extensive amount of additional
 22 funds that obviously were not accounted for previously.
 23 So there is some concern on my end with Lucas and the
 24 amount of money that it would take to proceed in an
 25 all-virtual format just particularly for the

1 presentation of evidence, witnesses, arguments, and the
 2 additional cost that would be incurred.

3 So I just want to note that to the Commission
 4 that just as a matter of simple fairness -- I mean I
 5 understand that the City has additional resources,
 6 obviously the Commission has resources, but Lucas is an
 7 individual and he has a limited amount of resources to
 8 appeal this action.

9 Then on the second point that I'd like to
 10 make, with regard to the actual setting the format when
 11 it gets closer to the hearing -- and this is not in the
 12 joint motion, the joint motion was what the parties
 13 could agree to as far as language. I do believe that
 14 when I look at the Code that the Code requires -- when
 15 it says "a place" it's requiring an in-person hearing at
 16 least implicit in the Code.

17 Obviously we want to make sure that it's safe.
 18 I don't think that COVID's going to be completely gone
 19 by September, I would be shocked if it was. But I do
 20 believe that there are reasonable precautions that could
 21 be implemented by the City to account for safety. I
 22 know that the Commission can contact the Iowa Public
 23 Information Board and request an opinion and talk to
 24 Margaret if they'd like to verify that the format of
 25 in-person for the parties and witnesses complies with

1 the governor's proclamation and the current Code.

2 Obviously we'll need to wait and see what
 3 happens with the governor's proclamation and if she
 4 extends the disaster emergency to September though. But
 5 I would prefer to set it as in-person for now, because I
 6 have to issue subpoenas, Jason may have to issue
 7 subpoenas, and there's a legal question whether we can
 8 even issue a subpoena for something that's going to be
 9 held virtual. Because on the subpoena form that you
 10 signed previously, Nancy, it indicates a place, and a
 11 place for somebody to appear, a place for somebody to
 12 produce documents. And so there are a number of just
 13 other legal concerns about how would we go about doing
 14 this and whether that's even valid and consistent with
 15 Chapter 400.

16 If it gets closer and the COVID situation
 17 doesn't improve or the Commission's not happy with the
 18 precautions that the City is taking or the governor
 19 doesn't extend the proclamation, I think that would all
 20 be appropriate to talk again and see what the Commission
 21 would like to do with it. But our preference would be
 22 to set it for in-person with a specific place. That way
 23 we can issue subpoenas for witnesses, get those
 24 witnesses served, and start preparing our case.
 25 Otherwise there's going to be a lot of uncertainty and

1 cost incurred on both parties' ends with preparing for
 2 this hearing.
 3 MR. MO SHERONICK: Nancy, could I chime in?
 4 CHAIR EVANS: Yes, certainly, Mo.
 5 MR. MO SHERONICK: Couple of points. I think
 6 the point about the uncertainty and the kind of
 7 up-in-the-air nature of whether a person -- in-person or
 8 all virtual deserves some separate comment. At the risk
 9 of sounding really foolish, these are unprecedented
 10 times in any of our lives and careers and everything
 11 else. This is the pandemic.
 12 I understand -- And I'm speaking partially for
 13 myself here, but I'm trying to express the Commission's
 14 position as well. I understand Lucas Jones wants an
 15 in-person hearing. Anybody would. That's not the
 16 issue. The issue is would it be responsible for this
 17 Commission, during what looks like at least round two of
 18 a nonending pandemic, to go that route. We haven't seen
 19 the results of opening schools yet. That could -- From
 20 what we've seen just in the news, that doesn't appear to
 21 be going too well in the areas that have opened schools.
 22 Iowa is going to find out whether that was a good idea
 23 or not, and September should tell us a lot.
 24 I think given this incredible uncertainty that
 25 our society's found itself in, to ease the legitimate

