City of Lawton

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

Committee on Performance Excellence

Special Meeting Agenda

Monday, July 20, 2026 **2:00 PM** **City Council Conference Room**

Recommending Body

"Official action can only be taken on items listed on the agenda. As a recommending body, the Committee may review and discuss agenda items, propose and enact floor amendments, and then choose to make a recommendation to the City Council or provide direction to the City Manager. The Committee may also defer items for further review, refer matters to the City Attorney, or send items to standing committees, boards, commissions, or authorities for additional study. In some cases, items may be postponed to a later date or removed from the agenda entirely."

Meeting Called to Order

Statement of Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314

Roll Call

Introduction of Guests

Business Items

1. Review and approve the minutes of the June 5, 2026 meeting.

2. Discuss a change to the Committee of Performance Excellence's organizational membership.

3. Discuss and review the Inspection Process Map, including a comparison of the original process and the process changes presented by Community Enrichment at a previous City Council meeting.

4. Discuss the status of ongoing committee projects:

    E-signing of contracts

    Staff review of Norman metrics and internal metrics comparison.

    Peer City Review After-Action Discussion

5. Discuss the process for warehousing digital process maps and future work.

6. Consider developing a review of standing committees, including justification logic for potential elimination or consolidation to reduce staff support

requirements.

7. Discuss alternative approaches to identifying, cataloging, and codifying ratepayer-funded services provided under agreements with external entities.

Future Meeting Topics

Continued discussion regarding Council Policy 04-08 and potential expansion of applicability to the capital improvements program, trusts, authorities, and other entities.

Adjournment

The City of Lawton encourages participation from all of its citizens. If participation at any public meeting is not possible due to a disability, notification to the City Clerk at (580) 581-3305 at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting is encouraged to make the necessary accommodations. The City may waive the 48 hour rule if interpreters for the deaf (signing) is not the necessary accommodation."

Item Title:
Review and approve the minutes of the June 5, 2026 meeting.

Initiator: Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Information Source: Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Background:
The minutes of the June 5, 2026 meeting have been drafted and are awaiting approval.

Once approved, the minutes will be posted to the City of Lawton's website at www.lawtonok.gov.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Transparency

Exhibit:
06/05/26 Draft Minutes

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Approve the minutes of the June 5, 2026 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 06.05.26 Performance Excellence Minutes

City of Lawton

Committee on
Performance Excellence

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

Minutes

Friday, June 5, 2026 | **11:00 AM** | **Lawton City Hall City Council Conference Room**

Meeting Called to Order

"Official action can only be taken on items listed on the agenda. As a recommending body, the Committee may review and discuss agenda items, propose and enact floor amendments, and then choose to make a recommendation to the City Council or provide direction to the City Manager. The Committee may also defer items for further review, refer matters to the City Attorney, or send items to standing committees, boards, commissions, or authorities for additional study. In some cases, items may be postponed to a later date or removed from the agenda entirely."

Meeting called to order by Chairman Kirby Brown.

Statement of Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314

City Clerk Donalynn Blazek-Scherler confirmed compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25. O.S. 301-314.

Roll Call

Present:
Councilman - Ward 3 Kirby Brown
Councilman - Ward 6 Bob Weger
Councilman - Ward 2 Taron Epps
Councilman - Ward 5 Allan Hampton

Absent:

Also Present:
John Ratliff, City Manager
Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Introduction of Guests

Judy Franco, Information Technology Director, and Everett Bonine, GIS Analyst, introduced themselves.

Business Items

1. Review and accept minutes from 27 April meeting.

Motion by Bob Weger, Second by Taron Epps, to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2026. AYE: Kirby Brown, Bob Weger, Taron Epps, Allan Hampton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

2. Review compliance with Council Policy 04-08 (Maximize Taxpayer Value Strategy) during development of the Fiscal Year Ending 2027 budget; consider future performance measure improvements; and take action as deemed necessary.

Chairman Brown opened discussion by explaining that he had revisited Council Policy 04-08 several times while reflecting on the City's recent budget process. He stated he wanted the committee to evaluate whether the City had fully complied with the policy and suggested the committee consider preparing a report to the City Council documenting compliance with its provisions. Brown noted there were several portions of the policy he wanted to discuss, beginning with the requirement for real-time verification. He stated he understood staff was working toward implementation of that requirement and recalled that the committee would be receiving a demonstration of the system.

Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk, confirmed that staff was prepared to demonstrate the real-time verification system whenever the committee was ready.

Chairman Brown shifted the discussion to another provision of the policy concerning departments whose budgets exceeded peer city averages. Referring to the section requiring departments to provide written justification to the City Manager, who would then forward that information to the City Council during budget preparation, Brown stated he believed staff had done an excellent job preparing the peer city comparison analyses. However, he questioned whether the City had formally completed the final step contemplated by the policy. Specifically, he asked whether the Council had ever expressly acknowledged or accepted the departments that exceeded peer city averages, or whether he was misinterpreting the policy's intent. Brown emphasized that his concern was simply ensuring the City had fully complied with its own policy and that no housekeeping items remained outstanding.

Ratliff responded that he did not believe Brown was misinterpreting the policy but offered a different perspective on how the requirement had been satisfied. He explained that every department operating above the peer city averages presented its gap analysis during the budget process, providing the justification contemplated by the policy. Those presentations were made to both the City Manager and the City Council before the budget was adopted. Ratliff stated that, in his view, the Council's approval of the budget constituted its affirmative acceptance of those departments operating above the peer averages. He explained that each exception was discussed during budget deliberations and that adoption of the budget represented the Council's agreement that the justifications were appropriate.

Chairman Brown stated his primary concern was ensuring that the committee had not overlooked any procedural requirement. He reiterated that if the policy required additional communication with the Council, he wanted to make sure that obligation was fulfilled before considering the matter complete.

Ratliff stated he did not believe any additional action was necessary because the information required by the policy had already been presented during the budget process and accepted through the Council's approval of the budget.

Hampton asked whether department directors routinely communicate budget impacts to the City Manager throughout the year as operational decisions are made. He used Public Works as an example, explaining that Director Michael Watrous frequently discusses budget considerations when addressing requests for traffic calming measures, such as speed humps. Hampton stated he was less concerned with whether speed humps were ultimately approved and more interested in understanding whether the costs associated with conducting engineering studies, traffic analyses, and related work were tracked and communicated to the City Manager as part of departmental budget oversight.

Ratliff explained that department directors regularly discuss budget matters with him and stated he believed Watrous' comments regarding budget constraints generally related to the existing Council policy governing traffic-calming projects. He explained that the policy limits each councilmember to a specific number of traffic-calming requests each year, with any additional requests requiring the use of ward funds. Ratliff stated he believed those policy limitations were likely what Watrous was referencing when discussing budget constraints.

Hampton acknowledged Ratliff's explanation but clarified that his question focused on the cost of the work performed before a traffic-calming project is either approved or denied. He noted that engineering studies and evaluations require staff time and resources regardless of the outcome and questioned whether those cumulative costs become part of the City Manager's overall evaluation of departmental budgets. Hampton explained that he was attempting to better understand how detailed the City's internal budget oversight becomes, particularly regarding recurring operational costs that may not be immediately visible during the annual budget process.

Chairman Brown responded that he believed the discussion before the committee was intended to remain at a broader policy level concerning departments operating above peer city averages rather than focusing on individual operational expenditures. He stated the policy primarily addressed overall departmental budgets rather than the granular costs associated with individual projects or studies.

Hampton agreed with Brown's observation but explained that his questions stemmed from his experience serving on the Streets and Development Committee, where he routinely encounters discussions about traffic-calming requests and associated costs. He stated he was attempting to better understand how those types of expenditures ultimately fit into the City's larger budget management process and acknowledged that his questions may have ventured beyond the committee's immediate discussion.

Chairman Brown assured Hampton that the discussion had not gone off track but stated he wanted to return the committee's focus to the policy itself.

Chairman Brown next asked whether the City had satisfied the policy's training requirements.

Ratliff confirmed that the required training had been completed.

