



**OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT POLICE MONITOR
City of Madison, Wisconsin**

PUBLIC MEMORANDUM AND PRESS STATEMENT

TO: Police Civilian Oversight Board; Common Council of the City of Madison; Mayor's Office; Members of the Press; Community; Public Record

FROM: Aeiramique Glass, Interim Independent Police Monitor, Office of the Independent Police Monitor

DATE: April 21, 2026

RE: Formal Response to Documented Misinformation; Continued Opposition to Proposed Ordinance Amendments to MGO 5.19 and 5.20 (Legistar File 92386); Formal Notice of Active Violations of MGO 5.19(6)(b); Notice That the Office of the Independent Police Monitor Is Considering All Available Legal Options

OPENING STATEMENT

City leadership and staff orchestrated false statements about this office and its staff. Those false statements were used to mislead the Chief of Police into giving a media interview under false pretenses. The result was a front-page headline that damaged this office based on information that was not true. The Mayor's office inserted written claims about this Monitor into the official legislative record. Those claims are factually impossible, as the Mayor's Chief of Staff had not met me when he wrote them. That email was sent after the PCOB voted to reject these amendments. And after the record made clear the issue with the OIPM was pre-My Tenure.

City Attorney Haas told this Police Monitor and PCOB Chair Pearson in a meeting, with the Chair as witness, that Alder Govindarajan had misunderstood what the department heads were trying to communicate. He then supported the uploading of those same mischaracterized concerns into Legistar anyway to support the amendments.

The Common Council and public were given a selective record, allegations without the responses that directly contradicted them. Those responses exist. They were not uploaded. They are attached to this memo.

The email correspondence between City Attorney Haas and this office documenting the conflict of interest, the records and ordinance mandate obstruction, and the coordination with the alder sponsoring these amendments is also attached.

What follows is the account of what actually happened. The documentation confirms it. The City Attorney's office requested a list of independent investigations from the office of the independent police monitor, claiming the need to protect the City Attorney's insurance.

This office does not issue public statements lightly. What follows is issued because the public record has been deliberately shaped to support a political outcome, because false statements about this office and its staff have been used to manipulate news cycles, and because the Common Council is being asked to vote on amendments whose stated justification relies on a record that is incomplete by design.

The documentation attached to this memorandum does not require interpretation. It requires reading. What was uploaded to Legistar tells one story. What was left out tells another. This document puts both stories in the same place so that the Common Council, the press, and the public can see exactly what happened and who made it happen.

FALSE STATEMENT ONE

A Staff Member Who Gave No Interview Was Reported as Having Given One, and the Chief of Police Was Asked to Respond to a Lie

On the morning of Friday, March 27, 2026, Chief Patterson contacted this Police Monitor. He had been told by City staff that OIPM Data Analyst Greg Gelembiuk had given a sit-down interview to the

Wisconsin State Journal on March 26th, claiming that MPD was denying this office access to data. The Chief was being asked by City staff to respond to that interview.

Greg Gelembiuk gave no interview. Not a sit-down, not by phone, not in any form. He confirmed this without ambiguity when reached. He does not and would not speak to the media without explicit authorization from this Monitor. That is established office protocol that has been followed without exception. This Monitor called Chief Patterson back that same afternoon and informed him directly: the interview did not happen. The Chief told this Monitor that he had already given the interview and the reporter had never corrected the record with him during the interview the Chief then gave. This Monitor told the Chief plainly: the City is attempting to create division between this office and the Chief's Office and to discredit this office using information that is not true.

On April 17, 2026, the Wisconsin State Journal published the following: Madison police watchdog mishandles sensitive data, police chief says.

That headline exists because City staff told the Chief of Police something that was not true, did not correct it when the truth was available that same afternoon, and allowed a front-page story to be published based on a fabrication. The underlying data issue used as the basis for that fabrication was a pre-tenure matter resolved on this Independent Police Monitor's first day in office, December 8, 2025, when she met with Chief Patterson and the Assistant Chiefs and the data-sharing pause was addressed and lifted immediately. That matter was closed. It was then retrieved, attached to a fabricated interview, and used to generate a headline the weekend following a Common Council vote.

Greg Gelembiuk is cleared. Fully. He followed office protocol. He did nothing wrong. His name and professional reputation have been used as a vehicle for a coordinated effort to damage this office, and that use is documented in the sequence of events above and will not be tolerated by this IPM.

This office formally requests that Chief Patterson correct the public record and publicly condemn the conduct of City staff who provided false information to produce a response from him. This office also calls on the Wisconsin State Journal to correct the record regarding the interview that was never given and the false premise on which its April 17, 2026 story was constructed, and to stop the biased and misleading media coverage of the Office of the Independent Police Monitor.

FALSE STATEMENT TWO

The Mayor's Chief of Staff Characterized This Monitor in Writing Before They Had Ever Met, Days After the PCOB Voted to Reject These Amendments

April 4, 2026, Mayor's Chief of Staff Sam Munger sent an email to Alder Govindarajan stating that this Police Monitor had specifically asked the Mayor's office not to reach out to PCOB Chair Pearson about their concerns about this Police Monitor, and that this Monitor had scolded them on several occasions for doing so ([Mayor's Office Email](#)).

This Monitor met Sam Munger for the first time on April 8, 2026. That was the first time she had been in the Mayor's office. The first time she had a meeting with the Mayor. The first time the Mayor introduced her to his Chief of Staff. All on April 8th. His email was dated April 4th.

The alleged incidents are not in dispute. They are impossible. There is no occasion on which these conversations could have taken place with Mr. Munger. This Monitor had not met him.

The timing of that email is as significant as its impossibility. The PCOB voted to reject these amendments. Four days after that rejection, a City official who had never met this Monitor sent an email to the alders sponsoring those amendments characterizing the Police Monitor as the problem. That email was uploaded into Legistar as part of the legislative record. It was then circulated as context for why the amendments remained necessary despite the Board's vote. This is what political interference looks like when a vote does not go the way City leadership wanted.

This office formally requests that the PCOB ask the Mayor's office to provide the specific dates, the individuals present, and the documentation for every occasion on which this Monitor allegedly issued this directive. And what concerns (about the Independent Police Monitor) the Mayor was trying to communicate to the Chair that were obstructed.

FALSE STATEMENT THREE

City Attorney Haas Told This Monitor and the PCOB Chair That Alder Govindarajan Misunderstood, Then Uploaded That Misunderstanding Into Legistar Anyway and Left the Contradicting Responses Out

This is documented. PCOB Chair Maia Pearson is a witness to what was said in that room. When Chair Pearson and this IPM met with City Attorney Haas following the PCOB full board meeting and executive committee discussion of the PCOB ordinance amendments, department head concerns raised by Alder Govindarajan, Haas stated clearly that Alder Govindarajan had misunderstood what the department heads were communicating, and that the concerns were not about this IPM or this office's current operations. The department heads confirmed this in writing. HR Director Hillson stated she had no evidence or reason to believe issues like this are going on in the OIM currently. IT Director Edgerton confirmed the concerns related to the previous office and that Independent Police Monitor Glass has been a good partner to work with. Those responses are attached to this memorandum.

City Attorney Haas said in that room, with the PCOB Chair present, that the Alder misunderstood. He then assisted in uploading those same pre-tenure, mischaracterized concerns into Legistar, without the department head responses that directly contradicted them, to build the legislative case for amendments scheduled for a full Council vote. The Common Council and Public received the allegations. It did not receive the responses. It received documents selected to support one outcome. The complete record is attached. Read what was uploaded to Legistar. Then read what was not.

THE INVESTIGATION LIST DEMAND: THE CITY ATTORNEY ASKED THIS OFFICE TO DISCLOSE ITS OPEN INVESTIGATIONS

On December 22, 2025, City Attorney Haas and Assistant City Attorney Patricia Lauten asked this office to provide a list of all open investigations. Their stated reason: the City's legal insurance requires that no City agency conduct an investigation concurrent with active City Attorney litigation on the same matter.

This Monitor asked directly: is this the law, and does it apply to all City agencies or only those the City Attorney represents?

