

**HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES OF AUGUST 7, 2000 MEETING**

The scheduled August 7, 2000, meeting for the Hutchinson Charter Commission was held at the Hutchinson City Council Chambers at 4:00 p.m.

Commission members present were Steve Auger, Carl Bretzke, Michael Cannon, Charles Carlson, Donald Glas, Philip Graves, Ron McGraw, Roger Petersen, Jean Peterson and Linda Remucal. Not Present: Walter Clay and Virgil Voigt.

Those members present were sworn into office by Attorney Marc A. Sebor. Nominations for the office of Commission Chairperson were heard and upon motion and second, Charles Carlson was elected Commission Chairperson.

Nominations were entertained for the position of permanent secretary / vice-chairperson and it was moved and seconded to have Michael Cannon assume the position of secretary / vice-chairperson and the motion was unanimously carried.

A motion was made and seconded to set the quorum of the Hutchinson Charter Commission as being a majority or the majority of the Commission which is seven (7) members. Said motion carried unanimously.

It was moved and seconded to retain the services of the law firm of Arnold, Anderson, & Dove to advise the Charter Commission. Said motion carried unanimously.

The topic of meeting times was discussed and it was decided that the Commission would meet, at least for now, on an at needed basis only.

A discussion was held concerning the petition being circulated by Steve Cook's group. It was decided that Chairperson Chuck Carlson be authorized to receive such petition on the Commissions behalf, if and when such petition is completed.

A discussion was also held regarding the Commissions ability to make amendments of any petition forwarded to it. Attorney Sebor advised that under statute, the Commission has no authority to approve or disapprove of any petition filed, nor does the Commission have the power to amend any such petition presented to it.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

**HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES
AUGUST 21, 2000**

Due to the lack of a quorum, the Charter Commission meeting could not convene until 4:27 p.m. when a quorum was present.

Commission members present: Carl Bretzke, Michael Cannon, Charles Carlson, Donald Glas, Philip Graves, Roger Petersen, Jean Peterson, and Virgil Voigt. Not present: Steven Auger, Walter Clay, Ronald McGraw, and Linda Remucal.

Also present: City Attorney Marc A. Sebor, City Administrator Gary D. Plotz, and Recorder Marilyn J. Swanson.

The minutes of the organizational meeting held on August 7, 2000 were presented. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Motion unanimously carried.

Virgil Voigt was sworn into office by Attorney Marc A. Sebor.

Chair Carlson reported that the 33 petition sheets, containing 602 signatures, were delivered to him and accepted on August 14, 2000. He had reviewed them and found them in order.

It was moved and seconded to present the petitions to the City Administrator, Gary D. Plotz. Motion unanimously carried.

A legal issue was raised regarding the date the petitions were officially delivered. Legal Counsel determined that the date was August 14, 2000.

Chair Carlson suggested that Steve Cook and Mike Ribich have the opportunity to give a presentation to the Charter Commission on Monday, August 28, 2000 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Center Council Chambers.

The motion was made and seconded to amend the previous motion that the petitions were officially presented to the Charter Commission on August 14, 2000. Motion unanimously carried.

Discussion followed regarding the timeframe for the petitions to be placed on the ballot. The City would have 10 days to verify the signatures of registered voters from August 22, 2000 when the petitions were received by the City Council at their regular meeting. On September 12, 2000, the City Council will be given the official language to be on the ballot. September 19 would be the last date that material could be turned over to the County Auditor for a question to be placed on the ballot.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES – AUGUST 28, 2000

Commission members present: Carl Bretzke, Charles Carlson, Walter Clay, Donald Glas, Philip Graves, Ronald McGraw, Roger Petersen, Jean Peterson, Linda Remucal and Virgil Voigt. Absent: Steven Auger and Michael Cannon.

Also present: City Attorney Marc A. Sebor, Recorder Marilyn J. Swanson, Vi Mayer and Keith Enstad of the Chamber of Commerce.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2000 meeting.

Attorney Marc A. Sebor swore Walter Clay into office.

Steve Cook and Mike Ribich were invited as guests of the Charter Commission. They presented their views on the five issues listed in the petition for Charter amendments to be voted on at the November general election.

