

**Brooklyn Park Charter Commission Minutes  
Wednesday, October 9, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.  
Donnay Room, Village Creek South Precinct  
7608 Brooklyn Boulevard**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Scott Simmons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present were: Mary Ann Bishman, Barbara Bor, John Hultquist John Irvin, Dennis Secara (arrived at 7:10 p.m.), Scott Simmons, David Williams, Staff Liaison Devin Montero.

Absent: Gordy Aune, Jr. (excused), Commissioners Beatrice Otieno (excused); Evans Odhiambo; and Council Liaison Lisa Jacobson (excused)

Also in attendance: Community Long-range Improvement Commission Chair Kathy Fraser.

2. Additions/Approval of the Agenda of October 9, 2019

**Motion Commissioner Hultquist, seconded Commissioner Bishman, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.**

3. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Hultquist provided minor corrections to the minutes.

**Motion Commissioner Hultquist, seconded by Commissioner Bishman to approve the minutes as amended by Commissioner Hultquist. The motion carried unanimously.**

4. Old Business

4.1 Continued Discussion of Section 9.04, Community Long-range Improvement Commission (CLIC)

Chair Simmons stated they had talked about Section 9.04 for the last two meetings and invited CLIC Chair Kathy Fraser to attend tonight's meeting to figure out how to work through the Commission's questions. He stated the CLIC would be meeting tomorrow night and anything that came out of tonight's discussion, CLIC Chair Fraser would take back to their meeting.

He referred to Item 4.1B, with the CLIC's recommended changes to Section 9.04. He stated the Charter Commission had some housekeeping organizational issues and some substantive questions of meaning and intent.

He stated the organizational one was under, "C, Duties", where there were four items of factors. He stated that after Factor #4, the Commissioners wanted to start a new subsection, because the content of that paragraph after the first sentence of Factor #4, didn't relate to the other four duties and it would be a new subsection as "D."

He stated there were also questions the Commissioners asked, such as the reason for the March 31 date and CLIC had responded because it was a uniform date by which all the Commissions reported.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated they usually did that before the end of the quarter and not the day it was due by.

Chair Simmons stated there was a question on the turnover of the Commissioners, whether they would be part of that process. He stated he didn't know if the Charter Commission wanted to set a policy on it.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated what they usually did with new Commissioners was the first thing on their agenda was to review the Work Plan with them, so they would have some background on why they came up with those items and some history.

Chair Simmons stated Council Liaison Jacobson was concerned that the new Commissioners wouldn't have any involvement or creation of it but because of the timing of the appointments and the timing of the mandatory submittal of the document didn't know if there was any way around it.

Commissioner Hultquist stated he didn't think it was for the Charter Commission to decide when reports were due and thought it was CLIC's business. He thought the Charter Commission decided on the structure of how it read in the Charter. He stated the more he thought about it and Chair Fraser could take it back to their Commissioners, that someone coming in brand new into a Commission whether it was that CLIC, and previously served on the Budget Commission and CLIC, there was a lot to learn. He stated it was better to go ahead with the timetable they had for the Work Plan and the new Commissioners that started. He stated they had a year to get up to speed and that would give them time to have a thoughtful approach to the following years Work Plan.

Chair Simmons stated he didn't know if he had it straight yet on submitting the Work Plan by March 31 for consideration for the following years budget. He stated the Work Plan was a guide to direct what they did as a Commission and asked if that was what their Work Plan was.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated the Work Plan was what they planned on taking on that year.

Chair Simmons asked if there was a follow up report that went back to the council and did something like the language said, "for consideration for the following year's budget."

CLIC Chair Fraser stated yes and at the time the report was presented, they talked about what they accomplished and did a report of the previous year and then presented what their Work Plan for the upcoming year was. She stated that in addition to the yearly report, periodically, for example, they were working on some communication recommendations and those would be presented to the council in addition to any annual report they would do. She stated they also had the Age Friendly report that was presented outside of that yearly time period so they were additional reports they would give to the Council outside their yearly presentations.

Chair Simmons asked the Commissioners if they had additional questions for CLIC Chair Fraser. He stated that under Section E, the CLIC wanted to say, "review by the City Council of the Long range Improvement Report.". He asked if that was something separate than the annual Work Plan.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated yes and periodically they might have a report they wanted the Council to follow up on for them. She stated that was just to have a response/review back from the Council in terms of things that were presented to them whether it was written or oral.

Chair Simmons asked if they were requesting some sort of response or a review by the Council within 60 days.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated yes.

