

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 20, 2019

Those present at 7:02 p.m.:

Presiding:	Mayor Jerry Clifton District 1, James Horning District 2, Sharon Hughes District 3, Jennifer Wallace District 4, Chris Hamilton District 5, Jason Lawhorn District 6, Stu Markham
Staff Members:	City Manager Tom Coleman City Solicitor Paul Bilodeau Acting HR and Labor Relations Manager Mark Farrall Acting City Secretary Tara Schiano Director of Finance David Del Grande Planning and Development Director Mary Ellen Gray

1. Mr. Clifton called the Special Council Meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Mr. Clifton noted the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the 2019-2020 Council Rules of Procedure. He noted in the past; the process occurred at the Organizational Meeting. However, since there were numerous items to discuss, it was decided to hold a special meeting.

2. Mr. Clifton first addressed the proposed idea to increase the frequency of meetings to every Monday night to lessen the length of time during the meetings. He stated there was some information provided separately as to the amount of time which was spent on each agenda item.

Ms. Wallace thought about how to make the Council more efficient and how to discuss items that do not get discussed at previous meetings. She tried to compare similar municipalities and their committee structures but then realized it would not work because either there would not be enough people, or everyone would want to be on every committee. The next logical conclusion would be to have more regular meetings. The City Secretary's staff compiled data to present statistics to show how many meetings were held in 2018 to early 2019, how much time was spent on each agenda item and where the most time was spent. Ms. Wallace pointed out that in 2018 there were 37 meetings. This would be in line with the proposed idea to have meetings every Monday with some excluded Mondays due to work life balance. She felt that the additional meetings would be good for everyone as well as cutting down on overtime. Ms. Wallace stated it would be good for all to avoid having to stay until midnight because their item may fall at the end of an agenda.

Ms. Wallace felt the benefits would be efficiency, get into items which there had not been enough time to discussed, provide a work-life balance for staff and Council. She believed it would be fair to residents and developers who present and to other public officials and organizations who share information. She also believed agendas would be easier to schedule. She noted many of the public presentations were important and it gave Council a chance to ask questions as well as provide feedback. There would need to be a balance of time limitations for the presentations and feedback would not be necessary. At the same time the presentations need not impede other items or burden the residents to stay longer for items they have attended the meeting to discussion.

Mr. Clifton referenced the two subparagraphs which showed the proposed breakdown for each of the meeting's agenda items.

3. Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the table.

Mr. Lawhorn agreed that work needed to be regarding the meetings. He approached the data from a different angle and advised of his findings for meetings held in 2018:

- 22 regular scheduled meetings
- 14 special meetings
 - 8 were related to the City Manager search or hiring the new City Solicitor
 - 2 were budget meetings
 - 1 was a training

Mr. Lawhorn believed there to only be three special meetings in 2018:

- UD Economic Impact presentation
- Joint Planning and City Council meeting
- Emergency meeting to pass a resolution

Mr. Lawhorn thought those numbers were well under 30 meetings per year. To increase the number of meetings to 45 would be a large increase. He also calculated the length of the meetings and found the following:

- 60%+ ended before 11:00 pm
- 30% ended before 10:00 pm
- 40% went beyond 11:00 pm
 - 4 finished just after 11:00 pm
 - 4 beyond 11:00 pm

Mr. Lawhorn explained the meeting that went beyond 11:00pm had specific items such as Caffè Gelato which took up 5 hours. The Newark Partnership took up 3 hours and over 2 hours were on the Unruly Gathering Ordinance. Within three of the four cases, each took up an extraordinary amount of time. However, the meetings as a whole were efficient. Mr. Lawhorn believed the cause of longer meetings came from how the meeting was managed, the number of items placed on the agenda and how Council conduct themselves during the meeting.

Mr. Lawhorn also reviewed the cost of the meetings. He estimated the cost to have staff run the meetings was around \$1,500.00 per hour. He thought it would be best to gauge the cost against the discussion. There should be an added value to the proposed increase in meetings verses the estimated cost to staff run those meetings. The cost should include the preparation of the agenda, staff discussing with other staff about the agenda and to have someone take the minutes. Mr. Lawhorn added that last year the City Secretary's office received an added position due to the increase in length of time of the meetings.

Mr. Lawhorn preferred to limit the number of meetings. The proposed idea to hold a meeting every Monday night, except for around certain holidays, could limit the pool of council candidates. He felt that Council should be a diverse group but that could be stunted by the acceptance of some of the proposed suggestions. It could make things difficult for a person who was a parent with a full-time job to serve on Council and since that was a large portion of the community, he did not feel it would be a good idea to segment out that population of the community.

Mr. Lawhorn also believed that it would be a negative impact to a work-life balance to hold meetings every Monday. He did not believe that the meetings would be shorter. In Mr. Lawhorn's view, Council became more efficient at the later hour because they felt the urgency. He would like to find a way to drive that efficient behavior throughout the entire meeting which hopefully would lower the length of time spent in meetings.

Mr. Lawhorn offered a few ideas to work towards that goal. The first idea would be to have staff build the agenda with expected time frames per item to help balance out the time allotted. This could double as a tool for the Mayor to either redirect the discussion or suggest the item be held for a later time.

Mr. Lawhorn stated the second idea came from several residents which would be to add the use of timers. He believed this would work with the first idea to have estimated times outlined on the agenda. For example, if an item was expected to take twenty-five minutes and the clock showed it close to the time then they would know how to move forward and could be a tool for the Mayor.

The third idea was to promote public comment via email. Mr. Lawhorn stated he received a lot of his public comments in that manner. It has given him a chance to hear the public's feedback on an ordinance or a project. He then had the time to research or talk to staff for answers to help him formulate

an opinion. Mr. Lawhorn felt that public comments heard moments before when a vote was required, may not have the same value. There could be a way to save time and increase the quality of feedback by prompting the public to contact their council members.

Lastly, Council needed to be cognizant of what they wanted to discuss and to steer away from a "Townhall" style of meeting. He believed the main objective of the meeting was to conduct City business and sometimes items come up which should be held in a workshop setting. Mr. Lawhorn agreed with the idea to have more workshops. The focus should be on the priority as Ms. Bensley did highlight in her memo to figure out the priority of the meeting. The object of these meetings should not be a way to communicate to the masses and would not be a good use of time. Mr. Lawhorn believed if the goal would be to communicate out to residents, he would continue to do so through his newsletters and email communications.

