

Charter Commission Meeting

August 29, 7p.m., Room 211

Present: Josh Krintzman, Chair, Rhanna Kidwell, Vice Chair, Bryan Barash, Jane Frantz, Howard Haywood, Anne Lerner, Brooke Lipsitt, Karen Manning.

The first order of business is review of the meeting minutes from July 12, 2017.

Brooke moves acceptance of the July 12 minutes; seconded by Anne. Motion passes 7-0. Chris Steele Abstains. Rhanna arrives late.

Public Comments

Councilor Schwartz presents letter from him and 4 of his colleagues in response to the ballot summary language. (note: Councilor Schwartz explains this is a response to the wording that will be sent to voters. However, it should be noted the text is wording for the Nov. 4 ballot).

He wishes to share thoughts as colleagues, in the spirit of collaboration, to clarify for households that receive the summary. (note: again - this will be on the Nov. 4 ballot).

He thanks the Commission for their time. The minor suggestions are in the name of having all the good work clearly communicated to the voters.

The councilors suggest the following changes.

While the first sentence is accurate, it does not reflect the language in the current or proposed charter (i.e. "to be elected from each of the wards" in proposal; with "domiciled" is used in the current charter). The concern is that "representing wards" is less clear than either.

Their proposed changes are as follows, with changes in bold:

Effective with the 2019 municipal election the city council will be reduced from 24 members to 12, with 8 members representing wards **who live in their respective wards** and 4 members who can live anywhere in the city. All members will be elected by the voters citywide for 2-year terms. **Ward Councilors elected only by their wards would be eliminated from the Council, as would one councilor living in each ward elected by voters citywide.** Voters will continue to elect a mayor as the city's chief executive officer for a 4-year term and the school committee will continue to be a 9-member body with 8 members representing wards **who live in their respective wards**, plus the mayor, all elected citywide. Term limits, which currently exist for the school committee, will be added for the mayor (3 consecutive terms/12 years) and councilors (8 consecutive terms/16 years).

This is an attempt to make this as clear as possible for voters and down the road. This is to insulate against any challenge people might have that this wasn't clear enough.

Also, Lenny Gentile who chairs the Finance Committee wanted to make it clear that the language about the financial reporting practices reflects what is being done currently by practice. The change is to codify what is in place. Otherwise, the language implies this is something that is not being done.

Bob Burke, Newton Highlands Area Council and Newton Democratic Committee believes that ward councilors elected by ward are uniquely important. The ballot question should explicitly say that they will be eliminated; something persuasive to supporters and opponents of the proposal. It should be as clear as possible and then it's a roll of the dice. Over time, he'll be more specific about why he supports ward councilors and why they are important for our villages.

Tarik Lucas, Central Ave. Newtonville is against the proposed charter, since it was finalized several months ago. This charter commission says it is preserving ward representation, and he is sorry but that is just not true. The truth is that the ward councilors in this charter would only require a ward residency, it has nothing to do with representation. A city councilor will be elected by all eight wards, so the overwhelming majority of the votes will not come from the immediate neighbors, but from elsewhere in the city. That's not representation for the ward. It is a residency requirement for the ward. The city will be represented, but not the ward. If you're trying to preserve ward representation then the councilor who lives in the ward should not be elected citywide. They should be elected by their neighbors. He asks that this committee take this under consideration if not tonight then at future meetings and please put this information out there to the public.

Sandra Beal, Newton opposes the charter. She is an attorney and her experience (in this role) is that language very much matters and she agrees with the city councilors' proposal to change the language so that it is not suggesting that the 8 councilors who live in the wards represent the wards because they are elected citywide. Also...make clear that ward councilors elected only by their wards would be eliminated. None of the people she's talked with in the community are familiar with the proposal in detail and she would find it misleading that there are members who represent the wards, in respect to the proposed charter.

