

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF AVON, OHIO, HELD THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2022,
AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING,
LOCATED AT 36080 CHESTER ROAD**

Chairman John Weigman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patricia Ashley, Ward 1; Mary Berges, Ward 3; Elizabeth Damstra, Ward 3; Clint Gault, Ward 4; Joseph Glick, Ward 1; William Logan, Ward 4; Marcel Mylen, Ward 2; Alternate A Melissa Ramirez, Ward 3; Alternate B Bruce Klingshirn, Ward 4; John Weigman, Ward 1

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

James Gemelas, Ward 1

ALSO PRESENT:

Law Director, John Gasior; Secretary to the Commission, Barbara Brooks

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MARCH 24, 2022, MEETING

A motion was made by Mr. Gault and seconded by Mr. Glick to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the meeting of the 2022 Charter Review Commission, held Thursday, March 24, 2022, and to approve said minutes as published. The vote was Ms. Ashley, "yes"; Ms. Berges, "abstain"; Ms. Damstra, "yes"; Mr. Gault, "yes"; Mr. Glick, "yes"; Mr. Logan, "abstain"; Mr. Mylen, "yes"; Ms. Ramirez, "yes"; Mr. Weigman, "yes".

The vote was 7 in favor and 2 abstentions and the Chairman declared the motion passed.

DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AVON

a. ARTICLE VII – BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Ms. Berges referred to Article VII, Section 2 (d) and said that about halfway down the paragraph, it says..."Any matter so referred to the Planning Commission shall be acted upon by it within 70 days from the date of referral unless a longer time is allowed by Council." She said, so her question is, what does "acted upon it" mean? Is it that a vote is taken or that it is on the agenda and discussed? What is the definition of "acted upon"? Mr. Gasior said he would think that it would mean that you took action which would be a vote of yes or no.. That issue has never come up as long as he has been around. Mr. Weigman asked what the usual cycle was on something like that? Mr. Gasior responded that usually when something is actually put on the agenda, we sometimes will act on it that night or we will call it a first reading and it will be on the agenda again the next month. Planning Commission has a set of rules that requires you to suspend the rules if you are going to act on a matter that was first presented that night. So we have gone through meetings where for instance a Special Use Permit is on and Planning Commission will suspend the rules and act and then vote to recommend to Council positive recommendation to approve the Special Use Permit. We have subdivisions, however, that may have to come back as there

are engineering issues that have to be resolved so it gets a first presentation and it comes back in a month. Then, if not all of the issues are resolved, it comes back a third month and now when it comes back the third month, we are past the 70 days. So he guessed nothing had been acted upon and 70 days have gone by since the matter has been referred and according to the Charter, the matter would be deemed disapproved. But it is almost as if when Planning Commission does those first or second or third presentations, it is actually with the consent of the applicant and no one treats the matter as disapproved. We treat it as being continued at the request of the applicant until additional engineering can be done and that avoids the hardship of the developer losing all of his fee upfront which in subdivisions can be thousands of dollars. So we just continue to work with the individuals until we reach that point where they either have the project in order and ready to be acted upon or they get voted down. So the 70 day issue has never really come up, but it is there.

Ms. Berges noted that it seemed there were a couple of items just recently that went to third and fourth presentations and that is what made her think about this because most items are done within two months. But these two items going forward four months is....., unless Mr. Gasior is saying that making it a first, second, or third presentation is an action taken by Planning Commission. Mr. Gasior said that we could look at it that way. Again, he has not even studied that because the issue has never really presented itself where someone were to make a rule of order and say, we have to dismiss this; we have to vote against it or deem it denied tonight because we are outside the 70 days. It has never happened. He think that probably the interpretation that Ms. Berges just placed on it would be the one that we would probably rely on because what we are doing is going outside the 70 days. But again, he looks at it almost as if the applicant requesting to come back for the second or third presentation is almost like there is a waiver of that 70 day period and both parties are agreeing to waive that 70 day period.