Chairman Brown then turned his attention to the budget document itself. Referring to another provision of the policy, he asked whether the final published budget would include an overall summary demonstrating that the preliminary budget reflected costs at or below the peer city averages. Brown stated he had not yet seen the final budget document and wanted to understand how staff intended to present that information.

Ratliff explained that the peer city comparison information would be incorporated directly into each department's section of the budget book rather than included as a separate appendix. He stated readers would be able to review each department's budget alongside its peer comparison, gap analysis, and supporting information without having to reference another section of the document.

Chairman Brown stated that approach answered his question but asked whether staff had considered providing an aggregate summary showing the City's overall performance against the peer city averages.

Ratliff responded that staff had not specifically discussed preparing an overall summary. He stated Brown's question was the first time the idea had been raised and indicated staff could evaluate whether such a summary would provide additional value in future budget documents.

Chairman Brown stated he had one additional observation regarding the peer city comparison process. He suggested the City conduct an after-action review now that the first complete cycle had been finished. Brown explained that after reviewing the comparison charts, he calculated that approximately one-third of the City's departments operated above the peer city averages while roughly two-thirds operated below them. He stated that information alone was a valuable finding, but questioned whether staff had collected more information than was ultimately necessary. Brown explained that the City had invested a significant amount of time assembling the comparisons and suggested evaluating which data elements actually contributed to decision-making and which could be eliminated in future years. He stated the goal should be to reach the same conclusions while reducing the amount of work required from staff.

Ratliff agreed that the City should evaluate the process before beginning another comparison cycle. He stated he was not yet prepared to determine which information should be retained or eliminated because he wanted to discuss the issue with the Finance Director and Deputy City Manager. Ratliff explained that some of the comparison categories had already raised questions. For example, he noted several departments exceeded the peer city average in the number of employees while remaining below the peer average in salary expenditures. He stated that example demonstrated that some benchmarks, such as employee counts alone, may not accurately reflect departmental efficiency or performance. Ratliff indicated he wanted additional time to evaluate which measures provided meaningful information before making changes to the process.

Chairman Brown stated that was exactly the type of discussion he hoped the committee would have. He reiterated that the City's objective should be to identify the information that truly contributes to decision-making while eliminating data that adds work without improving the quality of the analysis. Brown emphasized that he was not suggesting the City abandon the peer comparison process, but rather refine it now that staff had completed the first full cycle.

Ratliff agreed and stated the discussion would help determine which performance measures actually provide value.

Chairman Brown then suggested adjusting the annual schedule for preparing the peer city comparisons. He stated the information is based primarily on historical data and believed the comparisons could be completed in January or February rather than during budget preparation. Brown explained that completing the work earlier in the year would allow staff to focus on developing the budget while still having the comparison information readily available when needed.

Hampton stated he had fallen slightly behind in the discussion and asked for clarification regarding Ratliff's earlier comment that the peer comparison information would be "embedded." Hampton questioned whether Ratliff meant the information could eventually be embedded into a database or automated spreadsheet so recurring information would not have to be recreated manually each year. He acknowledged that peer city comparisons are not always "apples to apples," describing them instead as "apples to bananas" in some instances, but suggested there may be portions of the benchmarking process that remain consistent from year to year. Hampton asked whether those recurring data elements could eventually be linked through spreadsheets or databases so staff could update information once and allow formulas to perform much of the repetitive calculations rather than manually recreating the comparisons each budget cycle.

Ratliff clarified that when he previously used the term "embedded," he was referring to the information being incorporated into the budget book itself, both in the printed and digital versions, rather than being embedded into a database. Ratliff added that none of the City's peer communities include the level of comparative information Lawton is providing, and he was not aware of any municipality in Oklahoma that had produced a budget document with this degree of detail. Drawing on conversations with city managers across the state, Ratliff stated he believed Lawton's budget was the most transparent budget document in Oklahoma. He acknowledged, however, that the City may be approaching a point of diminishing returns by including such an extensive amount of information. Ratliff stated the current budget would serve as a valuable test case because once it was published, the City would receive feedback from both elected officials and citizens regarding whether the information was useful or excessive. He noted he had recently signed the introductory letter for the budget book, which alone totaled nineteen pages, illustrating the comprehensive nature of the document.

Chairman Brown stated Ratliff's comments reinforced his own observations. He explained that he was not questioning the value of transparency, but rather whether the City had reached a point where additional information no longer provided additional value. Brown stated he believed the after-action review he previously suggested would help determine whether the City could simplify future peer comparisons while maintaining the same level of accountability and transparency.

Hampton agreed with Brown's assessment and stated the current Mayor, City Council, and City Manager had demonstrated innovation in numerous areas beyond the budget process. He suggested the extensive information included in the budget may reflect the City's effort to address shortcomings from previous administrations by providing a higher level of transparency. Hampton stated he understood how labor-intensive the peer city comparisons had been and appreciated the amount of work required to prepare them. He added that if the City could continue improving the process through innovation, such as using spreadsheets or databases to automate recurring calculations, it would benefit staff while preserving transparency.

Ratliff responded that he did not believe the peer city comparison process could realistically be automated to the extent Hampton suggested because staff must sift through significant amounts of information and manually determine appropriate comparisons between jurisdictions. He explained there were simply too many differences in organizational structures and reporting methods among peer cities to create a fully automated process.

Hampton acknowledged Ratliff's explanation and stated his comments were simply intended as a suggestion for future innovation. He explained that because someone in his household works extensively with databases, he naturally considered whether technology could reduce repetitive work. Hampton stated he realized the process may never become fully automated but believed it was worth considering whether some efficiencies could eventually be achieved.

Using the City Clerk's Office as an example, Blazek-Scherler stated each departmental section would include the department's budget, gap analysis, peer city comparison, and performance metrics, allowing readers to understand both the financial and operational performance of every department in one location.

Hampton responded that he recognized the budget contained a tremendous amount of information and appreciated the significant effort staff invested in preparing it. He reiterated that his comments were intended only as questions about future improvements.

Chairman Brown concluded that portion of the discussion by stating the committee had sufficiently discussed compliance with Council Policy 04-08.

Blazek-Scherler stated the demonstration of the metrics heat map fit within the current discussion because it addressed the policy's real-time verification component.

Chairman Brown stated the dashboard had been developed internally by City staff.

Judy Franco, Information Technology Director, recognized GIS Analyst Everett Bonine as the individual primarily responsible for its development before beginning the demonstration.

Using the Human Resources Department as an example, Bonine explained the dashboard would allow users to select individual departments and view each department's mission statement, goals, and performance measures. He demonstrated how department performance would be displayed graphically and emphasized that the data shown during the presentation was fictitious and intended only to illustrate how the system would function. Bonine then selected Animal Welfare to demonstrate how department heads would enter updated performance information. Using a sample goal of increasing live animal release rates by five percent, he entered additional data and showed how the dashboard automatically updated the graph and displayed an indicator showing the department was performing above its established goal. Bonine explained the dashboard had been designed to display each department's progress toward its established performance measures over time.

Chairman Brown asked whether the graph displayed during the demonstration was based entirely on sample data. After Bonine confirmed that it was, Brown stated the graph appeared to function as a modified S-curve that would allow users to monitor departmental objectives and performance measurements over time. Brown stated he believed the graphical format would provide an effective way to measure progress once actual departmental data was entered into the system.

Bonine confirmed that department heads would be responsible for entering and updating their departments' performance information through the dashboard.

Bonine explained that the dashboard was intended to provide public access to departmental performance information.

Chairman Brown questioned that approach, noting Council Policy 04-08 specifically references providing the information to the City Council rather than making it available for public viewing. He stated the policy appeared to contemplate the dashboard serving as a management and oversight tool for the Council rather than a public-facing application. Brown acknowledged the City could later amend the policy if it chose to expand public access but recommended limiting the dashboard to the Council and the Committee on Performance Excellence until the system had been fully developed and implemented.

