

CR 2025-03-13 (1)

[Speaker 2]

March 13th 2025 and the time is 7 o'clock p.m. and clerk is not here so I will call the roll in present Sharon present Dennis here Lenny present Jennifer present John present they're all present and myself Steve present next is the acceptance of the agenda today's agenda we need a motion a second so move second every motion by Ian and second by Eleni and any discussion on the agenda hearing none we'll vote all in favor opposed it's unanimous approval of the minutes from the previous meeting February 25th 2025 we have a motion to approve so moved second and we have a motion and a second any discussion on the minutes hearing none all in favor aye opposed I abstain okay and we have one abstain abstention by Ian okay public participation we have nobody present open discussion on the process of reviewing the charter I just have one thing I did ask Lisa to send out a an email highlighting the questions that during the process that we said we would refer to the call-in center and then tonight we'll add whatever we do tonight hopefully we'll finish it but we'll add that to these questions and then at the next meeting let's review it I know so if anybody what I'm going to ask is instead of taking too much time now if you can read through these questions and if the questions are not clear like and you think there's a better way to ask the call-in center can you just email and and email it to Linda the clerk as well as the assistant clerk because because Lisa's not here for the week but also copy Paul the acting solicitor and just ask Linda to forward your comments to the committee and I'll just ask everyone don't reply all but as long as it's going through the the clerk and the solicitor then you know we're not dealing with anything that's going to be a open meeting violation you're just sending out information that's it so Steve what's his last name Oh Paul Lambert Paul Lambert yeah yeah and if you're not if you can't find it it's on the solicitors office on the website or I can get it to you if you ask and Linda's email address is on the city this the City Council clerks website so so again you know just to save time it whoever sends an email in if you could do it this week and and Linda will forward it to all of us but I'll take them and I will just make a new form with the the direct one-line questions if we have any and and we'll just review them at the

[Speaker 1]

next meeting before we send them I have one more question all of the prior homeroom petitions that passed and became law are they all in this the copy of the working copy of the charter that we're dealing with you know I had we did get a

[Speaker 2]

few that at the beginning of the process because I asked that question I would if I were a betting person I'd say there's more out there but you know we don't have them but but whatever is included on the charter whatever was provided to us at the beginning of this process and there were only a few that's

[Speaker 1]

what we have is there anyone that you can think of in the clerk's office that

[Speaker 2]

could do a review of that you should email Linda yep Linda is or I can reach out but but Linda is a wealth of knowledge going back you know 50 years so you know she can definitely

if you remember anything or have any other issues on it but she can do some research and send us any homeroom petitions to modify the charter thank you okay are we all set let's move on so we're going to review article 7 8 9 10 and 11 time permitting so we're going to start with article 7 which is let's just be one second here we'll get

[Speaker 1]

election current charter 7 new charter 8 oh the other thing is Steve could you ask Lisa to number pages because we've got this large document I reprinted it

[Speaker 2]

okay so yeah currently it's article 7 so looking at my and it's page 15 by the way they're all a little different so okay so let's begin with 7-1 city

[Speaker 1]

elections but like Lenny mentioned even we should make a note that it will not be article 7 it will be article 8 well it isn't yet until we technically

[Speaker 2]

is because we already adjusted article 7 so article 7 is now going to be out of

[Speaker 1]

here you're right you're right in the same title nominations and elections will

[Speaker 2]

stay the same correct so we're gonna call this now 8-1 because you're right we already changed 6 so any issues with 8-1 okay hearing none we'll go on to 8 8 2

[Speaker 1]

are we going to go by when you say anything on 8-1 we're talking about the

[Speaker 2]

revised one we do know we're reading the actual charter the original charter now if you want to look at the revised because because there's a different

[Speaker 1]

timeframe article section 7-1 or 8-1 there's a different timetable I don't

[Speaker 2]

know which one you want to recommend so here's how we got to do it like we've been doing it we're looking at the original chart now you can use the revised charter as guidance and if you like the way it's written then we can make the motion to bring that over okay if not we just but right now we're working I'm just referring to the original charter and if you want yeah

[Speaker 1]

so it's just different the second sentence is different on the two one is the third Tuesday and the other one's the fourth Tuesday and I have a feeling

[Speaker 2]

that uh I have a feeling sorry guys I won't take it just silence this I have a feeling that the you know the previous Commission for some reason thought it would make more sense to change it but if that makes sense we can bring that

[Speaker 1]

over yeah well I'll make a motion to do that because I remember some discussion I don't remember what it was I think Marilyn was saying something about it's usually the third so I'll make a motion to change section 7-1 to reflect section 8-1 as the 2019 Charter States okay we have a second on that second okay so we

[Speaker 2]

have a motion this second to bring over the wording from the the revised charter over to this charter any discussion on that hearing none all in favor opposed okay that's done okay next is section 8-2 preliminary elections mr.

[Speaker 1]

chairman I know it's a lot I think I was the last minute we talked about the difficulty of collecting so many signatures particularly for an at-large kind of race and you know getting from 50 from each one of the districts and I know in the last effort we talked about doing 25 as opposed to the 50 or it was 150 it

[Speaker 2]

was it's was it 150 I think we talked about in 19 instead of 50 from each district you still needed 150 but a minimum of 25 yes right and making it a

[Speaker 1]

little easier for folks because I know you submit them to the clerk's office they certify them and then they find out that you're three shot in the central right and then you have to rush out to the central to get them because people aren't really accurate when they sign those as far as where they live they don't know what district they're in and alike so I like the idea of making it easier for folks to be able to get nominated I think we did make it a little bit more easier we in the 2019 charter we changed it from 100 instead of 150 but still keeping it 25 from each so in the revised I see a hundred and

[Speaker 2]

a minimum of 25 well Ryan says not less so let's let's talk about what do we

[Speaker 1]

think what do we want to do we want yeah I mean citywide 150 signatures is not unreasonable okay I just I just thought it was difficult sometimes again this district orientation right so we want to keep it 150 but a minimum of 25 for me

[Speaker 2]

okay we want to bring the wording over from section a of the revised and I would do that okay do we have a second second there's an emotion this second to bring the word in a section a over to the charter the one I'm referencing only says 100 so let's make sure that we're going to bring it over what we're going to call it's going to be 150 so that's what I mean we have different copies but that's what I have is 150 all right so the motion is to bring over a section a make sure it's 150 signatures with 25 signatures from East District and

if there's no other discussion all in favor aye opposed ayes have it okay that's done so now we're going to jump over to section we're on 8 8 2 section B ballot position there were no changes there mr. channel and how does everyone like the way it is written does anyone see any have any recommendations nope okay hearing none we're gonna keep that moving on to section C determination of

[Speaker 1]

candidates for election in paragraph 3 there's a word missing in the third sentence it says a wooden title a candidate receiving the same to have name printed I think it should say to have their name printed this one oh I'm looking at you know what I'm looking at this one but it says a candidate receiving the same to have name printed I think it should say to have their name

[Speaker 2]

are you on the revised yeah I was no okay we're gonna work up this so if you

[Speaker 1]

want this one says to have his name printed upon the official ballot and in the revised version it says to have name so that just the word is missing so it should have their name this was the the official Charter says his name so it

[Speaker 2]

should say to have that office whose names may be printed or no this is the

[Speaker 1]

original to have his name printed upon oh I see it okay it should say I think

[Speaker 2]

what's happening in and Lisa will be doing these minutes she's going through

[Speaker 1]

it and adjusting all of this I mostly meant if we were going to use the 8 and

[Speaker 2]

the word was completely missing yeah so we're gonna adjust his is there anything else in section C that anyone has any thoughts for and even if it's not on the I mean you don't like something let's talk about it they know okay then we're gonna we'll move on Lisa's gonna adjust that so we'll move on section D nomination of candidates conditions making preliminary election unnecessary hey do we have any recommendations on that it's pretty straightforward okay we're gonna move on okay section 7 a section 8 3 the regular election section no and you said Lisa's going to make so 8 3 section a anything it's just a

[Speaker 1]

curiosity more than anything because the present mayor has been elected to be mayor so I thought I had read somewhere that he's not able to use candidate for re-election on the next ballot or perhaps wasn't able to use it for the special but if you are the mayor I mean even acting you are the mayor why wouldn't you be able to say because you've been I don't think he was elected that's why you're not a candidate for the election you you're a candidate like it's I think the candidate because you just were appointed so we're talking

[Speaker 2]

about a specific situation where there's an acting mayor but he has been appointed yes right mayor so I don't know if we need to change it but I would think that he's currently the mayor and even though he's just been elected to

[Speaker 1]

fill out the rest of the term yeah there should be some designation because it was an election yes but because he was appointed he couldn't put it on a few

[Speaker 2]

months right and we didn't have an election so he's he's just the acting

[Speaker 1]

mayor I guess I was saying if you're the mayor you're the mayor yeah it should not make any difference and you're almost signaling he or she out because they happen to have been appointed that there's no designation that they are the man the election I think it's the word re-election election maybe you could say I don't know what you probably wouldn't because like say current mayor incumbent incumbent incumbent you know I thought they used to use the word incumbent more

[Speaker 2]

so than re-election do we want to make a note on it I'll make one if it's an acting mayor it would say incumbent well yeah it's the regular city you're right

[Speaker 1]

okay and you know what if what if it was person that was one month came in you know and now they have that designation I think it's what this is saying they won an election they're now a candidate for re-election yes you know you can use the word incumbent for some reason I think I wonder if people changed it because it feels pejorative these days call yourself an incumbent candidate for re-election sounds all right so

[Speaker 2]

sure are we good with section a I believe so right so we're gonna move on to section B ballot position yes done by a drawing so that's pretty straightforward if none we're gonna move on section eight four and that's the one that just has to be changed okay so we're just gonna have Lisa update it to the correct districts as current since we're gonna vote on a change of that let's I have the numbers if you want them okay we'll instruct Lisa to update the districts current okay section 8 5 application of state laws I in the edited vert you know the later

