

# Charter Commission Meeting Minutes

December 14, 2016, 7p.m., Room 205

Present: Josh Krintzman (Chair), Rhanna Kidwell (Vice-Chair), Bryan Barash, Jane Frantz, Howard Haywood, Anne Larner, Brooke Lipsitt, Karen Manning, Chris Steele.

Approval of December 7, 2016 Minutes: Brooke makes a motion to approve minutes with minor edits to pages 1 and 3. Chris seconds. Motion passes 9-0.

## Public Comment:

Nathaniel Lichtin, 53 Pinecrest Rd, recommends keeping “candidate for re-election” on both ballots. [special and regular elections]. This helps people keep track of 21 candidates, and some will want to vote for or against current elected officials. People might vote for the “wrong” person or skip the question. It’s better to have the information there.

Planning -He likes Option “D” within the planning discussion document and supports a complete review of the Comprehensive Plan. There shouldn’t be a need for a new Comprehensive Plan with each new mayor.

Regarding Transition Provisions, a new city council will have a lot on its plate and probably will not have time to address area councils for a while. Keep things as they are until then. He agrees with the Newton Highlands Area Council letter to the Commission on this topic. The area councils should be able to receive funding from the city as other organizations do, especially since they are “a city body”.

Sally Lipshutz from Waban is in agreement with Nathaniel and wishes to ensure that during the transition the area councils will continue to function as they have. She is not satisfied with the handling of the indemnification and liability clause in Sec. 11-5. She wants to know why multi-membered organizations are not listed. Why are some city officials and agencies referenced and the others are ignored?

Councilor Lisle Baker is concerned that calendar provisions with the Planning article may not be feasible. Also, he understands the Commission has decided upon its preferred composition for the city council, but is concerned about the loss of diverse opinion. He is struck by the value of having multiple points of view, and this cannot happen with the smaller body. He is concerned that the new charter will go into effect in the middle of a mayoral term which could create challenges, and suggests invoking the change in 4 years to coincide with the new mayoral term.

Planning- Consider edit about ordinances reflecting the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. He does not want the plan to hold unintended power. There should be a high policy, but leave it up to the legislative body to figure out the details.

## Discussion of Article 8

The Commission is revisiting whether a candidate’s ward should be listed on the ballot. Rhanna does not currently support this.

Anne raises whether village or zip code, for instance, should be included in addition to the street name.

Brooke raises concentration of residents in Newton Centre. Wards 2, 5, 6, 7 would be put at a disadvantage. The street address is adequate. People have access to the ballot prior to voting if they would like more information. Less information is consistent with our goal of simplicity.

Rhanna- there is no legal definition to the city’s villages.

Bryan is concerned people may vote based on the information provided vs. the qualifications of the candidates.

Jane emphasizes we should be clear about what we want indicated. Anne does not believe ward should be specified. Josh puts forward that we will clearly indicate name and street address, which are required by state law.

Chris makes motion to add the word “street” so that Sec. 8-1(d) Information to Voters will read: “name and street address of each candidate but not any other information regarding the candidate, shall appear on the ballot at any city election;...”. Brooke seconds. 9 in favor. 0 opposed.

### Discussion of Article 9

The article leaders review comments from Barney Heath, the new planning director. This is an opportunity to take one last look at the planning article. Brooke helped review the planning departments’ comments.

He is suggesting a possible edit to the first section, but the comment is unclear. It appears he suggested a change to the Article title, but the group does not support changes to the article title or 7-1.

Sec. 7-2: Barney Heath has suggested that the parameters for review of the Comprehensive Plan are too strict. Karen reads the section, and 4 options are described:

1. No change
2. Eliminate “within 2 years of swearing in a new mayor”, keeping “not less frequently than every 12 years, the mayor shall submit a Comprehensive Plan... to the council”
3. “Within two years of swearing in a new mayor, the mayor shall initiate a review of the Comprehensive Plan and submit amendments if necessary”.
4. “Within 2 years of swearing in a new mayor, the mayor shall initiate a review of the Comprehensive Plan and submit amendments if necessary. Not less frequently than every 12 years, the mayor shall submit a Comprehensive Plan...to the council.”

Chris brings up what it means to create a new Comprehensive Plan versus review and updates. Option 4 makes the language explicit and draws the distinction between the review and a true new plan.

