



# City of Saint Paul

City Hall and Court House  
15 West Kellogg Boulevard  
651-266-8560

## Minutes - Final

### Charter Commission

*Chair Richard Kramer*  
*Vice-Chair Deborah Montgomery*  
*Commissioner Brian Alton*  
*Commissioner Kathi Donnelly-Cohen*  
*Commissioner Bridget Faricy*  
*Commissioner Amy Filice*  
*Commissioner Matthew Freeman*  
*Commissioner John Paul Kirr*  
*Commissioner Joyce Maddox*  
*Commissioner David Maeda*  
*Commissioner Gladys P. Morton*  
*Commissioner Virginia Rybin*  
*Commissioner Gary Unger*  
*Commissioner Rick Varco*  
*Commissioner Carrie Wasley*

---

Tuesday, December 4, 2018

4:30 PM

Room 220, City Hall

---

#### ROLL CALL

*Chair Kramer called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM*  
*Commissioners signed in via check-in sheet*

*Chair Richard Kramer - present*  
*Vice-Chair Deborah Montgomery - present*  
*Commissioner Brian Alton- present*  
*Commissioner Kathi Donnelly-Cohen - present*  
*Commissioner Bridget Faricy - present*  
*Commissioner Amy Filice - absent*  
*Commissioner Matthew Freeman - present*  
*Commissioner John Paul Kirr - excused*  
*Commissioner Joyce Maddox - present*  
*Commissioner David Maeda - present*  
*Commissioner Gladys P. Morton - excused*  
*Commissioner Virginia Rybin - excused*  
*Commissioner Gary Unger - present*  
*Commissioner Rick Varco - present*  
*Commissioner Carrie Wasley - present*

#### 1 [CCI 18-1](#)

#### Introduction of New Commissioners

*Matt Freeman, Currently County Relations Director in the Department of Human Services, previously worked in Secretary of State office and State Mayor Coleman MN Legislature, Dept. of Agriculture. Lives in Ward 3 and will be moving to Ward 2*

*Gary Unger, Ward 6, Retired from 3M. Involved with various committees: County CIP, Capital Bonding, President of District 2 Community Council, happy for new challenge.*

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*Chair Kramer: There is an addition of two more resolutions asking for action sent by City Council included in the staff reports, consider these items on the agenda.  
Commissioner Varco moves to approve the agenda  
Commissioner Alton Seconds  
Approved by unanimous vote*

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- 2      [CCI 18-2](#)      Approval of the December 27, 2017 Minutes

**Attachments:**      [Minutes of the December 27, 2017 Charter Commission Meeting](#)

*2017 Charter Commission meeting minutes.  
Commissioner Donnelly-Cohen moves to approve  
Commissioner Montgomery seconds  
Adopted by unanimous vote*

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

*None.*

**REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE**

- 3      [CCI 18-3](#)      Committee Reports

*Committees did not meet in 2018*

- 4      [CCI 18-7](#)      Committee Sign-up

*Sign up sheet circulated for those interested in serving on Charter Review Committee and Communications Committee. Only 7 persons may sit as a committee to avoid a quorum. Others may attend meetings. Mr. Alton has served as chair of the Charter Review Committee, and if still willing, can be considered appointed.*

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

*None*

**NEW BUSINESS**

- 5      [CCI 18-4](#)      Staff Report: Ramsey County Elections Update from Joe Mansky, Ramsey County Elections Manager

**Attachments:**      [memo to charter commission on suggested charter changes](#)  
                                 [Chapter 8.02 and 8.03 amendments](#)  
                                 [Butler Letter](#)

*As noted in his memo, they have received an increased number of petitions from citizens, so this might be a good time to review mechanics of when you can submit petitions and how they are inspected.*

*Brought a couple amendments to the charter that might be considered*

*Petition was started during the election, but submitted after election day, unsure which election to use to determine how many signatures they would need. He suggests that if this situation happens again that both elections would be looked at, and go with election with smaller number of votes cast.*

*For referendum items, it clarifies that the number of signatures required would be determined on the day that the ordinance in question would be published by the City Clerk. There would be a date certain that would occur.*

*Commissioner Varco: You went with fewer votes, is that required, or could we go with more votes?*

