

# Minneapolis Charter Commission Minutes

June 13, 2012 - 4:00 p.m.  
Room 317 City Hall, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Commissioners Present: Clegg (Chair), Cohen, Connell, Dolan, Ferrara, Gerdes, Johnson, Kozak, Lazarus, Metge, Peltola, Rubenstein, Sandberg, Schwarzkopf

Commissioner Excused: Lickness

Also Present: Burt Osborne, Assistant City Attorney

## 1. Roll Call

Chair Clegg called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Roll call was taken.

## 2. Adopt Agenda

*Lazarus moved adoption of the agenda. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Ferrara, Lickness, Metge.

## 3. Approve the minutes of the regular meeting of May 2, 2012 and the public hearing journal of the May 21, 2012 public hearing

*Lazarus moved approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of May 2, 2012.*

Seconded.

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Ferrara, Lickness, Metge.

*Lazarus moved approval of the public hearing journal of the May 21, 2012 public hearing. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Ferrara, Lickness, Metge.

## 4. Chair's Report

Clegg stated that he had no report.

## Discussion

### 5. Plain Language Charter Revision:

a) Discussion of most recent version of the Plain Language Charter Revision; and

b) Consideration of placing the Plain Language Charter Revision on the 2012 ballot.

Clegg stated that Commissioners had been provided with Draft 12(E) of the Plain Language Charter Revision, which had been prepared by former Commissioner Brian Melendez following discussions with the City Attorney's Office and the counsel for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. He noted that Draft 12(E) contained sections with two versions of language. Mr. Melendez was present to answer questions from Commissioners, and then the Commission.

Former Commissioner Brian Melendez answered Commissioners' questions regarding the following sections of the Plain Language Charter Revision:

**~~§2.2(b)(3) not dilute the voting strength of a racial or linguistic minority or other cohesive community of interest and, where possible, increase the probability that a member of such a minority or community will be elected~~**

Melendez stated that this language had been deleted on the advice of the City Attorney's Office in light of amendments passed since the provisions were first drafted in the revision project.

**§6.4(c) Rules. The Board may adopt rules of order for the conduct of its own business.**

Melendez explained that Robert's Rules stated that it was only a default parliamentary authority and didn't cover every contingency that an organization might encounter, so most organizations adopt a short set of their own rules, as the Charter Commission had, and in those rules adopt Robert's Rules to cover any situation not covered by the board's or commission's own rules. This was consistent with the current Charter and with the parallel provision relating to the City Council.

**§7.2(a)(4) The City Council must establish, organize, and otherwise provide for these departments: (4) a city finance officer and budget office, including a director;**

Peter Ginder, Deputy City Attorney, explained that currently the City Coordinator appointed the Finance and Budget Directors, and those positions did not go through the Executive Committee process. Section 8.4 delineates appointments that go through the Executive Committee process. As long as special laws or ordinances provide for appointment by the Coordinator, the appointment of the city's finance officer would not go through the Executive Committee.

**§1.4(e) Unmentioned powers. This charter's mention of certain powers does not limit the City's powers to those mentioned.**

In answer to a question regarding whether this provision was in the current Charter, Melendez stated that he did not believe it was. The language was taken from the Minnesota League of Cities Model Charter.

Schwarzkopf pointed out that **§2.2(c)** had been changed to allow members of the Redistricting Advisory Group to have served as election judges.

**§2.2(c)(3)(ED) Effective date. The final plan takes effect upon, and Applicability. A ward-boundary plan applies to the first general election for which filing opens after, its adoption. A redistricting the plan takes effect. A plan does not affect the**

**eligibility or term of any incumbent holding office when the plan takes effect, and does not apply to any special election held before the next regular election.**

Melendez clarified that the new ward plan recently adopted by the Redistricting Group would take effect for the 2013 election. It would not be in effect if a special election occurred prior to that date.

**§2.3(c) Park & Recreation Board. Before holding at the last two public hearing hearings on any tentative park-district boundary plan, the Commission must—(1) notify the Park & Recreation Board of its tentative plan; and (2) a draft plan or plans. The Commission must consider any recommendation by the Board.**

Melendez explained that this provision provided for the Park Board to receive the redistricting plan prior to the final public hearings in order to allow them time to present any concerns at those public hearings.