Mr. Lawhorn expressed concern about all the development projects coming. He suggested providing staff with direction to figure out ways to streamline the agenda. He asked if there were items addressed that do not need to be voted on because it was his impression that some items were brought back three times where the same discussion happened and then a vote would happen.

Mr. Lawhorn agreed with the workshop format and would like to find a compromise. He believed the workshops would be a better way to conduct the initial discussions of the meeting. However, he would like to find a way to work that into the current timing structure. He added that personally he did not need to see presentations similar to the Vanguard presentation four times a year. It would be acceptable for those types of presentations to be done once or twice a year.

Mr. Horning agreed with the points and considerations made by Ms. Wallace and Mr. Lawhorn. He also received compliments from residents about Ms. Bensley's and Ms. Schiano's memo. Mr. Horning believed Council had shown consideration to the public and their time, especially in terms of the public comment. He suggested if a topic had the potential for high public interest, maybe the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to indicate the high level of interest. This would help to schedule public comment accordingly. Mr. Horning added that to Mr. Lawhorn's point, to essentially have a meeting every Monday it would limit the applicant pool and limit the diversity for someone who might be interested in City Council service even if it could be amended the following year.

Mr. Horning agreed with Mr. Lawhorn's suggestion to add estimated times per item to the agenda as it may force Council to prioritize. He would also like to understand better the agenda process and the work staff puts into it.

Mr. Horning received feedback from residents regarding the special budget meetings. They found it extremely important to take the time to dig into the details. He believed the special meetings needed to stay in the current format because they deserve the attention to detail they currently receive. Mr. Horning felt that it would be best to schedule special meetings ahead of time so that staff could prepare accordingly for long public comments.

Mr. Markham stated he would be looking for a memo written by Doug Tuttle which had described the following:

- How the workshops should be structured
- How to rearrange council to discuss items coming up
- How to get all the comments and conversations out to be able to take the time out before the next meeting and then make decisions at the next meeting

The basic idea was to have the major conversations at workshops without votes, provide time to digest the information, then to receive more public input for the next meeting and finally Council would move on to make decisions. Mr. Markham thought it would be helpful to have that format of conversation.

Mr. Markham recommended to limit the number of any development projects per night.

Mr. Markham addressed Council comments. He remembered a few years ago there was a public comment made stating that "Council just rubber stamped" everything, they did not ask questions or make comments. Mr. Markham believed there needed to be balance between comments and being talkative.

Mr. Markham did not oppose more meetings, but he did not want to double the number of meetings. There would be a stronger possibility to have less Council on certain nights. He agreed with

the workshop format and to schedule additional meetings on a different night other than Monday. The budget meetings would still need to be held which could be done during a workshop meeting.

Mr. Markham believed that in Robert's Rules the dais would have one chance at a conversation which would limit the number of conversations, but it may not be the right thing to do. Mr. Markham explained the reason was because if two people prior to him ask a question he would then have a different piece of information so if he already spoke then he would not be able to comment further with the new information.

Mr. Markham summarized his thoughts as to agree to one more meeting with a workshop to hold the conversation without voting.

Mr. Hamilton stated he was there to serve the residents and he appreciated public comment. He added that there was a difference between someone emailing him from someone who would speak before Council. Comments made in front of Council become public record. He does not want to limit conversations and prefers to hear from more people. Mr. Hamilton appreciated feedback from residents as they have previously given great ideas and suggestions.

Mr. Hamilton asked if all the staff was required especially in a workshop format. It may deal with a topic that does not concern all departments. He believed money could be saved if meetings were staffed by departments which were part of the conversation.

Mr. Hamilton added that when the conversations happen, they start to formulate an opinion, feel as though they may vote one way and he has had his mind changed many times on votes. Council was there to listen and to communicate. Mr. Hamilton estimated that each Council member per meeting spoke for about 7.41 minutes. It was an opportunity for him to speak to someone new and if they were there they would be there for a reason.

Mr. Hamilton addressed the agenda suggestions. He felt that the Mayor set the agenda and already had the ability to comment if the conversation needed to move on. Mr. Clifton stated he worked with the City Manager and the City Secretary on the agendas.

Mr. Hamilton stated he was willing to work with Mr. Markham's idea to add a workshop each month which did not have to be held on a Monday.

Mr. Hamilton shared that most of his constituents were appreciative to the City for providing more information to the public through the website. He believed the more involved and more informed the people contributes to better relationships and a better town.

Ms. Hughes believed there needed to be a back and forth conversation. Ms. Hughes stated that she was new to Council and a resident in District 2. As a resident she believed time should be added. She agreed with the idea of a workshop or whatever would work to keep the line of communication open to the residents because that was who there were there to serve. Ms. Hughes found the time to attend meetings and she stated it did not matter the day of the week. It would help to have a lot of the items spoken about and others etched out. This would also take a load off of the regular Council meetings and it also helps new Council members such as herself.

Mr. Clifton explained that the recommendation to add additional meetings and possibly to use the format outlined on page 2 of the City Secretary's memo would help lessen the other agendas. This would ensure that the important work could be done where it could not be done in a workshop. If a workshop was needed, then that decision could be made later. Mr. Clifton believed that at least, a third meeting needed to be added to lessen the agenda for the other two meetings especially the meeting which have the land use issues.

Mr. Clifton felt that much of the issues heard at the table would take some downstream planning. Meaning there were issues that once they went through the Planning Department, the clock started to get those issues in front of Council. He thought that with a little help from the Planning Department regarding the land use issues that came before Council could help to stay within their legal constraints to have them done in a timely manner.

Mr. Clifton stated the budget workshops last year was Council's time to work with the Director and City Manager to drill down on the budget. When it came together at the last meeting it seemed to him that there was a lot of questions that could have been asked during the budget conversations. He felt that the entire purpose was to have a format to firstly, enhance public participation because holding

a meeting there until 1:00 am was counterintuitive. Secondly, to allow Council to have an agenda that may go to 9:30 pm or 10:00 pm it would be well accepted and Council would still be thinking clearly to make the best decisions for the City and to the public. His suggestion would be to look at the format and at least have a meeting in-between to take care of what had been previously referred to as “housekeeping ordinances” and items which could be gone through without a lot of conversation.

