

## Charter Commission Meeting

January 11 2017, 7p.m., Room 211

Present: Josh Krintzman (Chair), Jane Frantz, Howard Haywood, Anne Larner, Brooke Lipsitt, Karen Manning, Chris Steele. Bryan Barash and Rhanna Kidwell (Vice Chair) arrive during Article 9 discussion.

Approval of December 14, 2016 Minutes: Brooke makes a motion to approve minutes with minor edits (pages 7,9,10). Anne seconds. Motion passes 7-0.

### Public Comment:

Sallee Lipshutz, Radcliff Rd, Waban. It is a relief to see Paragraph “M” in the Article 12 draft, ensuring that the area councils will not go into a state of “suspended animation”. In addressing the points of deliberation [re: area council transition], she recommends operating as they have as far as boundaries and elections. New area councils should be allowed to be formed “as is”. She strongly recommends a city council deadline and timeline. Otherwise, things could get uncomfortable. Area councils should be able to get funding.

Nathaniel Lichtin, 53 Pinecrest Road, agrees with Sallee’s points. He would like to see “ordinances” changed to “resolutions” as a clarification within Paragraph “M” of article leaders’ proposed draft. Allowing new area councils to be formed during the interim period is a matter of equity and expanding coverage is in everyone’s interest and may encourage the new council to act more quickly in adopting the new framework.

Article 11, Section 2(b) should be removed. It appears too restrictive in suggesting anything new to a city official or staff member. This language suggests an opinion or suggestion (even to repair a road or fix a streetlight) could not be expressed unless it was relating to a matter before the city.

Karen explains that the deliberation is not over whether area councils are eligible for funding, but whether to address funding directly in the transition clause. Nathaniel would like to see a reference to allowing funding (for area councils if decided by council) if Paragraph “M” stands as is because funding is excluded within the area councils’ resolutions.

### Discussion of Article 12

The draft presented is a codification of last meeting’s Article 12 decisions. The charter will take effect upon adoption, but some items “will not work on day 1”. These items are spelled out in Article 12, Sec. 7.

Two things still require discussion. The first is in subsection J. Brooke spoke offline with Marilyn about Section 5(2) regarding the setting aside of funds for city council legal counsel. It currently says the amount may be amended by ordinance, though would not go into effect until the next fiscal year. We’d all agreed that for the first year, the amount should be 2% of the law department’s proposed budget. Marilyn was concerned about clarity of the starting date, so Brooke and Rhanna are proposing a slight change to Paragraph J as follows:

“The third paragraph of section 5-2 shall take effect upon the mayor’s submission of the FY2019 budget; the amount appropriated for legal assistance to the city council shall be 2 per cent of the proposed budget for the city law department.”

It will then be clear that the ordinance would apply to subsequent budgets. The group agrees.

Three other issues are marked “TBD”. 1 is which part of special legislation we’re retaining or repealing. Marilyn wants to discuss with Josh. Brooke wants to leave it with them because of their expertise with state legislation. Article 12 Sec. 7(a) should say regular city election.

For “M”, Area Councils, the article leaders have no recommendations. There are no area council ordinances. Everything related to the area councils is being controlled by the charter and action of the city council.

Karen previews points of [area councils] deliberation. A main question is whether area councils would not be permitted to change their boundaries, for instance, during the transition.

Chris makes the argument that freezing the boundaries or the creation of new councils, for instance, creates a risk that the council will not act to create the ordinance(s) for the area councils. In that case, he would strongly recommend a timeline for the city council.

Karen proposes that a good starting point may be confirming no changes to elections, with Chris clarifying the elections would be same as they were in Nov., 2015. The group agrees.

Brooke wishes to think through what might compel the city council to take action [creating a framework for area councils]. The pressure will come from existing area councils or those that want to form. In this case, we could choose to freeze everything. For instance, once the Newton Highlands area council asks to add a street there will be pressure to create the ordinance. A deadline would need to be a long deadline because there is a lot happening, and some is time-constrained. If area councils want to “make a move” and we create a system responsive to demand, the city council may take timely action.

Jane is concerned that the city council might say “no” to adding streets or setting boundaries or won’t create the ordinance - in short, that no action would take place.

Brooke - They have that authority anyway.

Jane - But if there were a date?

Brooke - Even with an ordinance, they can choose to take no action on neighborhood area councils’ requests.

Jane - This is different because much more open ended. Her concern is that if the charter passes the city council will not take action, specifically with the boundaries and creation of the new councils.