That question was raised publicly at a subsequent PCOB executive committee meeting because it goes to the heart of this office's independence. If the City Attorney can place a hold on this office's investigative work whenever it is in active litigation, and this office has no independent legal counsel to challenge whether that requirement is legally binding, then the City Attorney controls the scope of this office's investigations through legal process.

This Monitor declined to provide a list of open investigations. This office offered instead to receive the City's litigation list and hold matters with genuine overlap in good faith. What was asked of this office, disclosing all open investigations to the office that represents the department those investigations concern, is a direct example of why this office requires structural independence and independent counsel. If the Mayor were to formalize this demand as an Administrative Procedure Memorandum, it would directly impact the only Independent City agency with this mandate, the only agency that provides oversight of MPD. Timing of investigations matters. Litigation can take years. A hold tied to active litigation is, in practice, a hold tied to the City Attorney's calendar. That is not independence.

THE CITY ATTORNEY'S COORDINATION WITH THE AMENDMENT SPONSOR, IN HIS OWN WORDS

City Attorney Haas's office is legal counsel to this office. He is simultaneously assigned as legal counsel to MPD, the Mayor, and Common Council. In his own April 2, 2026 email, he wrote:

“I have conveyed my thoughts to Alder Govindarajan and he has not directed that we carve out any other instances in his proposed ordinance where the OIM is authorized to retain separate counsel.”

The City Attorney is this office's counsel. He is simultaneously shaping the amendment that restricts this office's access to independent counsel, in active coordination with the alder sponsoring that amendment. When this Police Monitor asked him directly whether his office would draft a memo in opposition to these amendments on behalf of this office, if he truly represents all City agencies equally, he would not commit. When asked again, he would not answer. That non-answer is itself an answer.

The Board of Public Works Contradiction

On April 8, 2026, the City Attorney's office arranged outside counsel for the Board of Public Works on a matter where it had already advised City staff, specifically to ensure the Board had confidence that its legal advice was not influenced by the advice given to City staff. That is precisely the structural situation of this office. By City Attorney Haas's own stated reasoning and his own documented practice, the dual representation of MPD and the OIPM requires independent counsel for this office. He applied this logic to the Board of Public Works and refused to apply it here.

The Police and Fire Commission Contradiction

The Police and Fire Commission uses independent counsel for open meetings law, public records law, and general operations, the exact categories City Attorney Haas claims must belong exclusively to his office for the OIPM. He accepted that structure for the PFC without objection. He is rejecting it here. That contradiction is his, not this office's. It is also worth noting that the PFC does not conduct investigations. This office does. The case for independent counsel here is stronger, not weaker. As they are trying to say, the Office of the Independent Police Monitor only needs independent counsel for investigation purposes.

THE STRUCTURE IS NOT NEUTRAL: EVERY APPROVAL PATH RUNS TO THE MAYOR

The City frames administrative compliance as a neutral requirement. It is not. Every department this office is required to operate through reports directly to the Mayor.

Finance: This office cannot produce payments or make certain purchases without going through City Finance processes. The Finance Director reports to the Mayor. The Mayor's office is among the entities this office should be completely independent from.

Information Technology: This office cannot adopt the technology it needs without City IT review and approval, a process that takes months for systems that other jurisdictions implement in weeks. This office has been navigating that process for a case management system purpose-built for police oversight, police data and information sharing, processing cases manually in the meantime. The IT Director reports to the Mayor.

Legal Counsel: The City attorney's office represents MPD, advises the Mayor's office, and has now documented in writing that he is coordinating with the alder sponsoring amendments to constrain this office while simultaneously serving as this office's counsel. The City Attorney reports back to the Mayor.

Every operational function of this office, if run through City administrative structure, feeds information upward to the Mayor's office. Budget requests reveal investigative priorities. Technology procurement reveals what tools oversight uses and how. HR involvement reveals staffing decisions and internal operations. Legal consultations reveal this office's legal strategy and case concerns. Every activity of the Monitor, community engagement, record requests, case intake, and expert consultations, can and does trigger investigations. When those functions are visible to City administration, the investigative work of this office is transparent to the institution being overseen before it becomes a formal investigation or formal finding. That is not independence. That is the appearance of it.

When this Police Monitor raised this directly with the Mayor at their April 8th meeting, the Mayor acknowledged she had been completely hands-off with this office, because of its independent nature. While that acknowledgment exists, the reality of it does not. The structure does not accommodate the

independence this office requires. The amendments being proposed would make that structural dependency permanent in ordinance.

WHAT WAS NOT PROPOSED, AND WHAT THAT ABSENCE MEANS

Alder Govindarajan acknowledges in his own legislative memo that body-worn cameras, this office's budget, and staffing are important issues. He introduced no amendment on any of them.

The lawsuits uploaded to Legistar as justification for these amendments are City lawsuits, arising from City processes, defended by the City Attorney's office. The Board and this office did not control the processes that generated them. The lawsuit involving a discriminatory hiring claim that the City lost arose from a process managed under City policy and advised by the City Attorney's office. Presenting those lawsuits as an argument against independent counsel for this office does not follow. They are an argument for it.

FORMAL NOTICE OF VIOLATION — MGO 5.19(6)(B)

“No City employee or official shall attempt to use their political or administrative position to unduly influence or undermine the independence of the Monitor or any employee of the OIM in the performance of their duties and responsibilities as set forth in this Ordinance.”

The documented violations of this provision include:

- Use of false information to cause the Chief of Police to give a media interview producing a materially inaccurate public record about this office, designed to create division between this Independent Police Monitor and the Chief of Police for political agendas and to sow public mistrust
- A City official inserting false written statements about this Monitor into the legislative record, dated four days before they met, sent after the PCOB voted to reject these amendments, and circulated as justification for why the amendments remained necessary
- City Attorney Haas stating in the presence of the PCOB Chair that Alder Govindarajan misunderstood the department heads, then uploading that same mischaracterized record into Legistar to support the amendments while omitting the department head responses that directly contradicted the concerns raised
- Selective presentation of an incomplete record to the Common Council, withholding responses that directly contradict the stated justification for these amendments
- The City Attorney applying public records statutes to obstruct this office's ordinance-mandated records access to MPD while simultaneously serving as counsel to the department that withheld those records only on his office's advice
- The City Attorney coordinating with the amendment's sponsor on language restricting this office's independent counsel, documented in his own April 2, 2026 email, while serving as this office's counsel
- The City Attorney demanding that this office disclose all open investigations, citing insurance requirements, while simultaneously representing the department those investigations concern, with no independent counsel available to this office to challenge whether that demand is legally binding
- A structural approval framework requiring this office to route every operational function through departments that report to the Mayor, while this office is charged with providing independent oversight that must remain independent of the Mayor's administration

The Office of the Independent Police Monitor has placed the City on formal notice of these violations. This notice follows a documented pattern. It is not made lightly. This office will explore the necessary legal action to address these violations and will pursue all available options to protect the independence the ordinance was written to guarantee.

TO THE POLICE CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT BOARD AND THE COMMON COUNCIL

The work is happening. Cases are being reviewed. Reports are issued. Community engagement is active across every district. The structural barriers to effective oversight have been named and placed in the official record. The response from City leadership to an office that is finally producing has been to attempt to dismantle and discredit it using an incomplete legislative record, impossible allegations, and a media cycle built on something that did not happen.

The PCOB voted to reject these amendments. After that vote, a City official who had never met this Monitor sent an email characterizing the Monitor as the problem. This Board should understand what that sequence means and name it accordingly.

