



A Charter Review Committee Meeting of the City of Everett was held on May 19, 2016 in the 5th floor Human Resources training room of the Wall Street Building located at 2930 Wetmore Ave. The meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. and was presided over by Committee Chair Reid Shockey.

Attendees:

Committee Members	Christopher Adams	Clair Olivers
	Terrie Battuello	Reid Shockey
	Megan Dunn	Angie Sievers
	Dave Koenig	Michael Swanson
	Jim Langus	Erica Temple
	Jo Metzger-Levin	Michael Trujillo
	Tom Norcott	Walter White
Excused Members	Mark Nesse	
Guests	Tom Hingson, Everett Transit	
City Staff	Liaison: Bob Bolerjack	Admin: Lisa Harrison
	City Attorney: Jim Iles	

1. Call to order

2. Approval of Minutes

The May 12th meeting minutes were approved unanimously (14-0)

Chair Shockey reviewed the agenda for the meeting:

- Review the report format
- Discuss two new issues:
 - Section 1.5 Intergovernmental affairs. The original version was voted on and was not passed. However, there is a new version prepared by city staff and Clair Olivers that attempts to offer clarity to this potentially confusing section.
 - Mr. J.T. Dray has submitted a recommendation for a Transit Advisory Committee to be added to the Charter. Tom Hingson from Everett Transit is present to answer questions.
- The Committee will go through the process of reviewing any issues that members want to bring back up for discussion.
- Then go to work finalizing the report.



3. Committee discussion

a) Report format

Chair Shockey reviewed the outline for the report. Part A, Recommended Charter Changes; Part B, All Changes Considered by the Committee; Part C, Comments from Individual Committee Members; and Part D, everything else (Appendix). Shockey asked whether Committee members wanted to leave in recommended ballot language or delete it.

- Committee member Koenig stated, “I like it. I think it clarifies what we are thinking about.”
- Committee member Norcott agreed: “I think it makes it easier to understand.”
- Committee member Langus stated, “I concur with the language as an explanatory statement, however, the City should be drafting the ballot language, not the Committee.”
- Committee member Trujillo: “I think having the sample ballot language and the explanatory section are information we are providing to the City Council for their use.”
- Shockey suggested they remove the header, leaving an explanatory statement telling the council how the Committee arrived at its recommendations.
- Committee member Battuello stated, “The word ballot, proposition and the yes and no boxes makes it look like a ballot. It’s not our job to decide whether it goes to the ballot or not. We are limited to providing the Council and the Mayor as to our position. We also will not be the ones writing the ballot so I don’t think it’s fair to do this.”
- Shockey suggested that they state “Charter change, recommended ballot language and then explanatory statement. It would include a minority report unless there was a unanimous vote.”
- Motion was made and seconded to accept Shockey’s recommendation but removing the word “ballot” and the yes/no boxes:

✓ **Vote: 12 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain.**

b) New issues to discuss

- 1) The question of whether to add a Transit Advisory Committee to the Charter was discussed first because Tom Hingson (Transportation Director, City of Everett) was



only available for a limited amount of time. J.T. Dray was asked if he had anything else to add to his proposal. His comment was that Everett has not been transit friendly. He said he would like to give citizens a genuine opportunity to have their voices heard.

- Shockey asked Hingson to address the issue brought up by Dray – specifically whether the Charter should specify a board that advises Everett Transit.
- Hingson stated that he believes Everett Transit is transparent, deals with issues immediately and solicits citizen feedback prior to making changes. He is not opposed to adding another committee, but he believes that participation in the monthly Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting is successful in updating people. He clarified that there is no animosity between Everett Transit and Community Transit. They are partners and work together to solve issues.
- Hingson noted that TAC was a large committee with appointed citizen participation.
- Committee member Trujillo stated that he would like to understand what Dray is asking for that would be different than TAC.
- Committee member Olivers asked Hingson if he would you see any advantage to having a riders’ advisory committee to Transit, and if not, what are the disadvantages?
 - Hingson: I think we have a very large rider’s committee with today’s modern communication tool. They call or they email/comment on the website to give us their comments in real time.
- Committee member Battuello: What would prevent the council from creating this type of committee by ordinance? Per city attorney, nothing.
- Committee member Temple: Where are the voices of the riders being heard? We try to get them on the advisory board but don’t solicit them specifically.
- Committee member Metzger-Levin: Do we know if this has been on the table with City Council at all?
 - Dray: I asked to be a part of the ATPA assessment done on Transit and it was very cursory, never reported. I would stand by my report. I would dispute how well Transit is hearing us (the riders). Regarding whether or



not this was brought up with the City Council, no it has not been brought up.

- Regarding who should be on the committee, he feels it should be riders, including paratransit riders, school representatives, nonprofit representatives and those living in new developments who will be relying on transit.

Shockey thanked Mr. Dray for his comments and the time he has put into this discussion.