Sallee Lipshutz, Radcliffe Rd., Newton, wrote the comments before reading Brooke's words but they still apply. The Charter Commission has labored for two years in its efforts to revise the charter, under which we have been governed in this city for four decades. I've watched as all of you argued and weighed each suggestion until ultimately you found unanimity on the final version which you are about to send to the electorate with your legal message of encouragement that the proposed charter be accepted. All that is admirable, acceptable, and understandable. What is disturbing to me and many others with whom I have discussed the issue is your intention to send the new charter to the voters with a cloudy description of the changes you've made. I counted at least 20 councilors packed into the Programs and Services meeting two weeks ago as the committee members questioned the clarity of your words and sent you back to reconsider them. Why? Because the words that you crafted are deceptive and misleading. The claim that you lifted them from Everett's letter to its voters is a weak point. You risk being exposed as trying to deceive Newton voters by attempting to slip something through that you believe the voters do not want. You must remember that your unanimous vote to accept the final draft of your proposal indicates that you believe the changes you propose are good for Newton. I fundamentally disagree with some of the proposed charter's contents such as the elimination of directly elected ward councilors. I am surprised that you have written a letter that does not proclaim your changes to the voters in a lucid and clear language. In the first place, your language in the letter includes a sin of commission. Your decision to indicate that councilors elected citywide but with a ward residency requirement "represent" the ward where that councilor sleeps is a blatant employ of news speak. Only a ward's councilor elected solely by a ward's voters represents that ward. Secondly, your language in the letter contains a sin of omission. You fail to acknowledge the elimination of directly elected ward councilors in so many words. This failure to acknowledge that profound change shows that you are trying to deceive the voters that might disagree with this change if they were properly informed. I submit for the record my oped to the Tab on Wed., Aug. 23rd, and had been asked if Councilor Schwartz had not been here to admit his letter from the councilors as well. Both of the submissions contain honest language more clearly understood by the reader and I urge you to adopt them tonight in your final edit of the letter to accompany the charter in the city funded mailing. I hope you will revise your language to produce a document that correctly and directly explains the changes you are promoting. If you believe in the worthiness and value of your work, sell it to the voters honestly. There is no need for you to stoop to guile, distortion, or intentional omissions.

Ken Parker believes everyone would benefit from clarity. He compares the existing and proposed compositions. The proposal should include wording about eliminating the eight ward councilors. Words have meaning and they mean things that evolve over time. If you look at a Newton ballot, for years it has said “Ward Alderman” or now “Ward Councilor”, or alderman at-large, or councilor at-large. These are the words people associate with these roles. When you say you are preserving ward representation, you think that means “ah - the ward alderman”. This is deceptive to people who have known those words over time. I don’t think it was intentional, that it was taken from another document but this language cannot stand. It might persuade people of something that is not in the proposal and they might vote one way or the other based on false information. I urge you to adopt this change. Also, if “the voters access to initiatives and referendums will be maintained with a minimum of 20% participation required for such votes”, then it should be more clear. What are you changing it from? State clearly what it is now and what it will be changed to. That is no less than the voters of this city deserve.

Brooke - We clearly need to make clear the substance of the language. However, she would like to clear up a misunderstanding from some of the people in the room. The language being discussed this evening is not the language for a city wide mailing, it will not be used to support the proposal. It is the language that will appear on the ballot. It may appear as legal language, but it is not persuasion language.

Councilor Schwartz - I wanted to explain why my colleagues cannot attend tonight. Councilor Baker is teaching a course at Suffolk Law School , Amy Sangiolo has a campaign event, and Marc Laredo is traveling. Councilor Gentile was also unavailable.

Howard and Josh point out that the charter proposal is finalized; we are only looking at the ballot question summary.

Josh recaps the Program and Services Meeting which was held to discuss the ballot question wording and funding of the Commission’s final report. The Committee Councilors requested additional review of the ballot summary language. Therefore, this additional meeting was called.

Anne suggests starting with Paragraph 2.

The Commission reviews the ballot language summary voted on 7/12/17:

Shall this city approve the new charter recommended by the charter commission, summarized below?

YES NO

SUMMARY

Effective with the 2019 municipal election the city council will be reduced from 24 members to 12, with 8 members representing wards and 4 members who can live anywhere in the city. All members will be elected by the voters citywide for 2-year terms. Voters will continue to elect a mayor as the city's chief executive officer for a 4-year term and the school committee will continue to be a 9-member body with 8 members representing wards plus the mayor, all elected citywide. Term limits, which currently exist for the school committee, will be added for the mayor (3 consecutive terms/12 years) and councilors (8 consecutive terms/16 years).

Effective with the adoption of this charter, school committee responsibilities will be updated to reflect changes in state law. Modern practices will be adopted for financial reporting, including an annual financial audit, inventory of capital assets and progress on the capital improvement plan. Voters' access to initiative petition and referendum will be maintained, with a minimum of 20 per cent participation required in such votes. Public comment policies will be established by each city body. Charter review will be required every 10 years.