Brooke: We agreed the mayor should be given the chance to review the plan and define vision. We need to revisit this idea and confirm, and the rest will fall out of that conversation.

Bryan agrees with Brooke. We’re pre-supposing that a Mayor will come in with a different vision (Brooke notes - or any vision). Perhaps a mayor leaves after 2 years, and the new mayor could be happy with the direction [of things]. He questions whether there needs to be a new plan. Nothing would stop a new mayor who wanted a new direction, but it doesn’t need to be forced.

Brooke provides the argument on the other side. Roughly 30 years passed before the adoption of the current plan. She does not remember modifications to the old plan, and it became outdated. It was referred to occasionally, but it was not a document that informed decisions. We need to figure out what we want it to do, and this is a difficult decision.

Chris: Our objectives were to ensure a review, and give a new mayor the opportunity to set forth new vision. The language in Option 4 lays that out exactly.

Brooke: What if a mayor is in first or last year at “Year 12” - is that the person you want guiding the Comprehensive Plan?

She likes the idea of strong intervals, and the review within the first 2 years of entering office and is not sure about forcing 12 years.

Rhanna: If it were reviewed every 14 years, in some cases a mayor would not need to review during last year in office. Perhaps consider the new plan every 12 or 14 years. She also likes Option 4.

Jane's concern is changes over time, i.e. recessions, school buildings that may need to be rebuilt that may not be in the Comprehensive Plan. With current plan, no one knew school enrollment would skyrocket. The period review allows the city to account for variations. She'd always assumed [the requirement] was a review, with submitted amendments.

Brooke points out distinction between Options 3 and 4. Option 4 requires the full new plan every 12 years. A review could be a whole new plan.

Rhanna - the review could just involve reading the existing plan and not making changes. It would not involve appointment of a commission.

Bryan - The 12 year parameter prevents ongoing reviews without needing to act.

Josh recalls this was a way to ensure the Mayor had taken the Comprehensive Plan into account when first taking office.

Bryan is looking for more than a review. Perhaps the mayor should reaffirm commitment to the plan (to show still valid/represents view of the administration) or propose amendments.

Josh: The 12 year parameter allows for this. The Mayor could submit the same Comprehensive Plan, but must submit this.

Bryan: This doesn't account for the time in between.

Brooke likes Bryan's direction. Don't define the review, but the Mayor should affirm the current plan and propose amendments "as necessary". (vs. "if"). She opposes proposed intervals that might pre-suppose existing tenure of a sitting mayor.

Discussion of how term limits are a factor. Karen points out the 12 years is to "loosen" the [currently drafted] requirement of 8 years [based on Barney Heath's comments].

Chris - wishes to separate two important concepts. He agrees about the review. However, he shares Jane's concern that times change and we risk having a "stale document" that doesn't do anyone any good. The plan needs a periodic review, and we should stipulate when. 12 years is not unreasonable. A while back, we thought 8 years was not unreasonable.

Rhanna: The interval needs to be determined independent of term limits.

Brooke: The change since our last discussion has been the input from our Director of Planning and Development who knows exactly how much work it takes to produce a new Comprehensive Plan. Phil Herr's committee worked for years to produce the plan. She is arguing against Chris's position because she does not want to add burdens.

Chris: It took a long time, but much time had passed since the last plan, as Brooke pointed out. It's like maintaining a house.

Karen does not share Brooke's concern that the 12 year mark might coincide with a mayor's leaving, though maybe we could stipulate 10-12 years, and sees the benefit of not leaving on the shelf too long.

Bryan: There is no way to ensure the quality of effort or a new plan.

Rhanna: This would be evident to voters and does not feel comfortable with the possibility that the plan could go a very long period [again] without a new one being required.

Jane asks for clarification about the 12 year parameter, which would be for the whole process around a new plan. Chris reiterates his support for this and accounting for changes over time.

Bryan sees Chris's points but does not think the current language forces a full-scale new plan unless we provide specifics. Chris agrees.

Howard points out the importance of accountability, reporting on the status of the Comprehensive Plan, etc. which outweighs the importance of the 12 years parameter.

For 7(2)b: Brooke makes a motion to adopt "Option 3" but modify the language: "Within 2 years of swearing in a new mayor, the mayor shall initiate a review of the Comprehensive Plan, reaffirm the plan, or submit amendments as necessary." (changed from "and/or").

Bryan seconds.

