



Charter Review Commission Minutes

Boards & Commissions Room, Thursday, May 13, 2010, 7:00 p.m.

Prayer was given by Jack Dodgson, and Pledge of Allegiance was given.

Members Present: Jack Dodgson, Doris Stewart, Gwen Heeney, Christina Gary, Elgie Underwood, David Renninger, and Mary Botts

Members Absent: Brian D'Antonio

Meeting called to order at 7:01 p.m.

Motion to Approve Minutes: Motion to approve minutes of the May 6, 2010 meeting with changes on page 7, item #21, change word "reduce" to "redistrict", and Page 9, 1st sentence, change word "extend" to "defend", motion by David Renninger, seconded by Gwen Heeney, minutes approved as noted.

Mr. Underwood said after the CIC meeting on Monday, he was able to meet with Brian Reali afterwards to ask him a few more questions on the process as we continue to go forward because I don't want us to necessarily fall behind. Some of the things that we have to keep in mind is whatever we do, finally whittle this down to what we would like to present to the electorate, we are then going to be asked to write it out exactly how we would like to see it on the ballot in our language, we will give that to Brian Reali, Brian will then go ahead and rewrite it for us and then give it back to us to give us a time to adjust it, any modifications that we want to make and then after we present it back to him, it will go on to Board of Elections, we are assuming before Board of Elections, it will go onto Council first and it will be formalized at that point. This brings us to tonight's meeting so what I would like us to do, and I am challenged by the fact of even bringing it up, only because if it were me being asked, and I would like the right to reserve to vote on the issues too, either go down our list for a vote or begin writing to the best of our ability, what we have in front of us, the twelve of them, to go ahead and consider. Ms. Stewart said didn't we agree not to vote unless everyone was here? Mr. Underwood said that was exactly why I want to make this meeting productive and I am all for that because again, if it were me, that I unfortunately missed, because of the restaurant or whatever, I would struggle not being there for the vote as well, but we are also up against the fact that we just want to keep moving forward so if we don't want to have a vote to whittle it down, we can look at these twelve and begin to have some type of form to what we would like each one of these to say as we present it to Brian to go ahead and rewrite it because he is going to need his time too, I don't know if it is something he can knock down in a week and give it back to us on a Thursday or if he is going to need two weeks or whatever it takes him to do. Mr. Dodgson said since he is not going to be here next week, his suggestion, how about we just go through it and just have a better understanding and another review. Mr. Underwood said probably going forward too if we have vacations or travel or whatever, I will probably just ask for your vote if it is coming down to a voting week to say, how do you feel, so I have a copy for the file, what do you feel about

whatever item number we are doing at that particular time. I didn't think about doing that with Brian. Mr. Renninger asked did we discuss whether anything that we are going to forward to the ballot has to have a unanimous recommendation from this committee or are we going to go with a 4-3 or 5-2 vote or whatever. Mr. Underwood said my understanding was after the discussion last week, it was going to go on a majority vote. Mr. Renninger said I don't have a problem with that, I just wanted to clarify that and make sure we are all on the same page. Mr. Underwood asked if everyone was fine with that and everyone was. Mr. Dodgson said I am fine with that and I think that is pretty much going to show how the voting public is going to show too. Mr. Underwood said I did put a phone call in to Brunswick Law Director about item #9, again, I wanted to get a better understanding of how we would write something like that, what exactly what it would be that we are trying to accomplish, etc. Just talking on other things, they are doing 17 issues on the ballot. I didn't ask what they were, I just thought that was pretty ambitious. We are nowhere near that. I am not too concerned about the number of items, as I am making sure that something that we think should be on, is put on the ballot. Ms. Heeney said when we went through the 27 items last week, there were a few that we wanted left on there for more discussion. I think we should definitely discuss those. Some of those are worth questioning, like the Law Director and Finance Director elected or appointed and the discrepancy between Acting Mayor and Council President and put on the ballot all recommended amendments. Those were the three we didn't really have a consensus of opinion and that we wanted more discussion on so that might be a place to start today.