Chris understands Brooke’s logic but thinks other items will also be in the pipeline with the force of public concern behind them. Options include straight deadline, extending current provisions as they are, or motivate the council to act another way. [For instance], if a request is made, the city council must pass an ordinance by “x”. Another option: if the Council fails to act, then the current de facto regulations would remain in effect. Waiting for the council to act without an “or else” may leave this at the bottom of their priorities.

Karen agrees with Brooke’s sensitivity to the impact this will have on the council and the changes they will be undergoing. If we move in the direction of “freezing” area council activity for some time, it would be with the best of intentions to provide space for the city council.

Anne prefers a straightforward solution, and avoiding a lose-lose situation that leaves things hanging. This does not speak to transparency and involvement.

Josh -We cannot direct the City Council that if they don’t provide “x” then “y”, because the Council is providing “y”, the solution.

Brooke -This should not be different from other points of the transition, which involve deadlines. “Or it goes back to how it was” is not a good approach. There should be a deadline (not too short) but not an “or else”.

Anne does not agree with having a deadline, but thinks the area councils should be able to act under the old rules until the new rules are set up.

Brooke is assuming the existing councils are acting under the resolutions that approved their formation(s). Josh points out they will be operating under Article 9 also, and brings up whether it is sufficient to say they will be operating under their own resolutions.

Chris points out that changing boundaries and creation of new area councils are what fall under the charter.

Brooke continues to support no new boundaries or creation of new councils until there is an ordinance. The current area councils are not kept from operating. If we make it possible for changes to be made under the old charter language, it takes the pressure off [the Council] to form the new ordinance. The deadline should involve some pressure, as this will not be a priority for the Council.

Chris is in agreement.

Brooke does not see harm if certain streets were not annexed for a time. However, Chris is concerned about equity within the city and not having a roadmap for new area councils to form.

Brooke says this would be addressed in time - the council would get its ordinance ready.

Bryan asks if anything would prevent new area councils from forming. Chris and Brooke reply that this would be prevented because the old Article 9 would no longer be applicable.

Josh brings up point that if ordinance not created by a certain time, the old Article 9 could be brought back into effect [a point discussed later].

Rhanna joins the meeting.

Anne points out that under the current Article 9, the Council may accept or reject a petition. The Council could decide whether it should include a moratorium on formation of new councils. Why should we impose this from the outside? Isn't it better to leave open during the interim period so the Council may make the decision? Do we need to "protect" the Council from this - are we getting into the weeds?

Chris - can we preserve the language in Article 9 that provides latitude to the Council to accept petitions?

Brooke - this is provided under the new charter, but they need to write the ordinance.

Jane - If the new charter is approved, can we refer back to or use the old charter?

Josh believes we could refer back to it, i.e. if the deadline were not met, but would turn the question to Marilyn.

Bryan doesn't like the angle that the City Council might not act. If a group wants to form an area council, the City Council needs to address the question. He is not inclined to "save them from an action".

Brooke reiterates that she is not inclined to invoke dates because pressure from area councils would put pressure on the Council to act.

Jane is concerned that the Council might address only one piece, i.e. the boundaries, and elements of the old charter could remain. It could get very confusing.

Example: Imagine the City Council establishes boundaries for new area councils, as stated under new proposal, but doesn't address the others. What are we left using? She is questioning the logic and legalities.

Bryan - it is up to [the City Council] to write a coherent ordinance if we did not.

Chris - and we left it to them.

Brooke - How much pressure do we put on the Council? Do we set the date or do we trust they'll do it on their timetable or when necessary?

Rhanna - do you think setting a date would increase the likelihood of it getting done?

Brooke does not believe it will get done until an area council comes in and there is pressure. Whether there is a deadline or not, this issue will rise as a priority as needed.

Chris asks for clarification of what the deadline might look like. Brooke reiterates her support for leaving out the deadline and reminds the group that as things stand now, the Council may choose not to act upon an area council requests.

Bryan hopes that the Council would start some of its own work on the transition immediately after the new charter were to pass.

Chris clarifies he would like to see an affirmative action to review the petition to ensure a straight answer.

Brooke responds that if an item is docketed, the Council has to act.

Chris is concerned that their action will not be timely.

Brooke- The Councilors keep each other motivated to act/respond and we are looking for a solution to a non problem.

Karen sees some benefits to not having changes for a certain amount of time because of the pressure area council changes can bring to city departments, and this will be a very busy time.

