

# ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL

---

---

## Minutes for Charter Members Meeting Thursday, February 22, 2007 7:30 a.m.

Charter Member Meeting started at 7:30 am

Purpose: To Review Charter every 7 years.

### **Session:**

Economic Development Conference Room.

Roll Call: Sign -In sheet was sufficient.

- 1) Dorothy Stratton
- 2) Ev DeVaul
- 3) Ron Baker
- 4) Ken Seidner
- 5) Dennis VanScoy
- 6) Bernard Sargent
- 7) Richard Wolfe, II, Law Director
- 8) Howard Scanlan

Ken Seidner- Chair Person, called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Old Business: Contents of the minutes.

#### **Dorothy Stratton:**

- a) Summarize the minutes.

#### **Everett DeVaul:**

- b) Send minutes to Ken Seidner to review.

#### **Ken Seidner:**

- c) Clearly identify person who is speaking.
- d) Record minutes as is.

New Business: The next meeting for Charter Review is upstairs on 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Municipal Bldg. Council Chambers Conference Room on Thursday 3/8/2007. The following meeting on Thursday 3/22/07 at 7:30am will be on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor Economic Development Conference Room.

First Item on the Agenda this A.M. is gender inclusive, in the Charter using He, His, Him.

Ron Baker - In going through the Charter, there are a number of areas, where he, him and his are used quite frequently, maybe we should be making that gender inclusive. My question is Rick, Is that something that needs to be voted on by the electorate or is there a way of cleaning up some of the language.

Richard Wolfe: You just cannot go in and clean up language or change words, or change punctuation or something like that. If it is an obvious typographical error, something of that nature, then that could be corrected, but you cannot just change something.

If you are going to look at that subject, then you need to go through the entire charter looking at all wording and once you have identified how many places that it is, then figure the simplest way change could be. Change would need to be voted on.

Dorothy Stratton: Would our recommendation be just to make it gender inclusive or would we need to have suggestions for the re-wording from the committee.

Richard Wolfe: Again, without looking at each individual change that is necessary, I think if you look under the Mayor, for example. It says the Mayor, and then a couple places it says he, could change it to the Mayor, and refer to the position, then it is not referring to any gender, just to the position. Whether that could be done in every instance or some other way we have to do it, I don't know, I would have to look at all the places are that could be changed,

Dorothy Stratton: But is it the Committees responsibility to make those individual suggestions or do we just recommend?

Richard Wolfe: It is however you choose to do it. Figure out where they all are so that we don't miss anything, that would be one thing. But if you say we recommend that the Charter be made gender neutral, then we could do it that way also.

Ken Seidner: We have one thing to work on then.

Richard Wolfe: Take a copy of it and highlight everything that you think is necessary to be changed then it will all come through me at some point anyway so I will look at it and try to figure a way to accomplish that task. I will look at it as well to make sure we get all the places to make changes/recommendations and not one or two places.

Ken Seidner: Is that something that should be put on the ballot, to be voted on?

Richard Wolfe: You know, over the years, we have seen things like that happen with State Legislature and there is even a section that I looked up that made

reference to gender changes. Of course once it is done, it's done then you do not have to worry about it again.

Ron Baker: Does the Charter become a part of the City Ordinances, or does it stand alone? I know in the City Ordinances, there are references to where his or he is used .

Richard Wolfe: The Charter is a separate document. The City's Constitution and there is a State Constitution and a whole set of State Statutes. There is a Federal Constitution and volumes, and volumes of Federal Statutes. It is in part, the basis upon which we operate. Then you have to understand where the Charter is silent, then we refer to the State.

Ken Seidner: Anyone else have any more comments on this?

We will then move on the ordinances using and declaring an Emergency.

Dorothy, Do you want to give us the background, and what your thoughts are on that?

Dorothy Stratton: I mentioned in our last meeting that we had a concern for that term "Emergency". We had a discussion of that at the City Council meeting. I just feel that if business is expedited, that is perfectly appropriate; that it would clarify "Expedited" business from "Emergency " business. If different terms could be used, and I think you said Rick Emergency came from the State?

Richard Wolfe: I don't really view this as a significant issue but I guess I have dealt with it so much that is just a part of everyday operation. I understand how there is confusion because the wording in itself seems to indicate some kind of a dire urgency, "The City is going to Shut Down Tomorrow" if we don't take care of this right now. And it is something that goes way, way back in both City and State governments, there are 3 pages here and I tried to alternate them. Pass these around for everyone to get a copy. I will go back and make a distinction. I hope I am not taking time to tell you something that everybody already knows. Just so we clearly understand.