Mr. Clifton suggested having the presentations placed under Item 11A. This would place Council centered items later in the meeting and require the City Manager to have Council member’s support. Mr. Clifton provide an example of the discussion of the school district on the referendum. Many people in attendance wanted to hear more about the topic, then work their way down for Council to make comments or announcements to end with having the Public Comment. He referenced a time where public comment did not happen until 9:15 pm. He believed it would be fair to the public to add a consistent third meeting.

Mr. Coleman stated from a staff side he was a little hesitant to jump from two to four meetings. It may be difficult to have everything prepared in time for the meetings. If there was a third meeting it would increase the yearly meetings to 36 which would be in line with the number of meetings done in 2018.

Mr. Coleman agreed with the idea of adding a workshop format.

Mr. Coleman added that in general not every department was represented at a meeting. If a specific department did not have an item on the agenda, they were not in attendance. The staff in attendance would be specific to the topic of the workshop. He added the base level of staff who attend every meeting were the City Manager, City Secretary, Deputy City Secretary and a representative from the Communications Department. Historically, in addition to those stated, the Deputy City Manager and the HR and Labor Relations Manager attended but that may not need to continue.

Mr. Coleman felt that if additional meetings were approved, then there should be a serious discussion about the electronic packets as there would be some feedback requested from Ms. Bensley and Ms. Schiano as it may help to speed up the packet production. Another concern about additional meetings was that they would all end up being five hours. If a third workshop meeting was added it would need to have a specific end time where if something was not addressed, it would be added to the next workshop to be discussed.

Mr. Coleman agreed that it would be worthwhile to have Vanguard and the monthly Financial Report. It was recommended last year that those two items could be added to the Consent Agenda for the first half of the year. If a Council member or staff member felt a topic was worth additional discussion, the item could be removed, and placed under Special Departmental Report items. It would be too early in the year to worry about the financial reports from the first three months of the year. Much of the cost at the beginning of the year pertained to the season and weather. Vanguard could be added to the Consent Agenda and if Council wanted to pull it off staff could remove it and then asked them to come to the next meeting to give a presentation and answer questions.

Mr. Coleman voiced his concern about being able to do business and the most important thing would be to get done. He agreed to move the Public Presentations to Item 11 and have a Council member sponsor the presentations. Especially since the data showed that Public Presentations were estimated at 15 hours of last year’s meetings. Mr. Coleman also agreed with the recommendation to add on the agenda the estimated time for each item.

Mr. Markham added that Council members had the ability to pull anything from the consent agenda for a conversation. Mr. Clifton stated this was how Council operated until recently. Mr. Clifton asked Mr. Bilodeau if it had to be written in the Rules of Procedures or was it the discretion of the Chair. Mr. Bilodeau said it was the discretion of the Chair as it had been done before in the same manner. Mr. Coleman said it would help to benefit staff time to move items into the Consent Agenda since it occurred at the beginning of the meeting. Many times, staff stayed just for those items.

Mr. Coleman recommended to move the Recommendations on Contracts & Bids to the Consent Agenda items because recently the conversations were short on time. Mr. Clifton liked the idea which was why he suggested a third meeting to cover “housekeeping” items in a workshop format.

Mr. Clifton opened the floor for public comment.

Amy Roe, District 4, paraphrased from the book titled "The Technological Society" by Jacques Ellul, "When efficiency is a fact, justice becomes a slogan". She asked Council to not become too efficient because the justice component could be lost. Dr. Roe agreed with the suggestion to add time estimates on the agenda as she had attended other meetings where that was a practice. It provided a way to stay on track. She did not agree with the timer suggestion and questioned why there were so many presentations. Dr. Roe posed the question as to why a school board made presentation about a referendum when in her opinion, it did not have anything to do with city government. Dr. Roe added that the school district has a budget for outreach. She felt that if it had nothing to do with the activities of the City, she does not want to see the presentation at a Council meeting. She believed it to be a waste of her time. Dr. Roe continued about the conversations regarding staff time and saving time. The most important time was the public's time as they do not get paid to attend meetings.

John Morgan, District 1, stated that he agreed with much of what had been said by many of the Council members and endorsed Dr. Roe's comments regarding the presentations by the Christina School Board. He addressed the presentation which occurred in November. He thought it was a nice PowerPoint presentation followed by questions from Council and then public comment. He believed the Christina School Board have their own ability to set up listening sessions to hear the concerns of residents not just in the City of Newark but in many other nearby areas too. He urged that the Christina School Board not make regular presentations at Council meetings and suggested yearly presentations.

Dr. Morgan asked how Council was impacted by how the Planning Commission had emphasized their recommendations must be based on only what was in the public record. He believed this would be made up of either public comment at a Planning Commission meeting or through emails submitted 24 hours in advance to be entered into public record. He questioned if it was legal for Council members to make decisions on development projects influenced by email from constituents that were not part of the public record. Mr. Bilodeau explained that the Council could only decide on information presented at the hearing. That would be the record and whatever decision Council would make would need to be supported by the record from the hearing at that Council meeting. Dr. Morgan believed it was important for there to be adequate time for Public Comment in a Council meeting and not rely on emails. It may be different when crafting an ordinance, but public comment must be the primary way for the public to express their thoughts on development proposals and other items.

Mr. Hamilton explained that he has told his constituents to email every Council member and staff and request for their email to be placed into the record.

Jean White, District 1, stated at the April 22nd meeting there were two presentations. One by WILMAPCO and one by the Christina School District regarding the referendum. Ms. White believed there should only have been one presentation and it should have been the Christina School District since the referendum was to happen soon after the meeting. Each presentation was 15 minutes however, with Council's questions added it took an estimated 60 minutes to 75 minutes which made the formal part of the meeting start at 8:15 pm. She believes Council should ask an important question but not double the time.

Ms. White noted the Planning Commission had a very important role in evaluating projects. The Planning Commission had the time to put effort into those projects. She noted they were an advisory to Council and Council made final decision. Ms. White stated her concern was that in the past, she believed some Council members did not study the project and had rubber stamped the project. She hoped that in the future each member would make it clear that the project had been reviewed.

Ms. White believed that the DFIT topic at the last meeting could have been a special meeting or workshop. Ms. White added that the most important thing to her was to hear the public comment at the beginning as they could speak on anything and then speak again later to a particular topic.

Ms. White wanted to address the March 25th meeting which had three development projects that generated many comments. She thought once a project went to the Planning Commission the developer had the right to bring it to the next meeting and someone could comment on it but, was there a way to defer one to the next meeting to keep the number of projects per meeting to two.