*Mansky: That is totally up to you.*

*The second proposal has to do with the manner in which petitions are submitted and reviewed by staff. Want to make sure everything in our position to inspect someone's the petition is available to the public. The document currently used from the state-wide voter registration system is called the Public Information List and would like to state formally that is the document used. The benefit would be that any question from petitioner on what we did, a list can be provided because the list is public. It is possible that a name or two. We can give the list to a petitioner if they think someone was missed, the list can be given and they can show where the name is on the list. The charter provides that a person needs to be registered to vote in order to sign. Would want to make clear that the determination will be made on the day they submit the petition. The benefit of this is that if they find when they circulate the petition that someone is not registered, they should register them on the spot, turn in documents before the petition is submitted, so that new registrants can appear on the list.*

*Questions -*

*Commissioner Maeda: We had information provided to us this year that a candidate petition could check eligible voters- is there a reason why that's different?*

*Mansky: The filing fee petitions are signed by eligible voters, however the activities described in the charter are legislative activities, they involved initiative referendum recall, or related petition not affected by the charter are charter amendment petitions provided by state law. Charter amendment petitions do require registered voters and have for over half a century. We are not proposing any changes to that. In the last year alone, we received 3 referendum petitions, and using criteria described here, all of them have cleared without any problem.*

*Commissioner Faricy: Clarify - the list of people who sign petition is private/ or kept from public view.*

*Mansky: Previously, we would look people up on our database. The database has non-public data. A person could not sit in the office while we look people up. We need a document that is completely public, so we can turn it over after the process is*

completed and you can see exactly what we did when inspected the petition and that is why we would like the charter to provide that we use this public information list to inspect all petitions.

Commissioner Faricy: Information like date of birth could be sensitive for some people- would that be published?

Mansky: Public list would only include information available to the public. The database has day and month of birth, which are not public, part of social security which is not public, drivers license number, and other information which is disclosed to the public. Candidates use the public list for campaign purposes, it includes year of birth, and that is public information.

Commissioner Varco: If someone is not registered or registered at a different address when they sign the petition, potentially they could fill out a voter registration form and therefore be valid.

Mansky: Yes. We do provide petitioners with voter registration applications so they can do just that.

Commissioner Varco: When you make the list of rejected signatures public, does provide an opportunity for anyone rejected or others on their behalf to challenge that ruling?

Mansky: Yes. There is a provision in the charter for the petitioner to gather additional signatures. You can see what we are proposing to do is to tell you what we think is wrong with the petition, and give you the list we used and allow you to point out where and error that we made might have occurred.

Commissioner Freeman: If an individual signs the petition, proceeds to move between the petition is turned in, will their signature be considered valid or invalid signature?

Mansky: If you move between signing the petition and the time the petition is submitted, you are not registered to vote on the day the petition is submitted. If you move and then go to vote that day, what do you have to do?

Commissioner Freeman: You would have to verify your address.

Mansky: You would have to re-register to vote.

Commissioner Freeman: If you move after signing and then reregister at your new address, that registration would not match the signature, although you are a registered voter?

Mansky: If you didn't take any action so that the address on the petition is different than public list we would reject that. If you sign the petition, fill out the application, so that the information we had on the list matched voter registration system, then we would be able to count that signature.

Commissioner Freeman: You could be a registered voter when you sign, register in new location, and still be ineligible.

Mansky: The thing that makes us able to count signatures is that we are able to match up addresses. If you can't do that then we can't confirm that you are registered to vote.

Commissioner Freeman: Is there a remedy available to those that have signed the petition, other than signing again with the new and most current address to make them valid?

Mansky: The later course of action would be the way to do that. Strike their first signature and sign it again with their new and current address.

Freeman: If they were not deemed an eligible signature, were provided the list, verified that they were that individual and verified that they registered at a new address, would that be sufficient to verify the previous signature, or would that still be invalid.

Mansky: As long as the signature on registration matches the signature on the petition the day it is submitted, we can then accept that signature.

Chair Kramer: Typically, you provide an update on voting machine, is there any information there?

Mansky: We conducted two recounts, one in Vadnais and one in Maplewood.