Chair Simmons stated he didn't know if it was just a review, in person, on camera, at a meeting where they were requesting feedback from the Council. He stated what they did as a Charter Commission was they wanted to put words in the Charter to reflect what actually happened, whether it was CLIC or anything else the city did.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated they didn't think "written" was accurate because it might be a verbal response.

Commissioner Hultquist stated when it talked about "other appropriate committees" and that was included in the responses too thought there was a question to what was meant by that. He asked who deemed the committees appropriate and thought the word "appropriate" wasn't as descriptive as it could or should be in the Charter. He stated it made more sense to say, "impacted" or "affected" committees because it lent itself more to if they were doing some work that directly impacted, for example, the Recreation and Parks Advisory Commission, the report went to RPAC, and thought it was a lot more linear to have it phrased that way.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated that it made sense.

Chair Simmons stated it was under Item #4 under Duties, the second sentence. "The Commission shall submit reports on projects it has studied to the city council as well as other committees deemed appropriate." He stated he didn't know who deemed it appropriate and was subjective on what was appropriate. He asked if it was other entities that were directly affected or just get rid of that objective language as well as other committees.

Commissioner Hultquist stated that it was affected by the project.

CLIC Chair Fraser stated most of the time it was the common interest situation, for example, from a long-term perspective they might look at Housing but the Human Rights Commission was also looking at Housing in a different lens but together they had to do work together to come up with solutions that were long term impactful to the community. She stated they had shared interests in those things.

Chair Simmons stated he was going to put together a motion unless there were other substantive things to consider.

CLIC Chair Fraser asked about how the Commissioners were going to add a separate subsection to Section 9.04.

Chair Simmons stated that under C, Duties, at the end of the paragraph talked about priority ratings and consideration of factors and there were four of those factors. He stated the language after the fourth factor had nothing to do with the factors. It was a separate concept and they wanted to separate that into a new paragraph and start the new section with "The Commission shall submit reports on projects it has studied to the City Council as well as other committees deemed appropriate."

Commissioner Hultquist stated they were all in agreement with that it didn't change the duties of

what CLIC did but what it did do, was separate out their four duties from a totally separate thought and report and splitting it out made more sense.

Chair Simmons summarized the suggested changes:

1. C. Duties, at the end of the paragraph talked about priority ratings and consideration of factors and there were four of those factors. The language after the fourth factor had nothing to do with the factors. It was a separate concept and they wanted to separate that into a new paragraph and start the new section with “The Commission shall submit reports on projects it has studied to the City Council as well as other committees deemed appropriate.”
2. Under Factor #4, substituted Annual Work Plan instead of Annual Long-range Improvement Plan.
3. Under Factor #4, substituted March 31 instead of July 1
4. Under E. Response by Council. Took out the word “written.”

He asked if they were seeking clarity about E and if that was how they wanted it. “A review by the council of “the” report.”, because it was a singular report unless there were multiple reports, then he would replace it with an “a” instead of “the.”

Commissioner Hultquist suggested “reports” if it was plural.

Chair Simmons stated “reports” with the “s” in parenthesis, i.e., “report(s).” He stated that E became F, D became E and asked if the captions were correct. “Contents of Reports” and “Response by Council”

Commissioner Hultquist stated Section “F” should read, “The city council shall review the Long-range Improvement Report(s) and returned to the Commission within sixty days after the submission of the report(s)

Chair Simmons stated that since they were talking about plural, asked if it should be under Section D too, Commission “Report(s)” with parenthesis as the same way it was done in Section E to contemplate potentially more than one.

**MOTION CHAIR SIMMONS, SECOND COMMISSIONER HULTQUIST THAT THE CHARTER COMMISSION ADOPT AND REFER BACK TO THE COMMUNITY LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION THE CHANGES THE CHARTER COMMISSION RECOMMENDED FOR SECTION 9.04. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**RECOMMENDED CHANGES BY THE CHARTER COMMISSION TO CLIC**

**SECTION 9.04 COMMUNITY LONG RANGE-IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION:**

*C. DUTIES. The Commission shall study all improvements consistent with the present and future needs and requirements of the City where improvements are defined as items that involve future development or redevelopment or that constitute significant budgetary changes proposed for future fiscal years. Commission study shall not be limited to proposed improvements, but shall exercise investigative functions, soliciting and taking inventory of community needs as necessary to perform and the duties whereby community-initiated requests for improvements are heard and considered. The Commission shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Council, and may also advise other committees, Commissions, and*

task forces where their studies or projects involve long-range improvements. The Commission shall establish priority ratings of improvements, taking into consideration the following factors:

1. Public reaction as determined from informal public meetings or surveys.
2. Desired development direction for the City.
3. Proper usage of public monies and/or collected fees.
4. Any other factors necessary or helpful in determining improvements for the City.