The term is consistent with not only State law but this is in any city and village throughout the state, you are going to pretty much see the same or similar language. We have to remember, there are two separate things that I know you are talking about, passing legislation all on one night rather than 3 different readings and passing it as an Emergency. Those are two totally separate things. We need to understand they are two separate things.

We start off with a proposition that legislation is required to be read 3 times on 3 separate occasions. That is the basic proposition. But then you have and if you take the first page 731.17 in the upper corner and there is a section 731.17 this talks about, look at #2. Each ordinance shall be read on 3 different days provided the legislative authority may dispense with this rule by a vote of at least  $\frac{3}{4}$  of its members. At this point, we are only talking about disposing or completing legislation in less that 3 nights. It doesn't have to be only one, but it is something less than 3 different nights. And I would suggest to you that the vast majority of legislation that Council deals with has either been worked on so much

up to the point of a vote or is of such a routine or customary nature that there is no reason that it should span over 6 weeks, If you just use regular meetings every 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>. If you go through all of the legislation that is passed in the year and you can take each one and look at different examples but there is just no practical reason to delay. Now Council as a general rule, things such as re-zoning, and sometimes appropriations and other kinds of matters will purposely defer, just pass it once and then maybe dispose of it at another meeting, so that there is ample opportunity for any kind of community reaction or input or response. This 3 different days could be Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, meaning you could have special meetings. You could get it all done in 2 days, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, that is 3 different days. You have one Regular meeting and 2 Special meetings or 3 Special meetings.

Howard Scanlan: Do we have to close that 24 hours before the meeting?

Richard Wolfe: You give 24 hours notice unless it is an Emergency such as if we had a water emergency. Special Meetings have to have 24 hours notice. Those provisions of that are in the Charter as well. As far as Regular, Special and Emergency are the 3 classifications of meetings. You could also give notice of 3 meetings at one time. Say there is going to be a meeting Tuesday night at 7:00pm, Wednesday morning at 9:00, and Thursday morning at 9:00. Legislation could be voted on sometimes on one reading and then it is deferred to the next meeting and then passed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> reading in one night. So you do it two nights, but here again you are still dispensing with the rule requiring 3 separate readings, 3 separate nights. You hear that motion, it is becoming a routine thing and then it is usually because there is no reason to just delay. In order to keep things moving and get on with our business and take care of the bidding or get the application in or whatever it is. In Councils judgment they may just want to go ahead and get it done at that time. When there is no reason what-so-ever for something to be done that quickly, we don't, but most times there is no practical reason to delay. That is how many times it is read and how many different meetings is involved. That is State Law.

Dorothy Stratton: Are these pages from City Hall?

Richard Wolfe: The one 731.17, that is State Law, and the second to the last page is 731.30, and the one in the middle is the Charter Section. Okay, that requires  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote with a 5 member Council, that requires 4 members to vote for that and sometimes if 2 members didn't want to then it would pass on the 1<sup>st</sup> reading and then it would just automatically be deferred because of the motion to suspend the rule requiring 3 separate readings, 3 separate nights does not get a minimum of 4 votes then it fails and that is as far as they can go with that piece of legislation that night. So in that instance, lets just say there was some issue that there was 3 members of Council for and 2 members against and was going to stay that way all the way along. The typical rule for parliamentary procedure, the minority can have its say, but the majority will have its way. So legislation could pass on 3 readings eventually even if there are not 4 people that support it. The other issue then is what is called the Emergency clause and

that has to do with nothing more, but it has to do solely with the issue of when the legislation becomes effective. That requires 2/3 vote. Now with a 5 member Council however, 2/3 is still 4. So it still takes 4 to pass legislation as an Emergency. If it was drafted as an Emergency but it did not get 4 votes, and it was passed 3 times by a majority, then it passes even though the emergency clause is there, it passes as a non-emergency because it did not get the required number of votes they need to meet the provisions of the Emergency Clause. The reason we are talking about when it becomes effective is that there is what is known as the referendum period. Referendum Period is 30 days following the passage of legislation and you have provisions not only in state law but there is also in the Charter about Referendum. That is where if someone doesn't like it, there is provision and the actions of Council is provisions for the circulation of the petition requiring that a certain number of signatures based on the last election for governor, I think it is 10% that I looked at, then I assuming that the petition was in proper form and the minimum number of valid signatures were obtained within a required 30 day period. Legislation would be then referred back to Council to either repeal it or if they refuse to repeal it, then it must go on the ballot. Now we have probably had, I am just guessing 3 or 4 maybe 5 of those in the last 30 years. It is not something that should happen often but it is always there .

