

City of Broadview Heights

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

April 22, 2014

Mr. Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Wolf led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Brian Wolf, Todd Kinzer, Don Barich, Brad Clifford, Paul Barlak, Julie Brown, Jerry Pantaleano, Scott Maitland, Diane Varga, Mayor Alai, Vince Ruffa, Helen Dunlap

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Barich moved to approve the Meeting Minutes dated April 15, 2014; seconded by Mr. Kinzer. All voted in favor except Ms. Varga who abstained. The Meeting Minutes dated April 15, 2014 are approved.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Mr. Wolf stated that the Commission will begin with the discussion points from the April 15, 2014 meeting. He asked Mr. Ruffa if he had contacted the codifier regarding the three sections that referenced 2007.

Mr. Ruffa responded that he has left a message with the codifier but has not heard back from them at this time.

Mr. Wolf continued the discussion regarding the Department of Development and whether or not to put it in the Charter.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the position is created by ordinance so the question is whether or not you want it to be in the Charter.

Mr. Kinzer asked if it was a proposal to put it in the Charter and it is voted down does that mean the city should remove the position.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the legislation would still be in place, it just would not be in the Charter. He also clarified that if the position was to be in the Charter the legislation would not have to be repealed.

Mr. Maitland asked what the advantage to having it in the Charter is.

Mr. Ruffa stated that ultimately there is none but people may want to have all of the different positions in the Charter. The most recent one was Human Services that was added in 2002.

Mr. Maitland stated that the reason that it came up is that the Building Commissioner section stated planning and zoning and he knew that the Economic Development was there so he wondered if that was the correct verbiage for that because the Building Commissioner and Department included planning and zoning. This is on page 20 under Powers and Duties and where it states planning and zoning and he thought that is more under the Economic Development Director.

Mr. Ruffa stated that from the economics side of things this position is to bring in people and businesses but from the technical and administrative side of things, it is still the Building Commissioner that runs through all of that. The Economic Development Director does not necessarily have the expertise with respect to the process of getting the application through. The Building Commissioner is still responsible on the construction side of things. The EDD tries to bring things forward and then they have to work through the other processes to make sure that they can actually come in and do what they want to do. A good EDD is going to try to bring in many different things that may or may not fit and

then it goes through the process.

Mrs. Brown stated that her only hesitancy is if this is put on there would people be confused that they are voting for a position that is already there. She thinks that could potentially cause problems.

Mr. Kinzer stated that if we put it to the voters and it passes, then is the expectation that this position has to be filled. Currently, because it is legislative it doesn't have to be filled, but if it is in the Charter is the position supposed to be filled.

Mr. Ruffa replied that legislatively, if we would like to get rid of the position, we could do that with the passage of new legislation, whereas if we would want to get rid of the position that is in the Charter, you would have to go to a vote of the people again. He looked at some of the other departments in the Charter and whether or not it is mandatory or permissive language. Such as, there shall be a, meaning there must be, but if you use the word "may" then it is permissive.

Mr. Barich stated that if it isn't broke then let's not fix it. If it is on the ballot it is going to be one of those things that is going to confuse people. Some people will vote against whatever they see coming forward and they may run into a problem where the voters vote something down.

Mr. Wolf stated that if it is voted down the position is still there legislatively so the position would not go away; it would just not be in the Charter. They would just think that if they voted it down then why does the position still exist.

Mr. Barich stated that everyone wants Human Services, this is one of those people that people may be unhappy with the whole plan and know who it originates from and more stuff to vote on to confuse people.

Mr. Kinzer asked if there are other departments that the city has that are not in the Charter.

Mr. Ruffa responded that Mayor's Court is not in the Charter.

Mr. Barlak asked for a moment to remember how they got to this point and he is starting to lean towards Mr. Barich's points. Perhaps last week it seemed like a good idea to consider, but after a week of thinking about it and looking at it now and it being fresh, since it is already in legislation, the position is already in place, to put it on the ballot and if you get a no vote, people will wonder that if you put it on the ballot and yet the position is still there, what did they just vote on. If anything, you end up with a confused polling group.

Mr. Maitland stated that this was just being brought to Mr. Ruffa for consultation and after hearing what he has said, he is leaning more towards what the rest of the committee is saying. Maybe this is not the time to bring this up.

Mr. Barich stated that he has mixed feelings regarding this at this time.

Mr. Barlak stated that this highlights an issue that is really not an issue. It works today.