**§7.1.(g)(1) Administration/Mayor. The Mayor's staff serves in the unclassified service.**

Ginder stated that he believed that currently all of the Mayor's staff was in the unclassified service.

**§9.4(e) Professional sports facility. Neither the City, nor any board, commission, committee, or department, nor any governmental body whose territorial jurisdiction is coextensive with or falls wholly within the City, may finance any professional sports facility in an amount greater than \$10 million unless the voters in an otherwise scheduled election (and not an election held only for that purpose) so authorize. For this section 10.49.4(e)'s purposes, "finance" includes applying existing realty, infrastructure, overhead, or other resources, and forgoing taxes or any other revenue, as well as spending money directly, issuing bonds, or otherwise incurring debt.**

Melendez stated that the words "board, commission, committee, or department" appear throughout the Revised Charter as covering the range of groups that the city can create. The current charter was written by many different hands who used many different terms. This was a drafting choice made in 2003 in an attempt to be consistent in the kind of governmental bodies that exist under the charter in the city. Melendez disagreed that it created a substantive change.

**§8.2(g)(3) Officers generally. Removal. The electing or appointing body (or, in the case of an elected office, the City Council) may remove any officer after notice and hearing.**

Melendez explained that this provision provided one means of removal for any elected or appointed person. There could be other means of removal elsewhere. This provision conformed to the existing charter.

Clegg stated that the Commission would next consider those sections of the Plain Language Charter Revision where there were unresolved issues either between the Park Board and the City Attorney’s Office or between the Draft language and the language recommended by the City Attorney’s Office.

John Erwin, President, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, stated that the Park Board had significant concerns and wanted to make sure that the powers of the Park Board were not diminished by any of the provisions in the revised Charter. He asked the Commission to support the Park Board’s recommended language.

**§6.2. Park & Recreation Board/Functions and powers**  
**(a)(2) Other powers.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>[Park Board version]</u></p> <p><u>(2) Other powers. The Board also enjoys all the powers for which any general law, special law, or ordinance provides, including any power necessary and proper for exercising its enumerated powers or for performing its lawful functions.</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>[City Attorney version]</u></p> <p><u>[The City Attorney’s office recommends that this subsection 6.2(a)(2) be omitted as already covered by sections 1.3(b), 1.3(c)(2), and 5.4(a).]</u></p>
--	---

Brian Rice, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board counsel, stated that the language recommended by the Park Board was actually language developed by Mr. Melendez that had been in previous drafts of the revision for the past eight years and would continue any powers that the Park Board currently had by general law, special law, or ordinance to carry out its mission. The City Attorney recommended omitting the language based on other existing provisions in the revised charter. He didn’t feel that the powers of the Park Board were covered by Sections 1.3(b), 1.3(c)(2), or 5.4(a), as cited by the City Attorney’s Office. Section 5.4(a) no longer existed in Draft 12(E). In repealing the existing charter and replacing it with a new document, many words were dropped and without this provision, it could be likely that Park Board powers would be diminished. He felt that removing this section would be a substantive change and that the provision was needed and appropriate.

Ginder noted that there had probably been more changes made to the Plain Language Charter Revision in the past two months than in the past two years, from the removal of a complete section dealing with boards and commissions to a number of changes now being suggested by the Park Board that were new and different from what was agreed

to over a year ago. Some significant changes had come forward within the last five or six days, and he didn't feel the City Attorney's Office had been able to give them proper consideration as to how important they were. The city is not trying to diminish or enlarge the powers of the Park Board. The City Attorney's Office felt the language in question was redundant because two different sections of the charter already stated that any board or department of the city had all the powers it held under any special law or any other law.

Clegg recommended that the Commission adopt the Park Board language since in the past the Commission had included redundant provisions to satisfy a party's objection.

Metge noted that she could not vote for the Plain Language Charter Revision if it removed the section relating to boards and commissions which were valuable to the city and should remain in the charter. With that said, she supported all of the Park Board's recommendations.

Lazarus recommended that the Charter Commission heed the advice of their attorney who had stated that omitting the proposed language would neither expand nor diminish Park Board powers. Clegg noted that the Park Board counsel represented the Park Board and the City Attorney's Office represented the interests of the city, except for the Park Board, and they had competing interests. However, the Charter Commission represented everyone and should be mindful of that as they deliberated.