[Speaker 1]

revised version there's that notation yes and I it wasn't clear to me if we needed to note that in any way because it must somehow differ from what is stated in you know some of the Commonwealth things so it says note the substantive change to this article appears in section 8 2 meaning the in this case the old 7 2 regarding the collection of a minimum number of signatures in each district right so I don't know why it is or not yeah why I was calling it out to anyone's attention except for insofar as maybe the reader if they went and looked at something in the you know in the laws of the Commonwealth you'd say well the laws of the Commonwealth are saying this and we say and

[Speaker 2]

that's what they're doing is they're pointing us back to saying the laws of the car we do yeah so maybe that should be in there it might be helpful for the reader so there's somebody if you all agree to someone want to make the motion to bring that note note over to specify so that where it's clear that one thing that takes precedent is how many votes required in each district yes I'll make that motion second any other discussion on that I have noticed in the new review the 2019 whatever

[Speaker 1]

it is at the end of each section or article it just summarizes what the changes were so and

[Speaker 2]

that's all that's really doing no very different this one's different and so so this is saying that except as expressly provided in the charter and authorized by statute all city elections a government by the governed by the Commonwealth right but what is expressly provided in the charter is that we set a standard of having to get 25 per district with the total of 150 votes so I think that's a little different than just Peter putting a history it's just referring back to say no we're not we're not conflicting here I just took it as a summary of section 8 what was

[Speaker 1]

changed and that's what previous ones had and there's already a typo because it says the substantive change to this article appears in section 7-2 do they mean in the former charter because 7-2 8-2 in this new current one so I mean I think that's why Ian might be correct this is just telling people that there is no I think you're right I'm gonna withdraw my

[Speaker 2]

so 8-5 is good okay we're gonna go to article 9 now originally 8 on the original charter well it's actually 9 now it will be yep alright so article we're in article 9 free petition why is this okay free petition initiative referendum recall and in just I'll make the change because you

[Speaker 1]

want to make it no no no I'm saying okay so this the the it's not free petition initiative yes thank you for saying that because I've been saying that for a long time that this gotta get true it's true so instead of saying free petition initiatives referendum or recall in the in the revised charter it says citizen participation mechanisms so I'd like to make that change under it will be article 9 formally 8 where now so it would be article 9 yep citizens participation mechanism so we'll tell you what that's what it says in the so they were going to address the

[Speaker 2]

petition initiatives we have a second second motion the second is there any discussion on that okay then all in favor opposed the ayes have it we bring that over and we rename article 9 okay article 9-1 free petition section a first any any issues with section a they will go on

[Speaker 1]

to section B who petitions action required I just a general question in this section with it it refers several times to seven days seven days do we need to say seven business days or seven calendar days or is there a standard like a legal standard where if it doesn't state explicitly it assumes calendar it just I happen to be doing something at work this week in which it was I think we should be challenging whether it was business days or calendar days and so that

[Speaker 2]

has been that has been a topic of discussion through the years and I think we should specify

[Speaker 1]

it in the charter yeah so business days is always more time and I you know I wonder if the definition right business days is changing so I'm writing that we're telling tell telecommuting so business days would bring you over to the next week so and is that is that giving too much time no I'll make that motion so that both of these that the seven business days should be the word business before days yeah and that's in there twice in that article in that section so we're

[Speaker 2]

going to say seven business days is your motion yeah and I seconded that so we have a motion this second in the two spots referring we're going to add business any other discussion on that okay if not all in favor opposed you guys have it we're moving on I also like using the number versus written number mm-hmm yeah written out yeah so you want to use the numerical definition

[Speaker 1]

as opposed to writing the word out 150 using yeah you want the numbers and yeah yeah that's

[Speaker 2]

right okay do we have a sec is that a motion second second we'll just that way now anyway all the original yeah right so how about if if you want to amend that a little bit to say write

[Speaker 1]

it out and have the number in parentheses you can put the number in parentheses yeah works for me

[Speaker 2]

so any other discussion okay we're gonna vote to not just write out the days but also put the numeric next to it right all in favor aye opposed the ayes have it okay section nine just one more

[Speaker 1]

but notice by publication you know what I'm glad you said that I noted that on the next section but not here yeah I didn't hear what is it John on the next line where it says notice by publication and I know we've talked about publication last meeting but what does that mean where is it published you have to define it how do we resolve that earlier we remember we have a question into them but you know right you know what we could do for this one is but because this is a public hearing and usually in when we do a City Council

public hearing we just put it on the City Council website so maybe in the definition portion we can write pertaining to public hearings notice of publication means city website whatever it's official city official municipal social media yes you know but again we can ask we can ask them because there has to be certain other maybe a little bit of a description of public hearing for instance you know budget hearings they can break

[Speaker 2]

it down but this here do we want to move to change this and define publication now and then we'll check with the calling center so on public publication how do we want to do we want to say notice by publication to the website someone needs to come up with a wording on it what you

[Speaker 1]

don't know we have it someplace else yes why don't we just use what we have yeah we had it in the very beginning I think maybe that would have been three I might have it right here oh right here so we have the public hearing and in our question once changed from the original charter that says general circulation I think that we were going to ask for that one it was something about the website and municipal official municipal social media something we

[Speaker 2]

changed it to say the city council this is a section 5 6 a it wasn't 6 4 yeah that's what I but I didn't write the new language here we changes as you shall publish in at least one newspaper of general circulation public hearing we don't do that now no not this wasn't that was

[Speaker 1]

the no but I think this was the budget that's why this was a public hearing for the budget that's why it was for the budget okay and just to know Felisa because there's a 14 days if we're going to put the the letters then it should go throughout the whole document and then parent the the

[Speaker 2]

numbers so do we want to say it has to be published on the city website and posted on the bulletin

[Speaker 1]

board for a public hearing now and then we have you know the local channels the bulletin board outside I think that definition rather than spend a lot of time once we figure out again what how we want to word it that can go right at the back of definition so if they say well you know we might be spinning wheels they may have a there might be a suggestion they could say budget hearing you know then you can talk about the publication and then it might say City Council public hearing the website just fine for that well it is interesting in the edited version we do have an actual definition of city website okay so um but I still think publication is we should we should have it yeah so we may have to change that um oh look at they do have days the word day should refer to business days does it right here not including Saturdays Sundays and legal holidays when the time set is seven days or less when more than seven days every day shall be counted oh well yeah I'm just looking yes that was

that is true so there is a definition of days and so anything under seven shall refer to business days anything over seven is essentially calendar day every day is counted and then a funny story too it talks about the city website just so that we don't yeah that's getting into this conversation read it read it Elaine it says the words quote city website shall mean a site established and maintained by the city as its online repository of municipal information whether on the internet or access through another comparable technology and I think we probably would add in a definition at some point of like official social media channel or something we would need to come and put that in at some point

[Speaker 2]

okay so first of all some days do we not need do we don't need the business so I guess we don't need

[Speaker 1]

that we don't need it as long as we all agree at this time all right let's just make a motion

[Speaker 2]

to this is where Lisa loves following these meetings and coming up with notes let's make a motion to we need someone to make a motion to remove business from seven days I make a motion to

[Speaker 1]

strike the word business from the seven days in what we inserted in section nine

[Speaker 2]

one b we have a second second okay any other discussion all in favor I opposed okay business has been removed now on publication do we want to say notice by on city website

[Speaker 1]

yes I think we want to say notice by publication although we're going to ask the call center what publication means the city's website and other other official municipal social other do we just say as prescribed in the definition because that way we can reference that throughout the whole document let me just see what that says um we'd have to add a definition at the end right yeah there isn't a definition but a definition for municipal social media so like a twitter account or whatever we're calling it these days um website you know if the city is maintaining an official channel on it right they should have to put something on it so if they maintain a municipal facebook page a municipal x account would that be um the mptv page would that be considered do we run that directly or do

[Speaker 2]

are they separate well they're separate but they are also I believe the city uses them to get the

[Speaker 1]

that is a good way to get the yeah I don't know if you want to write something like that if we can maybe make a make a um right underneath that like change all the letters and make it e let me ask this does it make sense for us to add to it go back like at the end go back and create some definitions and anytime we see areas that say publication we do that maybe on

I think we should go back and say we'll come up with the definition of social media come up with that and then we can do one more change and then everything gets posted

[Speaker 2]

and the thing is we'll have read through the entire chart I'm going to see all the notes so when we go through the second read we're going to be able to clear that up okay good idea that way okay so then I'm mocking that for the call-in center um so now we'll pick up John on that so we're at section nine two now Mr. Chairman if I could

[Speaker 1]

well not reminding all of us because not all those were in a lot of committee but we had a significant amount of discussion around this section uh to make it easier for citizens to petition and set up a process so if you look at the revised it's significantly different and more straightforward I think than the than the original uh I would kind of recommend that we review the revised one as a possible substitution versus trying to compare the two because I think we we spent a lot of time you know ten percent versus seven percent you know I mean there's uh 32,000 registered voters could we move them over section by section because I do have a no no we

[Speaker 2]

can't no I think but using that as opposed to the old one because the old one I think is it make it's very difficult to get any petition or issue before voters because the way it's great you want to bring it over section by section then we'll start with um nine two uh citizen initiative measures and section a it just as a just as history

[Speaker 1]

this section was put in because there was a concern that a citizen could come in and try to have a petition and not word it properly and there would be a lot of different petitions and a city clerk a city solicitor's office would be involved with trying to draft a lot of different so they thought we thought that if we required them to show at least the interest from citizens that something needs to be done by the initiation of 150 or 250 signatures then it's a legitimate concern it's not a concern from like five or six people or ten people it's a legitimate concern and that's why this position uh this uh provision was was added to to make it a little bit more of a uh uh an issue that the citizens do want to reconsider yeah like a minimum threshold yes a minimum threshold yeah that's a good way of putting something forward