This office asks four things:

1. Formally request from the Mayor's office the specific dates, individuals present, and documentation for every occasion on which this Monitor allegedly scolded or discouraged that office from contacting PCOB Chair Pearson regarding concerns of the Independent Police Monitor, given that this Monitor did not meet the Mayor's Chief of Staff until April 8, 2026, four days after that characterization was put into writing and circulated to alders
2. Formally place on the record that the department head responses contradicting the Legistar allegations were not included in that record, and that City Attorney Haas acknowledged in person, with the Chair as witness, that Alder Govindarajan had misunderstood what the department heads were communicating
3. Formally note for the Council that City Attorney Haas's April 2, 2026 email documents his coordination and drafting with the amendment's sponsor on language restricting this office's independent counsel while serving as this office's assigned counsel, and that this coordination is documented in his own words and attached to this memorandum
4. Reject these amendments in their entirety and stand on the side of the structure this community was promised when this office was created

EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO THIS MEMORANDUM

Exhibit A: Email correspondence between City Attorney Haas and Independent Police Monitor Glass, PCOB Chair including the April 2, 2026 email documenting coordination with the amendment's sponsor on independent counsel language, and the April 18, 2026 formal response from IPM Glass

Exhibit B: Department head responses omitted from Legistar: HR Director Hillson confirming no evidence or reason to believe issues are ongoing in the OIM currently; IT Director Edgerton confirming concerns related to the previous office and that Independent Police Monitor Glass has been a good partner (April 1, 2026)

Exhibit C: Q&A correspondence between this Monitor and the City Attorney, with this office's questions and the City Attorney's written responses confirming that the OIPM is treated as a public requester for personnel records access purposes (February 2026)

I will not be silenced. The PCOB will not be dismantled. And this office will not be policed. The community this office serves is owed the truth, and this memorandum with its attachments is that truth.

Respectfully submitted,

Aeiramique Glass

Interim Independent Police Monitor
Office of the Independent Police Monitor
City of Madison, Wisconsin
April 21, 2026

[REDACTED]

From: Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2026 1:45 PM

To: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>; Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: Ordinance discussion

Thanks for the email, Meeka. There is a lot there and I will get you a more complete response when I have time. It will not surprise you to hear that I do not agree with all of the characterizations and conclusions you outlined. Have a good weekend.

Mike

From: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2026 1:19 PM

To: Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>; Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: Ordinance discussion

City Attorney Haas,

This is my formal response to both emails you sent following our meeting on April 2nd. I am writing with full awareness that this correspondence may become part of the public record, and I want it to accurately reflect what occurred, what was agreed to, what has been mischaracterized, and where things stand. I will address each issue directly.

On the Meeting and What Was Agreed

You noted in your own email that what was scheduled as a one-hour meeting became a three-hour meeting. That acknowledgment matters, because a almost three-hour substantive conversation produced agreements that your emails do not reflect.

I left that meeting with a clear understanding that we had agreed to each draft our respective positions on the division of duties between the City Attorney's office and independent counsel, so we could work toward a defined structure going forward. I was already actively working on that draft when your emails arrived and reversed course. What you sent was not a continuation of what we agreed to. It was a written position that does not reflect the direction of that discussion or the agreement we made. It is disheartening, disappointing, and further shows why true independence is necessary to fulfill our mandate. And further confirms my concerns.

On Independent Counsel:

My position on independent counsel has never been ambiguous, reactive, or personal. Before I began this role, in my hiring interviews and in statements to the media following my appointment, I stated clearly that independent counsel was

powerful in the ordinance and needed and would be utilized for this office. My position was explicit and public: you cannot claim independence when the same legal department is responsible for protecting the City, defending the police department, and advising the oversight body. Even when attorneys operate in different divisions, they function under the same department, the same leadership, and the same institutional priorities. That structural conflict exists regardless of who is assigned to this office.

I stated this before I knew who was assigned. Then on December 8th, my first day, during lunch I let you know I was informed that the attorney you have assigned to simultaneously represent OIPM and PCOB had spent over 20 years working with and for police unions/associations, and that he was also assigned to represent the Madison Police Department. His history did not create my position on independent counsel. It confirmed the structural conflict I had already described publicly before I began this role. I raised this with you immediately on December 8th and asked whether another attorney in your office might work with us until we got our outside counsel in place. You declined and kept the Assistant City Attorney assigned in place.

On December 15th, during a meeting with the Chief and Assistant Chief, I made clear that while I would begin to draft the MOU, I wanted to include language covering the case management system and have independent counsel serve as our witness, as your office represents MPD. I raised it again on December 22nd, in the meeting with you and ACA Patricia Lauten, at which point I stated clearly and directly: effective immediately, this office will not be working with Attorney Schauer. That was not a suggestion. It was not an open question. It was a definitive position communicated in the presence of you and ACA, and I operated under that and notified my staff. Chair Pearson reiterated, on behalf of the Board, at our April 2nd meeting, that the decision to seek the same independent counsel as this office was not personal about Attorney Schauer. That was stated clearly, in the room.

Your latest emails reintroduced Attorney Schauer's name as though the matter remained open, after it had been closed verbally, clearly, and in the presence of your own colleague on December 22nd and again on April 2nd. I want the record to reflect what was actually said in those meetings, because what appears in your emails does not.

The ordinance authority for independent counsel is explicit. MGO 5.19(7)(I) states: 'The Monitor may retain independent legal counsel if necessary to fulfill the duties of the OIM.' I am telling you it is necessary, and the following makes that undeniable.

MGO 5.19(6)(b) states: 'No City employee or official shall attempt to use their political or administrative position to unduly influence or undermine the independence of the Monitor or any employee of the OIM in the performance of their duties and responsibilities as set forth in this Ordinance.' That protection exists on paper. But who enforces it if this office does not have independent counsel? The City Attorney's office cannot bring a claim or advocate a position adverse to the City, the Mayor's office, or MPD, which are the very entities it represents. Without independent counsel, MGO 5.19(6)(b) is unenforceable in practice. Independent counsel is the mechanism that makes that protection real.

Additionally, this office holds subpoena power under MGO 5.19(7)(j). The exercise of that subpoena authority may need to be directed toward MPD, City administration, or other agencies your office represents. It is structurally impossible for the same attorney to advise this office on the exercise of subpoena authority against a party that attorney simultaneously represents. That conflict cannot be resolved by an ethical screen. It requires independent counsel by necessity.

On the Conflation of Monitor and Law Enforcement Background:

I want to address directly your statement that there are reputable independent police monitors who spent part of their careers in law enforcement. That statement reflects a conflation that needs to be corrected clearly for the record.

The national best practice guidance from the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement is consistent and clear: it is strongly discouraged for the head of a civilian independent oversight office to have prior law enforcement employment or immediate family members currently employed in law enforcement. This is not an arbitrary preference. It reflects decades of documented experience showing that prior law enforcement alignment creates inherent institutional bias that undermines the credibility and effectiveness of civilian oversight. This is precisely why the ordinance establishing this office explicitly prohibits the Monitor and all OIPM staff from having been employed by MPD or having worked as law enforcement officers in Wisconsin within the ten years prior to their appointment.

The ordinance applies this principle at every level. MGO 5.19(7)(h) states that no OIM employee shall have ever been employed by MPD or worked as a law enforcement officer within the State of Wisconsin in the ten years prior to becoming a staff member. MGO 5.20(3)(a)(4) applies the same restriction to every member of the Police Civilian Oversight Board. The Council codified this principle across the Monitor, all staff, and all board members because they understood that law enforcement alignment at any level of the oversight structure undermines its integrity and credibility.

That same logic, the logic the Common Council embedded in the ordinance, applies directly to the question of assigned legal counsel. An attorney who spent over 20 years working with and for police unions and associations, and who is simultaneously assigned to represent MPD, brings the same category of institutional alignment concerns to this office's legal representation that the ordinance was written to prevent in the Independent Police Monitor and staff positions. Applying that understanding to assigned counsel is not an extension of a personal grievance. It is a direct application of the principle the Council, who did the research and work, already codified.

Your characterization that most criticism of Attorney Schauer comes back to his work for WPPA and that the rest is piling on or related to his First Amendment rights asks me to discount a 20-year professional history that is directly relevant to his assignment, and to treat that history as less significant than I would treat the same history in an Independent Police Monitor or staff candidate. The ordinance does not allow me to make that distinction for Monitor and staff positions. I am applying the same standard to assigned counsel. That is not piling on. It is consistency and common sense best practices.

On the Social Media Conduct and the Request for Video:

You wrote that you do not know whether the social media conduct is connected to a complaint involving a post that was apparently actually liked or whether it is something else, and you asked me to send you the video so you could address it with him.