One of the things that is kind of interesting is that under the state law, there are certain types of legislation that are not subject to a referendum if passed as an Emergency, however our Charter makes all legislature subject to a Referendum so sometimes if there might be an annexation or something to do with a construction issue or something, we have to be a little careful about acting within that 30 day period if we think there is any possibility or prospect of a Referendum or maybe if there is a dedication of an allotment, people are building houses or if you recall, the new area that Samaritan built out there on Mifflin and Route 42. There is a lot of concern about that. If those concerns hadn't been alleviated, that could have been something that might have been subject to a Referendum. So the people who are engaging in the project would have to be attentive to that and they will proceed at their own risk within the first 30-day period. If it is passed as an Emergency, it becomes effective immediately, and if not then it is not effective for at least 30 days. So you could have a non-emergency, non-suspension of the rule of legislation that in the regular course of business it would take you almost 2 1/2 months because you took 3 different Regular Meetings to pass it then it didn't become effective for 30 days. I would submit to you that the City is a business and in today's operation of City business, in most instances there is just no reason to stretch legislation out over that kind of a period of time. It is common and routine that legislation is prepared as an Emergency so it can become effective as quickly as possible and it is common and routine that Council votes to suspend the rule requiring 3 separate readings, 3 separate nights. Not because they are trying to do something under the radar or slide anything by, usually all the Councils I have worked with have been diligent, have done their homework and Mr. Sargent knows that. A lot of meetings, a lot of discussion and so that is pretty much an overview. I don't think there is really any need to change it. We explain it frequently to the people who have questions about it but I don't think it is that

big an issue. If we start changing terminology it might end up being more confusing to people more than it is right now.

Dorothy Stratton: You said that something had only been done 5 or 6 times, is that the Referendum?.

Richard Wolfe: I don't have an exact number, This is not something that happens frequently. There was an issue on re-zoning out by the Park many years ago, and if you go back far enough I suppose Liquor by the glass was a ballot issue. There has even been a few where there has been an attempt to a referendum but it was not successful, either they did not get it done in time, didn't have a proper form, or enough signatures so it is a process that is there, it is available, it isn't meant to happen often. We elect Council members to conduct the City's business (to get it to the voters on legislation), so it really isn't consistent with the whole concept of elected legislative government that the voters would vote on every issue that comes before Council so it would only be those that are of great community concern or some dispute or issue about if you get enough people that would sign the petition and want to vote on it.

Dorothy Stratton: If I may ask about the City Charter , Section 73. Emergency Ordinances. Ordinances passed as Emergency measures or measures necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace.

Richard Wolfe: That is all saying the same thing because those are the buzz words. This Ordinance is hereby declared to be an Emergency measure being necessary for the preservation of public peace, property, health safety and welfare for the reason that the grant application is due on the 30<sup>th</sup> of the month and this is the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month. Sometimes it may be fairly generic, statement of Emergency, other times there is more specific reasons that are put in.

Dorothy Stratton: This is the point where the people that we are talking to may have felt confused and may be, you know railroaded. And so I bring it only as a concern that that wording seems to be very limited and yet the use of it in conducting City Council business is much more broad and I guess from a citizens point of view, I feel it would probably be worth some kind of clarification just so that kind of confusion didn't come off at the time something that didn't seem to be an emergency was presented that have strong feelings and I just felt at the time when that group was before City Council that a lot of their negative feelings would have been alleviated if it hadn't been called an emergency that didn't seem to meet that definition. So we as a committee could then go on and consider that in light of what you said about the way the process was done. (The Grant Street Closing)

Richard Wolfe: That certainly wasn't one that was railroaded, it was discussed over a long, long period of time and it was just that by the time Council was ready to make a decision, they were ready to make a decision. So once they reached that point, (it would work). You know, sometimes people ask questions about it and we try to answer it then we move on. Without me becoming

redundant, I don't know if there is any more I can explain about that unless you have another question.

Dorothy Stratton: No. I think that is very helpful to us.

Ken Seidner: Anybody else have anything?

Ev DeVaul: Rick, Since you were invited to discuss this stuff, are there any things in the Charter that you feel should be reviewed by this Committee?