Amendment No. 1 – Elective Officers; Qualifications; Terms; Ward Representation

Ribich stated there was no guarantee that all of the City would be represented. However, he discovered when he researched 17 Minnesota Charter Cities that 16 out of 17 cities used wards, or wards and at-large representation as was being proposed in the amendment. Some cities had more than three wards, while others had several individuals from one ward elected on a staggered basis. Ribich used Litchfield as an example where they have five wards and one City Council Member and Mayor elected at large. He thought that under this system, people would be more willing to run for City Council. Also, there would be better communication for the people represented. Under this system, the candidates would only canvass their own ward instead of the entire city.

Ribich thought the wards would be larger with three representatives and one at large City Council Member and Mayor. Perhaps the Charter Commission would want to research the number of wards needed in Hutchinson. The presenter also thought wards would bond the representative and residents closer together.

Clay inquired about a ward representative who would be always pushing a certain agenda or issue. He questioned how that would be handled.

Cook and Ribich thought the ward representatives would work for all of the City's residents, but they would be more likely to consider their local ward more important. There would be different problems in other areas of the town or wards. This system would be another step to make government more responsive to the people or ward members.

Amendment No. 2 – Vacancies in the Council

Cook addressed the appointment process when Jeff Haag resigned from City Council. He thought the people should have a choice in the appointment.

It was reported that Mankato and Albert Lea hold a special election by ballot box if more than a year remains of a City Council member's term. The person appointed becomes an incumbent on the ballot.

Phil Graves inquired why everyone would not vote on the person to be elected to fill a vacancy if he or she would represent the entire city.

Ribich stated that with more people involved, it made for a better government and improved accountability.

Amendment No. 3 – Regular Municipal Elections

Cook stated the Charter amendment would move the regular municipal election to an even numbered year. He referred to the poor turnout at previous elections. It would save money to hold them at a specific time and to merge together the City and general elections.

Ribich stated that he believed government was better when more people were involved, and an election would do that. Government of many is better than government of the few. In 1995 only 7% of the people voted. The residents should be challenged to become more involved in the voting process.

Amendment No. 4 – Special Elections by Mail Ballot

Cook commented one area that needed improvement was the voter turnout. He noted that in the special election held on September 15, 1998, there were only 2,921 votes. In the Community Needs Task Force survey, it showed that the people preferred to vote in November and to use a mail ballot for other special elections. He noted that a special election was held for the one-half cent sales tax, but he believed it should be voted on when there was a larger voter turnout. This would reflect a truer picture of the public's opinion on the issue.

Both Cook and Ribich thought the mail ballot would create more participation in the voter response. They assured the Charter Commission that everyone would vote because it would include everybody. The mail ballot school election was cited as an example to communicate with the people and get them to vote on the issue. They felt a good issue was worthy of the public vote.

It was reported that the Minnesota State Statute required permission to be obtained from the County Auditor to use a mail ballot. There is a higher cost in using a mail ballot, but the return is much better.

Chuck Carlson stated that in the 1980s the law required special permission from the State Legislature, but the law was changed to approval from the County Auditor.

Someone pointed out that the School District had changed its election to coincide with the City election in order for both entities to save money. The response was that the school could change its election year to correspond with the City election.

Amendment No. 5 -- Petitions

Ribich felt it made more sense to hold an election in an even year, and twice as many people would vote. Also, a lower percentage of voter number would be required, i.e.: 10% for even year and 20% for odd year. There needs to be a cushion in the number of names collected to make sure that enough signers are registered voters.

Closing Comments

The City Attorney reported the City Council would have to determine the exact language for the ballot. There was a question if the old language and new language would be presented to the voters to compare the amendment changes. Sebora stated that both languages would be presented to inform the voters what they were voting on.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting date was set for Monday, September 11, 2000 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Center Staff Conference Room.

The meeting will be devoted to a review of what had been presented today and discussion of the proposed Charter amendments.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES - SEPTEMBER 11, 2000

Present: Steve Auger, Carl Bretzke, Michael Cannon, Charles Carlson, Don Glas, Ronald McGraw (excused at 4:17 p.m.), Roger Petersen, Linda Remucal, and Virgil Voigt

Absent: Walter Clay, Philip Graves, and Jean Peterson

Also Present: City Attorney Marc A. Sebor and Recorder Marilyn J. Swanson

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m., and the entire time was devoted to review of the five proposed amendments to the City Charter. Each Commission member was asked to express his/her vote on each item and the reason for the decision.

