A Charter Review Committee Meeting of the City of Everett was held on March 31, 2016 in the 10th floor Mayor’s conference room of the Wall Street Building located at 2930 Wetmore Ave. The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. and was presided over by Committee Vice Chair Megan Dunn.

Attendees:

Committee Members
Christopher Adams
Terrie Battuello
Megan Dunn
Jim Langus
Jo Metzger-Levin
Tom Norcott
Clair Olivers

Angie Sievers
Michael Swanson
Erica Temple
Michael Trujillo
Walter White
Mark Nesse

Excused Members
Reid Shockey
Dave Koenig

City Staff
Liaison: Bob Bolerjack
City Attorney: Jim Iles
Administrative: Lisa Harrison

1. Call to order
The March 24th meeting minutes were approved with the following amendment: It was requested that the minutes be amended to mention the name of the district map provider who is geographer Richard Morrill. Yes: 12, No: 0, Abstain: 1

2. Welcome new member, Mark Nesse
Nesse provided his background and interests in being a member of the Committee. The City staff provided clarification for members that Mr. Nesse was appointed by the Mayor, with the endorsement of the appointing councilmember and that Mr. Nesse was drawn from the original volunteer application list.

3. Update on retention of outside counsel
Thom Graafstra has been retained and is already doing some work for the Committee. Several committee members had a conference call with him in the past week and discussed City Council districting. Next week he will attend the meeting and can talk with Committee members about their questions. He will be prepared to talk about the districting process.
The Committee agreed that they will need to decide what legal issues we want him to cover versus city staff.

4. Comments from the public

Everett resident Jackie Minchew brought two items to the attention of the Charter Review Committee: 1) It was noted in earlier conversations that the dividing line is considered 41st for north and south Everett. Minchew suggests that they also consider a central Everett district if pursuing districting; 2) Currently the Charter does not include a directive on environmental responsibility and he asks that they consider including something about this issue that compels the city to have an action plan.

5. Update on voter research from County, other sources

Bob Bolerjack talked through the various hand-outs provided to the Committee this week:

- Language from Committee Member Clair Olivers regarding a proposed amendment.
- Number of registered voters north vs. south in the last general election.
- Research on City Council races and where candidates lived from 1981-2015.
- Costs for elections if we move to districting: there would be no cost increase.
- Ranked choice voting in Pierce County: Was adopted in 2006 and was repealed by voters in 2009—was thought to be too confusing.
- Information from the 2013 voters pamphlet regarding the Seattle initiative that created districting, including pros and cons from supporters and opponents.

6. Review Report Outline

Megan Dunn referred to the outline provided by Chair Reid Shockey last week. Dunn reviewed the outline for the committee. The idea would be for various members of the committee to take on different parts of the report.

- Unclear to the Committee what Shockey meant by “minor” amendments in his outline. The Committee decided to revisit the outline at the next meeting and take volunteers for each section.

7. Continue discussion of individual items on list

1) SECTION 5.1: REPRESENTATIVE ADVISORY BOARDS

- Consider that members of boards and commissions strive to reflect the makeup of the community in terms of ethnic diversity, gender, age and geography.
  ✓ Remove from list. This is being handled in Section 15
2) SECTION 5.2: ADVISORY BOARDS
   • Appointing officials for boards and commissions should strive to reflect the makeup of the community in terms of ethnic diversity, gender, age and geography.
     ✓ Remove from list. This has been addressed in Section 15.
   • Consider adding a caveat requiring that a city employee should not be allowed to serve on an advisory board to the department where they work.
     ✓ Motion was made to table this issue. Vote: 13 yes, 0 no (unanimous).
   • Consider whether some boards or committees should be put in the Charter.
     ✓ Suggestion was made that the Charter remain the same and keep it to the 5 mentioned in the Charter currently: Library, Planning, Civil Service, Parks and Salary commissions/boards. In this way, the City Mayor and Council retain the authority to form and disband others.
     ✓ Suggestion was made that any environmental committee, as suggested by the testimony from the public, also remain within the purview of the City Council and Mayor.
     ✓ Motion made to remove this from consideration. Vote: 13 yes, 0 no (unanimous).

3) SECTION 8.1: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
   • Change the wording “board” to “commission” where mentioned.
     ✓ Remove from list, can be corrected under the scrivener’s error provision

4) Articles 9 & 10 (new)
   • Archaic language should be modernized, which should go on the ballot.
   • Legal will draft the language that would cover it and bring to next week’s meeting.