Richard Wolfe: You know I have been through this process 3 or 4 times now and I have files from the last Charter review and the one before that and the one before that. So from my perspective, I think these issues that have come up to me have been addressed by this time. There are maybe some things in there that don't get utilized very often but if necessary they are there and can fall back on them. I don't know, I don't have anything specific that I think is crying out to be changed.

Dorothy Stratton: I think that there were some questions which were the reasons that was the main reason that Rick was invited.

Ken Seidner: Any other comments?  
The next item of discussion were the assessments.

Ev DeVaul: This was given to us and we had all this other legal language in here from Barry Keefe.

Ken Seidner: That last Committee that we had on this 7 years ago that was one of the recommendations and I don't think Council acted on that and was reviewing the assessment procedures within the city and we had a whole packet of stuff here about 3 pages that Barry presented to us and I read it 3-4 times, it was like banging my head against the wall. Howard did some research and sent out a bunch more stuff.

Richard Wolfe: The reason that we had input from Mr. Keefe and I have know him for many years, he is with the firm Squire, Sanders and Dempsey and that firm has served as bond Council for the City of Ashland and that is a very specialized endeavor and we have issued bonds and anticipation for projects and different things as we have done. Many thousands and sometimes Millions of dollars, and that is very specialized area so that is why we referred to them for that. Along the same line are special assessments. There was one for the Claremont Garmon Ave. Storm Sewer project and there has been some others over the years. The process for assessments is set out in state law because if you look at all these different sections in his proposal, he makes reference to some 700 section of the State code and it is dealing with municipal law and that is so these pages I gave you 731, you look at the numbers left of the decimal, so 700 section is municipal law it is all pretty well covered in state law and I think, can we put in the Charter? yes, do we need to? Probably not, unless we wanted to make

some slight differences to what is provided in the state law and all the assessments that we have done during my Tenure have all been accomplished under State law and they all have proceeded properly so is it something we need to do? I don't think so, I don't think there is a crying need for it. Is it something we can do? That is why it was considered last time and Council just decided to defer. I haven't re-read all the proposals to see how or what might differ or what might make it any different than what we already have under State Law and the other thing we would have to look at is whether there has been any changes in the law in the last 7 years that would require this to be updated.

Howard Scanlan: There might be one like it in section 93. 729.06 ORC It does not impose a 5% penalty and if connections are not installed in 30 days, from date of service, -- may be done. And the cost therefore with a forfeiture of 5%. You're looking at the assessment and recommendations. The final section 729.06 It says 5% assessment on it. That might have happened in the last 7 years. This might have to be changed.

Richard Wolfe: We would probably want to ask for an update. This is a specialized area that there are people, this is all they do is bonds and assessment work and if this something this committee is seriously looking at then I would recommend, I can get a hold of Barry and say Hey, Could you look at what you gave us 7 years ago and update it to make sure everything is okay?

Ron Baker : I am still confused, of this information, so this is our responsibility to be doing as part of the Charter?

Richard Wolfe: Well, you are not necessarily supposed to be the drafters of legal language. It is a review, to review areas that are either obsolete or not effective or whatever it may be. You would think over a period of time that the more this is done, the fewer things that would need to be addressed and maybe not necessarily so. It isn't something that you would anticipate a lot of changes every time.

Ev Devaul: I guess my point is, just by saying have Barry do this, this is costing the city money in order to have it done and to me I would think Rick would be the one through his normal responsibilities of his job to make sure this stuff is updated. I am confused if that is our role to make that recommendation or spend that time or spend that money. So that is why I just question that. It should be done and I am in favor of it but if it shouldn't be done or if it is Rick's responsibility, I don't see spending several hundred dollars of the city's money to have this done unless Rick would be the one saying it should be done.

Ken Seidner: I think you mentioned Rick though that anything you do or anything along this line basically follows State Law. The States Statutes already have been changed on this, it is already there so anything that we do would follow the State Law.

Richard Wolfe: Also you don't have to necessarily wait until you are all done, to submit suggestions to Council. You can maybe as you are going along say you know this is something we were seriously thinking about and kind of get some feedback from Council as you go along too. I am sure they would be willing to periodically review your progress if you want to. There is no hard and fast rules about how you have to do this.

Dorothy Stratton: So if we would not ask for this kind of review and make recommendations then how would it come to awareness that there had been a change? Just when something came up and you needed to refer to State Law then? If the State Law has changed and it would impact on something that was being done here and a formal review had not been done, then it would just come to your awareness when it became an issue?

