

Canal Winchester

*City Hall
Council Chambers
45 East Waterloo Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes – DRAFT

September 5, 2023

5:00 PM

Rules Committee

*Laurie Amick - Chair
Jill Amos - Vice-Chair
Mike Walker*

All City Council and Committee meetings will be streamed live on the City's YouTube channel which can be accessed by clicking the link below.

City YouTube Channel – [CityofCW YouTube Page](#)

- A. **Call To Order** *Amick called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.*
- B. **Roll Call** *Present 3 – Amick, Amos, Walker*
- C. **Also In Attendance**
Mayor Ebert, Matt Peoples, Lucas Haire, Amanda Jackson, Jesse Shamp, Bill Sims
- D. **Approval of Minutes**

MIN-22-031

August 1, 2022 Rules Committee Minutes

A motion was made by Amos, seconded by Walker to approve MIN-22-031. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 3 – Amos, Walker, Amick

- E. **Items for Discussion**

OTH-23-014

Council Member Request to Speak Signaling Software

Discussion started at 3:18 on YouTube Channel!

Amick – Several months ago, I was approached by the Presiding Officer of council meetings about Rule 22. Hopefully, you’ve had an opportunity to review that particular item. It stems from limitations on debate. The Presiding Officer shall recognize members prior to such member taking the floor. No member shall be permitted to speak longer than five (5) minutes at any one time. No member shall be permitted to speak more than two times for or against the proposition under consideration. While members may yield to other members, the limitations set forth above shall prevail. No member shall be permitted to speak the second time until all members have been heard at least once or a member who has not been heard wishes the floor. The Presiding Officer, subject to challenge from the Council, may refuse the floor to any member when the tactics are obviously dilatory and not in the best interest of Council. The above rules may be suspended to permit unlimited debate by a vote of three-fourths majority of Council. The question was about opportunities to bring this particular rule into better order and specifically what types of speech signaling software would be available. In your packet this evening, you have a couple of options. The first option is from a company called Alzatex, and essentially, it’s a relatively simple system allowing the presiding officer to have a control mechanism that gives members of the council the ability to request to speak, followed by a clear request by either the presiding officer or the council member. The Alzatex solution runs about \$3,600, give or take. The second option that you have in your packet this evening is from a software company called Open Meeting. This particular option for speaker signaling software is highly sophisticated. Hopefully, you had the opportunity to read through it. It does pretty much anything a meeting would need to have performed. The price tag for the Open Meeting software ranges anywhere from \$6,200 to \$14,000 and includes an additional annual fee. The third option is an in-house, homegrown solution. The price tag is estimated to be a little less than \$500 and would require some minor cabling. I believe Steve Smith, one of our city employees, believes that he could do this relatively inexpensively and would perhaps meet the needs of the council. Bill, I don’t know if you have anything that you want to add to Steve’s solution.

Sims – It’s not a bad solution, certainly. It’s pretty minimalistic. He did a mock-up here for me, but essentially, each chair would have a button that they would hit to request to speak. At the chair’s position, there would be a little light for each of the other seats, so you would know who it is that wishes to speak. It’s very simplistic. Actually, what he mocked up doesn’t even cue. It’s one person who requests, and then

everybody else is blocked out, and once that is cleared, the next person can request to speak. It's definitely the cheapest option, by far. It is hardwired, as is the Alzatex system.

Amick – This is simply a visual indicator; there's no auditory component to that. It's just a visual indicator. Correct?

Sims – What we mocked up was simply visual. I mean, it would be possible to add a tone as well.

Amick – Is it something you'd like to demonstrate for us?

Sims – You wouldn't actually see this. These are the relays that would be hidden somewhere under the counters. Somewhere in that vertical space in front of you would have a button to request to speak. In the chair position, there would be a few indicator lights that would light up. The chairperson could press that button when he recognized them, and then someone else could request to speak. It is possible to get them to cue in order with some additional relays. I mean, it is an option. It does the minimum of what you were looking for, I guess. It does require hard wiring, so there's a bit of labor involved, so most of this cost is probably labor rather than parts and pieces. I think option one was \$3,600 for material only. It would still have to be installed by somebody.