I want to be clear about the timeline. I informed you and ACA Lauten on December 22nd about the incident, before our April 2nd meeting and your follow-up email requesting this video, that effective immediately this office would not be working with Attorney Schauer. That position was stated definitively. Your subsequent request for the video arrives after that position was already clearly communicated and is framed in a way that treats the matter as still open and subject to your internal review process. It is not. I already made that clear to you. And I have been responsive to you and others in your office.

I also want to note what your own email acknowledges: that the conduct occurred. You described it as accidental. Whether it was accidental or not, from my knowledge the conduct involved multiple engagements in one time period on a post around discourse content related to the arrest of Brandi Grayson. I told you about it as it was flagged to me directly by multiple community members as antagonistic and concerning, given his assigned role as counsel to the oversight body that serves those communities. The characterization of this as accidental is noted. This office's decision regarding Attorney Schauer was made on structural grounds that predate this incident entirely. The social media conduct provided an additional specific and documented basis. I want the record to reflect that clearly.

On Why Your Own Practice Contradicts Your Position:

Your office has already applied the exact logic I am asking you to apply here, in two documented instances, and declined to apply that same logic to OIPM and PCOB.

First: On April 8, 2026, the Board of Public Works held a hearing on a Privilege in Streets Application Denial. Your office arranged outside counsel to advise the Board because your office had already advised City staff on the same matter. In your own words, this was done to ensure the Board had confidence that legal advice was not influenced by the advice that your office had given to City staff. That is the structural situation of this office. Your office advises MPD and City administration. By your own stated reasoning, that dual role requires independent counsel for OIPM and PCOB. You applied this logic to the Board of Public Works and are simultaneously refusing to apply it here. That is a contradiction documented in your own words. And I have made clear I have no confidence in the City's legal counsel and its ability to provide unbiased advice and minimize compromise to minimize liability.

Second: The Police and Fire Commission, which holds hiring, discipline, and termination authority over the Chief of Police, and officers, utilizes independent counsel specifically for open meetings law, public records law, and generally all

other functions, with only occasional communication with the City Attorney's office where needed. The PFC does not conduct investigations, so your argument that independent counsel is appropriate only where investigations are involved is directly contradicted by the PFC structure your office has accepted without objection. These are the exact categories you are asserting must remain exclusively with your office for OIPM. That structure exists precisely because of the recognized conflict in having your office advise PCOB, OIPM, and the Police Department and City administration. There may also be instances where OIPM's independent counsel and PFC's independent counsel need to communicate directly, another operational reason why independent counsel for this office is not optional but functionally necessary. You have acknowledged this logic in practice for PFC and for the Board of Public Works. You are refusing to acknowledge it here.

Additionally, when I asked you directly in our meeting whether your office would draft a memo in opposition to the proposed ordinance amendments on behalf of this office, if you truly represent all City agencies equally, you said you did not know, and when asked again, you would not commit. I asked if you agreed with the amendment changes that you influenced and drafted. That non-answer is itself an answer. An attorney who genuinely represents all City agencies equally would be able to advocate for this office's position before the Common Council. Your inability to commit demonstrates that you cannot and that you are in opposition to the needs of the Board and this office. This is exactly why lawyers, courts, judges exist and why independent legal interpretation matters. I gave you concrete examples of what independent counsel would be used for and needed: MOU negotiations, records access disputes, subpoena authority, potential litigation against MPD or the City, legislative advocacy, board operations, and open meetings laws. Those examples were not substantively addressed. You focused on potential litigation, saying City agencies do not have a practice of suing each other. I told you that of course I hope that would never be the case, but if violations of the ordinance and other matters arose and could not be resolved, it is a possibility and we need protections in place.

On the Concrete Conflict: The Records Access Example You Asked For

You have asked repeatedly for a concrete example of where your office's representation of this office has been problematic. I want to be clear that I have raised this before. I am providing it again here, for the record.

When your office advised MPD to apply public records statutes to delay this office's access to officer interview transcripts needed for an active investigation, I had no independent legal counsel to challenge that interpretation on this office's behalf or to pursue appropriate action if the law was being applied incorrectly. Instead, I was left arguing alone for my own office's access rights while the attorney assigned to represent me was simultaneously advising the department withholding the records. Those are adverse legal positions held by the same office at the same time. I was required to develop a formal memo myself to protect this office's access because I had no independent counsel to do so.

That is what the absence of independent counsel produces in practice. But it is not the only consequence.

This office and the Board are mandated by ordinance to be independent from the Mayor, the Common Council, and MPD. That independence is not symbolic. It is the foundation of what makes civilian oversight meaningful. Independent legal counsel is part of that foundation. Without it, this office does not have attorney-client privilege in any meaningful sense. Anything discussed with your office or through City leadership moves through a structure where information is shared across the very entities this office is charged with oversight of or is supposed to be independent from. I have experienced this directly. What is discussed in confidence does not remain confined. It moves. That is not a structure that serves this office. It is a structure that compromises it.

And yet your office is now actively supporting amendments that would formalize that structure in ordinance, adding Council enforcement authority over the Monitor, restricting independent counsel, conditioning records access through a framework your office controls, and placing an elected official inside the civilian oversight board. These amendments do not clarify the ordinance. You restructure it to match a model of administrative control rather than one that positions this office to fully exercise the powers and independence the ordinance was designed to provide. That is the conflict. It is structural, documented, and ongoing.

On Why This Office Is Categorically Different:

No other City agency provides independent oversight. This one does. If the entity this office oversees has any visibility into its legal strategy, investigative direction, or operational decisions outside of what I share in collaboration with MPD leadership, and confidential information is learned through shared counsel, then independent oversight does not exist in

practice, regardless of what the ordinance says on paper... but you know that. An independent police monitor created by City ordinance operates solely within the protections the ordinance provides. Those protections, unfettered access, independent counsel authority, and independence from City officials and staff, were written deliberately by people who understood exactly what structural pressures this office would face. Weakening them removes the only foundation the community has that this oversight is genuine and independent.

On Records Access:

MPD has been cooperative in sharing information since December 8th. I want that stated clearly because the narrative being constructed around records access does not reflect operational reality. The barrier has not come from the Police Department. It has come from your office's legal interpretation being applied to MPD's obligations to this office, an interpretation that treats this oversight office as a public requester subject to public records law, rather than as an oversight body operating under ordinance-granted access authority. The effect of that interpretation is delay in oversight access with direct operational consequences for active investigations and for the communities this office serves.

On Records Requests, Media, and the Appropriate Role of Your Office:

There is a pattern in this correspondence and in practice that I want to name directly. On multiple occasions your office has contacted me about open public records requests that were already being actively processed by this office, often after being contacted by the requester rather than first asking me about the status. This office has acknowledged requests upon receipt and has operated well within legal timing and requirements.

The situation involving a State Journal reporter Chris Rickert is a documented example. That reporter asked me repeatedly about an open and active investigation, asking the same questions in different formulations, clearly seeking a different answer. I answered every question asked, appropriately and completely. When the reporter did not receive the answer sought, a public records request was submitted and your office reached out to me about it, without first asking me what the status of our communication was or whether the request was already being processed. Your subsequent email referenced the prior Independent Police Monitor's reputation for delayed records responses. I am not the prior administration. I have been responsive. Invoking that history in correspondence about this office's current operations does not reflect current practice and did not belong in this correspondence.

The effect of these interventions, whether intended or not, is to position your office as an intermediary that requesters can use to apply pressure to this office around records that are already being handled appropriately. That is not an appropriate role for the office claiming to be our counsel.

On Greg and the Institutional Double Standard:

Every concern you raised about my staff member Greg in your emails relates to approvals he had that predates my tenure entirely. Nothing you described has occurred under my supervision or to my knowledge during my time in this role. I want that stated without ambiguity, because the framing of your emails implies an ongoing pattern under my watch. That implication is not supported by the record.

You have not provided, in your emails or in our meetings, specific evidence of misconduct or problematic behavior occurring during my tenure. I asked for it. It has not been provided by you or anyone else. Greg has not spoken to media without my directive. He has not made public comments about this office or our work without my agreement. What he does on his own time, his political views, his social advocacy, his activism, is his First Amendment right as an individual, the same right you invoked in your email after our in-person meeting where I stated he has rights.

