From: Jennifer Giesler
To: All Alders
Subject: 4/21 ordinances 5.19 and 5.20
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:46:37 PM

You don't often get email from jen@giesler.net. Learn why this is important

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alder Guequierre,

I am one of your constituents in District 19. I also follow the work of the Police Civilian Oversight Board. I supported the formation of the PCOB and co-exisitng Office of Independent Police Monitor and continue to feel that their role is essential to the safety of our city for all residents. It's been brought to my attention that at today's Common Council meeting at 6:30 amendments are proposed that could change the status of PCOB and OIPM and threaten their independence. Without restating all the info and reasons I oppose these amendments (you'll no doubt get several long emails from other folks), I will simply ask that you vote against all amendments to Madison General Ordinances 5.19 and 5.20.

Respectfully,

Jennifer Giesler
21 Apple Hill Circle
Madison, 53717

_____
Jennifer Giesler
Jen@giesler.net
(608)770-4330

From: MGR Govindarajan
To: All Alders
Subject: MGR Public Comment, Substitute vs. Alternate
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:46:11 PM
Attachments: Substitute vs. Alternate (MGR Comments)-2.pdf

---

mgr.murali07@gmail.com appears similar to someone who previously sent you email, but may not be that person.
Learn why this could be a risk

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Alders,

I had wanted to send this while I still had access to my alder email, alas I was too talkative during the brunch. Regardless, please see the attached PDF which compares the Substitute versus the Alternate submitted by Alder Glenn.

I am immensely thankful for the work and effort that Alder Glenn has put into her alternate, and although I wouldn't support it, there are major portions of it which we talked about two weeks ago, which I included in the substitute. The PDF above explains what was included, and wasn't included (and why).

Feel free to reach out if you have questions. My personal email is this, mgr.murali07@gmail.com.
I will also be registered to answer questions at tonight's meeting.

Best,
MGR Govindarajan

Comparison: Govindarajan Substitute vs. Glenn Alternate

Alders,

As you prepare for tonight's discussion on Legistar 92386, I wanted to briefly outline key differences between my Substitute (version 2) and Alder Glenn's Alternate (version 3).

Over the last few weeks, I developed Version 2 through a collaborative process that included two PCOB meetings, follow-up discussions with Board members, discussions with Alders, and input from City staff. **This included reviewing an earlier draft from Alder Glenn about her alternate, which included me incorporating elements that aligned with the goals of the ordinance.**

I appreciate Alder Glenn's alternate proposal and the role it has played in prompting thoughtful discussion. My intent with Version 2 has been to focus on clarifying existing structures rather than introducing new structures involving the Council. There were elements I agree with and have incorporated into the Substitute. At the same time, I believe some provisions move beyond the goals of the ordinance and raise practical questions about implementation. I'm truly grateful for her collaboration and perspective, and all the effort she has put into this issue – all of which has helped strengthen Version 2.

What I DID Include into the Substitute
- MGO 5.19(7)(i) – Access to MPD Records
- MGO 5.19(6)(d) – Legal Counsel

What I did NOT Include in the Substitute
- MGO 5.19(6)(c) – Administrative Structural and Legal Compliance
  - Section #1
  - Section #2
- MGO 5.19(7)(i) – Access MPD Records (Additional Provisions)
  - Section #1
  - Section #2

Closing

*What I **DID** Include into the Substitute*

MGO 5.19(7)(i) – Access to MPD Records

The Alternate suggested the following language in an earlier draft, which I incorporated into the Substitute:

> *"The MOU shall govern the mechanics of access and shall not restrict the categories of records, or data to which the OIM is entitled to under this subsection."*

Additional language from the Alternate which I modified and added into the Substitute:

> *"The MOU shall also define how the data is shared, stored, and managed by the OIM in compliance with all applicable laws."*

MGO 5.19(6)(d) – Legal Counsel

The Alternate suggested the following language:

> *"For administrative matters involving the operations of the OIM as a City agency, including but not limited to compliance with public records laws, open meetings laws, hiring practices, contracting and procurement, the OIM shall consult with the Office of the City Attorney."*

This language was fully incorporated into the Substitute. The only difference is that the Substitute begins with "for all other legal matters involving…" rather than "for administrative matters involving…"

*What I **did NOT** Include in the Substitute*

MGO 5.19(6)(c) – Administrative Structural and Legal Compliance

Section #1
The Alternate (Version 3) adds the following language:

> *"The Common Council retains the authority to enforce compliance with City administrative policies and procedures governing the administrative operations of the OIM, including but not limited to hiring practices, contracting, budgeting, use of technology, and procurement."*

This part above was the original Amendment #1 which I worked on with HR Director Hillson. While I expressed hesitancy about this during the PCOB meeting, I introduced it as an attachment on Legistar to encourage discussion rather than advancing it as a direct amendment. (aka, this was only ever a discussion item.)

I ultimately decided to not add this language because existing provisions in the Substitute already require the OIM and PCOB to comply with federal and state law, as well as City APMs and Ordinances, which already establish the Council's ability to enforce compliance.

Section #2
The following language was added into the Alternate (Version 3):

> *"Before invoking enforcement authority under this subsection, the Common Council shall provide the Independent Monitor and the PCOB with written notice of the alleged non-compliance and a minimum of thirty (30) days to cure, except where non-compliance poses an immediate legal or financial risk to the City."*

This part raises several practical and structural questions which I believe are important to answer:

- What does it look like for Council to provide "written notice"?
    - Is this done by Council Leadership?
    - The language says "The Common Council" – does this require a resolution? Who introduces and sponsors it?
    - What happens if that resolution fails? Does the non-compliance go unaddressed?
- **This language places Alders in the position of determining what constituents an "immediate legal or financial risk to the City"**
    - I believe the Finance Department or City Attorneys office are better equipped to make that determination, rather than Alders.
    - Again, what if a resolution (if that's the agreed upon method) fails?
- How is "immediate" defined?
    - The council meets, at best, every two weeks
    - It seems impractical to address an "immediate" risk through a fully noticed public meeting process while complying with Open Meetings Law.

MGO 5.19(7)(i) – Access MPD Records (Additional Provisions)

Section #1
There are two parts which I did not include from the Alternate, the first:

"Including protocols for requesting, receiving, storing, and securing records"

The reason is because this is already covered in the Substitute by:

"The MOU shall also define how the data is shared, stored, and managed by the OIM in compliance with all applicable laws."

Section #2
From the Alternate:

"If the OIM and MPD are unable to execute a mutually acceptable MOU within ninety (90) days of this ordinance taking effect, either party may request that the Common Council convene a facilitated resolution process."

This was **not included** because it introduces the Common Council into what should remain an administrative and legally guided process. In my view, this creates a risk of politicizing decisions that directly affect records access and investigative work, which would impact the OIM's independence.
This also raises several logistical questions:

- What does a "facilitated resolution process" look like?
    - A public hearing? A resolution?
    - Who leads it? Council leadership?
    - The language says "the Common Council," suggesting all 20 alders would be involved. Now you have to abide by Open Meetings Laws and other quorum rules.
- Would this become a debate between:
    - An MOU favored by the OIM seeking administrative independence, versus
    - Guidance from the City Attorney's Office requiring compliance with state law?
- If the Council were to approve an MOU favored by the OIM, could that create a situation where the City Attorney's office is expected to sign onto a document that may conflict with state law? *Can* the Attorney's Office even sign that document?

Closing

I appreciate the conversations that have taken place over the last several weeks and the work that has gone into both versions of this proposal. I hope this provides helpful context as you consider the differences between the Substitute (Version 2) and the Alternate (Version 3).