*In Vadnais Heights the result was exactly the same. In Maplewood, we had a small difference, added a few votes to both candidate. Many times, the voters occasionally make mistakes. The rate that we determined in the Coleman/Franken recount, for every 1,000 ballots we examine, about two will have marks not instructed to do, but are close enough to a candidate that we can determine intent and count it. As ballot's get bigger we start to see that.*

*Vadnais heights did not have a lot of ballots, so it is no surprise that the votes were right on.*

*Maplewood, we counted 18,000 ballots and at that point, that effect started to become apparent, it is a mathematical certainty that as number gets larger, more likely to have errors (presidential election numbers in the last election). Our voter registration is at an all time high. More people voted prior to election day in St Paul than any other election, prior to election day, even two years ago.*

*Ballots where votes are marked 2 for every 10000 cast were marked so the equipment couldn't count it, but with visual examination, we could determine their intent.*

*Chair: is that people circling a name?*

*Mansky: Circling, putting an x next to a name but not in the box, marking the box with something the ballot counter couldn't read, not filling in the target enough, crossing out a name. One had a name crossed off, but other names filled in, the board could not determine the intent, so the vote was not counted.*

*Commissioner Freeman: Another question about the previous matter: your proposal doesn't change required matching information or stringency of matching of signature in the process. Just how you determine the number of signatures?*

*Mansky: Just so you know we are not comparing signatures, because we don't have that information in our database. What we are looking for is did that person sign more than one line and simply name, address, date of birth match record and petition.*

*These are the times in which we live – we have people who say we are too hard on petitioners, others say we are too easy. If we see petition where year of birth is different on the petition than the voter registration records, we have a legitimate concern that someone else who is not that person signed the petition. It is unfortunate that we have to think that way, but that's just the lay of the land.*

*Commissioner Freeman: You are not making recommendation on making them more or less stringent, merely the matters laid out in your proposal.*

*Commissioner Faricy: What concerns me is the number of people – 25 percent of registered voters have inactive status. Is that an accurate number that comes from Peter Butler?*

*Mansky: I think he is citing the legislative auditor's report and that is correct. I'll just remind you that it's easy to register in MN, voter registration is at an all time high. In the 16 years I've been checking petitions on your behalf, only rejected one petition, and it was his.*

*Commissioner Faricy: My concern is that something like that is easily remedied at the polling place... instantaneously.*

*Mansky: it is also easily remedied by the petitioner as they are circulating the petition. We advise petitioners who talk to us first, we advise them to get a copy of public information list from the Secretary of State. Then can easily validate as they go along, to do their own checking to make sure they have valid signatures*

*Commissioner Faricy: So, they have to go through the list of 30,000 names each time they go door-to-door?*

*Mansky: No, but if they would check it periodically during the time the petition is in circulation. If they don't, we certainly will.*

*Commissioner Varco: We said 25% of people – the document refers to records, is it the case that each person has one and only one record? Or may some of the inactive people have also have an active registration where they registered at a previous address and then moved.*

*Mansky: No. You have one record. The only way to become inactive is by not voting once every four years.*

*Commissioner Varco: I am confused then because in Minnesota you have 5,413,000 records of voters, and the population is only 5.489 Million.*

*Mansky: We have inactive records going back to mid 1990s.*

*Commissioner Varco: So those people may be dead?*

*Mansky: If they are dead we remove them, they are living in other states, haven't voted...*

*Commissioner Varco: Let me rephrase my question: it is not the case that correct every inactive corresponds to living person who is currently in MN*

*Mansky: I couldn't tell you that definitively. If someone passes away out of state, we wouldn't know about it. If they pass away in MN, we get the death record and their status is changed, they are no longer inactive, they become deceased.*

*We don't purge records since the enactment of the "Help America Vote Act" We simply inactivate them. Inactive voters are not registered. To restore status, they have to fill out a voter registration application.*

*Commissioner Freeman: If you are a registered voter, sign the petition, you move but don't vote in election, you would be considered a legitimate signature because you would still be active on the voter registration list, because there wouldn't be an indication that you moved.*

*Mansky: That is correct.*

## 6 [CCI 18-5](#)

### Report from the City Clerk

**Attachments:**    [RES 18-1727](#)  
[Charter Letter 4.04](#)  
[Proposed Amendments to Chapters 11 and 6](#)  
[RES 18-1958 with attachment](#)  
[RES 18-1962 with attachment](#)

*Staff Report: City Clerk, Shari Moore*

*Chair Kramer: We will now hear from City Clerk, Shari Moore regarding other proposed amendments and recommendations from the City Council.*