Chairman Brown stated the dashboard represented only one portion of the committee's broader performance measurement efforts. He explained the committee was simultaneously working through two separate initiatives: the peer city comparison process and the development of meaningful performance measures. Brown stated the peer city comparison answered one aspect of Council Policy 04-08, while the dashboard would ultimately be populated with critical performance measures that may or may not originate from the peer city comparisons. Using examples such as monthly residential trash collection and the number of water meters installed each week, Brown explained the committee still needed to determine which operational measures most accurately reflected departmental performance. He stated the dashboard would become significantly more valuable once the committee identified those critical measures because it would allow performance to be monitored continuously rather than only during the annual budget process.

Chairman Brown complimented the overall layout of the dashboard and stated he particularly liked the graphical presentation and color-coded indicators. He recommended adjusting the graph so it reflected a true S-curve and stated he believed each department should ultimately be assigned one or more critical performance measures that could be monitored over time. Brown also observed that the dashboard appeared to include an overall summary percentage and commented that the existing layout might eliminate the need for an additional aggregate measure because the left side of the dashboard already provided an overall departmental overview. He emphasized that his comments were intended as suggestions and not criticism of the work completed by staff.

Bonine acknowledged Brown's comments and stated the suggestions could be incorporated as the dashboard continued to evolve.

Chairman Brown asked Ratliff for his thoughts on the dashboard demonstration.

Ratliff stated that, from his perspective as City Manager, the dashboard should ultimately provide the City Council with two key pieces of information for each department: how the department was performing against its adopted budget and how it was performing against its established performance measures.

Chairman Brown explained that the budget represented one measure of accountability, while performance metrics represented another. He stated that although the committee had discussed the need for meaningful metrics, the City had not yet fully determined which measures should be tracked, where those measures would originate, or how they should be developed. He emphasized that those decisions still needed to be made.

Ratliff responded that those standards are established through the companion performance measurement policy, which adopted the City of Norman's metrics as the baseline. Ratliff explained that staff had already completed a significant amount of work developing their own departmental performance measures before that policy was adopted. He stated that approximately a year earlier, he directed each department director to develop three to five performance measures that reflected the core responsibilities of their department. Ratliff explained that department directors invested considerable time identifying meaningful measures, meeting with him to review them, making revisions, and refining them into performance indicators that staff believed accurately measured departmental effectiveness. Before those measures had even been evaluated through a complete budget cycle, however, the Council adopted the requirement that departments also implement the City of Norman's metrics. Ratliff stated that, because of the policy, he instructed department directors to retain the performance measures they had already developed while also incorporating the Norman metrics as the minimum required standard.

Epps asked how the City's original performance measures compared with the metrics adopted from the City of Norman.

Ratliff responded that, in many cases, the City's original measures were significantly better indicators of departmental performance. He explained that many of Norman's metrics simply measured activity rather than effectiveness. As an example, Ratliff stated that tracking the number of animals received by Animal Welfare during a year did not necessarily measure how efficiently or effectively the department operated because animal intake is influenced by factors outside the department's control, including population changes and residents abandoning animals. He stated that while such a measure recorded activity, it did not demonstrate whether the department was accomplishing its mission. Ratliff added that staff found many of the Norman metrics suffered from the same shortcoming because they measured outputs without measuring organizational effectiveness.

Chairman Brown agreed with Ratliff's assessment and stated he also believed many of the Norman metrics failed to measure effectiveness.

Ratliff reiterated that despite those concerns, the Council policy established the Norman metrics as the minimum standard. Consequently, he directed department directors to include them while also maintaining the measures they had already developed because he believed the City's internally developed metrics continued to provide more meaningful information.

Chairman Brown observed that if the committee concluded the Norman metrics were ineffective, the Council had the authority to amend the policy. He stated he would have no objection to recommending changes to the policy. He explained that after reviewing Norman's budget document in detail, he concluded many of its metrics were largely "for show" rather than practical management tools. Chairman Brown stated he had also reviewed the performance measures Lawton's departments developed the previous year and believed they were substantially stronger than the Norman metrics. Chairman Brown stated that was precisely why he believed the committee should move forward with identifying and codifying a meaningful set of critical performance measures that could populate the dashboard demonstrated earlier. He explained that once those measures were identified, they could be formally presented to the City Council as the standards the City would use to evaluate departmental performance. Brown stated the dashboard should allow those measures to be monitored continuously over time rather than simply reviewed during the annual budget process.

At that point, Ratliff expressed concern about the pace at which the committee was proposing additional changes. Addressing Brown directly, he stated that while he understood the committee's mandate and appreciated its commitment to improving organizational performance, he believed the City needed to "ease off the gas a little bit." Ratliff explained that staff had only recently completed the extensive process of developing departmental performance measures. He described that effort as neither simple nor painless, explaining that department directors spent considerable time identifying potential metrics, meeting with him to review them, making revisions, and refining them until they reflected meaningful indicators of departmental performance. Before staff had an opportunity to evaluate those measures through even one complete budget cycle, they were directed to begin using an entirely different set of metrics based on the City of Norman's model.

Ratliff stated the continual changes had become more than a performance management issue. He explained they were now affecting employee morale because staff had invested significant effort developing one system only to be told almost immediately to replace it with another. He stated that continually changing direction undermined the confidence employees had in the work they had already completed. Ratliff remarked that "it's like dogpiling at this point," adding that the process had become "suffocating" and was making it increasingly difficult for departments to simply perform their work. He asked the committee to allow departments to use the existing metrics for at least one full year before considering additional changes so staff could evaluate whether the measures were effective and gather meaningful data before the system was revised again.

Epps asked how far staff had progressed toward implementing the Norman metrics and whether departments had already begun transitioning to the new system.

Ratliff replied that implementation would begin on July 1 because that was the effective date established by Council policy.

Epps explained that he was only asking questions and was not advocating for a particular course of action. He asked Ratliff how staff morale would be affected if the committee eventually recommended returning to the City's original performance measures after comparing them with the Norman metrics.

Ratliff stated he believed such a decision would send an important message to employees. He explained that it would communicate that the City valued the work staff had already completed and recognized the effort department directors invested in developing meaningful measures. Ratliff stated employees would see that the organization trusted their judgment and believed the original performance measures were legitimate indicators of departmental efficiency. At the same time, he reiterated that he believed staff first needed the opportunity to work with both systems long enough to determine objectively which measures produced the most useful information before making another significant policy change.

Epps asked Chairman Brown whether he believed the City's previously developed performance measures were already better than the City of Norman's metrics, which he described as "fluffy."

Chairman Brown replied that, in his opinion, the City's original performance measures were better. He stated that if the committee agreed with that conclusion, it appeared the issue could be resolved by amending the companion Council policy. Brown explained that because the requirement to use the Norman metrics was contained in a separate policy, the committee could recommend that the City Council eliminate the Norman metrics and allow departments to return to using the performance measures they had previously established. Brown stated he believed doing so would improve efficiency by allowing departments to focus on measures that actually reflected organizational performance rather than measures he considered superficial. He clarified that while effectiveness was also important, he believed improving efficiency was the first step.

Hampton responded that while the committee was discussing efficiency, he believed it was equally important to recognize the practical improvements the City had already achieved through the committee's work. He recalled that before the current administration, the City had struggled with completing audits, maintaining financial accountability, and balancing the budget.

Ratliff stated that the peer city comparison process had been extremely valuable because it allowed the organization to evaluate itself objectively through measurable data rather than relying on perceptions. Referring to Chairman Brown's frequent statement that an organization cannot improve until it can first "see itself," Ratliff stated the peer comparison process had accomplished exactly that. It allowed departments to objectively identify strengths and weaknesses instead of relying on assumptions about how well a department was performing.

Ratliff explained that while staff found the peer comparison process extremely beneficial, it had become difficult to sustain momentum because each time departments reached a point where they could analyze the information, evaluate themselves, and begin implementing improvements, another significant initiative or policy change was introduced. He stated it was difficult to fully describe the impact, but the continual addition of new requirements made it challenging for departments to gain traction and focus on improving performance because they were constantly adjusting to another new expectation.

Chairman Brown stated that the meeting needed to move on.

Hampton responded that he needed to finish his discussion with Ratliff before the committee moved to another topic.