Mr. Wolf stated that it does not fit the standard of all the other departments, however it does exist in legislation.

Mr. Barlak stated that to a point he made several weeks ago, if you were to start with a clean piece of paper, you probably would describe it and put it in the Charter, but to highlight it during an election for voters to look at and vote on it, you may come away with the wrong meaning.

Mr. Maitland asked if it dilutes everything else that we are trying to do here.

Mr. Ruffa stated that he has figured out what he was being asked earlier. The discussion was on the actual city zoning that you felt should be under the EDD. That can be accomplished by removing that from the duty of the Building Commissioner. So on page 21 under the Powers and Duties, to make that work you would want to remove “and Zoning in the 4 parts of this section and the zoning reference in this section also. Maybe with respect to the city and how things should be zoned should fall under the EDD. That doesn’t necessarily put the EDD in the Charter but taking that language out. Then if that passes, Council can add that legislatively to the ordinance that states what the responsibilities of the EDD are.

Mr. Maitland asked then originally the committee talked about adding that language in here, now that is not what they would like to do. Then he thinks that the language under the Building Commissioner needs to be changed as Mr. Ruffa mentioned.

Ms. Varga just noticed on the job description for the EDD under responsibilities, one of the bullet points is to serve as a resource for the public by addressing inquiries etc. businesses to discuss appropriate zoning. Wouldn’t that be a collaboration between the Building and Zoning Department and the EDD and this person would be more of a liaison in the community. She is asking the committee members. Who came up with this job, it is a great job but shouldn’t they collaborate together.

Mr. Ruffa stated that all of these departments do ultimately work together and collaborate together. He thinks the idea is to clean up where that zoning question is falling under his responsibility rather than the Building Commissioner. He thinks that is the idea so that we can just clean it up so we know under who what falls.

Ms. Varga asked if the Building and Zoning Commissioner also does residential does he not, as well as commercial? This role is more directed toward new business in the City. They still both work on zoning. She is trying to think what the imperativeness of cleaning the wording up under Building and Zoning when he/she are going to be involved in that anyways.

Mr. Ruffa stated that he could be wrong, but ultimately we would just want to be able to delineate under who will be the ultimate responsible party rather than having to figure out one or the other, although now that is not an issue, there could be times when there is going to be some control issues.

Ms. Varga asked then if the EDD would also have responsibility for residential zoning as well as business.

Mayor Alai stated that absolutely yes. He explained last week that the difference is that the Building Commissioner and the Building Department is in charge of the physical structure, is this building built to code, are the walls right, is the water coming in the HVAC, that is construction. The EDD is the oversight of all residential, commercial, what is the proper zoning for that area. Personally he does not see that as the primary function whatsoever of the Building Commissioner. That should fall in the Department of Development or EDD. There is some conflict with the Charter which says that it is the Building Commissioner and he would submit that it is not the Building Commissioner. The BC has more important day to day operations than to worry about what is going to be zoned over at Broadview and Rt. 82. They will be collaborating, that should be under the Department of Development. He thinks that it should be delineated or at least put out there that is not the function of the BD to worry about the Planning and Zoning of the City overall but necessarily a piece of property for something that is built.

Ms. Varga asked if that would create confusion on the ballot if the zoning, how is it going to be worded that zoning is going to be removed from the BD and then is it going to say that responsibility to fall to the EDD.

Mayor Alai stated that it will only show the language that you need. If you look at the Powers and Duties, if you just took out the references that say “and Zoning” and “and Planning”, it will just simply say that the BC shall be responsible for the performance and oversight of the duties of the BD which shall include directing, organizing the department and

administration. The BD shall, instead of the Building and Zoning. We will put zoning into our own legislation which does not require a charter change.

Ms. Varga asked the Mayor if he thinks that will create any confusion as to who will do the zoning for the city for the people going and reading it on a ballot, they will not be confused.

Mayor Alai stated "no".

Mr. Ruffa stated that they will just see that this is how we want the language to read.

Mayor Alai stated that they won't necessarily wonder who is doing it.

Ms. Varga stated that she would if she didn't see this other job description she would say now who is going to do zoning.

Mayor Alai stated that this is the way that it is going, most cities are doing it this way, we are going to be doing it this way, and we are doing it that way. His thought is that you may as well have the Charter reflect actually what we are doing because this is the way that we are doing it.

Ms. Varga stated that she agrees with the changes, she is just saying that now you are going have at least 10 things on the ballot for people to vote on.