Ms. Berges said she was just curious because we have had those things come up. Mr. Gasior said they do not come up too often but they do come up, especially in recent years because stormwater issues are a little more intense and sometimes the engineering is more demanding and it requires the applicant's engineer to come back maybe two or three times to satisfy the City Engineer's demands for how the project is going to be sewerred, etc. He thinks the way Planning Commission looks at it is that we just want a good project and if we have to deny it, they are going to come back. Mr. Gasior said he thinks it is more form over substance and he does not know if it is worth addressing it in the Charter. We could remove it or clarify it but it is one of those, if it's not broken, why fix it? We are not dealing with it; we have not dealt with it in the time he has been around. If the applicant wants to come back and get the engineering squared away on the fifth presentation we will let him do that as long as we are making progress toward compliance with the Code.

Mr. Logan stated that before we leave that page, there is a bookkeeping thing. Further down, under (e), (2) about the Lake Pointe Construction lawsuit, and he is not suggesting a Charter amendment, but that does not need to be there anymore, does it? Mr. Gasior responded, no, but leaving it there is kind of like a point of reference if there is a dispute somewhere down the line between a property owner and the City. There is a small piece of residential property that sits behind Drug Mart and this might come into play yet if somebody were to want to rezone. We probably would dig back in there and determine what that actual acreage of property was; he thought that it included the property that Romes owned at the time. So we may just want to leave it there until all of that area is finally built out.

Ms. Damstra stated that, under (e)(1) in that same Section, she cannot find the Exhibit A which is said to be attached. Is it actually attached and what is Ordinance 95-06? Mr. Gasior said that the Exhibit is attached to Ordinance 95-06 and Ms. Damstra asked, on the online version too? Mr. Gasior said the

Clerk could probably provide that to Ms. Damstra. He explained that what happened at that time was that we had a planner, North Star Planning, that came in and reviewed a number of areas in the City and made recommendations for future use, so it is helpful and it is in our Master Plan. You could call it a footnote to the Master Plan. You will find on that Exhibit little circles with a number in it and you will look at a piece of property and it will tell you the property is currently zoned residential to be zoned commercial at some future date.

Ms. Damstra said again that she just could not find it. Mr. Gasior said, yes, we have it; it is attached in the records. Ms. Brooks said she would be happy to email it to Ms. Damstra.

Ms. Damstra then asked, in Section 1, where it says who is going to be appointed to the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, and it just says, "qualified members", she wondered about the qualifications. What is a qualified member? She thought that in other areas we have listed more specifics but in this one it just seems quite generic when it says "qualified members". Mr. Gasior said that he takes that to mean that they live in the City and they are over 18 but Ms. Damstra is right, we do not use that terminology in other areas. Ms. Damstra said she does not know if you need to say they should have some sort of background in building and zoning. Mr. Gasior said he could not say where a qualified member is defined anywhere in this Charter. Ms. Damstra said she was not suggesting a change but she just wondered what qualifies someone to be on an important Commission? Mr. Gasior said that there have to be some qualifications and if a Council member wants to challenge an appointment, they could certainly do that. There is a 2/3 requirement of concurrence of Council for any appointment. Mr. Weigman asked Mr. Gasior if he had ever seen an appointee challenged by Council and Mr. Gasior said, no, and he thought it is in deference to the Mayor. Most people defer to the judgment of the Mayor on these Boards and that has worked over the years.

Ms. Damstra asked about the levy that is going to be on the ballot about buying residential land for parks. Would that be affected in any way by this Section 2 (d) about changing the zoning? If it is residential, is there a zoning change between residential and green space? Does it have to be rezoned to make it a park? Mr. Gasior responded, no, parks are Special Uses in residential districts. But the City would have to come before Council to get a Special Use Permit for a park to exist on the residential land they had purchased. Ms. Damstra said, so it would not have to go through this rezoning and Mr. Gasior said, no.