Items for discussion:

1. **Term Limits for Council** – Mr. Underwood said per our discussion last week, it was not necessarily that we are looking at a particular position or elected official as much as we are looking for some consistency so either term limits or no term limits, that is not how it is written. Mr. Renninger said that is basically where I am, I think my personal opinion is we should not have term limits for anybody but if that is not going to be a solution, then we need to make it consistent so that everybody has term limits, either everybody has them or nobody has them, in my opinion, including Council. Ms. Heeney said she was on the fence on that because in some cases I know that they can be voted out and all that but people like Mayors that are in their position for too many years. Mr. Renninger said my personal opinion is that we should do away with term limits but I am not cast in iron on that, I just want to have consistency and uniformity, either we have term limits for everybody or have term limits for nobody. I don't like the way it is right now. Mr. Dodgson asked why he didn't like it the way it was right now. Mr. Renninger said because the Law Director has term limits and the Mayor has term limits but the Finance Director doesn't nor has Council and particularly with the two elected positions, Finance and Law, I think it is very unfair that the Law Director has term limits but the Finance Director doesn't. If these are career positions, yes, they are both professional positions so why would we say the Law Director has to have term limits but the Finance Director doesn't, it makes no sense to me at all. Ms. Stewart, Ms. Gary and Ms. Heeney all agreed. Ms. Gary said especially the fact that the Finance Director does deal with the City's finances and it seems like he can be under the guise of continuing employment without anybody else coming in in the end and checking to see what he has done in years past. I don't like the fact that the Finance Director doesn't have a term where the Law

Director does, it seems like there is no, if there is an audit, the Finance Director can hide under his cloak of authority and keep funneling money, not that he has any plans or thoughts to do so, but I just think that it leaves it open for abuse of power. Mr. Dodgson said my question is do we add the Finance Director to have term limits or do we do away with term limits? Mr. Renninger said that is the big question. Mr. Dodgson said I think the Mayor should have term limits. Ms. Stewart asked why. Mr. Dodgson said especially what I am hearing about weak Mayor/strong Council, I just think possibly eight years, I like the fact that under the way we are at present form, the Mayor having a limit, I think the Finance Director should be added for no term limits but I don't know if I believe Council should be in that group either. I think we should just add the Finance Director. Ms. Gary said we should really be asking whether the Law and Finance Director should be appointed and not elected because obviously they would possibly be appointed the term of the Mayor. Mr. Dodgson said there are a lot of steps there in the first article there. Mr. Underwood said some of this stuff we have to consider too is the number and the statistics, and the statistics are the previous votes of what we have, if it is about appointed, even if it is in regards to our personal opinion, I would love to see them appointed, but I truly believe that there is not a chance that Stow will turn around and appoint them. I like the flyer that Brunswick sent out where they talked about their issues that were coming up, but again, not having a budget and asking the Mayor to allocate funds to let us send something out. Ms. Heeney said maybe the Stow Sentry and Ms. Heeney said she wanted to talk also about the brochure. Ms. Heeney asked Mr. Underwood why he thought they would not go for an appointed position? Ms. Stewart said I agree with Brian that this whole thing, I think, has changed in the last year. I would rather it be that way or that way, I don't know but I think there is a lot of different thought processes going on out there. Mr. Underwood said that was just my feeling in having worked, for an example, like United Way where I was a Campaign Director in Industries and having to go out there and I would try to talk to the executives and ask permission to meet with employees and some of the stories I would hear from when it was called the "United Chest" and their grandfather was injured in one of the wars and had to pay a nickel for a donut, that went from generation to generation to generation to not give money to the United Way and I am thinking talking three generations later and didn't even happen to you though I understand that but. Ms. Heeney said that was another thing living here in Stow, living here a short time that the answer to a lot of things is "because that is the way it has always been done" and that is the answer you get for a lot of things. Mr. Underwood said and again if it makes it through the vote, especially with us having a majority vote, then it is something that goes out to the community regarding the appointment and we can let the tally come in. Ms. Heeney said I just think if we are going to stay with a Mayor, it would make the Mayor much stronger. Ms. Gary said the advantages of the appointed positions would be the residency requirement would be null and void for Finance and Law Director because they would not be elected officials so that would be a plus. The advantage would be we could select from a larger pool rather than a subgroup in Stow. The downside, I think, though to the appointed side would be when a new Mayor came in, it would be a lot of uncertainty because if it were Mayor Fritschel running, more likely than not, she would probably keep Brian and John, her current people. It is just the timing. An appointed allows them to choose from a larger pool. Mr. Underwood said and it is a more stringent hiring

