

# Minneapolis Charter Commission Minutes

July 1, 2009 - 4:00 p.m.  
Room 317 City Hall, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Commissioners Present: Bernstein (Chair), Clegg, Connell, Dolan, Ferrara, Jancik, Kadwell, Lazarus, Lichty, Metge, Remme, Rubenstein, Stade  
Commissioners Excused: Bujold, Street  
Also Present: Lisa Needham, Assistant City Attorney

## 1. Roll Call

Chair Bernstein called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. Roll call was taken.

## 2. Adopt Agenda

*Lazarus moved to amend the agenda to add a new Item No. 7 encouraging the City Council to form a study group as proposed by Council President Johnson, Park Board President Nordyke, and Council Members Goodman and Benson in their letter to the Charter Commission dated June 2, 2009. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

The agenda, as amended, was adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

## 3. Approve minutes of June 3, 2009

*Lazarus moved approval of the minutes of June 3, 2009. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

## Old Business

### 4. Proposed Charter Amendment - Replacing the membership of the Board of Estimate and Taxation with the membership of the City Council:

**Review final amendment language.**

Lisa Needham, Assistant City Attorney, summarized the changes the City Attorney's Office had made to the amendment language submitted by Council Member Ostrow.

Commissioners had received an updated document that day (dated 7/1/09). Changes included:

- Adding language to preserve the mayoral veto over Board of Estimate decisions
- Deleting language relating to the Board of Estimate and Taxation electing a President and Vice President from their membership and adding language that the President and Vice President of the City Council serve in those positions on the Board of Estimate and Taxation
- Deleting language relating to the Board of Estimate and Taxation receiving a per diem or salary
- Changing required Board of Estimate and Taxation meetings to "at least once a year and from time to time throughout the year as the business may require", rather than "monthly"

- Reinstating language relating to the Park Board that had previously been deleted in the Ostrow amendment contemplating the abolishment of the Park Board
- Changing references to "two-thirds" to "nine members" when referring to the City Council sitting as the Board of Estimate and Taxation

Discussion followed relating to the changes proposed by the City Attorney's Office.

Lazarus pointed out a reference in Chapter 15, Section 9 that had not been changed from "two-thirds" to "nine members" and suggested that all references be changed to "nine members" for consistency.

*Ferrara moved to adopt the language recommended by the City Attorney's Office (dated 7/1/09), with the following amendment to Chapter 15, Section 9 (second to the last sentence):*

"If the proceeds of the bonds or obligations be intended for the use of any board or department the expenditures of which are not controlled by the City Council, there shall be in addition to the request by the City Council, a like request expressed by ordinance or resolution adopted by the governing board of such department by the vote of at least ~~two-thirds~~ nine of the members thereof." Seconded.

Carol Becker, 3201 48th Avenue South and a member of the Board of Estimate and Taxation, requested that the Charter Commission postpone the adoption of the amendment language until they had discussed other proposed alternatives that had not yet been acted upon.

Bernstein stated that the decision to place this item on the ballot was adopted by the Charter Commission in June. The Commission was now simply adopting the amendment language received from the City Attorney. A Commissioner could move to reconsider the previous action, if they chose.

Ferrara stated that the agenda had been adopted, and in his view it would be irrelevant to now debate everything all over again.

Metge inquired how Park Board Resolution 2009-152, which asked that the Commission withdraw their support for the amendment, fit in with the process.

Bernstein stated that if someone wished to reconsider the decision made by the Charter Commission at their June meeting they could do so, providing they had voted on the prevailing side.

*Ferrara's motion to adopt the amendment language recommended by the City Attorney's Office, as amended, was adopted upon a voice vote.*

Declining to vote: Jancik, Metge.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

Connell stated that the Park Board Resolution requesting that the Charter Commission reconsider its actions of the previous meeting with respect to the Board of Estimate and

Taxation qualified as New Business, not Old Business where it had been placed on the agenda.

Discussion continued relating to the placement of Park Board Resolution 2009-152 on the agenda.

*Metge moved to amend the agenda to place consideration of Park Board Resolution 2009-152 under New Business as Item No. 7, and move Item No. 7 (Proposed Study Group) to Item No. 8. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

## New Business

### 5. Proposed Charter Amendment:

***The Board of Estimate and Taxation shall set the maximum property tax levy for both the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board at the same rate on an annual basis. Furthermore, that the net debt bonding for capital projects be directly proportional to the property tax supported operating budgets of the two jurisdictions. (Vreeland)***

Clegg noted that the Commission had not held a public hearing on either of the proposed amendments on the agenda, nor was today's meeting noticed as a public hearing.