[Speaker 2]

all right so in section a and it did it did cut it back quite a bit from what we

[Speaker 1]

so just just for clarification so you're asking that the whatever the issue is the petition is it has to be signed by 250 voters but then at least 25 signatures must be certified from each district is that a little redundant but we are 250 from the central district you know without having it be across the whole city 25 in the east west and in central and then the rest can be from anywhere right yeah but that's the way it's it is now oh not now but that's where we're unbelievable and then there's an affidavit signed by 10 voters right they would be the initiator yes and so they would be contacted by 10 of them to do it the first in fact later on

we talked about the first 10 that signed the petition would be the almost like a uh what do you call those suits we're a civil right suit yeah yeah all right so

[Speaker 2]

a we're on a

[Speaker 1]

a

[Speaker 2]

okay so um do you want to make a motion to bring the wording in 92a over to the if that makes more sense i'd be willing to do that go ahead and we have a second yes second okay so the motion in the second is to bring section 92a from the revised 2019 over do we have any other discussion on that okay hearing none all in favor opposed none the ayes have it okay we're bringing over 92a okay next 92b and i'll go to the city solicitor and i'll just make the motion

[Speaker 1]

now and we can discuss it but just to take the language from 92b and move it over to the to the new charter referral of to city solicitor we have a second on that there's been some changes

[Speaker 2]

we'll give a motion to second to bring the writing from uh the revised over any discussion

[Speaker 1]

this might be obvious but i think the intent originally was once you've got a legitimate petition you send it to the city solicitor's office to make sure that the wording is constitutional correct uh so they invest time in making sure that if it does go before the voters that it is plausible what's the process if they determine that it's not constitutional or appropriate or i don't know if it said it talked about that if it if it doesn't i mean for the state or any general right i mean that's it would be mimicking that process right so if the city solicitor says no that's not you know appropriate constitutional legal whatever it just dies there if the opinion of the city solicitor is that the measure is not a proper form the reply shall state the reason for this opinion in full so you tell the petitioners that you tell them why but then as it it's dead for the and those 10 voters are the uh the members of the petitioning committee

[Speaker 2]

right okay so we have a motion to second to bring over section b all in favor opposed the ayes have it so we're going to import section b

[Speaker 1]

okay uh section c there's a new one compared to the original and i'll make a motion to insert section c of the of the 2019 revised charter submission to the city clerk that's a new additive and in the form the same form in the 2019 charter the big change in that in some respects is going from the 10 that the original charter required it was there's a small number of seven percent and why i i don't even know exactly why we picked seven percent but uh i'm not sure if she mentioned that my that it was more in tune with general law we can ask

them yeah i asked i had no note about no i had a note saying why i don't even know that they have this seven felt oddly specific i don't it's what did you say lani i said seven percent felt oddly specific it was ten percent than the original yeah right but so the seven yeah but what's the reason for it why seven why yeah why not six why not i don't i'm not sure i don't recall maybe it should be 10 for 10 well 10 you remember you got 32 34 000 registered voters right so 10 percent you know you're talking 3 200 yeah it's a lot of it's a lot of signatures i think that's why we

[Speaker 2]

had cut it back right i know that you know four fives too low so we yeah if i remember that right

[Speaker 1]

i think you're right when you had to do the the last the elected charter commission they had they went out and got the votes they could have come to the city council and asked to establish it but they wanted to go out with jerry mccall in that group and um they got about 4 200 signatures yeah to put you on the ballot so you know this just lessens it a little possible yeah it's just if it's serious it will work at it yeah but you know seven percent just gives it a and the city's growing so me you know maybe more people will become registered voters and the number will go

[Speaker 2]

up and up okay so first of all do we want to change the title to submission to city clerk

[Speaker 1]

well i made the motion to bring the whole thing right over and bring it right over including the

[Speaker 2]

title yeah and we had a second okay we have a motion in a second any other discussion on section c okay all in favor aye opposed the ayes have it so we're importing the title and the entire section okay we're now going to go on to

[Speaker 1]

well we have to add no we have to add another one yeah we have to add a couple more from the

[Speaker 2]

if this if this can be section d yeah okay so we right now we stop it okay so

[Speaker 1]

we need a motion if you want to do that i'm going to make a motion to incorporate section d so it would be nine two d and it's called action to put on petitions and i'd like to bring that coming to charter we have a second second um so does this effectively allow the council or the school committee to pocket veto an item in 30 days essentially so if they fail to act on it in 30 days it's considered rejected correct um let me see you then you go to the vote then you have to go to the vote it's the same as the state yeah yeah okay just i want to make sure my reading a bit when i i was trying to do a flow chart yeah i was reading this to understand so i was like it is like a flow chart all the sections kind of feed into each other yeah

[Speaker 2]

that's not a bad idea okay so all in favor of bringing over section 9-2d aye aye the ayes have it okay we're going to move on to e e if well if we want to do that

[Speaker 1]

oh i'll make the motion again it's reading it yeah so if the petition is not accepted there's another bite of the apple yeah so essentially i think what it says is if the school committee or the city council doesn't act on it yeah you can bring it back to life within 60 days by the original petitioners can get i thought this was odds the seven percent to sign and then i i got confused here i was like and then the signatures on a supplemental petition so you have to get another round of signatures it wasn't clear to me it's very confusing percent yeah 14 percent of the people who voted in the last election so if you get three thou if it's 4 000 people we usually vote to be 14 percent of 4 000 versus up 14 percent of uh the registered of the total number of registered voters as of the date of the most recent regular city election but why is it double so they're saying that you're going to still count

[Speaker 2]

the original and then you're going to get seven percent more more is that saying that you can't

[Speaker 1]

use the same vote is that you could put in there how would you how would you you're gonna go and say did you remember signing this it's this is very confusing i know i think we have to work on this if not tonight maybe in the next go of it yeah i mean why don't we let's do this money's

[Speaker 2]

idea is probably a good one to follow it yeah how about if we agree to take unless you want to go through the rest take this this section work on it and then we'll come back and we're going to review this one section section 9-2 right yeah that's a great idea does someone want a motion to just i'll make that one 9-2 and we'll we'll all read it through so we better understand and read through you know okay we have a motion i'll second we have a second is that all any other discussion okay so we're going to vote to table 9-2 so we can review it more over the next two weeks and come back and pick this up again at the next meeting all in favor aye opposed okay the ayes have it so let me just make a note here too

[Speaker 1]

steve a lot of the um changes may have come from the call-in center so i think talking to them and sending them an email and asking them to review 9-2 for us and see if that is any um statutory language in there from that that's because a lot of that language

[Speaker 2]

9-2 there was a lot of interaction with them on their lane yes just have them look at that review

[Speaker 1]

because if that's what they're saying that's how the state would handle a referendum then rather

[Speaker 2]

than us reinventing the wheel yeah yeah good point yeah okay call-in center 9-2 um uh you know maybe i should be sending them the original charter and this although that's all we have is a revised on nine on this part uh original okay okay did we vote yes yes okay we're gonna move on section 9-3 citizen referendum procedures let's start with section

[Speaker 1]

well this this yeah we have to figure out section 9-2 first because i did laugh that it says if the committee vote has voted finally to approve any measure you know so we're gonna

[Speaker 2]

let's just agree to have the call-ins look at 9-2 and 9-3 yeah that's a good idea because

[Speaker 1]

they were a lot and now we're up to 15 of the voters i'm like wait yeah it's very confusing we keep moving around i think something like an initiative petition anything that involves citizens trying to redress whatever it is they're unhappy with should be fairly simple not to make it easier but it should the language should be simple so everybody understands it

[Speaker 2]

everyone should know exactly what the stuff yes right do we also have to 9-4 is all new

[Speaker 1]

yeah 9-4 we can probably review let's go ahead with that one because it's what you don't want to be subject to a petition okay so uh chapter 9-4

[Speaker 2]

let's review that

[Speaker 1]

this is a lot of uh call-in center recommendations yes what would be the inner workings of the city council i'm just curious excuse me what they're in what number you want operations proceedings relating to the internal organization or operation of the city council it's not or the school committee is not something that you can petition maybe if they set up a committee they wanted to take if you wanted to have a committee or an emergency measure under the charter yeah city school budget as a whole so these are all you know yeah these are these are and clearly it was recommended this is this is good language though this is very good language

[Speaker 2]

so does anyone um i'm kind of thinking the entire section should go to the call-ins but

[Speaker 1]

well they already already did that so i'll make a motion to yeah we can take to incorporate section 9-4 ineligible measures and incorporate that into our proposed charter can i ask a question before we go oh i'm sorry i'll second okay so this came from the call-in center so there aren't other things that could be added to this or

[Speaker 2]

you know i think we're going to bring them in for a meeting and that might at that point might be a why is why are these the only items we're just going to put together our questions for them um you know for that meeting too just so you know we're still waiting the solicitor wanted the call-in center to redefine a few parts of the agreement so we're not on contract with them yet but i'm waiting for him to say it's a go and then we'll do this who signs that steve uh that would be the capital the mayor oh okay yeah but the solicitor won't

[Speaker 1]

do it okay so now we're going to jump on tonight we have a motion in a second to add that over

[Speaker 2]

yeah on nine five okay so is there any other discussion on nine four and we could add to that of course we can we can i think it'll be good to do that on the second read when we've got more familiar um okay all in favor i opposed the ayes have it we're bringing section nine four over from the revised okay now section nine five wait a minute yeah it's originally eight six yeah so it's originally nine so uh hold on one second yeah nine five the number is going to change depending if we bring everything over uh so we're on section first of all on the charter nine four we brought that okay okay see i keep jumping just like we're jumping back and forth so