Mr. Wolf stated that the committee has not decided that everything that they have asked for legislation on has not passed the committee to go to council and ultimately to the ballot.

Ms. Varga stated that she is just thinking how this could have the best chance of passing when someone reads it.

Mrs. Brown asked if she understands the fact that when this was written that this was all one and their duty was building and zoning and now as we have changed and moved forward it now has become separate entities.

Mayor Alai stated that at that time there was no Economic Development or department in the city.

Mrs. Brown stated that now that has changed so the charter should reflect that change.

Mr. Ruffa stated that we did not have one, then we had a part-time and now we have a full-time one. Communities everywhere you are seeing is that cities are becoming a little bit smarter and knowing that they have to attract businesses and you see a lot more now that cities actually have a Department of Development that they didn't have 10 or 15 years ago. Prior to that there was a Mayor's Assistant that did kind of some of this work.

Mr. Maitland motioned to change the language to remove "and Zoning" from the Building and Zoning Department under Powers and Duties along with the word zoning on the fourth line of that section; seconded by Mr. Barich. Roll Call: Mr. Wolf, yes; Mr. Kinzer, yes; Mr. Barich, yes; Mr. Clifford, yes; Mr. Barlak, yes; Mrs. Brown, yes; Mr. Pantaleano, yes; Ms. Varga, yes; Mr. Maitland, yes. Motion passed.

Mr. Ruffa asked if the plan is to present what happened four years ago with the logic and reasoning behind what this committee is presenting. Is that still going to be done? That is a good way to educate the residents.

The Committee answered yes.

Mr. Kinzer reiterated that the only place that they will be removing zoning is from section (d) on page 21.

Mr. Wolf stated that the Building and Zoning Department would enforce the zoning that was dictated by the Economic Developer.

Mr. Barlak stated that he is not familiar with how the two departments work together. He just wants to make sure that what they leave in (c) and after the changes in (d) is not going to cause an issue.

Mr. Ruffa stated that technically it is not two departments; technically it is just one department. It sounds like it is two but it is all under the one department in respect to the enforcement issue. He just wanted to be clear, it is not like we have one department that is one and one department that is another, it is all under one.

Mr. Kinzer stated that even within (d) it still covers zoning from the code enforcement standpoint at the end of paragraph 1, and that is what we are looking for that position to do which is code enforcement and building inspection.

TALKING POINTS

FOUR (4) YEAR TERMS FOR COUNCIL

Mr. Wolf moved on with regards to the "Talking Points" specifically those that were passed out regarding how Charter Review Committee did it 4 years ago. He thinks it is a good idea for the things that were sent to legislation to get talking points to discuss to the residents whether it is in print or how it gets out there regarding how they came about some of the recommended changes and the reasoning behind it. If they have done all of this work and without explaining it to the residents and how they came about it, they are not going to know what happened and why. The main one that this committee discussed was the four (4) year term and there are talking points from four years ago.

Mr. Ruffa stated that he does not know what the committee wants and does not want on the ballot, but what he finds in his business if they are trying to decide yes or no, they develop those talking points on each side of the issue and that helps them decide whether to keep or get rid of an argument.

PROS FOR A 4 YEAR TERM

Longer terms
 Longer commitment
 Continuity on Council as a whole
 Not spending the first half of the term learning and the second half running for re-election
 Reduce time and cost of running for re-election
 Cost savings to the city for not having something on the ballot (saving up to \$19,500 every 4 years)
 Focus on real issues facing the community
 Less politics, increased council productivity
 Better stewardship and accountability for short and long term projects, initiatives, etc.
 Stability to government
 Does not limit the ability to remove a council person for just cause
 Same cycle as Mayor so no "running from cover" situation
 Council President and Pro-Tem are still elected every 2 years

CONS

Longer commitment
 Not being able to change council person every 2 years

THE SECTION REGARDING "SERVED PERSONALLY" REGARDING COUNCIL GETTING THEIR PACKETS

Mr. Wolf stated that this had to do with the material delivered to the Council at least 24 hours personally served. We were discussing moving towards better technology and using email and digital transport of information.

Mrs. Brown inquired if this is the issue that was discussed that the Police deliver these things to the council persons. She thinks that is a big point right now that they are responsible for doing that. She thinks that our tax dollars could be better served.

Mr. Maitland stated that new technology could take care of it.

Mr. Wolf stated that one of the points that he heard was that the Police Department are already driving around in our neighborhoods and they are just driving by anyways so they could just drop them off.