Best,
Recovering Alder-holic, MGR Govindarajan

From: noreply
To: All Alders
Subject: [All Alders] OIPM
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 4:18:44 PM

Recipient: All Alders:

Tuesday, April 21, 2026 – 4:18pm

Sarah Hughes
703 Glenway St
Madison, Wisconsin. 53711 Yes, by email. hughes.sarahann@gmail.com All Alders OIPM Council,
Please remove funding from the OIPM until there are better systems in place for this important work. The actions from the monitor over the previous weeks, culminating in today's press release are embarrassing, irresponsible, and damaging. Imagine what 500k could be used for in our city. The needed and important work of ensuring equitable policing deserves better than what has happened with this office over the last 5 years.
Thank you,
Sarah Hughes

From: Sol Kelley-Jones
To: All Alders; ellenfordistrict8@gmail.com; Noah.L.Lieberman@gmail.com
Subject: please vote against amendments 5.19 and 5.20
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 4:18:13 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from solkelleyjones@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders,

I am writing to ask you to vote against all amendments to Madison General Ordinances 5.19 and 5.20.

The OIPM and PCOB were hard fought for and came as a result of residents demands for greater accountability and oversight of police conduct and police as an institution in Madison. The need for this kind of body has not gone away and in our current political moment with increasing impunity of law enforcement across the country it would be a dangerous message to undermine the mechanisms of independence that are so critical for the OIPM and PCOB to operate effectively.

I ask you to vote against the amendments that would undermine OIPM and PCOB's independence.

Thank you for your leadership,

Sol Kelley-Jones

From: Scott Krause
To: All Alders; ellenfordistrict8@gmail.com; Noah.L.Lieberman@gmail.com
Subject: Opposition to OIPM/PCOB Ordinances
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 4:01:36 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from krause.scott@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders - specifically John Gyequirre (I'm in District 19) ,

Before reading the proposed amendments to the Office of the Independent Police Monitor (OIPM) ordinance 5.19 and Police Civilian Oversight Board (PCOB) ordinance 5.20, and reasons why we urge you to oppose them all, it is important to acknowledge 4 facts that frame the relationship between the OIPM/PCOB and the driving force behind these amendments: the City Attorney's Office.

The main goal of the City Attorney is to prevent successful lawsuits and, if need be, they will do so at the expense of civil rights, and the health and safety of city residents. Given their mission, they have to deny that civil rights violations ever occur.

The main goal of the OIPM/PCOB is to ensure the civil rights, health, and safety of city residents and police officers through community engagement, independent investigation and review, transparency, and recommendations. By default, this reduces the need for lawsuits.

The City Attorney does not offer the same level of respect and client/collaboration privileges to the OIPM/PCOB as they do other city entities. Some in key leadership positions have repeatedly demonstrated this by violating their ordinance and Roberts Rules, talking down to the OIPM/PCOB, and surprising them with debilitating amendments that were in the works for weeks, sometimes months, without ever once reaching out to express concerns or collaborate. They do not do this to MPD.

The City Attorney's mission is in direct conflict with that of the OIPM/PCOB and they act like it and therefore, the City Attorney must not serve as their source of legal oversight, advice, and representation.

OIPM ordinance 5.19
[https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOICH1--10_CH5PODEPORE_5.19OFINPOMO]
(https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOICH1--10_CH5PODEPORE_5.19OFINPOMO)

PCOB ordinance 5.20
[https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOICH1--10_CH5PODEPORE_5.20POCIOVBO]
(https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOICH1--10_CH5PODEPORE_5.20POCIOVBO)

THE AMENDMENTS:
The most recent amendments to OIPM/PCOB ordinance are summarized below along with why we believe they are harmful. The amendments discussed in A-C are sponsored by Alders MGR and Sabrina Madison. The amendment discussed in D is sponsored by Alder Davy Mayers.

1.) Restricting data and records access:

- No access to computer databases
This is obstructive and incongruent with the national standard for police oversight.

- Play with confidentiality to restrict access.