AMENDMENT #1

CHAPTER 2, SECTION 2.01 - FORM OF GOVERNMENT

**CHAPTER 2, SECTION 2.04 - ELECTIVE OFFICERS; QUALIFICATIONS; TERMS;
WARD REPRESENTATION**

Remucal stated Hutchinson is still small enough for representatives to know about the City without the need for wards or sections that might be in competition.

Cannon questioned if wards would produce the quality of people that we presently have. He would be opposed to wards and thought they would reduce community participation.

Glas stated he looked at the question from the viewpoint of a businessperson. He would prefer to be represented by the entire City Council.

Voigt thought the ward system for elections was determined by the size of the community. He stated some people have a false impression about the size of Hutchinson because of its strong economic structure and activities. The residents know each other and are close knit. In larger cities individuals choose certain areas to live in because of the nationalities located there. He did not believe that Hutchinson was ready for the ward system.

Bretzke had no argument with the petition amendment and thought Hutchinson was big enough for wards that would provide representation.

Petersen did not think the ward system was necessary and viewed it as pitting one part of town against another. He pointed out that qualified people could run for City Council under the present system.

Cannon favored the current majority rule and saw no reason to change the structure. He stated that a ward system could produce a low vote in one area compared to the other wards. Cannon also noted that it was already difficult to obtain volunteers.

AMENDMENT #2

CHAPTER 2, SECTION 2.09 – VACANCIES IN THE COUNCIL

McGraw had no problem with the present system and the way the elections were held. He thought the City would be making a mistake to pattern our system after other cities.

Remucal suggested that one petition at a time be presented over several years. She expressed concern about the amount of time it will take voters to read and vote on the issues.

Glas thought the issues should be reviewed and voted on at a later time.

Cannon inquired what it would cost the City to hold a special election to vote on a City Council vacancy.

Voigt commented it would require a lot of effort and cost to hold a special election, but an individual could be elected and disqualified from office. Under the present Charter, the Mayor could appoint someone else to fill the vacancy. Voigt could see the potential need of the amendment to prevent the City Council from handpicking replacements. If the remaining length of term was longer than 365 days, it might not be true representation.

Carlson stated that since elections were held every two years, he could not see much gain in holding a special election.

Bretzke commented that he had no argument with the issue since the situation doesn't happen very often.

Petersen asked if a Council member resigned in a ward, would only that ward elect the replacement.

Sebora confirmed that the special election would be held only for that particular ward.

Auger said he had no major problem with the amendment, but he thought the verbiage could be made clearer.

AMENDMENT #3

CHAPTER 4, SECTION 4.01 –REGULAR MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Auger didn't see any need for the proposed amendment and thought the present wording was acceptable. He thought people would vote regardless of whether it was an even numbered year or odd numbered year.

Petersen pointed out that the School District and City hold a joint election. He stated it could take the voters a long time to vote with all the amendments on the ballot.

Bretzke concurred with the previous statements.

Voigt said he could go either way on this amendment. Although more people would vote in the national elections, he thought residents would turn out to vote on local issues. He was led to believe that the general public didn't care whether the election was held in an even or odd year.

Glas stated he preferred the odd year election at this time.

Cannon commented he had given this item some thought. It was his opinion that the amendment would bring out more uninformed voters or those who didn't care about the local issues.

Remucal concurred with Cannon's comments.

AMENDMENT #4

CHAPTER 4, SECTION 4.02 – SPECIAL ELECTIONS (MAIL BALLOT)

Remucal did not see any need for going to a mail ballot. She did not think it would not make any difference in the School District election, except to create extra work that was not necessary.

Cannon stated he had no problem with the mail ballot. He wondered if it would bring out more voters who were not educated on the issue.

Carlson stated that in a regular election the person in the booth is alone. With a mail ballot, others may influence the voter.

Glas stated the mail ballot was a more expensive process. As long as the City had the ability to use it when desired, he would leave it that way. Glas didn't think there was a need to make it mandatory.

Voigt concurred with Glas. He commented there may be instances for a mail ballot, but it didn't need to be mandatory. He was not comfortable with it in all situations and didn't think it allowed the person to express his own opinion. Voigt questioned which was easier to put together.

Bretzke stated he liked to go to the polling place and express his opinion.

Petersen commented on the recent school election by mail ballot. He noted it required extensive communication to get the people to vote. He favored the voting booth.

Auger asked what was considered a special election. He noted that the City Charter already addressed this issue.

AMENDMENT #5

CHAPTER 5, SECTION 5.02 – PETITIONS

Auger stated that if it makes it more difficult, there is no reason for the amendment. The present system works so there is no need to change it.

