Board of Directors Meeting of the Unified Forensic Laboratory
August 27, 2025
1:30 pm - close
The meeting will be held via Teams

Members

AC Sheriff Tyler Brown (V) – Chair	**AC Sheriff Darren Weekly (V) – Vice Chair**	**Aurora Chief of Police Todd Chamberlain (V) – Secretary**	**18th Jud. District Attorney Amy Padden(V)**
Alternate Bureau Chief Mike McIntosh	**Alternate – Chief Ken McKlem**	**Alternate Dep. Chief Mark Hildebrand**	**Alternate - ADA Ryan Brackley**
Aurora -Mayor Mike Coffman, (V)	**AC Commissioner Jeff Baker, (V)**	**DC Commissioner , Kevin Van Winkle (V)**	**Lab Director Kimberly Morrow (NV)**

BOARD MEMBERS	
P	**Todd Chamberlain**, Chief, Aurora Police – ***(V)***
A	**Mark Hildebrand**, Division Chief, Aurora Police, Alternate
A	**Darren Weekly,** Sheriff, DCSO – ***Chair (V)***
P	**Jason Kennedy**, Undersheriff - Alternate for Sheriff Weekly ***(V)***
P	**Tyler Brown**, Sheriff, Arapahoe County – Vice Chair ***(V)***
P	**Ken McKlem,** Chief**,** Alternate for Sheriff Brown **(V)**
P	**Amy Padden**, DA 18th Judicial District ***(V)***
P	**ADA Ryan Brackley,** Assistant DA 18th Judicial District, Alternate ***(V)***
P	**Mike Coffman,** Mayor, City of Aurora ***(V) (Teams)***
P	**Jeff Baker,** Commissioner, Arapahoe County ***(V) (Teams)***
P	**Kevin Van Winkle,** Commissioner, Douglas County ***(V)***
P	**Kim Morrow,** UFL Director, Arapahoe County ***(NV)***
P	**Megan Pratt**, Aurora Attorney of Record for UFL ***(NV)***

P=Present A=Absent

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES
Wendy Wales, Support Specialist, UFL/APD
Tracey Montano, Deputy Director, UFL/DCSO
Celina Oropeza, Deputy Director, UFL/APD
Dan McMillan, Division Chief DCSO
Shane Williams DNA UFL/ACSO
Amanda High DNA UFL/ACSO

CheyAnne Ivis UFL/ACSO
Mary Schleicher UFL/ACSO
Stewart Travis ACSO
DA George Brauchler 23rd Judicial District
John Schneebeck APD
Olga Fujaros ACSO
Captain Terry Brown APD
Chief Ken McKlem
Commander Marc Paulino
Brian Murphy, Commander DCSO
Mary Schleicher DNA Analyst UFL
Ryan Brackley ADA 18th Judicial District
Mara Nelson APD
Dan Avery Douglas County Commissioner's Office
Jason Kennedy, Undersheriff DCSO

Call to order:

The meeting was called to order by Undersheriff Kennedy at 2:04 pm.

Roll call / Confirm Quorum: A roll call was conducted Sheriff Brown. We have a quorum.

1. **Approval of minutes from last meeting:**

A motion to approve the minutes of the last meetings 06/25/25 and 07/23/25, was presented by Chief Chamberlain, 2nd by Sheriff Brown. Motion passed.

Meeting notice:

Notice of the meeting was posted on the UFL website on Monday 08-25-25.

1. **Open ongoing items:**

- **Legal Counsel – Interview 1 – COLLINS, COLE, WINN AND ULMER**

Welcome from Undersheriff Kennedy

The members of the board introduced themselves to the firm.

The firm introduced themselves. Ashley Hernandez-Schlagel, Rebecca Zisch, Kathryn Winn

The firm has been together in some form or another for 47 years. They have served local government and special council and municipalities. Number of authorities inherited them, Bob Cole represented Fire .

Questions being asked by Chief Todd Chamberlain, APD, Undersheriff Jason Kennedy, DCSO, Sheriff Tyler Brown, ACSO. In a round robin style.