Anne asks for clarification of not including "M"~ & Article 9 would go into effect, what is the situation for existing area councils? What they can/not do?

Josh - With Sec. 12(1), Continuation of Existing Laws, they would continue to operate under their resolutions.

Anne - Could they petition for changes?

Brooke - They could, but in order for the Council to answer the petitions, the Council would need to create an ordinance.

Anne - This would also be the case if new area councils were to form?

Brooke - Yes, there would need to be an ordinance. The best way to get ordinance language passed is for there to be a need.

Anne - If "M" is in there, they can proceed?

Brooke - Without "M", they will act on their own schedule.

Anne - But with "M" and no deadline?

Brooke: If there's no deadline, we wouldn't put "M" in at all. Article 9 would go into effect immediately and the Council could pass an ordinance the next day if they wanted to or in a year.

Anne - With the word resolutions in there, do the resolutions or old article hold sway? It's confusing.

Josh - The old article is gone.

Anne - What does "M" do?

Josh - It's placeholder language, not a proposal. The question is when does Article 9 go into effect? If it goes into effect, what happens to the existing area councils, and do we want language to deal with that? For instance, do we want to have a deadline for the city council to enact its ordinance?

Anne - So the question is whether we want Area 9 to go into effect immediately or at the time an ordinance is passed?

Chris favors including "M". The earlier language in Art. 12 implies area councils' continuation, but he recommends explaining within "M" that they'll continue in force under their resolutions.

Bryan agrees being explicit is helpful. It's important that 10 years from now in looking at this charter and transition, no one will need to reference the old charter.

Brooke suggests narrowing the discussion to what is in front of us. Do we need to impose a timetable for creating the ordinance?

Bryan supports Chris's point. It could be as simple as saying existing resolutions will remain in effect until the new ordinance is passed.

Rhanna - Article 9 already says this. We can't say they'll operate under the old charter, because we're not going back to the old charter.

Bryan - we can say board orders (resolutions).

Brooke and Rhanna do not believe this is necessary, but Bryan thinks it would help to be clear.

Jane - there was so much concern about current Article 9 that it's in our best interest to provide clarity about when we move forward with the new article and it is completely in effect.

Chris - we need to establish that the old article is out of play, but likewise need to know when the new one is in play. The new Article 9 references an ordinance that doesn't exist. You can either set a deadline, or allow it to work by context.

Brooke - It will happen. We could be explicit and say the Council shall take no action [on a petition] until the ordinances are in place [on a petition].

Chris - This is a Catch-22. The board can't respond to something until there is a petition but there are no stipulations about what a petition looks like until there is an ordinance.

Jane sees risk for confusion, so it is helpful to have a deadline for when the new Article 9 would go into effect.

Josh - The authority to create the ordinances will go into effect immediately.

Jane is concerned that one ordinance may address boundaries, another creation of new councils, etc.

Brooke expects that it will all be one ordinance. She reads from the Article 9 draft.

Karen - the new ordinance will create the whole framework, but this is our opportunity to help ensure the transition goes smoothly by spelling out specifics that could be helpful too.

Brooke reiterates that it will all get done in one ordinance and moves that we do not reference neighborhood area councils within the Transition document.

Josh rephrases this to “Brooke’s motion is to omit any reference to Article 9 in Article 12, aside from a reference to “existing resolutions” in the first sentence of Article 12, Sec. 1.” There is no second.

Bryan confirms agreement with Chris that the board resolutions reference will be included.

Brooke makes another motion: The City Council will develop the appropriate ordinances to support Article 9 by January 1, 2020.”

Rhanna seconds.

Chris still wants the explicit reference that the area councils will continue to exist. He is not sure he can support the motion without that in front.

Brooke points out the ordinances still could pass day 1.

Karen still sees benefit in having a period of inactivity to avoid pressure on the council to address this immediately.

Rhanna expects that the current area councils will drive the Council to act and likes the proposal.

Chris wants to include the language to acknowledge the existence of the current area councils operating under their current board resolutions.

Brooke thinks this is unnecessary. Rhanna reads from Article 9, Sec. 1, affirming their continued existence. It is already in the charter so it does not need to be in the transition provisions.

Bryan agrees with Chris and does not think it is redundant~ and worth getting clear.

Brooke learned during her time on the BofA not to use different language to refer to the same issue.

Josh restates the motion. 8 are in favor (Kidwell, Krintzman, Barash, Haywood, Lipsitt, Frantz, Larner, Manning). 1 abstains (Chris Steele). Motion carries.