Discussion:

Bryan: The wording should be that the City needs to reaffirm its commitment to the plan.

Chris: This is good and necessary language, but insufficient. To speak to Howard's concern, there is language in the policy that states that the ordinances are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Karen: We do not want to be too directive but this article, not usually found in charters, is intended to provide structure through the reviews. Hopefully they would be more comprehensive when needed.

Brooke: Nothing in the proposed language would prevent a full review.

Karen understands people are uncomfortable with a hard limit [12 years], but also sees Chris's points.

Brooke and Bryan work through modifications to the proposed language. Brooke proposes: "submit to City Council..." & to requiring a public hearing. The language would read: "Submission to the Council to Reaffirm [the Plan]".

Bryan suggests: "... reaffirm the City's commitment to the plan and submit it to the Council with or without amendment".

Brooke: "for ratification".

Josh points out separate sentences may be needed.

Josh will craft proposed language if it passes. The point is that Mayor may submit and the City Council may adopt with or without amendments, so this should be consistent.

Chris points out that a review does not ensure that baseline data is being updated. The report simply could be read through with a highlighter. It does not involve gathering data and examining changes in housing, business, and transportation patterns, etc. These affect day-to-day life in the city and policy. This information should be looked at on a periodic basis. If not required, taking that on will go longer and longer because [creating a new plan] is such a difficult process.

Bryan: In that case, the points would need to be better spelled out in Option 4, and would that level of detail belong in the charter.

Brooke hopes that the Mayor, Council, Planning Dept. would step up as needed to address problems. If no one does, the plan is probably good enough to go for a few more years.

Rhanna: The data goes out of date quickly. People may not be attuned. There are no guarantees...but a requirement to redo [the plan] helps ensure an eventually well-done plan. She points out that Article 7 draft also states that ordinances should not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and agrees with Chris. There should be a reasonable interval for the city to go through this exercise, even though we cannot legislate quality.

Anne supports what Chris and Rhanna have said.

Karen is curious whether there are guidelines/standards for Comprehensive Plans.

Chris: MA General Laws describe the elements.

Karen is interested in best practices.

There is a brief discussion of 8 vs. 12 years for new plan. Chris continues to support his points.

Bryan: Is a Master (Comprehensive) Plan something that can endure for 50 years if looked after properly, or is it something that dies, and a new one is required?

Chris uses the metaphor of looking after a car. Routine maintenance is needed, but periodically there is also a need for more substantive overhauls.

Rhanna asks Phil Herr for his thoughts on the requirement for a full review. He is not sure if he knows better, and is not concerned about the interval, but that it gets done. The current plan has more weight now than it did in the past. That isn't so much about timing, but the city from time to time making an effort to break out of its usual patterns to think through things comprehensively. 8 or 10 years doesn't matter. It's terribly important that people in key positions know what they are doing.

Howard asks if the current Comprehensive Plan was dictated by the charter. We have problems when we try to create things that aren't in anyone else's charter. Problems with timing could arise. The Comprehensive Plan should come from city leaders and shouldn't be dictated in the charter. They created the Comprehensive Plan and should be accountable. Our efforts would not help with plan quality and compliance.

Karen describes the support we received from city officials and planning professionals when we held the Article 7 panel. A subset did support putting in parameters and structure.

Bryan thinks the most important element is the Mayor being on the record saying there is a Comprehensive Plan under effect w/his or her leadership. Buy-in is important.

Brooke agrees with Howard that it is not a good idea to force the process. Does he agree a mayoral review is helpful?

Howard does view as useful - to vote it up or down. If not in support [of the plan], then the mayor should revise to meet the city's needs. Private people put the Comprehensive Plan together. Don't detail in the charter.

Jane said that without guidelines in the charter, there was not a Comprehensive Plan for 30 years. She supports the review with approval by the Council.

Josh recaps what is on the floor about submission for the review.

Rhanna describes the benefits of making a 12 year Comprehensive Plan review a discipline and using it as a live tool/practice, with ordinances kept consistent [with it]. A mayor would know of [the practice], and it would be better to have a lackluster mayor taking on the responsibility than to go 30 years without having a new plan.

Howard points out that this is not a topic Newton residents know about. He views it as ok to "hold feet to the fire" for reviews, but not to set out the 12 year limit for a new plan.