Mrs. Dunlap asked about the “served personally”, could that also cover electronic transmission.

Mr. Ruffa stated “no”. He would have to change the language to read “at least 24 hour written notice to the Mayor and each member”. “Personally” means personally handing it to them.

Mr. Wolf asked if written also covers digital formats or is written the analog paper and ink.

Mr. Ruffa stated that he feels that the digital format is still written therefore covers the written part of the question. Digital is either written or scanned; this would be written vs. verbal is how he interprets that.

Mrs. Brown stated that when this document was written, written would mean written on a piece of paper but now that definition has changed somewhat. But what is normal.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the context in which this is written means written vs. verbal. It has to be documented. Reading this further, this is only required for Special Meetings.

The discussion continued about Special Meetings and how often they are held and the answer was about once a month.

Mr. Ruffa stated if you want to put the burden on the council person to be responsible for picking up his own packet and not depending on the Police Department to get it to them.

Ms. Varga stated that the committee should forget about this issue. The council hasn’t determined if they are going to get iPads yet. She recommends leaving this for the next Charter Review to discuss.

Mr. Maitland stated that just by taking that verbiage out does not mean that they could not receive the information hand written. It does not specifically say that it is now automatically digital. It is just giving them options.

Mr. Wolf did state that it did say “Special Meetings”. It could be sent out electronically for everything but special meetings.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the average for special meetings is about once a month.

Mr. Barlak would like to remove this wording.

Mrs. Brown asked if there are any other things in the Charter that would be like this that refer to written or delivered where digital could not be used.

Mrs. Brown motioned that they do not continue with this change in reference to “served personally” as one of the pieces of legislation that is drawn up by Mr. Ruffa; seconded by Mr. Pantaleano. Roll Call: Mr. Wolf, yes; Mr. Kinzer, no; Mr. Barich, yes; Mr. Clifford, no; Mr. Barlak, no; Mrs. Brown, yes; Mr. Pantaleano, yes; Ms. Varga, yes; Mr. Maitland, no. Motion passed to remove this from further discussion.

SECTION WHERE IT STATES THAT THE MAYOR IS OFFICIALLY ABSENT FROM THE CITY

Mr. Wolf stated that the next item for discussion will be the reference to the Mayor being “absent from the City”. This is on page 6 & 8. This again brings up the issue of technology where the Mayor can function as Mayor through technology even though he is not specifically in the city.

Mr. Wolf stated that the TALKING POINT would be that the Mayor can function through technology remotely even though he is not in the city. This would be by cellphone, internet, email, texting, face time, conference calls, etc.

Mr. Barich stated that absent does not mean that he is unable to perform. There is language in the Charter that covers “unable to perform”.

SECTION MAKING REFERENCE IN THE MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS TO GENDER NEUTRAL

There was no further discussion on this issue

THE SECTION WHERE THE PRO-TEM WILL BE CHOSEN FROM ALL OF COUNCIL

Mr. Wolf stated that this is the last paragraph on page 6.

Mrs. Brown stated that all the other sections that refer to electing a Council President and Pro-Tem refer to the entire pool of council members. This is a HOUSEKEEPING issue to make it all uniform.

Mr. Kinzer mentioned that if they go to 4 year terms, the Council President serves a term of 2 years, would we want to change that to 4 years.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the fact that you may go from 2 year to 4 year terms doesn't automatically change the term of the President of Council or Pro-Tem. His concern that he has is if the 4 year term does not pass and you have on the ballot the issue of 4 year President of Council and Pro-Tem terms and the Council person that is President of Council or Pro-Tem does not win re-election or does not run again, this could be an ongoing issue. He stated that a TALKING POINT may be that the President of Council and/or Pro-Tem will be elected from council every 2 years and this could also be a TALKING POINT for the 4 year terms of council.

TALKING POINTS

Council President and Pro-Tem is still elected every 2 years
This is housekeeping to make the section uniform and consistent

THE CLERK OF THE CITY IS NOT THE PURCHASING AGENT

Mr. Wolf stated that this is on page 10. He stated that this was to remove that the Clerk of the City is the Purchasing Agent because the Purchasing Agent works in the Finance Department.

Mrs. Dunlap mentioned that the motion was to leave the first sentence under the Clerk of the City, completely remove the second sentence and move the rest of the paragraph under the Department of Finance.

Mr. Maitland stated he is trying to figure out the pros that finance is handling this vs. the Clerk of the City.

