

**Milton Charter Commission
April 11
Minutes/Agenda Summary**

1. Meeting called to order at 6:06 p.m. with a quorum recognized. All members present, plus Chris Lagerbloom, Ken Jarrard and Christine Doss.
2. March 21, 2012 minutes – motion and second to approve the minutes, 5-0 to approve.
3. Motion and second to approve agenda as published – 5-0 to approve.
4. Discussion of Charter recommendations thus far made.

Member advised that the minutes of the March 21, 2012 provide the best guide as to what has been approved for recommendation thus far. Discussion ensued regarding bringing in stakeholders, like State representatives and others to go over the proposed recommendations. Discussion ensued regarding whether there had been input from any City Council members. No such feedback, other than the original recommendations by the Council.

5. Charter issues
 - a. Minor points from previously discussed power point presentation

A discussion ensued as to whether there were any remaining items. The topics to be discussed were:

Section 1.12(b)(38) - there was a request to add the phrase “pain management clinic” into the Charter. **There was a motion and second to recommend addition of the phrase “pain management clinic” to this Section. Motion passed 5-0.**

Section 2.15(a)(4) – a discussion ensued regarding the phrase “valuable gift.” The Commission determined to take no action.

Section 3.12 – a discussion ensued regarding whether language providing for the City to have investigative and subpoena powers should be changed. The Commission determined to take no action on this item.

Section 3.20(c) – a discussion occurred as to whether the requirement of the ‘printing’ of approved ordinances should be analyzed. The Chairman directed that Section 3.20(c) be added to the next Charter Commission agenda. The City Manager advised that he would get with the City Clerk and receive feedback on the actual process for publishing ordinances after they are approved. This will be addressed at the next Charter Commission meeting.

Section 3.23 - a discussion ensued regarding whether the process associated with removal of the City Manager should be reviewed. After discussion, it was the consensus of the Council that no action was warranted.

Section 4.11(g) – a discussion ensued regarding whether Charter language should be modified such that a board or commission member may be removed by majority vote, with no requirement that “cause” be established. **Motion and second made to make this change. Motion approved 5-0.** Therefore, the new language will read:

Any member of a board, commission, or authority may be removed from office ~~for cause by~~ majority vote by a vote of the city council.

Section 4.11(h) – a discussion ensued regarding whether the Charter Commission should address attendance and other issues related to Boards and Committees. The consensus of the Commission was to take no further action on this section.

b. District Boundaries

The City Manager distributed maps reflecting different configurations. The City Manager advised that the local delegation believes the City needs to redistrict. There were multiple maps/configurations of Council member districts discussed. A member inquired as to whether moving toward fewer districts made sense. The consensus is that fewer districts made sense but further discussion was warranted.

A discussion ensued regarding the pros of three districts versus six. One argument was that condensing/consolidating district boundaries was to open up the pool of candidates that would be eligible to serve on volunteer boards and committees, and to provide greater flexibility on such appointments. Also, a point was raised that it might save election costs, particularly if it resulted in the removal of a voting precinct.

The consensus was again that three districts were preferable. The discussion then turned on which three-district map was preferable. **A motion was made to recommend 3 districts and that the district map identified as Milton 12-3dp2 be forwarded as the Charter Commission’s recommendation. Second was given. Vote was 5-0 in favor.**

c. Committee appointments

Section 4.11(b) – a discussion ensued regarding modifying 4.11(b) of the Charter per verbiage provided by a member. A motion and second were made to recommend the following language:

All members of boards, commissions, and authorities of the city shall be approved by a majority vote of the city council for such terms of office and in such manners as shall be provided by ordinance, except where other appointing authority, terms of office, or manner of appointment is prescribed by this charter or by law. Unless otherwise provided by an ordinance adopted by the City Council, each board, commission or authority shall consist of seven (7) members with one member being nominated by each member of the city council and the mayor. The mayor’s nominees may reside anywhere within the

corporate limits of the city, but a nominee of a member of the city council shall reside within the district of the councilmember who nominates such member.

Motion passed 5-0.

- d. Term limits

Section 2.10(c) – a discussion ensued regarding whether to modify the term limits section of the Charter. A qualified consensus was that term limits was generally a positive for the City. Members passed out recommendations on the term limit issue. The Council discussed the following specifics:

- a. For member of the city council, it was agreed that after serving two full terms, there should be a break in service before running for council again;
- b. There was a discussion regarding whether a council member should be allowed to run for mayor at any time;
- c. There was a discussion regarding whether term limits were conducive to good governance;
- d. The City Manager provided general thoughts regarding term limits, but did not offer a specific opinion on term limits.
- e. There was a general consensus that the language needs to be tweaked, even if no further changes recommended.

No action was taken on term limits. Matter would be addressed at the next meeting.

- e. Ordinance adoption

Section 3.16 – member discussed proposed verbiage regarding changes to this section. A motion and second was made to change the Charter as follows:

a. ~~Any proposal for a new or amended ordinance shall be in writing and in the format required for final adoption. Every proposed ordinance shall be introduced in writing and in the form required for final adoption.~~ No ordinance shall contain a subject which is not expressed in its title. The enacting clause shall be "The Council of the City of Milton hereby ordains ..." and every ordinance shall so begin.

b. ~~A new or amended ordinance may be proposed by the mayor or any councilmember at a regular or special meeting of the city council. An ordinance may be introduced by the mayor or any councilmember and be read at a regular or special meeting of the city council.~~ Ordinances shall be considered and adopted or rejected by the city council in accordance with the rules which it shall establish; provided, however, ~~that (i) no new or amended ordinance shall be approved until the ordinance has been available for public comment at two (2) city council meetings and (ii) the beginning of such meetings shall not be less than twenty-four hours nor more than thirty (30) days apart, except in the case of emergency as provided for in section 3.18 of this Charter an ordinance shall not be adopted the same day it is introduced, except for emergency ordinances provided for in section 3.18 of this Charter. After adoption~~ Upon introduction of any ordinance, the clerk shall, as soon as possible, distribute a copy to the mayor and to each councilmember and shall file a reasonable number of copies in the office of

Formatted: Font: +Body (Calibri), 11 pt

the clerk and at such other public places as the city council may designate.

Motion approved 5-0.

6. Miscellaneous

A brief discussion occurred regarding presentation of the Charter recommendations to the Council and the local delegation.

The next agenda was also discussed. Next agenda – (1) Term limit; (2) printing of ordinances after adoption, (3) housekeeping items.

It was discussed that the next meeting would be April 18.

Motion and second to adjourn. Motion passed 5-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.