Bernstein verified that the meeting was a not public hearing.

Scott Vreeland, 2437 33rd Avenue South, Park Board Commissioner, stated that he had presented this amendment to the Charter Commission before the June meeting was held. It was the decision of the Charter Commission not to hold a public hearing on this amendment. His intention was that this would be a thoughtful discussion based on information that was missing from the decision that was just made about the Board of Estimate and Taxation. He had provided all Charter Commissioners with his proposed amendment language and other handouts. The action just taken by the Charter Commission relating to the Board of Estimate and Taxation will have a great impact on the Park Board. A survey by the Park Foundation showed the importance of a funded park system to the citizens of Minneapolis. 99% see the parks and lakes as a unique and valuable asset to the city. 94% report existing parks and facilities meet the needs of their households. Although the Park Board is an independent board, if they do not have financial independence or some way of making sure that they have funding, then those things are at risk. Something that hadn't been discussed at Charter Commission meetings, including the public meetings, was the current relationship of the Park Board and the City Council. He displayed a chart showing the decreased funding of the Park Board over the past several years. The system is being shrunk severely. Park Board services are diminishing even without the elimination of the Board of Estimate and Taxation, which is the one place where the Park Board has a seat at the table to discuss these issues. Funding for the replacement of wading pools, play grounds, buildings, etc., comes from net debt bonding. In the next five years, there is no funding for neighborhood parks shown on the chart. The proposed amendment will make things a lot worse. The only proposed park improvement in the five year capital plan is for a single bridge. The five year plan by the city of Minneapolis for park funding is zero for neighborhood parks. The relationship between the Park Board and the City has been a struggle about money, and in the past eight years or so the Park Board has felt significantly underfunded in a way that really hurts the city. Balancing these taxes and

taxing authorities is a huge challenge. The Board of Estimate and Taxation has provided some balancing mechanism and without it, those opportunities are lost. His amendment would be a way to balance the needs of the Park Board and the city. It would provide that the Park Board property tax levy be equal to the rate of increase or decrease in the city's property tax levy from the prior year. He requested that the Charter Commission place this proposed amendment on the ballot

Stade stated that the proposed amendment wouldn't actually protect the Park Board because they could receive the levy but have their Local Government Aid (LGA) allocation reduced. Also, he wondered if there was any precedent in the Charter where it specifically addressed setting budgets or levies. Typically that would be a discussion at the City Council level as things change from year to year. The amendment seemed like a permanent change, and he didn't believe there was any other place in the Charter that contained similar language.

Vreeland stated that the Park Board was becoming less reliant on LGA funding moment by moment, and it may not be an issue at all in the near future. Currently, the Park Board receives 11.9% of the city's LGA funding. If the city's LGA funding gets cut, the Park Board takes 11.9% of the total hit.

Carol Becker, 3201 48th Avenue South, Board of Estimate and Taxation member, noted that the Charter does contain language relating to the Park Museum levy.

*Metge moved to place the Vreeland amendment on the 2009 ballot. Seconded.*

Ferrara spoke against the motion. As a citizen, he wanted to be able to hold someone accountable and felt that the City Council would be held more accountable if the voters decide to approve this amendment.

Metge stated that she made the motion because she wanted the Commission to continue thinking about substantial changes and the process thereof and about insuring that the Park Board had the funding it needed.

Connell stated that if there was going to be an independent Park Board and a City Council that both survive and serve with one source of funds, the two groups need to talk to each other. He blamed the people of both organizations if there was no communication between the two entities. If they are not talking to each other, they are not doing their job, and the voters need to understand that.

Clegg spoke against the motion. He didn't feel it was good government practice to, by Charter, freeze the proportion of the funding for two groups. In some years it might make sense for one entity to get more or less. To take that discretion away from the elected officials would be unwise.

Rubenstein spoke against the motion. She agreed with Commissioner Clegg and also with Commissioner Stade that details about the budget do not belong in the Charter.

Dolan spoke against the motion agreeing that it is does not belong in the Charter.