*Ms. Moore: On October 17, 2018, City Council adopted a resolution 18- 1727 requesting charter commission to review the proposed amendments to the City Charter 4.04. The amendments would allow, the City Council, set by an ordinance, so rules that would be set up in an ordinance, to cancel council meetings other than what is already listed in the charter as meetings that will not be held. Currently the council does not meet the fifth Wednesday of the month, the week of the 4th of July, the week of Thanksgiving, and the week of Christmas.*

*So, what they are asking for here is to put into ordinance to be able to cancel additional meetings if warranted. For example: looking ahead to 2020, will have new council come in and inaugurated, the way the calendar falls in 2020 is the 1st is on a Wednesday. So, the council would need to meet the same day that week, to try to get the public and a quorum the 30th and 31st or on the 1st and 2nd and have the inauguration on the 1st or 2nd would be some logistical headaches. It's the rare occasion with something like this, or the rare occasion that the majority of the council wants to attend National League of Cities. It would be prescribed number of days, set in ordinance it wouldn't be something that they would decide next week. There are public notification and things of that matter that would be taken into consideration.*

*Commissioner Alton: Question about grammar: You could read this to say... "provides*

*notice of cancellation under a procedure outlined by ordinance, during the weeks in which the legal holidays of Independence Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas occur.” You could read this to say you could cancel during these 3 weeks.*

*Ms. Moore: We can change that.*

*Commissioner Varco: Ordinances normally require 4 readings for weekly meetings, is there any procedure, like in the legislature where you can declare an emergency and waive those rules so that you could pass an ordinance in one meeting?*

*Ms. Moore: We do have emergency ordinances that the council can pass. We also have in our procedures that the Council Secretary, if the members are not able to attend, can call the meeting and essentially cancel it.*

*Commissioner Varco: So, if the council so chooses, under this language, they could declare an emergency, pass an ordinance, and cancel the meeting for next week?*

*Rachel Tierney: Chapter 6.06 of the Charter which defines emergency ordinances. It needs to be a sudden, unforeseen situation affecting life, health property or the public peace or welfare that needs immediate action. So, it’s a fairly high bar.*

*Ms. Moore: The intent would be for the unusual year we would have enough public notice hearing notice, publishing in the newspaper, keeping within those timelines.*

*Commissioner Freeman: Did the council discuss other incidences or scenarios beyond their individual instance January of 2020 where they would need to cancel a meeting? You mentioned League of Cities, travel. Is there an interest in this being utilized in a wider sense beyond the one instance.*

*Ms. Moore: I do not believe council discussed this matter. It was our director, Trudy Moloney and I, when planning the 2020 inauguration. If I may add, Councilmembers have attended conferences, things like that, but try to juggle schedules so at least quorum is present. Things like that do not happen a lot. It would be beneficial to them to have that option.*

*Commissioner Freeman: If this was not passed, by the Charter Commission or changed, what would be the remedy in 2020? Would they just have to have meeting and inauguration? Meeting of existing or previous council?*

*Ms. Moore: The Charter just says they need to have a meeting.*

*Commissioner Varco: Given that you want to fix that problem, when do you need action by Charter Commission in time to fix that problem?*

*Ms. Moore: There are a few deadlines. State statutes states that you as a body need to act on this item in 60 days. You can request 90 additional days by passing a resolution and filing it with the City Clerk. That’s a timeline that’s set for you. We would need it by end of summer for our ordinance to be in effect, and time to send out the schedule. There are public hearing notices that go out 30 days in advance.*

*Commissioner Varco: Can we do it now?*

*Chair Kramer: We would have to waive our readings if we did. Continue?*

*Ms. Moore: Last week the Council passed two other Resolution asking for review from you as a body. Public Hearing 19-1958 Requesting the Saint Paul Charter Commission to review the proposed ordinance amending Charter Section 11.03 regarding the City of Saint Paul’s Property Tax Authority.*

*And Resolution Public Hearing 18-1962 Requesting the Saint Paul Charter Commission to review the proposed ordinance amending Charter Section 6.03.1 regarding an amendment to allow the City of Saint Paul to enact an ordinance that allows the imposition of civil penalties for violations of city ordinances.*

*We do have staff people here from both departments, if you wish to hear from them.*

*Chair Kramer: I think since they are here we should give them an opportunity to answer any questions*

*John McCarthy, Budget Director Office of Financial Services: The item related to property tax authority is a housekeeping change that came to our attention while doing*

research on something else that this language is still in the charter and refers to statutes that no longer exist and have been appealed. It refers to mill rates which is not how we calculate property taxes in MN and haven't for quite some time, so we want to strike that language. We want to update that to be more accurate and reflect the current property tax system is in Minnesota and the City of St. Paul.