Mr. Clifton stated he did not believe every project was under a time restraint.

Mr. Coleman recommended that Public Presentations that were non-City business to be publicly recorded and uploaded to the City's livestream page as an informational presentation. Following would be questions to staff.

Ms. Wallace stated since 2013 the trend had been for longer and more meetings for more than just 2018. There was a lot going on in the City and the meetings had been better attended. Ms. Wallace believed this to be the new normal.

Ms. Wallace felt these recommendations would drive down the cost of the meetings because even if it was not overtime it would be comp time. Comp time could be disruptive and hard for people to manage. She did not believe this to be the best way to manage staff.

Ms. Wallace stated that if meetings were added to the first and third Monday, they should be limited to 9:00 pm. The model was outlined in Ms. Bensley's memo to possibly hold them in a workshop style. Each item would be open for public comment but there would not be an open public comment each time with added Council comments or the Consent Agenda. Ms. Wallace believed having a meeting every Monday or three Mondays per month would help to build a better agenda.

Ms. Wallace added that the previous two special meeting prior took between 2 to 3 months to be scheduled because of scheduling conflicts. Ms. Wallace stated she personally kept her Monday nights open because of being on Council and rather than trying to add on special meetings as topics come up made more sense to her.

Ms. Wallace wanted to reiterate that Public Comment was not taking up the time and she did not want to do anything that would limit it in any way. She had envisioned budget meetings to be done on the first or third Mondays. Ms. Wallace stated that the City Manager brings items to Council first for discussion and encouraged it because she believed it did make Council more efficient.

Ms. Wallace explained that Council was already at three meetings a month which was supported by the numbers. She did not like to have meetings on a Monday night however, per the code at least one of the meetings had to be held on a Monday night. Ms. Wallace believed if all the meetings were held on the same night it would make it easier for the public.

Ms. Wallace believed the electronic packets were in the works.

Ms. Wallace stated County Council met every week and they also have committees. Wilmington does not meet every week, but they also have committees. The City is growing to meet the same levels and Council should do what they can to not short shift the items that need to be discussed but do so in a smarter way.

Mr. Clifton agreed that it would be efficient operating in a smarter format and to Ms. Wallace's point the meetings have grown since 2013. It would be difficult to know when the next major project was to come along and he believed it would be best to position Council to best handle those items.

Mr. Lawhorn believed the consensus and maybe a reasonable compromise would be to add a workshop and one additional meeting. Doubling the amount of meeting would be extreme. He would like to see the workshop format happen during one of the two meetings, but it would be reasonable compromise to add 12 more meetings to the calendar, but it may absorb some of the other special meetings such as the budget meeting.

Mr. Lawhorn believe there were efficiency gains to be made and would like staff to always keep in mind to always evaluate how Council does things and to find ways to streamline the time allotted.

Mr. Lawhorn agreed with the idea to have the presentations to be at the end. He felt some of the presentations were more for Council than for the public which gives Council information to share with the public. He believed the information was better dispersed to the public by either Council or on the City website.

Mr. Lawhorn also agreed with the discipline of time and with the idea to move the Contracts and Bids on the agenda.

Mr. Lawhorn added that emails could be placed on the record it would be responsibility of the Council member to submit the emails for the records and thought it was a good idea to place the estimated time per item on the agenda.

Mr. Lawhorn reiterated that it was a good recommendation to have special meetings. He had requested a meeting last year priorities of the City as a whole which he thought helped to figure out the prioritization of work.

Mr. Lawhorn also believed that there should never be three development projects on one meeting.

Mr. Hamilton agreed to move to four meetings and if there was nothing to be put on the agenda then the meeting could be canceled.

Mr. Clifton asked Mr. Bilodeau if Council could take a vote for direction.

Mr. Markham agreed with the recommendations for the Consent Agenda and asked if it was legal to place them under the Consent Agenda or would there need to be a motion made. Mr. Bilodeau believed that if the contracts were, the bid was to be waived, then there needs to be a discussion and they would not be able to be added to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Markham liked the idea to add the time estimates to each item on the agenda and supported to add one more meeting on a Monday night with the format to be determined. He believed that if a second meeting were to be added, there would be items to fill it.

Mr. Clifton asked Mr. Bilodeau if it was appropriate in terms to give direction to ask for a motion and a vote. Mr. Bilodeau stated yes as the agenda notated that Council may give direction to staff and take votes regarding the path forward.

There was no further discussion from the public or from the table.

MOTION BY MS. WALLACE, SECONDED BY MR. HAMILTON: TO GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF TO ADD MEETINGS ON THE FIRST AND THIRD MONDAY OF THE MONTH AS OUTLINED IN MEMO FROM THE CITY SECRETARY AND IN ADDITION THE MEETINGS SCHEDULED UNTIL 9:00 PM IN A WORKSHOP FORMAT AND RECOMMEND STAFF TO COME BACK WITH AN AGENDA FOR EACH STYLE OF MEETING AT A LATER DATE TO VOTE ON THAT SPECIFIC FORMAT.

Mr. Lawhorn wanted to clarify that the motion was to add two more meetings and to go from 22 meeting to 45 meetings. He also wanted to be clear with the first point that there were 14 special meetings in 2018. Eight of them were related to hiring a City Manager or City Solicitor and one was training. Mr. Clifton stated that he was correct.

Mr. Clifton asked for clarification about the additional meetings for them to limited to 9:00 pm, Ms. Wallace responded yes.

MOTION PASSED: 4 TO 3.

Aye – Clifton, Hamilton, Hughes, Wallace.

Nay – Horning, Lawhorn, Markham.

4. Mr. Clifton moved on to the suggestion to add agenda items for officials from local school districts limited to five minutes.

Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the table.

Mr. Hamilton wanted clarification because Christina School District was local, Newark Charter was its own entity, there was Newark Center for Creative Learning and he was not sure of how many other schools they had in the area. He wanted to make sure that if they were going to add an agenda item for officials from local school districts that they be fair, and it would be representative of the diverse schools in the area.

Ms. Wallace stated she was one of the Council members who made this recommendation and since they had passed the four meetings she wished to withdrawal this item because she felt that there would be an opportunity at the first and third meetings for them to present. Ms. Wallace added that she has heard from other constituents that schools were not there, but they want Council to be involved more to the extent that they could because education and schools were so important to the quality of life in the community to attract new families. She saw it as a benefit to have the schools speak at Council meetings and any school that served the area should have the same opportunity. Mr. Clifton verified that Ms. Wallace wanted to withdraw this request, Ms. Wallace stated yes.