Please detail your history of representing special districts and quasi-governmental bodies similar to the UFL, specifically identify and describe a relevant IGA developed by your firm.

Kathryn: The firm has been together in some form or another for 43 – 47 years. They have only served as general counsel for local government to primarily, special districts and authorities and, also some municipalities. They would estimate around 65-70% special districts, 20% authorities and the rest municipalities. One of the partners represented South Metro Fire Rescue Authority. They are very familiar with the format of law enforcement agencies coming together, as well as bringing on new members.

How would you prioritize the obligations of the UFL in conjunction with the responsibilities and expectations of your other clients? Please explain how your approach (team or individualized) would impact your ability to meet the needs of the UFL?

Ashley is the firm's newest partner, coming on board around 3 months ago. She previously litigated for governmental entities on a variety of issues. She has the capacity to take on new clients. Ashley finds this work is super interesting. The firm operates with a team approach, having Kathryn available to take on projects with her experience in IGA's as well as having Rebecca, they will always have someone available to meet the UFL's needs. They have ten attorneys as well as paralegals, but Ashley, Kathryn and Rebecca would be the team.

They prefer to use a team approach it allows the client to know who they can contact and if someone is out on vacation or unavailable it makes it easy for someone else from the team to jump in since they are already familiar with the lab.

What do you see as the immediate challenges and opportunities in the first 180 days of representation?

The initial 30 days would be getting to know the client and finding out what the needs are and how the firm can best serve us. They would work on understanding the documents, including our IGA, MOU's, SOPS and getting the lay of the land as well as finding out what we need vs what we want. They want to know how they can best use our time. A lot will be driven by us. The IGA is a big job; it takes a lot of time, but they feel well prepared to handle it.

Describe your experience with the Colorado Open Records Act and the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act. How would you handle questions of application of these Acts to records regarding forensic work?

They feel they have a broad and great amount of experience. Not only do they work the general counsel work they have also litigated a lot of cases. CORA is a huge part of any governmental business, along with open meetings laws, including CCJRA although it is a little more nuanced. It would be a lot of collaboration given the content of the records and the status of any kind of investigation. Having litigated these cases, Ashley feels she knows the downfalls and is aware of the risks and tries to avoid those things for their clients. They have handled a lot of CORA cases.

What is your experience in advising boards on open meeting laws? What are the most common mistakes clients make with open meeting requirements in your experience?

Having guidance is pivotal for the lab is pivotal . They handle meetings all the time, it is a regular part of the practice. Executive sessions are what they are looked at the most. Do you have the correct language to get into an executive session? Are you keeping the conversation within the executive session parameters? Breaking these rules is what most of the litigation is about. They help with the language of agendas but the guidance

they give is around executive session especially around employment-related issues. Executive sessions, to stay within the topic of discussion. Help with setting meeting agendas, with the most guidance around employment.

What is your experience in advising boards on open meeting laws? What are the most common mistakes clients make with open meeting requirements in your experience?

The firm has been practicing since 1978, and end 2021 they had become large and split into 2 different firms with this one becoming more of a service group. Andy Nathan was the senior partner for the lab when the original IGA was written. Ashley worked with Andy for 15 years but wanted more time with her family and stepped away from litigation. She loved working with Andy.

The Board is comprised of several jurisdictions that sometimes may have competing interests or policy objectives. How would you deal with those?

Communication and learning what the issues are is the fundamental place of learning and seeing if they can reach a consensus on how to move forward. This type of work requires a lot of personal relationships and trying to understand the different agency priorities and reaching a consensus. If that has happened in the past, how has it been dealt with in the past? What could you do differently now to bridge the gaps. There is give and take, there is a reason all these agencies came together. If you had your own lab you would always get what you wanted but economically you may not be able to meet your goals. There has to be give and take. What do you have to give up, what will you gain and look at the bigger picture and remember why you are here.

What is the correct procedure for entering an executive session? What must be done during that executive session to remain compliant with the open meetings act?