Chair Kramer: do you have a timeline for this change?

John McCarthy: There is no urgency on this it has been like this for a while. There are potentially other changes and wanted to add this along with other changes.

Chair: Any questions?

Deputy Director Bistodeau: Travis Bistodeau, Deputy Director Department of Safety and Inspections. I am speaking on behalf of the department in support of amendment to chapter 6. Will read a short statement and can stand for questions. This amendment, according to the City attorney's office, is foundational in establishing the ability of the city to issue administrative citations to property owners who fail to comply with the city's legislative code. The creation of administrative citations will allow for a new enforcement tool that in some cases will be more effective than the existing tools we have at our disposal and are more right-sized for the type of deficiencies we see in the city. Rather than issuing a criminal citation to the property owner, or vacating the property for non-life-threatening deficiencies, the city will be able to issue financial consequence to the owner and encourage future compliance and do so in a timely manner. In addition, administrative citations will reduce unintended consequences of the city's current enforcement actions which often include displacing tenants or other users or occupants. Administrative citations are a proven tool in other municipalities within the state. These citations can be structured so that repeat violations escalate in fines. If repeat violations escalate the fines and if deficiencies are not corrected, in some cases those fines can be assessed to property taxes, further encouraging compliance of those property owners. Lastly, administrative citations are not just a tool for DSI. Other city departments, such as HREEO, may find use of this enforcement mechanism beneficial to daily operations.

Commissioner Freeman: What other municipalities have this ability?

Deputy Director Bistodeau: Minneapolis, Duluth, Bloomington, St. Cloud, West St. Paul, Woodbury, Coon Rapids, Brooklyn Center and Brainerd. I personally have used them with Bloomington and St. Cloud.

Chair Kramer: Chair any further questions?

Commissioner Maeda: Is there any opportunity to appeal? What is the process?

Deputy Director Bistodeau: Typically, it is an independent, third party hearing officer that would be contracted to hear individual appeals. It would be a question for legal counsel as to what is the appeal process following that determination by the hearing officer. In my experience, I haven't had anybody appeal an independent hearing officer with the municipalities that I have worked with.

Commissioner Faricy: Did number of citations go up after implementation of the civil penalties versus criminal? Or is that historical?

Deputy Director Bistodeau: I am not familiar, I never been in city where implemented, and worked through that process, so I don't know if the numbers typically go up or if they would decrease after instituting this practice.

Commissioner Freeman: Could you give examples of what the uses for HREEO would be versus DSI?

Deputy Director Bistodeau: Possible use might be fair housing provisions where they could use some provisions, minimum wage, sick and safe might be another application that might be useful for them. We brought this before the mayor's office as part of our budget process this session. Unfortunately, we do have a process where we displace tenants with our enforcement action, through no fault of their own. We would much rather go after the property owner versus having unintended consequences for those tenants. That's really where this originates from for my department.



*Chair Kramer: Any other questions?*

*As this works through the process, someone from your office will be available?*

*Deputy Director Bistodeau: Yes.*

*Chair Kramer: We did not list these items on agenda with intent of taking action today, since some of them have come very quickly. It would be my suggestion that when the Charter Review Committee is reconstituted, we charge Chairman Alto to call a meeting of that committee to make recommendations to act on these amendments, and then we will call a charter commission to act on the proposed amendments.*

*At that time – they have to have readings - we can waive readings and if the Charter Review Committee's recommendations are non-controversial can waive readings and enact them at the next Charter Commission meetings. Or, if you want, we can have several meetings and conduct all the readings as required by our standing rules. Once we vote on them, they need to go to the City Council, where they need to be unanimously approved to amend the charter. Does that sound right, Rachel?*

*Rachel Tierney: Yes.*

*Commissioner Unger: Motion that we send it to committee.*

*Commissioner Faricy: second*

*Chair Kramer: Is there any discussion? All those in favor of referring the proposed amendments to the Charter Review Committee for review and recommendation:*