Mr. Clifton asked if anyone had an objection to Ms. Wallace's request. Mr. Markham stated he did not believe they should have an agenda item of their own.

Mr. Clifton explained that there were multiple suggestions for the agenda. He asked if it was the desire of Council to discuss them in their entirety or individually. He recommended that Council look at it as a package of what they agree or disagree with. Mr. Clifton stated from the first bullet point of Ms. Bensley's memo to the following page.

Mr. Markham did not have any recommendations on this list. He suggested to proceed by following the City Secretary's summarized bullets. Mr. Clifton asked if there were any that Mr. Markham was in favor of.

Mr. Markham stated it was a good idea to move the appointments to happen earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Markham felt it would be difficult to know which item would be of the highest priority. Sometimes the Mayor or the Chair need to have the ability to change the order.

Mr. Markham asked how many items were listed under the items not on the public agenda portion of the meeting and thought it went against the whole process.

Mr. Markham was in favor of the recommendation for boards and commissions appointments.

Mr. Markham believed the Items not finished at previous meeting should be earlier in the process since it was on the agenda previously then it should be finished earlier on.

Mr. Markham was not sure about the recommendation to move the development projects up on the agenda. He thought it needed to be eliminated or limit by regulation or by code the number of when the projects come before Council. Mr. Markham asked Mr. Bilodeau if it was by regulation or by code that projects were brought before City Council at a certain period of time. Mr. Bilodeau stated some of the rules were in code. It would depend, it was in the code that Planning Commission had 30 days to decide once they began to consider the project. Mr. Bilodeau would need to look at the particular code to give an answer. Mr. Markham add that if Council could not limit the number of development projects then Council would not be in control of the agenda.

Mr. Hamilton believed appointments to boards, committees and commissions should be moved up because if those being appointed appear it would advantageous to be able to release them early during the meeting. Also, if Council had questions then they could be asked at that time.

Mr. Hamilton stated that if the meetings were to be shorten then he agreed to remove the recommendation to not change the agenda order at the meeting.

Mr. Hamilton agreed to move up Items no finished at previous meeting.

Mr. Hamilton wanted to continue to get consensus on the appointments to be moved earlier and to continue the conversations that were shortened the night before to the next meeting.

Mr. Bilodeau answered Mr. Markham's earlier question by stating that Council had a reasonable amount of time after Planning Commission decides before Council needed to make their own decision. Mr. Markham stated the important part was that then yes, they could control it.

Ms. Hughes wanted clarification on the recommendation to shorten the meetings to 9:00 pm. Mr. Hamilton stated it would be the first and third meetings, the new meetings added.

Mr. Coleman went back to the first motion by Ms. Wallace in as part of that motion was for staff to come back with ideas of the agenda. He asked if they would be getting in front of themselves having the conversation about how to change the agenda when staff does not yet know what will be on the next meeting.

Ms. Wallace said as outlined in the memo from the City Secretary, it was recommended for Council to at this meeting give direction, provide feedback, and then vote later. She thought that to have it in an agenda format to see the difference would help with the final vote.

Mr. Coleman asked what the start date would be for the new meetings after the approval of the agenda at the follow up meeting. Ms. Wallace stated it could be determined upon the return of the City Secretary.

Mr. Hamilton added the recommendation to move ordinances was just placed on because there was some ability to do so.

Ms. Hughes did not have any comments.

Mr. Lawhorn asked if Council was just going over the bullet points on page 3. Mr. Clifton stated there was a lot of redundancy up to the bullet point of Comments and Suggestions.

Mr. Lawhorn was fine to move the appointments up and with the recommendation to move Items not Finished at previous meeting.

Mr. Lawhorn felt that Council should allow themselves the flexibility to change the agenda but not make it a practice.

Mr. Lawhorn thought the recommendation regarding the "highest priority" raised a difficult question. He believed the business of the City that staff felt needed to be done should be the highest priority.

Mr. Horning stated he agreed with the comments made and had nothing to add at this time.

Ms. Wallace felt most of the recommendations were moot since the changes as public presentations was the largest problem. She did want to clarify one item. items not finished at previous meeting was already item four and asked what was being proposed. Mr. Clifton stated it was to move it to the first priority. Mr. Hamilton explained that what had happened previously was that if an item was not discussed, the item was placed back into place under Item 11. Ms. Wallace stated she was in favor of the recommendation that if an item was already on the agenda under the heading it should come earlier at the next meeting.

Mr. Clifton liked the idea to prioritize and thought it was a great topic for its own workshop. He thought it would be prudent to ask Ms. Bensley, Ms. Schiano and Mr. Coleman to bring discussions to find out how Council could also help. Mr. Clifton asked if Mr. Lawhorn agreed and he did agree.

Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the public.

John Morgan, District 1, stated one of the advantages to having four meetings a month was that when the Legislature happens to be in session. Council could interact with their Lobbyist twice as frequently and that was a big plus when the Lobbyist may need feedback on controversial items. He urged that the Lobbyist appear earlier on the agenda so that there could be a full interaction.

Dr. Morgan felt that it was important for public comment to precede the consent agenda so that the members of the public could point out that maybe there was something on the consent agenda that should be pulled. He stated several years ago Dr. Roe identified certain items on the consent agenda that should have been regarded as controversial.

Dr. Morgan addressed the concern Mr. Markham raised about Council not being able to control its own agenda with the timelines to consider development projects which he thought were built into the code. Mr. Bilodeau stated the timeline for when the Planning Commission had something but what he had stated early was that when the Planning Commission makes a recommendation, Council would have a reasonable amount of time to make their decision on that application. Council was not bound to decide within 30 days. Council can control that part of the agenda.

Dr. Morgan said he was disturbed by the Lang Hotel project. He believed it was considered, voted upon and approved by Council before the minutes of the Planning Commission were approved. The Planning Commission had the meeting in early March and when the meeting to approve the Planning Commission minutes was in early April and by March 25th Council had approved the project. If that was legal, his reaction was that there should have been approved minutes of the Planning Commission before the proposal was to be considered by Council and perhaps it needed to be clear in the code.