Chairman Brown stated that if the discussion did not move forward, he was going to cancel the remainder of the meeting.

Hampton replied that he would "shut up."

Chairman Brown stated he had heard enough on the subject and believed the committee had been more than rational and reasonable in its discussion. Chairman Brown stated he was willing to entertain a motion recommending that the City Council authorize the City Manager to substitute the City of Lawton's previously established performance measures for the City of Norman metrics.

Ratliff stated he would appreciate that recommendation. He explained that it would send a positive message to City staff by demonstrating that the work they had already invested in developing performance measures was valued.

Chairman Brown then apologized to Hampton for being harsh during the discussion.

Hampton accepted the apology and stated there were no hard feelings. He remarked that he would deal with his own issue later and acknowledged Brown's role as chairman in keeping the meeting moving.

Epps stated that before the committee made a recommendation to the City Council, he wanted to make sure the recommendation made sense. He explained that rather than immediately recommending the elimination of the Norman metrics, he wondered if it would be more appropriate to ask the City Manager to bring both the City of Norman metrics and the City's existing performance measures back to the committee for review. Epps stated that after comparing the two sets of metrics, the committee could then develop a recommendation to present to the City Council based on its own evaluation.

Ratliff asked whether Epps was referring to bringing both sets of metrics to the committee's next meeting.

Epps confirmed that was his intent.

Chairman Brown noted that the next committee meeting would not happen until July, which means the committee's recommendation would have no effect on the 1 July start date.

Ratliff stated staff could easily do that. He explained that bringing the comparison back to the committee in July would not interfere with implementation of the Norman metrics because departments would still begin tracking those measures on July 1 as required by Council policy. Ratliff stated that, in the interim, departments would continue tracking both the Norman metrics and the City's existing performance measures. He acknowledged that maintaining both systems would require additional work but stated staff would manage the temporary overlap.

Hampton asked whether part of the morale issue Ratliff had described stemmed from the fact that department directors recognized many of the Norman metrics were "fluffy" and did not actually measure meaningful performance.

Ratliff agreed that was part of the issue. He explained that staff understood many of the Norman metrics failed to measure effectiveness. As an example, he stated one Human Resources metric simply measured the number of community engagement events conducted during the year. While that information could certainly be counted, Ratliff questioned whether it actually measured how effectively the department was performing its responsibilities. He stated employees recognized that many of the Norman metrics did not provide meaningful performance information, which contributed to the frustration staff experienced when they were required to adopt them.

Epps asked whether waiting until the July committee meeting to compare the two sets of metrics before making a recommendation to the City Council would create any problems for staff.

Ratliff replied that he believed staff would be fine with that approach.

Epps stated he respected Ratliff's experience and wanted to rely on his judgment.

Hampton observed that Ratliff had expressed concerns that the committee was moving too quickly and that the effect on employee morale was something the City Manager had to manage on a daily basis. Hampton stated he was concerned that declining morale could ultimately affect organizational efficiency.

Epps stated he believed it made sense for the committee to review both sets of metrics first so it could present a stronger and more informed recommendation to the City Council. Epps added that he could support either approach but leaned toward reviewing the information before taking formal action.

Ratliff stated he supported bringing the metrics back to the committee for review first.

Epps explained that after the committee reviewed both sets of metrics, it could then determine what recommendations it wanted to codify and present to the City Council.

Hampton stated he had one final question. He asked Ratliff whether the City's existing performance measures had been developed using a format similar to the City of Norman's metrics or whether the City's departments had taken a different approach when creating their measures.

Ratliff explained that when departments originally developed their performance measures, his guidance was for each department to establish three to five metrics that captured the core functions of that department. He stated the objective was to identify a small number of meaningful measures that reflected the department's primary responsibilities rather than attempting to measure every task it performed.

Ratliff contrasted that approach with the City of Norman's metrics, stating Norman's measures lacked consistency from department to department. He explained that some of Norman's larger departments, including Public Works, had only one or two performance measures despite consisting of numerous divisions. By comparison, Lawton's departments developed metrics for each division that more accurately reflected the work being performed. Ratliff agreed with Chairman Brown's earlier observation that many of the Norman metrics appeared to have been created for inclusion in the budget book rather than to serve as meaningful management tools. He stated that while the Norman metrics looked good on paper, many of them did not provide useful information for evaluating organizational effectiveness.

Chairman Brown agreed with Ratliff's assessment.

Hampton stated the Norman metrics would not produce greater efficiency because they failed to establish meaningful standards.

Hampton asked whether both sets of metrics could eventually be incorporated into the performance dashboard so they could be compared side-by-side. He explained that displaying both the Norman metrics and the City's original performance measures would allow the committee to evaluate which measures actually established meaningful standards and which simply reported activity.

Chairman Brown stated Hampton had raised a good point because the committee's goal was to establish standards that measured effectiveness. Brown explained that, after reviewing all of the City of Norman's metrics, he concluded they failed to establish meaningful standards. He stated he had raised those concerns several months earlier because he believed the Norman metrics offered no value to the City of Lawton. Brown commented that, in his opinion, many of Norman's metrics were "garbage" because they did not measure effectiveness and would not help improve City operations. Chairman Brown stated the compromise is to give the City Manager the ability to pick his old metrics or Norman's metrics as appropriate. He stated that the policy does not require the committee to have Council approval to do that.

Hampton stated he would not object to that approach but would like the committee to review the City Manager's selected metrics before any recommendation was made to the City Council.

Chairman Brown agreed.

Hampton returned to his earlier suggestion of using the performance dashboard to compare the City of Norman's metrics alongside the City of Lawton's metrics. He stated that displaying both sets of metrics side-by-side would allow the committee, and ultimately the City Council, to clearly see the differences between them and better understand why he believed many of Norman's metrics were "fluffy."

Weger observed that Norman's metrics appeared to be based on a community with a population and income base approximately 30,000 to 40,000 residents larger than Lawton. He questioned how those differences affected the applicability of Norman's metrics to the City of Lawton.

Chairman Brown stated Weger was "on a good track" but explained that, unlike Lawton's peer city comparison process, Norman's performance metrics did not account for those differences through per capita or similar comparative measures. Brown stated that was one of his concerns with Norman's metrics, as they failed to provide the type of objective comparisons the City of Lawton had developed through the peer city analysis.

Chairman Brown stated that many of the Norman metrics were simply task lists rather than performance measures. As an example, he noted that one of Norman's legal department metrics was to "develop a tracking system".

Ratliff noted that a police department metric measured the number of traffic citations issued during the year. Ratliff questioned what either metric actually demonstrated about departmental performance. He stated that counting the number of citations issued did not indicate whether the department was operating effectively or achieving positive outcomes for the community.

Chairman Brown reiterated that, in his opinion, the Norman metrics appeared to have been developed simply to satisfy a requirement that departments have performance measures rather than to provide meaningful management information.

Chairman Brown offered to entertain a motion to make a recommendation to Council to allow the City Manager to develop a set of metrics. He stated Ratliff could use some Lawton metrics and some Norman metrics if he finds any good ones. He believes a set of three to five metrics would be a good start.

Epps stated that the discussion had caused him to rethink the recommendation he had been prepared to make. He explained that he initially favored bringing the City's previously established metrics directly before the City Council but, after listening to the discussion, believed it was important that the committee first ensure it was presenting the strongest possible recommendation. Epps stated he understood the committee could either move quickly or take additional time to review the information, and he was beginning to lean toward allowing the committee to review the metrics before making a recommendation to the Council.

Ratliff asked if he could make a suggestion. He stated he appreciated what the committee was trying to accomplish but cautioned against making additional changes that could further complicate the process. Ratliff recommended leaving the current system in place for the time being, with departments continuing to track both the required Norman metrics and the City's previously established performance measures. He explained that after completing a full year of data collection, staff could return during the next budget cycle with both sets of metrics, identify which measures proved to be meaningful indicators of effectiveness and which did not, and make recommendations based on actual experience rather than opinion. Ratliff stated that approach would allow the committee to demonstrate why certain metrics were more effective than others and would also address concerns that the Norman metrics had not been given a fair opportunity to be evaluated.

