

**Hutchinson Charter Commission
Public Hearing
Thursday, January 31, 2002**

Members Present: Chair Chuck Carlson, Jean Peterson, Mike Cannon, Don Glas, Roger Petersen, Carl Bretzke, Steve Auger, Virgil Voigt, Walt Clay, Linda Remucal and Phil Graves.

Members Absent: Ron McGraw

Others Present: Dick Schieffer, Legal Counsel and Melissa Starke, Recorder

Chair Carlson opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Carlson introduced the members of the Charter Commission. Mr. Carlson gave a brief history of the creation and updating of the City Charter and further noted that the last time the City Charter was updated was 1987. He went on to explain the petition presented by Steve Cook and Mike Ribich in 2000, with the proposal of five amendments to the City Charter. These amendments were voted on by the citizens of Hutchinson in the November 2000 election, with two of the five passing. Mr. Carlson detailed the amount of work the Charter Commission has devoted to reviewing the City Charter and proposing updates to it. He explained that two chapters had been added to the Charter, one outlining the ownership and operation of Hutchinson Area Health Care and the other outlining the ownership and operation of Waste Management Facilities, which are both enterprise funds. Mr. Carlson noted that the intent of this public hearing is to allow citizens the opportunity to bring forth suggestions and recommendations regarding the updates of the Charter. The Charter Commission will then review the proposals and consider the recommendations for incorporation into the corrected version. Mr. Carlson then invited the public to address the Commission.

Steve Cook, 728 Juul Road, presented before the Commission. Mr. Cook commended the Charter Commission for all of the work made to the proposed corrected Charter.

Mr. Cook questioned the transfer of funds from the Utilities Commission to the City in Section 11.05. He questioned what action would be taken if an agreement is unable to be made – how then will funds be transferred? Mr. Cook recommended that if an agreement would not be able to be made, a majority of the Commissioners could decide the amount to be transferred.

Mr. Cook also questioned the amount of authority the HAHC board has. It appears to him that it is considerably less than the amount of power the Utilities Commission has. Mr. Cook also voiced concerns regarding bonding issues for both HAHC and the Utilities Commission. He expressed that he felt all bonding issues should be brought before the voters.

Mr. Cook presented, for a second consideration, the petition amendment that was narrowly defeated regarding the percentage of voters being reduced to 10% to pass a

petition. He feels that the public was not well informed of the intentions of the amendment proposal. Mr. Cook presented a graph that plotted the amount of signatures needed at both a 20% and 10% requirement. The graph indicated that due to the fact that elections are now held on even years and have a much higher voter turnout (general elections), with a 20% requirement to pass a petition, it is much more difficult to retain the amount of signatures needed.

Chair Carlson noted that due to historical low voter turnout, on average, the actual number needed is approximately 10% of the population of Hutchinson, which appears to be an achievable number.

Mr. Cook also proposed a new section to the Charter. He stated that Hutchinson is unique in the fact that all Council positions are at-large positions. This new section would designate seats on the Council (either 1,2,3,4 or A,B,C,D, etc.). In this way, a candidate can designate which seat they would be vying for. This method gives an advantage to the candidates in that they can decide whom they would like to run against. Mr. Cook also proposed a primary election be held so that only two candidates would be seeking office for each position in the general election.

Dick Schieffer, Legal Counsel, noted that the 700 cities that are structured in statutory form use the same Council method that Hutchinson does. Mr. Schieffer noted that the method currently used allows the “best candidates” to fill the seats (overall top vote-getters).

Mr. Cook noted that Ortonville, MN operates under this type of method of filling Council seats. Mr. Cook feels that this method would “level the playing field”, whereas now the incumbents generally have the advantage. Mr. Cook encouraged that these proposed changes be presented as separate questions to the voters and not included with the overall adoption of the Charter.

Don Glas stated that he feels that this is a “back door approach” to a ward system.

Walt Clay noted that incumbents are defeated often and this method may not necessarily give them an advantage.

Mr. Cook further explained that the proposed method of designated seats is far different than a ward system.

Roger Petersen voiced that he feels incumbents do have an advantage. Mr. Petersen proposed that a candidate make it publicly known which incumbent/candidate they are running against and use that in their campaign.

