

Ramsey County Charter Commission
Wednesday, August 31, 2011

A special meeting of the Ramsey County Charter Commission meeting was held at the Association of Minnesota Counties Building, 125 Charles Avenue, St. Paul, MN, and was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Rich Sonterre, with the following members present:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

District 1: Richard Sonterre
Bob Weisenburger
District 2: Richard Moses
District 3: Bryan Olson
Randy Gustafson
District 4: Peter Hendricks
Chris Leifeld
District 5: Rod Halvorson
Robert Spaulding
District 6: Mike Fratto
Russ Miller
District 7: Marv Koppen
Bud Berry
At-Large: Beverly Aplikowski
A.L. Brown
Fred Perez

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bob Benke (excused)

Also present: Phil Carruthers, Director, Civil Division, County Attorney's Office and Bonnie Jackelen, County Manager's Office.

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 31, 2011 AGENDA

Weisenburger moved, seconded by Koppen, to approve the August 31, 2011 Agenda.

Halvorson believes his motion at the August 15th meeting was to "consider" rather than "discuss". He believes the agenda inaccurately describes his motion. He asked if others recall his motion.

Sonterre was absent from that meeting but doesn't believe there was specific mention of a vote at the last meeting. The agenda was mailed out on August 16, 2011 and therefore the language was available for consideration since then.

Halvorson said he drafted a proposed amendment to the Charter which was emailed out to members.

Sonterre said there has been an opportunity to question the validity of the agenda and the Commission has not had actual language to present to the public.

Halvorson said when he saw the agenda he did not know that 'discussion on the general topic of prohibiting use of County sales tax revenues for professional sports facilities' would prohibit a motion to amend the charter.

Brown asked if a vote would be prohibited if the agenda was approved.

(Continued)

Sonterre responded affirmatively and said the Commission's attorney said the agenda of a special meeting cannot be changed.

Brown said it is disingenuous to pretend we came here tonight to not vote on the issue. Everyone knows exactly why they are here. He recalls the purpose of the meeting was to vote. He doesn't believe 'discuss' precludes voting. He believes whatever needs to be done to permit the vote should be done. He suggested that an emergency meeting be called, which can be done without notice.

Aplikowski said that words for an amendment had not been provided; there was one version in the paper, another in email. She does not know what she would be voting on because she does not have the words in front of her. Without proper notice of the exact words that would be voted upon, the Commission cannot vote tonight.

Brown said the exact words are not necessary.

Sonterre said that in the past, the Commission has held a public hearing prior to adopting an amendment.

Carruthers said that in Section 13D.04 – notice of meeting – does provide for emergency meetings, which are "a special meeting called because of circumstances that in the judgment of the public body requires immediate consideration by the public body". The issue would be whether or not this is something, in your judgment, requires immediate consideration. It goes on to say the public body would make good faith effort to provide notice of the meeting. When a special meeting is held, it takes extra caution, and the law for special meetings states that an agenda that goes out must include the purpose of the meeting. The bar is higher for emergency meetings than it is for special meetings.

Moses suggested voting tonight and setting aside legalese.

Spaulding doesn't believe it is appropriate to vote tonight.

Halvorson moved, seconded by Fratto, to amend #3 on the agenda to:

- a) Discussion
- b) Consideration of charter amendments

He said that if that amendment were to lose, he is hoping another date in the near future could be considered for a special meeting. The amendment was not accepted as friendly.

Brown said rather than having an amendment to the agenda, the body should interpret it more broadly to not to prohibit a vote. He would rather interpret that 'discussion' include permitting a vote.

Halvorson agreed with Brown and withdrew his amendment.

Weisenburger asked for a clarification on whether the agenda was going to be changed to include 'vote'. There were negative responses received.

Vote on agenda: The agenda was approved with 15 ayes and 1 nay.

Discussion on the general topic of prohibiting use of County sales tax revenues for professional sports facilities

(Continued)

Sonterre asked members to respect the time and comments of their peers.

Aplikowski said the Commission is operating under Roberts Rules of Order, and suggested that members be limited to approximately two minutes apiece.

Brown asked if the word 'discuss' means 'precludes a vote'?

Sonterre said in his opinion, 'discuss' does not mean 'to vote'.

Brown challenged the decision of the chair, seconded by Halvorson.

Carruthers said a quick review of Roberts Rules of Order it looks like it is debatable.