- Arbitrary definition of key records as confidential could, in combination with this ordinance amendment, end up greatly restricting the ability of OIPM to carry out its functions.

2.) Reducing access to MPD Records:

- In contrast with current ordinance language, which requires that MPD provide absolutely "unfettered access" to its records (to the extent permitted by law), the amendment would require negotiation "to define the degree of access to specific MPD records". And it mandates insertion of the City Attorney's Office, which has a structural conflict of interest with OIPM, into the execution of any negotiated agreement.

3.) Requiring that OIPM must follow all city rules and procedures, without exception.

- Adding this language to ordinance is unnecessary, because the city rules and procedures (on hiring, budgeting and purchasing, information technology systems, etc.) are already being followed by the OIPM/PCOB.

- This addition might seem harmless, but the added language undercuts the Independence provision within the OIPM ordinance.

- Under the existing ordinance language, a new Mayoral policy that targets the OIPM/PCOB would be without effect, because ordinances (laws) supersede policies (that can be written by a single person). Because the amendment would effectively give all policies the weight of law, mandating compliance without exception, it would allow a Mayor to write policies that infringe on OIPM/PCOB function and independence, or an administration, via the City Attorney, to interpret and enforce policies in a manner that infringes on OIPM/PCOB function and independence.

- This is a particular problem because of an underlying structural conflict of interest. Elected officials, such as mayors, often depend on the support of police officials, police unions, etc. in elections, and want to avoid embarrassing revelations, and thus tend to compromise the function and independence of civilian police oversight agencies. This has occurred repeatedly with civilian police oversight agencies across the country, crippling those agencies.

4.) Requiring that OIPM/PCOB use the City Attorney for most legal work, rather than an independent attorney:

- As stated at the start, this creates a severe problem, given the inherent conflict of interest.

- It allows use of an independent attorney only for a very restricted set of functions, mandating that the City Attorney be used for all else. This includes use of the City Attorney for four specific areas where city attorney offices and civilian police oversight offices are most often in conflict.

- For example, it mandates use of the City Attorney for all public records work. But the primary clients of city attorneys are elected officials (especially mayors) and police departments (with whom they necessarily have a close working relationship). City attorneys strive to prevent records that would embarrass elected officials or police departments from becoming public, undercutting transparency.

- Placing the amendment in the ordinance would greatly expand the City Attorney's power over OIPM/PCOB, and make it much more difficult for OIPM/PCOB to challenge the City Attorney's opinion, undermining OIPM/PCOB INDEPENDENCE.

- Because of the same inherent conflict of interest, the Police & Fire Commission uses an independent attorney for all its functions, rather than the City Attorney. It makes no sense to, in contrast, require OIPM/PCOB to use the City Attorney.

5.) Adding an alder to the PCOB:

- Putting an elected official on a police oversight board directly curtails independence and contradicts universally recognized best principles for police oversight.

- As the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) states: "One of the most important and defining concepts of civilian oversight of law enforcement is independence. In its broadest sense, it refers to an absence of real or perceived influence from law enforcement, political actors, and other special interests looking to affect the operations of the civilian oversight agency."

- As noted above, there is a fundamental structural conflict of interest between elected officials and civilian police oversight.

- For the very same reason, elected officials are not given seats on the Police & Fire Commission.

These proposed changes in ordinance language violate the letter and legislative intent of the original ordinance. Contrary to claims the City Attorney has made, they are the opposite of what Alders Kemble, Moreland and Bidar wrote and intended when the council passed the original ordinance.

The proposed amendments are being promoted based on past issues that are long since resolved or alleged issues that never actually occurred. They represent a failure to acknowledge that a new IPM, who started only four months ago, managed to already process multiple cases and put out an annual report with novel, important data analyses. They also represent a failure to acknowledge improvements, and how the volunteer board and understaffed/underfunded office are exceeding past goals and functioning effectively with excellent attendance. Such actions by alders cause frustration, exhaustion and burnout.