Mrs. Brown stated that it is already being done that way.

Mr. Barich asked why it is a good idea for it to be done that way.

Mayor Alai stated that this is how business is done today and this goes all the way back to the Bender Administration. We have a purchasing agent that works in the Finance Department. He stated this could be put to a vote so that it reads correctly, because the City Clerk is not doing the job of the purchasing agent.

Mrs. Brown stated that if the committee says that this is not important to change then the issue of President and Pro-Tem of Council isn't that important either and so on and so forth. She stated that if they found this then it is their responsibility to put it out there.

Mr. Maitland is trying to come up with more meat for those to read as to why this should be changed.

Mr. Kinzer asked who is signing off on requisitions and who approves the invoices.

Mayor Alai responded that the requisitions come from the department head and then the Finance Director signs them and sometimes the Mayor. The Finance Director and all of the department heads sign off on purchase requisitions. The purchasing agent is actually the person who will call the company and purchase whatever is signed off on. It may be the same person making the phone call but they are not the ones approving the purchase. The city purchasing agent has no control; she cannot just call up and buy anything that she wants. She has to have a signed purchase order by the department heads and the Mayor or the department heads and the finance director. He stated that the State Auditor stated that the City has met all of the checks and balances for a clear audit. The City Clerk has absolutely nothing to do with this. The only thing that the City Clerk buys is stuff for the Mayor's Office because she is under the Mayor and his department.

Mrs. Brown asked what would happen if this didn't pass.

The unanimous response was that nothing would happen.

Mrs. Brown finds it interesting that this has come about and the Charter in place and people went and changed the way things were done and we are working backwards now and trying to change the Charter to comply with what is going on, there is something amiss. If we put this on the ballot and the people vote it down then what we should be doing is that the Clerk of the City should be doing all of this.

Mr. Ruffa stated that would ultimately have to happen and that is just the formality of running it through, but the actual hard work part of it is being run through Finance.

Mr. Barich asked whose job is it to make the public understand what is going to be on the ballot and what and why they are being asked to change something. What are we doing to educate the public so that they know what is happening.

Mayor Alai stated that there are a lot of things that we can do to educate the public, but you have to understand that depending on what you put on the Charter, small changes aren't bad, but if you are going to put things on the Charter to change the term of the Mayor or the term of the Council, he thinks that it is inappropriate for the Mayor or the Council to go out there and try to educate the public. There are certain changes that should come from the administration, but those should be more of the mundane things.

Mr. Kinzer stated that he agrees with Mrs. Brown that if they change the one line and if it doesn't pass and you continue business as it is now then you basically are not following the Charter.

Mr. Ruffa stated that if it doesn't pass then we will have to do what the Charter says.

Mr. Maitland stated that if you read through this, ultimately the purchasing agent may, it still has to go through the approval of the Director of Finance.

Mr. Kinzer stated that this person is currently not performing this role.

Mr. Barlak stated that since we have been operating for about 15 years where the Clerk of the City has not been doing what it is described, he thinks that this has to be dealt with. It is not going to go away in 4 years.

Mr. Ruffa commented as to how you want to do this. The Clerk of the City, if we go down this path that Section 4 should read that there is a Clerk of the City who shall be appointed by the Mayor. And then there should be a paragraph that says there shall be a purchasing agent for the City, and these are the duties of the purchasing agent but not say who the purchasing agent is.

Councilman Goodwin stated that you do not have to have a City Clerk in the Charter, so he stated that you could just remove the City Clerk and it is already stated in the Charter that the Finance Director signs off. In his time, the City Clerk did sign some paychecks and things like that as an additional signature, so she did sign off on some of those things but realistically, right now with how restricted we are with the budget the City Clerk is also the Mayor's Secretary and 40 other positions and there is not a chance in the world that she would have any time at all to look at the other expenses of the city. Just remove the City Clerk, if it doesn't pass, just appoint the Finance Director as the dual position of City Clerk.

Mr. Ruffa stated that in other words, section 4 should read: Purchasing Agent of the City and there shall be a purchasing agent of the City who shall be appointed by the Mayor and then get rid of the second sentence and then keep everything else the same unless you change the dollar amount.

Mr. Kinzer stated then that the body of the City Clerk will then be the purchasing agent and be under the Department of Finance.

Mr. Maitland asked if the purchasing agent has to be appointed by the Mayor if it falls under the Department of Finance.

Mr. Ruffa stated that right now leave it that way, but he will look at it.