What I find genuinely disrespectful, institutionally and personally, is the repeated inclusion of my staff member's name and pre-tenure history, in written correspondence, deployed at the precise moment this office has become operational and is producing results, while no documented evidence of current or previous misconduct has been provided. Since my arrival, this office has been focused on carrying out its mandate. That is the record I am building. And I would note that the same standard being applied to secondhand, unverified accounts about Greg's off-duty expression has not been applied to documented conduct by Attorney Schauer during his active representation of this office.

On the Ordinance and Legislative Intent:

I have spoken directly with individuals involved in drafting and passing the original ordinance. The language was intentional. Unfettered access, the authority to retain independent counsel, and independence from City officials and staff were deliberate policy choices made by people who understood exactly what structural conflicts this office would face. The characterization of these provisions as unclear, unintended, or requiring correction through the proposed amendments is not consistent with what some of the drafters and advocates from the beginning have told me directly.

The proposed amendments, taken together, would formalize the structural constraints that have already been documented as barriers to effective oversight. The Amendment placing a Council-appointed alder on the PCOB is a categorical change to a body designed to be civilian and independent from electoral politics. It is not a clarification.

Formal Notice

I have raised every concern documented in this email through every appropriate channel, consistently and in good faith, since December 8th. What I have received in return is verbal and written positions that do not reflect prior discussions, reliance on pre-tenure information introduced strategically into potentially public correspondence, legal interpretations that limit this office's operational independence while being advanced by the office assigned to represent it, and active participation in legislative efforts to formalize the constraints this office has documented as barriers to its mandate.

The trust I came into this role hoping to build has not been eroded by misunderstanding. It has been eroded by a documented pattern that this correspondence reflects. That pattern has only reinforced what I stated publicly before I started: true independence is not optional for this office. It is the only condition under which meaningful oversight can exist.

The City is currently out of compliance with the ordinance governing this office as politics and personal agendas have been and are currently impacting the OIPM's work and independence. I am placing your office, as the City Attorney, on formal notice of that. The Office of the Independent Police Monitor will take the necessary action to address it. I want the record to reflect that this notice has been given, that it follows a documented pattern, and that it is not made lightly.

This office and the Board have been building. We will continue to build. We will not be silenced, and we will not be dismantled.

Respectfully,

Aeiramique Glass

Interim Independent Police Monitor

Office of the Independent Police Monitor

From: Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 4:31 PM

To: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>; Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Subject: Ordinance discussion

Hi Meeka and Maia,

I apologize for not following up sooner regarding the proposed ordinance changes related to the OIM and PCOB. I was at a national conference for four days and needed to connect with Patti Lauten who is on vacation in Japan to discuss our office's involvement in creating the MOU related to MPD records and in MPD's response to specific records requests of the OIM. I was not in the discussions regarding the MOU but based on my conversations with Patti, Chief Patterson and Robin, those conversations were not adversarial and focused on what is permitted and required under federal and state laws. Both sides were heard and they reached an agreement. Our role was to provide advice about what state and federal law requires, to ensure that both agencies and the City as an organization comply with those laws. In addition, it is my understanding that the only categories of records that MPD has not provided to the OIM or that have required a delay are records related to open and active investigations, disciplinary records or other records that cannot be disclosed under federal or state law. I understand that Meeka would like to reopen those discussions but I am not certain what additional records she seeks access to that can be released under the applicable laws. When Meeka expressed concerns about the OIM being treated like the public for purposes of records requests, I thought that meant that MPD was putting the OIM in the same queue as public requests but I am told it had to do with whether records could be released or where MPD staff were required to be notified, and that is the same regardless of whether the requestor is a City agency or the public. The distinction is between requestors who are themselves the subject of personnel records and all other requestors. Again that is state law that MPD does not have the choice to ignore.

During our meeting I indicated that I was open to considering whether the OIM should have access to outside counsel for the purposes of providing advice regarding terms of the MOU or records requests of the OIM. Having given this additional thought and based on how we have operated with MPD and the OIM, I cannot recommend that and see no value in it. If an independent attorney argues for provisions in the MOU or access to records that are not permitted by law, that would be both improper and pointless, as the City cannot disregard those laws in the creation or implementation of the MOU.

I understand that you feel strongly about the ability to choose separate legal counsel for any matter involving the OIM based on a perceived conflict and what may have occurred in other municipalities around the country. I believe that the perception or preemptive concern is based on a misunderstanding of our office's role in advising all City agencies. And I have not been given a concrete example of where our office's assistance to the OIM or the PCOB has been problematic, incorrect or unethical. Working with MPD and the OIM to create an MOU does not mean we are representing one or the other; we are representing the City as an organization and the OIM is part of that organization. It is no different than other situations where we work with different agencies to provide guidance about legal procedures and compliance. And I am not aware of any conflict that has arisen since the OIM started processing complaints and conducting investigations as our office has not been involved in those. If we are not involved in investigations and complaint processing, I fail to see how our representation of MPD is a barrier to providing legal advice to the OIM and the PCOB, and I have not been given a specific example of where a conflict has arisen or could arise. What I have heard is that you do not have trust in our office to represent the OIM but that feeling is not based on anything that has occurred to date. In my opinion, an agency head expressing a subjective lack of trust in our representation without any basis is not a reason for our office to not fulfill its statutory duty and authority to conduct the legal business of the City, and I

do not think it is a wise precedent to establish. In addition, I do not believe the City should rely on outside counsel to advise City agencies when that attorney is not responsible for representing the City in potential litigation.

I am certainly willing to continue the conversation if that would be helpful but I wanted to let you know that I have conveyed my thoughts to Alder Govindarajan and he has not directed that we carve out any other instances in his proposed ordinance where the OIM is authorized to retain separate counsel other than for the core duties of conducting investigations, processing complaints and oversight activities. The MOU and access to records seemed to be the key issue that Meeka identified in our meeting. If there are any aspects of the OIM's duties that you believe require outside counsel, please let me know so that I can address them.

Finally, I wanted to remind you of my request for the video that Meeka indicated she would send related to Attorney Schauer's social media activity.

Mike



Michael Haas

City Attorney ~ City of Madison
210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, ~ Room
401
Madison, WI 53703
608-266-6598 Direct Line
FAX: 608-267-8715
mhaas@cityofmadison.com

PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This electronic message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain privileged or confidential information and should not be disclosed to third parties without our express permission. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this message in error and review, dissemination or copying of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately, delete the original message and destroy any electronic or printed copies of this message. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2026 6:28 PM

To: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>; Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Subject: Meeting

Hi Maia and Meeka,

Thanks so much for the time and patience in our one-hour, I mean three-hour meeting. I appreciate your willingness to have an open and frank discussion in a civil manner. And I appreciate talking things through with people who are as stubborn as I am.

I will follow up separately with an email about the ways in which our office represents and assists agencies, and I look forward to continuing the discussion to see if we can agree on a division of duties between our office and outside counsel. For now I wanted to address something else we discussed. When I brought up concerns regarding Greg's statements, Meeka said she took that as disrespectful of her supervision of Greg, that she had addressed concerns with him, and that he has a First Amendment right to say whatever he wants off duty. First, I want to make clear I did not intend to be disrespectful. And my concerns about his behavior and comments are not limited to what he did prior to becoming a City employee and prior to Meeka becoming his supervisor, although his minimizing of the security risks related to accessing MPD data on his personal computer is definitely a concern and does not inspire confidence. I hear secondhand about comments he makes to others or on social media, some of them specifically critical of Attorney Schauer, including some statements which may be untrue. While Greg does have First Amendment rights, he should know that in some cases employers can take action regarding behavior that occurs off duty, including when off-duty statements have an impact on the workplace. I trust that Meeka addresses concerns or behavior as they arise but the impression that Greg sometimes leaves is that he does not want to be considered a City employee or affiliated with the City and does not need to treat other City employees with the respect and civility that he and all City employees deserve and which is required by City work rules. I do not tolerate my staff publicly badmouthing staff of other City agencies and claiming that they are unqualified to do their jobs because that reflects on our office and is detrimental to our working relationship with other agencies. I would hope we could expect the same in return.