**D. REPORTS.** The Commission shall submit reports on projects it has studied to the City Council as well as other committees deemed appropriate. In addition to such reports, the Commission shall prepare and submit an Annual **Long-range Improvement Work Plan** to the City Council by ~~July 1~~ **March 31** each year for consideration for the following year's budget. The recommendations of this Commission to the City Council shall be advisory. The Commission shall receive the full cooperation and support of all City officials (elected and non-elected) in the performance of their duties and preparation of their reports.

**E.-D CONTENTS OF REPORTS.** The Community Long-range Improvement Commission report(s) shall include the following, if applicable:

1. A concise summary of the report.
2. A list of all improvements which were considered by the Commission with appropriate supporting information concerning the need for such improvements.
3. A priority rating for each listed improvement.
4. An advisory opinion on any significant changes to the Capital Improvement Plan and Capital Equipment Plan (CIP/CEP).
5. General impact of the improvements in terms of community development.
6. Any matter about which the City Council has requested information.

**F E. RESPONSE BY COUNCIL.** ~~A written review by T~~the City Council ~~shall review of the Long-Range Improvement Report(s) and shall be respond returned~~ to the Commission within sixty (60) days after the submission of the report(s).

Chair Simmons thanked CLIC Chair Fraser for attending the Charter Commission meeting.

Staff Liaison Montero stated he would provide a draft of the recommended changes to Chair Simmons and CLIC Chair Fraser prior to the CLIC meeting on Thursday to share with her Commissioners.

5. Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees – None.

6. New Business – None.

7. Correspondence/Communications

7.1 Legislative Updates

Chair Simmons stated the Commissioners received legislative summaries and the City Attorney's email with LMC Law Summaries and no action was needed.

7.2 Budget Timeline

Chair Simmons stated the budget presentation and timetable was given to the Council at a previous Council meeting and was for information only.

### 7.3 Commissioner's Contact Information on the City's Website.

Chair Simmons stated that unless there was a hyperlink, only the cities of Minneapolis and Mounds View showed Commissioner contact information on their websites, either in a form of a phone number or email addresses. He stated the Commissioners received the City Attorney's email about the law, but the law was, the phone number, email or both, was public information. He stated his view was that it should be posted on the Charter Commission's web page in addition to the other Commissions and their web pages since it was public. He stated he didn't know the Commissioners were in a position to do anything with the other Commissions, but he wanted to recommend to the city that everyone follow their lead and do it.

Commissioner Bor stated the definition and how that was interpreted that it was public access, but putting it on the web page, thought she would challenge that interpretation. She stated cities had a funnel into a central place if people had a concern and wished to speak with someone. She stated there was a way to get that information and it didn't have to be out there everyday for anyone to read. She stated her experiences and the privacy of an individual who volunteered to be on a Commission should be considered. She stated she had no issues with anyone contacting her but didn't want it on the webpage out in the open like the two other cities. She stated it went back to what the definition was of available to the public and she would like to have more investigation on it. She asked if there was some flexibility to still have the individual reach a Commissioner, whether it was through the city staff or designated individual, but to have it open on the web page really lent to difficulties and she knew people who had difficulties. She stated it was not a matter of serving the constituents and public but needed to carefully think about it.

Commissioner Irvin asked if her concern was about the email address and phone numbers.

Commissioner Bor stated if she clicked on the Charter Commission's web page, she didn't want to see everything come up right away and if there was a way for public access and not differentiating between phone numbers and emails it was all the same. She just wanted to talk about their privacy and what people could do with that information but more importantly what constituted public access.

Staff Liaison Montero stated some of the Staff Liaisons he spoke with said there could be less volunteers if their information was posted on the Commission web pages.

Commissioner Hultquist provided copies of Boards and Commission information from the Secretary of State's website. He stated he worked on the Boards and Commission appointments the Governor had made and worked at the Secretary of State's office. He showed an example of what the Secretary of State's Offices published on their website. The example, Agricultural Chemical Response Compensation Board, included the person's name, position, phone number, email and had a lot of information to contact someone. He stated they had a couple of Board Members who had restraining orders from people and they didn't want their contact information included and the individual used a P.O. box and had an email address that was rarely checked.