Weger asked if that approach would essentially expose whether the Norman metrics were "fluffy" after they had been measured for a full year.

Ratliff replied that it would. He explained that allowing both sets of metrics to operate simultaneously would provide objective information showing which measures actually demonstrated effectiveness and which did not.

Weger asked how much additional work that approach would require from staff.

Chairman Brown noted that this was the opposite of what Ratliff had initially requested.

Ratliff acknowledged that his request was changing based on the discussion of the committee.

Chairman Brown stated that, based on the discussion, he would not entertain a motion at that time. He remarked that the committee would "kick the can down the road" and allow the current process to continue. Brown added that it remained within the City Manager's discretion to continue developing and refining the City's performance measures while the committee gathered additional information.

Hampton stated he agreed with delaying formal action but expressed concern that the committee should not simply postpone the issue without establishing a clear objective. He stated he believed the committee should identify what it ultimately wanted the City's performance measurement system to accomplish so that, when staff returned with the information, the committee would have a framework for evaluating the results rather than beginning the discussion from scratch.

Chairman Brown agreed that the committee needed to continue working toward that goal. He stated the committee would schedule the item for a future meeting and review the consolidated list of performance measures after staff had additional time to develop and evaluate them.

Hampton stated he was not suggesting that staff complete all of the work before the next meeting or create additional work unnecessarily. Rather, he asked whether staff could begin developing a general framework showing the direction they believed the City's performance measures should take so the committee would have a basis for discussion.

Ratliff asked whether Hampton was referring to projecting future performance trends based on the data collected.

Hampton replied that he was not certain he was describing it correctly but clarified that he was simply looking for a general concept of where the City's performance measurement system was headed rather than fully developed metrics.

Chairman Brown stated he believed it would be best to leave the process as previously discussed. He asked Ratliff to continue developing the consolidated list of both the Norman metrics and the City's existing performance measures and stated the committee would review that information in September. Brown explained that approximately 90 days would give staff sufficient time to assemble the information without requiring every metric to be fully developed before the committee's review.

Hampton stated, for the record, that he believed the earlier exchange between himself and Chairman Brown was simply a normal disagreement that occurred during discussion. He added that Chairman Brown had significantly more experience in this area than he did and stated he respected Brown's leadership as chairman.

Chairman Brown accepted and stated the committee's decision would be to place the item on the September agenda.

Blazek-Scherler acknowledged the direction and confirmed that the item would be placed on the committee's September agenda.

3. Discuss potential revisions to Council Policy 04-08 (Maximize Taxpayer Value Strategy) following the first iteration of implementation and take action as deemed necessary.

Ratliff noted that the proposed policy applied only to operational expenditures and questioned why the same level of review was not being applied to other significant areas of City government, including the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), the City's authorities, boards, and committees that exercise decision-making authority. Ratliff stated that he was not asking the committee to answer the question that day but encouraged members to consider whether the policy should continue to focus solely on operational functions. He commented that limiting the policy in that manner would not provide a complete snapshot of the City's overall operations and would omit significant areas of government activity from the peer city comparison and performance measurement process.

Ratliff also suggested that the committee consider revising the frequency of the peer city comparisons. He stated that conducting a full Peer 6 comparison every year was likely excessive because the underlying data would not change significantly from year to year. Ratliff suggested performing the comparison every third year while using the intervening years to evaluate and refine the City's internal performance metrics. He acknowledged that the committee could evaluate the results after the next comparison to determine whether less frequent reviews would be appropriate. Ratliff further commented that much of the policy had been generated using artificial intelligence and questioned whether it had received the level of rigor and scrutiny necessary before implementation.

Hampton asked whether Ratliff's point was that the data itself was unlikely to change enough each year to justify an annual comparison.

Ratliff replied that he believed the data would remain relatively consistent from year to year and that repeatedly evaluating largely unchanged information would continue producing the same conclusions.

Chairman Brown stated that the committee's original objective had been to demonstrate to the public that the City operated efficiently. He explained that his intent was to focus the discussion on identifying meaningful changes to the policy before it returned to the City Council. Brown stated that one possible approach would be to restructure the comparison process by identifying only the most critical comparison elements rather than attempting to evaluate every available measure. He observed that the current process included numerous comparison methods and data points and suggested reducing the process to the most significant indicators. Brown stated that doing so would make the annual review less time-intensive while still allowing the committee to answer the question of how effectively and efficiently Lawton compared with other cities.

Brown added that staff should work together to identify those critical elements because staff had originally developed the comparison measures. He stated that after the process had been streamlined, the committee would be in a better position to make an informed recommendation to the City Council. Brown also stated that Ratliff's comments regarding the Capital Improvements Program, authorities, boards, and committees raised issues that deserved additional consideration.

Hampton stated that Ratliff's perspective was especially valuable because he was responsible for implementing the process throughout the organization. Hampton observed that employee morale directly affected efficiency and stated that if employees became discouraged by continually changing expectations, the quality of the information produced could also suffer.

Ratliff responded that staff would ultimately carry out whatever direction was given but reiterated that the committee should remain mindful of employee morale. He stated that one of the challenges was that staff continually found themselves adjusting to changing expectations rather than being allowed to evaluate established processes.

Hampton acknowledged Ratliff's concerns but remarked that during his eight-year tenure, the City had made significant progress. Hampton stated that, compared to where the City had been when the process first began, Lawton had improved substantially and, in some respects, appeared to be approaching or surpassing the standards established by the City of Norman.

Weger then addressed Ratliff's suggestion regarding conducting the peer comparison every three years. Weger asked how extending the comparison cycle might affect the City's budget process, particularly when the City Council considered annual funding requests for authorities and other organizations. Weger questioned whether using a three-year comparison cycle might create challenges when evaluating annual funding decisions.

Ratliff responded that the primary risk of moving to a three-year cycle would be relying on older data when making comparisons. However, he reiterated that he was not convinced the data would change enough from year to year to justify the amount of work required for an annual comparison. Ratliff emphasized that this represented only his opinion and acknowledged that he did not have data available to support that conclusion.

Hampton stated that one possible solution would be maintaining an ongoing spreadsheet or other tracking mechanism between formal comparison years. He explained that such a tool could allow the committee to monitor general trends and determine whether the City continued moving in the right direction without requiring a complete peer comparison every year.

Chairman Brown responded that the committee did not yet have enough information to determine whether changing the comparison schedule would be appropriate. Brown stated that he believed the best course of action was for staff to review the existing comparison process, identify the most critical performance measures, and report back with recommendations based on what had been learned from the first year of implementation. Brown stated that after gaining experience with the process, the committee could "right-size" the comparison so it could be completed annually as part of the regular budget process without creating unnecessary work.

Hampton agreed that Chairman Brown's experience would be helpful.

4. Review and discuss process mapping of the contract approval and signature process and take action as deemed necessary.

Chairman Brown asked the committee to review the process map that had been prepared. He explained that process mapping would become a monthly occurrence and that the long-term goal was to develop a standardized format for documenting City processes. Brown stated that future discussions would address matters such as where the process maps would be stored and how they would be used. He emphasized that the committee was beginning with a small step and commented that, although the first process map might not be perfect, he believed it was an excellent start.

City Clerk Donalynn Blazek-Scherler thanked Chairman Brown for the positive feedback.

Chairman Brown stated that the current example represented the most straightforward way to begin process mapping.

Chairman Brown explained that Blazek-Scherler had not only mapped the existing process but had also identified and developed an improved process. He stated that, ideally, the original process and revised process would be presented side by side, so the differences could be clearly evaluated. Brown clarified that his comments were not intended as criticism of the work completed. He explained that the revised process demonstrated an improvement that could be implemented administratively by staff without requiring City Council approval. Brown stated that the revised process streamlined a manually performed procedure and represented the type of process improvement the committee hoped to encourage throughout the organization.

Blazek-Scherler stated that she appreciated the opportunity to complete the project because the existing process had been broken. She explained that mapping the entire process highlighted all of the areas in which problems existed, including issues she had not previously recognized.