[Speaker 1]

okay section nine six it's really nine five on the um on the new charter because she added nine four ineligible measures i shouldn't say she the call-in center additional added it additionally so to stay in concert with the older charter it would be section 8-6 from the old charter the new charter number reflects section 9-5 and it's recall okay okay and there is a couple of changes but i'm just for the sake of discussion i'm going to make a motion to to incorporate the whole 9-6 recall i'm sorry 9-5 recall and put it over and then we can adjust each each one as we

[Speaker 2]

go along sounds good do we have a second on that second can we motion a second to bring all of section 9-5 9-5 over recall yes called recall any discussion on that okay all in favor oh no i have

[Speaker 1]

we're going to go through them yeah we're going to just bring it all just bring it all in favor

[Speaker 2]

i opposed you guys have it it's brought over now with a 9-5 okay now we can go through it and we go by letters section a which is application so i had a a question you know

[Speaker 1]

when i went through this the i i think i get why we have the with more than six months remaining and not until six months we have two year terms so that effectively means only 12 of the 24 month period you could recall someone 18 18 18 is my math yeah that's right that makes sense because i was like why is that not adding right and i think they leave the six because by the time you organized and had the election and all of that stuff that would be your six months to me six months is not

[Speaker 2]

i mean you know you've got somebody you're talking our election this year is going to be in november right right so is it worth the effort to recall someone that's got oh it has to be the first six months only i'm remembering i'm getting confused so you can only recall in the first

[Speaker 1]

six months in the first six months after the first after the first like you have the first

[Speaker 2]

six months you can't which i think is six months remaining two year term this is i think that's so here's the thing so you can't recall them till after the first six months but you can recall them until the six months before the end of their term which means 12 months yeah yeah it doesn't it

[Speaker 1]

doesn't i don't like the way it's worded if this if we had four-year terms or something like that that at least would make sense but for a two-year term that's what i'm saying for a two-year term 12 months of the of the term you can't do anything to them so it's sort of like well what if they make the most outrageous vote six months one day later here's what we can consider

[Speaker 2]

right because i mean the second part the last six months i do we want to recall someone with

[Speaker 1]

six and a half months exactly that's my point yeah it seems accomplish it i mean i mean isn't the recall the next election petition you can't recall no petition shall be filed against an officer with six months after taking oh after taking office right i just find this i don't know it's all right yeah i i i would prefer to give people the um the right to do it now the thing is it's pretty hard to recall someone we have a pretty high threshold in there you need 500 voters so my thing is if you can get that within six months before or after you should be able to do it i do you know just it's inconvenient for the city but i do think that from a citizen engagement perspective i'm not sure we should limit it it would be um it would be very unsettling for the whole city excuse me to be going through that in that very short period of time and i would think that no city business anything difficult or important in terms of city business could be conducted because everybody's focus uh would be on not getting along with the mayor or the city councilor or the school committee for whoever it may be it could have a real negative effect on moving the city forward and so what would make sense

[Speaker 2]

to give the voters the ability to recall from day one of taking office and then because that

[Speaker 1]

you know i mean what what do we i mean you you run the risk of so somebody won but he didn't win you don't want to get a situation where the vote the supporters of the person who didn't win want to do like poke your eye and proceed with having some kind of a recall as i'm saying it's not a good thing you have to wait for six months right no but our current

our current oh yes you can do it it's sharon's point you can do it day one i'm not sure six months to me is yeah what's somebody gonna do in six months rob a bank well they're gonna do they just affect this anyway but it just seems superfluous to me yeah can i just tell you can

[Speaker 2]

you clarify when you say what someone's going to do in six months you mean in the first six months yeah right so let's say and i we don't have any examples but let's say that we have somebody who um two months into their term commits a crime commits a crime it does something that the residents are in uproar saying this person does not belong if the person committed a crime

[Speaker 1]

then they're going to be involved in the legal system so it's irrelevant i don't know i think i don't think they lose their seat for that unless they get they're in jail but right you don't have to resign my thing is i think we you know i for better for worse see a lot of things online of what people are saying these days and i think the ability to remove people who say very horrible things um is important for people to be able to access and so if you're two months into this and you say something you know that is uh hate speech or something exactly yeah so you're saying these people that you're quoting um are saying things on social media or no no they're in i see videos of people talking at other school committee meetings from different states from council meetings in different states that are saying things that are different states we've seen a couple of school committees on the south shore say some things and in and so if they say that on month two we're like oh we can't do anything for four more months by then people forget about it would you rather censure them than recall i mean recall is a really long but it but it does take some time to put everything together so if say if say there's something in two months you'd have to organize the recall uh so that it could take effect within you know another four months so i mean it's not like it's going to go away it just it gives you more time maybe the person apologizes maybe that's enough i don't know uh but you can't even file the recall petition for six months correct so you could organize it you can gather the signatures signatures yeah that's gonna take some time i thought that well okay i maybe i'm misreading that i i assume that meant no recall petition shall be filed as essentially you can't even right because you're gonna get a petition right where do you get the petition by filing so so i feel like this is like um i don't know i personally no one has to agree with me i my view is uh it we shouldn't have only half the time that someone's in office that they uh you're only

[Speaker 2]

talking 12 months if you could yeah you want to shorten that to three have we ever had a recall

[Speaker 1]

yes um who did we recall yeah there was something wasn't there tom well they were tried to there was the whole thing with uh tom grondine and uh that was a recall back in 19 they were trying to do it i don't think they did it no because they didn't wind up having it was foolish this is on the record i'm not that's like a personal vendetta and and what happened was uh they didn't certify all the signatures because they were found to be fraudulent you

think three months that way if something we could do three months and i agree i i agree with

[Speaker 2]

sharon that you can't say on day one right because all that is uh disgruntled voters voters who just vote someone in so there's got to be a reason right so and and i i'm not saying

[Speaker 1]

things that people don't believe but personal agendas in doing is not something that yeah not but i guess the thing is we already have this established and it hasn't happened to date knock on wood so you know what i kind of agree with what you said before about where you know we're in a new era here with what people say publicly which some of it is like crazy but what if we put stipulated what the criteria could be for the recall that there has to be something substantive set of personalities you can't just recall someone because you don't like them so

[Speaker 2]

you still have to get the votes i mean yeah you're trying to recall someone because you don't like them i mean i wouldn't necessarily sign that petition and it does go to a vote right yes it has to go out to the voters so and you have to get assigned by 500 voters

[Speaker 1]

or 300 for a district office and so you know and then uh you have another thing this was also confusing 25 of the voters and one other part here and then further down you have to have a election you know so it's it's not um it's it i wonder i'm kind of stuck on the there have to be reasons why i thought that there is a section where they have to i thought i could be mistaken i mean someone should have committed um some i don't know what it would even be but i mean not but you see what's happening in everett if they wanted to recall i mean that's an issue

[Speaker 2]

i don't i'm not sure about listing there's always something that we're not going to think of or whatever but obviously you have to rely on on the voters to make sure this this you know equalizes

[Speaker 1]

into something that's really legit oh you have to here it is it does say you have to provide a statement of the grounds for recall provided in the affidavit and a statement of the grounds for recall

[Speaker 2]

do you want again do we want to do i hate to keep pushing this stuff off but do we want to take section nine five and i think i think this was was very verbatim

[Speaker 1]

recommended too i think the process was was recommended of course marilyn is not going to be helping at this time and i don't know if andrew i think with anthony anthony you know uh hopefully he well if he gets this beforehand he'll know that we're going to ask him about it so maybe he can feel more comfortable giving it some advice as well because i did wonder

because there are some kind of oddities in here that i felt someone must have like from the call-in center looking like this provision of not less than 64 days oh yeah so that must be something related to you know um to that i mean i we can send this to him we have different versions but

[Speaker 2]

um i think but i'll work off the one i have which i took off the city website so we're going to

[Speaker 1]

consider that to be official but i will also note that in section d of this section of office holder there's a provision that's a person chosen to fill the vacancy caused by a recall but it never states how that person is chosen so just as an aside we will need to also remedy that to my

[Speaker 2]

i think it does refer to the articles that talk about filling okay positions by the city and there's a few of them depending if it's school committee city council or mayor oh okay okay

[Speaker 1]

because wasn't there some kind of a lot of discussion that you recall somebody and then you have if you recall them and it gets approved then you which one of these fallen people do you want to replace them with uh you know there would be a mayoral election say right yeah at the same time right you're doing the recall if the recall fails then the mayoral election is debilitating but that's we talked about i remember that whole discussion was the fall rhythm mia recall yes it was the fall yes yes yes and that was around the same time yes yes it was i remember this talks about he got but it but he got reelected

[Speaker 2]

that may be why you know it's six months prior to the end of the term in other words you don't want to coincide it with with an election either right um well it all depends how do you like if you

[Speaker 1]

recall the mayor a right now it doesn't sound like this and you have to hold an election once you recall them right well the city council could do an action well they could if you recall they

[Speaker 2]

can do it and then they would follow the procedures it goes back to the original

[Speaker 1]

i thought that was missing too but steve pointed that out that it was there okay so

[Speaker 2]

we can take a stab at this so first of all i would suggest that we talk about you know do we keep it no earlier than six months no later than um or do we say you can't recall a person in their first three months in office so from starting from

[Speaker 1]

i mean

[Speaker 2]

after an election yeah it can get very hot you know it could be very very contentious and and the people who lose might say let's recall them right away let's and dennis it should be easy to recall right i agree so you think it should be easy it should not be

[Speaker 1]

that yeah but you want to just leave it the way just because it is if you think about it the six months they can't do the end of the six months they still have the hatred after six months right

[Speaker 2]

and then they still have to go through the whole process so right now let's talk about section a and we need a motion to accept as we're in i'll make that motion do we have a second okay okay do we have any any conversation any any discussion on that having none all in favor aye opposed it's no yeah i'm opposed i'm opposed as well so

