## **Red Wing City Council Meeting** 1 February 27, 2023 2 3 Transcribed by Carol A. Overland – close but not sworn to as to accuracy! 4 https://youtube.com/watch?v=rqZKMLVXYI4&si=EnSIkaIECMiOmarE&t=8603 **Agenda Item 7 – Public Comment** 5 6 Patricia Allende de Jung: Hi. You might have heard this already because I posted about this 7 online. I would like to speak... I'm Patricia Allende de Jung, I live in Ward 2, and I am happy to 8 speak here. I would like to speak on the importance of public comment. 9 10 It is essential for the good of the people that the City Council by its rules and procedures 11 encourages and provides equal opportunities for public comment. And I stand to speak to oppose 12 any suggestion that requires a person who wants to speak before the council to be physically 13 present in chambers in order to be recognized. As we all know, we have virtual meetings and 14 web ex and that makes it possible for people to speak from remotely when they're at home and 15 attend from home. The Council, I believe, should avail itself of the means of communications in 16 order to allow anybody who wants to speak to do so. 17 18 It is not fair, right, or equal to make access and means to participate for those attending the 19 meeting virtually more cumbersome and less effective than it is for those who are able to be here. 20 I'm referring here to the suggestion that has been made that people attending virtually should 21 give up the right, or privilege, to speak publicly, via virtual meetings, an instead submit emails.

1 Sending an email that is read into the record after everything has been discussed, decided and

2 voted on is not the same as having our voices heard when people can actually hear and consider

3 what we say.

4

6

8

9

5 Unlike when having to send a comment via email, there is a direct immediate connection and

impact when we speak publicly in real time, when the metaphorical iron is hot, when people

7 listening are plugged into the event as things are happening and it all comes together as a part of

that meeting. As a result, what I would say, what anybody else would say, we carry the same

weight, because everybody needs the opportunity to speak and be heard.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Now when I stand to speak publicly at the City Council, I'm aware that I have two audiences. I

come here to speak to the City Council, whose members, who sit in this membership and vote on

things, and I speak to the residents of Red Wing who are here, who are listening online, who talk

with their neighbors. This gives me the opportunity to connect with two audiences immediately,

which makes what I say much more influential, more effective, more powerful, and more

memorable. That does not happen with emails or other things after the fact.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

To sum: Having to attend meetings in person as a condition of being allowed to speak publicly is

not fair or right. It is a rule that threatens, that treats one group of people differently than another.

it denies some people the opportunity to fully participate the same as other people, and it denies

all people their right to know what the residents think, the neighbors and residents and fellow

people think about the issues and concerns that affect us all. Not only might the City Council

benefit from hearing and considering what I have to say, some of my public comments stir others

to learn about an issue of importance that they should know about and be interested in. In effect,
my comments, or somebody else's who comes to speak here, might change minds, and make a
difference in how the Council reacts, considers the things, and ultimately votes, affecting the
very policy and proposals being considered and discussed, and that is the point of taking public
comments. So I would urge the Council to consider policies that incorporate things and needs
that are equal and fair and allow everybody the same opportunities and weight. There's

somebody that suggested to me always add emails to this. There is a possible suggestion that emails could read aloud by someone who would stand at the podium here and give it the same

·

authority that anybody who is able to speak for themselves can do. All this is reasons why people

can't come here. A lot of people are disabled, poor, we don't have transportation, have kids at

home, and probably the most disparate effect on people are the people who are low income, and

people of color, and the elderly. So let us do better than that. And I ask that you consider that

when you do any changes to the rules and procedures that you consider. Thank you so much.

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

7

8

9

10

11

12

## Agenda Item 10C - Consider a Motion to adopt resolution number 7852

Biese: Move on to Item 10C, it's a Motion, to consider a Motion to adopt resolution number

7852 amending the Rules of Order and Procedures for the City Council in accordance with the

18 City Charter 5.04.

Kuhlman: If you would prefer, I'd like to, or if you're OK, I'd like to walk through these

changes, proposed changes. If you remember back when we did the rules, for the organizational

meeting, we adopted, or we had proposed Rules of Order, and we did get some suggested

changes from a local citizen, Carol Overland, who I believe is online, and had said she has

comments or questions. Last week, a committee of council members sat down and walked

1 through the proposed changes by Carol, and if you recall, we did also have comments from our

City Attorney, and so we talked through each one of those and in the end came up with a series

of proposed changes.

4

2

3

5 So, the first one, on the track changes, p. 1., is just a housekeeping change, that's the, that if you

do approve this resolution, it supersedes the old one.

7

9

10

6

8 On page 2, under 5c, there is language to talk about virtual meetings, and so you heard some

comments tonight earlier about that, that's one, this language would then say that we do not have

virtual public comments, people would provide those by email or through being in the city

11 council chambers.