Ms. Berges stated that with other Commissions, it says that these individuals will not hold other municipal office or appointment, but we do not say that for the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, and she just thought that was interesting. It does not preclude someone who is holding another office from being on this Board. Most likely, they would not be appointed but they are not precluded. She said that this was just an observation and she was not asking Charter Review to do anything. Mr. Weigman asked Mr. Gasior if that was because they are serving without compensation? Mr. Gasior said, no, the Board of Zoning is compensated. Ms. Damstra noted they receive compensation even though this Section says they are not unless it is otherwise provided by ordinance but it is changing the ordinance that they are paid. Mr. Gasior said that they are paid by Ordinance, correct. But that is a good point. One of the things a Charter Review Commission could do would be to go through the Charter with a fine tooth comb and try to find those inconsistencies and clear them up. But then you could end up with 12 or 15 items on the ballot, far too many for people to consider at the polls. Mr. Gasior said that the one thing that is very interesting to him is the 70 day provision in the Charter that they talked about tonight. He said that he was going to talk to the Planning Coordinator and the City Engineer and ask them, in practice, what are

we doing here? Are we following this rule or not and if we are not, maybe we should do something with the Charter.

b. ARTICLE IX – NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Ms. Berges noted that Article IX, Section 1, talks about the number of signatures of registered electors needed for the filing of petitions by both At-Large and Ward candidates. Is that something that the City has set up through this Charter or is that something that the State or County requires? Mr. Gasior answered that he believes that the Charter governs that. That is not State law because we are a Home Rule city by virtue of the Charter so we are setting forth what our requirements are there.

c. ARTICLE X – INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM, RECALL

Mr. Logan said that he thinks this is interesting and maybe he will see a referendum happen one day in his lifetime. Mr. Gasior said that a referendum is very difficult to do which is why you do not see it happen very often. That 10% of the electors needed for a petition is a lot of people; it could be 800 to 1,000. Mr. Logan stated that he thought there are at least 14,000 registered voters in the City of Avon per the Board of Elections. Mr. Weigman asked if the City ever cleanses the voting rolls because there is no way we have 14,000 eligible voters. Mr. Logan said that is the job of the Board of Elections. Mr. Weigman asked if they followed a process and Mr. Gasior said that it is the Secretary of State that governs that. Mr. Mylen said that he just came from a meeting and one of the candidates for Secretary of State brought that up and his opinion is that it is not being done at all in the way that it should be done. In fact, one woman said that she had contacted the Board of Elections to get a listing of registered voters in her precinct because she wanted to canvass for a particular candidate and when she got it, she noticed that a gentlemen on there who used to live across the street from her had been dead for three years and voted last year.

Mr. Glick stated that there is an inconsistency between recall and referendum and he just wanted to ask a question. Recall requires 25% of the total electors who voted for the office of the elected official who is the subject of the recall whereas the referendum is 10% of the total electors. Is that an error on referendum? Mr. Mylen said that a recall is for an elected official, right? Mr. Glick said, correct. Mr. Mylen said as opposed to a referendum which is for a piece of legislation. He said he would guess it is by design to make it more difficult to recall someone. Mr. Glick asked, but do the numbers stack up? He guessed his question was, is it more difficult? If we have a low voting turnout one year, is 25% of a low voting turnout higher or lower than 10% of the total electors on our City rolls?

Mr. Weigman said that maybe it is suggesting that they are only polling 25% of the people who actually voted because they are the ones who put that person in office? Mr. Gasior said, yes, it says in an election. And it might be a light vote because those are usually off-year elections for Mayor or Council. Most of your municipal elections are in odd years; most of the State elections are in even years.

d. ARTICLE XI – FRANCHISES

Mr. Gasior stated that there is nothing wrong with this Article but there has been discussion recently about bringing in fiber to the City and this is something that could impact that. He is not sure how the fiber is going to come to the City but the City could end up being a utility for fiber, or another utility could come in besides Spectrum.

Mr. Glick said that he was reading this with that same point in mind around bringing in a utility or a service provider. He said that the way he read this section on franchises is that the City would be in its rights to create a municipal utility to deliver that service. Mr. Gasior said he thought Mr. Glick was right; he thought that they were giving us the ability to do that in this Charter provision, which would be consistent with a Home Rule city. We would not want to be beholden to any State laws that would prohibit that; we want to be able to do this as a form of local government and set the rules, draw up the franchise agreement, determine the fees, etc.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF ARTICLE VIII, SECTION 5 – PUBLIC BIDDING

Final Comments Regarding the Definition of Personal and Professional Services and/or the Bidding Threshold Spending Amount

Mr. Logan said that he has read through this again and he and Mr. Gasior talked about it today. Mr. Logan said, at this point, he does not see the need to really ask for a change in anything. We are following this provision. They kind of wish that the word “personal” for “personal services” in point (4) of the Public Bidding paragraph on page 21, Section 5, were the word “professional” but he does not think it is worth amending. He thought that a responsible Council and Administration is going to follow this and not take advantage of something so at this point, he is not proposing that we change anything.