Aplikowski said it comes down to a vote of the body.

Carruthers said a 'yes' vote upholds the decision of the chair; a 'no' vote is against the chair.

Brown believes the decision of the chair should be voted down.

Gustafson said if the agenda is changed, in the future it could be determined as a violation of the open meeting laws.

Brown said the agenda would not be changed; the body would just decide that 'discussion' is broader to include a vote.

Gustafson said that would preclude people from having a public hearing on the topic.

Halvorson said that over five years or so, other large issues have had public hearings. If another meeting is held it should be a public hearing. He doesn't believe a hearing is required but has been the tradition.

Gustafson said the right legal thing to do is support the chair.

Hendricks believes people do not know the role of the Charter Commission and are confused about the role of this Commission.

Sonterre commended people for being in the audience today, but believes the audience is not representative of a total public hearing/public notice effort. He understands that whatever decision is made, it would not be available to voters until November 2012. Thus, there is no sense of urgency.

Brown said that people who come out to meetings are almost always against an issue.

Fratto doesn't know the purpose of tonight's meeting if the chair's ruling is followed. The reason the meeting was called was to decide how to get something on a ballot, which is perhaps how the word discussion was used. Based on various interpretations, if nothing can be placed on a ballot until 2012 we are wasting our time. If nothing is on the 2011 ballot the legislature will do it for us. So either it is discussed and a decision made about our plan to get it on a 2011 ballot or we should adjourn.

(Continued)

Aplikowski said that most people who called her said they don't want to 'lose their vote'. She believes that was a misconception put upon them. A vote will not ever be lost. The procedure is what is in question. If we deviate from procedure, we do not have any function anymore. She has had five versions of the amendment in front of her; she would not vote for two of them and has questions on the others.

Halvorson agreed that citizens right to vote will not be taken away. However, there is a strong possibility of having the charter-given right to petition an ordinance and having the people vote on whether they approve of the sales tax being used for the Vikings stadium. He believes they will lose that right if this body does not act and the legislature passes a bill in October or November that would forbid Ramsey County from voting on a provision that state law says they should vote on and our charter says they should be able to petition and then vote on.

Aplikowski said that is very clear, but is still only half the truth. The legislature could do something that would preclude anything to do with the Vikings; she doesn't like it either, but that is not in this body's purview to do this. Our purview is to get ready to take a motion to whomever we have to, to get it on the ballot. It is not to stop the legislature from doing anything nor to take the vote away from the people; it is a method of procedure.

The question was called.

Spaulding said he is in the middle of both sides of the issue. The legislature could do something to preclude a public vote, but he is also not ready to make a commitment to set in motion an amendment. Perhaps this body could meet again with language that we could all live with. It is our responsibility to be thoughtful and find an orderly way to proceed.

Vote on challenge of the chair: Ayes – Koppen, Berry, Weisenburger, Spaulding, Hendricks, Aplikowski, Perez, Leifeld, Gustafson, Sonterre – 10. Nays – Olson, Moses, Miller, Brown, Halvorson, Fratto – 6. The decision of the chair is upheld.

Halvorson will make a motion later in the meeting to hold a special meeting in the next few weeks.

Halvorson said he would not make a speech in favor of the amendment but would save that for another meeting. He wants to help members with what the amendment would be. If there were to be another special meeting and if there were to be a charter amendment, the following would be the wording he would suggest as an amendment to the Ramsey County Charter: "*Sec 9.06 Prohibition on Taxing and Bonding – Effective November 6, 2012, Ramsey County shall be prohibited from using any revenues, including those raised by taxes or bonding, to fund or assist in funding a Major League Baseball or National Football League sports team or stadium. This prohibition shall apply to both existing and future revenues.*"

Halvorson said a hearing could be held before the next special meeting. He is not making a motion of five pages; he is making a motion with five lines.

Aplikowski asked why the language has been changed to be very specific to major league baseball or national football league teams.

(Continued)

Halvorson said his desire is to include top level professional sports teams who have traditionally asked local taxpayers to make contributions to some of the wealthiest people we know. He specifically wanted it narrowed to national football league and major league baseball.

Fratto said that assuming language such as this is placed on a ballot and assuming it is passed, what impact would that have on prohibiting the legislature from ignoring it.

Sonterre said the impact, or effective date, would not be until after the vote.

