



City of Somerville, Massachusetts

City Council Charter Review Special Committee

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 24, 2023

6:00 PM

Committee of the Whole

This meeting was held via GoToWebinar and was called to order by Chair Scott at 6:02 pm and adjourned at 10:08 pm on a Roll Call Vote: 10 in favor (Councilors McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed, 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Others present: Kimberly Wells – City Clerk; Bernabe Rodriguez – Assistant City Clerk; Brendan Salisbury – Legislative and Policy Analyst; Neha Singh – Legislative Liaison; Marilyn Contreas - Edward J. Collins Center for Public Management; Beverly Schwartz – Charter Review Committee Member

Roll Call

Present: Chairperson Jefferson Thomas (J.T.) Scott, Vice Chair Kristen Strezo, Willie Burnley Jr., Matthew McLaughlin, Lance L. Davis, Ben Ewen-Campen, Jesse Clingan, Beatriz Gomez Mouakad, Charlotte Kelly and Jake Wilson

Absent: Judy Pineda Neufeld

1. Committee Minutes (ID # [23-0736](#))

Approval of the Minutes of the Charter Review Special Committee of the Whole Meeting of May 10, 2023.

RESULT: ACCEPTED

AYE: Chairperson Scott, Vice Chair Strezo, City Councilor At Large Burnley Jr., McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly and Wilson

ABSENT: Pineda Neufeld

Public Hearing on Item #22-1520 (continued)

2. Officer's Communication (ID # [22-1520](#))

Charter Review Committee conveying its recommendations and proposed Charter text.

Chair Scott referred the Committee to the slides dated 05.24.23, related to the public hearing and line-by-line review.

The Chair re-opened the public hearing at 6:07pm.

Nate Clauser stated that the current draft falls short of what Councilors have been advocating for and complaining about, such as approval for outside legal counsel for the Council, and the ability of the Council to fill vacant seats on multiple member bodies. This charter also fails to give the Council any additional power

over the budget process. Councilors have campaigned on these ideas and should not cede their responsibility to the legislature or outside experts. Beverly Schwartz thanked all of the Councilors for their work and their good intent and encouraged that moving something forward is incredibly important, and a huge improvement over the current charter, including the addition of the requirement for review every ten years. Chris Dwan urged passage of this package, despite its imperfections, noting that it is an improvement. He expressed a new understanding of the limitations and thanked the Council for their work during the process. Jessica Lieberman also thanked the Council for moving this charter forward, noting it does not contain everything that everyone wanted but is a huge improvement and represents what is reasonable at this stage. The obligation for future review and the opportunity for future changes will be a benefit to a future city. Derrick Rice shared that this is an opportunity to create more opportunity and the Council should stay true to its values and commitment to residents. Catherine Leech expressed support previously for financial reallocation powers for the City Council and reiterated that support. She noted that we should not settle for incremental improvement.

The Chair closed the public hearing at 6:19pm.

The first outstanding item was the substitution of the scrivener's errors document dated 05.24.23 as the working document. *The Chair moved to accept all of the changes in the document titled 05.24.23 CHARTER WHOLE Proposed Charter Text - Scrivener's Errors. The motion was approved by a roll call vote of 9 in favor (Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed, and 2 absent (McLaughlin, Pineda Neufeld).*

The document titled 05.24.23 CHARTER WHOLE Proposed Charter Text - Requested Language & Analyst Recommendations was the next document reviewed. Chair Scott shared this using a comparative tool created by Beverly Schwartz. Councilor Davis expressed concern about the impact of some of the simplifications and the limited time for review. Councilor Gomez Mouakad echoed that sentiment.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 1-7, definition of business day, as requested by the Council. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury noted that definitions for full city council and full multiple member body do not appear in the document and do not need to be included.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 1-7, removing definitions of full city council and full multiple member body, as requested by the Council. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury recommended removing the qualification of the definition of General Laws with the clause "a codification and revision of statutes enacted on December 22, 1920, and including all amendments subsequently adopted".

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 1-7, the definition of General Laws. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad,

Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury noted that the definition of majority vote was written in a way that does not include the city council and school committee, and the changes presented address that issue. Councilor Kelly asked if a definition of body is now needed for clarification. Analyst Salisbury added that the definition of a full body is defined in the enabling legislation of those bodies and there is no consistent number. The use of the term body was not intended to be specific. Chair Scott suggested adding “or city council or school committee” to the end of the definition or removing the last sentence as it is redundant.

*Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to **the first sentence only** of Section 1-7, the definition of majority vote. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).*

Analyst Salisbury noted that the definition of multiple member bodies was updated to include clauses to address committees and subcommittees of elected bodies.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 1-7, the definition of multiple member body. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury shared that the clauses in the definition of quorum are redundant. Councilor Kelly noted that the phrase “by ordinance” is used elsewhere and may be useful even in its redundancy. Analyst Salisbury responded that specificity in this manner often creates issues with interpretation. Analyst Salisbury will draft a new definition that includes a clarification of the term “body”.