Mr. Gasior stated that one of the things that we do when we get into that fuzzy area is we will go to Council and present it to them by way of an Ordinance authorizing the hiring of whatever individual we are seeking to hire and Council, acting as a group in hiring that individual, kind of shields the City from any findings by the Auditor because Council has acted. It is not like something that we do behind the scenes and just hire somebody and all of a sudden, they are here. When we get into one of those tough personal hires, we usually present it to Council because they are going to approve the pay for that individual as well. There will be a fee agreement if it is an engineer, lawyer, accountant, etc. One of the problems that we have had is that \$10,000 limit on sale of property; sometimes you want to get that up to \$50,000. We have solved the problem, though, with GovDeals. Mr. Logan stated that we will sell assets on GovDeals. If we go to sell, say, an old ambulance, which you are going to get more than \$10,000 for, we will have Council pass an Ordinance authorizing that sale and he will still probably put it out on GovDeals. Mr. Gasior added we are covered if we sell that ambulance to another governmental entity so we could sell it without a competitive bid in that case.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF ARTICLE XIII, SECTION 9 – DETROIT ROAD PRESERVATION

Final Comments Not Covered in the Previous Meeting Regarding This Provision

Mr. Logan, who had been absent at the last meeting when this discussion took place, said that he had read the minutes and it was quite a discussion. Ms. Berges, who had also been absent from that meeting, said that she also read the minutes and having been on previous Charter Review Commissions, she would say the last time it was brought up and put on the ballot the comment was made, “let the voters decide”, and she thought that they had decided. She said that until ODOT comes along and says they want to widen certain sections of Detroit Road, she thinks it is a moot point so she says to let it go. Mr. Mylen added that he has been on previous Charter Review Commissions too and he does not think that a third time is a charm with this; he thinks it would be a strike three.

DISCUSSION OF ARTICLE IV – THE COUNCIL, SECTION 7 – Salaries and Bonds

Discussion of the Creation of a “Public Oversight Commission” to Make Recommendations for Compensation Adjustments of the City Council

Mr. Glick stated that this is a response to the two things that Mr. Gasior had mentioned: complexity involved with Council voting to increase Council’s pay in certain election cycles and a certain number tending to abstain from those votes. The other issue in his mind is while an individual Council member may not vote for their own increase or an adjustment in compensation, Council as a Whole, as the governing body of the City is voting for compensation increases for themselves and he finds that, from an optics perspective, or a conflict of interest perspective, worthy of discussion. So his thought would be that we would have some form of a three or five person body that is appointed either by Council or by the Mayor, to review and make a recommendation concerning an increase. His concern is that while it is not an issue today, it could become a risk in the future and may be something we may want to look at. How do we address that through the Charter review?

Ms. Berges asked Mr. Glick if he knew of other cities that have oversight committees that have been used for this process? Mr. Glick said, yes, there are although he did not find any in our region but increasingly local governments are using oversight committees appointed either by the Mayor or the Council to provide input on matters like this, just to create the transparency as well as eliminate that optics that there may be a conflict of interest. So it is definitely an increasing trend in small governments. Ms. Berges said the only thing that she found was for School Boards. Some of them had oversight committees but it was for bonds so they were for specific issues, not salaries. Mr. Weigman added that that is set by the State and it has not changed in 13 years, at least. Ms. Berges said that there were increases for our Council in 2011, and in May of 2017, there was discussion of salary increases so six years went by for even discussion about salary increases. And there was a lot of research done looking at other communities and what their Council members were being paid, how often they met, if they got benefits, etc. It was a pretty comprehensive review and there were a lot of things thrown around like doing an automatic 2% increase every year but at the end of the day, Council voted to just simply give a \$1,200 flat rate increase and that was it. There was no discussion about continuing the increase ongoing. So she understands what Mr. Glick is saying; you could always get a Council that is going to try to do whatever they want but she thinks there are enough people there, the Finance Director, the Mayor, or the Law Director, who would say, you really do not want to be doing that. And a Council understands that the constituency is aware of what they are doing. When they discuss these salaries, they are in a Finance Committee meeting but those meetings are all public so anybody can come in and say they do not think Council should give themselves a 10% raise, and if they did, she thought the public would say, they were not going to vote for them next time.