*Stade called the question.*

*Metge's motion to place the Vreeland amendment on the 2009 ballot* lost. Yeas, 0; Nays, 13.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

**6. Proposed Charter Amendment:**

***Replace the elected Library Board Trustee position on the Board of Estimate and Taxation with a second, elected Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board Commissioner. (Becker/Scott)***

Pat Scott, 2413 Russell Avenue South, explained that this proposal would amend Chapter 15, Section 1 of the Charter as follows:

**"Chapter 15, Section 1: Composition of Board of Estimate and Taxation.** There shall be in the City of Minneapolis a Board of Estimate and Taxation, consisting of the Mayor, the President of the City Council, the Chair of the Committee on Ways and Means/Budget of the City Council, ~~an elected member of the Library Board as designated by the board at its annual meeting each year by a majority vote of all of its members,~~ the President of the Board of Park Commissioners or such other member thereof, and one other additional Park Commissioner as the Board may designate at its annual meeting each year, and two qualified electors to be elected at large for terms of four years each commencing on the first business day of January following their election."

Carol Becker, 3201 48th Avenue South, Board of Estimate and Taxation member, stated that the Board of Estimate and Taxation is the place where the Park Board, Mayor, and City Council sit down and work out their issues. The three issues they work together on are: (1) Setting the maximum property tax levy. In that process, everyone has to sit down together and agree that all of the levies are going to total no more than a certain amount. There has to be a vote at the Board of Estimate and Taxation for that coordination to happen. (2) Issuing debt/borrowing money for things like parks, water treatment plants, streets, and sewers. For debt to be issued, there must be a like resolution from the city and from the Park Board. The Board of Estimate and Taxation cannot move ahead on park funding unless the two entities agree. (3) Internal audit. There are a lot of shared financial systems and financial processes between the two entities. The Board of Estimate and Taxation has an internal auditor. Clean government doesn't just happen by itself. The internal auditor investigates fraud and looks at processes. That is overseen by the Board of Estimate and Taxation. There is shared oversight. The Board of Estimate and Taxation has been around for 130 years, and in its current form since 1920. During that time there has been a balance of 3-2-2 on the board. Three people from the city, two people from the independent boards, and two independently elected people. She thought of the two independently elected members as referees. If the city wants to do something, it can't do it all by itself; it has to get the approval of someone from the independent boards or an independently elected person to get a majority of votes. Nor could the independent boards accomplish anything without support from either the Council or the elected members. That balance needs to be brought back to the Board of Estimate and Taxation. The action the Charter Commission took at their last meeting would give all of the authority to the City Council. If that happened, then soon there would not be an independent Park Board. The Board of Estimate and Taxation forces the entities to work together. This proposed amendment would bring back the seventh member of the Board of Estimate and Taxation and restore the Board to its former 3-2-2 balance. If the voters are presented with a proposal to eliminate the Board of Estimate and Taxation, they should also be deserving of the opportunity to strengthen it. This alternative will strengthen the Board of Estimate and

Taxation and preserve the balance needed to keep an independent Park Board. She added that she was profoundly disappointed in the Charter Commission's process. She had provided her amendment early enough so it could have been discussed at the same time as the Ostrow proposals. She had had no opportunity before tonight to speak about the role of the Board of Estimate and Taxation other than a minute and a half at a community meeting. The Ostrow amendment is not well thought through. The implications have not been well discussed.

Ms. Scott pointed out that Commissioner Clegg had commented that the two proposed amendments on the agenda had not yet had public hearings. The proposed amendment to change the membership of the Board of Estimate and Taxation to consist of the members of the City Council had never had a public hearing either. What went before the public at the community meetings was the proposal to eliminate the Board of Estimate and Taxation. When people learned about the functions of the Board of Estimate and Taxation, it was decided that it wasn't such a good idea to eliminate it. So the next iteration of the proposal was that if the city needs to keep the Board of Estimate and Taxation, then the City Council should sit as the board. She had been a City Council member and challenged people to identify real transparency in a lot of the City Council decision making process. Transparency is very difficult under any circumstances in political bodies. When there are 13 City Council members but citizens live in one ward, how much accountability can be demanded on all the issues that a City Council member votes upon? She urged the Charter Commission to give strong consideration to placing this question on the ballot. The balance of the Board of Estimate and Taxation was changed when the Library Board was dissolved, and this proposal will restore that balance.