Mike Ribich, resident of Hutchinson, spoke before the Commission. Mr. Ribich further detailed the proposed designated system. He noted that this system eliminates split votes (i.e. incumbent receives 35% of votes and two challengers remaining votes are split down the middle, the incumbent prevails). This method would give more power to those

candidates that want to see change among council seats. Mr. Ribich explained that in this proposal, all of the negatives and fears of the ward system were removed.

Mr. Ribich also recalled a controversy a couple of years ago between the Utilities Commission and the City Council on the decision of the amount of funds to be transferred. He has concerns on the wording proposed in the updated Charter regarding the Utilities Commission and City Council “reaching an agreement on the amount of surplus utility funds...to transfer...”. He feels that this wording may endanger the funds of the Utilities because ultimately the Council has full authority on the amount that should be transferred.

Walt Clay expressed that he did not feel that a council member would jeopardize an enterprise fund of the city and request a larger amount than necessary.

Don Glas stated that he believes the City Council represents the citizens of Hutchinson and they will oversee city finances in the best interest of its citizens.

Roger Petersen stated that the Charter Commission spent ample time on this issue and overall felt that this worked the best for both the Council and the Utilities Commission.

Roger Stearns, citizen of Hutchinson, commented on the questions and proposals of Mr. Cook and Mr. Ribich. Mr. Stearns feels that the best candidates would not be voted in with the designated system. Mr. Stearns also commented that elected officials should have final authority over appointed officials (i.e. City Council vs. Utilities Commission).

Mr. Cook noted that having a primary election would not increase costs, due to the fact that a primary election is already held before general elections. Mr. Cook also addressed the designated system and how it allows even opportunities for all candidates.

Tim Cook, HCVN, noted that there was an audio problem and this hearing will be replayed in its entirety on February 2 and February 5.

Mr. Carlson adjourned the public hearing at 8:00 p.m.

Charter Commission Minutes February 11, 2002

Members Present: Chair Chuck Carlson, Jean Peterson, Roger Petersen, Steve Auger, Don Glas, Linda Remucal, Walt Clay and Carl Bretzke.

Members Absent: Mike Cannon, Ron McGraw and Virgil Voigt

Others Present: Dick Schieffer, Legal Counsel and Melissa Starke, Recorder

Chair Chuck Carlson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Motion by J Peterson, second by Auger, to approve minutes from December 17, 2001. Minutes were approved as presented.

Chair Carlson thanked Melissa Starke, Recorder, for detailed minutes taken from the Public Hearing on January 31, 2002.

Section 11.05 – Transfer of Utility Funds

Motion by Clay, second by R Petersen to approve the revisions remain as proposed by Charter Commission.

Chapter 12 – Power and Duties of HAHC

Mr. Steve Cook and Mr. Mike Ribich requested at the Public Hearing that the same provisions apply to HAHC as they do to the Utilities regarding a public vote of the sale of the Utilities. These gentlemen would like a section in this chapter that would also require a public vote of the citizens for the sale of HAHC.

Mr. Schieffer asked the Commission their feelings on adding this provision to the other enterprise funds. Mr. Clay felt that not all enterprise funds would need voter approval regarding the sale of such entities due to the fact that they are directly supervised by the City Council.

Motion by Glas, second by Remucal to add a like section to Chapter 12 regarding the sale of HAHC. This section will read exactly as Section 11.09, however “Utilities” will be replaced with “HAHC”. Motion carried unanimously.

The Commission addressed the issue of changing the percentage required for a petition from 20% to 10%, as presented by Mr. Steve Cook and Mr. Mike Ribich.

Motion by R Petersen, second by Bretzke, to have the percentage requirement remain at 20%. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Carlson noted that these gentleman may bring this as a petition to the citizens of Hutchinson.

The Commission addressed the proposed ordinance of having “designated” seats on the Council, also presented by Steve Cook and Mike Ribich. Mr. Petersen expressed an option that a candidate may announce whom they are running against, as opposed to running in an official designated seat.

Ms. Remucal paralleled this proposed ordinance to the way the last School Board election was held, which was in a similar way. She felt that good candidates were passed over because they had to designate a specific seat they were running in.