Chairman Brown agreed and asked whether the committee needed to take any action to authorize implementation of the revised process.

Blazek-Scherler responded that formal committee action was not necessary.

A committee member asked what program or tools had been used to create the process map.

Blazek-Scherler stated that she used PowerPoint, artificial intelligence, and a combination of other tools.

The committee complimented the appearance and quality of the completed process map. Chairman Brown described the work as excellent and encouraged Blazek-Scherler to implement the revised process if she was able to do so.

Blazek-Scherler confirmed that she would proceed with implementation.

Chairman Brown explained that the broader purpose of the initiative was to establish process mapping as a regular practice throughout the organization, eventually extending it to department directors, supervisors, and other employees. He stated that when employees encountered inefficient or problematic procedures, they should map the process so they could visually identify each step and determine where delays or breakdowns occurred.

Chairman Brown provided an example in which a document might remain on his desk for a week while he was unavailable. He explained that a process map would make that delay visible and allow staff to consider alternatives, such as completing the work remotely, bypassing an unnecessary step, or otherwise modifying the procedure so work could continue.

5. Discuss future process mapping review of the inspection/permitting process and take action as deemed necessary.

Chairman Brown advised Ratliff that he had already spoken with Larry Parks, Community Enrichment Director, regarding the process map to be presented at the next meeting. Brown stated that Mr. Parks had discussed an improved inspection process during a City Council meeting and that the committee would like to review a process map documenting that improvement. He indicated that Mr. Parks could use the same format presented by Blazek-Scherler or develop an alternative format.

Ratliff acknowledged that Chairman Brown had provided Mr. Parks advance notice of the request.

Chairman Brown stated that he wanted the inspection process map placed on the following month's agenda.

Chairman Brown then asked whether any committee members had read an article published in the Lawton Constitution the previous day. He explained that the article discussed the E911 group's use of the City's peer city analysis. Brown stated that the group had used the completed peer city comparison sheet as part of its analysis and complimented Mr. Ray for effectively explaining the information during the interview.

Chairman Brown encouraged committee members who had not read the article to do so. He stated that the E911 example demonstrated a practical use for the peer city comparison sheets and reflected the purpose behind the substantial work staff had invested in preparing them.

6. Discuss performance management and incorporation of Lean Methodology as a future committee topic and take action as deemed necessary.

Chairman Brown stated that funding had been included in the City Council's budget to begin implementing Lean/ Six Sigma training, process mapping, and related process-improvement initiatives. He explained that he did not yet have specific details regarding how the program would be implemented, but anticipated that the Committee on Performance Excellence would oversee and collectively guide the initiative.

Chairman Brown stated that there were several possible approaches to obtaining the training. He explained that he had sent an unsolicited proposal to the Legal Department and requested guidance regarding whether the services could be obtained through a professional services agreement or whether a formal solicitation or request process would be required. Chairman Brown stated that he had not yet received an answer but confirmed that a specific budget line had been established to fund the initiative.

Chairman Brown asked the committee members to begin considering the matter and stated that it would be placed on the draft agenda for the next meeting.

Ratliff asked what the initiative was expected to look like.

Chairman Brown responded that he did not yet know. He stated that he had reviewed a proposal but was still determining how the program should be structured.

Ratliff asked whether Brown knew which employees or groups would be involved.

Chairman Brown stated that he did not yet have a definitive answer. He explained that he knew who was interested in providing the training and how that individual proposed to conduct it, but believed the program could be adapted to meet the City's needs. Brown remarked that he could personally provide the training but did not believe that would be the best decision.

Chairman Brown clarified that no action was required on the item. He stated that he only wanted the committee to be aware that the initiative would be brought forward at a future meeting. He explained that the committee's work to finalize the performance metrics and Peer 6 comparison process was connected to the broader process-improvement initiative. Brown stated that the committee would need to integrate the various efforts while remaining mindful of both employee morale and staff capacity.

Chairman Brown acknowledged that implementing the program would require a delicate balance. He stated that he strongly believed in process-improvement practices and recognized that several people involved had prior experience. However, he also emphasized that the City employed many capable individuals who could identify and implement meaningful process improvements.

Ratliff agreed.

Brown concluded his comments and asked Councilman Hampton whether he had any final remarks.

Councilman Hampton stated that he was satisfied with the discussion and believed the work was moving in the right direction. He then addressed Ratliff and expressed concern about whether staff would be able to accomplish all of the work within the proposed flow and timeline.

Ratliff responded that staff would do its best.

Hampton stated that if the workload or timeline proved unmanageable, the process might need to be changed. He suggested that Ratliff's recommendations regarding necessary adjustments would likely be appropriate.

Chairman Brown stated that staff could create a process map of the workload.

Chairman Brown then asked Epps whether he had any final comments.

Epps stated that he did not have significant objections but was concerned the City might miss an opportunity by eliminating, or considering the elimination of, the Norman metrics. He questioned whether tracking the Norman metrics for an additional year would unnecessarily consume staff time and whether continuing the process could negatively affect employee morale.

Chairman Brown responded that the concern had been discussed and that the current direction was for staff to track both the Norman metrics and the City's existing metrics. Brown stated that he was personally prepared to recommend that the City Council eliminate the Norman metrics but suggested that the committee leave the matter alone for the time being because it had already been discussed extensively. He added that the issue could be reconsidered at the next meeting.

Weger stated that he shared Epps's concerns. Weger said he was particularly concerned about the amount of staff time required to maintain both sets of metrics for an entire year. He referred to examples discussed earlier, such as counting the number of traffic citations issued, and questioned the value of requiring employees to track measures that were likely to be discarded. Weger stated that employees could reasonably question why they were being directed to spend time on work that management and the committee already believed was ineffective. He expressed concern that the unnecessary work could further affect employee morale.

Ratliff stated that he did not disagree with the concerns raised. However, he emphasized that the requirement to use the Norman metrics had been directed to him and was not an initiative he had independently developed. Ratliff explained that, based on his understanding of the individuals involved, he anticipated questions regarding whether the City had collected sufficient data or given the Norman metrics an adequate opportunity to work before eliminating them.

Ratliff stated that he was not opposed to eliminating the Norman metrics immediately but was uncertain whether such a recommendation would receive sufficient support from the City Council. He added that the committee could place the matter on an agenda and allow the discussion to occur.

Chairman Brown stated that the committee could revisit the issue at the next meeting. He suggested giving Ratliff time to speak with department directors and employees to determine their opinions before the matter returned to the committee.

Ratliff reiterated his concern that the organization was already undergoing numerous changes. He stated that reversing direction at the last moment by eliminating the Norman metrics could create additional uncertainty for employees. Ratliff said he was unsure of the best answer.

Chairman Brown told Ratliff that the committee would consider his input and emphasized that the members were attempting to support him. Brown stated that if Ratliff believed immediately removing the metrics would not be beneficial, the committee could delay action. However, Brown predicted that the committee would ultimately conclude that the Norman metrics should be eliminated.

Chairman Brown offered to send the previous year's City of Norman budget book to the committee members so they could review the metrics themselves.

Hampton stated that he would review the document and consider analyzing it through ChatGPT.

Chairman Brown commented that the Norman metrics were not particularly strong.

Blazek-Scherler apologized for raising a minor procedural issue and stated that she would email the Norman budget book to each committee member individually. She explained that she did not want the committee members discussing the document through a group email in a manner that could create a quorum issue.

Brown agreed and asked Blazek-Scherler to ensure the committee remained legally compliant.

Adjournment

The City of Lawton encourages participation from all of its citizens. If participation at any public meeting is not possible due to a disability, notification to the City Clerk at (580) 581-3305 at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting is encouraged to make the necessary accommodations. The City may waive the 48 hour rule if interpreters for the deaf (signing) is not the necessary accommodation."

Motion by Taron Epps, Second by Bob Weger, to adjourn. AYE: Kirby Brown, Bob Weger, Taron Epps, Allan Hampton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:15PM.