*Commissioner Freeman: My question – for the timelines for the additional amendments for the proposed amendments that Clerk Moore cited exist of 60 days and our ability to meet that or have opportunity to extend that further.*

*Ms. Moore: Keep in mind that the first resolutions was adopted on October 17, the 60 days does not start today*

*Commissioner Alton: Could we just do the scheduling one right now?*

*Chair Kramer: We'll have to refer to Rachel on that.*

*Rachel Tierney: According rule number 5 of your standing rules, no such vote shall be taken until proposed changes and language have been presented in written form and read at two separate meetings. So, you do have to have a second meeting, but you can adopt at the second meeting. The MN law requires that to do the 90-day extension, you have to pass a resolution which you can make a record of what that can be and just vote on it. We can type it up and get it where it needs to be. But that does have to happen by a specific vote. And you need to make a finding that additional time is necessary.*

*Commissioner Alton: In respect to the amendment to sections 8.02 and 8.03, I would make a motion to extend for 90 days, the period of time required for action on the basis that this originally passed on October 17, 2018 and we are now meeting on December 4, 2018 to allow sufficient time. Correction: section 4.04*

*Unger seconds*

*Chair Kramer: Discussion?*

*Commissioner Freeman: Just want to review the timeline for the other ones, 11/28 would carry out then and give is sufficient time line to complete those. Asking for an extension on one and needing an extension for the others we might as well do it in one piece*

*Chair Kramer: I think that is a reasonable motion, but you have to state reasons.*

*Commissioner Freeman: As I think aloud, 60 days gets us to the end of January and will we complete it in that time. As this is my first meeting, I don't have any awareness of how quickly we will move forward with subcommittee and other work. I would defer to feedback from other members if that is a reasonable timeline for other two motions as well.*

*Chair Kramer: Thoughts anyone?*

*Commissioner Alton: I think it would be fine to consider that extension of time if we are*

*not going to meet before. I think we should do it by separate resolution.*

*Chair Kramer: We'll Vote on your original resolution now and come back to that.*

*All those in favor of the motion by Alton to extend consideration period say Aye.*

*Chair Kramer: Motion passes. A resolution will be prepared and submitted to the City Clerk.*

*Commissioner Alton: As long as these are going to be referred to the Charter Review Committee, as Chair of the Charter Review Committee, I move accordingly to respond to resolutions 18-1958 and 18-1962 on the basis that additional time is required fully to consider these matters*

*Commissioner Varco seconds*

*Chair Kramer: Discussion on the motion?*

*All in favor, please say aye – unanimous vote*

*Chair Kramer: Carried, and will require a resolution.*

*Your Charter Review Committee will take up anything that has been brought before us that doesn't have a time line for referral back or what have you.*

#### [CCI 18-11](#)

A Resolution under Minnesota Statute Section 410.12, subd. 5 extending the time period for the charter commission to review the proposed amendment to Chapter 4.04 of the Saint Paul City Charter.

#### [CCI 18-12](#)

A Resolution under Minnesota Statute Section 410.12, subd. 5 extending the time period for the charter commission to review the proposed amendment to Chapter 11.03 of the Saint Paul City Charter.

#### [CCI 18-13](#)

A Resolution under Minnesota Statute Section 410.12, subd. 5 extending the time period for the charter commission to review the proposed amendment to Chapter 6.03.1 of the Saint Paul City Charter.

### 7 [CCI 18-9](#)

A Resolution of the Saint Paul Charter Commission Directing the Chair of the Commission to submit the 2018 Annual Report to the Chief Judge of the Second Judicial District.

*Chair Kramer: Item 7, in the state statutes there is a requirement to submit an annual report to the chief judge, which had never been done as long as I have served on the Charter Commission, but finally caught up on that last year and we need to pass for this year. Before us is a proposed resolution which is an annual report in packet in the form of resolution. It states that we held our only meeting on December 4th for this year and we need a motion to consider that for this year.*

*Commissioner Varco: Motion*

*Commissioner Montgomery: Second*

*Chair Kramer: All in favor of the resolution of the Charter Commission directing the Chair to submit the annual report say aye*

*- unanimous vote*

*Chair Kramer: The Annual report is approved.*

### 8 [CCI 18-10](#)

Election of 2019 Officers

*Election of 2019 Officers*

*Chair Kramer: Item 8 is the election of 2019 officers. Nominations for the office of chair?*

*Commissioner Alton: nominates Richard Kramer to be chair in 2019*

Montgomery seconds

Chair Kramer: additional nominations?