Carlson stated the number would be increased if it were a regular election. More registered voters would be required, and it would make it more difficult to obtain the required number of signatures.

Petersen commented on the number of voters required and stated there weren't that many petitions received by the City.

Bretzke didn't think there was a need for a change.

Voigt liked the fact that the amendment would make it more difficult to obtain a certain number of signatures on a petition.

Glas stated he could go either way.

Cannon didn't see any difference in the two versions.

Remucal was in favor of the amendment.

Discussion followed on the procedure to be used in putting the petition before the City Council and on the ballot.

The motion was made, seconded and carried to postpone approval of the August 28, 2000 minutes until the next meeting.

The next meeting date was set for Monday, September 18, 2000 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Center.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES - SEPTEMBER 18, 2000

Present: Steven Auger, Walter Clay, Michael Cannon, Donald Glas, Ronald McGraw, Roger Petersen, Jean Peterson and Virgil Voigt

Absent: Carl Bretzke, Charles Carlson, Philip Graves, and Linda Remucal

Also present: City Attorney Marc A. Sebor, Council Member John Mlinar, and Recorder Marilyn J. Swanson

Vice-Chairperson Michael Cannon called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. He stated the purpose of the meeting was to continue discussion of the petition for the five proposed amendments to the City Charter. The Chair requested approval of the minutes dated August 28, 2000 and September 11, 2000.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the August 28, 2000 meeting.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the September 11, 2000 meeting.

Clay thought it would be after the fact to review the amendments since they had already been approved by the City Council. Sebor noted that the corrections Cook and Ribich brought before the City Council were minor.

Petersen questioned if the Charter Commission members could express their opinion by writing letters to the editorial page of the newspaper.

The Legal Counsel stated the Commission members could express their viewpoint on the petition and five amendments and publicly declare where they stood on the issues. Sebor suggested that the Charter Commission pass a Resolution to either support or oppose the petition issues.

It was recommended by Clay to send a letter to the newspaper. Sebor confirmed that it would be appropriate for the Charter Commission to obtain the publicity.

Petersen thought it would be a good idea to express the Commission's position before the election.

Sebor suggested that the Charter Commission publicize the fact that a public forum would be held to discuss the issues. Also, the forum could be televised on Channel 10 with the public in attendance.

MINUTES OF CHARTER COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 18, 2000 – PAGE 2

Voigt moved to use the medium of radio, newspaper and cable TV and to broadcast a public forum on the cable public access channel. Motion seconded by Clay and unanimously carried.

Cannon stated he would arrange the forum date and coordinate the effort. It was suggested that a moderator be used to conduct the forum and that the Legal Counsel be available. During discussion, it was recommended to hold the open forum during the City Council meeting on either October 10 or October 24, at 6:00 p.m., to present both sides of the issues. Also, Steve Cook and Mike Ribich would be asked to attend the forum.

Discussion followed whether there was a majority opinion on all five issues. Each Commission Member should be able to substantiate why he/she was for or against each issue.

The City Attorney was instructed to compile a list of pros and cons on each of the proposed Charter Amendments set for the November General Election. Then the Charter Commission members would individually decide where they stood on the issues. Each Commission member was asked to submit his/her survey opinion on the five amendment issues to Mike Cannon by Friday, October 7.

Council Member Mlinar reported that Cook and Ribich were publicly promoting their petition and proposed Charter amendments.

The next meeting was scheduled for **Monday, October 9, 2000 at 5:00 p.m.** in the City Center Staff Conference Room. It was decided to order in pizza for the meeting to allow the Commission members adequate time to discuss the survey results and plans for the upcoming public forum.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES – OCTOBER 9, 2000

Present: Carl Bretzke, Charles Carlson, Mike Cannon, Walter Clay, Donald Glas, Philip Graves, Ronald McGraw, Roger Petersen , Jean Peterson, and Linda Remucal

Absent: Steven Auger and Virgil Voigt

Also present: City Attorney Marc A. Sebor, Mayor Marlin Torgerson and Recorder Marilyn J. Swanson

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2000 meeting.

During discussion of the upcoming forum and its format, Clay suggested that the Chair and Vice-Chair act as representatives for the Charter Commission and Chair the forum. The other Commission members concurred with the suggestion.

The Mayor recommended that individuals be invited to speak out on the issues. He stated that his observation was that people tend to be hesitant to express themselves at a public meeting.