Misinformation and accusations of rule violations without evidence are driving repeated attempts to amend the ordinance in ways harmful to the OIPM/PCOB's ability to conduct independent police oversight. This pattern demonstrates a high level of unwarranted scrutiny that is disproportionately applied to this body when other groups that are violating rules experience no such attention. This behavior is the antithesis of collaboration. It demonstrates harmful biases and disrespect, and it harms the relationship between the OIPM/PCOB, staff, and Council.

Please leave the ordinances 5.19 and 5.20 as they are and, for now, instead focus your attention on meeting the funding and staffing needs of the OIPM and PCOB.

Sincerely,

Scott Krause
1147 Pauline Ave

From: noreply
To: All Alders
Subject: [All Alders] OIPM
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 4:06:06 PM

Recipient: All Alders:

Tuesday, April 21, 2026 – 4:05pm

Jacob Meyer
9518 Tawny Acorn Dr
Verona, Wisconsin. 53593 No, do not contact me. All Alders OIPM As a taxpayer whose 2025 city property taxes were about $13,000 last year, I am outraged at how unprofessional the OIPM is being operated by Ms. Glass. From the use of AI to generate a useless report, to now waging a public battle against the mayors office (https://www.cityofmadison.com/independent-police-monitor/documents/news/OIPM%20Memo%20April-21-2026%20%28with%20exhibits%29.pdf). This person is unfit for this position, and seeing the expenses of the salaries and operation of the OIPM should make any citizen disgusted with this program. It is an absolute waste of our city resources. I'd love to see the nearly half million dollar budget for the OIPM go elsewhere, helping homeless, going to our schools, our utilities, etc. Please defund and eliminate the OIPM. It is an unnecessary burden to this city that has provided no meaningful impact. At the very least, divert the OIPM funds to a traditional Police and Fire Commission - a proven, standardized practice in the majority of municipalities, both small and large. The OIPM is a performative waste, but it's fooling no one. Thank you.

From: Wendy Reichel
To: All Alders
Subject: Please Vote Yes on #92386
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:35:30 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from reichelwendy@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders,

I am writing to express my support for Legistar 92386 and urge you to vote **yes** this evening.

I am a Madison resident and small business owner who believes in both effective public safety and meaningful accountability. It is precisely because I want civilian oversight of our police department *to work* that I support this ordinance. Six years of dysfunction, missed deadlines, incomplete investigations, data mismanagement, and a board that voted to table discussion of reasonable governance reforms rather than engage with them is not the accountability our community was promised.

Asking a public body to submit quarterly reports, follow city policies, and have at least one elected official present at its meetings is not an attack on oversight, it is the basic definition of it.

I support this ordinance because good governance requires accountability at every level, and that includes with the agencies created to provide it.

Please vote yes on #92386

Thank you for your service and for your vote tonight.

Respectfully,

Wendy Reichel - District 11

From: noreply
To: All Alders
Subject: [All Alders] Defund the OIM
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:30:08 PM

Recipient: All Alders:

Tuesday, April 21, 2026 – 3:29pm

Victor Toniolo
111 N Hamilton St
201
Madison, Wisconsin. 53703 No, do not contact me. All Alders Defund the OIM The latest press release is not only embarrassing, it likely opens up the city to lawsuits.

Defund the OIM immediately. Divert funds to the PFC to cover their responsibilities (if any, seems to me the entire office was already redundant)

From: Larry and Ginny White
To: All Alders
Cc: Mayor
Subject: April 21st Common Council Meeting
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:29:34 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Item #55, Legistar 92386 - Amendments for OIM & PCOB

I ask you to **SUPPORT** the amendments.

The OIM and PCOB should adhere to the common practices and procedures expected of City staff, boards, committees, and commissions. They must be accountable to Madison residents and taxpayers.

Thank you for your work on this issue. Please vote "Yes".