Chris makes the additional motion to include: “existing neighborhood area councils shall continue to exist and operate under their resolutions in effect at the time of this home rule charter”.

Brooke - Does this mean that those resolutions can’t be modified?

Chris - That is a good point and agrees to state until the new ordinances go into effect, per Bryan’s suggestion. His motion: “Existing neighborhood area councils shall continue to exist and operate under their resolutions in effect at the time of the adoption of this home rule charter until the city council adopts new ordinances applicable to such neighborhood area councils”.

4 are in favor (Barash, Manning, Larner, Steele). 5 are opposed (Haywood, Krintzman, Kidwell, Frantz, Lipsitt). The motion goes down.

Bryan brings up one more point. At the end of A9, we reference ordinances that *create* the area councils, but the word should be resolution.

It’s noted that the guidelines are established by ordinance.

Bryan~ it says the ordinances creating an area council.

Rhanna suggests an edit: “The ordinances providing for neighborhood area councils shall include the requirements for area council bylaws, etc....”

Brooke: “providing for their structure, etc.” - suggests use of the word “their”.

Brooke asks if we should be forming area councils by ordinance rather than by resolution?

Marilyn points out that resolutions have no force of law.

Brooke - do we want them to have force of law?

Marilyn questions whether it needs to continue to be by resolution.

Bryan - We’re not really speaking on this anyway. The Council will decide.

Marilyn re-raises question about whether we should be referring to area councils in the plural.

Josh - another approach, given that 9(3)b says the city council approves area council petitions, might be: “the approval of a neighborhood area council shall include the requirements for area council bylaws, etc.”

Brooke - the issue is establishing new area councils versus the existing, and the rules should be the same. Establishing implies a new one. We’re not asking the city council to re-establish those that exist.

The group agrees to Rhanna’s edit.

### Discussion of 3-3

Josh directs the council to proposed changes of the previous draft:

“Rejection by the city council shall require a 2/3 vote” (applying to mayoral appointments including department heads, boards and commissions, etc.)

We had created subsections (a) through (d). The above language got placed in subsection (d) which dealt exclusively with mayoral appointments of volunteer boards, commissions, and agencies.

As drafted we omitted from (b) which refers to mayoral appointments of city officers and department heads. This would have leave it at a majority vote which was not our intention.

He is proposing adding a subsection (e): Rejection by the City Council of an appointment by the Mayor under (b) or (d) shall require a 2/3 vote.

Josh asks if the group is in agreement with this change.

Brooke points out that committee appointments (in d) would not go to the council, and Josh responds this is the existing language. Brooke cannot think of a committee appointment that would come to the Council. They are informal bodies. Josh believes removing would create more problems.

Marilyn says ad hoc committees can be exempt and “ad hoc committees” can be included in the Article 1 definitions.

### Definition of Re-organization Plan Discussion

Jane leads a discussion about the Article 1 definition of “**Reorganization Plan**”, a plan submitted by the mayor to the city council, which proposes the abolition or consolidation of 1 or more city agencies, including the

reassignment of functions from 1 agency to another, or the establishment of 1 or more new city agencies as deemed necessary to deliver 1 or more municipal services.

Jane recaps that several councilors had raised that the definition of re-organization was not defined in the charter so anything could be a reorganization (or not), therefore the Commission came up with the definition. She is concerned we could be tying the hands of the various departments. "Reassignment of functions" is particularly troubling because it happens in just about any organization.

Josh clarifies that her concern is that this is too expansive, and too restrictive on the Mayor.

Anne recaps she had numerous conversations with the President of the Council. One of the issues was tension between the council and the Mayor over what constituted a reorganization, and people wanted clarity regarding what constituted a reorganization. The timing was addressed in Article 6 itself. Marilyn looked at language from other places and together they tried to ensure a higher level of reorganization and that "getting into the weeds" or smaller "management efficiencies" would not rise to the level [of requiring council approval]. The focus would be major changes involving whole agencies, whole departments, and major changes.

Marilyn agrees a goal was for the Mayor and Council to understand this would be [invoked] over significant need.

Jane had a long conversation with the President of the City Council. She understood there were major reorganizations not including the reassignment functions. It's the phrase "including the reassignment of functions from one agency to another" that concerns her. It could tie the hands of how the department heads, Mayor, and the city function.

Anne and Josh clarify how a timeline gets triggered and the Council votes up or down, with no amendments allowed.

Jane concerned approving "reassignment of functions" could be over minor items.