Halvorson quoted article 12, section 2 of the Minnesota Constitution – *the legislature may enact special laws relating to governmental units. After we act, they could vote a special law saying that we can't vote. It goes on to say unless otherwise provided by general law, shall become effective only after approval by the affected unit expressed through the voters or the governing body and by such majority as the legislature may direct.* He believes that means that yes, they have every right to overrule our charter now. If we propose an amendment for November 2012, they have to assume the legal risk that the people might vote on November 6, 2012 against the sales tax being used. He believes they will 1) find another source for the revenue rather than the very inappropriate Ramsey County sales tax, which would raise \$670 million of taxes, not \$350 million. Yes, they might overrule us and then if the people vote against it, we could go to court and say the constitution says that the local governmental unit can adopt subsequent laws on the same subject and that would be a prohibitive amendment. That is why he believes this has to be done before a special session anytime after October 15. He believes action needs to be taken to protect Ramsey County voters before they come into session. They will know with their voting that they will not only have to override state law that requires a vote and the Ramsey County charter that says we can petition for a vote, but would have to override a proposed charter amendment that won't even be voted on by the people until November 2012. He can't imagine legislators doing that.

Brown asked why it went from referendum to amendment.

Halvorson said after reading the charter that it would have to be in a general election. He has always thought the definition of general election is every two years when the federal offices are up. It was his opinion that a referendum wouldn't work and couldn't get it on the ballot anyway. He is not sure this body has the right to call for a referendum.

Brown knows that the amendment process has to take place in a general election, but didn't think that same restriction was placed on a referendum.

Carruthers said that section 8.06 of the charter states that any ordinance may be subjected to a referendum by petition filed within 45 days after publication. Once it is filed it shall be suspended in its operation as soon as the petition is found sufficient. It shall be placed on the ballot of the next election, or special election called for that purpose, as the county board shall determine. Thus, there must be an ordinance first.

A member of the public said that the Charter Commission cannot initiate a referendum – it must be initiated by citizens.

Fratto said this body needs to move forward with a charter amendment. We should hold another special meeting and two public hearings within six weeks.

(Continued)

Spaulding moved to schedule two hearings within the next month with a subsequent meeting to consider potential changes to the Ramsey County Charter, all to take place within the next six-seven weeks.

Fratto said without putting the seven weeks in the motion, because there is meeting date scheduled for November 14, after two hearings there may be no need for another special meeting until the regularly scheduled meeting. Schedule two hearings now.

Aplikowski seconded that motion.

Sonterre asked if the second is to include scheduling of an additional special meeting.

Aplikowski seconded the motion so it could be discussed.

Spaulding restated his motion to hold two public hearings within six weeks on a Charter amendment to address the stadium issue.

Aplikowski said she wants the stadium off the table. We are talking about the use of the sales tax for professional sports stadiums. The Vikings stadium is not part of this.

The motion was restated to schedule two public hearings with times and locations to be determined later within a six-week period.

Spaulding said he made the motion on the issue about a sales tax expenditure for professional sports stadiums.

Sonterre restated the motion -- to hold two public hearings in the next six weeks to discuss Ramsey County participating in revenue toward funding of professional sports stadiums. Fratto asked if it could be amended to include amending the Charter to deal with that.

Aplikowski seconded the motion.

Halvorson moved to amend the motion to one public hearing, seconded by Brown. Roll Call: Ayes – Koppen, Spaulding, Olson, Moses, Brown, Leifeld, Halvorson, Sonterre. Nays – Berry, Weisenburger, Miller, Hendricks, Aplikowski, Perez, Gustafson, Fratto. Motion failed 8-8.

Brown moved to amend the motion to hold the two public hearings within four weeks, seconded by Leifeld. Roll Call: Ayes – Olson, Moses, Miller, Brown, Leifeld, Halvorson, Fratto. Nays – Koppen, Berry, Weisenburger, Spaulding, Hendricks, Aplikowski, Perez, Gustafson, Sonterre. Failed 7-9.

Leifeld moved to amend the motion after the word revenues “including those raised by taxes or bonding”, seconded by Brown. Roll Call: Ayes – 15. Nays – 1 (Aplikowski).

Jackelen read the restated motion: to hold two public hearings within the next six weeks to discuss Ramsey County’s participation in revenue, including those raised by taxes or bonding, toward funding for professional sports facilities.

(Continued)

Brown moved an additional amendment after the word discuss “with a vote concluding at the second public hearing” so we don’t end up here on the same issue.