Amick – Now that he's had an opportunity to do the mock-up, do you believe that the price tag of somewhere south of \$500 has changed?

Sims – No. Steve told me the cost was much less than that, but I don't think he was including his labor. I think we would be talking about Steve and a helper for a day or two, possibly to get everything up and running. It is possible to do this.

Amos – I have a couple questions.

Amick – We do have a fourth option. The fourth option is to not have any change at all. No signaling software. We have the option to continue to simply ask the presiding officer to administer Rule 22 as it is written, or we have the option to rewrite Rule 22 to something more that we would like to see. Essentially, there are five options on the table.

Amos – I know I talk a lot. I ask a lot of questions. I'm okay with that. It's the point of why we're up here. I know we don't adhere to Rule 22 very well. I'm also not opposed to that because I feel like there are so many times when things come up in conversations that they lead to another question, thought, or consideration. For me, the flexibility that we've had has been great because it does allow you to actually engage in conversations to try to get to a deeper level. I'm not opposed to making sure that everybody gets a chance to talk because, again, I know that I can take over a microphone like nobody's business, but I think for me, I would like us to try something a little more simplistic with even a checklist. I mean, Jordan has something where she does the voting each time. The President of Council can check off each council member that has spoken, making sure everyone gets a fair chance to speak. To me, trying something simple like that before we spend a lot of money on something we're not sure we'll totally need just seems a little extreme. \$500 is not bad, but do we want our staff working on something that, again, we haven't determined whether we actually need yet?

Walker – I like Rule 22 the way it is. I like that we all express our thoughts or opinions, and we come back at the end to see if we have any additional questions. However, if we were going to make a change, I would be looking at the homegrown option because it wouldn't include an additional annual fee.

Amick – Honestly, I've kind of mulled this one over quite a bit, and this is just my opinion: our residents, I think, pay us and expect us to fully debate an issue. I appreciate the talents of our chair to know when something is perhaps going off the rails. We voted for the chair to be able to control the meeting. For me personally, I would probably not be in favor of any change at all. We've all kind of shared what our thinking is, so at this point in time, Mr. Milliken, do you want to address the Rules Committee?

Milliken – My goal in bringing this up was to make sure that we're adhering to the rules and not necessarily changing what we're doing. If it's the will of this committee and of the council to just continue on, that's fine. I just want to make sure whatever rule is in our council rules is what we're abiding by, and if there's something that I could be doing better, I would like to know. I don't want to restrict anybody's time or anything like that. I would just make sure that if we're going to continue forward with the status quo, myself and the rest of the council included, we are mindful of adhering to the rules. That's all I want—just for us to abide by the rules that we have.

Amick – Being on the end of the table, I will say, and I've shared this with Mr. Sims, but the way that the council bench is curved, usually you can anticipate if someone wants to speak, but it is not always possible to tell if Mr. Walker is going to speak unless I bend way over. I think that's really the only challenge. Otherwise, I think we can see and be respectful of someone else who wants to speak just by their facial cues.

Milliken – Jill, I think you mentioned a checklist, and that's fine. I don't mind doing that at all. I think that's the simplest solution, and it's easy.

Amos – I think it speaks volumes that our group, and maybe we're just very fortunate right now, has been able to openly communicate with each other and to share the microphones. You've done a great job at making sure that sometimes you do shut down.

Milliken – I guess the secondary reason for me bringing this up was courtesy for our Clerk of Council. When people kind of chime in on top of each other, it helps keep that decorum a little bit if everybody's just waiting for their turn in line, so to speak. If we want to just continue doing the things we do and I can take the recommendations from you guys and move forward that way, by all means, I'm happy with that.

Amick – At one point in time, you asked us to raise our hands, and I'm not sure that we did that faithfully. Will that also assist you if we desire to speak to kind of give a hand?