Marilyn gives example of removing a function from a Library Board to Parks and Rec, not within the Library Board, which is major.

Josh summarizes implications: 1) up or down vote 2) public hearing within 30 days 3) by 2nd regular meeting after that, city council approves or disapproves

Anne reminds the group of the Article 6 Mar. 1 deadline for notification to Council if there are budget implications.

Jane remains concerned the wording could be misinterpreted, particularly "reassignment of functions".

Josh - Is it your concern that it ties the hands of the Mayor or ties the hands of the City Council?

Jane - ...the Mayor but also the department heads, who might think a function would work better in another city agency.

Josh - believes having a larger definition including more things provides an expedited process for the Mayor to effectuate these changes. Because more things are included the Mayor can have a quick process and avoids the City Council "sitting on a change" or a "pocket veto".

Jane is thinking in terms of the executive, department heads, and staff.

Josh - if you take "reassignment" out, it would be difficult for the Mayor to reassign functions from one agency to another. It limits what could be defined as a reorganization plan, which allows for the expedited process. This forces the up or down vote within specified time frame. Otherwise it's like any other ordinance, and the City Council does not have to address in a timely manner.



Brooke has a different interpretation. If we take the language out, it will free the Mayor to reassign functions without ever talking to the City Council. Example: DPW and Parks and Rec have had overlapping functions over the years. If the Mayor does not need to consult the council, an initial change could take place without consulting the Council. The Mayor could later ask the City Council to continue, and they would be hard pressed to undo what was in progress. It's better to be up front and to have an active review before something is put into place.

The group leaves the language as is.

### Discussion of Draft of Preliminary Report

Jane provides introduction. Karen and Jane wrote this draft based on outline. They do not expect all items to be included. Jane was thinking of audiences with the report. This is for the whole city, with a range of interest levels.

They asked for feedback from the article leaders about what they felt was essential to include. Much was incorporated into the draft, and there is flexibility going forward for whatever is not.

After circulating the draft, several people proposed minor changes and 2 sent back major edits.

Brooke suggested to Jane that the group first review the content (highlights section) and craft the writing at a later point. Handouts of Josh and Rhanna's edits are also provided. Discussion involves which content should be included.

Mayor: The Executive Branch:

Jane would prefer to use the phrase "strong mayoral".

Brooke suggests "retain our strong mayoral". Take out "carry out responsibilities" and "financial responsibilities".

The group approves Rhanna's drafted language, with question/discussion over "changes to financial procedures would ensure transparency". Josh likes that sentence. Brooke suggests we keep an open mind to moving to financial procedures section.

City Council: the Legislative Branch

Bryan, Chris, Josh - including values would do good, providing the "why".

Jane - Go back to the objectives?

Brooke - Regarding Rhanna's draft, change to "no ward residency requirement". The group agrees.

Josh - Also, "All councilors could serve up to eight consecutive terms.

The School Committee:

Jane wants to include overview of responsibilities for School Committee.

Rhanna disagrees because we are highlighting changes to the charter in this report.

Bryan believes we should describe the model and stress that it has served us well. It helps strengthen our city council proposal.

Brooke - Is this an explanatory or persuasion piece?

Bryan - There is a benefit to over-viewing how our government works [alongside] what we are proposing.

Josh - We should highlight that state law has changed and we are updating the charter to reflect that.

Brooke - That is for the whole charter.

Josh - This has particular significance for the School Committee and its review.

Bryan agrees.

Rhanna is ok with one sentence about being consistent with state law, but believes it will be assumed.

Bryan and Jane see Ed Reform as an important element.

Rhanna - Ed Reform is not part of our work or this charter.

A brief discussion continues.

Howard - a reference to updates to state law is also in the conclusion, which most people will read.

Jane supports reiterating the state law updates throughout the report.

Brooke does not think we need to call attention to this - the School Committee and School Department have run fine even without outdated language.

Josh asks to see how people lean.

4 would prefer a sentence in the School Committee section about compliance with state law, and 5 do not.

Vacancies for Mayor, City Council, and School Committee:

Karen and Jane decided to put the vacancies information in one place.

Rhanna - the only change is how a mayoral vacancy would be filled in the the last 9 months.

Brooke and Howard suggest leaving out the language which is very technical.

Bryan does not oppose including it, but does not support the order within the report.

Jane - Special elections and vacancies are something a lot of people spoke to her about.

Josh - It is an issue but something shorter suffices.

Bryan - Including these types of items emphasizes the breadth of the proposal.