5) SECTION 11.2 INITIATIVE PROCESS: CLARIFICATION OF UNCLEAR LANGUAGE
   • If necessary, consider reviewing and clarifying the language -- Remove section D (confusing). Change “per centum” to “percent”, remove reference to absentee ballots.
     ✓ Covered in archaic language to be covered all in one entry on the ballot.
- Make consistent with state law
  - Motion was made to table this issue until a review can be done comparing to state law. Vote: 13 yes, 0 no (unanimous).

6) SECTION 11.6: PUBLICATION OF ORDINANCES
- On line 2 consider changing from newspaper to “local media”
  - Current language is actually required by state law, so changing the charter would not eliminate the requirement by the state. Remove from list.

7) SECTION 13.9: PUBLICATION
- Consider changing reference to newspaper to “local media”
  - Current language is actually required by state law, so changing the charter would not eliminate the requirement by the state.
  - Motion was made to remove all review items that recommend these changes. Vote: 13 yes, 0 no (unanimous).

8) SECTION 14.2: FINANCE AND TAXATION CAPS
- Consider including a limitation on “payments in lieu of taxes” by city-run enterprises to an amount no greater than the maximum tax rate for a similar service not provided by the city.
  - Clair Olivers provided proposed language and stated that the intent is to limit the rate while reserving the city’s authority to seek an increase by vote.
  - One committee member asked what the problem is that Olivers is trying to solve. He mentioned that the city might be pressured to increase in lieu of tax rate against captive utility funds in order to increase city general funds. His intent is to make the city’s taxation more transparent and limit how high they can go.
  - One member expressed a concern that further limiting the city council options when there were natural political incentives to control the rate was unnecessary and noted that the City has managed this responsibly thus far.
  - A suggestion was made for Clair to draft the narrative he would include in the report to support this and to allow the Committee to have a better understanding of the betterment proposed.
  - Motion made to table for further clarification. Vote: 12 yes, 1 no (majority).
9) SECTION 15: BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (new)

- A motion was made to add a Section 15.10 called Boards- Diversity which would read as follows: Appointments to City boards, commissions, and committees should consider factors such as geography, gender, ethnicity and age in an effort to better reflect the City’s diversity.
  ✓ Vote: 13 yes, 0 no (unanimous).

10) SECTION 16.3 AMENDMENTS- PUBLICATION

- Consider changing mention of the newspaper to reference “local media”
  ✓ Remove from list for reasons mentioned in 13.9.

11) SECTION 16.5 AMENDMENTS- PERIODIC REVIEW OF CHARTER

- Request from the public that the committee consider shortening the length of time between Charter reviews.
  ✓ Comment was made that it takes a while to make sure that the past changes had the desired effect.
  ✓ As it stands the City Council has the authority to ask for a review before 10 years have passed (Charter says at least every 10 years).
  ✓ Motion made to strike this item, Vote: 13 yes, 0 no.

One member asked the other members whether Charter Review Committee seats should be elected positions in the future, as this is how it is handled by the County.

- City Attorney Jim Iles pointed out that this is an advisory committee versus the county, where Charter Review Commission members are freeholders whose recommendations go directly to the ballot.
- One member stated it would be a lot of work for people to run for Charter Review Committee and people may not be interested. It was noted that the County had an overwhelming response when they held these as electoral positions.
- One Committee Member asked that the reasoning behind changes suggested by city clerk in section 3 (Council meetings) be provided to them.
8. Date and topics for next meeting 4/07/2016

Agenda next week:

- Attorney Thom Graafstra will be here to share what he learned about districting. Committee to provide him with items they want him to research.

- Homework is to draft questions for him and send them to Megan Dunn.

- Richard Morrill will be able to join the meeting via phone to discuss his rationale behind creating the district map. He was an advocate for districting. The suggestion was made to find someone from Seattle who was against districting to get their point of view as well as to study the information provided by Bob Bolerjack.

- One Committee Member asked what the process will be for getting through the districting issue. Discussed that the committee has the option of recommending how to district or recommending that a committee be formed to create districts.

- The Committee requested an updated copy of the neighborhood map for all members.

- As a final note, one Committee Member stated that they need to make sure they have a plan in terms of how they will get to the final report before the June 1 deadline.

Note: The meeting on 4/07 will be in the Mayor’s Conference Room on 10th floor.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:21 p.m.