Commissioner Alton: moves unanimous ballot

Richard Kramer as 2019 chair

Chair Kramer: Nominations are now open for vice chair:

Commissioner Alton: I nominate Commissioner Montgomery

Commissioner Donnelly Cohen: second

Chair Kramer: Are there further nominations?

All those in favor of electing Debbie Montgomery as Vice Chair say aye.

Approved by unanimous vote.

Chair Kramer: And then we need secretary.

Commissioner Alton: Moves reelecting Virginia Rybin as secretary

Chair Kramer: Second?

Commissioner Faricy: second

Chair Kramer: Further nominations? Motion in order for unanimous ballot.

Commissioner Alton moves

Chair Kramer: All those in favor of electing Virginia Rybin as Secretary for 2019 say aye

Approved by unanimous vote.

## OTHER BUSINESS

### 9 [CCI 18-6](#)

#### Set dates for 2019 meetings

Chair Kramer: We need to select date for 2019 meeting. Commissioner Alton can set a date for the Charter Review Committee.

Commissioner Alton: January 14 would be a good date

Chair Kramer: Why don't we set date for Charter Review Committee January 14, 2019 and January 28, 2019. We can cancel that if need be.

We also need a charter commission meeting in February.

Commissioner Freeman: Monday, February 11, 2019 seems fine. Is there any meeting notice issues if we need to take action on January 28?

Chair Kramer: I think we need 3 days notice before meeting. We will set dates of January 14 and 28 for Charter Review Committee, noting that we will cancel the 28th if need be. We will also set a Charter Commission meeting for February 11.

All meetings will meet in this room. Can we give notice of intent to waive readings on the agenda?

Rachel Tierney: I don't think that's necessary.

Commissioner Freeman: When do we decide if we will waive future readings.

Chair Kramer: We would vote to waive additional readings on the 11th. I guess we can take comments from commissioners now. Probably our intent on the February 11th meeting, that we would not schedule additional readings on the Charter review committee's additional recommendations, but that we would move to recommend them to city council for amendment to the Charter, unless something blows up. Does that sound reasonable? That we proceed with final charter commission action on 11 of February.

Other business:

Commissioner Varco: Are sign up sheets for committees are sufficient to constitute them or do we need to take action?

Chair Kramer: Previously, we decided that the chair would appoint committees. And if you want to proceed with that, that's fine. There are a couple commissioners who aren't here, I don't know if we want to afford them an opportunity to sign up for committees or not?

*Commissioner Freeman: Can you describe for me what communications committee does?*

*Chair Kramer: Previously they did work when we did redistricting they on getting notices out about hearings for redistricting. Right now you have six people signed up for Charter Review Committee. Donnelly-Cohen, Alton, Unger, Freeman, Varco, Montgomery, and Carrie, you arrived after we passed this, were you interested?*

*Commissioner Wasley: Yes*

*Chair Kramer: That gives us seven, which is one short of a quorum. I may attend the meeting, but not be a voting member.*

*Commissioner Varco: moves to appoint those seven people, if you think that's a needed motion.*

*Chair Kramer: my only concern that previously Kirr and others might have been on it. But you certainly can vote to appoint this group.*

*Commissioner Varco: If other people wish to serve, you would simply select seven and appoint them? Do we need to give you that authority?*

*Chair Kramer: I would prefer you just approve list and then be done.*

*Commissioner Varco: moves to approve the list*

*Commissioner Montgomery: second*

*Unanimous vote*

*Chair Kramer: Charter Review Committee, you can select your own chair, but Brian will start it out. I don't think we need to take any action on the Communications Committee since only two persons have signed up, but if someone wants to jump in, let us know.*

*Chair Kramer: Is there any news or announcements?*

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*Commissioner Varco moves to adjourn*

*Commissioner Donnelly- Cohen second*

*Chair Kramer: Meeting adjourned.*

## **For More Information**

**Rachel Tierney, Deputy City Attorney, [rachel.tierney@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:rachel.tierney@ci.stpaul.mn.us), 651-266-8710**

**[CharterCommission@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:CharterCommission@ci.stpaul.mn.us)**