Hendricks said he would vote against the motion by Brown. The Charter Commission needs time to digest the public comments and the vote should be taken at the next regular Commission meeting after the public hearing.

Fratto concurred with Hendricks.

Brown clarified that his intent was to vote at the second public hearing.

Halvorson said the Commission has held meetings after public hearings in the past.

Brown restated his motion to the amendment to conduct a vote after the second public hearing in a Commission meeting, as opposed to at the public hearing.

Gustafson asked if this wording has to be exact tonight so that the Commission is not in violation of a special meeting agenda. If the vote is called for it would be to hold the two public hearings, with a regular meeting in November, where amendments to the Charter are in order or provided for within the Charter, and the action would be a proposal to bring an amendment before the people to happen in November 2012. Does this need to be done in October 2011 and have the people wait for 13 months wondering why when they show up at the polls they are not voting on this when there is no real urgency to do anything because nothing can be done until 2012 anyway. We want to allow people to have the chance to speak loud and proud on whatever side they are on for this issue and take it up as the normal course of business in the normal way so that we are not under any legal challenges and put it in front of the voters in 2012 just as we would do if we rushed it through.

Halvorson supported the motion so we can be more efficient. The motion was for two hearings; he wanted to have only one hearing, but would vote for the motion because hearings are a good idea and he is comfortable with the two hearings. For efficiency, we could follow-up one of the hearings with a meeting of the Commission to vote on a proposal. It has been done before and can be done again. He pointed out that there is a timing issue. It is correct that we can only pass a Charter amendment that will go on the next general election ballot in 2012, but he strongly believes that we have to act before the Legislature is called into special session.

Gustafson said that the issue isn’t whether or not the people have a right to be heard or vote or to support the Charter – our right is to send a message to the people at the Capitol. If that isn’t the purpose, why then do we need to make such a statement in order to do that when we can’t do anything until 2012 anyway.

Halvorson wants to protect this Charter where it says that where people disagree can sign petitions and propose one and propose a referendum and to vote on it. But, he believes there is evidence to prove that the Legislature will pass a law that says something doesn’t have to be adopted by ordinance and won’t be voted on by Ramsey County citizens. That is what they are going to do. That is why he believes this is good public policy for Ramsey County for the next 30 years. That is why he wants this proposed now and for people to know they would have a chance to vote on this. It is not to send a message, but he believes we should not be using taxpayer dollars at the cost of \$670 million to give

(Continued)

\$350 million to help build a Viking stadium. We need to do that before the Legislature takes action in special session – they would restrict our ability to vote.

Fratto said he is not sure where he stands on Brown's amendment. His concern is that the Commission came together today to discuss an idea for how to proceed, which included in his mind a right to vote. That was precluded because of the way the agenda was set up. He wants to make sure that the Commission is in a position that after two hearings a special meeting could be held to make decisions then, including making a proposal and possibly voting on it as language to be requested for placement on the November 6, 2012 ballot. He does not want the amendment to mean that the Commission has to vote, but is not precluded from discussing what was heard at the hearings. If that is the intent of the amendment, he would vote in favor of it.

Brown said that is the exact intent of the vote; to have the right to vote. After the second public hearing there should be no surprise to anyone if the Commission takes action.

Jackelen restated Brown's previous amendment "with a vote being taken following the second public hearing".

Brown asked if the motion could state "authorized to vote after the second public hearing".

Jackelen said the language would read "with a vote being authorized to be taken following the second public hearing".

Hendricks echoed Gustafson's remarks that there is no sense of urgency with this body. The sense of urgency is with the State Capitol and elected officials who are considering a stadium bill that would ultimately be signed by the Governor. It has nothing to do with the Charter Commission.

Sonterre said an amendment has been made that authorizes a vote after the second public hearing. He wanted to reaffirm that there was a first and second to that motion.

Olson asked for the number of meetings that are required to accomplish what we have been talking about. At some point, the Commission should have discussion about the language used for the agendas, such as where the word "discussion" came from for this agenda. His point is that we need to be clear about what is being set up tonight to avoid such future meetings.

Sonterre said that is a good point but it is not germane to the motion.

Sonterre hearing no further discussion on the amendment to the main motion, called for a roll call vote. The amendment to the motion passed.

The question was called, and seconded.