McGraw commented that there was a committee working on letters to the editor for publication in the Hutchinson Leader.

SURVEY OF CHARTER COMMISSION MEMBERS

<u>Charter Amendment Question No. 1:</u>	For: 1	Opposed: 10
<u>Charter Amendment Question No. 2:</u>	For: 2	Opposed: 9
<u>Charter Amendment Question No. 3:</u>	For: 0	Opposed: 11
<u>Charter Amendment Question No. 4:</u>	For: 0	Opposed: 11
<u>Charter Amendment Question No. 5:</u>	For: 7	Opposed: 4

It was noted that no survey response was received from Virgil Voigt.

Carlson noted that the proposed amendment to Question No. 5, changing the percentage amount from 20% to 10%, would make it more difficult to get a petition through. He thought this was one petition issue the Charter Commission could support.

MINUTES OF CHARTER COMMISSION
OCTOBER 9, 2000 – PAGE 2

Regarding Question No. 2, it was pointed out that if less than a year were left in the City Council Member's term, it would go to the City Council to appoint the replacement to fill the unexpired term. The petitioners' proposal would allow the Mayor to pick the new Council Member, which could leave a ward without a representative.

Roger Petersen pointed out that in Nebraska where he previously lived, they have the ward system. However, the residents were trying to eliminate this form of government because there were problems. He stated the residents were given the impression that the ward system would do a lot for the public, but the truth was they wanted to get rid of it.

Graves thought the ward system was self-serving or for self-interest.

Clay stated he had a concern about the ward system. Under a ward system only one person would be available for discussion. However, under the City's present system, he was represented by all five City Council members and could call all of them to discuss a concern or an issue.

McGraw pointed out that not everyone will be, or wants to be, involved in the government process. He noted that the County Commissioners think they represent only their district instead of the entire County.

Torgerson emphasized that people did not realize having full representation gave more support to what needed to be accomplished. The entire City Council attempted to determine if a project or issue would benefit the whole City and its residents. However, in a larger city there might be a need for geographic locations for representation within a specific area. The Mayor further commented that no one had touched on why the change was being recommended. He stated the reason the petitioners desired a ward system was because it would be easier to get elected in a small City section. It was not because it would be a better form of government. The motive was for personal reasons to get elected to the City Council.

Bretzke stated that he thought the ward system could be beneficial for the sake of change. Apparently some people do not think the current system is working.

Carlson pointed out that in Cook and Ribich's presentation, they stated their intent was to involve more people in government. However, it has been proven that there must be an issue in order to get voters out to the polls.

Graves recommended publishing in the newspaper the list of pros and cons on each of the proposed Charter Amendments to make people aware of what they were.

MINUTES OF CHARTER COMMISSION
OCTOBER 9, 2000 – PAGE 3

The Mayor thought the consensus from tonight's survey of the Charter Commission members should be printed in the paper to make the public aware of where they stood on the issues.

Remucal suggested covering one Charter Amendment issue in each edition of the paper prior to the November election so that all five amendments would receive a good review. Furthermore, it was recommended that it be acknowledged the City Attorney had compiled the list of pros and cons from League of Minnesota Cities material, conversations at City Council and Charter Commission meetings, and a review of the amendments by Sebor.

It was determined that Carlson and Cannon would talk to the editor of the Leader about obtaining newspaper space in future editions. It was also suggested to approach the radio station regarding coverage of the public forum.

Petersen requested that one or two Charter Commission members do a presentation on the petition of the proposed Charter Amendments for the Kiwanis Club meeting on October 31. He will be acting as the moderator. Graves also requested speakers for the Rotary meeting, but no date had been set. It was determined that Mike Cannon and Jean Peterson would represent the Charter Commission.

Carlson encouraged the Commission Members to attend the public forum which will be held immediately following the October 24 City Council meeting. He also noted the group would not meet again until the forum had occurred. The Chair announced that after the November election, the Charter Commission would begin the process of reviewing the entire City Charter.

The motion was made, seconded and carried to adjourn at 6:10 p.m.

HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
MINUTES - DECEMBER 28, 2000

Present: Dr. Carl Bretzke, Charles "Chuck" Carlson, Jean Peterson, Steven Auger, Michael Cannon, Ronald J. McGraw, Roger Petersen and Linda Remucal.

Absent: Walter Clay, Philip Graves, Virgil Voigt and Donald Glas.