Motion by Bretzke, second by Auger to deny the proposed ordinance. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schieffer noted that Duke Addicks, League of MN Cities Legal Counsel, would most likely be able to review this Charter for any obvious revisions that should be made. The City Council may need to make the request, as opposed to the Charter Commission.

Motion by Clay, second by R Petersen to request the League of MN Cities to review the revised Charter. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Clay, second by Clay to authorize Chair Carlson to forward the corrected Charter to the City Council for final review. Motion carried unanimously.

The last step will be for the Charter Commission to meet with the City Council.

Walt Clay excused himself.

Chair Carlson commended both Dick Schieffer and Melissa Starke for their hard work, as well as all of the Charter Commission members.

Motion by Glas, second by R Petersen to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.

**Charter Commission Meeting
Monday, March 25, 2002**

Members Present: Chair Chuck Carlson, Jean Peterson, Phil Graves, Don Glas, Roger Petersen, Mike Cannon and Ron McGraw

Members Absent: Walt Clay, Carl Bretzke, Linda Remucal, Virgil Voigt and Steve Auger

Others Present: Dick Schieffer, Legal Counsel and Melissa Starke, Recorder

Chair Carlson called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

The minutes from February meeting need to be changed to reflect a second by Cannon to the motion made by Walt Clay. Motion by Cannon, second by R Petersen to approve the minutes from February.

Dick Schieffer, Legal Counsel, reported on the recommendations made by Duke Addicks, Legal Counsel for the League of MN Cities. Recommended changes were made as follows:

Section 2.08

Mr. Schieffer noted that the language recommended would be okay to include in this section, but is not necessarily important.

Motion by McGraw, second by J Peterson to approve the additional language, “as such statute may be amended from time to time” to Section 2.08. Motion carried unanimously.

Section 3.04

Additional language was recommended by Duke Addicks that is included in the Open Meeting Law. This language requires that a roll call vote be taken for each appropriation of money, except for judgments, claims and amounts fixed by statute. Mr. Schieffer noted that the term “appropriation” can be open to interpretation. For example, appropriation may mean to one individual approving the entire budget at the beginning of each year. Appropriation may mean to another, each time expenditures are made, rather than those listed as exceptions. Mr. Schieffer recommended including this language in this section.

Motion by McGraw, second by R Petersen, to approve the recommendation of the additional language to section 3.04. Motion carried unanimously.

Section 4.03

The word “registered” was added before “voter”. Motion by Glas, second by Graves, to approve the additional wording. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Auger joined the meeting.

Sections 5.03, 5.05, 5.06, 5.07, 5.08 and 5.09

Section 5.03 – The words sufficient and regular are defined. The word “regular” was added to sections 5.06, 5.07 and 5.09. In section 5.08, the three statements of grounds were added. Ron

McGraw suggested the word “serious” be injected before the word “malfeasance” in section 5.08.

Motion by Graves, second by Cannon to adopt the changes as presented in section 5.03 – 5.09. Motion carried unanimously.

Section 6.01

Wording is included to refer to Minnesota Statute 415.16, Subd. 2. regarding the City Administrator residing outside city limits.

Motion by J Peterson, second by Auger to approve the changes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Phil Graves commented on Section 12.08. Mr. Graves noted that HAHC is contemplating selling Burns Manor Nursing Home. Mr. Graves has concerns that if the sale of the hospital has to approved by a vote of the people, he does not feel that the public could be convinced to sell, due to the complexity of the issues at hand. Mr. Graves recommended that the sale of the hospital be left as initially drafted and be the decision of the Council. Mr. Graves explained that the HAHC board would not necessarily be comprised totally of citizens of Hutchinson if the hospital became a private entity. Mr. Graves explained that the benefit of the hospital going from public to private is that the physicians would be able to join the hospital organization.

The reason for the sale of the hospital being approved by public vote included in the Charter is to have it worded parallel to the Utilities Commission. Current ordinance states that the sale of the hospital requires the approval of the City Council, and not a public vote.

Phil Graves suggested that the words “and by a majority vote...” and the last sentence be removed from section 12.08. The section would end after the words “City Council”.

It was discussed that Section 12.03 grants the powers and duties of the HAHC board and the subject of the sale of HAHC would default to this section.

Discussion was held as to how this would effect the language regarding the sale of the Utilities Commission. Mr. Schieffer noted that the language used for the Utilities mirrors state statute.