Mr. Glick stated that \$1,200 is about a 10% raise but again it is really about mitigating future risk, not addressing current issues.

Mr. Gasior stated that he had one comment about salary raises. When Council does this, they are reluctant to do it, he can tell you that because as soon as the discussion turns to salary increases for Council, it is on the front page of the newspapers the next morning and Council does not like that kind of press. So they are reluctant to do that until they get to a position where they honestly believe that the people out there would say, yes, they have not had a raise in 10 or 12 or 15 years and maybe they deserve a 10% raise of \$1,000. And he thinks that is the overriding deterrent, is just the press and the fact that no one wants to be perceived on Council as trying to feather their nest at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. Gault said it is amazing that there is not an inflation adjustment at all. It is wild how much time everybody on Council and on the School Board, puts into things and if you would calculate the hours they put in and what they are paid,it is amazing how much effort and energy and time people put in.

Mr. Glick stated that having a committee like this could address those concerns whether it is a cost of living adjustment or some other bi-annual adjustment. If it is a third party, it is not serving the interest of the body that an individual sits on and then it really takes a lot of that perception out of the equation that Council is voting to increase Council's pay. We could rely on the ever-shrinking local journalists to report on it, but he would rather have something in the Charter. And maybe this is a storm in a teacup sort of issue but he just feels that there are enough interested and invested individuals in this community that such an oversight committee would mitigate the future risk or mitigate any sort of optics around that.

Ms. Damstra said, to turn Mr. Glick's suggestion of an oversight committee into a positive, if Council has not taken a raise and maybe based off from the hours they spend, they might deserve one, would an oversight committee allow that discussion to come up without having the awkwardness of the public thinking they are just here for our money; would that make it more of a neutral topic and more of a deserving one? She does not even know how many hours a City Council member is serving. Mr. Weigman said that he wanted to ask Ms. Berges that question tonight and he also has talked to two former Council members. The numbers that he got from them for a monthly total was about 18 to 22 hours of effort and they both said about 20 hours made sense for an average. As a School Board member, he spends about 5 hours a month preparing for meetings and then being at the meetings, so to him the hours are about comparable to those of Council at a factor of 4. School Board compensation last year was \$2,250; \$150 per meeting. He said that they typically meet once a month; some months they will meet twice but not often, so to him if the number is about \$10,000 for Council he thinks we are in the ballpark. The other piece he looked at was, shouldn't we look at what our taxpayers are making, like their median income as a comparison and maybe the computation would be some fraction or per cent of that for those 20 hours a month.

Mr. Weigman asked Ms. Berges for her thoughts on how much time she put in as a Council member. Ms. Berges said that it varies; some months are busier than others. In the summer months of July and August, Council only meets twice a month. But it just depends because you have committees that you are on and there are times where the Finance Committee could meet several times a month and then when you are doing the budgets, you are going to spend more time with that. Some Council meetings can be over in an hour and other meetings can be two to three hours because you have Executive Sessions, you have pending litigation, you have issues that require a lot of time. There is research to do; if you are doing your job right, you will do research so that means looking up what other communities do or it could mean driving to where residents live who are having issues if you really want to be involved. So she thinks the time is 20 hours on average but it is definitely going to be more than that some months. So 20- 25 hours is probably reasonable.

Mr. Gault stated that he would argue that Ms. Berges put in more time than that when she was on Council because she was always at French Creek Foundation meetings which were often long. And she always planted the flowers on Detroit Road and was involved with the Christmas Tree lighting and the Easter breakfast. She put a ton of time in everything and they always appreciated that. So not enough credit was given for all that she does.