Also present: Recorder Dianne M. Hierlmaier and Mayor Torgerson (arrived after the meeting was adjourned).

With a quorum present, the meeting was called to order at 12:25 p.m. Dianne M. Hierlmaier stated that State law requires the commission to send in an annual report on the charter's activities for the year, so the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed annual report for the year 2000 and vote on it.

After members read over the report, a motion was made by Ronald J. McGraw and seconded by Steve Auger and unanimously carried to approve the annual report for the year 2000.

Chairperson Charles Carlson stated that the time for the meetings for the year 2001 had not yet been set.

Some discussion was held regarding extending incumbents terms to even years.

A motion was made by Dr. Carl Bretzke and seconded by Roger Petersen and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Mayor Torgerson discussed several issues with the Charter members for approximately twenty-five minutes.

Charles Carlson thanked everyone for coming.

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
FOR THE YEAR 2000

COPY

The Hutchinson Charter Commission, whose positions had been vacant since approximately 1987 were filled by appointment of the Hutchinson City Council at it's July 25, 2000, meeting. Those persons appointed to a two-year term included Dr. Carl Bretzke; Charles "Chuck" Carlson; Walter Clay; Philip Graves; Jean Peterson; and Virgil Voigt. Those persons appointed for four-year term were Steven Auger; Michael Cannon; Donald Glas; Ronald J. McGraw; Roger Petersen; and Linda Remucal.

The first meeting of the newly reconstituted charter commission was held on August 7, 2000, for the purposes of organizing the commission. Those commission members present were sworn in, guidelines for conducting business were set, and legal counsel was retained. A discussion was held regarding the charter amendment petition being circulated by Steve Cook's group and chairperson Carlson was authorized to receive such petition on the commission's behalf, if and when the petition was completed.

The next meeting was held on August 21, 2000. Chairperson Carlson reported that on August 14, 2000, a petition containing 602 signatures were delivered to him and were found to be in order. A motion was made and seconded to present the petition to the City Administrator pursuant to State statute. A motion was made and seconded to acknowledge that the petition containing opposed charter amendments were presented to the Charter Commission on August 14, 2000, thereby allowing sufficient time for these amendments to be voted on at the general election should the City Council desire that these amendments be voted on at that time.

A meeting of the Hutchinson Charter Commission was then held on August 28, 2000, to discuss the proposed charter amendments to the Hutchinson City Charter. Also present were Steve Cook and Mike Ribich, who had been invited to present their views on the amendments they were proposing. At the conclusion of the discussion on the proposed amendments, a meeting was set for September 11, 2000 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Center Staff Conference Room.

At the September 11, 2000 meeting, the charter commission members had a discussion on each individual charter amendment to obtain feedback from individual charter commission members and to get an idea as to what the consensus of the commission felt with regard to each individual charter amendment. A meeting was then held on September 18, 2000, to continue the discussion of the commission's stance in relation to the proposed charter amendments.

On October 9, 2000, the Charter Commission met and the individual charter commission members were polled to see where they stood in support of the proposed charter amendments. As a group, the charter commission was opposed to all of the proposed charter amendments except the proposed amendment changing the percentage of voter signatures required to petition the petition for charter amendment changes from ten to twenty percent. The commission agreed to host a public forum on October 24, 2000, following the regularly scheduled City Council meeting.

The public forum was held on October 24, 2000, for the purpose of promoting public dialogue, discussion and input on the proposed charter amendments which were slated to be voted on at the November 7, 2000 election. The public forum was broadcast on local cable access Channel 10 but was, however, sparsely attended by members of the public. Steve Cook, and others, presented their reasons for being for or against the proposed charter amendments.

The election was held on November 7, 2000 and the results of the election were canvassed the following day. The amendment requiring a special election should there be a vacancy in the City Council of longer than one year passed as did the changing of the date of the time for regular municipal elections from odd years to even years. On December 6, 2000, those amendments were ratified by the Hutchinson City Council and were made a part of the Hutchinson City Charter on that date.

On December 28, 2000, the Hutchinson City Charter Commission met to discuss the approval of the year 2000 annual report and such annual report was approved.

Therefore, upon the affirmative vote of a majority of those members constituting a quorum of the Hutchinson City Charter Commission, the foregoing report was approved on the 28th day of December, 2000.

HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION

By: Charles D. Carlson
Charles Carlson
Its Chairperson