Ms. Becker noted that she was elected to the Board of Estimate and Taxation on a city-wide basis. She received 31,828 votes four years ago. Council Member Paul Ostrow received approximately 3,500 votes. Being elected city-wide provided more accountability. Also, the proposal will not save money. The elected members have been paid \$35 per month since 1920.

Peter Wagenius, Senior Policy Aide to Mayor Rybak, was present and stated that he wanted to correct the record relating to the claim that was made that parks would be endangered by the dissolution of the Board of Estimate and Taxation and the claim that there is no money for parks in the capital budget over the next five years. To take one page out of a budget book and make a misrepresentation of that kind is inappropriate. That didn't include the net debt levy for parks, which is \$1,500,000 per year. He and the Mayor agreed strongly with Carol Becker and Scott Vreeland that the Park Board doesn't have enough money. The Public Works Department doesn't have enough money; the streets and infrastructure are in disrepair. The Mayor has referred to what is happening potentially in the future as it relates to public works and the parks both together as being an infrastructure time bomb. The voters should first be allowed to decide whether or not they want to keep the Board of Estimate and Taxation. If the voters decide they really want to keep the Board, then it would be appropriate to ask the question of how to avoid a 3-3 tie moving forward. This amendment currently only adds to the anachronism. It assumes that the only problem with the board is that it now has an even number of members. There is also the issue of voter confusion. As it is, the voters will be asked to make two decisions this November relating to the Board of Estimate and Taxation: Do they want it to be eliminated and its powers transferred to the City Council, and who do they want to elect to the board. This proposal would ask the voters to decide on three things relating to the Board of Estimate and

Taxation on the same ballot: Who should be on the board, whether or not the board should exist, and whether or not the board should be expanded. Having a board which the public hasn't heard of and that many decline to vote on make one of the most important decisions of the year is an anathema to open, transparent, and accountable government. Citizens shouldn't have to hire an attorney to digest the Charter to know who to yell at about their taxes or their level of service. Government should actually work the way people think it does. Accountability and responsibility should be in the same place. He had asked Jill Schwimmer, the other at-large member of the Board of Estimate and Taxation, how many times she had been complained to by citizens about either their level of service or their level of taxation, and her answer was once in four years. Council Members and the Mayor have a far, far higher number of complaints about levels of service and taxes, which is exactly the way it should be. The amendment the Charter Commission passed last month and reaffirmed today is not a revolution, but is an important step toward greater accountability, efficiency, and transparency.

*Clegg moved the agenda.* He did not feel the Commission should be taking testimony unless they wanted to convert the meeting into a public hearing. The Commissioners could ask questions of the proponents if they chose, but except for that, the discussion should take place among the Commissioners.

Stade stated that for purposes of discussion, he would to move to replace what the Commission had already voted on with this amendment, and put this on the ballot in the place of it.

Clegg stated that that would be a motion to reconsider.

Peter Ginder, Assistant City Attorney, stated that the motion to reconsider was not proper at this point. It is only proper when there is no other business in front of the Commission.

Metge stated that this will be very confusing to the voters, and that is why she voted 'no' last month. She still questioned the overall process of taking in substantial changes. She would have loved to have had this discussion before voting last month.

*Dolan moved to place the Becker/Scott amendment on the 2009 ballot. Seconded.*

Ferrara spoke against the motion. The Board of Estimate and Taxation was an outdated structure that he felt was too political. The fact that there is no cooperation or communication now was evidence to him of how outdated it is. This issue has been discussed since the Minneapolis Library system was merged into the Hennepin County system. He recommended that the Charter Commission consider a motion, post-election, regarding the membership of the Board of Estimate and Taxation if it still existed.

Connell spoke against the motion. Undoubtedly a commission shouldn't have an even number of voters and the issue should be addressed if, after the November election, there is still a Board of Estimate and Taxation. He was one of the Commissioners who voted to replace the members of the current Board of Estimate and Taxation with the City Council, and then voted against the eliminating the Park Board. He recognized at the time that there was a certain amount of inconsistency in that vote. He would have been happy to vote to eliminate the Park Board if he had been presented with an amendment that he believed was developed to the point that he could support it. The proposal last month was not fully

developed and no replacement for the current system was presented in the event that the Park Board was eliminated. He saw this as an incremental step toward fixing what is already a clear and evident dysfunction within city government.