Mr. Glick said one last point on this, thinking back about what Mr. Weigman said about looking at an innovative model like tagging it to a percentage of the median income or some sort of percentage of that and also to what Ms. Damstra said about looking at it from both an upside as well as a downside, are our Council members getting equitably compensated for the work they do? Again, the dwindling journalism population may really not provide a strong backstop and it may currently stop Council from discussing what they need to discuss. He said, again, maybe he is making too big of an issue of this but having a body that is not Council discuss Council compensation could be a really interesting way for us to make sure that our Council is compensated in line with both what the market would dictate as well as allow us to explore opportunities that are specifically beneficial to Avon.

Mr. Logan noted that there are surveys out there. Ohio Municipal League does a pretty comprehensive survey every year of all salaries and he thinks they include elected officials in those surveys, so a lot of cities within Ohio will report or submit data to that. We do it every year. He has looked at a lot of the cities surrounding Avon and we are in the ballpark with our Council salaries. He does not think that we are overpaying or underpaying our Council.

Ms. Damstra said that she just wanted to add the thought that maybe in general people are serving on Council to do that very thing, to serve, and so compensation is not the top of their priority.

Mr. Weigman asked what the Commission wanted to do with this issue. Ms. Damstra said she thought that it is a good idea but does not know if it is necessarily the right fit for this type of service. But she can see the benefits of it.

Mr. Klingshirn stated that he thought that it is working pretty well for us now the way things are. To Mr. Gasior's point before about the public newspaper, when Mayor Bibb in Cleveland brought in a part-time person for \$105,000 a year, that sort of thing makes the paper. Mr. Gasior said that the other thing about Cleveland, too, is that they have full-time Council members and they get paid about \$75,000 a year and have a staff. He could see an oversight commission maybe being involved there to make sure they are not getting out of hand. That would be a situation where he could see something happening. He added that he does not see the press falling apart in this country. They are enshrined in the 1st amendment and he thinks they are going to carry that on.

Mr. Weigman stated, just to put some numbers around the discussion tonight, at about \$1,000 a month and about 25 hours per month, that is \$40/hr roughly so he does not think the compensation is too far off from where it ought to be. So it is working today but if we get to the point where it does not work, then maybe it should come back on a Charter Review down the road.

Ms. Damstra asked if, in that second part where it says "including officers and members of any Board or Commission", do they hold back on increases for others as well and not just Council themselves? Ms. Berges said that Planning Commission went for years without an increase. Mr. Gasior said that it was about 10 years. Council has been trying to deal with Planning Commission on a more regular basis and the last couple of years they have gotten 2% or 3% increases. Ms. Berges stated that she will say that the people who are on the Commissions and on Council, are not on them for money. She said she thinks that they are just happy that they get something and so it does not occur to them to go to Council or the Mayor and ask for a raise. That is just not something that they do; it is the service element of it that drives them.

Mr. Klingshirn, who is on the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, said that Ms. Berges is right. What they get on BZA covers their gas money of running around looking at properties, etc. and maybe a

little more. When all the positions got like a 2-1/2% increase this year, it went to Council and Council approved it so there is an oversight on these compensation amounts and if the people think the compensation is too high, they can vote people out that are giving those raises.

It was agreed to do nothing on this issue and Mr. Glick said yes, he was just one voice on this Commission.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

a. MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Damstra asked if they had gone through all of the Articles of the Charter and Mr. Gasior said, yes, and they have voted on one amendment which regarded the posting of enacted legislation.

Mr. Weigman stated so that one regarding the posting is already voted on and complete. We are waiting on the language for the amendment regarding the census. Mr. Gasior said, yes, we want to get language in the Charter that is very general that will instruct Council to review the Wards for possible redistricting every 10 years when the census comes out.

Mr. Weigman said, so for the next agenda, all we have left to do is get the language for the second topic finished up. We meet on April 28th and he would think that would be a fairly short meeting, mostly to finalize discussion and put a vote to that topic. He said that if there is anything else that Commission members want to review, to please contact him or Mr. Gasior.

b. MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There were no comments from the General Public.

ADJOURN: 8:05 p.m.

A motion was made by Mr. Gault and seconded by Ms. Berges to adjourn the meeting of the Charter Review Commission. The vote was all ayes and the Chairman declared the motion passed.

Respectfully submitted by:
Gail Hayden, Assistant Clerk of Council