Chris agrees with Rhanna and stresses the importance of examining data. It doesn't matter that people don't understand [what a Comprehensive Plan is] - it's an issue of having good data that is refreshed on a regular basis to inform policies.

Howard asks if there is a plan for that data, i.e. who is responsible.

Karen reads all of option 4 without ellipses, which describes collaboration with the planning department.

Josh recaps the motion on the floor, to replace the first sentence of 7-2(b) with a sentence that reads: Within 2 years of the swearing in of a new mayor, the mayor shall submit to the City Council reaffirmation of the Comprehensive Plan or amendments to the plan for the City Council's approval with or without amendment. 5 in favor (Frantz, Lispitt, Haywood, Barash, Krintzman). 4 opposed (Steele, Kidwell, Manning, Larner). The motion passes.

Josh points out we need to ensure that the Mayor may propose a new plan vs. modifications only under Option 4. All are in agreement.

Karen next raises the need to clarify within the article that all amendments to the Comp. Plan require a hearing (as raised by Planning Dept.). Brooke points out all zoning amendments requiring hearings.

Bryan stresses the importance of using "amendment" and "modification" consistently.

Re: c) Effect: Planning Dept. recommends we not use the word "reflect" to describe the relationship between the Comp. plan and ordinances.

Brooke suggests: "Any ordinances adopted by the city Council will be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan" and points out this may be encompassed with the 5-year review of ordinances that already occurs within the City Council.

The group agrees that the Council's regular review of the city ordinances should specifically include a check for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

The sentence about resident and professional assistance is removed.

The final point raised is whether the final section should be named "Action by the City Council *and the Planning [and Development] Board*". The group agrees to the change.

Bryan thinks we should still include in c) Effect: "Ordinances passed by the city shall be consistent with the Comp. Plan".

Lisle Baker comments that it is preferable to say: "Ordinances passed by the city *shall be not inconsistent* with the Comp. Plan" and the group agrees.

#### Article 12: Transition Discussion

Rhanna and Brooke recommend that the charter go into effect upon certification of election results, but certain sections cannot take effect at once and require a later start date. Anything not mentioned in their document is assumed to be effective upon adoption.

Composition of City Council: Change would be 24 to 12 councilors, elimination of position of ward councilors, and instituting the 8 and 4 composition. The group agrees to Nov. 2019 election, the first election after the new charter.

Term limits for councilor and Mayor: Because [by happenstance] there will be a new mayor at the same time of the vote of the new charter, it's an easy time to begin the new term limits on the mayor. They would start for the City Councilor as well. For someone who had served, the term limits would start over. Would go into effect Jan.

1 (2018).

School Committee members would continue to be term limited under charter at time of their election - no reset.

Filling of Vacancies: Proposal is the new rules take effect Jan., 2018. Josh suggests perhaps the rules could go into effect immediately. Rhanna points out there is a language issue with this point and some explanation will be necessary. Some of the new positions, i.e. councilor-by-ward and councilor-at-large are defined, but the charter will not exist in January of 2018. The offices will exist but [are] specified in [current] the charter. A question arises with regard to ward councilors, who would serve until 2020, but whose positions would not exist under the new charter. If there is a vacancy in that case, they are not covered by language in the new charter. Special language needs to be written for them.

Bryan suggests the new rules go into effect Jan, 2020 to avoid needing to make new rules. The group agrees.

Anne: If a ward councilor requires a special election (between 2018 & 2020), the city would be spending a lot of money on a short-lived appointment. Should there be a way to address that?

Brooke points out sometimes people do leave the councilor position soon after being elected. Should the position be left vacant?

Rhanna: There would still be two councilors for the ward.

Josh and Brooke note the other wards would have three.

Bryan does not see the logic in changing the rules in advance. The “new person” could run for a seat when the structure changes.

Rhanna: There could be trouble getting someone to run for a seat that is going away.

Brooke again points out the cost.

Josh supports operating under the existing provisions until that time so the wards may have [equal] representation until the change.

Councilor Lisle Baker points out the importance of having the full group for zoning and land use permit votes requiring 2/3 approval. Also, the ward councilor races are less expensive to run than city-wide.

The group agrees to leave “as is” until 1/1/20.

“Meeting of Council to Discuss Rules”: This is actually the council-elect. Brooke explains that the council adopts rules as the first thing it does, even before electing officers. The rules will need to change when the construction of the council changes. How does that happen? If the “new council” comes in under the old rules, the old rules won’t work. The article leaders are proposing the councilors-elect meet to discuss the rules within 20 days of certification of election in November, 2019. (note: typo on handout).