Jean White, District 1, had two questions regarding the Green Mansion seven story hotel project. She wanted to know why and what happened for it come to Council on March 25th as well as whose decision

was it for it to be brought to Council instead of it being on the first meeting in April. She believed it made it difficult for the public. The project went before the Planning Commission on March 5th and 20 days later it was brought before Council. Mr. Bilodeau stated he was not aware of any requirement to have it on the agenda at that time. Ms. White stated she would also like to know the timeline for when a development project first goes to the Planning Department and then go to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Wallace said that Ms. White and Dr. Morgan brought up some points that needed more attention. Ms. Wallace asked for staff to explain how the decision was made, how the timing played out, who made the decision and why. Additionally, she requested the City Solicitor give an opinion on whether the Planning Commission minutes have not yet been should be voted on by the Commission, could a development project be brought before City Council. Ms. Wallace stated it did not seem like a good idea but wanted to know if it was in the Code and could it be required if it was not already a requirement.

Mr. Coleman explained staff tried to accommodate requests as all three of the development applicants asked to be on an agenda quickly. Staff kept other topics off the agenda knowing that all three of the projects were going to come out of the Planning Commission at the same time. Staff would like to have clear direction from Council to have no more than two. Mr. Coleman felt to limit the agenda to one project per agenda was too restrictive but two was reasonable.

Mr. Markham added that to him there was a difference between major versus minor development projects. Mr. Markham suggested there could be a combination between the two types to make a balance.

Mr. Lawhorn believed an earlier recommendation to add estimated times per item would help and it was a recommendation on which everyone had agreed.

Mr. Coleman stated again if there was clear direction from Council that based on the time estimates the meeting should not extend passed 10:00 pm or 10:30 pm then that would give staff the ability to make clear decisions on how to build the agenda.

Mr. Clifton brought the discussion back to the table for a motion from Council.

MOTION MR. HAMILTON, SECONDED BY MR. HORNING: TO KEEP CONSENT AGENDA AT ITEM 3, MOVE THE APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS TO ITEM 4 AND ITEMS NOT FINISHED AT PREVIOUS MEETING TO ITEM 5.

Mr. Hamilton provided clarification that previously the rule was if the conversation for an item had not started it would be placed back into Item 11, but if the conversation did start it would be moved to Item 4. Now, if it was on the agenda as an item it should be moved to Item 4. Mr. Clifton asked if there was a desire to add a different time frame to Mr. Lawhorn's point to help manage the agenda. Ms. Wallace stated she was going to make a separate motion.

Ms. Wallace thought items not finished and not done need clarification because they were already listed on the agenda as "Items not Finished at Previous Meeting".

MOTION AMENDED BY MS. WALLACE, SECONDED BY MR. HAMILTON: TO KEEP CONSENT AGENDA AT ITEM 3, MOVE THE APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS TO ITEM 4 AND ITEMS NOT FINISHED AT PREVIOUS MEETING NOT STARTED TO ITEM 5.

MOTION PASSED: 7 TO 0.

Aye – Clifton, Hamilton, Horning, Hughes, Lawhorn, Markham, Wallace.
Nay – 0.

5. Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the table for public comment suggestions.

Mr. Hamilton stated currently student representatives were allowed five minutes per meeting and residents only three minutes. He would like consistency for the residents, courtesy for residents and uniformity for everyone.

Ms. Hughes wanted to hear from other Council members.

Ms. Wallace has had residents reach out to her regarding the time difference in favor of the University. However, one difference was that there had been conversation about the University sharing

more and being more involved. She believed that was the original thought behind the change in time. Additionally, the student body representative spoke for a study body not as an individual and may have several items. Ms. Wallace agreed either way as a case could be made for both. She felt that most people ended at the three minutes and the Mayor had been more than accommodating and lenient for those who may have had a few more sentences.

Mr. Horning said he knew of some residents who have felt rushed but for the most part people have been concise within the three minutes. He thought to Mr. Hamilton's point that the perspective was that more time was given to the University more so than the residents and Council members even though they do represent a greater number of people. Mr. Horning agreed with Ms. Wallace that he did not have a strong opinion either way and saw both sides of the concern.

Mr. Lawhorn echoed Ms. Wallace's comments that more minutes for an individual that represents an organization. The other point in Ms. Bensley's memo was that the University never used all the time allotted. Mr. Lawhorn felt that the three minutes in Public Comment was sufficient. If there was a strong drive for them to have the same amount of time, he would rather limit the five minutes.

Ms. Hughes agreed with how the times were set originally. Based on her observations while attending meetings as a resident and council member, the five minute rule should be reinstated. The message was more to the residents that they were worth the five minutes.

Mr. Markham has watched the Public Comment evolve over time being put through a lot of input and perceptions were important. Mr. Markham recommended four minutes for all to be uniform and that the Chair would have the ability to extend and to remind people what the conversation should be.

Mr. Clifton agreed with the recommendation for it to be uniform and appreciated the Councilwoman's comments. If there were to be more residents approach to speak during the Public Comment, he might impose a more rigid standard in respect to everyone.

Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the public.

Amy Roe, District 4, wanted to first correct an error in the memo regarding the public comment reduction of time. She stated it was reduced in 2013. Dr. Roe objected to some of the comments regarding that if she was just a person, she was not speaking for her community. Dr. Roe stated she had attended several meetings on behalf of her Civic Association but, yet she was to be considered three fifths of the University and the University Students. She believed that 97% of the time the University Student Body Representative spoke their own opinion. Dr. Roe added that in 2013 two minutes were taken away from the public comment time and it had made things very challenging. She said there were a number of times when she had presented Council's information which she obtained through the FOIA. She believed that it was information that Council did not know about like the data centers and the Windy Hills Water Tower with the lead contamination issue. Trying to keep those presentations down to three minutes was very difficult and disrespectful. Dr. Roe stated the public had access to their government and they needed to maintain it.

Dr. Roe would like to see five minutes or at least equitable time with the University and the University student.

John Morgan, District 1, said he understood the feelings of Dr. Roe and believed the change was made in 2013. He believed the elected student representatives over the years had been well spoken and polite. Dr. Morgan stated the largest problem to him with the comment time for the University's official representative, Caitlin Olsen, was not the amount of time taken but it seemed the information presented was available by other means or could be communicated by other means. Dr. Morgan felt that it would be better to have higher level University officials with decision making capabilities to appear more often and have a dialogue in public about what the University has tried to do.