Motion by McGraw, second by J Peterson, to delete the language after City Council in Section 12.08. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by R Petersen, second by Auger to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.

Charter Commission Joint Meeting with City Council
June 4, 2002
5:00 p.m.

Members Present: All Council members, Chuck Carlson, Virgil Voigt, Don Glas, Steve Auger, Ron McGraw, Mike Cannon, Jean Peterson, Carl Bretzke, Roger Petersen

Members Absent:

Others Present: Marc Sebor, Dick Schieffer

Charles Carlson, Chair of Charter Commission, presented the changes that are proposed to the current City Charter. The main changes throughout the Charter include changes to the gender specifications and grammatical changes. The City Charter was also altered to be in concert with state law. The most riveting changes are to Chapter 11, which include the transfer of funds from the Utilities to the City of Hutchinson. A new chapter was added, Chapter 12, "Public Ownership and Operation of Hutchinson Area Health Care". The biggest issue with this chapter is that the sale of HAHC would be at the discretion of the City Council. Another chapter was added, Chapter 13, "Public Ownership and Operation of Waste Management Facilities and Related Services", which are enterprise funds of the City.

The Charter Commission voted unanimously to approve the corrected Charter. The Charter Commission also had Duke Addicks, LMC Legal Counsel, review the Charter as well. It is now at the discretion of the Council as how to proceed. The options available are (Dick's letter).

Mr. Carlson also distributed a letter from Steve Cook requesting that the Charter Commission accept a petition to place two proposed charter amendments on the November ballot.

Mayor Torgerson noted that the section of the corrected charter that has received the most publicity is in relation to Chapter 11, specifically the transfer of funds from the Utilities to the City. Mayor Torgerson read the original version and the corrected version. Mayor Torgerson stated that in the past 18 years, the transfer of funds has not operated as the original charter reads, but rather as the corrected charter reads. There have never been any issues.

John Mlinar questioned the term "surplus" and suggested using another term, such as "fund balance". Dick Schieffer, Charter Commission Attorney, stated that the term "surplus" is used in state statute and is familiar to the courts. Mr. Schieffer's recommendation to the Charter Commission was to comply with familiar terms and not create a new term that would be up for interpretation.

Mayor Torgerson stated that Section 11.05 has some clarity as to what should not be considered surplus funds. There was some discussion as to a “rebate” that could be given to the residents of Hutchinson from any surplus funds. Dick Schieffer noted that surplus funds could be considered a “rebate” as to the fact that these funds would be transferred into the general fund, which if the general fund has higher dollars in it, taxes could be lower.

Kay Peterson stated that she appreciated having the clean, corrected copy and the redlined copy. It helped point out the changes more clearly.

The Mayor commended the Charter Commission on the hard work they had feated on the City Charter. Mr. Torgerson asked Dick Schieffer his opinion on the proceedings of the Council.

Dick Schieffer explained that there are two options to adopt the amendments to the Charter. Option 1 is to adopt them by public vote. Option 2 is to adopt them by ordinance, with all five council members voting in favor of the amendments. After a published public hearing the amendments become effective 90 days after publication.

Petition may be brought forth.

Motion by Peterson, second by Mlinar to publicly receive the proposed revised Charter from the Charter Commission. Motion carried unanimously.

Chuck Carlson commented that this Charter Commission had Hutchinson at heart and they had done a lot of hard work.

It was clarified that the Charter Commissions terms expire in the month of August. Some members in 2002 and some in 2004.

Jean Peterson commented that this is the third citizens committee that she has served on with Chuck Carlson and she commended him for his amiable leadership on all the committees that he serves on. Ms. Peterson also commended Dick Schieffer on all of his legal advice and helpful answers during the process.

Mayor Torgerson invited the Charter Commission to attend the Council meeting when they vote on the procedure/option to use to adopt the amendments. This item will be on the agenda either June 11 or June 25.

John Mlinar commented that the Charter definitely needed some updating and it is very apparent that the best interest of Hutchinson was considered throughout the entire process.