1 concerns of uncertainty about the format, I think the
 2 Commission is well within its rights to just declare
 3 right now its adherence to the fully online plan. This
 4 way the parties can plan accordingly.
 5 In terms of Skylar's comment about subpoenas,
 6 that's an addressable issue. A lot of times remote
 7 witnesses are subpoenaed and they testify remotely. And
 8 although I'm not going -- I wouldn't presume to tell
 9 either lawyer how to fill out a subpoena, I think there
 10 are ways to compose the subpoena such that a witness
 11 knows to appear at the law offices of John Doe attorney
 12 for the purposes of giving remote testimony to the
 13 Cedar Rapids Civil Service Commission, or John Doe can
 14 appear remotely in his home with a connection through
 15 either John Doe's office or directly into the Commission
 16 hearing. There are surmountable -- that's a
 17 surmountable problem.
 18 The expense, the expense is truly unfortunate,
 19 but that's not something any of us on this call really
 20 can control given the state of our world. You know, if
 21 one person gets sick because of attending this
 22 Commission's hearing we're all going to feel terrible,
 23 and we don't want that.
 24 And I would think that with respect -- with
 25 all respect to the Iowa Public Information Board, the

1 Iowa Public Information Board doesn't set the agenda for
 2 the Cedar Rapids Civil Service Commission. They provide
 3 a tremendously valuable service. I've consulted them in
 4 the past myself. But the buck stops with the
 5 Commission, and the paramount concern for the Commission
 6 is safety and access, and with a fully online format the
 7 Commission is able to discharge that obligation.
 8 If I could encourage anything it's that if the
 9 Commission decides to retain the fully online format it
 10 make itself explicitly clear today. I would hate to
 11 have the lawyers going off preparing for two different
 12 formats. I think it should be clear at this point what
 13 the Commission's thinking is, and unless we are all --
 14 unless lightning strikes we're going to be -- at least
 15 in September, maybe into October, we're going to be face
 16 to face with this pandemic and everybody should just
 17 make the assumption that it's going to be fully online,
 18 plan your cases in chief accordingly and go from there.
 19 Thank you.
 20 CHAIR EVANS: Thank you. I had similar
 21 feelings. One, that if it's inconvenient or expensive,
 22 which I don't doubt, to plan for two different formats,
 23 then plan for all virtual. We can revisit that closer
 24 to the September dates if things have miraculously
 25 changed.

1 I also wondered why you couldn't subpoena a
 2 place being your office. I don't know whether that's
 3 impossible or what the rules are. I have great fears
 4 that a hybrid situation violates Chapter 400, which
 5 calls for public and that the public can challenge that
 6 if, okay, if -- it's safe for ten people to be in the
 7 same room but not for the public. So I think you plan
 8 for an all-virtual hearing in December [sic] and would
 9 not agree to a continuance into September if in fact
 10 that continuance includes a total in-person hearing.
 11 I just don't think COVID will get -- We'll be
 12 in a bad situation. I think Commissioner Reed and
 13 myself indicated that we are in a vulnerable population.
 14 Commissioner Kazimour indicated she has elderly parents
 15 and she would have real fears in terms of passing that
 16 on to them.
 17 So --
 18 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Nancy, this is Skylar.
 19 For purposes of the appeal, because I anticipate this
 20 may be an issue that ultimately -- we don't have any
 21 case law in Iowa. So if this does get appealed I do
 22 want to make my record just briefly. Lucas objects to
 23 any format that's outside of conducting the hearing in
 24 person. He understands though that if it's going to be
 25 held on online obviously a continuance will allow the

1 parties an opportunity to try to address some of these
2 issues, but would ask in the meantime the Commission
3 works with the City to try to identify ways to take
4 precautions for a public in-person hearing.

5 I noted the concerns about the public
6 requirement, but I just want to remind the Commission
7 that this is Lucas Jones's appeal, it's his opportunity
8 to appeal to the Commission. While the public has an
9 opportunity to be present and observe or to have
10 contemporaneous access, it's not the public's hearing,
11 it's Chief Jerman and Lucas Jones's appeal hearing.

12 So that's the purpose of Chapter 400, is to
13 provide employees that have been terminated, discharged,
14 disciplined the opportunity to appeal that to the
15 Commission. So I don't want to lose sight of the
16 interests of the parties as well. But I understand that
17 we have to balance a number of different interests in
18 this case, particularly with the pandemic in the
19 background.