Milliken – Yes. Like you said too, it is a little bit difficult to kind of see. The way I understand the rule, if we just go down the list, I think everybody gets two turns to speak. We go down the list once, and we go down the list again. I think that lends itself to what you were saying, Jill, that if someone thinks of something else after everybody else has had a turn to speak and interact with the administration that second time around, that's probably going to be it at that point. Unless we wanted to tweak that rule a little bit to allow a little bit more time to debate.

Amos – It was actually one of the questions that I had because there have been numerous times where we've had long conversations with builders, Lucas, etc. It does lead to other questions. We don't always follow the two-cycle rule, and I know that, but it's been great because you could continue to ask the question, so when you went home, you were going with the whole package. For me, the two rounds, I wish there was a better way for us to say it so it's not something that's set in stone.

Milliken – I think a couple of things on that. The first would be that I think there have been times where people speak multiple times and we end up rehashing the same thing that's been talked about already. That has been an issue. I think another solution we could do is, once we make it through the second round, we have a motion to end the discussion.

Amos – There's a motion to end, or there's a motion to allow additional debate.

Milliken – Or that. Yes. I think that would suffice as well.

Amick – We can certainly add that to the rule.

Amos – The last line states that the above rules may be suspended to permit unlimited debate by a vote of a three-fourths majority of the council, which I think is five out of seven.

Amick – Do we want to suspend the discussion to take a vote? If we're in a train of thought and a lively discussion about a particular topic because it's an important and challenging topic, do we want to pause in the middle of that to then take a vote on whether we should be allowed to continue?

Amos – I believe the President of Council can call for a point of order and just say, "Are there any new or additional questions?"

Shamp – I think the presiding officer is subject to challenge, so you could overrule him, but he could say, "This is what falls under obviously dilatory, not in the best interest; we're doing this over and over; we're not going to talk about it anymore." He can do that now.

Amos – So we could go past the two rounds of conversations if there's anything new or additional that needs to be asked. I guess that's my question. Do we have to take a vote in order to go past two rounds? If we get stagnant in a conversation and we're just rehashing, the presiding officer can just call for a point of order.

Shamp – Yes. You can really do whatever you want. I think, as this is written, yes, if someone's going to speak more than twice, this rule would require a vote by the council to permit more than two turns at the microphone.

Milliken – I would also like to just present a third scenario because I feel like we kind of get hung up on the hot button issues where people have a lot to say, but I think we all realize that probably 80% of the time people don't have anything to say. I think at some point you might be wasting time going down and checking boxes. There's probably a faster way to do that, but I guess that was another kind of reason why I brought this up. We want to have a balance between the times that we do have a lot to talk about and the times that we don't. We want to be able to get through both of those situations with an efficient

process.

Amick – I was listening to what you were saying, and I wrote down a few words. "The presiding officer may advance or restrict further discussion." How does that wording feel? He can say, "We've been through our two rounds, but there's obviously new information or a new conversation," or he can say, as you suggested, Mrs. Amos, "We've already been down that path; let's not rehash the same piece of that conversation." Just a thought. That way, we wouldn't have to hold a vote and stop the train of thought. We could assume that the presiding officer has the position to be able to advance or restrict additional conversation.

Walker – Hearing everything that I've heard, I am okay with keeping Rule 22 the same.

Amick – Without any change? Because if we make no changes at all, we have two rounds of conversation, and then we're done.

Shamp – So if you strike that sentence, no member shall be permitted to speak more than two times for or against, but then put sort of the onus on the presiding officer to limit or restrict, then there's no restriction on the two. So people can talk more, and then he can put a pause on it if it becomes repetitive.

Amos – I like that.

Walker – I'm good with that.

Amos – When we pick an officer, we're picking them to hopefully guide us through some of this.

Amick – Mr. Shamp, in order for this to move forward, we are going to need to either, perhaps not today, but at our next meeting, we'll need to advance this to the work session for the full council discussion. Would you mind taking the lead and writing up the language to support that?