It must be properly noted on the agenda. There are several reasons you can go into executive session, and they are limited, you can't just make up a reason. Depending on the topic of conversation depends on if it is recorded. If it is for legal advice, it doesn't need to be recorded for certain other things, it does need to be recorded. If you are talking about an employee and their employment, you need to discuss whether they permit you to go to executive session or if you have to do it in a public meeting. There is language that is required, you must stay within the scope of the executive session, otherwise it is recorded and can become public knowledge and challenged in court. There is also a process for getting out the executive session and everything must be appropriately documented. You require a 2/3 vote to go in, and the recording is kept for 90 days. Who is going to keep them? How do you deal with them after 90 days?

What is your preferred method of communication when conveying legal advice?

Depending on who we are talking to, some like email, some like phone. Ashley is available by phone but prefers to respond to email at off-hours and communicates.

With no further questions, the team said they were excited for the opportunity and thanked the Board for allowing them to interview.

- **Legal Counsel – Interview 2 – MURRAY, DAHL, BEERY, RENAUD**

Welcome from Undersheriff Kennedy

The members of the Board introduced themselves.

Joe Rivera and Carmen Beery; representing Murray, Dahl, Beery, Renaud

They are in the business of representing local governments all over the state. Joe Rivera has been with the firm since 2015. They are the attorneys for the towns of Fairplay and Lochbuie. They represent nine municipalities and lots of other local government interests. He previously worked for the Denver City Attorney's Office. He has a lot of experience with police and defending police. He brings lots of law enforcement experience to the table.

Carmen Beery has spent her career advising local governments, mostly municipals. She has worked with police departments, Chiefs of Police quite a bit and in many capacities. She has over two decades of experience working with law enforcement. She was also a police officer with Arvada from 2006-2007 so has actual law enforcement experience from the inside perspective.

Please detail your history of representing special districts and quasi-governmental bodies similar to the UFL. Specifically, identify and describe a relevant IGA developed by your firm?

They have not represented special districts but have been involved in litigation involving special districts. He has been involved in litigation involving IGA's and responsibilities involved in those and whether there were breaches. They have drafted IGA's with sheriff's departments. The paralegal has experience with special districts. Carla also has experience with special districts although not with law enforcement specifically. They do have experience with IGA's involving consolidated law enforcement functions.

How would you prioritize the obligations of the UFL in conjunction with the responsibilities and expectations of your other clients? Please explain how your approach (team or individualized) would impact your ability to meet the needs of the UFL?

Joe Rivera will be the point of contact; he will be the one attending the BOD meetings. He won't be the only person available to help us but, he would be the primary point of contact. He would also be the person to make sure the work is being allocated and completed. In terms of prioritizing, the easiest is deadlines, followed by public scrutiny and communication. They would not have responded to the RFP if they didn't have the capacity to meet the lab's needs. The key is to identify what is important and get that done and communicate if those deadlines are not able to be met.

What do you see as the immediate challenges and opportunities in the first 180 days of representation?

The first thing would be to work through and identify what our needs are. They would come to our meeting and find out what we want them to do. They have ideas of how they can add value. Their first job is to get us where we want to go.

Describe your experience with the Colorado Open Records Act and the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act. How would you handle questions of application of these Acts to records regarding forensic work?

Both Joe and Carmen represent local governments, and they have police departments, they have a great deal of experience responding to CORA and CCJRA requests on behalf of those police departments. They also respond to subpoenas. They have done this for many years. It is hard for Joe to imagine they don't already have an STD response to almost every question. It seems certain entities file the same requests over and over. Both attorneys have great knowledge of the statutes for both as they are different and it's important to know

which apply. The time responses are important, the amount of discretion is different, and they are very familiar with those.

Because of experience with 1983 they can respond as well as knowing who is asking and for what purpose they are asking, and they can give the request the time it needs.

What is your experience in advising boards on open meeting laws? What are the most common mistakes clients make with open meeting requirements in your experience?

They are very familiar with the open meetings law and have a lot of experience with it. The key to it is to manage the meeting how you would want to. When would we want them to jump in? Would you even want them to jump in. Agendas are very important to make the meeting as efficient as possible.