20 However, as I noted, Lucas does object to the
21 in-person requirement and would like to have a hearing
22 or a meeting set somewhere in September so we have a
23 date certain where we can revisit the issue to determine
24 whether the format will be confirmed as virtual or if it
25 will be in person or if it will be hybrid. But I would

1 ask that the Commission take some kind of steps with the
2 City to try to accommodate for an in-person hearing. As
3 Jason and I have discussed, I think that that -- a
4 virtual hearing creates a number of logistical and
5 practical issues, but also there are issues with the
6 appeal.

7 On the subpoena issue there's an issue under
8 the Code under Chapter 400 that if, for example, a
9 witness would not appear or they would not bring
10 documents, that the district court then -- the
11 Commission would have to report to the district court
12 and the district court would have to continue the
13 examination of that witness. So there are some
14 compliance issues beyond just simply issuing subpoenas
15 for witnesses.

16 And I understand that these are unprecedented
17 times, we don't have any appellate case law, but I would
18 ask that they try to work with the City to get some kind
19 of safe method for an in-person hearing. I understand
20 that all risk is not going to be eliminated, but
21 following CDC public health official guidelines I
22 believe, just based on my own research and conversations
23 with health officials, that it could be made safe for
24 in-person hearing.

25 Then on the public requirement issue,

1 obviously that's an advisory opinion from IPIB. Again,
2 I don't think the public would have standing to
3 challenge that. If IPIB is indicating that per the
4 governor's proclamation that's acceptable, I think that
5 the Commission should take that into account. Again,
6 the Commission's certainly welcome to contact the IPIB
7 and get a formal opinion.

8 But I did talk to Margaret Johnson this past
9 Friday for approximately one hour, I talked to Jason, we
10 looked at the governor's proclamation together. We
11 don't know if the governor's proclamation will be in
12 effect in September. But as it stands right now that
13 Section 116 does provide authority for the hybrid
14 approach, which should cover the Commission.

15 So I just want to note that for the record,
16 and I'll just fall back on my other due process concerns
17 that have already been previously addressed and note
18 Lucas's concerns about that for the purposes of appeal
19 should this go to district court later on down the road.
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIR EVANS: Thank you. Was there anybody
22 else that had something they wanted to add? I don't
23 want to cut people off.

24 So when we passed this motion to move it to
25 December we should probably include --

1 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: September.

2 CHAIR EVANS: September, excuse me. -- we
3 should probably include the dates. So right now I think
4 we're looking at 22 and 23; is that correct,
5 Mr. Limkemann, because of your witness?

6 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Yes. And my
7 understanding is those dates work for the City. My
8 previous conversation with Jason indicated that the
9 Chief and Lieutenant Abodeely had some time that they
10 were gone in September. So I believe that the 22nd and
11 23rd accommodates their schedules as well.

12 Is that correct, Jason?

13 MR. JASON CRAIG: Yeah, that's correct. I
14 would suggest maybe we look at the 23rd and 24th, if
15 that works for your witness, Skylar, so that way we
16 could avoid the city council meeting on the 22nd if we
17 do end up having it in council chambers.

18 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Just as long as we can
19 ensure that my witness can get in on the 23rd to
20 testify. I don't know what his orders are at this time.
21 My one concern about the 23rd was, you know, if he has
22 to be somewhere, leave to travel for military duty, to
23 try to get him on the 22nd so he could plan accordingly.
24 But certainly we could probably make the 23rd work.

25 MR. JASON CRAIG: We could fit him in out of

1 order if necessary, Skylar, to accommodate his schedule.
2 Rachelle, would it be preferable to avoid the
3 22nd?

4 MS. RACHELLE STEWART: Depends on where we
5 have it of course. What I'm hearing now is it still is
6 going to be online unless I'm missing something. But I
7 would -- you know, in the unlikely event it does happen
8 in the council chambers, we would want time to clean
9 between the commission being there and any council
10 members or city staff that are in that room for the
11 council meeting. And I don't know -- I need to look, I
12 don't know if that is a noon meeting that day or a
13 4 p.m. meeting that day. I'll look it up.