process versus an election process so there are a few more hurdles to make sure that maybe whatever happened in the past will not happen again but having politics, it is not necessarily the game as much as the individuals who play it. The only weakness would be for the electorate just believing that somehow or someday they are giving up power. Mr. Renninger said I am in the same boat you are, I want this on the ballot but I don't think it is going to win, I think the electorate is going to turn it down like they have in the past. Ms. Stewart said one of the ways to battle that is to find out but also to add the education. Ms. Heeney said you may want to put on there is what Christina said that you would get a bigger pool of candidates. Ms. Gary said it also allow them to be fired, If they are not doing their job and they are at-will employees, they can be terminated so it allows the Mayor to have a little bit of power than every four year election to see if they are going to lose or win. Mr. Dodgson asked if it would be more expensive to appoint them. Mr. Underwood said if I would have to guess, I would say it is probably a little bit cheaper, just on the administrative part of it for election and all of that. I would think with the salary there would be a little wiggle room or a range of salary and depending on that individual, everybody is going to be a little bit different. Mr. Renninger said did we also clarify that if in fact, the Mayor has the authority that his or her choice must be confirmed by Council? Mr. Underwood thought that was true because it was true for pretty much any employee, especially Department Heads. Ms. Stewart said then for the next one for qualifications of the Finance Director, that would alter what we would do for appointed position, and what do you do with setting term limits for the Finance Director if you go that route? Mr. Underwood said well if that passes and that is something we are going to take on for the appointed, then we would still, I am assuming that everyone's position is the same for term limits regardless of taking the Finance and Law Director to appointed positions versus elected, now we are down to Council and Mayor. Ms. Gary said what happens if they turn down the appointed and we didn't even address it? Now those things are going to be addressed by the next Charter. Mr. Renninger said that is a good question, that could happen. Ms. Stewart said what would we do then, would we have to make a decision? You almost kind of have to make a decision which things you want to address this time around and which things you want to leave for the next commission.

2. **Council Term – two years versus four years?** Mr. Underwood said he is fine with two years and again in my opinion, just to make sure they are in the public. It is all part of the salary. Mr. Renninger said I would lean towards four years but I am not really totally committed to that. Mr. Dodgson asked how long ago was it four years? No one knew for sure. Ms. Stewart said she felt strongly about four years. Ms. Heeney said I think four too because I think you have more continuity with things and you don't have so much interruption with some of the changes that two years with people coming in and all of that. Mr. Underwood said just going back to Jack's comment that he said to Doris prior to this Charter Review Commission, that he wouldn't know how to start a conversation and that is my drive with trying to have it every two years to get turnover, in my personal opinion, the more people that play that are that understanding in the community, the more resources the community can draw from, I just think the better off we will be. Ms. Stewart said I just think from experience with Chamber, that would be two years, the smaller of 350 members versus the City of this size, that having somebody there, you start a project and some projects take you three years and by the time you really feel like

you know what you are doing, you really have reached out into your ward or the city at-large and really gotten to know some of the citizens and their feelings and everything about issues, sometimes that takes two years and it takes time to build those relationships and let people see what you are all about before you can really comfortably, in my mind, be able to represent them even better as time goes on because you do have a better understanding of what is going on, what they want and what is going on back here, and to me, having longer time doing your job and not campaigning every other year, makes sense. Ms. Heeney said she thought four years goes by in a flash and two years goes by in a second and I like four years. Mr. Renninger said Jack said what I was thinking, if I would go for four year terms, I would also then be okay with term limits for everybody. Mr. Dodgson asked Ms. Stewart do you really think that would have been hard to do two years later? Ms. Stewart said yes, going out and doing it is not so much as now you have a job to do as well, you have another job as well so you are committed to your job first, in my mind, your campaigning has to be secondary because your first job is where you are getting paid and that better be first so when you work full-time, and you have a lot of people on Council that do, and they have that part-time job on Council, and now you are campaigning. That has to be more taxing the next time around than your first time around when your total focus was on the campaigning. I don't see why, if you are in for four years, why you can't still knock on doors, still walk the street, still call people and talk to them, I can't see why you still can't do that without campaigning and putting up the signs and other things that we do. Mr. Dodgson said I don't think you will. Ms. Stewart said but you could. Mr. Underwood said that was what Mr. Heeney said was that four years just gives you a lot more time to get your name entrenched into the community which gives the new person a tougher hurdle to get over which goes back to the 40% of the regular voters that are also in the organizations in order to vote for that person so it becomes a feeder system versus actually allowing somebody, who he or she may have better potential or whatever, to again, not get in just for the reason of name recognition and name entrenchment. Ms. Gary said this takes away from the argument that negates this by Mr. Earle because look at the turnover, we have Ron Alexander who got defeated, Mary Bednar who got defeated so even with this two year turnaround, there still were people who had been in Council a long time who had their name out there, they were still defeated so it may be the hard work by the new person or whatever the factor may be, it is give and take here. Mr. Underwood said I think the math being what is it and Mr. Armstrong had tried to make the point that if you back those up two years or move it forward two years, then the statistics skew, that argument aside though, let's remember that Rasor won by defeating a 16 year veteran and Janet has been there 14 and the next one is Sara Drew. Ms. Stewart said that several people had commented about these people who get themselves in Chamber and you get involved in Rotary and Kiwanis but that is a good thing in my mind, you are truly getting involved. You can go to club meetings but a lot of these people truly get involved and they are building their base of knowledge, their support systems because people see that they are out in the community really giving back and so to me, that is a positive way. We heard the comments that it is a negative, you get your name in there. I have been in these organizations a long time and I see the hard work. Mr. Underwood said I am not saying anything negative about those organizations I am just going to the statistics of what Walt Heeney brought in and that is exactly what we ran into when we ran, so it was just interesting to see a play on