***Councilor Davis moved to amend the definition of quorum by replacing “required” with “established”.** The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).*

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 2-1 (c) to include “in the city”. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 2-5 (c) Rules of Procedure. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott highlighted the recommended change to the provision for the period of public comment in Section 2-5 (d). Councilor Ewen-Campen supported the change to remove that provision. Councilor McLaughlin added that it is often difficult to manage and does not provide a general sense of public sentiment. He added that public comment works well when there is a substantive issue and there are avenues in place to provide for that. Councilor Clingan agreed and suggested possibly reducing the threshold for residents to call for a public hearing. Councilor Kelly expressed concern about removing a democratic avenue for participation. Analyst Salisbury also noted that none of the 44 Massachusetts

charters he reviewed had a reference to public comment.

Chair Scott also noted the recommendation to increase the number of Councilors required to call a special meeting to 6 would be consistent with current practice.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 2-5 (d) Meetings. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 2-5 (d) to read: Special meetings of the city council shall be held at the call of the president or at the call of any 6 members... The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 2-5 (d) Meetings (1) and (2). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 2-6 (b) (1), replacing "prepare" with "determine". The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 2-7 to include a provision for the appointment and term of the city clerk. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 2-8 (b) and 2-8 (b) (2) to clarify multiple member body appointment timeline and posting requirements. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott highlighted the changes to Section 2-5 (c) Constables, to set parameters for constable terms, noting that this would provide for any constable re-appointment not submitted in this timeline could still be submitted and would then be considered a new appointment.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 2-8 (c) for constable terms and appointments. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott explained the charter objection provision, noting that it differs slightly from current practice.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 2-9 (b) to remove the word "present". The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Councilor Kelly expressed a desire to lower the threshold for submission of a petition and requested feedback on what number other Councilors would suggest. Councilor Clingan suggested that 50 would be reasonable. Councilor

McLaughlin agreed that 50 is a good number.

Chair Scott moved to amend Section 2-11 to change 100 municipal voters to 50 municipal voters. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Councilor Ewen-Campen asked for clarification on the definition of an action as it is used here.

Chair Scott noted that the language in Section 3-1 was updated to include the specific language for the Council's requested intent to change the mayoral term.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment in Section 3-1 (b) to change four to two. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Councilor Davis had submitted a resolution to add language for a term and confirmation process for the City Solicitor. He emphasized that this position has the strongest argument for accountability to the City Council, as the Council is effectively a client. Analyst Salisbury noted that confirmation is a common feature of city charters, but reconfirmation is not. Liaison Singh noted that the administration has not reviewed language on this but they are open to providing feedback. Councilor Ewen-Campen expressed that he remains committed to working with the administration and is cognizant of their concerns relative to recruitment, but he supported Councilor Davis's arguments about how this addresses Council concerns about good-faith engagement from the City Solicitor. Councilor McLaughlin reiterated a previous suggestion from Councilor Wilson that the City Solicitor be appointed by the Council, but also noted that in practice, City Councils rarely called the City Solicitor before them for consideration of reappointment.

Analyst Salisbury noted that most of the edits to Section 3-6 were at the request of the Council.

Chair Davis moved to amend the last line of Section 3-6 to read: Within 30 days of the beginning of a new mayoral term, the mayor shall submit ~~the~~ a chief administrative officer for confirmation or reconfirmation in the same manner as a new appointment under section 2-8(a). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).
Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 3-6. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury noted that the changes to Section 3-9 are for clarity, and consistency with the Rules of the City Council and current practice.

Councilor Davis moved to amend the first line of Section 3-9 to read "Every ordinance or other measure as required by law adopted or passed by the city council..." The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 3-9. The motion was

approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott noted that the change made to Section 3-13 (a) to provide for 6 months rather than 4 for a vacancy before a special election is required, which reduces the likelihood of multiple successive elections and the cost to the city. *Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 3-13 (a). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).*

Analyst Salisbury clarified that the changes to Section 5-1 include a specific reference to majority vote as the vote requirement, and updates to language requested by the Council to provide for timing allowances if the Council is in recess.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 5-1. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

The changes in Article 6 reflect resolutions previously voted on by the Council and provides the language requested.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 6-2. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 6-3. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 6-4. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed, 1 absent.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 6-6 (c). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury shared changes to Sections 8-4 and 8-5, suggested after review with the Collins Center, to clarify that revisions are not a requirement.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 8-4. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 8-5. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Analyst Salisbury presented the changes to Section 8-6, noting that the changes

clarify the goal of the review. Councilor Ewen-Campen suggested striking the requirement that all members are municipal voters of the city. Councilor McLaughlin suggested that there be a residency requirement, but not a voter requirement. Councilor Ewen-Campen noted that valuable experts and contributors may not be residents.