Shamp – Sure.

Shea – I was going to propose a suggestion on that rule. Rather than three quarters, change it to two-thirds because it's five of seven instead of six of seven. Within those five minutes of allotment, allow the rule to read follow-up questions along the same train of thought or idea of thought that may come up during the course of that dialogue that may be occurring. That way, that particular member has the ability to follow up. They're not trying to take the whole meeting; they're just drilling back down on another question.

Amick – If I'm listening to what you're saying, you're sort of paraphrasing, perhaps, what was said to seek your own understanding of what was contributed.

Shea – Sometimes. Yes. Further clarification. As long as you're staying within that five-minute limit that we've all agreed upon, I would think you should still be allowed to have a continued follow-up on your five minutes of time.

Amick – Mr. Shamp, it would be something along the lines of advancing or restricting with the appropriate

allowance for follow-up to the train of thought or line of questioning. I'm not sure what the appropriate words might be.

Shamp – Sure. Understood.

OTH-23-015

Council Process for Planning and Zoning and Landmarks Appeals

Discussion started at 27:54 on YouTube Channel

Amick – In previous councils or on previous councils, in addition to some that this existing council has needed to address, is the fact that the appeal process occurs when someone receives a decision from either Landmarks or Planning and Zoning and would like to appeal that decision to the council. In a recent situation, it was a little confusing about who was to speak, when they were to speak, what they were to prepare, and so on and so forth. The appeal process is already laid out in Section 1175 of the old town overlay district code, but basically what this additional Rule 7B Quasi-Judicial Hearings would bring about is that it would establish rules for these kinds of hearings. The reason behind it would be that it would provide a more meaningful opportunity for interested parties to be heard on applications where an appeal has been presented. The other thing that it allows is that everything offered by every party who wishes to speak or to present their case would all become public record, whether it's drawings, pictures, or whatever the case might be. Therefore, the notice of appeal would include: a statement of the decision being appealed; a copy of the underlying application on which the decision was rendered; a statement of the legal or factual basis for the appeal; a statement of the basis for the appellant's standing as an affected or aggrieved party to the decision being appealed; and any fee for the appeal as prescribed in the city's fee schedule. That was the first appeal that I had ever sat through. At times, I was like, "What's going on here?" and so I think a strong process for how those hearings are handled is important. The other thing that would happen during the appeals proceedings is that if you reference item 'H' in the proposed rule, it would be an administration of oath. Each party speaking would have to, in essence, take an oath that the information that they're giving is factual and true. There would be an acceptance of documents by council motion that we are receiving, and we have acknowledged the documents in question. There would be a case presentation by staff and a case presentation by the appellant. There would be testimony by non-appellant aggrieved parties. There would be a rebuttal presentation by the appellant. Then council could then go to a closed or open deliberation session of our choosing to discuss the appeal. The final step in that process would be a council vote. Again, this rule is intended to bring some order to the appeals process for manners that are brought before council from either an appeal on Landmarks or Planning and Zoning. With that, I'll take a pause and see what questions are presented.

Amos – Who wrote this?

Amick – Mr. Boggs.

Amos – Well, that probably makes it easier to answer my question. I really liked the way it was written. My only question came down to when council goes to deliberate, and it says closed or open session. How does that fall under the revised code as far as passing in a closed session?

Shamp – A quasi-judicial hearing is not an open meeting, so you are perfectly permitted to do that. There are no minutes of your decision-making process, discussion, or anything of that nature. We would just have you make a motion to go to a closed session, frankly, for the formality of it, so it's up to you. You can do it openly or in a closed session.

Amos – Would these be set up as separate hearings outside of our normal work sessions and city council meetings?

Shamp – Yes.

Amos – Is there a time frame that was established that we have to fall within?

Shamp – I believe that we refer it back to the specific code provision depending on whether it's the old town, the conditional use or variance, and what they require.

Amick – The materials must be submitted to council not less than 72 hours prior to the hearing.