- Committee member Metzger-Levin: If this is one of the top five issues that came up during the Council's retreat, where are they on this issue now? Nobody had this answer.
- Committee member Norcott asked if the committee could make a recommendation to the council to establish a Transit Advisory Committee by ordinance.
- Committee member Battuello asked if some obstacle is getting in the way of full disclosure or if Everett Transit is like all other city departments. Per Isles, yes it is a department just like the others, but it receives substantial federal funding.
- Committee member Temple stated, "I don't see the need for us to put it into the Charter, but one thing we could do is include in our recommendations to the Council that they form an advisory board for Everett Transit."
- Chair Shockey stated, "What I'm hearing is there may be issues with whether or not TAC is doing what it needs to do. I think we have to be very careful mandating any boards by Charter. I'm having a tough time understanding if we have a TAC why would we create a separate free-standing committee. Seems like duplication."
- Committee member Battuello: "I don't feel like I would recommend anything at this point. It's beyond our scope to look at how it's operating now."
- Committee member Olivers: "I do agree that TAC is overwhelmed with everything else they address (roads, bike paths, development, etc.) focused on the dollars and they have limited amount of time to address ridership issues."
- Committee member Koenig: Agreed that the focus is primarily on the 3-year plan and funding. Perhaps transit issues could be addressed in a separate committee.
- Committee member Langus stated that he appreciated Mr. Dray's interest in Everett Transit, but that the decision to add a Transit Advisory Committee should be a City Council matter. He said he believes Mr. Dray attends a number of Council meetings and often communicates on transit issues. The City Council already has a much better perspective on this matter than the Committee.



- Committee member Temple moved that a statement be included in Part B of the report that recommends the City Council consider the establishment of a Transit Advisory Committee made up of citizens interested in transit issues.

✓ **Vote: 10 yes, 4 no, motion is approved.**

- 2) New language from the legal department which addresses including tribes and reads much clearer. A motion was made and seconded to accept the new language.

Discussion took place as to whether this would be a meaningful change and would be at risk of being voted down, which would send the wrong message to tribes. With or without this change, the City has the same ability to contract and negotiate with these entities.

- Could this be addressed as a Scrivener's error? Answer was no.
- Committee member Adams: "I struggle with whether or not this is a ballot issue."
- Committee member Trujillo: "For me it is a matter of inclusiveness, recognizing groups that we do business with. It is still up to the Council to decide if it goes on the ballot, but we need to do what's right."
- Committee member Battuello: "I don't know if we want a community discussion over something that's not broken, that is a non-issue."

✓ **Vote: 7 yes, 6 no, 1 abstain (not passed)**

- Committee member Dunn made a motion to create a Climate Action Committee in the Charter. Chair Shockey ruled the motion out of order because it has been voted on previously. Will need to bring up under reconsideration.

c) Votes to reconsider

- Committee member Dunn made a motion to reconsider previous vote on Section 5.2 (Advisory Boards) included in the Charter and amend the Charter to include a Climate Action Committee to create recommendations for a climate action plan for the City of Everett.
- Dunn read a statement: "The plan should include research and data gathering, be advisory to committees and the council on all issues that impact climate change and preparations to address climate change, including but not limited to the Planning Commission, Parks Board, Tree Committee, Emergency Response and Transportation. The Committee should propose outreach to all city residents and establish an understanding of the impacts of climate change on public health, emergency response, population vulnerability, and data gathering. The committee should have staff support from the Planning Department. Members of the committee should include relevant



stakeholders and residents representing a diverse collection of neighborhoods.”
Seconded to bring it back on the table.

✓ **Vote: 7 yes, 7 no (not passed). Will not be reconsidered.**

- Dunn then made a motion that the Committee recommend that the Council consider adding a citizens’ Climate Action Committee. Motion was seconded. Discussion took place as to whether this was included in the climate change element of the City’s recent Comprehensive Plan update. Dunn pointed out that this has to do with involving citizens, research and outreach rather than just the city staff. Per Shockey, this could be an implementation tool of the Comprehensive Plan.

✓ **Vote: 7 yes, 6 no, 1 abstention. Did not pass.**

- Council districting issue: Chair Shockey asked if anyone moves to reconsider this issue. There was no interest among those qualified to make the motion.
- 14.2: payment in lieu of tax move to reconsider (Dunn), seconded.

✓ **Vote: 7 yes, 7 no (not passed). Will not be reconsidered.**

4. Finalizing report

- Committee member Temple: Table 3, 4.0 comments says change isn’t necessary. I recall that we were considering state law and we didn’t think we could make this change. Recommends removing the comment.
- Committee member Langus: Page 8, need to add comment to the recommended Charter change regarding Council meetings that the weather causes issues as well as the fact that there sometimes is no need to meet. He recommended striking the first paragraph of the explanatory statement, and adding the factors of weather and reasons to meet. Add as second sentence: “at times weather, limited business or holidays make a meeting unnecessary.”
- Committee member Dunn would like to specify that Mark Nesse was appointed by the Mayor with consent of the Councilmember who had chosen the member Nesse replaced. The Committee decided to leave as is.
- Committee members decided the statement regarding “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” on Page 4 should be removed from introduction.
- Motion made to accept changes as outlines, seconded.
✓ **Vote: 14 yes, 0 no (unanimous).**
- Motion made and seconded to accept the report without reviewing the final.
✓ **Vote: 12 yes, 2 no (passed).**



All comments from individual Committee members to be included in the report are due by close of business Wednesday. Trujillo put it on the record thanking Reid Shockey for being a great Chair. Applause.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.