this. Ms. Stewart said there are plenty of people who didn't know who I was and I have been involved in those organizations but when I got into our ward and you are knocking door to door, it is a whole different world than the business world that we go in and out of day in and day out. Ms. Heeney said the people that belong to those organizations are more likely to vote, they are more attuned to what is going on. Ms. Gary said from what I am hearing, I think this is a good issue for the ballot, I am fenced on this. Mr. Renninger said are we going to take a vote on two years versus four years. Mr. Underwood said we can't vote on this with Brian out. Items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are all sort of interconnected and we have to deliberate on these and talk about them more. Mr. Underwood said he is going to ask Mr. Reali if we have to separate these per Article in the Charter, I believe we have to, but I just want to get it confirmed with Brian Reali.

6. **Section 3.05 and 3.06 and Section 4.04** – Ms. Gary said I made a note that you pretty much lose your vote but gain a veto. I think that was pretty much what we were talking about last time. If you are acting Mayor, you are going to lose your vote but you retain the veto or were you guys thinking about you get to keep your vote and you don't get to veto? Ms. Stewart said if you are now the Mayor and have the Mayor's powers, you lose your council powers. Ms. Gary said as it stands right now, they keep their vote and they also gain the veto. I think the way to clean it up is they lose their vote but gain the veto. Mr. Renninger said he would agree with that and Ms. Stewart and Ms. Heeney also agreed with that. Mr. Dodgson said but then what, it goes to six council votes? Ms. Stewart said that could be an issue. Mr. Renninger said but the person acting would have veto power. Ms. Stewart said that is a question for Mr. Reali, if three say yes and three say no, it won't be going anywhere, there won't be a majority vote. Mr. Underwood said the actual sections are 3.06 and 4.04. Ms. Stewart asked if anyone had a laptop to type on instead of hand-writing it. Ms. Heeney said she will bring one in. It may make it faster. Ms. Gary said she will write this one up.
7. **Add section on the CIC to Charter** – Mr. Underwood said they were going to strike the "CIC" and go with the "Intra" government language which would be section 2.03 in the City of Green Charter. It was also in the Brunswick Charter. They have an inter governmental relations section which ironically happens to be section 2.03 as well. Ms. Gary asked if going to the CIC on Monday was fruitful. Mr. Renninger said he thought it was fruitful and he learned more than if he hadn't gone to that meeting. Ms. Stewart thought it was. Ms. Heeney said if they only have a small amount of money and a company comes to them and wants a lot of money, they can only deal with one company basically. It just didn't make sense to her. Ms. Stewart said she thought she learned Monday that if they have money or not, that is very important to that function, but if it doesn't, it can still act as a conduit for businesses and the bigger things and needs are met because that was a conduit that is, from my understanding, under the Ohio Constitution, very valid. Ms. Heeney asked how do they elect who is on the board or who appoints the board members. Ms. Stewart said Mike Weddle said if we have more questions on that too, he is more than willing to answer those. Mr. Dodgson said I don't understand how that all works with the risky loans scenario. If I own a business and I go to the bank and they turn me down so I am going to come and talk to the City, and if I am not a corporation that is not going to turn around in income taxes, they are not looking for a company that is less than 10 employees. They did not say that but I don't see where it is advantageous for them. I am sitting there listening and it made more sense to me to from