Marilyn Contreas explains that the Attorney General has approved these meetings of the councilors-elect. No public business is taking place, which was a concern of Bryan’s. Brooke explains that with current practice, councilors elect meet on a date between the election and roughly Dec. 1. Rules can be modified at any time, but they still go through this. City Council had always chosen their leaders prior to swearing in Jan. 1, by secret ballot. The League of Women Voters took this to the Atty. General in approx. 1995, who ruled the votes had to be cast in public according to Open Meeting Law. The votes had to be cast in public. This resulted in one year without a BofA President for 2.5 months. The BofA then rewrote its rules.

The group agrees with what article leaders have proposed.

The Number of councilors required to call a special meeting and sustain a charter objection: This should be determined Jan. 1, 2020.

Chairs of boards and commissions cannot be city employees: Article leaders propose that chairs who are city employees shall be replaced (appointed or elected as they originally were) by June 30, 2018. This provides 6 months.

City employees should not comprise more than 1/3 of boards and commissions membership: The article leaders propose “no additional city-employee members shall be appointed until city-employee membership falls below 1/3, w/natural attrition allowed.

Brooke emphasizes that some commissions have a majority of city employees, and it is important not to disable the group.

Discussion: Anne asks if Boards and Commissions have terms. Brooke says it depends on how formal they are, and some terms are automatically rolled over. Anne thinks this could go on quite a long time. Sitting members may stay until new members are seated. Brooke suggests we perhaps could add language that those serving cannot serve beyond current term, and asserts that most key boards and commissions do have terms, ie. if established by ordinance. Bryan proposes a hard date. Jane suggests 2020, which the group thinks is too soon. Howard points out extensive current vacancies on Boards and Commissions. Josh is comfortable with the idea of a fixed date.

Brooke points out the “default term” is 3 years, and the group agrees to Jan 1, 2021.

Boards and Commissions - [mayoral] notification of vacancies: The group agrees to initial required listing by June 30, 2018.

Report on [city’s] financial condition to council: This would be not less frequently than semi-annually. There is brief discussion. Already there are regular updates, but the requirement is now that the information be sent to the Council formally twice a year. The group agrees to six weeks after close of FY18.

Posting of School Committee Rules: Rhanna and Brooke are not recommending a date. Marilyn suggests new policies should be immediately posted, and all existing policies within one year, which Brooke views as too strict.

Jane shares that the School Committee has been working on policy updates for six months. The group is comfortable with allowing the new requirement to go into effect with the charter as Rhanna and Brooke have proposed.

5-year Financial Forecast: Rhanna reads section 5-1. The forecast is prepared at least 6 mos. prior to submission of the next fiscal year’s operating budget. Brooke explains since the FY 2019 will be submitted fewer than 6 mos. after the new charter is adopted, she and Rhanna are suggesting 6 mos. prior to the fiscal year 2020 budget. The other deadline will have been missed. Maureen Lemieux was consulted and provided language to Anne. This is just codification [of current practice]. Maureen prefers November to January,

The requirement can’t be forced the first year because it “won’t fit”.

Funding for independent legal counsel and audit will be implemented as part of the 2019 budget. The group discusses that the amount will be set by ordinance, but 2% of budget is specified in transition provisions.

Marilyn still has questions about this and is concerned that the ordinance could undercut the 2% and the charter. Brooke suggests further discussion with Marilyn outside of meeting.



Capital Inventory: The Council needs to adopt the ordinance by June 30, 2018.

Anne asks if this is realistic. Bryan is concerned that if there is no ordinance, there will be no inventory. Jane points out that this is not happening currently. Howard clarifies that this would be part of the Capital Improvement Plan.

The group decides on “First inventory filed within 6 months of council ordinance or November 1, 2018”

Filing of annual report on Capital Improvement Plan: The mayor reports on the progress of the Capital Improvement Plan. Rhanna and Brooke do not think a date is needed, and Josh and Marilyn propose Mar. 1, 2019.

Anne agrees there should be no date~ it’s most efficient to file as one document. Brooke points out a progress report would be needed in order to move forward. It’s left with no date.

Independent Audit: Question arises if an ordinance is already in place. If so, there is no need for a reference in the Transition Provisions. Brooke will check to see if there is an ordinance- if so, they will take it out of the Transition Provisions.

