

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION MINUTES

November 12, 2020

The Charter Review Commission met in video conference meeting at 5:30 p.m. hosted in the Municipal Building Council Chambers on the 12th day of November, 2020, and notice and agenda of the meeting were posted in the Municipal Building at 201 West Gray 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL.

PRESENT:

Ms. Aisha Ali
Mr. Trey Bates
Mr. Doug Cubberley, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Tom Hackelman
Mr. Kenneth McBride
Mr. Kevin Pipes
Mr. Richard Stawicki
Mr. Bob Thompson, Chairman
Mr. Bryan Vinyard
Ms. Shon Williamson-Jennings

ABSENT:

Mr. Jim Eller
Mr. Jim Griffith
Mr. Greg Jungman

STAFF PRESENT:

Ms. Kathryn Walker, City Attorney
Ms. Brenda Hall, City Clerk

Item 2, being:

CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ADDING LANGUAGE TO THE CHARTER RELATED TO REQUIRING A VOTE OF THE ELECTORATE FOR APPROVAL OF A TAX INCREMENT FINANCE DISTRICT OVER \$5,000,000.

Ms. Kathryn Walker, City Attorney, said City Council asked the Charter Commission to look at this topic again since the prior consideration resulted in a tie vote and all members were not present at the previous meeting.

Commissioner Bates said he was not sure what would be accomplished by revisiting this topic. His recollection of the topic was it was very well discussed and debated with a lot of thoughts brought to the discussion, but ultimately the Commission was a very split and felt it was difficult to make call. Members of the Commission felt like this is a very divided topic both within the Commission and the community and that the tie vote reiterated that opinion.

Commissioner Hackleman said he was not able to attend the meeting when this was previously discussed, but did not see the harm in letting the voters weigh in on these major projects.

Item 2, continued:

Commissioner Vinyard agreed with Commissioner Bates and said there were good points on both sides of the issue. He was a little confused why Council referred this back to the Commission to see if the vote might change with reconsideration, when they moved forward with the auditor position although this Commission recommended against it. He felt the outcome of the previous vote shows Council how divided this topic is within the community and Council can decide whether they wish to move it forward or not.

Commissioner McBride said his position has not changed since January and did not see the need to reconsider.

Commissioner Hackleman recommended to postpone any action on this item until a greater number of Commissioners could participate. Commissioner Bates said it did not serve much purpose to revisit this topic given the same set of facts. He felt if the Commission was going to revisit it again it needed to be something that has not been considered before.

Items submitted for the record

1. Draft language for Voter Approval Required for Tax Increment Finance Districts

*

Item 3, being:

DISCUSSION REGARDING ARTICLE XIII, RECALL OF ELECTIVE OFFICERS TO PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION ON WHETHER THE LANGUAGE SHOULD BE MODIFIED.

Ms. Walker provided an overview of the existing Charter language relative to recall of elected officials. Having gone through a recall process for the Mayor and three councilmembers in recent months brought to light some areas of the Charter that may need to be cleaned up to provide clearer language regarding the process. One area of concern identified by City Clerk Hall was the amount of time allotted to review the signatures. Current language states the review must be completed no later than 30 days from receipt of the petition, which is very problematic when multiple petitions are filed or a petition for the Mayor has been filed as it would require more than 23,000 signatures. Ms. Hall said Staff was also looking at revising the petition form to require additional information that would make it easier to identify the signature.

Commissioners ask Staff to review recall processes in other cities for further review. Additional information was requested regarding the percentage of votes cast in the last Mayoral election and statutory regulations for municipal elections.

*

Item 4, being:

DISCUSSION REGARDING ARTICLE XVII, SECTION 9, TO CONSIDER WHETHER TO REQUIRE BIENNIAL REVIEW OF THE CHARTER.

Commissioners discussed whether or not to recommend a biennial review of the Charter. The consensus of the Commission was that biennial was too often given the fact it has taken almost two years to complete the current targeted review and felt the current Charter language of at least once every ten years was sufficient.

*

Item 5, being:

MISCELLNEOUS DISCUSSION.

None.

*

Item 6, being:

ADJOURNMENT.

Chairman Thompson declared the meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.