what Mr. Underwood said than what they are trying to do with a limited funds base, and I still, even though Brian said it and I understand, I just can't fathom who is paying that bill. Ms. Stewart said there is no guarantee that it is paid back but your hopes are with say, Wrayco, with that payroll taxes alone, they are significant, and also getting them from point A to the bigger picture where they actually ended up, I don't know where it stands with the 1.1 million dollars, but they helped them get back to get the strength they needed to keep the company going, and there are a lot of factors that played into their decision on their part. They didn't make it lightly. Mr. Underwood said it takes 3 declinations versus the one and Mike said under the State Constitution you can go to the minimum of one, I understand that, but how do we get there, but all that aside, what I was looking for here with the inter government relationship was simply because we are talking about a reactionary situation where the company in question was struggling and they were able to work as a conduit to go ahead, and with the development and growth with the last quadrant that we are developing up there in Stow, so whether we are proactively addressing companies to come here to do whatever and if there are tax credit incentives or bond issue money or whatever the case may mean, they would allow the City and/or the CIC to work with whomever, to be able to qualify for that funding, that grant, that bond, in other words to proactively address, not necessarily to be a lender in all situations, of last resort. They would just not want to lose a company if there is something the City can do to help the company continue. Mr. Renninger said my confusion is I do not fully comprehend the workings of the CIC although I have a better understanding than before I went to that meeting, but I guess my issue is why does this need to be in the Charter? They have the ability and the authority to do this and they have already done that. Council can appoint whatever so that is where I am losing you. I don't know if this needs to be addressed in the Charter. Mr. Underwood said that was Christina's question last week and the again unfortunately, we need to strike the word CIC but she said what is it about the Charter that negates them from the ability to do it and my question is, I am not sure what is in the Charter that allows them to be able to do that so "that" is whatever those agencies working relationships are. Please try not to just think of what we are all hung up on the CIC. Ms. Gary said my concern the last time was Council contracting with individuals or is somebody contracting with individuals and there is no authority under the Charter that allows you to do that, whereas how the Charter specifically provides that Council can contract outside legal counsel and the City allows them to do that, but whereas in intra governmental relations, there is no authority that gives Council the ability to contract with outside agencies. That was my point last week and I didn't know if the meeting on Monday would shed any light as to whether or not it has to be in the Charter, whether or not they already doing it, or whether or not the electorate or people don't even have to agree to allow them to do, I don't know, I was kind of hoping the meeting on Monday would shed some light as to whether or not they are doing that without having the authority to do so in the Charter. Mr. Renninger said I would presume that Brian's response is that they obviously have the authority because they are doing it. Mr. Underwood said I went back over the Charter to try to read some more of it to readdress that statement that I made to you and I don't see where they get it and one of the challenging paragraphs that I have, again, thinking agencies and the contract and the relationship that Christina was just referring to, for example, the emergency legislation, "No action of Council authorizing the surrender or joint exercise

of any of its powers, or in granting any franchise, or in the enactment, amendment, or repeal of any zoning or building resolution or ordinance, or in the changing of any ward boundaries, or in authorizing any change in the boundaries of the Municipality, shall be enacted as an emergency measure.” Mr. Underwood said so with that, I’ve got an agency that is working a parallel agency with my Council that has the same power and authority as my Council so the question in my mind, not being a lawyer, becomes is there usurping or is there delineation of that power that is going outside my Council to an agency. Ms. Stewart said doesn’t Council still have to approve any funding, doesn’t Council still have to approve any of those types of activity before they are done? Mr. Renninger said I think they do. Mr. Dodgson said as far as any loans or anything? Mr. Underwood said I am talking about any contractual relationship. Mr. Renninger said the point that I got was the Ohio Constitution grants them the authority for the CIC. Mr. Dodgson said so your question was do they have to approve different organizations or do they have to approve inside? Ms. Stewart said my understanding is if Council didn’t approve the money, it definitely would not be there. Mr. Underwood said you are going to the comment where they are getting X amount of dollars taken in two increments from the lodging tax in March and October and that has to be approved by Council. Mr. Dodgson said but that \$50,000 and what they do with it doesn’t have to be approved by Council. They are approving disbursement of funds but not approving where it is spent. Ms. Stewart said I, like Dave, would say before we guess on this stuff, let’s have Brian Reali let us know on paper our questions.