In that same vein, if criticisms of Greg are seen as disrespectful of Meeka's supervision, I could certainly say the same about criticisms of Andy and my supervision of him. The criticisms that I heard about Andy include his prior career and things he has allegedly either said or reacted to on social media on his own time and not involving other City staff. You can't have it both ways. I certainly address issues with my staff when I am aware of them. It is the whisper campaign that is unfair to Andy when he is not even giving an opportunity to address the concerns or provide his perspective on whatever he is accused of doing. All of us are in the arena where we are concerned with due process and not taking a mere accusation as the truth without people being heard. That is why, while I understand your position regarding one attorney representing MPD and the OIM as a general principle, I would ask you to take what you hear about Andy with a grain of salt, and to afford him and my supervision of him with the same respect that you rightfully expect of you and your staff. There are undoubtedly reputable independent monitors who spent part of their careers in law enforcement and most of the criticism I hear about Andy always comes back to him working for WPPA, and the rest is just piling on or related to his First Amendment rights. So I hope you can appreciate my perspective on that. To that end, Meeka, you said that there was some video regarding Andy's behavior on social media. I do not know if that is connected to Amelia's complaint where he apparently actually liked something she posted or if it is something else. But in order for me to understand what your concern is about that, I would appreciate if you could send me the video and if there is something to address with him, I will do that and make sure it does not happen again.

I appreciate and respect all of the hard work that both of you have taken on in your roles and I look forward to continuing to work with you. Thanks again for the meeting and for considering these thoughts.

Mike



Michael Haas

City Attorney ~ City of Madison
210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, ~ Room
401
Madison, WI 53703
608-266-6598 Direct Line
FAX: 608-267-8715
mhaas@cityofmadison.com

PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This electronic message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain privileged or confidential information and should not be disclosed to third parties without our express permission. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this message in error and review, dissemination or copying of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately, delete the original message and destroy any electronic or printed copies of this message. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Govindarajan, MGR** <district8@cityofmadison.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 24, 2026 at 12:26 AM
Subject: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up
To: mpearson.cob@gmail.com <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Hi Maia,

Thank you again for taking the time to speak with me on Saturday regarding Legistar 92386. I appreciated the conversation and your willingness to engage on this issue. As discussed, I wanted to follow up in writing to share a set of concerns that have been raised to me by multiple City departments regarding the current operations of the Office of the Independent Monitor.

My intention in sharing this information is not to assign fault or draw conclusions prematurely, but to ensure that the PCOB as the governing body of the OIM, is aware of potential operational, legal, and compliance risks that may warrant further discussion or review. I believe that you having all the information available will allow you to do the vital role you've all volunteered to fulfill.

Several departments have raised concerns regarding adherence to City policies, processes, and APMs. In particular, there have been instances where standard City requirements have been questioned or not consistently followed, including:

- Technology procurement processes (APM 3-20)
- Logo usage policies (APM 3-18)
- Use of City-managed systems and devices

In some cases, City staff have had to reiterate that OIM employees, as City employees, are subject to the same policies and procedures as other departments. This has placed department leadership in the difficult position of

needing to clarify or enforce policies with a peer office, particularly given the unique structure and perceived independence of the OIM.

Information Technology leadership has also raised concerns to data security and compliance. These include:

- Use of personal or unmanaged devices to access or store City data
 - This presents significant cybersecurity risks
 - Would not meet Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) standards
 - Could jeopardize MPD's access to state and federal data systems
- Resistance to required training and established processes
 - Requests for access to systems without completing required trainings
 - Questions about whether certain procedures are "mandatory"
- Website and digital infrastructure concerns
 - References in the OIM Annual Report to a potential independent PCOB website raise issues related to:
 - Records retention and open records compliance
 - Accessibility requirements
 - Long-term maintenance and staffing capacity
 - Cybersecurity risks

There are also questions regarding compliance with existing policies in published materials, including logo usage standards and the potential use of generative AI in official documents.

Human Resources has similarly identified areas of potential legal and financial risk. These include:

- Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) compliance if staff are working beyond allotted or budgeted hours
 - There was also a public statement made during the press conference indicating that OIM staff may be working beyond their allotted or budgeted hours, which could raise FLSA compliance concerns if staff are working unpaid hours.
 - Tax law compliance concerns related to out-of-state work
- Hiring process for the next Independent Monitor
 - Ensuring the process follows established HR procedures and legal standards to avoid potential claims of discriminatory hiring practices, particularly given prior issues that have required significant staff time and legal resources
- Adherence to workplace policies related to
 - Discrimination
 - Workplace safety

As you know, these policies exist to mitigate risk and ensure that issues are addressed promptly and appropriately.

I haven't yet directly spoken to them, but I've heard that the Finance Department has similar concerns, mainly regarding:

- Contracting with services or programs without following established processes

- Purchasing equipment, software, or other items without following city policies

From my understanding, the Finance Department will not process payments if required policies are not followed. This reflects their responsibility to ensure that taxpayer funds are spent in accordance with Council authorization and City policy. Situations like this can create legal and financial risk if not addressed proactively.

The issues above, which staff have shared with me, seem to be just from the last three months.

Across these conversations, a consistent theme has emerged: concern that the OIM's independence in carrying out its core mission (investigations, findings, and recommendations) is being interpreted to include administrative, legal, and operational requirements. *While independence in its core function is both important and necessary, extending that independence to areas such as compliance with City policies and legal requirements creates risk not just for the OIM, but for the City as a whole.*

I am sharing these concerns so that the PCOB is aware of potential compliance gaps and operational risks, as well as areas where additional clarity or oversight may be warranted. These issues also directly informed portions of the ordinance revisions I recently introduced, particularly those clarifying that the OIM is fully independent in its mission but remains subject to City administrative structures, policies, and other applicable laws.

Staff Contact Information:

- Information Tech.: Sarah Edgerton -- SEdgeron@cityofmadison.com
- Human Resources: Erin Hillson -- EHillson@cityofmadison.com
- Finance Dept.: Dave Schmiedicke -- DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com
- City Attorney: Mike Haas -- MHaas@cityofmadison.com

Additionally, as I mentioned in our call, some of the information shared here may become part of broader public discussion. My preference, however, is to work collaboratively with you and the Board to address these concerns directly *and ensure that the Council is kept appropriately informed*. If these risks are not addressed and result in avoidable liability for the City, I believe the Council would be compelled to take steps to mitigate that risk, including reevaluating the structure, oversight, and funding of the OIM and PCOB.

I want to reiterate that I believe strongly in the mission and importance of both the OIM and the PCOB. My goal is to ensure that the structure supporting that mission is sustainable and aligned with existing policies of the city. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss any of these concerns further and to hear the Board's perspective.

Best,

MGR Govindarajan (*he/him/his*)

District 8 Alder | (608) 509-9119

[My Blog](#)

--

Maia Pearson, Board Chair

City of Madison Police Civilian Oversight Board

[Office of the Independent Monitor](#)

From: Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2026 5:16:05 PM
To: Govindarajan, MGR <district8@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>; Edgerton, Sarah <SEdgeron@cityofmadison.com>; Schmiedicke, David <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>; Hillson, Erin <EHillson@cityofmadison.com>; Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Re: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up

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

[The full PCOB has been bcc'd for information purposes only]

Good Afternoon MGR,

Thank you for following up on our phone conversation and outlining the concerns raised. To ensure transparency, I have cc'd the relevant department leaders, as noted in your email.

To date, the majority of the concerns outlined in your email have not been formally communicated to me or to members of the Board by department leadership or alders, particularly within the timeframe you reference. To the concerns that have been raised previously under prior leadership, they have been addressed. Moving forward, timely and direct communication of this nature will be important to ensure concerns can be fully understood and resolved by the board.

As a governing body and the Independent Police Monitor's direct report, we take seriously both our oversight responsibilities and our obligation to the community.