Neighborhood Area Councils: Josh raises whether the area councils will simply operate according to their existing resolutions. Jane explains this would not address all the issues. Karen requests that the article leaders discuss and include as an agenda item at an upcoming meeting.

Initiative Petition Procedures: Brooke raises the question of what would happen in the unlikely circumstance of an initiative petition being started just prior to an election. Brooke and Rhanna propose the “old charter rules” would be applied, but the 20% voter participation level would be required. This would prevent an “under the radar” vote, but would provide for the six months to collect the signatures. The group is in agreement.

Rules and Regulations filed with City Clerk within 2 weeks: This is a new item in the charter, so Rhanna believes all rules should be included. Brooke views all the rule filing as too labor intensive and believes it won’t happen. Rhanna does not think we can file changes if we’ve never filed the first set of rules.

This is for all agencies, not only City Council. Brooke points out theoretically new rules are adopted but many existing Commissions have not established rules or called a new session.

Josh likes [the proposal of] any rule or regulation adopted after Jan. 1, 2018,

Rhanna brings up initial filing of rules before filing the changes.

Brooke- “People are going to file what they are going to file”.

Rhanna recommends filing with a date or it won’t happen.

Bryan - This ensures that if the filing doesn’t happen, a person can get a copy of the rules and regulations.

Jane - If something untoward is happening, you can come back to this.

Anne - It’s common to start a new system with a given date [vs. retrospectively]. It takes a while to get a full picture, but it is an improvement.

Bryan - City Clerk may choose to be proactive but we do not want to put onto his shoulders.

What needs to be published are rules that are adopted, amended, or revised after 1/1/18. (clarified at the 1/11/17 mtg.)

Appointment of Committee to review ordinances - 1 year: Rhanna and Brooke do not recommend a date. Marilyn recommends a date for emphasis and to ensure it gets done.

Josh proposes the language included in Sec. 11-4 relating to the timing of the review taking place (within a year of the charter being adopted) should be moved into Transition.

The group agrees to Jan. 1, 2019 for the appointment of the committee. The language about the 5 year review stays in the section. This is for ordinances and Boards and Commissions/for 11 a and b.

Public comment policy posted electronically: The group agrees to June 30, 2018 as proposed.

Bryan recommends putting something in transition about examining compensation. The group prefers to address in their letter. Bryan makes a motion that is not seconded. Josh says we can discuss at another meeting.

Josh leaves meeting @ 9:25p.m

### Discussion of Final Report Outline

The group agrees to a strategy for the final report. The content should be clear and succinct with references to the website for additional information.

Marilyn clarifies the preliminary report goes to the newspaper and is paid for by the Charter Commission. The final report is mailed to city residents and is paid for by the City.

Brooke highlights the need to make our information available in print. Those who do not have easy access to the web can contact us directly for detailed information .The simpler the better.

Marilyn will forward another Commission's marketing Powerpoint for our reference.

The group would like to see brief summaries for topics proposed in the outline.

Anne suggests a summary web page.

Article leaders will provide input on the topics or articles they led. Everett's report is a helpful guideline.

Bryan points out it should be clear that any councilor can run for any of the seats- Karen suggests he send an email.

Karen and Jane are contacts for this phase of the draft.

### Meeting Schedule

Anne brings up getting feedback from the community.

Marilyn clarifies the preliminary report is published in the newspaper, and a public hearing on the preliminary report is required. The Commission needs to decide how they want to respond to the testimony provided.

The report sent to the Attorney General in May will get mailed to people prior to the election. The Commission can make changes in reaction to the public hearing as long as it falls within the parameters of state law (not inconsistent with state law).

Brooke suggests holding the public hearing soon after the publication of the preliminary report. We also need to

give as much notice to the public as possible.

Lisa Mirabelle shares that the LWVN would like to hold a forum/informational session before the public hearing, perhaps in Feb.

Rhanna recaps what was discussed and a clean copy of the charter would be helpful.

Bryan makes a motion to adjourn - seconded by Rhanna.

Meeting adourns at 9:46p.m.

Documentation Used:

[Agenda](#)

[Minutes](#) (12/7/16 DRAFT)

[Article 8: Updated Draft](#)

[Article 12: Discussion Guide](#)

[Article 7: Planning Department Comments](#)