Item Title:
Discuss a change to the Committee of Performance Excellence's organizational membership.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
The Committee of Performance Excellence currently consists of up to four City Council members who are nominated by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Effective July 1, 2026, Councilman Allan Hampton resigned from the Committee, creating a vacancy in its membership.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Transparency

Exhibit:
None

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council as deemed necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
Discuss and review the Inspection Process Map, including a comparison of the original process and the process changes presented by Community Enrichment at a previous City Council meeting.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Larry Parks, Director

Background:
At its previous meeting, the Committee of Performance Excellence selected the inspection process as a process to be evaluated through process mapping. Since that time, Community Enrichment presented modifications to its inspection process during a recent City Council meeting. This discussion will provide the Committee with an opportunity to review the process map, compare the original process with the revised process presented by Community Enrichment, and better understand the differences between the two workflows.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
Process Map for Inspection Review will be provided at the meeting.

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council as deemed necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
Discuss the status of ongoing committee projects:

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
The Committee will receive status updates and continue discussions on several ongoing initiatives previously identified for review. The following sub-items provide updates on each project currently under consideration by the Committee.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
N/A

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Discuss the status of ongoing committee projects.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
E-signing of contracts

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Background:
The Committee will receive an update on the implementation of electronic signatures for City contracts. Discussion may include the feasibility of automatically incorporating recurring implementation metrics into the Committee's heat map prototype and the potential application of similar automated reporting for future performance metrics.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
Contract Signature Process Map

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council as deemed necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
Staff review of Norman metrics and internal metrics comparison.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: John Ratliff, City Manager

Background:
The Committee will receive a progress update on staff's review of the City of Norman performance metrics and their comparison with the City's internal performance metrics. Discussion may include preparations for the September City Council meeting, development of a final recommended metric list, and any potential recommendations regarding amendments to Council Policy 04-08.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
None.

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council as deemed necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
Peer City Review After-Action Discussion

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: John Ratliff, City Manager

Background:
The Committee will continue its discussion of the peer city review process, including opportunities to reduce the scope of future reviews, develop a consolidated summary spreadsheet, and establish a schedule for annual updates.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
None

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council as deemed necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
Discuss the process for warehousing digital process maps and future work.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
The Committee will discuss options for maintaining a centralized digital repository for completed process maps to support future reference, evaluation, and continuous improvement efforts.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
N/A

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council.

ATTACHMENTS:
None

Item Title:
Consider developing a review of standing committees, including justification logic for potential elimination or consolidation to reduce staff support requirements.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3, Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Background:
The Committee will discuss whether to develop a review of the City's standing committees that incorporates justification logic to evaluate opportunities for eliminating or consolidating committees in order to reduce staff support requirements. The review would examine each committee's purpose, responsibilities, workload, and continued need to develop an objective framework for future recommendations. The long-term goal would be to develop a proposal for consideration by the City Council, including any recommended amendments to Council Policy 01-06. This discussion is derived from the City Clerk's peer city committee review.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
List of Current Committees

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. 2026 Annual Meeting Notice Checklist

2026 Annual Meeting Notice Checklist

Ambulance Council Committee	City Clerk – Kobe Humble	
Arts for All	Karen Villarreal {artsforalllawton@gmail.com}	
Board of Adjustment (BOA)	Planning – Jennifer Wynne	
Building Development Appeals Board	Building Division – Madison Aust	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Building Materials Review Committee	Planning – Jennifer Wynne	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
CIP Advisory Committee	City Clerk – Kobe Humble	
Citizens Advisory Committee	City Clerk – Tammy Branstetter	
Citizens Police Advisory Committee	Mary Fountain {mary3854@gmail.com}	
City Council	City Clerk – Donalynn Blazek-Scherler	
City Planning Commission (CPC)	Planning – Jennifer Wynne	
Committee of Performance Excellence	City Clerk – Donalynn Blazek-Scherler	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Downtown Lawton Architectural Review Committee	Planning – Jennifer Wynne	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Downtown Transfer Center Site Committee	City Clerk – Ashton Bailey	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Employee Advisory Committee	Human Resources – Ashley Nauni	
FISTA	Charli Hall {chall@thefista.com}	
Fire VARB	Fire – Alyssa Lydon	
Freedom Festival	Arts & Humanities – Jason Poudrier or Reagan Williams	
Friends of the Library	Library – Kristin Herr or Megan Stockton	
General Employee Injury Review Board	Human Resources – Ashley Nauni	
General Employee Safety Committee	Human Resources – Ashley Nauni	
General Employee Vehicle Accident Review Board	Human Resources – Ashley Nauni	
Health & Wellness Committee	Human Resources – Mary Sellers	
H.E.L.P. Advocacy Center CCSART	Devin Ray {ndsacoordinator@mariedetty.com}	
Highland Cemetery Board	Parks & Recreation – Dylan Dunavin	
Historical Preservation Commission	City Clerk – Tammy Branstetter	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Holiday in the Park	Candace Hammond {candace.hammond@sccl-lawton.org}	
Homeless Action Committee	City Clerk – Julia Mantzke	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Honorific Naming Committee	City Clerk – Donalynn Blazek-Scherler	**(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
International Festival Committee	Arts & Humanities – Jason Poudrier or Reagan Williams	
Investment Committee	Finance – Kaitlin Nunley or Chevonne Asenap	
Juneteenth Committee	Bishop Dunaway {john.dunaway@yahoo.com}	

Lakes & Land Commission	Lakes – Misty Roberts
Lawton Access Board	Engineering – Mike Jones
Lawton All Hazard Mitigation Plan Review	Emergency Management – Clint Langford
Lawton Arts & Humanities Committee	Arts & Humanities – Jason Poudrier or Reagan Williams
Lawton Community Theater	Kristoffer Pendegraft {director@lctok.com} or Scott Hofmann {tetinc@yahoo.com}
Lawton Economic Development Authority (LEDA)	City Clerk – Tammy Branstetter
Lawton Enhancement Trust Authority (LETA)	City Clerk – Tammy Branstetter
Lawton Fort-Sill Chamber (Executive Committee)	Jamie Southerland {jsoutherland@lawtonfortsillchamber.com}
Lawton Fort-Sill Chamber (Board of Directors)	Jamie Southerland {jsoutherland@lawtonfortsillchamber.com}
Lawton Fort-Sill Habitat for Humanity	Patty Nuewirth {habitat.lfs@sbcglobal.net}
Lawton Heritage Association	Jim Whiteley {jswhiteley@gmail.com}
Lawton Housing Authority	Linda Johnson {ljohnson@lawtonhousing.org}
Lawton Industrial Development Authority (LIDA)	City Clerk – Donalynn Blazek-Scherler **(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Lawton Metropolitan Area Air Quality Committee	Planning – Jennifer Wynne **(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Lawton Metropolitan Area Airport	Pat Hurley {pat@flylawton.org}
LMPO Transportation Policy Board	Planning – Jennifer Wynne
LMPO Transportation Technical Committee	Planning – Jennifer Wynne
Lawton Philharmonic Society	Patty Nuewirth {lawtonphil3647@sbcglobal.net}
Lawton Urban Homesteading Agency (LUHA)	City Clerk – Donalynn Blazek-Scherler **(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Lawton Urban Renewal Authority (LURA)	Planning – Jennifer Wynne
Lawton Youth Sports Trust Authority (LYSA)	City Clerk – Kobe Humble
Library Board	Library – Kristin Herr or Megan Stockton
Library of Tomorrow	City Clerk – Donalynn Blazek-Scherler **(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Mayor's Commission on the Status of Women	Wyonna Alberty {relonahouse@gmail.com}
McMahon Auditorium Authority	Arts & Humanities – Jason Poudrier or Reagan Williams
Museum of the Great Plains	Rebecca Royal {rebecca.r@discovermgp.org} or Bart McClenny {bart.m@discovermgp.org}
Parks & Recreation Commission	Parks & Recreation – Dylan Dunavin
Pension Trust Commission	City Clerk – Tammy Branstetter
Race Relations Commission	Bishop Dunaway {john.dunaway@yahoo.com}
Redistricting Committee	City Clerk's Office **(MEETS AS NEEDED)**
Streets & Development Committee	City Clerk – Ashton Bailey **(MEETS AS NEEDED)**

Waurika Lake Master Conservancy	Charlotte Knutson – {charlotte@wlmcd.net} or Dave Taylor – {dtaylor@wlmcd.net}
Youth & Family Affairs Committee (YFAC)	City Clerk – Tammy Branstetter

Item Title:
Discuss alternative approaches to identifying, cataloging, and codifying ratepayer-funded services provided under agreements with external entities.