With respect to the specific areas you elevated:

Technology procurement processes (APM 3-20) and logo usage (APM 3-18):

At this time, no specific instances of noncompliance have been provided. Additional detail would be helpful to ensure clear and accurate understanding of these concerns. Based on current information, the interim IPM is actively working with IT to procure appropriate systems needed by the office. It is also important to note that oversight bodies often require specialised systems that are different from standard City infrastructure, which may require additional clarification and coordination. Regarding branding, the Board previously engaged with the City Communications Manager to discuss branding and received approval to use a distinct logo reflecting the unique role of the PCOB. To further note, in the spirit of collaboration, when creating the branding, the Board ensured to use the City's branding document as reference.

Information Technology and data security:

Concerns related to device usage and data access were addressed prior to the interim IPM's tenure. My understanding is that the necessary trainings have been completed and

that staff are working within established protocols. If there are new or ongoing concerns, the Board would welcome the opportunity to review and discuss them directly.

Website and digital infrastructure:

The concept of a more independent, accessible, and functional web presence has been discussed for several years, in response to community feedback regarding the accessibility of PCOB and OIM information. Improving public access to reports, meetings, and materials remains a priority for the Board. I would like to note that due to the unique role of oversight, most oversights in the US have their own standalone sites or have more autonomy with design and mechanisms/coding of said site. We are happy to provide examples and anticipate working collaboratively with the relevant departments.

Human Resources:

The OIM and PCOB are actively working with HR to ensure compliance with FLSA and other HR applicable policies. The recruitment and hiring processes for the next IPM has started. We are working in partnership with HR, learning more about the City's Equitable Hiring Plan and crafting a process that ensures robust community input.

Finance:

At this time, the board has not been made aware of the concerns referenced. We are committed to working collaboratively with finance to ensure procurement and contracting processes align. Especially as we prepare for the 2027 budget.

More broadly, I want to acknowledge the theme raised regarding the relationship between independence and administrative compliance.

The Board fully understands that the OIM operates within City systems and may be subject to basic applicable legal and administrative requirements. At the same time, the independence of the OIM and PCOB in carrying out its core mission is fundamental and must be preserved. In practice, this can require thoughtful coordination where existing policies do not always fully align with the unique structure, needs, and responsibilities of civilian oversight.

We believe that alignment is best achieved through direct communication and welcome continued conversations with alders and City stakeholders to ensure there is a shared understanding of this balance and to strengthen the systems supporting this work.

Finally, with respect to your reference to potential Council action, I would simply note that the ordinance establishing the OIM clearly affirms its independence in the performance of its duties. Maintaining that independence remains essential to the integrity and effectiveness of the oversight function and the Board remains committed to upholding that independence while also ensuring accountability and compliance with applicable basic requirements ([MGO 5.19 \(6\)\(b\)](#))

I appreciate your willingness to raise these concerns and agree that continued communication will be important moving forward. The Board remains committed to addressing issues constructively, collaboratively when necessary, and ensuring the long term suitability of the OIM and PCOB.

In solidarity,

Maia

--

Maia Pearson, Board Chair

City of Madison Police Civilian Oversight Board

[Office of the Independent Monitor](#)

On Tue, Mar 24, 2026 at 12:26 AM Govindarajan, MGR <district8@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Hi Maia,

Thank you again for taking the time to speak with me on Saturday regarding Legistar 92386. I appreciated the conversation and your willingness to engage on this issue. As discussed, I wanted to follow up in writing to share a set of concerns that have been raised to me by multiple City departments regarding the current operations of the Office of the Independent Monitor.

My intention in sharing this information is not to assign fault or draw conclusions prematurely, but to ensure that the PCOB as the governing body of the OIM, is aware of potential operational, legal, and compliance risks that may warrant further discussion or review. I believe that you having all the information available will allow you to do the vital role you've all volunteered to fulfill.

Several departments have raised concerns regarding adherence to City policies, processes, and APMs. In particular, there have been instances where standard City requirements have been questioned or not consistently followed, including:

- Technology procurement processes (APM 3-20)
- Logo usage policies (APM 3-18)
- Use of City-managed systems and devices

In some cases, City staff have had to reiterate that OIM employees, as City employees, are subject to the same policies and procedures as other departments. This has placed department leadership in the difficult position of needing to clarify or enforce policies with a peer office, particularly given the unique structure and perceived independence of the OIM.

Information Technology leadership has also raised concerns to data security and compliance. These include:

- Use of personal or unmanaged devices to access or store City data
 - This presents significant cybersecurity risks
 - Would not meet Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) standards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Hillson, Erin** <EHillson@cityofmadison.com>

Date: Wed, Apr 1, 2026 at 10:14 AM

Subject: RE: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up

To: Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>, Govindarajan, MGR <district8@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>, Edgerton, Sarah <SEdgerton@cityofmadison.com>, Schmiedicke, David <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>, Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Hi Maia –

Thank you for your email and for the conversation on Tuesday. I want to verify that you reached out to me to ensure we are working together to solve any FLSA issue that may exist. I provided guidance to staff in December about the need to ensure they are working within the hours authorized by Council, and my concerns came up after hearing the recent press conference that folks in the office were continuing to work over their budgeted time. I provided a couple of options last week to balance workload with reporting requirements, and I appreciated you reaffirming that this will be addressed.

I want to also share that the hiring process example used below was one that we ran into with a **previous hire** in this office, not an existing issue. I appreciate that we are working together to make sure this process meets the requirements of the ordinance and also meets standards we have at the City to ensure things like bias and discrimination do not enter into the hiring process, while having a robust community engagement process.

Lastly, the third example (adherence to discrimination or workplace safety rules) is an example of where we have **significant liability** as a City if policies aren't adhered to by managers, supervisors, and employees. **I have no evidence or reason to believe issues like this are going on in the OIM currently**, rather I want make sure it is understood that if policies aren't followed we incur the liability, whether or not we (as an organization) knew about it or condoned it.

I'll stop into the meeting tonight in case it would be helpful for the PCOB to hear this from me directly.

Best,

Erin

From: Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2026 5:16 PM

To: Govindarajan, MGR <district8@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>; Edgerton, Sarah <SEdgeron@cityofmadison.com>; Schmiedicke, David <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>; Hillson, Erin <EHillson@cityofmadison.com>; Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Re: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up

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

[The full PCOB has been bcc'd for information purposes only]

Good Afternoon MGR,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Edgerton, Sarah** <SEdgeron@cityofmadison.com>
Date: Wed, Apr 1, 2026 at 1:36 PM
Subject: RE: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up
To: Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>
Cc: Govindarajan, MGR <district8@cityofmadison.com>, Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>, Schmiedicke, David <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>, Hillson, Erin <EHillson@cityofmadison.com>, Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Good afternoon, Chair Pearson,

Thank you for your email. I appreciate your following up with us and your invitation to come to you with any questions or concerns regarding the Office of the Independent Monitor. If there are any future needs, I will reach out to you, and I would offer that you should also reach out to me directly with any IT questions.

As HR Director Hillson noted in her email response, I would also like to clarify with you that the examples provided below were issues that we had to address with the previous Office of the Independent Monitor and **are not existing issues**. These were highlighted to demonstrate the need for clear policies for the OIM so that they can operate successfully within the City of Madison structure. In fact, Independent Monitor Glass pointed out to me that it was not clear if these policies were legal requirements that the OIM had to follow. I agree with her observation that the current ordinance language is not clear.

Please know that Independent Monitor Glass has been a good partner to work with and is working with us to make sure that all requirements of Information Technology APMs are followed to ensure that we are mitigating risks and security concerns. We appreciate this partnership. I think it is important to acknowledge City IT policies do apply where we have not worked out alternative policies for the OIM.

Regarding APM 3-18, City of Madison logo, and the PCOB website, we are very open to having a discussion with you and Independent Monitor Glass on a PCOB website and providing guidance where needed.

I will see you at tonight's meeting.

Thank you,

Sarah

From: Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2026 5:16 PM

To: Govindarajan, MGR <district8@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>; Edgerton, Sarah <SEdgeron@cityofmadison.com>; Schmiedicke, David <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>; Hillson, Erin <EHillson@cityofmadison.com>; Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Re: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up

You don't often get email from mpearson.cob@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

[The full PCOB has been bcc'd for information purposes only]

Good Afternoon MGR,

Thank you for following up on our phone conversation and outlining the concerns raised. To ensure transparency, I have cc'd the relevant department leaders, as noted in your email.