Amos – In the other question I had, you said notice of appeal needs to be timely. Did we define timely? Did I miss that part?

Shamp – It kicks back to C (1) there.

Haire – They are all 10 days.

Amick – Mr. Walker, any questions or comments?

Walker – Not at all. I'm content with the way it's written.

Amick – I would like to give our other council members plenty of time to read through this if they haven't already.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Discussion started at 35:30 on YouTube Channel

Amick – Prior to this evening's meeting, Mrs. Amos did advise me that she wanted to introduce some new rules.

Amos – I apologize; I just had a lot more in-depth questions. Rule #4, vacancies: I know we touched on this the last time we had a vacancy when it came down to replacing the person that left us. My question came down to: is 30 days a law or part of the charter, or was that something that the council established years ago and it's just something that's been held firm? 30 days for us—I mean, maybe two meetings—but it is fast, and decisions were made on the fly. Is it something we could extend to 45 days to allow us a little more time to have good conversations?

Shamp – 3.08 (B) If the council shall fail to elect a person to fill a vacancy within 30 days after the occurrence of the vacancy, its power to do so shall lapse.

Amos – So we would have to change the charter if we wanted ours to be modified.

Shamp – Correct.

Amos – The other question I had was, and this was more for my council members, would we want to consider having an open debate versus a closed one? The last time we brought them into a room, we

asked them the same exact questions. Is it a possibility that we could have asked them the questions openly to the public? Then we could go into a room to discuss further, like we did. The public did not get to hear; the public votes for us. They're the ones that picked us. They had no say. They got to hear nothing. I just feel like if we had made it more of an open meeting where we asked those questions and had them sit outside the room until it was their turn to be called in, I just feel like our public got nothing.

Amick – If it's an open meeting, wouldn't it have to be recorded?

Amos – Yes, but I mean, it's the public's people.

Amick – Right. So, what I'm saying is to have people out in the hallway. I don't see the point of having other people wait if it's a recorded and public meeting. They could be watching it live on their phone.

Amos – Sure. It's no different than our debate, I guess, because we all heard each other's questions and answers.

Amick – True.

Amos – I just feel like our public deserves a little bit more understanding of the candidates. We took it to the closed doors. I mean, we were very efficient, and we asked the same questions of everybody. Our public votes for us. They didn't get to vote for that person. It would have been nice for them to at least hear what that person had to offer. If they're all sitting in the room, I'm not opposed to that either.

Amick – I think for me, it wasn't as much about open or closed as it was about consistency and length of time. If I recall, I think it was three minutes, and by the time the person was seated and greetings were exchanged, it really wasn't a lot of time for an appropriate assessment of that candidate. That would be my input, more so than making it public.

Amos – I think for me, we could have streamed that down. We could have minimized the greetings and that kind of thing. We could have just asked the questions and let the public hear them. We would have lost less time that way because we could have just addressed the person and asked our questions. It would have been a better opportunity for our public to at least hear the candidates and understand our decision. You can still go to the conference room and have further conversations and deliberate, like we did, but it just gives the public the right to see things that they deserve to see. If that's a questionable one, I'm okay if we write it up and vote on it separately if certain members of the council don't feel it's appropriate. I'm okay with that. For me, I just think our public deserves more. We had a lot of people ask questions that we couldn't answer because of the way we held it.

Amick – Yes. It was definitely within the executive meeting. I too have been asked questions, and I just said I couldn't talk about it.

Amos – Which really gives the air not being open, not being forward. If we had done it more out in the open and then had our conversations, then the community at large would have seen what happened and what went on. To me, that's fair. That's fair to them.

Amick – I would recommend, Mrs. Amos, that if you want to work with either Mr. Shamp or Mr. Boggs and

write something up, then we can bring that to the work session just as we will with these other items.