- 8. Under Outside Counsel, wording should say that outside counsel reports to Law Director. Law Director should have an approval piece to say who is hired as outside Counsel?** – Ms. Gary said I think it should be a joint venture between the Law Director and Council. I think that if outside counsel is hired by City Council, I think it should be that outside legal counsel should have to report to the Law Director as well as City Council. I think by leaving the Law Director out, I think really puts him or her in a very precarious situation because they are not being included in the legal matters. Mr. Renninger said you are saying that Council still has the ability to hire that person without input from the Law Director. Ms. Gary said I don’t think the Law Director really has to say yea or nay or whether they are going to hire that lawyer. Mr. Renninger said once Council retains outside counsel, then that counsel should report to the Law Director? Ms. Gary said the outside counsel should also report to the Law Director as well. I understand what Council members said that they hired the outside counsel and they want a full report but the Law Director is the authority as well and not letting them get involved in whatever decisions are being made on behalf of the City. Because he/she could be defending the legal decisions or opinions that outside counsel gives to City Council. Mr. Underwood said do you think of a situation where it is a benefit? Is there ever a situation when the setup that we have is a good thing? Ms. Gary said no. Mr. Underwood said I can’t come up with one, I just wouldn’t know why my lawyer for the city wouldn’t be involved. Ms. Gary said the only thing that she could think of if there was some sort of conflicting opinion or conflicting position that the Law Director would have but I can’t even remotely begin to think about that, I can’t think of a situation. Mr. Renninger said I can think of one, if the Law Director and Council disagree on whether or not to put these amendments on the ballots. If Council takes one position and the Law Director takes another position and it is going to ultimately be resolved in the courts. If

Council retains counsel to go against Brian Reali in this position that these issues have to go on the ballot, that could happen. Mr. Renninger said I tend to agree with other people in that the Law Director should have some input, I don't think he should have veto power but he or she should have some involvement in working with outside counsel.

9. At Large Council members run for each seat not just top three vote totals – Mr. Underwood said he would like to skip this one because he is waiting for a return call from the Law Director of the City of Brunswick to get the correct wordage.

10. Put on ballot whether Council should put all recommendations from Charter Review on Ballot? - Mr. Renninger said his position is, the current Law Director will and if Council should go against that, they will get a Writ of Mandamus and they will take it to court and the court will decide it once and for all. Ms. Stewart said that Mrs. D'Antonio's view of getting that resolved this time so the next Charter Review doesn't have to deal with that, we aren't going to deal with it. Mr. Renninger said my opinion is no, we aren't going to deal with it but I am only one vote of seven. Ms. Gary said what if next time it is found that it has to go to Council. Mr. Renninger said but in the meantime it has been ruled on by the court. Ms. Gary said what if this Council doesn't challenge it but the next Council does? Mr. Underwood said is it a weakness to have that there or do we put it on there once and for all so I don't know if we can conduct a vote without Brian. Ms. Gary, Ms. Heeney and Ms. Stewart all said for once and for all. Mr. Dodgson said there is no reason they should be able to sit there and say no, you are not going to put that on the ballot. I don't understand that.

11. Planning Commission – Parks Board Member to Serve - Recommend Parks Board no longer have to be on Planning Commission since City iks 84% built and new parks are no longer an issue. Mr. Renninger said I think it should go on the ballot. I don't see why Parks should have another position on Planning Commission. You would have to go to two meetings. Ms. Heeney said if anything, they should have someone from Urban Forestry on there.

12. Repealing Residency – Mr. Underwood said he will ask Brian Reali on how to repeal the residency.

Ms. Stewart asked Ms. Gary if she had time to write up questions 6 and 8 since they were right up her alley and Ms. Gary said she would write up some suggested verbiage for those.

Motion to adjourn made by Christina Gary, seconded by Doris Stewart, meeting adjourned 8:30 p.m.

Mary Botts, Secretary

Elgie Underwood, Chairman