Ferrara stated that he had a problem with the phrase "including any power necessary and proper for exercising its enumerated powers or for performing its lawful functions" in the language recommended by the Park Board. It seemed too broad of a statement.

Connell added that that phrase seemed to be a potentially substantive issue.

*Schwarzkopf moved to adopt the Park Board's recommended language relating to §6.2(a)(2), with the deletion of the phrase "including any power necessary and proper for exercising its enumerated powers or for performing its lawful functions".* Seconded. Adopted upon a voice vote.  
Absent - Lickness.

**§6.2. Park & Recreation Board/Functions and powers**

**(a)(3) General powers.**

<p><u>[Park Board version]</u> (3) <b>General powers.</b> <u>When exercising its powers under this charter, the Board may act on the City's behalf and enjoys all powers necessary and proper for the exercise of</u></p>	<p><u>[City Attorney version]</u> (3) <b>General powers.</b> <u>When exercising its powers under this article, the Board may act on the City's behalf and enjoys all powers necessary and proper for the exercise of</u></p>
---	--

<u>its function under this charter, including (but not limited to)—</u>	<u>its function under this charter, including (but not limited to)—</u>
---	---

Rice stated that the Park Board was asking that the word “charter” be used in the provision in order to refer to the entire document rather than only Article VI.

Ginder stated that the City Attorney's Office believed that this this provision should reference only the article that covered the Park Board.

Clegg suggested adopting the Park Board version because there were provisions in other articles of the charter that referred to the Park Board and gave the Park Board express powers.

*Metge moved adoption of the Park Board’s recommended language relating to §6.2(a)(3). Seconded.*  
 Adopted upon a voice vote.  
 Absent - Lickness.

**§6.2. Park & Recreation Board/Functions and powers**  
**(b) Status.**

<u>[Park Board version]</u>	<u>[City Attorney version]</u>
<u>(b) Status. The Board is a unique municipal department and, in the exercise of its general functions and specially defined powers, may, on the City’s behalf—</u>	<u>(b) Status. The Board is a unique department of the City and, in the exercise of its general functions and specially defined powers, may, on the City’s behalf—</u>

Rice indicated that the Park Board withdrew their objection to the City Attorney's proposed language.

*Kozak moved adoption of the City Attorney’s recommended language relating to §6.2(b). Seconded.*  
 Adopted upon a voice vote.  
 Absent - Lickness.

**§6.2. Park & Recreation Board/Functions and powers**  
**(c) Delegation.**

<u>[Park Board version]</u>	<u>[City Attorney version]</u>
<u>(c) Delegation. The Board may delegate its authority over a particular subject or in a particular matter to a committee or officer subject</u>	<u>[The City Attorney’s office recommends that this subsection 6.2(c) be omitted because it is a significant change from the Charter and may violate the anti-delegation</u>

<u>to the Board's direction, unless such a delegation is contrary to law.</u>	<u>doctrine.]</u>
---	-------------------

Clegg stated that the language proposed by the Park Board provided that the board may delegate its authority over a particular subject or matter to a committee or officer subject to the board's direction unless such delegation was contrary to law. The City Attorney's Office recommended that this subsection be omitted because it was a significant change from the existing charter and may violate the anti-delegation doctrine.

Rice stated that this was not a substantive change to the charter. Chapter 16, Section 1 of the current charter referred to delegation to the extent that it stated that the "Park and Recreation Board shall make rules to govern its proceedings, and may meet from to time, as it may by rule or vote determine, and adjourn its said meetings. It shall make and publish from time to time, rules, ordinances and regulations for the government of its officers, agents, servants, and employees, and for the government and regulation of the parks and parkways, which may be required under and pursuant to the provisions of this Chapter". The Park Board's proposed language had been in every version of the proposed Charter revision for the past eight years. It was an important concept of law to allow a government entity to operate. The Park Board routinely delegated its authority to a superintendent and its staff to carry out certain functions. He noted that the final phrase of the proposed language stated "unless such a delegation is contrary to law". He did not believe this was a substantive change.