Mr. Clifton brought discussion back to the table for further deliberation from Council.

Mr. Hamilton added that the community was made up of people who may be shy or unable to attend. So, some of the comments made were representative of other people beside the individual. He felt it important to make the time equitable for everyone.

Mr. Clifton commented that when he had first started, the public comment was the last agenda item and the meeting started at 8:00 pm. Ms. Wallace stated to Mr. Hamilton's point it would take more

time because it was not just public comment under Item 2 but also for each of the agenda items. Mr. Lawhorn asked for clarification about the topic of public comment and time being discussed.

Mr. Hamilton had a motion but first wanted to discuss. He observed people giving up their additional three minutes and many people finish before three minutes. Mr. Hamilton wanted to introduce the items individually.

MOTION BY MR. HAMILTON, SECOND MR. HORNING: MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS FIVE MINUTES.

MOTION PASSED: 6 TO 1.

Aye – Clifton, Hamilton, Horning, Hughes, Markham, Wallace.

Nay – Lawhorn.

MOTION BY MR. HAMILTON, SECOND HORNING: LENGTHEN THE PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AGENDA ITEMS TO FIVE MINUTES.

MOTION PASSED: 6 TO 1.

Aye – Clifton, Hamilton, Horning, Hughes, Markham, Wallace.

Nay – Lawhorn.

Mr. Hamilton added that he would like to shorten the public comment definition or put it on the City's website. Some residents had complained about it being difficult to read the agenda because of the rules and regulations section.

Mr. Hamilton withdrew the discussion as no one at the table wished to continue the discussion.

6. Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the table for the Boards and Commissions Appointments suggestions.

Mr. Hamilton would like to set the expectation for the Board members to be present in front of Council when they become appointment. During the appointments there have not been any questions, but there have been comments from the public and it would be unfair for the public to have questions and not have the people there to answer the questions.

Mr. Hamilton referred to a suggestion offered by the City Secretary to request in advance of the meeting for the nominee to be present. He felt it would be more unfair to the person who was to be voted on for the appointment. If everyone was there then the expectation would be to show up because the item had moved to the beginning of the meeting. If there were no questions at least Council would have the opportunity to put a face to a name and thank them for volunteering.

Mr. Markham explained that he had asked his nominees to be present and they usually do. Mr. Markham added that once he had the agenda item moved because someone could not attend but then the appointment was left open for a month. He thought that he would support it for the first appointment but not a "sitting" person. Mr. Markham was not ready to make it a requirement.

Ms. Wallace thought it the wrong move to make it a requirement. She gave the example that there could be a great nominee but for extenuating circumstances could not make any Monday meetings. Ms. Wallace stated it should be made as a recommendation.

Mr. Horning agreed with Ms. Wallace's thoughts, but his concern was that he did not have experience to try and find a volunteer, so he did not know if it became more difficult than if they were required to be present on a particular evening. He felt it was already addressed to move the item up on the agenda but thought to require an appearance might go too far. Mr. Horning made a request upon Council to really encourage the nominee to appear unless there was a legitimate conflict.

Mr. Lawhorn agreed with the previous comments and committed to do everything to try and get the nominee in front of Council. He believed it would be better for the nominee to be there but did not want to make it a requirement at this time.

Ms. Hughes did not believe it necessary to make it a requirement. She asked if the appointments were volunteers and Mr. Clifton responded yes. Ms. Hughes stated she agreed with Ms. Wallace.

Mr. Hamilton stated since there was no support to make it a requirement, he would withdraw it. Mr. Hamilton added that he did appreciate those who did reach out to ask for the nominees to be present.

Mr. Clifton added that he would commit to having his nominees present especially on a first appointment.

Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the public.

John Morgan, District 1, said this issue came first back in 2014 and on particular concern for several people was when David Levandoski who was the Director of 1743 Holdings was on the Board of Adjustment. While it was a volunteer position it was a very important position. Dr. Morgan felt that there was not a good reason for Mr. Levandoski to not be in attendance because he lived within walking distance. There was a more extreme case where Mr. McIntosh, a nominee for the Planning Commission was not at a Council meeting where his reappointment was under consideration. Mr. McIntosh did have a good excuse as he had just had eye surgery. Dr. Morgan believed that the general rule should be, with exceptions, first appointments should be in person. Uncontroversial reappointments there would not be a need for the nominee to be at the meeting. Dr. Morgan added that if there were to be a rule exception could be made but they would have to be for very good reasons.

7. Mr. Clifton moved opened discussion to the table for the Ordinance public hearing suggestions.

Mr. Hamilton stated there were some Charter issues he thought the Legislative Department had conversations about this topic. It was frustrating to have a first reading, know there would be numerous questions, but nothing can be said. Then when the second reading happens there needed to be a vote. The challenge comes when people comment with good points, then changes could arise which could push the vote back another 15 days. Whereas if it were open to discussion during the first reading it could have been corrected and time could have been saved. Mr. Hamilton stated it had only happened a few times while he has been on Council. He was in favor of the compromise put forth by Ms. Bensley.

Mr. Clifton asked Mr. Hamilton for clarification that he was speaking about ordinances for the first reading on the consent agenda. Mr. Hamilton said yes. Mr. Clifton stated as a matter of process in the past, if a Council member saw something to be problematic and Council voted as a body to pull it from the consent agenda; then at that point it would be open for conversation. Mr. Markham stated he did not believe ordinances for first readings could be pulled for public comment because the ordinances were not advertised for discussion. Contracts and appointments could be pulled. Mr. Bilodeau added that was when it would become an issue of having a public hearing on something not advertised as a public hearing which would be a problem.

Mr. Clifton stated the more controversial issues tend to be the ordinances which could not be pulled anyway. Mr. Bilodeau responded that if a Council person noted with a first reading of an ordinance it could be pulled, fixed and then resubmitted at the next meeting. It could not have a discussion and comment on the ordinance at that point.

Mr. Hamilton asked how a member of the public would go about voicing concern and request to have the ordinance pulled from the agenda if they cannot comment on it. Mr. Bilodeau said that if the public could contact their Council person ahead of time then that Council person would know. Mr. Markham pointed out that on the agenda the general public comment has been listed before Consent Agenda, so a person could comment then. The requirement to advertise to the public was also the requirement that stops Council from speaking about it in the first reading.