[Speaker 1]

i just think it needs to be redone we can do that though we'll just bring it over and we can still have common sense to look at that yes yeah i'm just opposed to the six so you want it you want to put something else no i just you want to just leave it as is for now is that what you're saying we voted to move over and to keep it yeah but if you're not in favor

[Speaker 2]

which is fine but do you want to make a change or do you want to just leave it as is i i i personally

[Speaker 1]

would have no six i would not have either end of the thing so that's just my opinion and you all

[Speaker 2]

don't think that's all right sharon did you want to leave it or do you want to make a

[Speaker 1]

an amendment no i'm i'm opposed to it in that i think it needs work and i think that's what we're here for yeah i know exactly so i'm saying right as of this moment um i'd like for us to think about review it all right at some future point and um i think it's good to look at other cities

[Speaker 2]

we'll bring this over and we're going to have another read at it so section b the recall petition

[Speaker 1]

and that again i looked at and we have we have that on the older one with some changes so i'll make a motion to keep the recall position from the 2019 and bring it over do we have a second

[Speaker 2]

second okay we motion and a second and now any discussion i did have a question um in that

[Speaker 1]

section uh it's the one two third or fourth sentence it says uh provided however that the signatures for a recall petition for the office of a district city councilor shall be from certified voters in the district for which the counselor was elected so that means that does that mean that i think this is you you someone from outside the district could initiate a recall petition for west city council let's say i live in the east end and i do that but this is saying to move it forward the votes have to come from the west district because that's the council signatures yes certified signature yep that's the way i would read yeah and then well i just wanted to again i'm a little short charting that's fine just to make sure because i'm thinking initially like to some extent one might say though well those people still also vote on the issues that affect all of us should it be 75 percent are from the district and 25 maybe from outside i don't know but it's just something to and are we clear in a situation like that where it's a district city councilor are we clear who replaces that person it goes back so the next person on the ballot would oh whatever yeah whatever the process we have a word because

[Speaker 2]

depends when yep right if they vacated it would be like vacating yeah right well as long as it was

[Speaker 1]

within the six month buffer because we have those stipulations in there about if it's

[Speaker 2]

appointment that would be appointed yeah yeah okay so um are you all set yep so do you have any other questions on section b i do first of all um the 500 voters 300 voters um maybe that's maybe that's reasonable the city has become bigger too um and again it shouldn't be too easy if you've got a group of residents that want to recall a person um i would think it should be a higher number of signatures you would need but maybe 500 is reasonable that's what i thought i just wanted to discuss it really quick well 500 at large 300

[Speaker 1]

would be 500 at large 300 in a district that's double the amount that you would need to be

[Speaker 2]

nominated well correct yes uh well you need a higher standard yeah you know that's what i'm

[Speaker 1]

saying i'm just thinking of it is is and and if you look at the last few elections we only get 10 to 12 percent of the participant you know participation so you're talking about four maybe five thousand people that are active in the community for voting purposes but any vote

[Speaker 2]

any voting can sign it as long as you're interested voter so steve what would you raise it to well i'm just i'm questioning whether or not that's sufficient because any voter can sign it but they're probably not going to a lot of them aren't going to go out and vote you know

what i'm saying but but i don't i don't think it should be easy and do we think that again having to get 500 voters for an outodge or 300 vote or 300 voters to sign for a district is sufficient to make it it's going to be would you recommend it's going to be some work i'm thinking it should go a little higher i would think maybe 750 voters and at least you know maybe 350 or 400 from a district i would support that yeah because you know you would think that you're going to have a group of people going out getting signatures it shouldn't be that hard it isn't but a lot of people going to sign it not knowing what they're signing right i'll do yeah you know so i'm a little

[Speaker 1]

concerned with that i would so if they sign just to go through the process they get an application you have the recall petition if they get enough signatures then they have to we have the recall election right i just want to so the first step is getting the signatures yeah you know if you look at the old charter it was 156 we did actually bring it up we did actually bring it up right and then the other thing this was the other question related and this relates to what your point is it says said recall petition shall be returned and filed with the city clerk within one says 28 one says 45 days after the filing of the affidavit it shall have been signed by at least 25 of the voters of the city for any officer elected so now it's 20 so i don't

[Speaker 2]

understand that was going to be my next question how how do we go from a number to a percentage

[Speaker 1]

does anyone pick something up on that this was very confusing to me to understand so if it's going to be it's 25 25 percent is a much higher threshold than anything of the vote 25 is very high because

[Speaker 2]

that's almost 25 to get 4 000 voters they're talking about uh uh 1 000 yeah but it's not the people that voted it's 25 percent i thought it was all registered voters all registered voters

[Speaker 1]

so that's like impossible those two things to me conflicted i was like is it 500 or is it 25 percent or is there a second stage i just don't understand so again me with the floaters i was like i i know that we're referring some of this back to the call-in center i i find the whole their whole redesign of this section to be very confusing i don't think it's well written and i think it would be good to have them take a shot at this or at least explain

[Speaker 2]

is a different person too this time right right all right so let's let's refer section 95 no just the b the b 95 b to the call-in center to help us nine five b i mean might be the whole the whole of nine five well so far a was okay i think but so let's look at nine five c and decide nine five c and that's new we don't have that at all

[Speaker 1]

in our charter so that talks about the election after the process so i will i mean we've already pulled it over here yeah um let's just see what it says it's just you know the original charter or whatever this version of the charter is the the language language was simpler i mean

irrespective of the numbers which you know you just change i it just seems to be so confusing

[Speaker 2]

and convoluted well here it's giving a different definition of replacing till where whereas in section b it talked about what was already decided earlier in the charter and now they they're defining what we have to do to replace that person so i'm not sure that i'm not sure c is even necessary i'm thinking that c should just refer to recall election um or it should be called replacement or recalled officer should be followed by what's earlier specified whether you're a city council member or the mayor or the city council earlier in the charter if it's within the time limit it's going to go out for an election well you know what this is

[Speaker 1]

what this is saying that if you're a sitting city councilor and you are recalled and the clerk has certified it they give you five days to vacate the office that's what it says here yeah okay now say you don't and what jen it says and then five days to vacate and then if you don't it then says if the officer does not resign within five days thereafter order an election to be held on the date fixed by the city council not less than 64 days and not more than 90 days after the date of the city clerk's certificate certificate that a sufficient petition has been filed provided however if that if any other city election is to occur within 120 days after the date of the certificate the city council shall postpone the holding of the recall election to the date of such other election if the vacancy occurs in the office after a recall election has been ordered the election shall not proceed as provided in this section again we could we could simplify that a little bit we could simplify it yeah i mean i'm gonna say this is written by a lawyer or whoever's a lawyer i don't mean to that that could we could simplify that it's uh yeah well why don't we do that we'll let them do we'll let them look at c2 let them look at c because they that was added that was not even in our charter so we can just have them

[Speaker 2]

something we clearly didn't come up with this language no i don't know again if that's

[Speaker 1]

because i remember when we just had the last vacancy there was uh something in our charter but when the city attorney uh mr risetti said he contacted the state and he they made it the 64 days and in here it reflects 64 days so there must be something some yeah that they're going by so we'll we'll have them look it's a good thing to know yes why is it that exactly but that whole fall river thing was really discussed significantly during that i think that's why they put in that g section where if you get recalled you can't run yeah yeah gee that's i'm not sure that's

[Speaker 2]

i don't know all right so let's go on to section d office holder and that basically looks like it

[Speaker 1]

describes what what happens in the in the interim yeah of everything and i think that's probably necessary so that they don't have to figure it out you know well what do we do he's not leaving so this i think d explains what the process looks fine well i'll make a motion

to add that we pushed it over but that that could stay the same do we have a second second okay in any discussion

[Speaker 2]

on d so we're going to vote to bring over section d to the charter all in favor i opposed it's official okay section e uh e ballot position proposition proposition i'm sorry and we have

[Speaker 1]

that we do have it in f in our current charter the only thing i i don't know why it says yes or no that could be just my is that on yours john it does say yes did you say yes or no yes oh it does yeah okay so i guess that's exactly how the charter question would read

[Speaker 2]

the question would read so so e looks looks fine right yes do we have a motion to bring that over

[Speaker 1]

oh we already did so we're gonna leave that okay section f repeat of recall oh my god yeah okay so basically you have to wait a year to try and

[Speaker 2]

failed you gotta wait 270 is working days you know is that necessary or should it be if the recall fails it's done you can't it should be done well that's a two-year term yeah two-year term so by the time the recall is done whenever it started do we even uh should it simply be a repeat of in the case that it fails it you know other attempts

[Speaker 1]

it's not bad to leave that language in there because it just says no recall petition shall be filed against such office until at least 270 days after the election if it fails it failed

[Speaker 2]

yeah yeah so why why shouldn't it just no further recall petition shall be filed against said officer i don't know they might do another issue right i don't i don't think some other bad thing i just say for the remainder of the term you want to leave it like that we can leave it like that i mean let's if if anyone has a motion to change it make the motion we'll vote on

[Speaker 1]

it you know i've seen people get impeached more than once in our time that's true that's amazing

[Speaker 2]

isn't it so they're still there next g g okay office holder recalled god bless him office holder recalled

[Speaker 1]

nope yeah that's not that's that's a day i don't think that's an issue or school we could add that actually but if yes we don't need them going over the school to happen either immediately

[Speaker 2]

yes so let's make that motion if someone will make a motion to insert the word

[Speaker 1]

city or school department yeah i like i don't like office city okay um city office or school or school or school office i guess school department any city for school the school department

[Speaker 2]

oh we have the motion do we have a second second okay so we have a motion to add after city office or school department any discussion hearing none all in favor okay that passes nine six required voter participation that's a tough one i mean i i understand it but you're gonna we're going to pay to have an election and if twenty percent don't show up if eighteen percent show up right we don't even count but it's twenty percent of the most regular election so it's not twenty percent of the register so again you're talking about one thousand people