Amos – Got it. I’m fine if we separate it out. That was a lot of feedback I got from individuals on that. My next one is Rule #7, meetings; we, as council, give out a lot of money to different organizations. We name quite a few of them in here, so first I did want to mention that we need to identify the Chamber of Commerce as one of them. It’s not in here, so we need to add it. The question I have is: with the amount of money that we’ve put out to these different groups, Mr. Shamp, if they want money from the council and the city, can we ask for a voting seat on the board? Because if they want our money, I would think that we should have some sort of opinion or value in there. I know that on the CWJRD we serve as voting members. Mr. Walker, you don’t serve as a voting member, but we do provide money. There are a lot of these organizations. We should have an opinion. We’re filtering our money. If you want our money, we should be able to have a voting opinion on every board we serve. If they don’t want our money, then don’t take it.

Shamp – I will get you an answer on that. It sounds reasonable but I’ll look into it.

Amos – That leads into my next one, which I would like for every organization that we’re funding to come in, and this would be at the pleasure of the council, whether it be quarterly or annually. I thought quarterly was fair, but just to give us a summary of where you stand. I ask that of our staff because I think it’s important for you to see our budget. You are funding a good chunk of our money, and you should be able to see our budget as council members. The last thing I want is for someone to say we’re not exercising our right to look. We’re giving money out without getting some sort of checks or balances. If you could add that to your list, I would like to be able to see them quarterly and have them come in and just financially tell me where you are and what you’ve done, just like the CWJRD and the Chamber have done. I think that would be valuable.

Amick – Would you be agreeable to a semi-annual versus a quarterly? There are six or seven different organizations, and for each of them to come in quarterly seems excessive to me, but a semi-annual does not seem unreasonable.

Amos – Yes.

Amick – First of all, before I will render a vote to advance money to an organization, I like to see a formal, documented proposal. I want to know why you’re seeking money. What are your other funding sources? How are you going to use the money? Etc. I like to see that there’s been some effort put into coming and asking us for money. As you suggested, a follow-up on how those funds are being executed is, I think, important.

Amos – Yes. I do too. Again, if they don’t want our money, then that’s okay. Every organization we’re funding or helping fund is a non-profit. There shouldn’t be any question when we ask to see your financials and come in to share them with us. I just don’t see a problem with us being voting members.

Jackson – If I could just chime in for one second, Human Services, CWJRD, Historical Society, and the Chamber of Commerce all have agreements approved by City Council for that funding, which includes what they are required to do. So if that is something you’d like them to come in for, perhaps we can work that into future agreements. Right now, those agreements do require them to submit financial information. I will tell you that one out of the four does that. Just something to think about. We do have

one on your Work Session for discussion tonight that ends this year, which is the Human Services contract. All the rest of them do not expire for a couple of years.

Amos – When I ask them to come in and present to council, I don't expect you to analyze in any way, shape, or form because I think that's a burden that's not yours. You are not their tax accountant, but would it be okay if they're coming through just to go to you as the center point, or would you prefer them to come to the Clerk of Council?

Jackson – What would they be coming to me or the clerk for? As sort of the secretary? That's the way it had typically been working many years ago.

Amos – I believe you manage the agreements.

Jackson – Yes. Typically, they will just turn them in, and then we disperse them to council, whoever may have taken them from that individual. Human Services usually drops it off when they drop off their quarterly invoice, and then either I will hand it out to you or I'll give it to the clerk, and she will hand it out to you. It just depends. We don't mind doing that.

Amos – If we put this in there, we would have to say, "Upon expiration, to be reconsidered, here's what you need to know."

Amick – Mrs. Amos, regarding a seat on that particular organization's board, if we, as council, have agreed to fund or provide funding for that organization in any amount, we have essentially given it our approval to proceed and conduct their business. What value do you see in a member of the council being on their board and being a voting member?

Amos – I'm going to speak from the CWJRD side because that's the part I can speak for. We do our reports. We share our reports, and we are voting members. As a voting member of the CWJRD, I know how the city's funds are used on a regular basis. I know that some of our committees are not being asked to attend meetings. They'll be given cliff notes, so there may not be a full understanding of how the council's money is being allocated. I can tell you where the CWJRD sits financially. I know we're not in jeopardy at this precise moment. I know what the director is doing. I know what is rolling out. I know from experience because we're actively engaged in the process. I think for me, it would be very helpful. We have a say in how our council money is spent. If it seems frivolous, then as council members, we can at least have our opinion to say that it doesn't seem like something that we should be spending our money on.