Motion by Mlinar, second by Peterson to adjourn at 5:35 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Charter Commission Meeting
Monday, July 8, 2002

Members Present: Chair Chuck Carlson, Phil Graves, Don Glas, Roger Petersen, Mike Cannon, Linda Remucal, Virgil Voigt and Ron McGraw

Members Absent: Walt Clay, Jean Peterson, Carl Bretzke, and Steve Auger

Others Present: Mayor Torgerson and Bonnie Baumetz, Recorder

Note: No Legal Counsel present.

Chair Carlson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

A motion was made by McGraw, second by R Petersen to approve the minutes from March 25, 2002.

Chairman Carlson presented Mr. Cook's letter and article and Mr. Ribich's letter.

Mayor Torgerson stated the question regarding the Charter will be on the ballot in November. Discussion followed on the petitioning of the new Charter. There was also discussion on possibly an article in the newspaper explaining the changes to the public. This would be done a week to 10 days before the election.

Chairman Carlson stated the terms of six members will expire on August 1st. He noted those wishing to be reappointed are: Walt Clay, Virgil Voigt, Carl Bretzke and Chuck Carlson. He reported Jean Peterson and Phil Graves are not seeking reappointment.

Mayor Torgerson stated he would like at least eight names to be presented to the judge for appointment.

Possible members suggested were: John Paulson, Judy Simons, Rob Totushek, Mary Henke, Murray Swenson and Cheryl Dooley.

Chairman Carlson will submit a letter to the Mayor of the names to be suggested for appointment.

Mike Cannon moved to allow Chairman Carlson to accept petitions that are submitted, seconded by Ron McGraw the motion carried unanimously.

Roger Petersen moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Linda Remucal, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Charter Commission
Monday, August 26, 2002

Members Present: Chair Chuck Carlson, Steve Auger, Linda Remucal, Virgil Voight, Roger Petersen, Walt Clay, Ron McGraw and Mike Cannon

Members Absent: Jean Peterson, Phil Graves, Carl Bretzke and Don Glas

Others Present: Mayor Marlin Torgerson and Melissa Starke, Recorder

Chair Chuck Carlson called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Chuck Carlson explained that Judge Spicer has not been in contact with city offices regarding new appointments to the Charter Commission, therefore no organizational meeting will be taking place today.

Mayor Torgerson requested that a representative from the Charter Commission explain to the public the changes proposed by the Charter Commission to the City Charter and to also explain why the amendments presented by the Petition Committee were voted down by the Charter Commission. The reasons projected by the Charter Commission as to the denial of the amendments were that one amendment was proposed after the Charter Commission had already revised the Charter and the second amendment was voted on in 2000 by the voters and the voters denied changing the percentage from 20% to 10% to pass a petition.

General discussion was held regarding the current referendum, recall and initiative process. Additional discussion was held regarding the pros and cons of changing the percentage from 20% to 10% to pass a petition. The consensus of the Charter Commission was that they wanted to leave the Charter as voted on in 2000.

Mayor Torgerson reiterated that he would like a Charter Commission representative present at a City Council meeting to cover the revisions made to the City Charter and the reasons why. He would also like the representative to explain the reasons why they denied the amendments that were presented.

Chair Chuck Carlson noted to the group that the local newspaper reported incorrectly on the changes to the Utilities chapter, which would be one reason to present at a Council meeting and explain the changes.

Discussion was held regarding the Charter Commission's stand on the proposed Charter and the amendments presented by the petition committee. The consensus of the Charter Commission was to not present at a Council meeting due to the fact that they had already previously stated their position at a public hearing and felt that presenting now would not necessarily enhance anything that the public is already aware of.

Motion by Walt Clay, second by Mike Cannon, to write an editorial to the citizens of Hutchinson to vote yes for the proposed Charter and against the proposed amendments and to publish the letter shortly before the general election in November. Motion carried

unanimously. Walt Clay suggested having Chuck Carlson draft the letter and circulate it to all Commission members for their approval. All members' names will be printed at the bottom of the letter.

General discussion was held regarding the open seats on the Charter Commission and the names submitted to Judge Spicer, whom will make the appointments.

Motion by Walt Clay, second by Roger Petersen to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Charter Commission Minutes Monday, October 7, 2002

Members Present: Steve Auger, Linda Remucal, Virgil Voight, Roger Petersen, Walt Clay, Ron McGraw, Mike Cannon, John Miller, Robert Stearns and Judy Simons

Members Absent: Jean Peterson, Phil Graves, Carl Bretzke

Vice Chair Mike Cannon called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Mr. Cannon welcomed the new members to the Commission.