Ginder stated that there was no reference to delegation doctrine in the language cited from Chapter 16 of the current charter. Those were standard provisions for the duties and obligations of employees. The City of Minneapolis had the same issues and delegated duties to employees all the time. Anti-delegation doctrine referred to taking away a body's right to make decisions and giving them to a subordinate. The City Attorney's Office was concerned that the language was so broad that it subsumed any kind of issue about what may be delegated.

Connell inquired if the Park Board would have the authority to hire a superintendent in the absence of the proposed language. Rice stated that the Park Board would still have that authority, but there might be some administrative duties that could not be assigned to the superintendent absent that provision.

Clegg recommended adopting the City Attorney's recommended language. The provision was not specifically in the existing charter. The provision that Mr. Rice cited dealt with adoption of rules governing proceedings and employees.

*Lazarus moved to adopt the City Attorney's recommended language relating to §6.2(c).  
Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lickness.

**§6.2. Park & Recreation Board/Functions and powers**

**(i) Employment.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>[Park Board version]</u></p> <p><u>(1) <b>Employment and compensation.</b> The Board may provide for any necessary employees and for their compensation, may regulate and direct them, and may discipline or discharge them (subject to the Civil Service Commission’s rules, in the case of an employee in the classified service).</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>[City Attorney version]</u></p> <p><u>(1) <b>Employment and compensation.</b> The Board may provide for any necessary employees and for their compensation, may regulate and direct them, and may discipline or discharge them.</u></p>
--	---

Ginder stated that he felt that the language proposed by the City Attorney's Office was clearer, but would not stand in the way if the Park Board wanted to include the parenthetical phrase.

Rice stated that Civil Service provided a personnel function, and similar language was in the current Charter.

*Dolan moved to adopt the Park Board’s recommended language relating to §6.2(i).*

Seconded.

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lickness.

**§6.4. Park & Recreation Board/Meetings**

**(g) Acts.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>[Park Board version]</u></p> <p><u>(g) <b>Legislative acts.</b> For this article VI’s purposes, the noun “act”—</u></p> <p><u>(1) means any ordinance, resolution, appropriation, any other lawful action of a legislative nature, and any action amending, repealing, or otherwise affecting any such act; but</u></p> <p><u>(2) does not include a rule or other vote that relates to the Board’s internal organization</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>[City Attorney version (parallel to § 4.4(a)(2))]</u></p> <p><u>(g) <b>Acts.</b> For this article VI’s purposes, the noun “act”—</u></p> <p><u>(1) means any ordinance, resolution, appropriation, any other lawful action, and any action amending, repealing, or otherwise affecting any such act; but</u></p> <p><u>(2) does not include a rule or other vote that relates to the Board’s internal organization or procedure.</u></p>
---	--

or procedure.

Rice indicated that the Park Board would agree to the City’s Attorney’s recommended language.

*Lazarus moved to adopt the City Attorney’s recommended language relating to §6.4(g). Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lickness.

**§6.5 Park & Recreation Board/Finances**

**(a) Taxing power.**

**(1) Charter powers. Subject to article XIX’s provisions:**

<u>[Draft 12]</u>	<u>[Park Board version]</u>
<p><u>(A) <b>Park &amp; recreation fund.</b></u>  <u>The Board may annually tax up to 0.10415 percent of the total value of the property in the City.</u></p> <p><u>(B) <b>Tree fund.</b> The Board may annually tax up to 0.02753 percent of the total value of the property in the City for taking care of shade and ornamental trees and shrubbery.</u></p>	<p><u>(A) <b>Park &amp; recreation fund.</b> The Board may annually tax up to 0.6 percent of the total value of the property in the City.</u></p> <p><u>(B) <b>Tree fund.</b> The Board may annually tax up to 0.005 percent of the total value of the property in the City for taking care of shade and ornamental trees and shrubbery.</u></p>

Clegg stated that the difference between the two versions was the tax rate. The existing charter was exactly the same as the Park Board’s recommended language. However, the existing charter had been modified by a number of special laws imposed by the state. The figures in Draft 12 were based on information that Mr. Melendez received from the Finance Department a number of years ago and may or may not continue to be accurate.

Rice stated that if the Draft 12 language were adopted, the Park Board would actually see its taxing capacity drop substantially. The numbers in the right-hand column were in the current charter and the purpose of the Park Board’s language was to make sure they were not artificially capped in their levy.