[Speaker 1]

would have to come out uh based on i think that's actually like that two years it almost seems undemocratic that you're to have a yeah but what if oh wow we went through this whole election this many people didn't show up well well it's higher the twenty percent is high but you don't want just 120 people to show up you want to have at least a you're talking about at least a thousand people we can probably and if it was a and if it was a an election that wasn't during an important time or have an important well actually the last election was elected yeah if there was no one else on the ballot if it was a small election you could that would be tough you'd be it would be the only

[Speaker 2]

election right exactly it would be up to both sides to get people out but you know it is fair to the person that's being recalled that if only one side shows up and other people don't you know he's out if it's 500 people or 300 people yeah i mean it's up to you does anyone want to make the motion to change that do we want to lower it i mean i don't know are we saying eliminating i don't know no i was questioning it but i'm not gonna i mean i'm not going any further like you

[Speaker 1]

you need some kind of yeah i agree yeah i don't know 20 but as dennis said 20 percent of those who show up for the election so right right in this case that last municipal election was only

[Speaker 2]

all right so if we don't have any changes yep guys are nine six um required voter participation

[Speaker 1]

here yeah you're right nine six yes yeah and then nine seven we already so we didn't no we didn't vote we pushed over and nobody wants to make changes to nine six so we're good

[Speaker 2]

sure we did we pull all of nine okay so we're good with that we're going to move on nine seven submission of other matters to voters correct and this was formerly eight foa i have that on my list but since we're bringing it over anyway

[Speaker 1]

it's already over but if we just want to look at and see if there was any changes doesn't look uh no it doesn't look like it was changed from our original charter

[Speaker 2]

okay anyone have any suggestions on that or are we good okay we're going to move on nine seven conflicting provisions

[Speaker 1]

where is that one i have two section nine sevens i think that's probably fair nine seven we have to change that number um yes i do too we have to make that nine eight john's right oh yeah yeah so uh

[Speaker 2]

nine seven has to be made into nine eight and are we okay with the wording yeah okay

[Speaker 1]

a couple of notes the two should probably be pwl i think we should change that throughout yeah any number under 10 is usually written out right anything over that is

[Speaker 2]

okay now i'm with friends but okay we'll ask these to write it out two okay next notes the notes

[Speaker 1]

and these are just notes yeah to ian's point before we don't need right this is just for us

[Speaker 2]

okay all right well then let's move on section and i try to go to nine section nine one which

[Speaker 1]

is now 10 well it will be when we push it over i'll make the motion to put the entire article 10 for now general provisions as one and i propose new charter to change um article nine and then

[Speaker 2]

we can go line by line okay do we have a second second all right so we have a motion in a second to bring over section 10 article 10 of the revised over to what was article 9 any discussion you're hearing none all in favor aye opposed the ayes have it so now that we brought it all over

[Speaker 1]

let's go through with section 10-1 charter changes i think it's excellent that it says the charter may be replaced revised or amended in accordance with any procedure made available under the state constitution or general law so it's mass general law if they come they cannot

[Speaker 2]

make that change okay we're all good yep okay section 10-2 severability i think it's pretty standard yeah it's pretty standard yeah all set section 10-3 looks pretty straightforward yeah okay i'm moving on section 10-4 i had a question about this yeah um it says a copy of

[Speaker 1]

all rules and regulations adopted by a city agency shall be placed on file what would be an example of that the master plan maybe the budget um zoning ordinances stuff like that this it says shall be placed on file in the office of the city clerk i think should we also not be requiring these to be published on the city website and as well i mean i kind of feel like it should be not everybody wants to no it should be i think we should amend this to say should be placed on file and available available on the city's website and available yeah that's fine

[Speaker 2]

you know and be made available so shall be placed on file in the office and made available on the

[Speaker 1]

city's website no not later than the effective date of the rule i like that yes i'll second that

[Speaker 2]

okay we have a motion to second any other discussion sounds logical but do you think

[Speaker 1]

it's worthwhile asking the city clerk if that's an onerous provision well on the website it wouldn't be the city clerk and that's something that again the city council should be updating they should be

[Speaker 2]

updating that website the council and the council clerk would then send it to the send it to the uh

[Speaker 1]

okay so and then there is an event just in case there's an emergency yes i'm good with that okay

[Speaker 2]

so we made that change um having discussed it all in favor aye opposed it's approved unanimously moving on 10-5 periodic review of ordinances

[Speaker 1]

does the city council do this now no they should go this is so important it is important to know what maybe can be repealed or what needs to is it i wonder if it's a city ordinances that have been adopted in the prior five years are you supposed to does this say you should be reviewing all of them i mean they could put a committee together a joint committee to look at them all

[Speaker 2]

and see if they're being followed this is unfortunately something that gets lost

[Speaker 1]

it really does i think it really should be in there it definitely should be

[Speaker 2]

all right does anyone have any uh issues with section 10-5 no okay we're going to move on section 10-6 periodic review of the charter oh yeah this was a good one we did this the only

[Speaker 1]

change i'm i want to make is ending in a five like the other one because it was a nine because we were in 2019 when we did it so i think if this goes it would be starting 2025 so it's 10-year intervals in each year ending in a five so it'll be 2025 2035 and so on instead of a nine because that would make them do it in four more years do you think it's possible this would be on the ballot in 25 well no uh well they couldn't they're looking to try to get this on november that's why well i mean it'd be good if they could but i i just did the last experience going to the state

[Speaker 2]

and getting it yeah hopefully i mean do we want this is something that before we present it to the council you want to do the six we can we can adjust it i think we also just make it an auto

[Speaker 1]

an auto correction so in the sense of why do we need to designate the year we could say not later than july 1st at 10-year intervals at starting at the date of this affirmation adoption so if it's a three or four or five that makes sense yeah all right say that language um not later than july 1st at 10-year intervals after the date of adoption yeah um yeah after the date of charter of charter adoption that's probably a better more elegant way to say it but adoption of the i was just saying after the most recent adoption so that kind of yeah after most recent adoption of the charter okay do you want to wear that if you just read it out one more time uh what did we say not later do you want to read sure i just wrote um not later than july 1st at 10-year intervals after the date of the most recent adoption of the charter

[Speaker 2]

and then the mayor yeah you like that do we have a second second okay any other discussion okay so what we're going to do is vote to just make that one change all in favor opposed the ayes have it unanimous case section 10-7 uniform procedures governing multiple member

[Speaker 1]

bodies any issues with that i think there may be an old um a resolution or an ordinance believe it or not on the next agenda and they're looking they're looking for you know i i'm going to look i'm going to look before i mention it um but it's regarding minutes it's regarding minutes of um i don't know if it was on this agenda or something else i was looking at but it regards it's regarding the minutes of each of these meetings and how they even executive session minutes that there has to be minutes even if it's recorded minutes to be made and then once the issue is over if somebody requests those minutes um they have to be available for the public and city

[Speaker 2]

council so that's the last line right oh is that the let me see well that just talks about uh this quorum the quorum so you want to add that as section f no they have c they do talk about c

[Speaker 1]

each member body shall provide for the keeping of agenda minutes in related submissions all such documents shall be public record which i think that's the issue talk about exactly and yeah um but that that's governed by law so and you know that that's governed by national law anyway wouldn't that be like a foyer request yeah and there are rules that govern that that's right yeah they're supposed to provide that i think in 10 days we haven't been following that too much but they're addressing it now they're addressing it now so well so do you think it's sufficient

[Speaker 2]

to leave it as is i do yeah i think so i do well then any other discussion on 10-7 no okay then we're going to leave that as is moving on to 10-8 references to general laws

[Speaker 1]

with this can i go back for two seconds um e quorum so what do you do in a situation where because of appointments not being made let's say a committee a commission does not have a full number so that there's always a majority that you could always constitute a majority yeah i have that actual issue right now on one of my boards is that we don't have enough appointed members to have a quorum right and so we meet they discuss but they cannot adopt the or actually vote on anything until the uh appointment is a new appointments are made to make it be a quorum and those will be the rules of um your organization yes yes they're not no no no i i generally i genuinely don't know yeah if it's if we if it's our own rules or whether where rules are right general law adopted but i do think we should have some point of clarification because there are long periods sometimes yes when and it impacts people trying to do business yes absolutely and it's not it's not the problem of the people that are appointed it's the lack of having a sufficient number that happened right that's what the community

[Speaker 2]

development board and that was a problem i think there should be more pressure on making appointments yes i mean if if there's we don't have someone just to say that oh there's not enough people on there then then it's time for the the mayor or the council whoever to go out there yes and get

[Speaker 1]

someone recruit well i'm wondering i mean it's a it's local government it's all citizen driven with citizen participation and i wonder if it would be acceptable that you do a majority vote as opposed to well i'm sorry not a majority of uh a majority of the people they are voting i would use the word seated a majority of seated yep so so you have a seven number but there's only been five appointed or yeah a majority of them could and that way it's very impactful to your building or if you have a development or you're making changes to a building or whatever if you can't get a decision at the monthly meeting you're held up i think it's unreasonable to people doing business with the city or even citizens who are trying to put an addition on their home or whatever it may be so shall we reword it to say

[Speaker 2]

that a quorum is the majority of those seated i don't know and again we would have to because

[Speaker 1]

we'd have to check a lot of robert rules which are parliamentary right they they guide in in absence of in a lot of these ad hoc boards some boards ad hoc committees um they they do follow the quorum your charter would take precedence over robert's rule yes oh yeah our city council rules take precedence but when there's a conflict and you're trying to like when there was an issue with the um who's the prevailing side and so when you have differences of opinion sometimes you go to that book and say with what does robert's rule say on what the prevailing side would be that's

[Speaker 2]

a failure of the charter to not cover it right and they do cover it in the back i think we cover it