TALKING POINT

The Clerk does not do this job.

A Finance Clerk does this job and has for over a decade with the City evolving.

PURCHASES NOT TO EXCEED \$15,000

Mr. Wolf asked if there was any further discussion regarding changing the \$5,000 figure to \$15,000.

TALKING POINTS

Bring an old value to current standards

Reduce paperwork

Expedite the purchase of needed materials and parts

Council still approves and sets the budget for the year

 this does not increase the city budget.

Mrs. Brown stated that if she was just going to vote and saw this figure that people may think that this will allow us to spend more, so she thinks that this information has to get out there.

Mr. Wolf stated that he is not sure if we need examples such as plow blades or parts for boilers or pump stations/sanitary pumps.

Mr. Kinzer would like the TALKING POINTS TO ALSO STATE WHAT THE CURRENT LANGUAGE IS AND THE PROPOSED CHANGE.

CHARTER REVIEW SECTION THAT REFERS TO BEING APPOINTED IN JANUARY

Mr. Wolf stated that he believes that the discussion was to remove the month of January from this section of the Charter.

TALKING POINTS

No matter when they are appointed, the review would be completed 120 day before the next November election.

They still have to meet at least once every 4 years

Mrs. Brown asked about the paperwork that was submitted regarding recommendations from residents and they have the opportunity to talk next week, are they going to be talking about what the committee has come up with and at that point can they come up with new discussion recommendations such as something that the committee hasn't talked about at all along with the submitted recommendations.

Mr. Wolf stated that it is up to the committee to make that decision as to what they will allow to happen at that meeting He thinks that there needs to be a time limit.

Mrs. Brown stated that the fact that the people sent things in and met the deadline, so if there was a deadline, for when people talk.

Mrs. Dunlap explained that those that made submissions should be the ones that the committee allows to speak to the committee.

Mrs. Brown asked if anybody else will be allowed to speak.

Mr. Wolf asked the board if they would like to have additional input on those or do you want to restrict the discussion to only what was submitted.

Mr. Ruffa stated that the whole point of people coming forward is for the committee to listen to their ideas and send it to the ballot or not. So you want to listen to them and hear what they have to say and to make a determination as to how long you will let them say it. He does not think it is appropriate to have a debate but to listen to what they have to say and have a discussion and then you make a decision if you like their suggestion is or not.

Mrs. Brown stated then that there is the opportunity next week when people come forward that they could add something.

Mr. Wolf stated that you could make it an open forum if that is what the committee elects to do.

Mrs. Brown just wants to be open to what the people have to say next week.

Mr. Ruffa stated that you just need to give the people to speak their minds.

Mrs. Brown stated that if they see something that they have missed then this would be their opportunity.

Mr. Maitland asked if that is that something that they listen, absorb and then talk about later.

Mr. Ruffa stated that you can take it in and absorb it and discuss it amongst the group afterwards then that is fine. But give them the opportunity to say what they have to say.

Mr. Wolf stated that they will absolutely hear from the people that did submit and then above and beyond that it could be anythings fair game.

Mrs. Brown thinks that they should be listened to first since they did take the time to submit something.

Mr. Kinzer asked if they should establish time limits now.

Mr. Wolf stated that in Council it is 3 minutes but this is a different forum so maybe we would want to make it 5 minutes.

Mayor Alai stated that you have to give them enough time and he does not think that 3 minutes is enough. You need to give them enough time to verbalize their ideas.

Mr. Wolf stated that the committee could decide if they are repeating what they said and then decide that they have heard enough.

Mrs. Brown stated that they should tell the people that the committee ask that they keep their comments to around 5 minutes so that they know about how much time that they have, knowing that they may go over that to complete their thought.

Mr. Wolf stated that maybe we give them a range of 5-7 minutes.

Mr. Kinzer stated that the topics need to be in the Charter.

Mr. Wolf stated that it would be specifically about the Charter. It does not have to be anything that the committee has already discussed; someone may have found another word or something.

Mr. Maitland talked about additions that are not in the Charter.

Mr. Wolf stated that those were submitted already. He thinks that any discussion after that should be things that are already in the Charter or were submitted.

Mr. Barich motioned to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mrs. Brown. Roll Call: Mr. Wolf, yes; Mr. Kinzer, yes; Mr. Barich, yes; Mr. Clifford, yes; Mr. Barlak, yes; Mrs. Brown, yes; Mr. Pantaleano, yes; Ms. Varga, yes; Mr. Maitland, yes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.