He stated they talked at one time with their legal counsel and by virtue of what defined something being made public, must be made available to the public upon request. He stated it didn't necessarily have to be proactively put on the website and he was not advocating one way or the

other and understood the concerns.

He also understood the concerns of people who wanted to contact someone and could always work through city staff if they had a Staff Liaison with a phone number and email address. He stated that if he needed to get a hold of Chair Simmons, the staff person could say, "here is his public email address", and he would be okay with that if the will of the Commission was to have more disclosure. He stated he saw one of the other city website's that had a hyperlink and it didn't have an email address but once they clicked on it the email address popped up.

Chair Simmons asked if the email address popped up or did it create a message system to send the message through that hyperlink and the email address was hidden. He stated the commercial enterprises did that all the time, they had customer complaints, and didn't know where it was going. He stated they received it and it was anonymous and didn't know the actual email address.

He stated he was uncomfortable of going through a filter. He stated he saw it in some small cities and they asked questions of "*why they wanted to know*", "*who were you*", which was inappropriate, uncalled for and illegal. He stated it didn't happen with volunteers but with elected officials and they didn't have emails for Council Members. He stated he understood some volunteers might be hesitant to have their information out there but when they volunteered and part of the city entity that made recommendations to city government, thought there was less than expectations of privacy if they didn't, they were not going to get volunteers anymore. He stated he thought it was hard to contact people the way it was now and it was burdensome for the average member of the public to figure out how to navigate the communication access links to government. He stated some people were fearful of government, didn't talk to government and was a hurdle and didn't think it was necessary. He stated he wanted the transparency and the information had to be out there and had to be given.

Commissioner Bor stated there was no argument with verbiage about transparency and wanting to give it. She thought the methodology on how it was given was what was being discussed and the difficulty in reaching someone, which was an operative issue the city staff could look at and there were ways to do it where there was a call into the city and asked to speak to the Commission Chair of the Charter Commission and it could be quite efficient. She stated then the Chair was notified and they were connected with the Chair and business was done. She thought it was more on the operative side and the argument was not that the city should have their contact information, the discussion for her was where that information was going to be and she preferred not to have it posted out in the open when on the web page for a variety of reasons and with the example of the restraining order situation given.

Chair Simmons stated that was an issue he forgot about and voter registration information was public except for those that had a legitimate fear and because of a restraining order type issues, those people could use P.O. boxes and some other alternate means. He stated information was public as a voter except the Secretary of State created a system where those individuals that had domestic abuse or whatever could do it in an alternate way. He stated the example given by Commissioner Hultquist on the AG Chemical Response Compensation Board, had a lot of data and didn't know why all that information was listed publicly.

Commissioner Hultquist stated the applicant didn't have to fill it all out but could if they wished to and the Secretary of State's Office left it blank if they didn't put anything in there. He stated he didn't remember if they asked the previous Secretary of States, but that was what they published, and wasn't advocating they do it on the city website.

He stated the State was also looking for good people to serve on Boards and Commissions and having served with all the Commissioners in the room, stated they were all very dedicated, had a lot to offer and encouraged them to apply to be on some of the State Boards and Commissions. He stated they had a lot of professional licensing boards, board of Architecture and Engineering; and most of the licensing boards, whether health licensing or professional licensing, were Environmental Boards, Disability Boards and Education related boards and had positions for public members.

Staff Liaison Montero stated next week on October 15, the new website would be launched and believed the Council Liaison/Staff Liaison with phone number numbers and email addresses would be on the Commission's web page for anyone who wanted to contact the Commissioners.

Chair Simmons stated he had 5 email addresses and no reason why he couldn't have a sixth and he created certain emails for certain purposes depending on what he was volunteering for. He stated if on the Airport Commission, they created a separate phone number and would take all the noise calls on the main number, but it was above and beyond with the home address.

Commissioner Bishman agreed with Commissioner Bor. She stated she got many scam calls all the time and if someone called her home phone number and she didn't recognize who it was, she would not answer the phone. She stated she would call them back if they left a voicemail, with a phone number and message about a Charter Commission question. She stated she created a Gmail account and used it for the Charter Commission.