Jackelen read the amendment: "The Charter Commission will hold two public hearings within the next six weeks to discuss Ramsey County's participation in revenue, including those raised by taxes or bonding for professional sports facilities with a vote being authorized following the second public hearing." She asked if this is the language that would be placed on the next agenda.

(Continued)

Sonterre said that motion establishes a process by which both public hearings would be scheduled. Olson's point would then go on task for approval of language for the agendas.

Koppen said if that is the case, there may not be a need to hold a regular meeting on November 14.

Sonterre called for those in favor of the motion, as amended (no roll call vote). Motion, as amended, passed.

Halvorson moved to cancel the meeting on November 14 and call the next regular meeting of the Ramsey County Charter Commission for a date, time and place large enough to hold a public hearing decided upon by Sonterre and Jackelen before October 25. The motion was seconded by Leifeld.

Hendricks said the regular meetings were established well in advance and set last year, and he is opposed to the motion to change the regular meeting.

Fratto said the intent of this motion is to establish a regular meeting immediately following the second public hearing. He understands the reason for the motion but would vote against it.

Halvorson wants the next regular meeting to be that meeting that Brown spoke of that follows the next hearing. The next regular meeting should follow the second hearing and there would be no other special meeting, and that the regular meeting would be cancelled on November 14. The reason for this is that the Legislature and Governor and all those on the opposite side would have the ability to move very fast. When they get the report on October 15 from the Met Council they could probably 1) make a decision on what kind of bill they want drafted, and 2) to hold a special session. November 14 may be too late.

Brown partially agrees with Hendricks and doesn't know that we would need to cancel the November meeting in order to have that special meeting, which is where the vote is authorized to take place. If the motion is intended to provide a timeframe in which the possibility for a vote to place, he understands the motion, but if it is something else, he doesn't understand.

Halvorson withdrew his motion.

Brown moved that the Charter Commission hold a special meeting immediately following the second public hearing, seconded by Halvorson.

Moses said the salary amendment was to be on the November 14 agenda, and he did not want to see that changed. Would that be carried to a different date?

Sonterre said there are items for November 14 and Moses' item would remain on that agenda.

Fratto asked if a specific agenda is to be determined on the question regarding the special meeting following the second public hearing. He wanted to make sure that the Commission is allowed to have leeway. We need to make sure when voting on Brown's motion that an agenda is established that is flexible enough to allow the Commission to do what it intends to do.

(Continued)

Brown said there would be two public hearings. The second public hearing would be adjourned and then convene a special meeting of the Charter Commission, and would choose whether it would vote or not – that a vote be authorized. That motion has already been passed. He now wants to establish when the meeting should take place. He would like it to take place immediately after the second public hearing is adjourned.

Aplikowski said when we call the special meetings we would have words to work off of, which is the purpose. We would propose some words to the people and listen to them, and at the meeting following the second public hearing is what is being voted on. From tonight's discussion, she did not hear whether we vote or not, but that we would vote at that meeting. Are we again putting this off, or would the Commission vote after the second public hearing?

Sonterre said there would be the option. He said we will need to work with Carruthers on this special meeting so that the legal qualifiers are adhered to.

Halvorson was not sure we would be able to if this motion passes.

Brown clarified that the motion that passed was to authorize a vote after the second public hearing at a special meeting following that second hearing. The current motion simply schedules that special meeting immediately after the second hearing. The second hearing would adjourn, then a special meeting of the Commission would be called at which time the Commission is authorized to vote.

Olson said a lot of motions have been going around. His notes state 'prior to October 25th'. Is there a time certain as to when both these meetings are to be completed?

Fratto said within six weeks.

Brown said the special meeting would be held after the second public hearing.

Jackelen said in the past when the Commission held public hearings, the last one was posted for 6:30 p.m., with the regular Charter Commission meeting held immediately following. There was a second agenda, posted as a separate meeting. There would be no time certain unless decided by the chair; otherwise it would be immediately following the public hearing on the same night.

Jackelen read the motion: Hold a special meeting immediately following the second public hearing.

Hearing no further discussion Sonterre called for a vote. The motion passed with 15 ayes and 1 nay.

Fratto said we need to be on the same page. We now know the date of the special meeting and that the subject would be revenue related to professional sports facilities. Do we need to put out a proposed charter amendment prior to the hearing to have something for the public to react to?