Anne & and Chris support Josh's recommendation.

Karen recommends keeping its placement/order.

Financial Procedures:

Anne had submitted a comment about tempering language about "improving" financial procedures- it's more about codifying best practices.

The group supports the bullet points and Anne's comments.

Brooke raises that the audit takes place because it is required by bonding agencies, etc. Do we need to call it out? Does the person on the street really care?

The group wants to include, but with the sentences merged.

#### Planning:

Brooke suggests keeping the first and third sentences of Jane and Karen's draft. The group agrees.

Chris highlights the city's interest in special permit granting authority.

Brooke clarifies we should explain city council determines which body has SPGA *because* it is within the purview of the city council, per state law.

Howard suggests this could be highlighted within the conclusion, but the group decides to keep where it is.

Bryan suggests Initiative, Petition, and Referendum be moved up within the report. The group will discuss order later.

The group agrees to eliminate the "Administrative Procedures" section.

Neighborhood Area Councils: The group agrees to removing the third and fourth sentences in Karen and Jane's draft. The second sentence is modified to "The City Council would set the boundaries for area councils and establish the election process for all area councils by ordinance". The word "new" should be omitted and "and any other functions" will be incorporated as part of the second sentence.

#### Boards and Commissions:

Bryan and Brooke point out we do have the regular review of the city charter, boards and commissions, ordinances, etc. and adding an umbrella section about "Periodic Reviews" instead of keeping this heading.

#### Initiative, Petition, and Referendum:

Brooke highlights that most important is that we have improved the language and streamlined the process.

The group does not wish to include thresholds, but instead to emphasize the updates and our keeping up with trends in other cities.

Brooke - Perhaps this should precede the Neighborhood Area Councils section because it is more general.

Marilyn is concerned that no one knows definitions of initiative and referendum and reminds us of the powerpoint she sent as an example of supplemental materials. Initiatives and referendums should be referred to as questions.

Jane and Bryan see value in emphasizing that this is how citizens petition local government~ Initiatives, Petitions and referendums are forms of ballot initiatives.

#### Conflict of Interest;

Brooke suggests using the first sentence only with "introduces" or "adds" vs. includes.

Josh proposes incorporating our guiding principles.

#### Public Comment:

Howard points out that this might not be supported by the City Council and refers back to the deliberations on this topic. He does not think this should be in the report.

Josh proposes one sentence about “public comments ensuring greater public participation in city government” and the group agrees.

The 10 year Review will fall under the heading of “Periodic Reviews” (or regular reviews). This would include charter, boards and commissions, ordinances.

Chris notes Preamble is out of sequence. Also, the last mention within the Periodic Reviews section should be of the Charter 10 Year Review, to lead into the next section, “Transition”.

Bryan suggests not having a preamble, but a section about “Values of the City” which refers to the Preamble.

Brooke suggests reference to the preamble/values belong(s) in the introduction and the group agrees.

Transition:

Josh likes the third sentence, and Rhanna believes the Commission’s work on the transition doesn’t need to be called out. The group agrees.

Rhanna points out clarifications in her draft, which includes the correct date (the new charter would go into effect November of 2017, as soon as the results of the election are certified). Also highlighted: when the terms of the councilors would start, and some elements will not be phased in immediately and are detailed in Article 12.

Josh will work with Jane on the next iteration of the draft. Bryan is available after 1/23 and Chris is available to help. Rhanna requests reference to her draft as part of the next round.

#### Commission Schedule/New Business

The upcoming weeks will include finalization the preliminary report draft, a draft of the charter, the vote on the charter draft, and finalizing Article 12.

Josh points out March 15 is when the public hearing on the preliminary report is scheduled, 2-3 weeks after publication of the preliminary report. The Attorney General has four weeks to respond.

The preliminary reports needs to be published in the newspaper before the 3/15 hearing. Target dates would be 3/1 or 3/8. Karen will contact Andy Levin and provide him with notice.

Marilyn explains the report is usually published as an insert. We will need to figure out who will print it.

May 3 is the deadline for submitting the final report.

The group does not support holding multiple public hearings but will make visits across the city in upcoming weeks and months.

Room 211 is reserved throughout the year. It’s preferable to hold the dates and cancel as needed.

We may choose to vote on the charter on 1/25, and Josh will incorporate the changes from this meeting.

Brooke moves the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourns at 9:52p.m.

Documentation Used:

Agenda

Minutes

Article 12 Draft

Neighborhood Area Councils Transition: Points of Deliberation