These represent the major changes to the city charter.

The group votes upon this final version 8/29/17:

Shall this city approve the new charter recommended by the charter commission summarized below?

YES NO

SUMMARY

Effective with the 2019 municipal election the size of the city council will be reduced from 24 members to 12, with one councilor from each of the 8 wards and 4 councilors who can live anywhere in the city. All councilors will be elected by the voters citywide for 2-year terms. Voters will continue to elect a mayor as the city's chief executive officer for a 4-year term and the school committee will continue to be a 9-member body with one member from each of the 8 wards plus the mayor, all elected citywide. Term limits, which currently exist for the school committee, will be added for the mayor (3 consecutive terms/12 years) and councilors (8 consecutive terms/16 years).

Effective with the adoption of this charter, school committee responsibilities will be updated to reflect current practice and state law. Current practices will be codified for financial reporting, including an annual financial audit. A newly required inventory of capital assets will accompany the capital improvement plan. Voters' access to initiative petition and referendum will be maintained, adding a minimum of 20 per cent participation required in such votes. Public comment policies will be established by each city body. Charter review will be required every 10 years.

These represent the major changes to the city charter.

Below are highlights from the discussion:

Anne agrees there should be modifications to the second paragraph to make it more precise. What we are proposing are codifications to current practice and current state law. The only new piece is the inventory of capital assets which is not now required. That language was worked on with Councilor Crossley, Maureen Lemieux, and others.

Rhanna - Nothing within the School Committee is being updated within the charter, just the language to be consistent. I don't know that we need to take up space on the ballot saying that we are making school committee language current with state law. State law takes precedence if something is out of date. Perhaps this could be taken out because nothing is different about how the school committee operates.

Jane - the word "adopted" was an oversight. We had used the word codification in deliberations. The School Committee article has been outdated which is misleading to the public. We have an opportunity to make changes to reflect state law and it is important to state why. Much of the language in that article came directly from state law. She supports the language as is.

Anne moves to accept the proposed language. Brooke seconds.

Bryan - we were attempting to codify best practices but some things were not always done consistently. We're not codifying what was always done but the best things. Perhaps "Current reporting best practices".

Anne - Current practices are in a sense best practices. This needs to be succinct. A lot of work has been put in over the last two years, such as the audit subcommittee. It is important to preserve progress that has been made.

Brooke - this is the ballot summary not the report.

The group decides "codified" is the optimal word for the sentence.

The only thing being added is asset inventory. The rest has been adopted and is required for anyone in the future to avoid a backslide. Josh suggests separating the sentences to make the distinction and the group agrees. Brooke suggests "Current practices" vs. "modern practices". After some additional discussion, the language is finalized. (as recorded above).

There is unanimous consent for changes, then Brooke suggests edit "Voters' access to initiative petition and referendum will be maintained, *adding a minimum of 20 per cent participation required in such votes*".

to respond to Ken Parker's comment.

There is unanimous consent to that change.

Discussion of the first paragraph:

Bryan - This ballot question is supposed to best inform voters about the proposal basics so they can make the best decision. We have strived not to use campaign oriented language that would push people to vote one way or the other. To me, the language suggested by some members of the city council is language intended to push people in one direction or the other. It is the language people against the charter are using to persuade people not to vote for the charter. I also don't think it's an accurate reflection of the conversations we've had. We made an active discussion that we would not start from our current city council and "remove pieces" to get to a lower number. We decided to reimagine what it would look like if we were not constrained by what it currently looks like. To say "we are eliminating ward councilors" does not accurately reflect what we did and we would be putting the [vote no] campaign language onto the ballot. I want language that describes the process we went through and the proposal we are making. As far as the suggestion it's misleading, it's very clear in the language that all voters will elect all councilors.

Brooke agrees with Bryan on that point. We at first adopted "represent" (or version thereof) wholesale from Everett's language. Many of us have heard pushback from the Program and Services meeting, the public, or people this evening. The fact that the word is at minimum confusing to people, and depending on your point of view is representative or misrepresentative of our intention. Over the last few days, Anne and I independently arrived at similar language getting away from the concept of "representing" which is a hot button word on both sides. There is no need for this - the ballot question should be neutral as possible. The persuasion arguments should be coming from the campaigns. The language we are now proposing is a great deal simpler than we were proposing before:

"Effective with the 2019 municipal election the size of the city council will be reduced from 24 members to 12, with one councilor from each of the 8 wards and 4 councilors who can live anywhere in the city".