Ginder stated that the figures in the Draft 12 language were based on information from the Finance Department in 2004. The problem with substituting the mill rate was that the old mill rate, as stated in the current charter, was based on a tax of “6 mills upon each dollar of valuation of the taxable property” in the city. That language was no longer contained in the revised charter. There was a dramatic difference between taxable property and total market value. A different section of the revised charter based

the city’s tax levy on market value. If one section was changed, the other section would also have to be changed. A lot of this was covered by special law, and he urged the Commission to adopt the City Attorney’s Office recommended language.

Melendez stated that the current charter expressed taxing authority in a number of different ways, and this was an attempt to be consistent in the way the charter referred to taxing authority. In 2004, he met with the Finance Department staff who recommended the language that is now consistent throughout the Plain Language Charter Revision. Also, one of the purposes of the revision project was to get rid of obsolete provisions. The figures in Draft 12 were included to try to capture the law at that time. He suggested allowing time for Finance staff to update the figures.

Rubenstein suggested describing the real process rather than carving in stone a number that changed from time to time.

Lazarus suggested adding the phrase “subject to superseding special laws, the board may ...”.

*Ferrara moved to defer further consideration of the proposed language in §6.5(a)(1) to either a special Charter Commission meeting or the regular July Charter Commission meeting, at the discretion of the Chair, to allow time to obtain further information from the Finance Department. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lickness.

**§7.2. Administration/Departments**

**(c) City attorney.**

**(3) Park & Recreation Board.**

<p><u>[City Attorney version]</u>  <u>(3) Park &amp; Recreation Board.</u>  <u>Notwithstanding this section 7.2(c), the Park &amp; Recreation Board may retain its own attorney.</u></p>	<p><u>[Park Board version]</u>  <u>(3) Park &amp; Recreation Board.</u>  <u>This section 7.2(c) does not apply to the Park &amp; Recreation Board.</u></p>	<p><u>[Current charter]</u>  <u>Provided, that the provisions of this section shall not apply to the Board of Park Commissioners of the City of Minneapolis. [ch. 3, § 8]</u></p>
--	--	---

Rice stated that the charter already had a provision that stated that the Park Board could hire its own attorney. However, the charter also stated that the City Attorney would be the advisor/counselor to all boards and commissions. The language proposed by the City Attorney’s Office didn’t address that issue. He felt the language was a grab on the part of the City Attorney’s Office to take control over the Park Board’s legal affairs.

Susan Segal, City Attorney, stated that the language proposed by the City Attorney's Office preserved the right of the Park Board to hire their own attorney but did not prohibit them from seeking the services of the City Attorney if they chose. The language proposed by the Park Board could mean that the Park Board would not be allowed to use the services of the City Attorney if they so desired.

Rice stated that nothing in the current or revised charter would prohibit the Park Board from retaining the services of the City Attorney's Office.

*Kozak moved to adopt the language proposed by the City Attorney's Office relating to §7.2.(c)(3), with the addition of the following phrase at the end of the sentence "except to the extent that the board so requests".* Seconded.  
 Adopted upon a voice vote.  
 Absent - Lickness.

**§7.4. Administration/Fire**

**(a) Fire Department**

**(2) Senior management. Except as otherwise provided by law:**

**(A) Senior managers. The department's senior managers are those holding the titles (which may be held by one or more employees)—**

- (i) assistant chief,**
- (ii) deputy chief,**
- (iii) fire marshal,**
- (iv) assistant chief of training, or**
- (v) engineering officer<sup>72</sup>**

<sup>72</sup>Footnote 2: The Board of Business Agents recommends that this list also include any title above the rank of district fire chief that was created by 2003 Minn. Laws ch. 115.

Jim Michels, Attorney for the Board of Business Agents, suggested deleting both the footnote and the phrase "Except as otherwise provided by law".

*Sandberg moved to delete the phrase "Except as otherwise provided by law" and the footnote in §7.4(a)(2).* Seconded.  
 Adopted upon a voice vote.  
 Absent - Lickness.