Fratto moved the language stated earlier by Halvorson: "*Sec 9.06 Prohibition on Taxing and Bonding – Effective November 6, 2012, Ramsey County shall be prohibited from using any revenues, including those raised by taxes or bonding, to fund or assist in funding a Major League Baseball or National Football League sports team or stadium. This prohibition shall apply to both existing and future revenues.*" Koppen seconded the motion.

(Continued)

Halvorson asked if Fratto plans on the normal process that this can be amended at the special meeting, and that this is just the subject matter for people to address at the hearing, and that it be the starting point for the special meeting, but it can be amended.

Fratto said the purpose of his motion is to have something that the public can react to for the public hearing, and it is his intention that when the members get to the special meeting and/or in subsequent meetings that this language could be amended.

Spaulding said he is curious as to the implications for considering language in the context of a public hearing. In other public hearings, you are not allowed to substantively deviate from the initial language put out to the public.

Fratto the purposed of the public hearing is to get input so that the Commission can make a decision on what the language is supposed to be. The purpose of his motion was to make sure that after that special meeting there is language in place that we can begin discussing as to how we want to deal with it.

Spaulding has a few questions about specifics and potential alternatives. He wants to limit the amount of impact of what we are doing. Is there any way to put out alternative language for consideration, to systemically present questions to those testifying?

Aplikowski agreed that the wording leads people into different things. She offered the following amendment:—“Sec. 9.06 Prohibition on Taxing and Bonding -- ~~Effective November 6, 2012, Shall~~ Ramsey County ~~shall~~ be prohibited from using any revenues, including those raised by taxes or bonding, to fund or assist in funding a Major League Baseball or National Football League sports team or stadium. ~~This prohibition shall apply to both existing and future revenues.~~” This gives the opportunity for public input and would allow the second statement to be added to this alternative question.

Hendricks said he is opposed to the motion and pointed a legal problem with the effective date. Sec. 11.02b of the Charter says that any amendment will take effect 30 days after the election; the election is November 6, 2012.

Fratto concurred with Aplikowski’s solution of the effective date, November 6, 2012. However, moving the word ‘shall’ before Ramsey County makes the Charter into a question when in fact, this would be the language that the Charter would be amended to should the Commission place this language on the ballot and the voters pass it. That is the question we want to ask at the hearing.

Aplikowski said that is the reason for the special meeting. The motion was seconded.

Leifeld asked Carruthers if the Commission is violating open meeting laws by voting on this language.

Carruthers said he felt the intent of Fratto’s motion was to say that the purpose of the meeting is to solicit public testimony regarding the following proposed amendment to the Ramsey County Home Rule Charter. It is really a discussion about the agenda for that meeting. He felt it fits within the discussion issue. If moving that language and taking a vote on whether the Charter should actually be amended, it would be a flashback to the prior discussion.

(Continued)

Fratto accepted Aplikowski's amendments as friendly. He agreed that the last sentence was not needed in the language. If the Commission gets to the point of Charter amendment language, it would then be appropriate.

Voice vote on the Aplikowski's amendment as restated: ~~Effective November 6, 2012, Shall Ramsey County shall be prohibited from using any revenues, including those raised by taxes or bonding, to fund or assist in funding a Major League Baseball or National Football League sports team or stadium? This prohibition shall apply to both existing and future revenues.~~ Motion on amendment passed.

Voice vote on the main motion. Motion, as amended, passed.

Brown moved to invite the members of the Ramsey County Board to the public hearings. The motion was seconded. Unanimously passed on a voice vote.

Fratto moved that the public hearings be split between the Ramsey County suburbs and the city proper based on what Ms. Jackelen could arrange. The motion was seconded.

Sonterre said he and Jackelen would look at the available facilities and her availability.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Olson moved that the St. Paul location be at the Court House to accommodate broadcasting. The motion was seconded.

Aplikowski said to have a public hearing at the Court House in the evening when it is dark – security would be needed and there might be access issues. Something close to the downtown area with fewer stipulations would be good.

Sonterre clarified that the intent is to have the ability to broadcast the meeting. He asked if Olson would reconsider his motion to give priority to a location that could accommodate broadcasting. Olson said there is no other place that could accommodate a countywide broadcast. It would have to be in the Council Chambers of the Court House.

Brown said it should be left to the discretion of staff. That is not something the Commission should be involved in. He would vote against the motion.

Voice vote on the amendment to the motion failed.

Voice vote on the main motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Bonnie C. Jackelen