The most common mistake is "reply all". If you send an email to the members on the BOD and someone hits reply all, you have made another meeting. It is important to embrace the spirit of intent with the open meetings law, which is transparency. Decision making must happen in front of the meeting attendees, not in an executive session. They encourage their clients to keep that in mind.

Asked how they would manage their load of clients with so many meetings, Joe said they wouldn't have applied for the RFP unless they were able to fulfill the obligations of it.

The Board is comprised of several jurisdictions that sometimes may have competing interests or policy objectives. How would you deal with those?

Joe says it is his job to get us where we want to go. It is the lab job to make policy decisions; it is their job to make sure those policy decisions stay within the law. He will guide conversations, so the lab knows what their policy alternatives are within the law, that we have the authority to do so and it meets the goals of the lab. It is his job to establish transparency, to establish the proper records and give us the tools that may be necessary to defend the decisions later.

What is the correct procedure for entering an executive session? What must be done during that executive session to remain compliant with the open meetings act?

There is a script, they set up the agenda and if there is the need for an executive session, they will provide the chair the script for the executive session. It is important to read the script so you can follow it to the letter of the law for discussions on legal advice, negotiations, personal matter or purchase agreements. They make sure the number of votes, and the bylaws comply with the law.

They may only discuss the subject at hand; any other discussion is in violation of the laws. The sessions must be recorded unless the reason for the session is for legal advice. The recording must be kept as required. Close the executive session and return to the meeting being careful not to have made any decisions.

What is your preferred method of communication when conveying legal advice?

Preferred method of communication depends on the advice being given. There are some things that require face-to-face meetings. For updates they would draft an email. On litigation matters they would draft an attorney client privilege information please do not reply all.

The board was asked what they were looking for. Sheriff Brown responded, the creation of new judicial districts in Colorado has affected this lab. We have added a district attorney to our lab. How do we make sure we are meeting our needs best. It would mean additions to the IGA and reformatting it, so it meets the needs of all the constituents and makes sure victims voices are heard through the work done at the lab.

Director Morrow said we get CCJRA's, and CORA requests and it would be beneficial having someone to available to handle those situations as they come up. We get enough that we need to have someone to answer them.

Chief Chamberlain said, although we collaborate, we are still 3 agencies with our own needs for our cities and counties, and we want to make sure we are serving them the best whilst remaining equally involved in the processes of running the lab.

Thank you for coming and speaking with us today.

- **Vote – Legal Counsel – Board of Directors discussion**

Megan Platt said the board has some options where you can discuss items that came up in the interviews and could set a motion on how to proceed. Alternatively, you could make a motion to set this over to another meeting or you could go straight to a vote. If you want to negotiate a rate set in the proposal you could set a meeting to discuss that as well.

Do you want to proceed today or select another day?

Director Morrow said we could start a discussion today and then determine how to proceed from there.

Undersheriff Kennedy asked for the discussion to begin. Chief Chamberlain said going off the submitted RFP's applicant #2 had a rate of $320 per hour, applicant #1 wasn't specific. Megan responded there was the possibility of getting a lower rate by using a paralegal for some services. The IGA caps legal expenses paid by the 18th to $8,000.00

Applicant #2 did say they had an associate available but never said what the rate would be. Megan said one thing to consider is when working on writing an IGA there is a lot of back-and-forth administrative communication that doesn't require an attorney that could be completed by a paralegal. If you wanted to, you could table this discussion and reach out to find out what #2's billable rate for an associate would be.

Sheriff Brown said he likes the availability of applicant #1 and the option for paralegals. He also likes the experience they bring. 47 years is substantial and they have experience with litigation and risk mitigation. When it comes to dealing with all the different entities sitting at this table, it's huge for us. This is an organization that is designed around science, the more we can be risk adverse, we will be better served by that representation. All the prework, like making agendas is so important to make sure we don't have any challenges. Sheriff Brown liked the way Collins, Cole, Winn and Ulmer presented today.