Commissioner Williams agreed with Chair Simmons based on transparency and recognized all the issues they could have with exposing their phone numbers. He stated, on the other hand, they were a public body and thought of all the times he tried to get information mostly out of corporations or other organizations and couldn't find a number. He stated he would come down on the side of having more information for the Commissioners and all city officials so that someone with a legitimate question could easily find it than not and then going to a central source and having to pass the information on. He stated they all had been on phone calls where they were trying to find information and were connected to a body then another body and it was just another level of giving the appearance of trying to avoid being accountable and answer questions. He stated he felt there would be legitimate requests to talk to public officials and there would be some that wanted to make noise or irritation and, in those instances, would be less than greater. He stated he didn't know all the answers on how that would work but felt they were a democracy and government needed to be accessible by citizens and the more they could do the better off they were.

Commissioner Bor stated she would like the Commissioners to consider what the Staff Liaison said and there were ways to be transparent, ways they could have quick access including creating a link through the Brooklyn Park city web address or how that worked, but there were ways to do it where it was not cumbersome and would get a direct link and connection to respond back to the individual and they give them the phone number if that was what had been decided the city would do. She stated it was an opportune issue on how to make it public and what that meant and could accomplish it without opening the webpage and seeing the whole list of information like some of the other cities.

Chair Simmons stated that was one way to do it and was in the middle. He gave another example, he stated when he tried to find the phone number of the front desk at the CAC and went on the webpage of the CAC for a phone number and there wasn't a phone number listed. He stated those were the basic things on how to get a hold of staff and was frustrating. He stated that went

back to his inability to find the CLIC Chair's phone number to verify that phone number to make sure that was current, because he called it 10 times and never got a response, was just a voicemail and didn't have the Chair's name on it. He asked what good it was to have a contact number and not posted on the website. He stated his experience to go on the website, do the homework and investigative part of trying to find someone to get a simple question answered was ridiculously hard. He stated websites kept changing and suggested the website pages could say, "Contact information for individuals Commissioners could be found by calling this number", something so it was explicit to say how to find that information.

Commissioner Hultquist suggested adding, contacting the Council Liaison or Staff Liaison.

Chair Simmons stated that it needed something deliberate to say to contact individual members or do something and that would go a long way. He stated he was not comfortable with filters by going through a staff person to find out something about some other part of government. He stated there could be biases and all kinds of roadblocks put in and uncomfortable situations. He stated that not every city was like what he had to go through and it was very uncomfortable to get what information he needed. He stated his point was, if there was some way to achieve that overall transparency to make it easy for people to find information that was after all, public.

He appreciated Commissioner Williams' comments and thought they needed to move the bar because they were public officials and part of an entity and that was what came with the program.

Staff Liaison Montero stated next week, the new city website would be launched and asked Commissioners to provide feedback on what they liked, what could be improved, and what information was needed on the Commission web page because the Communications staff would appreciate feedback on it.

Commissioner Irvin asked if they would still list the names on the website and the note to call the Staff Liaisons, etc. if people wanted to contact one of the Commissioners.

Chair Simmons stated at a minimum and the list of the names of the Commission members were already done with terms. He stated he didn't mind having the Chair listed to have that visible and a link without going through the trouble of calling staff or anyone in the city. He stated he had no problem with it and would leave that to the discretion on who occupied the Chair but just wanted to make it easy for people especially if it would be a city email address.

Staff Liaison Montero suggested to also list the officers of each Commission.

Chair Simmons agreed and stated one of the cities did that and showed the Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary with links. He stated he didn't know if it was a happy medium to accommodate the goal of making it easier for people to contact the Commissioners as far as the Charter Commission. He stated for Commissions that had more interaction with the public like the Planning Commission, didn't know how difficult it was to contact the Planning Commissioners outside of physically going to the meeting. He stated he just wanted to be able to contact Commissioners to give comments, for example, on chickens and pigs issue because they made recommendations to the Council and should not be exempt from having input.

He stated the Commissioners had a consensus of moving forward. He stated he was okay with not listing the phone numbers/email addresses unless the Commissioners wanted to push it and make a vote. He stated he was fine with having his phone number and email as the current Chair and felt that was an obligation of his to be accessible. He stated since being on the Charter

Commission and being the Chair he had never received a phone call but not to say other Commissioners of other Commissions wouldn't get calls.

Commissioner Williams thought it was significant as public officials to be accessible to hear those comments but was important that not only the Commissioners heard it but the individual had an opportunity to voice their opinions. He agreed there were all kinds of ways to create the accessibility without putting email addresses and everything on the website. He felt the whole design of it should be based on allowing the citizens easy access not for the official's benefit, but to avoid problems based on citizen ease and accessibility to their government.