Clegg spoke against the motion. Since the Minneapolis Library system was merged with the Hennepin County system, the Charter Commission had discussed options regarding membership of the Board of Estimate and Taxation, including the option of having a third elected representative, which he felt was just as viable as the current proposal. He agreed that it would be confusing to the voters to put this on the ballot. If the electorate decides to keep the Board of Estimate and Taxation in its current form, then the Commission should hold a hearing and consider the alternatives as to where that seventh member should come from.

Lazarus spoke against the motion. At its last meeting, the Charter Commission voted to place on the ballot the question of whether or not the City Council should sit as the Board of Estimate and Taxation because it was an anachronism and because it will give the City Council members more responsibility to the voters regarding how funds are allocated. The Board of Estimate and Taxation serves as a convenient hiding place for Council members when dealing with unhappy voters. This is just another attempt by the Park Board to protect itself. For all intents and purposes, the Commission might as well not have met last month if they passed this proposal tonight.

Metge stated that the Commission should have had this as part of its discussion last month so that they had alternatives in their choice. It was disturbing to hear folks talk about the different independent boards in terms of competition and fighting. Independent boards come with differing priorities. They must have debates on their priorities, and that's what she wants as a citizen; people looking out for those priorities. The Park Board will work to get their money from the Board of Estimate and Taxation because that is their priority. The city is going to have another priority. Transparency does not come from centralization of power. She believed in representative governance, and the more voices at the table the better the governance and the better the outcome. The trend in the city of getting rid of independent, multi-jurisdictional boards is very disturbing. Although it would be confusing to the voters to have both of the proposals on the ballot, she fully supported the proposal.

*The Dolan motion to place the Becker/Scott amendment on the 2009 ballot lost. Yeas, 1;*  
Nays, 12 as follows:

Yeas - Metge.

Nays - Clegg, Connell, Dolan, Ferrara, Jancik, Kadwell, Lazarus, Lichty, Remme, Rubenstein, Stade, Bernstein.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

**7. Park Board Resolution 2009-152:**

***Requesting the Minneapolis Charter Commission to reject Council Member Paul Ostrow's proposal to change the current membership of the Board of Estimate and Taxation from a membership consisting of the Mayor, City Council, Park Board, and independent board members to a Board of Estimate and Taxation comprised entirely of thirteen Minneapolis City Council members.***

Mary Merrill Anderson, Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board, summarized Park Board Resolution 2009-152, which requested:

- That the Charter Commission withdraw its approval of the Ostrow amendment
- That the Charter Commission support Board of Estimate and Taxation Member Carol Becker's proposal to replace the Library Board seat on the Board of Estimate and Taxation with a second Park Board Commissioner
- That the Task Force Commission proposed by City Council President Barb Johnson, Council Members Lisa Goodman and Scott Benson, and Park Board President Tom Nordyke add the issue of how to properly structure a Board of Estimate and Taxation to the list of issues to deal with over the coming year
- That if the Charter Commission continues to advance the Ostrow Board of Estimate and Taxation proposal for a vote in the fall election, that the Charter Commission require that the City Council acting as the Board of Estimate and Taxation set the maximum property tax levy for both the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board at the same percentage on an annual basis
- That the net debt bonding for capital projects be directly proportional to the property tax supported operating budgets of the two jurisdictions

Ms. Merrill Anderson stated that if the Ostrow amendment is placed on the ballot this fall and passes, it will severely and perhaps critically remove the Park Board as an independent authority in the city by depriving them of a say on their level of tax support. Surveys conducted by the Minneapolis Park Foundation show that an overwhelming majority of Minneapolis voters believe that the Park Board should remain separate and independent.

Bernstein stated that it was his opinion that the request was, in fact, a request for a reconsideration of the decision that the Charter Commission made in June, which would require a motion from someone on the prevailing side.

*Stade moved to reconsider the June 3, 2009, Charter Commission action to place on the 2009 ballot the question of whether to replace the membership of the Board of Estimate and Taxation with the membership of the City Council.*

Peter Ginder, Assistant City Attorney, stated that it may be necessary for the Commission to reconsider a previous action taken earlier in today's meeting regarding the Commission's change to the amendment language. He pointed out that "two-thirds" in the amended section was actually referring to the Park Board, not the City Council. Changing "two-thirds" to "nine" would require a unanimous vote of all Park Board members. If that was the Charter Commission's intent, it should be left as is. If it was an unintended consequence of the action, the Charter Commission may wish to reconsider that action at this point.