DA Padden also likes the litigation background of Collins, Cole, Winn and Ulmer, we don't see us needing it, but it is good to have someone who can see those pitfalls ahead of time. They would be able to hit the ground running and get the IGA in place. She would lean towards Collins, Cole, Winn and Ulmer.

Sheriff Brown feels it would be good to release the burden off the City of Aurora and move forward with a vote today to choose a legal representative for the lab, pending negotiations.

Mayor Coffman and Commissioner Baker (online) both gave thumbs up in agreement.

Undersheriff Kennedy presented a motion to offer the contract to #1 **COLLINS, COLE, WINN AND ULMER,** dependent on rates of partner, associate counsel and paralegal. The motion was 2nd by Sheriff Brown. All in favor. The vote was unanimous.

Megan Platt said it may be beneficial to set up a placeholder meeting in Teams in case they need an executive session related to negotiations, sooner than the next scheduled meeting. This will keep the process rolling whilst Aurora works on the back end with procurement. If the meeting isn't needed it could be cancelled later.

Executive session notices out by Friday before or 48 hours. Next week. Megan will be out of the office.

Time: Monday 15th of September at 4.30pm is the meeting time for the virtual invite.

2. **NFLIS data sharing – Director Morrow**

   You have a copy of a proposed MOU. This is a program through the DEA. It tracks drugs through the country. Pre-UFL Aurora lab was in an MOU with NFLIS, and it carried over to the UFL when the lab opened. It does involve sharing some information. Back in 2019 the lab realized we were participating without permission to share information, which was a violation of our confidentiality agreement. We immediately stopped sharing.

   We would like to participate again. There is no cost to participate. It is an automated process. The systems administrator will set a report to pull, and it will send to NFLIS once a month. There is no validating case information. Information shared includes, types of drugs, amount of drugs, jurisdictions, when the work was submitted and completed, counts of pills, form of material. We would like the BOD's permission to enter back into the program. Director Morrow is unsure if Douglas County previously participated. It would only pull information provided to the lab, although it will provide the submitting agency name.

   Chief Chamberlain wanted to know why the program was not carried over to the lab when it moved to the UFL. Director Morrow replied it was carried over, but the lab stopped because they had not got permission from the agencies to share the information.

   NFLIS is making a significant reach out to improve their data collection. We are converting our chemistry unit to LIMS by the end of the year, and it would allow the information to be automatically collected. It is effortless data sharing, at takes no time away of casework.

   Sheriff Brown said he feels it is important information to be sharing, if we can get it shared across multiple districts it can help us to have a better understanding of what is happening. He asked if they are good about sharing data in return so the agencies can see trends?

   Director Morrow said she is unsure. They do notify us if there is any type of breach.

Chief Chamberlain asked Megan if there were any landmines sharing this information? She said the main concern was with the other agencies and if it was pulling the information from their individual agencies rather than the lab. She doesn't see this as a high-profile concern. What should we do in those circumstances.

They are already collecting across the country, us joining would just add to their data.

Megan asked if there is any specifical language related to subpoenas? They do say they will notify the laboratory before releasing any information related to legal processes.

The Chief would like to read the document before deciding.

Megan suggested creating a motion to table a decision until the next meeting.
Sheriff Brown presented a motion to table a vote on sharing with NFLIS until the October meeting. 2nd Undersheriff Kennedy. All in favor. The vote is tabled until the October 22nd meeting.

IT gets cranky if you share. Where the drugs came from, potentially an item # would be the only info that would be sharing, not the agencies number but the lab number. City county and state is the biggest info that would be shared.

3. **Consortium Update – Consortium Representative**
   Consortium has no update at this meeting but has been very productive.

   Mayor Coffman must excuse himself as he has another meeting he need to attend.

4. **Next Meeting:** Next Meeting – September 15, 2025 / 4:30 – 5pm via Teams

   Adjournment – Motion to adjourn presented by Sheriff Brown, 2nd by DA Padden. Motion passed.

- Meeting concluded at 3.25pm