**§9.6. Finance/Improvements**

**(c) Special Assessments.**

**(5) County Auditor.**

<u>[Reporter's draft]</u>	<u>[City Attorney version]</u>
<u>(5) County auditor. The City Council or the Park &amp;</u>	<u>(5) County auditor. The City Council or the Park &amp;</u>

<p><u>Recreation Board may require that the county auditor furnish information about benefited property and its ownership in connection with a special assessment, in which case the Council or the Board (as the case may be) will—</u></p> <p><u>(A) set the rate, at least five cents per entry, at which the City compensates the county for this service;</u> and</p> <p><u>(B) annually deliver, by October 10, its assessment rolls to the county auditor, who must—</u></p> <p><u>(i) collect the assessed payment with and in the same manner as other taxes, and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) pay the money collected, with interest, to the City or to the Park &amp; Recreation Board (as the case may be) along with other collected taxes being paid.</u></p>	<p><u>Recreation Board may—</u></p> <p><u>(A) require that the county auditor furnish information about benefited property and its ownership in connection with a special assessment;</u></p> <p><u>(B) set the rate, at least five cents per entry, at which the City compensates the county for this service;</u> and</p> <p><u>(C) annually deliver, by October 10, its assessment rolls to the county auditor, in which case the auditor must—</u></p> <p><u>(i) collect the assessed payment with and in the same manner as other taxes, and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) pay the money collected, with interest, to the City or to the Park &amp; Recreation Board (as the case may be) along with other collected taxes being paid.</u></p>
---	--

Ginder stated that the language proposed by the City Attorney's Office was drafted by the attorney that worked on special assessments and understood the process best. He believed that the proposed language was more understandable and better represented the actual process.

Melendez stated that this was purely a drafting issue. The City Council did not have to require that the County Auditor furnish information. It was an optional power. If they did that, the next two items were not optional.

Segal stated that she didn't think that special assessments were triggered because the city asked the county auditor for information about the market value of properties. This

was a process initiated by the city and while the city may request the information from the county auditor, it was not the triggering event. The City Attorney who worked with special assessments drafted the language to reflect what actually occurred during the process.

*Kozak moved to adopt the language drafted by the City Attorney's Office relating to §9.6(c)(5). Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lickness.

Metge requested clarification on the deletion of Article V relating to boards. Draft 12(D), which had contained Article V, defined a board as to include the city council and, most importantly, "any other body that this charter or an ordinance calls a 'board' or a 'commission'". The city of Minneapolis had citizen committees and commissions that advised, provided checks and balances, and provided a venue for citizen participation such as the Heritage Preservation Commission, the Long Range Capital Improvement Committee, and the ADA Commission. In her field there had been a ten year strategy to eliminate citizen participation and she worried that was what was behind the deletion of this article. She could not vote for the Plain Language Charter Revision with the deletion of the article relating to boards.

Melendez stated that all boards and commissions mentioned by Commissioner Metge were not established by the charter and didn't derive any of their authority from the charter. They were established by ordinance or some other process. The only reason for deleting what had been Article V was that it didn't make sense to have an article to describe things that were common to only two remaining boards. Also, that language was not in the current charter, it was only in the draft.

Ginder stated that the language cited by Commissioner Metge would have the unintended impact of requiring all appointments go through the Executive Committee.

Segal stated that deleting the article relating to boards would have no impact because they are all created by ordinance. It would not alter the existing structure for advisory boards and commissions.

*Peltola moved approval of Draft 12(E) of the Plain Language Charter Revision, as amended, with the deferral of consideration of §6.5(a)(1) until such time as more information was received from the Finance Department. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lickness.

Burt Osborne, Assistant City Attorney, noted that State Statute required proposed charter amendments to be submitted at least 17 weeks prior to the general election, which would be July 10. To meet that requirement, he suggested either holding a special meeting or rescheduling the July 11 meeting to July 9 or 10.

*Metge moved to authorize Chair Clegg to reschedule the July meeting as needed to meet the required deadline for submitting a charter amendment. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Lazarus, Lickness.

Gerdes commented that he thought the questions asked in the survey from the Neighborhood and Community Engagement Department, which had been sent to members of all boards and commissions, were too personal and he would not be participating in the survey. Metge suggested that Commissioner Gerdes contact David Rubedor, Director of the Department, to express his concerns.

## **Public Commentary**

There was no one present wishing to address the Charter Commission.

*Connell moved to adjourn. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Ferrara, Johnson, Lazarus, Lickness.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Peggy Menshek  
Charter Commission Coordinator