Amick – Then, essentially, wouldn't your vote be no to provide that organization with future dollars? I feel like we've already cast our vote for or against that organization based on the data that is presented. I'm one of seven, but I feel like we're somewhat intruding. It's like we trusted that organization enough to use city dollars to better their organization, but yet we feel like we have to have more than just an overwatch; we need to have a vote in that overwatch. It feels a little intrusive to me.

Amos – I do see where you are coming from. For me, there are things happening in our community with some of the organizations, and the money is being spent the way it should. I feel like if we're the ones giving the money out and ultimately we're responsible for it, yes, we're doing the oversight, but when we give out money, we aren't always getting that full package. We're not always getting the full details. Some

of these contracts we've done for years, and that's good, but I feel like we should be taking an active role. Being on the CWJRD and taking an active role in approving the budgets for the CWJRD, knowing where the money is going, I can come to you and say this is how we're appropriating it, and it's being appropriated well.

Amick – I suppose if it's paid in advance, we can't, but Mrs. Jackson, isn't it true that they submit receipts to you for reimbursement of their dollars?

Jackson – No.

Amick – Are they supposed to?

Jackson – Again, I'm going to probably sound like a broken record here, but with these four community organizations that we have agreements with, it specifically says in there what those funds are for. We've already told them, yes, we'll give you funding, but it can only be used for this. They're supposed to be providing, I believe, quarterly financial information showing that's where that money is going. We have one organization from which we can certainly have another discussion; we don't require any type of financial information. All the rest is worked into those agreements that the council has approved.

Amick – How can we strengthen those agreements to add that you must come in for whatever we decide quarterly or semi-annually and give a full report, including a financial readout of your financials for that six-month period? How can we enforce that? Do we change the agreement language?

Shamp – Yes. I would say that if you fail to comply with the reporting requirements, there's a clawback provision that the council could enact.

Amos – Where I struggle the most, I think, is that there are some of our organizations for which the council is responsible. We each have our little committees, and they play a huge role in this community. There's underlying pieces everywhere. There are some groups where our members are not even being invited to the meetings. They are literally getting cliff notes. I have a huge issue with that.

Amick – The members of that particular organization's board are not being invited?

Amos – The members of our council are not being invited. They're getting cliff notes, and I don't think under any circumstances that's okay.

Amick – Have they been told explicitly that they are not permitted to attend those meetings? Do you know?

Amos – They would have to know about the meetings to attend.

Amick – Well, they should know that there are meetings being held. This is just me, and we can certainly write up the language and take it to work session, but I feel like we're showing a lack of trust. It's like we're giving you the money, but there's a whole bunch of strings attached to giving you the money. I just feel like perhaps we're micromanaging those organizations that we entrusted the money to in the first place.

Amos – I can totally see where you are coming from because it does kind of feel like we're micromanaging. For me personally, it comes down to our public. We are responsible for the funds. Maybe we start seeing the funds on a regular basis, that they're being appropriated correctly, being used in a timely manner, and that things are being handled. Maybe then, yes, I would totally agree with you that we don't need to have a seat and micromanage.

Amick – Maybe we need to specifically incorporate language into the agreement with that organization. Again, I don't necessarily care one way or the other, whether it's quarterly or semi-annual, but that needs to include a balance sheet or a profit and loss statement, whatever we feel are the appropriate financial documents to demonstrate to the council that they are using the money as they said they would.

Amos – I do like your semi-annual. I think you are correct. Semi-annual seems very appropriate.

Ebert – Just going back to the discussion about a voting seat, I don't think there should be two voting seats allowed. Only one of those people should be allowed to vote.