14 CHAIR EVANS: Well --

15 COMMISSIONER MUNSTERMAN-SCRIVEN: It's a
16 4 p.m. meeting. I'm sorry, Nancy.

17 CHAIR EVANS: I was just going to say we're
18 going to continue it as a virtual meeting with the
19 understanding that if significant changes happen we can
20 go in person. So since it's being continued as a
21 virtual meeting, the 22nd doesn't become an issue. If
22 time -- if things change radically is it possible that
23 we could -- and we decide we can do any of it in person,
24 that we move it to the 23rd or just go ahead and set it
25 for the 23rd and 24th?

1 Let me ask Commissioner Kazimour and
2 Commissioner Reed. Are any -- are all of those dates
3 acceptable, the 22nd through the 24th? I'll ask
4 Stefanie, but she doesn't get a vote. We need the
5 voting members there for sure.

6 COMMISSIONER REED: I have an issue with the
7 22nd, but I can change that if it needs to be changed.

8 CHAIR EVANS: Kory?

9 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: I'm okay either the
10 22nd, 23rd or 24th.

11 CHAIR EVANS: So, gentlemen, if it's going to
12 be all virtual, which is what it is currently proposed
13 to be, we can do the 22nd and the 23rd. If there's any
14 chance that it's going to be a fully public hearing, we
15 can do it the 23rd or the 24th. So I'll let the two of
16 you decide. Which two do you want?

17 If we -- if it's totally public we will lose
18 probably, it sounds like, half a day if it's a 4:00
19 meeting on the 22nd if we're in council chambers, which
20 I understand has the best audio/video. There's always
21 the 23rd and 24th. I don't know if the convention
22 center's available then. Again, I will say right now
23 it's all virtual, and that's what we should plan for.

24 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: If we're planning for
25 all virtual, I mean the 22nd and 23rd would be

1 preferable for me just simply because I know that the
2 witness is available, and the 22nd I'm sure we could get
3 him in to accommodate his military leave.

4 CHAIR EVANS: Greg, that means you would have
5 to move something. Are you okay with that?

6 COMMISSIONER REED: Yes, I will do that.
7 That's fine.

8 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Thank you.

9 CHAIR EVANS: Okay. Then as I see it now we
10 will -- I need a motion to recess the hearing and
11 reconvene on the 22nd at 9:00.

12 COMMISSIONER REED: I move.

13 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: Amend that, Nancy to
14 say in a virtual setting?

15 CHAIR EVANS: I'm sorry, Kory, I didn't hear
16 you.

17 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: Do you want to amend
18 that motion to say in a virtual setting?

19 CHAIR EVANS: Okay. That's a good idea.
20 We'll have a motion to recess and reconvene on the 22nd
21 at 9:00 for a virtual hearing, and let that be the
22 motion.

23 COMMISSIONER REED: I move.

24 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: Second.

25 CHAIR EVANS: Any further discussion? All in

1 favor say aye.

2 COMMISSIONER REED: Aye.

3 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: Aye.

4 CHAIR EVANS: Aye.

5 So that's done. Did I hear, Mr. Limkemann,
6 that you would like a date certain to be scheduled to
7 discuss the format?

8 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Correct. Please.

9 CHAIR EVANS: A week prior is the 15th.
10 There's also the 14th, Monday, the 14th of September.
11 If we had -- Kory, if your schedule is not quite as
12 arduous as it is now, what about noon on the 14th, can
13 you --

14 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: I'm in trial that day.
15 That whole week is pretty much out for me. I've got
16 some other hearings in the Polk County area, but I do
17 have the 10th or the 11th available in the morning.

18 CHAIR EVANS: The week of the 14th a noon
19 conversation would work. We can go the 10th or 11th.
20 That adds a lot of uncertainty to the question of
21 whether it's gotten a lot safer.

22 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Yeah, the week of the
23 14th will not work at all for me.