[Speaker 1]

in the back of the book under definitions that talked about quorum and we could address that and maybe again break it down yeah break it down and it could be that it says something about of um specifically so normally it would be like the city council would have a quorum but if there are fewer people appointed then it's to ian's point majority of the seated does that provisional work for three member exploits like assesses right if you only have one then you get a you know i mean you have three members so if there's only two seated uh well and i guess the mayor to get that appointed because you'll be stuck and you could be sometimes it's not that easy but it might help like an assessor you have to be certified right exactly yeah i mean they yeah most boards that's not the case but on that yeah and the voter registrar that's only three right that's it's a three that that i don't know if it works license and board i believe is only three minus what is the license and board i think is that only three i think that might be only so if they have three members and one of them is not appointed we're not still okay i think there's two you still have a quorum right two is still a quorum yeah if if you agree but you might not be able to advance anything because you might have a one-on-one but i think that the ability to vote and do business is what you're getting at yeah i can and the reason i raise this i can think of a lot of circumstances where that has is happening or has happened and and i just feel badly for the people who you know good citizens who are trying to do whatever and they they are stymied for what are probably unreasonable periods of time so it's under under the definitions of the newly revised charter and it says the word was quorum the word shall mean a majority of all voting members of a multiple member body unless some other number is required by law this charter so we do have the ability to do that or by ordinance yep and if we you want if we want to go down and say of course city council follows the you know you have to have the majority talks about super majority you can go to boards of commission you can identify we could add maybe something i'm just spitballing and i'm just but it could say after that in the event that a board of commission has does not have the full complement of seated members a quorum shall constitute a majority of the seated members yeah you could start off that section with a majority of the seated members of an appointed multiple member body shall constitute a quorum all right i want to read that again shannon i'm just going to

try to at least type it so i have it did you say to repeat it i'm yes um a majority of the members seated seated members thank you of an appointed was would be the same as an appointed multi multiple member body shall constitute a quorum so how do we handle that for board of

[Speaker 2]

assessors or something like that yeah i mean so when when the board says they have to be certified

[Speaker 1]

yes you do have a provisional time i think you have six months to get certified you can vote i think but you can't vote on certain things because you're not certified photo register that's another one we have three oh but there is a limitation on what you can vote on until you get certified real estate agents or it's a state you have to be certified yeah yeah you can take a court and in the case of the let's see the board of registrars the city clerk is one of the members so you'd always have one and i suppose you could get you know in that particular case one or the other but it's these seven member boards really tough sometimes to find and if they have a special requirement they're even if they have a relation to a state law it's like one person from western mass who has experience in accounting one person from the south shore that has construction and you're like trying to mix and match i'm thinking one board you need an architect there are no registered in a real estate in a real estate really yeah yeah and the doctor that's right yes they do yeah yeah but the licensing i think is another way they don't have a certification but they only have three members i mean they're if they made a decision that was controversial and i can't imagine well that could happen but there are remedies to that that's right i think we should talk about putting some language in there and maybe talk again because then we don't want the conflict to happen okay well what do you do with three so maybe if we we delineate on here about because we have to write it we'd have to be clear we'd have to all right so we can discuss that further but at least we now have a um a starting point all right

[Speaker 2]

so let's at least vote to accept seated did we do that i don't think we did yep we can do that yep okay we're all set did we vote no no no we didn't all right so so you made a motion to add seated so a majority of the seated members did we have a second on it second okay any other

[Speaker 1]

discussion can you just say where you are what number because i was i was oh okay yeah so we're

[Speaker 2]

going all the way the majority of the seated members so we added seated all right and we're going to vote on that all in favor aye approved i mean all um all against all in favor this is unanimous i've done this before okay yeah section 10-8 references to general laws

[Speaker 1]

i think it has to be

[Speaker 2]

any issues with that

[Speaker 1]

okay we'll move on 10-9 i know we took away that uh that business reference but with this you don't need that we've referenced seven business days any longer because it's right so i mean i think we eliminated the business we did yes because we have the definition here right and this is computing time meaning what day does the seven days start right oh good okay

[Speaker 2]

so 10-9 looks good how about 10-10 so we've actually um not followed it we've actually done on january 1st as opposed to the first monday in january a lot of times on new year's day for the past several years it's followed that um it does say

[Speaker 1]

modification to the section may be prescribed by ordinance so you can change it by ordinance

[Speaker 2]

yeah so maybe you should stay as is yeah yeah yeah okay moving on section 10-11 that looks good you certified yep it was pretty straightforward okay 10-12

[Speaker 1]

and this is this is the capital right i think those are out of legislation yeah yeah i felt like this didn't shouldn't have been messed with like it felt very very specific

[Speaker 2]

so i think that i mean any any questions on that or do we move on yeah

[Speaker 1]

i think we're okay 10-32 i don't have a question on this um there's a talk about when you know how like the city solicitor is appointed and um because i know not my did your council vote on a contract so is this a contract appointment now yes so should we have that in here because again i think there's an appointment coming up on this agenda and so

[Speaker 2]

but it's it's it's under city solicitor three-year contract not the capital oh the time careful um but we did vote on her contract renewal so i put somewhere yeah appointments for the position in section f oh all the way she'll be for three-year terms yeah we did vote on it okay um and it needs a uh super majority right

[Speaker 1]

oh supermajority six votes right yeah in this case for all for all department heads i can't

[Speaker 2]

remember is it six votes for all i don't think so i thought departments were department heads department heads they might be i don't remember i thought they were this was different because

[Speaker 1]

this was 278 yeah i mean it's what we would have to go yeah two-thirds of the council

[Speaker 2]

right so that looks fine right yep yeah okay 10 13

[Speaker 1]

is there a definition for good cause should there be a definition

[Speaker 2]

maybe we should add that in the back yeah what is it yeah maybe it could be in the original one

[Speaker 1]

cause shall include but no there is one john on the original maybe and we should keep it in we're going yeah um you don't think it's in the back nine ten it's not in the back oh we could

[Speaker 2]

have it defined in the back right 10 yep hold on 9 10 the term cause shall include but not be

[Speaker 1]

limited to the following incapacity other than temporary illness inefficiency insubordination and conduct on becoming i like that that's in the that's in the charter and how come that didn't make

[Speaker 2]

yeah okay so that should be added to definitions correct oh definitions you want it all right let's see is it in here well i mean we got to be a little consistent because i know sometimes we discuss it and we don't want to end up having a conflict between something within the charter and definition yep but again we go through this a second time i think that would that would be h

[Speaker 1]

but i'm just gonna put h just here and i'll just put good cause uh right well it would be h because we have full counsel it goes in it goes alphabetically so i would put it as h f g that's all right we could do that because but that you want to keep

[Speaker 2]

it the same so good cause would be there so you want to put it in h and everything else gets

[Speaker 1]

yeah renumbered put down so good cause and then john just read that the term cause shall include comma but not be limited to comma the following colon incapacity other than temporary illness comma inefficiency comma insubordination and conduct unbecoming the office lisa can know that from section 9 10 a it's in there too that's where she can get that okay can can i just mention one other thing um i wonder if in 10 13 a and b and c if we should mention collective bargaining agreements all right there might be provisions in those for how somebody is disciplined and what the sanction for that is okay we could add that to where where did you want to do that well it says um let me just find out i'm sorry it mentions the provisions of the state civil service law or collective bargaining agreement

what number a uh a in general down at the bottom there is a reference says nothing in this section shall be construed as granting a right to such a hearing to oh yeah right at the bottom of the last one of them is employees under any collective bargaining addressing removal and suspension procedures okay there you go yeah

[Speaker 2]

because that's a that's a lawsuit yes after section h everything else is going to be re-re-lettered yeah ending on q okay uh at the end of this we have notes

[Speaker 1]

well what about 10 14 we didn't do 10 14 yet limit limitation on office holding and this is in the device oh do we all have that i'm sorry i have a 10 14 oh you have a 10 14 for some of the some of the some of the um you have it oh limitation page 38 hold on why is this um and you have it right yeah

[Speaker 2]

i have definitions yeah where are we 10 14 there was another one oh okay i'm sorry we've got it

[Speaker 1]

okay um 10 14 can we think of an example of that why someone would hold two positions

[Speaker 2]

um well we have that uh a police officer can run for the city council no way

[Speaker 1]

i don't think they can didn't we address that yeah we did that in the chat this this i think on holding an office holding but they can only get paid on one um well it used to be in the old days remember you could double dip for your well didn't they pension purpose exactly how about the femur officer and also being a firefighter or that would be yes because they did that some of the we've done that many times yeah but they've got police off and they like the civil service the what do they call that that civil service yes i think that's that's what emergency man the emergency yeah well that's what i meant but there's a there's a provision to waive that no that's right yes again i know should it be with the city clerk or should that should have some authority from the mayor's office the mayor's office should allow that i mean it would be a well it's saying that this this isn't this isn't serving on the council this is like if you want to be like they said we we do have an emergency director used to be john santoro right right yeah he was also a police officer that's right correct and so if there was an emergency which there was yeah we had that flood right oh yeah mother's day flood yes and so i think it was a five thousand dollar stipend there was a stipend it was signed off by the mayor correct but this

[Speaker 2]

has to be this it can be waived by the mayor where oh by the mayor i'm sorry i didn't see i think i saw the city and then the city council by the council i think this is yeah i think it's good so 10 14 is fine yep yep 10 15 it's pretty straightforward yeah i jumped over to definitions we did so 10 15 felony conviction that looks fine yep okay 10 16 okay i think it sounds fine all set okay and then we get into 10 17 definitions

[Speaker 1]

always do we still have um are we going to look over um we went through that whole discussion about days and all that nothing he is we should have went over this first i know

[Speaker 2]

for the next charter review committee if we're on it we'll stop by looking through the definition