Karen - I do not think it would be well received if we told a school committee member, for instance, that he/she was not a representative of his/her ward. It seems a little extreme to avoid the word.

You and Anne are two of the most experienced politicians in Newton and I don't think you needed to walk back your initial language. I understand the need for collaboration, but don't see the need to take away the "status" of being a representative.

Karen shares proposed language: Effective with the 2019 municipal election the city council will be reduced from 24 members to 12, with one representative elected city wide from each of the 8 wards and 4 representatives who can live anywhere in the city...the School Committee would continue to be a 9 member body with 1 representative from each of the eight wards, plus the Mayor all elected city wide".

Jane - if you are elected then you are a representative. I don't see the necessity of having the word since it has become a bit of a lightning rod on both sides. We should say 1 councilor from each of the eight wards instead of 1 member from each of the eight wards.

Karen - I don't think we need to avoid the word and thought that was the middle ground.

Chris - We really did approach this as though we were starting from a blank piece of paper. Should we be using the word "reduced" or explain it will be replaced by a smaller body.

Bryan - I think that's a good point. I do prefer Karen's language. I do not think we should shy away from the word. As Jane said, it is clear - if you are elected, then you are a representative. The entire argument being made against the charter is there is not effective representation. If we change this we are sending the message this is not effective representation and I do not think that is the case.

Bryan clarifies for Anne.

Anne points out the word "member" is used in the charter. The most neutral, straightforward description is to follow some of the language in the charter.

Brooke - We don't need to fall into a trap but I don't think using "representative" or not does not mean these people do not represent their constituents and all their responsibilities. The ballot is to describe the new charter and the change. The word "represent" has become a lightning rod. There is no need to make this the focus. We don't need to feed into it. There are other good ways to say the same things and we can avoid putting ourselves in the middle of this battle.

Howard supports Bryan's points - that we look like we agree [with their point], and then they'll say "we said it". The opposition already says we planned to eliminate ward councilors from the first time we met, something he's read. And that's far from the truth. You should use the language that is correct but it is an opportunity to explain why to vote no.

Brooke - The language we discussing is not the language in support or in opposition... The language is a summary of the changes to the charter (for the ballot). It will not be put out by the proponents or opponents - they'll make their own cases. It's descriptive language, not persuasive language.

She describes the city mailing.

This should be accurate and non provocative. If "representative" is hot button making both sides crazy, then let's find another way.

Anne - I believe in the original language. It reflects an accurate picture but I went to the Programs and Services meeting. They're opponents but she's also heard from supporters who feel the word is ambiguous and is causing issues. I have no problems using the word...as a SC member I always said I represented Ward 3 and will continue to...but it is a hot button word diverting attention from the main issues. That's not helpful to our cause. If there is language that says the same thing concisely we should do so and move on so the focus is not on arguments over the word.

Bryan reiterates his points. We should use the common meaning of words. We have never avoided using the word representative to refer to people elected at-large. It has always been the common usage of the term and I do not think it is confusing. The only reason this is being raised is that the heart of the argument against the charter is that we are effectively removing local representation. The only reason this has become controversial is that this is the essence their argument.

Jane - I have always found representing/representation in this context to be unclear and I have wished and expressed it would be different. We all have experienced how many people in the city do not understand the [current] structure of the city council. It's in everyone's best interest to state as clearly as possible what the structure will be. She prefers one member or one councilor "from each of the eight wards". Using councilor is a clear implication...a councilor does represent. Any elected official represents. I don't understand the need for that word in this context.

Rhanna - Karen's language underscores the ridiculousness of arguing over the word representatives. We currently have 24 representatives on our council and we're proposing 12; they are by definition of being elected representatives as Jane pointed out earlier. With that said, I would support this language (Brooke and Anne's) and I prefer councilor over member. To say one member or representative really doesn't make much difference. And I think we should move on. This will be a neutral presentation of the facts.

Karen - Getting this out on the table, we should discuss the sentence about the ward councilors not being part of the proposal.

Howard - The first thing that is discussed is the reduction of the council. That's the main question.

Karen wouldn't object to having one line.

Brooke - I would propose that we adopt a working position and then discuss the issue Karen raises separately.