Mr. Cannon explained that new officers needed to be elected today. Motion by McGraw to cease nominations and that a unanimous ballot be cast for Mike Cannon as Chair of the Charter Commission. Motion carried unanimously. Motion by Miller to cease nominations and that a unanimous ballot be cast for Walt Clay as Vice Chair of Charter Commission.

Mike Cannon explained that Steve Cook had made a request that the Charter Commission hold a debate on the public access channel with the petition committee to argue the points of the revised City Charter. Both Mike Cannon and Chuck Carlson suggested that the Charter Commission deny this request. Motion by McGraw, second by Stearns to deny holding a debate with the petition committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Auger, second by Peterson to approve the minutes from August 26, 2002. Motion carried unanimously.

Mike Cannon explained to the Charter Commission that at the last meeting the Commission decided to draft a letter to be submitted to the Hutchinson Leader as an editorial the week prior to the election regarding the proposed City Charter. This letter will explain the revisions made to the Charter. Mr. Cannon explained that he and Chuck Carlson will draft the letter and circulate it to all members before it is submitted to the Leader. General discussion was held regarding the points to be covered in the letter. After receiving suggestions, Mr. Cannon stated that he will circulate the letter for all members' approval.

Motion by McGraw, second by Stearns to adjourn at 4:25 p.m.

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE HUTCHINSON CHARTER COMMISSION
FOR THE YEAR 2002

After much work the previous year revising the Hutchinson City Charter, the Charter Commission held a public hearing on January 31, 2002, to present the revisions to the citizens of Hutchinson. At this hearing, comments were received from citizens regarding additional revisions to be considered by the Charter Commission.

Following the public hearing and taking into consideration public comments and recommendations, the Charter Commission voted to add an additional section to the revised City Charter addressing the city-owned hospital. After careful consideration of other proposed revisions recommended by the citizens present at the public hearing, the Charter Commission voted unanimously to leave the Charter as they had presented it. The Charter Commission then forwarded the revised City Charter to the League of Minnesota Cities Legal Counsel for review of any obvious revisions that would need to be made. Minor revisions were recommended and made to the City Charter. The Charter Commission then voted unanimously to approve the revised City Charter.

Following public input, LMC Legal Counsel input and additional considerations by the Charter Commission, the final revised version of the Hutchinson City Charter was ready to be presented to the Hutchinson City Council by the Charter Commission. The Charter Commission and the City Council held a joint meeting for the Charter Commission to make its formal presentation of the revised Charter. The Charter Commission explained the changes made and the reasons for them, which included gender specifications, grammatical changes, and to be in concert with state law. In addition, changes were made to Chapter 11 of the Charter, "Public Ownership and Operation of Utilities", and two new chapters were added addressing the city-owned hospital and waste management facilities. At this joint meeting, the City Council publicly accepted the revised City Charter and at a later City Council meeting voted for it to be approved/disapproved by public vote at the general election to be held November 2002.

Following the joint meeting with the City Council, a petition committee submitted two amendments to the City Charter to the City Administrator's Office to also be voted on at the November 2002 general election. The Charter Commission submitted a letter to the editor of the designated newspaper of the City of Hutchinson shortly before the general election explaining the reasons and advantages of voting "for" the revised Charter and against the two amendments. The voters of Hutchinson voted in favor of adopting the revised charter and also voted in favor of one of the two amendments presented. The revised Charter and amendment to it took effect 30 days following the general election.

In addition, three new Commission members and one returning member were appointed in August 2002 to four-year terms. Those members were Virgil Voight, John Miller, Robert Stearns and Judy Simons.

The members of the Charter Commission:

Michael Cannon
Charles D. Carlson
Walter S. Clay
Steven A. Auger
Linda Remucal
Dr. Virgil Voight
Donald Glas
Ronald J. McGraw
Roger Petersen
Robert Stearns
John Miller
Judy Simons

Respectfully submitted,

HUTCHINSON CITY CHARTER COMMISSION

By: Michael Cannon

Its: Chairman