Commissioner Bor stated there could be an improvement proposed and to have that occur through the development of the new website. She stated it depended on what they were representing and how much interaction they were going to have and thought that was an easier way than coming to a meeting and doing an open mic. She stated it went back to the opportunity to set an example for the other Commissions and give it a try and stated they found a middle ground for her.

Commissioner Hultquist stated that after hearing everyone's conversations, one thing a potential might be, that to tell people when they were appointed, that they were putting contact information on the website, the information from their application per state law was public. He stated if they did not want their public email address displayed on the website, the city would be happy to issue them a city email address to be posted on the website knowing that if someone wanted their public email or public phone number, they could call the city and have it released to them.

Chair Simmons stated that creating a new email address was going around and didn't know that actually conformed 100 percent with the law because it did say to have their phone number or email accessible, not on the website, but having it public information. He stated to give out an email like [scott.simmons@brooklynpark.org](mailto:scott.simmons@brooklynpark.org), that was the way to contact him but that was not his phone number or email address. He stated while it was a step in the right direction of creating ease of contact, that alone didn't conform, and didn't think to the full letter of the law. He thought they needed to have a phone number if they wanted his phone number and that was what they needed to get, his phone number or real email address.

Commissioner Hultquist stated that was why it needed to have the disclaimer that if someone called and wanted their public phone number or email address, they would get it but if they didn't want it appearing on the website, the city could issue a city email address instead of putting the public one on the website.

Chair Simmons stated that was on the application and thought it was part of the Tennessee Warning and thought the applicants had to select which information they wanted public.

He asked the Commissioners where they landed on the discussion. He didn't know if Commissioner Hultquist wanted it to be uniform and everyone got a city email to try it or did they want to be selective. He asked how uniform they wanted to be at kicking that off. He stated he was not suggesting everyone get a new email address or have it on their phone or whatever but was happy with anything. He stated he would like some degree of uniformity with all the Commissions or they didn't or find some uniformity of contacting the Commissioners. He stated the only caveat was that the Chair should have their contact information no matter what and didn't have a problem with that on the website.

Commissioner Secara stated they should have a city email access for the Chair, Second Chair

and First Vice Chair and whatever information went into that account. He stated those emails were read on a regular basis and should be presented to the entire Commission. He stated there was no need for everyone to have access to that account or have their own email address with the city unless they wanted one because they were not elected officials and were public officials.

Commissioner Bor agreed it should be shared whatever was applicable to the Commissioners.

Chair Simmons asked the Commissioners if they had achieved some sort of consensus.

Staff Liaison Montero stated what he heard was to have the Council/Staff Liaison contact information for the citizens to contact them to get the Commissioner contact information, phone number or email address and maybe have the Chair or officers with city email address on the website.

#### 7.4 Charter Commission Work Plan

Staff Liaison Montero stated he provided an updated Work Plan and the only new item added was on Page 2, regarding the Charter Commission member contact information on the website.

Chair Simmons stated the Work Plan was what they talked about and a good source of information. He stated that now that they completed the CLIC issue, he thought of not meeting every month and didn't know if they had a lot of agenda topics for next month. He stated tonight's agenda was light and only had two issues and took care of them.

Commissioner Williams stated that if they didn't have a lot of agenda items they didn't need to meet every month and could skip a month. He asked if there was a way to leave it up to the Chair whether to call a meeting or skip a month, so they were not meeting if they didn't need to meet but it gave them the flexibility to handle business as it came up.

Chair Simmons stated that discretion already existed and he didn't want to meet just to meet, he stated tonight's items took up at least an hour, if something was less than that they wouldn't be meeting.

Chair Hultquist suggested if a week before the scheduled meeting and there wasn't much of an agenda, the Chair should ask the Staff Liaison to send out a notice to cancel the meeting. He thought it was better to have it scheduled and then canceled rather than having something come up and it was canceled.

Chair Simmons stated all of the Charter Commission meetings were scheduled for 2019 through the end of December and would just have to notice it, if a meeting was canceled by the Staff Liaison. He stated the Staff Liaison provided the draft agenda to him and Vice Chair Aune, Jr., to review to add or take off items a week before the meeting. He stated if there was nothing substantive, agreed, the discretion was there to cancel the meeting but didn't know if something organic would come from the Council, City Manager, or City Attorney.

#### 8. Adjournment

**Motion Commissioner Bor, second Commissioner Bishman to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Devin Montero, Staff Liaison