24 COMMISSIONER REED: I would propose the 11th,
25 Nancy, Friday the 11th.

1 CHAIR EVANS: Does the 11th at noon work for
2 people?
3 MR. JASON CRAIG: It works for me.
4 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: I could make that work.
5 CHAIR EVANS: Okay. Kory, Greg, Stefanie,
6 okay? All right?
7 COMMISSIONER REED: Okay.
8 COMMISSIONER MUNSTERMAN-SCRIVEN: Yes.
9 CHAIR EVANS: All right. We'll set a
10 Commission meeting for noon on the 11th to reconsider
11 the format which is currently scheduled to be all
12 online.
13 MR. MO SHERONICK: I wouldn't say we're going
14 to reconsider the format. I would say that we're just
15 going to assess factually where we are, and if there's
16 any compelling need to alter the online -- what I don't
17 want to have happen -- what I'm afraid will happen is
18 that if we keep it in that kind of a vague sense that
19 the attorneys will -- through just human nature will
20 start preparing for both eventualities, online and in
21 person. And what I would like the Commission to make
22 clear to the counsel, to both counsel, is that it is the
23 position of the Civil Service Commission that this is an
24 all-online hearing and counsel need to prepare
25 accordingly.

1 What we don't want to have happen is on
2 September 11th or on September 22nd to hear from the
3 attorneys who say that because of the uncertainty and
4 the intervening meeting we've had to prepare two ways.
5 So I think the Commission needs to be explicit that
6 unless lightning strikes this is going to be an online
7 hearing.
8 CHAIR EVANS: Right.
9 MR. MO SHERONICK: And prepare accordingly.
10 CHAIR EVANS: Well, it's the first time I've
11 rooted for lightning to strike, I want COVID to be a lot
12 better. All right. I agree with what Mr. Sheronick
13 said, if that wasn't clear from what I said, that this
14 is a virtual hearing unless lightning strikes. But we
15 will get together on the 11th to hear from counsel at
16 their request but to plan for an all-virtual hearing,
17 all online, on September 22nd starting at 9:00.
18 Is there any further business to come before
19 the Commission? Seeing none, can I hear a motion to
20 adjourn?
21 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Was there actually a
22 vote?
23 CHAIR EVANS: What?
24 MR. SKYLAR LIMKEMANN: Was there actually a
25 vote on the continuing hearing?

1 CHAIR EVANS: Oh, thank you. Thank you.
2 COMMISSIONER REED: Yeah, we voted. I made
3 the motion, Kory seconded.
4 CHAIR EVANS: I appreciate the assistance. We
5 have a motion to assist [sic]. Any further discussion?
6 All in favor say aye?
7 COMMISSIONER REED: Aye.
8 MR. MO SHERONICK: I think Skylar's question
9 was was there a motion on the September 11th date?
10 CHAIR EVANS: Oh, I don't think we need a
11 motion on that. Right now we're going to take -- we
12 never voted on the motion to continue to reconvene this
13 hearing on the 22nd at 9:00 for an online hearing on the
14 appeal of Lucas Jones, and we had a motion and a second,
15 and then we had discussion. All in favor say aye.
16 COMMISSIONER REED: Aye.
17 CHAIR EVANS: Kory, I saw you say aye, I
18 didn't hear you say aye.
19 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: Aye.
20 CHAIR EVANS: All right. So the hearing is in
21 recess until that date, and we have further decided that
22 the next meeting of the Civil Service Commission will be
23 on the 11th at noon. Is there any further business?
24 Now a motion to adjourn?
25 I think Kory said. Greg do we have a second?

1 COMMISSIONER REED: I second.
2 CHAIR EVANS: All in favor say aye.
3 COMMISSIONER KAZIMOUR: Aye.
4 COMMISSIONER REED: Aye.
5 CHAIR EVANS: Aye. Meeting's adjourned.
6 Thank you everybody for participating.
7 (Meeting concluded at 8:06 a.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, Karrie D. Truitt, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of Iowa, do hereby certify that on the 5th day of August, 2020, via Zoom videoconference, I reported in shorthand the above-entitled proceedings; reduced the same to typewriting under my direction and supervision and that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of all proceedings had on the taking of said matter at the above time and place.

I further certify that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties to this hearing, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand this 13th day of August, 2020.

Karrie D. Truitt
Karrie D. Truitt
Certified Shorthand Reporter