She proposes using the language she and Anne drafted, but with "councilor" and "councilors" instead of "member" and "members".

Chris raises whether it is preferable to say replaced instead of reduced.

Josh reads the paragraph using "replaced".

Brooke - We put ourselves in jeopardy using the word "replaced" since new city councils require an odd number of councilors. We are not replacing, we are reducing the size.

Josh confirms that legislative bodies/city councils do not require odd numbers.

Bryan - Perhaps we should explain that the current 24 member council would become a 12 member council rather than replace. Replace may suggest that more than the configuration is changing.

Rhanna - "Will become" is better. We didn't start with 24 and whittle down. We are going to have a new city council that will have 12 members.

Chris has no objection.

Josh proposes a friendly amendment.

The first 2 sentences: "Effective with the 2019 municipal election, the size of the city council will be reduced from 24 members to 12, with one councilor from each of the 8 wards and 4 councilors who can live anywhere in the city. All councilors will be elected by the voters citywide for 2 year terms".

Josh asks if there is unanimous consent. Bryan still prefers “representative”, even with the convincing points. He doesn’t feel as strongly.

Karen still thinks it is reasonable to use representatives and that her language was meant as a compromise.

Greg Schwartz- Representative is clear if it is next to “elected citywide”. That removes the concern of “representing” maybe implying just from that ward. There is no problem with that because it is very clear they are elected citywide. Otherwise it is may be harder to connect the dots.

Anne hears what the councilors says but other councilors may think differently.

Josh points out that all of the cosigners of the letters are voting “no” though their proposed changes may be well intended but should be taken with that in mind. In addition, the city council has legal requirements for our ballot and our mailing. He went through old minutes and hearings. Never have they intervened in the summary language of a ballot question in Newton. He finds it a little odd that it would only now be undertaken by a group of city councilors opposed to the change. It should be viewed with that in mind. Twice we agreed to the summary. He doesn’t think it’s misleading. He doesn’t think we are being asked to lead voters in opposition to this. He doesn’t think our summary is the place to do that. We could use the language to persuade. Our legal requirements don’t constrain us. Being neutral is a good thing but we don’t need to bend over backwards for opponents to this. We should be steadfast in our resolve.

Bryan thinks that what Councilor Schwartz said makes sense - to use citywide right next to the word representatives. I think that’s a fair and descriptive compromise.

Rhanna - We don’t need to compromise with anyone. We’re just trying to put out some neutral and straightforward language that describes the new proposal. We don’t need to entertain outside input. She is comfortable with the amended language.

Josh rereads.

Howard is in Josh’s comments (about city council involvement with ballot questions) and raises that 4 or 5 city councilors were on the last charter commission. Their influence was evident.

Sally, for the record - we have not been dishonest, we have not tried to deceive people. We have been open and have listened to people.

They should not have influence over the language the voters will see. We came up with this language honestly. I think I have to withdraw my second.

Brooke - I’ll look forward another “second” if you don’t agree with it. I agree about the additional sentence [about the ward councilors] that was provided in the letter and discussed at the programs and services meeting. However, the language on the table without a second at the moment is fine. I don’t object to Karen’s language, I still think “representative” is an easily avoidable word and it doesn’t cost us anything not to use it, or “representing”. The object of a councilor is to represent his or her constituents whether or not we use the word in the ballot summary. It’s the job of a councilor, school committee member, or Mayor.

Anne heard this issue raised by supporters or people learning about the proposal in addition to opponents. Some of those people find the word ambiguous and unclear. It's those people she's been listening to and is concerned about. She likes the word "representing" but it's about people out there. If the word has the potential not to speak clearly to some people, why go there if other language can be used. I hate to put it on the record but I will that I really don't care what those four councilors said. It's the voters - we're supposed to be concerned about speaking clearly to the voters.

Jane is appreciative of the councilors' input but it is not influencing her thinking about the best use of language.

Jane likes the motion [Josh] read the best for its clarity. Changing the sentence makes it too confusing with too many concepts. Our main concern shouldn't be satisfying councilors who are for or against us.

Josh remembers that the sentence about all councilors being elected by voters citywide for 2 year terms was to make things absolutely clear. There's no ambiguity.

Josh rereads the first paragraph. (small edit: size will be reduced from 24 members to 12).

Bryan makes friendly amendment to change "councilors" to "representatives".