To date, the majority of the concerns outlined in your email have not been formally communicated to me or to members of the Board by department leadership or alders, particularly within the timeframe you reference. To the concerns that have been raised previously under prior leadership,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Govindarajan, MGR** <district8@cityofmadison.com>

Date: Wed, Apr 1, 2026 at 3:06 PM

Subject: Re: Detailed OIM Concerns, Phone Call Follow-Up

To: Maia Pearson <mpearson.cob@gmail.com>

Cc: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>, Edgerton, Sarah <SEdgerton@cityofmadison.com>, Schmiedicke, David <DSchmiedicke@cityofmadison.com>, Hillson, Erin <EHillson@cityofmadison.com>, Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>

Hi Maia,

Thanks for your response. I'm glad that direct communication with the department heads is taking place, and I believe the Mayor's office will be issuing a similar directive to other department staff as relevant for them to speak with you if issues arise.

I appreciate your attentiveness to this matter, I just wanted to ensure that you and the PCOB were aware so you can fulfill your oversight duties with all the available information.

Best,

MGR Govindarajan (*he/him/his*)
District 8 Alder | (608) 509-9119

[REDACTED]

From: Lauten, Patricia <PLauten@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2026 6:07 PM

To: Glass, Aeiramique <AGlass@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Patterson, John <JPatterson@cityofmadison.com>; Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>; Kamoske, Angela <AKamoske@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Responses to Questions Posed in your February 11 Email

Meeka,

I met with City Attorney Haas, Chief Patterson and Assistant Chief Kamoske to answer your questions. Those answers are in red below. Both MPD and the City Attorney's Office are committed to working cooperatively with you and the OIM to timely provide you with the records your office requests. My understanding is that you have already made requests to MPD for non-personnel related records and have been receiving those records in a timely manner. To be clear, neither MPD nor the City Attorney's Office is denying you access to any records. However, as indicated in my responses, State law places certain requirements on government when public employee personnel records are requested, and we are following State law.

1. **Any record relating to an individual officer, including Internal Affairs or PSIA investigative files and officer interview transcripts, is categorically deemed a personnel record, including transcripts generated during an open and active investigation, solely because they involve an employee and may potentially result in discipline, irrespective of the record's investigatory purpose, function, or use.** Public employee personnel files are subject to open records unless the record or the information is legally exempt. Some common exemptions are employee home addresses, personal email, social security numbers, and records related to staff management, such as performance evaluations and letters of reference. The employer must notify employees before releasing records involving disciplinary actions. Records involving disciplinary action are not releasable until after the investigation has concluded.

2. **Investigatory materials created for fact finding, accountability review, compliance monitoring, or oversight purposes are treated as personnel records prior to any disciplinary determination, employment action, or final investigative finding.** Records relating to discipline would be records relating to the issue being investigated like the employee's timecard, or video showing them leaving their workstation, it would include the complaint, interviews with the complainant, the respondent, witness interviews, the final written report and any discipline notices and final written discipline determination. I do not know what an accountability review, compliance monitoring or oversight purpose records would be.
3. **OIPM, as an ordinance created independent oversight entity acting pursuant to its statutory mandate, is treated as "the public", "other City agencies", or otherwise equivalent to a non-employee requester for purposes of Wis. Stat. §§ 19.35, 19.36, and 19.356 when requesting records necessary to fulfill official oversight responsibilities.** The OIPM and the IM are part of the City. However, by ordinance they are an independent stand-alone agency. As I explained in my email, when it comes to personnel records, only the employee and their representative have a right to view their records. For requesters not the employee or their representative, any redactions to personnel documents, and notice to the employee, are made consistent with provisions in State law that provide for exemptions and notification (see #1 above).
4. **Wis. Stat. § 103.13 is interpreted as anticipating access to personnel records primarily by the employee or the employee's representative, and that any access request by a non-employee, including an ordinance authorized oversight entity, is therefore governed exclusively by Chapter 19 public records law.** The two main statutes that address employee personnel files in Wisconsin are 103.13 and 19.36. There may be other laws so I can't say "exclusively" but these are the two we deal with the most as a public employer.
5. **Wis. Stat. § 19.356 is triggered prior to providing records to OIPM even where no public records request has been made, no public disclosure has been requested or contemplated, and the records are sought solely for internal governmental oversight, investigation, monitoring, or evaluation pursuant to ordinance authority.** The statute governs disclosure to an individual that is not the employee or their representative. Again, there are many records that City agencies share with each other so each agency can do their job. There are many records that MPD provides to the IM so the IM can fulfill their statutory duties, but the Wisconsin legislature has carved out public employee personnel records for certain legal protections.
6. **The active status of a PSIA, Internal Affairs investigation independently authorizes withholding investigatory materials from OIPM notwithstanding the ordinance's express grant of access, and that the notice and hold provisions of § 19.356 apply at the point of internal access rather than only after a decision to permit public release of records.** For discipline investigations, the investigation must conclude before any records can be released. The investigation concluding is when the final investigative findings, generally sustained or not sustained, are determined. Typically, this is a written report, but it could be an email, or it could be verbal. Imposing discipline after the conclusion of the investigation is not part of the investigation so a public employer cannot deny or hold onto a request until after the employee is disciplined. The record request must be processed at the close of the investigation.
7. **MPD is prohibited from providing OIPM with investigatory materials, including officer interview transcripts, during an active investigation absent compliance with § 19.356 notice procedures.** The employee investigation must conclude. The conclusion of the investigation is what I've described above.

8. **The ordinance’s grant of unfettered access to MPD records to the extent permitted by law is subordinate to § 19.356 notice and delay provisions even where no public disclosure is implicated.** The City must follow State law. It would be illegal to produce records contrary to State law. At the time the ordinance was created the Council discussed the meaning of “unfettered access” and declined to define that term but specifically included the moderating phrase “to the extent permitted by law.” The City ordinance cannot supersede the rights and obligations established in the statutes.
9. **When referencing safeguards the law provides, the City is relying on mandatory statutory requirements rather than internal legal review practices, and if so, please identify the specific statutory provisions requiring such safeguards prior to providing records to OIPM.** The City is citing State law and not internal City APMs or MPD SOPs. The two primary laws are 103.13 and 19.36 but there are other laws that govern medical records, attorney client documents, etc.
10. **If OIPM is not being treated as the public for all purposes, please clarify the legal basis under which Chapter 19 notice provisions are being applied to OIPM’s ordinance authorized access rather than to a decision to release records to the public.** I don’t understand the question. If the public entity is going to release employee discipline documents, then it needs to provide the statutory notice under 19.356. There is case law, which the statute codified, stating that the employee is entitled to notice. See [Woznicky v. Erickson \(1996\)](#).

If any of the foregoing statements do not accurately reflect the City’s position, please identify the specific statement or statements at issue and provide the statutory or legal authority supporting the distinction being drawn. The City does not have a “position.” The City is following the law.

Separately, to ensure clarity regarding timing, if the city maintains that notice under § 19.356 is required, please confirm whether OIPM’s request for officer interview transcripts is being treated as a decision to permit public access under § 19.35. If not, please clarify the legal basis for applying § 19.356 prior to providing records for internal oversight purposes. I’m not sure I understand the question. The OIM’s ask for the interview transcripts is treated as a record request; the transcripts are part of the discipline documents. There is no denial to the OIM of the records. There is just the application of the law to those records.

Finally, OIPM requests that MPD provide the officer interview transcripts by close of business Today 02/11/2026. If MPD will not produce the transcripts by that time, please confirm that position. As explained, if the investigation is not concluded, we would not provide any documents at this time. If the investigation is concluded, then we would provide the employee with the transcript and give them the 19.356 notice. The employee may waive their right under 19.356, and the record could be released immediately, or we would have to wait and release the record on the 12th day if the employee did not go into court to stop the release.

Patricia Lauten

Deputy City Attorney
City of Madison
plauten@cityofmadison.com