*Chair Scott moved to amend Section 8-6 to **strike the line “All members of the committee shall be municipal voters of the city.”** and otherwise accept the amendments to Section 8-6. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).*

Analyst Salisbury noted that the change to Section 8-7 (4) is to remove duplication and aid in readability.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 8-7. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott suggested that striking the language in Section 8-10 would remove the ability to amend the charter by ordinance. Jessica Lieberman, Charter Review Committee member, noted that the intent was to give flexibility to the City Council if the timing did not work. Councilor Davis suggested building that flexibility in otherwise. Marilyn Contreas suggested that a fixed date in the charter is useful so a future Council doesn't amend the date before a new Council is sworn-in.

*Councilor Davis moved to **strike from Section 8-10 (a) “in years immediately following a mayoral election”**. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).*

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendment to Section 8-10 (a). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 8-10 (c). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Section 9-6 will be reviewed by the City Solicitor and City Clerk to determine which previously accepted Special Acts should carry forward.

Section 9-7 (a) includes changes previously requested by Councilors, early in the process.

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 9-7 (a). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 9-7 (b). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 9-7 (c). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 9-7 (d). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Chair Scott moved to accept the amendments to Section 9-7 (e). The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Councilor Kelly asked about the next steps and what work will take place in the summer. Chair Scott explained that this is step 2. The Council will send the language for the Law Department review, and well as for the Mayor to review and prepare recommendations and requests for collaboration on a document to be sent to the state legislature. There is no requirement that Councilors do anything during the summer, but there may be opportunity to work on new language with the administration if desired.

Councilor Davis moved to amend Section 3-5 to insert subsection (b) to read: The city attorney shall be appointed by the mayor, subject to review by the city council under section 2-8 (a). Within 30 days of the beginning of a new mayoral term, the mayor shall submit a city attorney for confirmation or reconfirmation in the same manner as a new appointment under section 2-8 (a); and renumber subsequent sections. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed, and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Councilor Burnley moved that language be added to the Charter Review Committee's proposed charter that the City Council may amend the mayor's proposed budget to allocate funding to a line item within a department or create a new line item within an existing department or previously non-existent department, as long as the amended budget does not exceed said operating budget. The motion was not approved on a roll call vote of 3 in favor (Burnley, Kelly, Scott), 7 opposed (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Gomez Mouakad, Strezo) and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

Councilor Ewen-Campen expressed some concerns about how well this would function, noting that the current level of staffing for the City Council would not be conducive to executing this well. His goal is to focus on moving the charter forward, which is a process that requires agreement between the City Council and the Mayor, even before the legislative is a factor. After many conversations with the Mayor's office, this process is precarious, and has halted in the past in Somerville and other communities when agreement could not be reached. He is not comfortable supporting this, as it pushes the process toward not acting in good faith toward the administration. Councilor Kelly also noted that she believes in this in principle, but this process requires more attention to procedure and can be re-evaluated following receipt of the Mayor's version of the charter. Councilor Gomez Mouakad added that concerns about this have been previously shared by

Analyst Salisbury. She also noted that she supports the spirit of collaboration, has concerns about this logistically, and encouraged attention to getting this passed. Councilor Burnley acknowledged these concerns and elaborated that the public has approached him regularly about this. He stressed that having this power will further the Council’s ability to serve residents. Councilor McLaughlin emphasized that this language will sabotage the charter and because of that, he will not support the motion. Councilor Wilson noted that he very much wants the Council to have this power and did a lot of research on the possibility earlier in the charter process and is confident it will not be accepted. Councilor Davis agreed that he understands the frustrations and this is something that he would like to see in the charter and also that it may be a better approach to wait and learn lessons from Boston’s approach, as this would put all of the other work at risk. Chair Scott noted that this is simply a vote and encouraged Councilors to not ascribe ill-intent to their colleagues.

Chair Scott moved to transmit the proposed charter, as amended by the City Council, to the Mayor for consideration. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 10 in favor (McLaughlin, Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Wilson, Burnley, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly, Strezo, Scott), 0 opposed and 1 absent (Pineda Neufeld).

RESULT: RECOMMENDED TO BE MARKED WORK COMPLETED

- 3. Officer's Communication (ID # [23-0794](#))

City Clerk submitting amendments to the proposed charter to address scrivener's errors.

See 22-1520.

RESULT: RECOMMENDED TO BE APPROVED AS AMENDED

AYE: Chairperson Scott, Vice Chair Strezo, City Councilor At Large Burnley Jr., Davis, Ewen-Campen, Clingan, Gomez Mouakad, Kelly and Wilson

ABSENT: McLaughlin and Pineda Neufeld

- 4. Resolution (ID # [23-0826](#))

By Councilor Davis

That language be added to the appropriate section of the Charter Review Committee's proposed Charter text to include a provision subjecting the City Solicitor to reappointment and reconfirmation every two years.

See 22-1520.

RESULT: RECOMMENDED TO BE MARKED WORK COMPLETED