[Speaker 1]

uh steve i won't be honest

[Speaker 2]

yeah let's hope this will go so three's a charm right

[Speaker 1]

see sharing too you know we're talking about you know the words full council shall mean the entire authorized complement of the city council so that's going to have different regulations so i think if we even want to break down um what quorums mean for some of these boys it's hard it's hard yeah yeah we're going to review that though yeah even there with the council i mean there are sometimes they require super majorities and you ask yourself why and you understand the fiscal issues obviously but there are other things and

[Speaker 2]

there was something recently like appointments some of the appointments are super majorities

[Speaker 1]

yeah yeah interesting some money transfers yeah money transfers stabilization and um oh there was one of the votes on the searls property before the council that was the first vote and part of it purchase of property there was there was a debate over the former city solicitor ruled that you needed the six votes and people that were aware of what the definition what it should have done something that should be five but you know you have to go with what the city solicitor says but it's interesting yes it is yep that's why sometimes the best thing is to write what we would like to eliminate that so i'm thinking that when we go to

[Speaker 2]

another reading yes this um we may want to add some items to the definition like i was saying like social media yeah exactly website and then we should have a section or even um publications we can define here right by saying social media or whatever and then it makes the actual charter

[Speaker 1]

cleaner yeah itself to read so since we're all done with this do you think that that would be a great segue to our next meeting is to see what we feel that we really want to emphasize in the charter and then if we want to add it to the definitions to make it clearer then we can send um get all our answers um from call and center before we have them come right don't we want

[Speaker 2]

uh emails answered first so we can discuss so i'm waiting for the city again to to yeah just so we can get the contract yeah so what we could do is once lisa can when she gets back from vacation updates the the charter without changes we can post that on the website at our next meeting we could um hold our first public hearing right so people can comment if anyone's you know whoever's

[Speaker 1]

watching whatever we'll post the changes not the next meeting the one after or no our next

[Speaker 2]

which will be in two weeks um but it may change we may change but we're gonna have another public hearing anyway so the point is if somebody does want to come with concerns or asks us to review something on the chart or whatever we could do that and then we can begin reviewing the charter at the beginning um because i'm not going to get an answer the way we're going right now i don't think we're going to get answers from the we got to email them the question the question should be next first we need the first we need the contract in place then we'll email them then they're going to need some time to review and get back to us so we have a choice to either just just not meet until that's done and lose you know maybe not for another month if you have our proposed changes

[Speaker 1]

which we we do some you know we could at least get our emails answered and then see if the public wants us to make us any changes and then once we get their feedback if we decide that that's so we

[Speaker 2]

may not get my what i'm saying is we might not get answers by two weeks from now because we don't have a contract yet yeah and we're waiting for the solicitor to go back to the call-in center with some changes he wants in the contract then they have to make the changes then it has to come back and get signed yeah nothing happens fast no nothing's happening fast because we're still here so so my point is that if we wait for the questions to get answered and by the way at the next meeting we could have uh the first public hearing and then we can review the the questions because i'm not going to get them there unless all of a sudden they turn around with this so if you wanted to

[Speaker 1]

have a public hearing at the next meeting it probably should be a general public public hearing yes you know are there things you would like to see included in that versus here's what the recommendations are because we're not there yet no that's usually what the first public hearing's been any these are what we've looked into do you have any suggestions that's why that's why i'm

[Speaker 2]

recommending that we put the revised that lisa finishes on the website saying this is subject to change but if anybody wants to participate they can read what we're doing and come in and comment

[Speaker 1]

you know she and we uh would you ask her i think you're planning on doing it anyway that we should have a whole new document for the next time we meet yeah so she the one that she gave

[Speaker 2]

us at the last meeting i told her not to print it she emailed it to everyone she did but once she updates this now we're done yeah so now she's going to give us a brand new that we can put the rest of the brand new one will have the changes and it'll have numbered pages it will be yellow like she's

[Speaker 1]

been doing because you want to see what was there and see what was changed that way if you want to read it on your computer but when we come to that next we don't have her print us all could i mention one more thing for the call-in center in our questions uh so for 25 years ago i was surprised to see the city did not have a redevelopment authority as probably do i know well it has to be enacted separately because the community development board is the redevelopment right when they did that whole reorganization in the 70s i think it was in the 70s that's what they decided to do but i would venture to say every city in the commonwealth has a redevelopment authority and other than i mean i could figure out what issues were but i think we're probably we should probably have one and i'm wondering if that's a charter issue or if that's not but i i thought that the community development board acts as a redevelopment authority that has the authority to be the community development i mean the urban renewal i'm not quite sure it's it's uh that clear viewed that way yeah or practiced that way because they could even do industrial revenue bonds but when i was here that you know the industrial bonds were big right exactly but they were all the urban renewal agency or was the board that's why it's not called the planning board it's called the community multiple responsibilities but when i was doing your job uh we had to actually go through a process of creating a redevelopment authority for a specific purpose and it was to do a major project on large scale basis but it wasn't it didn't go to the community development had to be dealt with separately and maybe how can we find out do we

[Speaker 2]

do we go to um the solicitor and find out if the community development i thought this

[Speaker 1]

issue came up recently with the with the charles well and that's that's why i'm excited thinking about it again why don't we have one of them um i think they have under the present circumstance they would have to come to the city council to have property declared surplus and or some other thing and then create have the council create the redevelopment authority which made me then think well right they did that reorganization but obviously it's not viewed as a redevelopment authority or the city council wouldn't have to create it um so it maybe it's a question for the call center i'm not sure that's why or this yeah we could go to the city and then being in the job of the city uh who's the community development he might say what the authority it has to be the provision that established the community development board they'd have to listen it's under 121 b you know and i almost think oh i'm sorry i almost i think it's might be under says urban renewal which that would fall under right uh did you google that lenny you're so smart uh we should look that up because it was

a whole petition going back i'm going to think in the 70s late 70s which is why i asked if we had all the homeworld petitions because it would be good to look at um and and i do remember it was a homeworld petition but what the system that we have which was reorganization of several boards into one um it's very confusing and i think it would be helpful to the city in many instances uh to be able to have such a beautiful i agree i think what dennis you're referring to is it says any city or town in the commonwealth may establish either either a redevelopment authority under 121 b right or a consolidated community development department under 43 c and that's what and undertake all urban renewal activities so you're saying we probably i think we did that we did that right we could do the second one you could do c did you just say 43 c is a consolidated first one lenny it was 120 121 b is for the redevelopment authority uh consolidated community development department is 43 c and either one of those can undertake the urban renewal is acceptable yes demolish rehabilitate acquire real estate all of that because even in my city of peabody when i worked there they had the community development authority right yeah yeah oh i would say most cities do i'd be surprised yeah if they all didn't have

[Speaker 2]

that specifically so i'll start i'll email um the solicitor and jack wilson tomorrow and ask if they know you know what i heard it just came up i thought i

[Speaker 1]

some people and they said it came up and i said well why can't they use a community development board but maybe there's a question well you can't you can't i don't know there might be at this point they may say you know what we actually want a standalone redevelopment authority because a lot of communities especially gateway cities have them standalone and they need to adopt the other language it's a it's a good thing for a city to have oh yeah and it's good to think of while we're doing this talk yes but everybody does it differently taught another time redevelopment authority and the community well we had the planning board i mean every community i worked in had a different a different way of doing it well the lr the lawrence redevelopment authority has just been constituted and they just they just accepted i think 15 15 or 16 municipal parcels uh to now start working on to put out the redevelopment on them yeah through the lra i worked on their first renewal plan right he is making something old i am okay so at the next i will reach out to

[Speaker 2]

them to get clarification and you were going to talk to lynda about um any the homework petitions in the past yeah i'll get the list you know what and i wanted to

[Speaker 1]

just address that some formal petitions that went through that was um like we raised the age limit for a firefighter you know who was in the active service so those those are one time we're talking about general right yeah that was so there could be hundreds as you said over the years but you're talking about stuff that are establishing um right procedures so right yeah definitely

[Speaker 2]

i bet you there would be all right and then we're all going to review the questions that lisa sent and then send an email to lynda asking her to send it to the whole group yeah and we'll

review them uh at the next meeting so at the next meeting uh on march 27th we can have a public hearing i would think 15 minutes earlier so 6 45 because honestly if if we do have a lot of people here when we start our meeting at 7 during public participation we'll let more people speak and we'll let we'll do a back and forth we'll make it open for them so we'll do the public hearing just see clarification on that so is

[Speaker 1]

the public participation going to be a dialogue event or is it going to be like it usually is

[Speaker 2]

there's somebody if we have more people we start the public hearing at 6 45 and we have people that didn't get to talk by seven yeah then the public hearing we will have a back we'll have it open back and forth yeah for the public hearing especially yes yeah okay we want to be able to engage and you know discuss i'm fine with it i just was curious what we would do uh and then we should be here by 6 30 be here by 6 30 we'll start the public hearing at 6 45 and then at the we're going to review uh the questions and have them ready to go so once that contract's signed and then we're going to begin reviewing the charter from article one and i will make a suggestion

[Speaker 1]

instead of doing it 48 hours before let's get it out on the internet and the page as soon as as soon as possible like even if it's as soon as they can get it up and just say alert you know we're changing our title we're reviewing that

[Speaker 2]

i'm going to ask um i'm going to have i have it posted i'm going to ask john malory to yeah mctv i'll ask john to put something on the home page about the public hearing i'm going to ask uh either the mayor or the chair to announce that there's going to be a public meeting at the city council meeting yes okay and we'll try to get the word out as much

[Speaker 1]

as we can mctv is good too yeah the city's facebook page i think the school uh the school has their own uh channel do you know what yes they do yeah 99 it's different on one channel

[Speaker 2]

on the other do you have the ability when we get this i'll get the agenda made tomorrow and then can you get it posted on the school's uh site on the school's

[Speaker 1]

television station i'd like it is it includes everyone yes because it does affect them

[Speaker 2]

well mr chairman i'll make a motion to adjourn a second okay all in favor opposed meeting is adjourned