Amos – That's all I'm asking for—one voting seat. CWJRD, we have two school and two city, but I think that's the way the tax document was written.

Ebert – How many is on your board?

Amos – We have five on the board. We have two school, two city, and then one public at large.

Ebert – CWJRD is a little bit different because they're pretty much fully funded by the city and the school.

Amos – Correct. It's a little bit self-funded. I'm only asking for one. I agree with you on that. This is where, if we make that decision, I know that we need to have that conversation with those groups because some of them may have to modify their charters or some of them may have to figure out how they're going to do it.

Peoples – I was just going to say that. Originally, the council only appointed one to CWJRD. They've changed their bylaws in order to set them up for two and two. Any of those organizations has to change its own bylaws.

Ebert – I also think it's only a percentage or the amount of money you're giving that organization. If they annually spend \$100,000 and we only give them \$5,000, then should we have a voting seat?

Amos – I can see that.

Ebert – You see what I'm saying? There should be a percentage there.

Amick – Just one more thing. I happen to sit on the Board of Trustees for Human Services, and we have seven people who are like hawks. We are all watching over every dime that we spend at every one of our Board of Trustee meetings. We have a full, detailed balance sheet, a profit and loss statement, and an accounting of all the financials for our organization. We have a Board of Trustees that already provides that level of oversight. Mrs. Amos, you're definitely welcome to work with Mr. Shamp and write up the

wording as you would like. I would ask that each individual request be not a separate ordinance but a separate item laid out in the wording because there are some items that I might agree with you on and other items I might not, so I'd like to be able to vote on this individually.

Amos – Rule #7 (E): Council will take a recess on the third Monday of July. Should we potentially modify this to say, “The council will take a recess during the month of July for one meeting?” We did not take the third this year. We took the first.

Jackson – We certainly can.

Amos – Rule #10: Attendance: We have all of our current people attending, including the sheriff. Is it prudent to ask Madison Township to attend these meetings on a more regular basis? Madison Township doesn't seem to be attending, unless we ask. Could we ask them to attend quarterly?

Ebert – The residents are the ones who are paying the money. We're not paying them. They're being paid by the residents. Now I understand that money's still coming from Canal Winchester, but are we totally responsible for them to answer to us or the residents?

Amos – I think we've already crossed that line when we had several meetings with them to try to get some more services. I know that we've had discussions in here about it, so I think we've already crossed the line of whether it's up for discussion. They're not coming in. They're not providing any monthly reports other than the written ones.

Ebert – If that's what you request of them, then yes, they should be coming in.

Jackson – There was a time when they would come in once a month. I don't recall when that stopped.

Amos – We were able to ask questions. It stopped at COVID. I think I just want to know that we have the ability. We've not had the ability to talk with them. I don't know that it necessarily has to be a rule thing. Maybe it's just something that we need to start asking them.

Peoples – It's always been an open invitation. Not necessarily an agenda item. They would let us know if they were going to come or not.

Amos – The last time they came in, he said, “I'm only here because you asked me to,” and I don't want it to be like that. I want you to come in because you have stuff to tell us and you want to share what's going on with the township. Rule #11 (E) After an ordinance or resolution is adopted, it shall be accompanied by a statement that it has been reviewed by Law Director and is correct as to form. Are we doing that?

Shamp – Yes.

Walker – Can we go back to Rule #4, vacancies? I'm okay if it were public, but the citizens have elected us seven to take care of any vacancies like that. The trust must be in us to be able to interview and decide who that person would be to fill that vacancy. I have never been approached, and I'm out as much as anyone. I'm okay either way, but I was okay with the way it was because of the trust they had to vote us in.

Amos – The only thing I struggled with was that, in a closed-door meeting, nobody could hear any of the questions that were answered. It just would have been nice if it were in open form. We'll bring it forth as a separate item so everyone can vote individually.

F. Adjournment @ 6:02 p.m.

A motion was made by Amos, seconded by Walker to adjourn. The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 3 – Amos, Walker, Amick

DRAFT