Ms. Wallace felt that she understood Mr. Hamilton. The law for first and second reading it existed for the public to have an opportunity to know when something was to come up. However, it would be unfair to hold a discussion about it and then people who wanted to be in attendance for the public hearing were not there because they saw it was on the first reading.

Ms. Wallace felt that the City Manager was doing a great job bringing items forward. She felt much less that items were surprises and that Council was more involved in the process to craft some of the more controversial ordinances with multiple components.

Mr. Hamilton withdrew concerns for "ordinance public hearing suggestions" and the "take adequate time to discuss and make changes at the Organizational meeting or designate time at a later date to make improvements".

Mr. Hamilton added that for the item “discussion for Council to take a more direct role in their responsibility as a legislative body” came down to policy and he thought it would need to be another discussion.

8. Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the table for the discussion on improving efficiency of Council meeting.

Mr. Lawhorn stated it was a general request that he would like to have Council to work on improving the efficiency of the meeting instead of adding more but the vote had already occurred to add two more. With that said he felt the Council should still consistently work on running an efficient meeting. Many of the points he wanted to make had already been discussed.

Mr. Lawhorn added that he was very concerned that with the addition of two meetings the opposite effect would happen since they do not have the clock ticking. He felt they may end up spending many more hours in meetings and thought it was very important to focus to improve the efficiency of time.

Mr. Markham stated he supported the items not finished or started at the previous meeting but on page 6 of the City Secretary’s memo he was concerned that there was an issue with the advertising. Mr. Markham asked Mr. Bilodeau if that was a problem for the items were for a regular meeting that were not actually started and the advertising. Mr. Bilodeau gave the example of if there was a meeting on the first reading at a regular meeting with the correct advertising it would not be discussed at the next workshop meeting, but it would be two weeks later. It would not be able to go the very next week.

Ms. Wallace explained that it could be changed at any time. Council was required to do this process at a certain point after the election, but they could revisit any of the items. If the four meetings do not work or the five minute public comment takes too long, a Council member could bring forward a motion at any time.

Ms. Wallace felt there needed to be clarification regarding the extension public comment on the general comment for Item 2E or Item 2F and on the agenda items. There had been an unwritten policy of allowing members of the public to transfer time. Ms. Wallace wanted to end that unwritten policy. She asked Mr. Bilodeau if a motion needed to be made. Mr. Lawhorn expressed support for the recommendation. Mr. Bilodeau stated it would need to be a motion.

MOTION BY MS. WALLACE, SECONDED BY MR. HAMILTON: DIRECT STAFF FOR THE SECOND AND FOURTH MEETINGS OF THE MONTH TO WORK WITH THE MAYOR TO BUILD THE AGENDA WITH BEST ESTIMATES OF TIME PER ITEM AND TO END THE MEETING AT 10:00 PM TO INCLUDE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Jean White, District 1, stated she had attended other Council meetings with adjusted times or recommended time, but she did not know how that could be done for development projects. It would depend on how many members of the public would like to speak and comments from Council in questioning the Planning Director but more likely to the developers. It was her opinion it may not be a good idea for development projects to have an estimated time.

Mr. Clifton believed that between he and the City Manager they had enough working experience as well as reading articles in the Newark Post comments enough to recognize which projects may or may not be controversial. Mr. Clifton added that it was a goal for Council to undertake to bring control back to the meeting.

Mr. Lawhorn offered an amendment for 10:00 pm. Ms. Wallace accepted the amendment.

MOTION PASSED: 7 to 0.

Aye – Clifton, Hamilton, Horning, Hughes, Lawhorn, Markham, Wallace.

Nay – 0.

MOTION BY MS. WALLACE, SECONDED BY MR. LAWHORN: THE INFORMAL POLICY OF CEDING TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT BE HALTED.

Mr. Hamilton stated that he appreciated what Ms. Wallace was attempting to do because public comment was extended to five minutes. Ms. Wallace explained that was the way it was previously. Mr. Hamilton said one of the challenges he had, then he asked Ms. Wallace for clarification. Ms. Wallace

provided an example of in the current setting a person has five minutes to talk. In some cases that person could have another member of the public cede their five minutes. So now the first person would end up with ten minutes. In the past when the public comment was five minutes ceding did not occur. The Mayor could grant more time and any Council member could make a request for more time.

Ms. Hughes believed it was all about perception. If Council moved to take away the option to cede time and in the same night increase the Public Comment to five minutes. Ms. Hughes asked if it had been a problem. Mr. Clifton responded that it had not been a problem however, he did recall where a member of the public was to speak on behalf of a larger group. The group had ceded their time to the one individual to discuss all of the concerns of the group.

Mr. Clifton opened discussion to the public.

John Morgan, District 1, believed in the Fall of 2013 or earlier that there was a formal policy allowing the ceding of time which may still be in effect. He felt the change from three minutes to five minutes would address everything that he would want as he tried to keep his comments to be three minutes or less. Dr. Morgan stated the only time he could remember where a council member from a neighboring city attempted to filibuster was during the ordinance prohibiting the open carry of firearms in council. At that time, public officials did not have a time limit to speak. Dr. Morgan urged Council to set a firm limit of ten minutes for any individual to prevent the abuse of filibustering.

Mr. Markham suggested to cede time by one person and that person would have to be present. This would allow it to expand but still have the current idea of the policy.

Ms. Wallace withdrew her motion.

Mr. Coleman said his concern was with a meeting limited to three hours with the public being able to speak up to ten minutes it would be hard to estimate how long an item would take. As an example, a controversial project could end up doubling in length. Mr. Coleman added that he was concerned about doubling the public comment. He stated that if he were to make a recommendation it would be for Council to take advantage of the ability to extend someone's time. If everyone was allowed ten minutes the time could not be taken back and control of the meeting would be lost.

Mr. Markham withdrew his comment.

Ms. Wallace stated she wanted to make a motion and wanted it to be said that this process was about compromise. To reiterated that the rules could be changed at any time. Ms. Wallace added that Council truly respected and appreciated public comments and staff as well. Ms. Wallace resubmitted her motion after hearing from the City Manager.

MOTION BY MS. WALLACE, SECONDED BY MR. LAWHORN: THE INFORMAL POLICY OF CEDING TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT BE HALTED.

MOTION PASSED: 6 TO 1.

Aye – Clifton, Horning, Hughes, Markham, Lawhorn, Wallace.

Nay – Hamilton.

9. The meeting adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

Tara Schiano
Acting City Secretary

/dmp