Richard Wolfe: Well Yes and part of my everyday work is to try to stay abreast of changes and became aware of things that happen at the State level and how they affect cities. I get publications and try to stay on top of that stuff.

Dorothy Stratton: Okay, so then maybe what this committee would do would not have any positive impact on you doing your job. You would just be reviewing it anyway when it came up as an issue?

Richard Wolfe: Well I am not saying that this committee's work wouldn't have a positive impact.

Dorothy Stratton: We're trying to decide if it is worth our having you check with Barry now and to your thinking about the way you carry out your job, would it help for the committee to have you contact Barry now and make a recommendation or should we just let you do your job as it comes along with regard to catching up with the State Law.

Richard Wolfe: I will just give Barry a call and ask him how he feels about this and how strongly if he thinks if this is something we should look at further. Then I will get back with you guys and let you know if it is something we need to look at in more detail. It has not really been a problem. It isn't something that happens a lot. So You know we just need to be careful about changing the rules for a few isolated circumstances unless there is a real great need for it.

Howard Scanlan: Isn't it somewhere in title 7 that says there is nothing in the Charter that Ohio Revised Code is dominant?

Ken Seidner: Okay, if you get a response, will you give it to Valarie and she will get a hold of us.

Have we gotten any response from any of the Departments based on that letter we sent out on February 8?

Valarie if you could just send out a reminder letter to all departments to get a response.

Howard Scanlan: It has to do with section 36 of the Charter. Actually the Law Director came up also. Could be an appointed position. So could the director of finance. The main concern was there are no qualifications, anybody can run for this. Straight out of high school, can run for this.

Richard Wolfe- I guess that is where you have to have a little faith in the electorate because the same would be true for State Representatives, Governor, State Office Holders with regards, I don't know if you are asking, in regards to the position of the Director of Law.

Howard Scanlan: We dropped that one fast because everything is pretty well covered in it. It could be an appointed position is what he was saying.

Richard Wolfe: I think that it is a good position to be elected, at least so that the Law Director is independent and not beholding to the Mayor or Council and I don't mean this in any derogatory way but at various times over the years, I have been asked questions where I have been kind of given the answers somebody wants to hear before they ask the question and If my job was dependent on keeping Council happy or the Mayor happy and always giving them the answer they want to hear then that might affect how I do my job; and there are cities where the Law Director is actually two separate positions; in larger cities there is a city attorney and there is a city prosecutor. The Law Director in Ashland is both of those rolled into one. I am the prosecutor for Municipal Court. There is only one Municipal Court in the County so I have Countywide Jurisdiction; it is always hard for people to understand why somebody gets into a fight down south of Loudonville, the Law Director's office in Ashland is handling it. Well, It is because, as the elected Attorney for the City and the only City in the County and the only Municipal Court in the County; I am the prosecutor for that Court. So I have Jurisdiction over the City of Ashland and all of the unincorporated area of the County. There are 8 incorporated villages and each of those villages have their own solicitor and that is the only areas that the Law Director's office doesn't have jurisdiction. I just think that is a good many times an independent elected official plus you have the succession provisions right now I am acting Mayor, this week the Mayor is out of town so there has been many times that I have filled in as Mayor when Mayor Richey was disabled for several weeks and Mayor Cellar was out for some period of time, I had performed all of duties and responsibilities of the Mayor. I hired people, I fired some people. I signed the requisition forms and all of those kind of things. So, you know, the process of acting succession, not succession of the office, but to perform the duties. It goes Mayor, Director of Law, and Director of Finance. Now if all three are either disabled, unable to perform their duties or out of town, I guess it goes to the Fire Chief. No, It would probably the President of Council. We have never had any type of situation where that has been the issue.

Ron Baker: You bring a good point Rick, because this is one thing that came to my attention. There is still some interest in recommendations item number 1) where calling the Mayor to appoint no more than 2 candidates to the eligibility list with motion to police and fire chief.

No in the early 1980's the Charter Review Commission at that time was faced with a proposal to take the police and fire chief out of Civil Service and man that is when I fought tooth and nail because I don't see, just like your talking Rick. Then you are at the beckon call of the Mayor. I had run-ins with the Mayors that wanted me to do something that was not the right thing to do and you do need to be independent and do your job.