Brooke keeps the motion on the floor, which is seconded by Anne.

Bryan makes friendly amendment to change "councilors" to "representatives". Karen seconds and wants to discuss further the placement of "citywide", which is not included in the motion.

3 are in favor - (Bryan, Karen, Josh) . Opposed: (Rhanna, Brooke, Jane, Anne, Howard, Chris)
CONFIRM

It is back to the language Josh read.

Karen proposes moving "elected citywide" in first sentence. Bryan seconds.

The second sentence would be eliminated.

Karen and Bryan are in favor. Six oppose. (Brooke, Rhanna, Josh, Chris, Jane, Anne). Howard abstains.

The motion on the floor is the language Josh read.

9 are in favor of adopting the language. 0 are opposed.

Josh will email the new language to David Olson.

Karen has an update on the citywide mailing. Do we (Josh, Rhanna, Karen, Jane) have your buy in to proceed with the mailing the following way? We have discovered there are two options for the mailing. 1 is a more expensive - it's personalized to each of 33,000 households [the report] will be sent to. There's also a less expensive version, a "saturated mailing" which is addressed "To Resident". It's \$14,000.

If we mail "To Resident" then we don't need to request additional funds, we have it left over.

We're running into a problem because we're short of the \$26,000 that we need - that's what was quoted for the personalized mailing. The Program and Svc. committee meets 9/11 and then the whole council meets 9/18 which makes things tricky since the file is due to the vendor in mid September.

This [second option] seemed sensible and reasonable and does anyone have any thoughts on it.

Brooke - My guess is that even if the document needs to be there by mid September, the addresses don't need to be complete until weeks later.

Karen - There won't be labels - it will be part of the document - I can't speak for their design timeline.

Brooke - I believe it is incumbent upon us to get this into the hands of every voter and it is important that we identify people by name because they're more likely to open it if it is addressed to "Joe Smith" instead of "Resident at".

Bryan - What about an accessory apartment or there are 3 roommates? Mailing it to a house won't get it into the hands of every voter.

Karen - David Olson is considering whether his Election Commission's citywide mailing might go "To Resident". He is still deciding. Maybe we should be consistent. But I wanted to raise the point now because I don't know when we'll discuss it again.

Josh raises that if something is personalized and the person is no longer there, it's returned. "To Resident" stays.

Brooke - I'm not worried about the fact that the city council needs to appropriate another \$5,000 or \$8,000.

Karen - \$6,400

Brooke - We have been extraordinarily frugal in the application of the funds that the council appropriated to us 18 months ago. Had you [Karen] not personally done work at no charge to the city we would be asking for tens of thousands of dollars, not \$6,400. I don't think we need to feel at all bashful.

Karen - It's not about bashful. If it's six of one, half a dozen of the other [the saturated mailing] seems to me like a sensible option but that's why I'm asking the chairman if it needs to go to a vote.

Bryan - My question is what is the best way to get this into the hands of voters. It sounds like there are arguments both ways.

He raises the option of personalized and also "Or to Current Resident" if that's the right way to go.

Rhanna - Under law, the mailing of this document does not fall to the Charter Commission. It's required by the city council to do. The fact that we have money in our budget because we have been frugal in multiple ways is a bonus for them, but it's not like we needed to have enough money to pay for this. It's not legally required to be part of the Charter Commission budget.

Karen - Yes, but for simplicity's sake - we don't have to wring our hands over this or ask for anything else [with saturated mailing option]. You all might not [be wringing your hands], but I am.

Josh clarifies that the Mayor has to ask for the funds.

Karen - I understand but there's a [funding] gap. It would be signed, sealed, and delivered to have it mailed "To Resident". I don't know what David is going to decide for his mailing, whether it's important for all of you to be consistent with him. We are being open with everyone about what is going on with the mailing.

Bryan - The City Council mails this. Is it even our choice?

Karen - This is our choice. If we didn't decide., they would have to.

Josh - David has asked for our input. For tonight's purposes, it sounds like people trust the four of us to make the appropriate decision.

Anne - Our intent is to get this into the hands of as many voters as possible.

The group asks Josh, Rhanna, Karen, and Jane to make the decision.

The joint meeting of Programs and Services and Finance Committees will meet September 11 to take up the question of the ballot question and funding. If approved that night, [the items] will go before the whole council on Sept. 18.

The meeting adjourns at 9:56p.m.