

CHARTER REVIEW BOARD MINUTES May 12, 2009

This meeting was called to order by Chairman Ed Pleasant

MEMBERS PRESENT: Becky Wever, Mike Rose, Martin Pratt, GaryMcKinley, Alan Seymour, Roslyn DeGood, John Popio

MEMBERS ABSENT:

CITIZENS PRESENT: Brian Dostanko, Director of Human Resources for the City of Marysville; Tim Alsaner, Marysville Law Director

JOURNALISTS PRESENT: Ryan Horns

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes from the last meeting were distributed. The minutes stand as presented.

GENERAL REPORT:

Chairman Ed Pleasant began the meetings with the request to number the pages of the Charter Amendment with notations from the Administration, making it easier to follow along with discussion.

It was noted there were no minutes or very sketchy ones regarding the reason for term limits in the Charter Review Board from 2003 and there were none on the subject from the 1993 Charter Review Board.

On the intent for the single reading for ordinary resolutions, Tim Aslaner noted that the council needs to abide by the Ohio Revised Code and as long as there is no expenditure of money – even with contracts – that a single reading can be allowed. The Charter Review Board agreed in round to the intent of the single reading resolution and recommended it as it is written.

The issue of a full time law direction was the next issue that came into focus. Marysville Law Director Tim Alsaner related his take on Marysville and whether or not it needed a full time director. He contacted cities comparable in size and duties and it seemed that every city is different. Marysville is especially so since it is the county seat which means it is responsible for prosecuting all the cases in the county, including sheriff and highway patrol cases as well. This fact makes it hard to compare in a fair and equal light. Tim said there is a lot of things to consider in regards to this question:

- Do you want to keep the position elected or have it appointed?
- In the past, contention between the administration and the council lassoed the law director into playing referee. If the position is elected, there would be more of a fair balance.
- When will this position become affective. As it looks now, it won't be until 2014.

Becky Wever asked if we could wait that long and if need be, change the charter to reflect the need. She also pointed out that there is no wording that allows for either a specific part-time or full-time position.

Questions regarding legal assistants, salary for both law director and assistant, and the question of funding were brought up by Gary McKinley, John Popio, and Alan Seymour.

Ed Pleasant proposed that the board come back to the issue on the 26th. He also reconfirmed that the public will be speaking at the beginning of the meeting then and will have a time limit of 5 minutes to cover whatever topic they wish to discuss in regards to the proposed changes.

Recommendations that were agreed upon and taken off the table:

- Changing the title to 'city administrator' from 'director of administration'.
- At large candidates issue is taken off the table as non necessary.
- Council is not required to do 3 readings regarding ordinary resolutions.

Issues that will be addressed again:

- Term limits on planning
- The question of a full time law director
- City form of government

Dates were set for the next two meetings (April 28 and May 12 at 6:30 pm) and punctuality was touched upon as important.

The topic of whether or not Marysville needs a city manager was introduced. The question of current population, estimated at around 20,000, implied the possibility of needing a more hands-on administrative person to oversee the many requirements and demands of the city. The question of defining the roles of a city manager versus a mayor came up and it was agreed further information was needed before further discussion was to happen. Exploring difference and similarities of other cities that employ the mode of governance was brought, with the cities of east Cleveland or Brunswick as examples.

Mr. Popio inquired as to what other parts of the charter a different form of government would affect.

Mr. Pleasant asked whether an item by item review of the charter was necessary or should it be reviewed by relevant issue only. He explained the definition of a charter and then the procedure of how the review board's recommendations go to city council, which then go to the voters to be amended. The drafting of the charter is done by the city law direction, Tim Aslaner. The ultimate intent of the charter review board was to have a good, in depth, intelligent discussion about items of question, which would include public input, if so deemed.

John Popio suggested public input in the form of a survey, perhaps through a survey, the website or the newspaper or even mailings. The idea of public hearings as part of the process was received favorably for the most part. A five minute limitation per person was agreed upon as a rule for the public hearings.

Mr. Pleasant brought the question of why the city mayor format was left behind in the 1980's. Questions regarding the history of that form of government were brought up. Mr. McKinley asked if the board could have access to the other review board notes and glean from those the issues surrounding that management style. Mr. Popio agreed and said reviewing past minutes would prevent redoing efforts that have already been done.

More questions regarding the distinct roles, job descriptions, and salaries were brought up by various members of the board. Mr. Pleasant agreed that more information was needed regarding

the chain of command in the city government as well as the various duties involved with each position. He offered to procure the information available and have it sent to the board members. The subject of term limits regarding certain position within the government was brought up for discussion.

Mr. Pleasant summed up the Charter Review board's points of interest to be explored:

- 1) Review the form of city government -- full time mayor versus city manager
- 2) Resolutions (additional notes are needed to explain details)
- 3) At-large candidates having different starting dates (recommendation for exploration came from City Council)
- 4) Law director - is a fulltime director needed?
- 5) Term limitations for planning commission - are they needed and where? Does a consistent protocol need to be applied?
- 6) Should there be a provision for departmental line of progress (for example, finance and administration departments and chains of command)

It was agreed upon by all to return on April 28th and decide on a date or dates for public hearings. The date of May 12th was mentioned.