Richard Wolfe: You're right, there are arguments on both sides. And at one time I know that one of those recommendations; to go outside of Civil Service actually came from one of the Police Chiefs, so you know, there are different views on that.

Ron Baker: Well, it can remain in Civil Service but you can also allow outside people to apply, but it is still under Civil Service which I don't think is a bad idea.

Richard Wolfe: Cleveland is an example where the Mayor appoints the Police Chief, I don't know about the Fire Chief. It becomes somewhat of a political thing and I don't think that is the healthiest situation for safety services or emergency services.

Ken Seidner: I don't know if any of you remember, but the last commission that I was on, we looked at this too, where the appointment or election of a Law Director and we kicked it around a lot and we decided it should stay on that position.

And to me the other thing that wasn't mentioned in this letter, we also looked at the same thing with the Finance Director. First of all I don't see the electorate electing anybody that is not an Attorney. It is a requirement. The Finance Director is another one. We kicked that around, should the Finance Director be required to be a CPA, you know and we went through that also and we let that drop too. I think the Finance Director needs to have some kind of financial background. In recent memory I cannot imagine, I don't know of any Finance Director of the City that hadn't had some extensive financial background. I know Bill Strine before he became Mayor was, he worked in Banking for 20 years before he became Finance Director. I think probably the person that I can remember in my memory who have at least financial background was Nancy, but then she worked for the City in that Department.

Richard Wolfe: Then you get into the discussion of salaries and qualifications and as you raise qualifications, the demand for salary raises. The first year I was Law Director, the salary was 12,000.00 dollars. Another lifetime ago.

Ken Seidner: Well, we are getting into that magic hour here. Is there anything anyone would like to add at this point? Any questions?

Richard Wolfe: I just want to make a comment regarding the minutes. A verbatim record is maybe not necessary, in some respects it might inhibit the free and open discussion because you might say something and then after

discussion you want to change your mind about it or whatever. You know you might want to think about that a little bit more, in how you want to handle that. Do you really need everybody's every word? Or can you say that we discussed the subject of such. Now if you come to a conclusion or a consensus, then that is obviously very important but you are all capable of writing minutes or writing notes for yourself and keeping notes as to what the points were or what you were discussing. You know there are points on both sides of that issue but, I guess at some point you can say if somebody wants to say something and they want it off the record, just say so, say I would like this off the record. On the other hand, if a reporter is here, you cannot ask the reporter to leave. They have a right to be here. It comes down to being more practical consideration than anything else and if the consensus is that you really want to have record of everything that was said here, fine, that is your choice.

Everett DeVaul: I certainly didn't request the record, I just don't want Valarie to assume or summarizing things that really should be reviewed by Ken or someone to really improve the minutes for us. I am not pushing verbatim stuff, I just don't think that it is Valarie's job.

Richard Wolfe: I don't think that she needs to necessarily summarize what somebody's else's statements are, she can just record that there was discussion on this and that these points were made. We certainly would not put the responsibility on anyone else to summarize the minutes. And you all are certainly welcome to submit anything in writing for the record as well if you have done some research on an issue and you want to put it in the minutes and say here is my thoughts on this, you are certainly welcome to do that.

Ken Seidner: Well, again, Howard submitted those research papers he did on the Charter and I agree, if you want to alter what you say or clarify a point, obviously you can bring it to the next meeting and have that included.

Richard Wolfe: Conversational speech's are usually not completely, grammatically correct and sometimes we see it, a perfect example was a transcript from a court case and did I say that, is that the way I talk?

Everett DeVaul: The only other thing would be is to put something in the paper, in the media inviting anybody else to respond. We did it with the City employees but we should do it with everyone.

Ken Seidner: Valarie if you could send another letter update reminding the public , employees, Department heads that we are expecting a response for the Charter?

Richard Wolfe: You can also ask Council to rent space in the Times Gazette for press release. And you might periodically meet once a month and say we have had 3 meetings and we are looking at various issues and we met with so and so and we want to reiterate that we welcome any input anyone might have then you have your forum right there and you made your announcements and that

would mean you are keeping Council aware. I don't think that Council is looking for a meeting by meeting report but I am sure they would welcome you if you came to a Council meeting just to give them an update. Council has the utmost confidence in this committee because you all expressed an interest and Council appointed you and charged you with the responsibilities so periodically, that is the way to get your message out too, through the Council Meetings.

Adjournment:

Move to be adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Submitted by  
**Valarie Bishoff**  
Clerk of City Council