*Stade withdrew his motion to reconsider the June 3, 2009, Charter Commission action.*

Bernstein inquired if it would then be possible to proceed with consideration of the Park Board Resolution requesting reconsideration of the June 3 action.

Ginder stated that it would not since one motion to reconsider would have already been taken up at the meeting, and no notice was given that the Commission would be reconsidering their June 3 action today.

*Clegg moved to reconsider the Charter Commission's previous action to adopt the amendment language recommended by the City Attorney's Office (dated 7/1/09), as amended. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Declining to vote - Metge.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

*Clegg moved to approve the language exactly as submitted by the City Attorney's Office (dated 7/1/09). Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Declining to vote - Metge.

Absent - Bujold, Street.

*Dolan moved that consideration of Park Board Resolution 2009-152 be placed on the Charter Commission's August 5, 2009 agenda. Seconded.*

Ferrara suggested the Commission consider the composition of the Board of Estimate and Taxation, if it exists, in the month of December.

Metge stated that if this option had been on the table last month, she would have supported it as proposed.

Lichty stated that in fairness, he felt the resolution should be placed on the August agenda. However, he would be voting against it because he didn't think it was a good proposal. It would require the Commission to reconsider a previous decision that he believed was reasonably well considered.

Connell inquired if the Park Board wanted consideration of the resolution placed on the August Charter Commission agenda.

Ms. Merrill Anderson stated that she would prefer the Charter Commission state tonight whether this is something they are going to consider. If they have already decided that they do not want to entertain reconsideration of their June 3 action, then she would like to know that tonight if possible, although she would certainly be happy to return in August.

Stade stated that a proposal to add another Park Board representative would give the Park Board as much representation as the City Council, and the City Council is a much bigger part of city government.

Clegg urged the Commissioners to vote in favor of the motion if they would vote in favor of reconsidering the June 3 action at the August meeting, and to vote against the motion if they would vote against reconsideration in August.

Rubenstein stated that although she voted against the Ostrow amendment because she didn't feel it had been fully thought through, she did not see any point in reconsidering the action and would vote against doing so.

*The Dolan motion to place consideration of Park Board Resolution 2009-152 on the Charter Commission's August 5, 2009 agenda lost. Yeas, 2; Nays, 9 as follows:*

Yeas - Lichty, Metge.

Nays - Clegg, Connell, Dolan, Ferrara, Kadwell, Remme, Rubenstein, Stade, Bernstein.

Absent - Bujold, Jancik, Lazarus, Street.

#### **8. Study Group Proposal:**

*In the absence of Commissioner Lazarus, Clegg moved that the Charter Commission request that the President of the City Council and the President of the Park Board proceed with assembling a study group, as outlined in their letter to the Charter Commission dated June 2, 2009. Seconded.*

At Ferrara's request, Clegg added to the motion the following language: "that the study group conclude their study and report back to all constituent parties within one year".

Connell spoke in favor of the motion. It had become clear to him that there is a valid reason for these discussions to be taking place, and it stemmed from dysfunction between the two independent boards as they exist now and the City Council. He encouraged the members of the City Council to do everything within their power to work, not only to appoint the proposed commission and outline their tasks appropriately, but to talk and compromise with each other and come to some sort of resolution as to the funding of the city.

*Clegg's motion that the Charter Commission request that the President of the City Council and the President of the Park Board proceed with assembling a study group, as outlined in their letter to the Charter Commission dated June 2, 2009, and that that the study group conclude their study and report back to all constituent parties within one year was adopted upon a voice vote.*

Absent - Bujold, Jancik, Lazarus, Street.

### **Public Comment Period**

Pat Scott, 2413 Russell Avenue South, inquired at what point the wording for the proposed amendment would be available so the public has an opportunity to learn about it.

Bernstein stated that the City Council and the City Attorney's Office will draft the ballot language. Discussion will take place in the Intergovernmental Relations Committee.

*Clegg moved to adjourn. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Bujold, Jancik, Kadwell, Lazarus, Street.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Peggy Menshek  
Council Committee Coordinator