Initiator: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Information Source: Kirby Brown, Councilman - Ward 3

Background:
The Committee will discuss alternative approaches to identifying and codifying ratepayer-funded services provided under agreements with external entities. The discussion is intended to support oversight and compliance with Ordinance No. 2026-23 governing ratepayer-funded public resources.

Correlation to the True North Statement:
Efficiency

Exhibit:
Ordinance 26-23

Key Issues:
N/A

Funding Source:
N/A

Recommended Action:
Provide direction or make a recommendation to the City Council.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Ordinance No. 26-23

ORDINANCE NO. 26-23

AN ORDINANCE CREATING DIVISION 2-5-2 AND SECTIONS 2-5-2-501 THROUGH 2-5-2-508 IN ARTICLE 2-5, CHAPTER 2, LAWTON CITY CODE, 2025, RELATING TO THE STEWARDSHIP OF RATEPAYER-FUNDED PUBLIC RESOURCES; ESTABLISHING MONETARY COMPENSATION AND FULL COST RECOVERY AS THE STANDARD FOR COVERED RESOURCES PROVIDED TO EXTERNAL ENTITIES; REQUIRING FINDINGS BY THE CITY COUNCIL PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

ORDINANCE

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAWTON, OKLAHOMA THAT:

Section 1. Division 2-5-2 is hereby created in Article 2-5, Chapter 2 of the Lawton City Code to read as follows:

Division 2-5-2 Stewardship of Ratepayer-Funded Public Resources.

Section 2. Section 2-5-2-501 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-501 Purpose.

The purpose of this Division is to promote the responsible stewardship of ratepayer-funded public resources under the authority of the City Council and to ensure that decisions involving the provision of such resources to external entities are made with consideration of the fiscal impact to the City and its residents.

Section 3. Section 2-5-2-502 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-502 Definitions.

The following words, terms, and phrases, when used in this Division, shall have the meanings ascribed to them below, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Covered Resources means landfill services, solid waste collection services, and any other ratepayer-funded public resource subject to the authority of the City Council.

Cost-of-Service Study means an analysis prepared or commissioned by the department responsible for providing the service, utilizing qualified staff or consultants, evaluating the direct and indirect costs associated with providing a particular service.

External Entity means any municipality, county, public trust, governmental entity, utility district, corporation, organization, or other person or entity that is not the City of Lawton or a beneficiary of the City of Lawton.

Ratepayer-Funded Public Resources means those public services, facilities, infrastructure, and operations supported in whole or in part through rates, fees, or charges paid by customers of the applicable service.

Section 4. Section 2-5-2-503 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-503 Monetary Compensation Required; Limited Exceptions.

Covered Resources shall be provided in exchange for monetary compensation except in limited circumstances where the City Council expressly finds that the requirements of this Division have been satisfied.

The provisions of this section shall apply to new agreements, renewals, extensions, and amendments that materially alter the rates, fees, compensation, duration, or scope of services provided.

Section 5. Section 2-5-2-504 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-504 Cost Recovery Required.

Covered Resources shall not be provided to an External Entity at rates, fees, or other compensation below the identified cost of providing the applicable Covered Resource.

No agreement involving Covered Resources and an External Entity shall be approved by the City Council unless the City Council expressly finds that the requirements of this Division have been satisfied and that the rates, fees, or other compensation to be received by the City are sufficient to recover the identified cost of providing the Covered Resource.

Section 6. Section 2-5-2-505 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-505 Fiscal Information Required.

Any agenda item seeking approval of an agreement involving Covered Resources provided to an External Entity shall include, to the extent reasonably available:

1. The identity of the External Entity;
2. A description of the Covered Resources to be provided;
3. The proposed rates, fees, or other compensation to be received by the City;
4. The proposed term of the agreement;
5. Information regarding the anticipated fiscal impact to the applicable ratepayer-funded public resource;
6. A current Cost-of-Service Study for the service involved; and
7. Any material operational considerations identified by staff.

Section 7. Section 2-5-2-506 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-506 Findings Required.

Prior to approving an agreement subject to this Division, the City Council shall make express findings that:

1. The agreement serves a lawful public purpose;
2. The City Council has received and considered the information required by Section 2-5-2-505;
3. The use of In-Kind Consideration, in lieu of monetary compensation, is justified by circumstances demonstrating that the arrangement provides a substantial benefit to the City of Lawton that could not be reasonably achieved through a traditional monetary transaction;
4. The agreement is in the best interest of the City of Lawton;
5. The estimated fair market value of the In-Kind Consideration has been reasonably documented and determined to constitute adequate consideration for the Covered Resource being provided; and
6. The agreement is not expected to materially impair the City's ability to provide the applicable Covered Resource to Lawton residents.

Such findings may be incorporated within the approving resolution, ordinance, contract approval, or meeting minutes.

Section 8. Section 2-5-2-507 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-507 Agreements Below Identified Cost-of-Service.

Where available fiscal information or a current Cost-of-Service Study indicates that the rates, fees, or other compensation proposed under an agreement are below the identified cost of providing the Covered Resource, the agenda item shall include a written explanation describing the public purpose served by the agreement and the reasons supporting approval.

Nothing in this section shall prohibit the City Council from approving such an agreement upon making the findings required by Section 2-5-2-507.

Section 9. Section 2-5-2-508 is hereby created as part of Division 2-5-2 to read as follows:

2-5-2-508 Existing Agreements and Lawton Water Authority.

Nothing in this Division shall impair the obligations of any valid contract existing on the effective date of this ordinance. Existing agreements shall remain in effect according to their terms unless otherwise amended, renewed, or terminated in accordance with applicable law.

The provisions of this Division shall not apply to utility functions governed by the Lawton Water Authority.

Section 10. Codification. Division 2-5-2 and Sections 2-5-2-503 through 2-5-2-508 shall be codified in Chapter 2, Lawton City Code, 2025.

Section 11. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, said portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

Section 12. Effective Date. The provisions of this ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after the date of passage of the ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Lawton, Oklahoma, that: **SAID ORDINANCE IS ADOPTED.**

ADOPTED and APPROVED by the Council of the City of Lawton, Oklahoma this 23rd day of June, 2026.

CITY OF LAWTON OKLAHOMA

STANLEY BOOKER, MAYOR

ATTEST:

For DONALYNN BLAZEK-SCHERLER, CITY CLERK

APPROVED as to form and legality this 23rd day of June, 2026.

JARI ASKINS, INTERIM CITY ATTORNEY

ORDINANCE NO. 2026-23

AN ORDINANCE CREATING DIVISION 2-5-2 AND SECTIONS 2-5-2-501 THROUGH 2-5-2-508 IN ARTICLE 2-5, CHAPTER 2, LAWTON CITY CODE, 2025, RELATING TO THE STEWARDSHIP OF RATEPAYER-FUNDED PUBLIC RESOURCES; ESTABLISHING MONETARY COMPENSATION AND FULL COST RECOVERY AS THE STANDARD FOR COVERED RESOURCES PROVIDED TO EXTERNAL ENTITIES; REQUIRING FINDINGS BY THE CITY COUNCIL PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BRIEF GIST

The proposed ordinance requires that covered resources provided to external entities be compensated at no less than the identified cost of service and establishes monetary compensation as the standard form of consideration. Any limited exceptions involving non-monetary consideration require express findings by the City Council.

ADOPTED and APPROVED by the City Council of Lawton, Oklahoma this 23rd day of June, 2026.

CITY OF LAWTON OKLAHOMA

STANLEY BOOKER, MAYOR

ATTEST:

For DONALYNN BLAZEK-SCHERLER, CITY CLERK

(Published in the Lawton Constitution this ___ day of __________, 2026.)