12

13

14

15

16

17

Under 5d, under the Statement of Intent, we added language so that the Council President would

determine whether that was part of the agenda, and I did note that there are several Boards and

Commissions who routinely read the Statement of Intent, and there are some who only read it at

their Annual meetings, and there are some who do not. We made that an option for them so they

can choose whether they read that or not.

18

19

20

21

Moving on, number 7, under 5d, the listing of the agenda, we switched the Presentation and

Public Comment, because we have been providing for presentations first so that it just makes

sense to explain that order.

22

23

If you move to page 4, number 10, as we looked at that language, we thought it was really dated,

because under no circumstances, I believe, would we go out and find a council member if we

2 need a quorum, so we changed that to how we operate now. So if a quorum is not present, a

3 majority of the members present may cancel the meeting. I don't remember that happening

except for one time, and I think that was a Board of Equalization meeting where we didn't have a

quorum. Otherwise, generally people call in, and if we know in advance, we can postpone that

meeting and do a special meeting.

7

9

10

11

12

4

5

6

8 On page 5, number 16, this also changes the language to reflect the way that we operate, this has

been our practice, normally if there's a roll call vote and if it's somewhat equal, with the ayes and

nays, the Council President will say OK I want a roll call vote, it's always after both the ayes and

nays are stated, so it, and the language in that, you have to ask after the aye vote and, but, and

before the nay vote, which, that's just not the way we've done it, so this language, we checked in

with our attorney, this language is appropriate, and so we modified that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

And then the last one was to clarify, lately, I guess last year, we took the Youth Commission and

the Harbor Commission and turned them into committees, so we added language to differentiate

between, those are committees, but they're not the direct committees of the City Council, so the

Council has standing committees and has the ability to do ad hoc committees, that is what we're

talking about in the Rules of Order. We are not talking about committees that are under our

Board and Commission and Committee policy, so that is why Section 27 was added.

21

22

23

So on each of these, I did check in with the City Attorney, they're fine. The one thing I did want

to point out is there under 5C, when I was doing the strike out language, some of the language

- that is not stuck out is not in the old one. This is more than just new language and newly struck
- 2 out language. That's not very clear, but what I want to tell you, this language that's in this
- 3 paragraph C is a little bit different in that we're keeping language, we're proposing to keep
- 4 language that wasn't in there before. So this is what... if you look at the language that was
- 5 accepted, that is what we're proposing.

- 7 So that is all I have as a high level, I can answer questions, or you can just discuss them one by
- 8 one. They are each stand alone, don't have to take it as an entire proposal, each one stands alone.
- 9 Farrar: I'll start off with a couple of questions, if that's OK. Kind of on the idea of public
- 10 comment, can you maybe say, is public comment, legally, do we have to do it, and secondly,
- when did we start doing virtual public comment.
- 12 **Kuhlman:** I don't think you have to do public comment, I think that's an option of every
- 13 government entity. The virtual started when we went to virtual meetings with COVID, so we,
- that has been a newer addition to our agenda.
- 15 **Farrar:** Thank you.
- 16 **Biese:** We have a number of people that want to speak, so we'll hear what they have to speak
- before we decide. So, we'll start with Martha Harris, you're virtual. I need bigger print, or
- bolder, I can't read that. You're on mic...
- 19 Martha Harris: All right. Thank you Council Members, staff, and Mayor Wilson for letting me
- speak again tonight, virtually. I am speaking to 5c, I would like for you to continue allowing
- virtual attendees to talk at Council meetings, as I am now, for the following reasons. One, it
- would close a door to communication. Decreasing access can decrease the opportunity for your
- 23 constituents to participate in matters of our community. And two, concerns of disease

- 1 transmission, when folks have that scratchy throat or some body aches, they will not practice
- 2 best practices and public health recommendations and stay home. When they're passionate about
- 3 something, they will come through that door to speak. Three, folks who have missed their bus, or
- 4 perhaps they go out to their car and it will not start, they are unable to get to the meeting and may
- 5 miss the 3 o'clock deadline. And I too wanted to be at this meeting tonight with many of my
- 6 friends that I've met through pickleball, and unfortunately this morning as I headed out, the rear
- 7 end of my car, as I exited my driveway, slid around and was headed down the road backwards on
- 8 our icy hill. We have two different contractors that service our road between my home and access
- 9 to Hwy 61 to come into town. One of the contractors evidently had plenty of sand and gravel,
- another section of my road, over one mile down hill was still iced over when my husband came
- 11 home this afternoon. And therefore, I was not going to leave the house tonight in order to come
- to the meeting because it was not safe for me. That's all I've got. Thank you.
- 13 **Beise:** Thank you. Next would be Terri Cook, unmute yourself.
- 14 **Terri Cook:** Hi, good evening, can you hear me, one, two, three...
- 15 **Biese:** Yes, we can hear you.
- 16 **Terri Cook:** Great. My name is Terri Cook, and I live in ward 3, it's a recent move. I wanted to
- share my concerns regarding the proposed changes to the rules. Great effort has been put into
- developing ways to increase public input into decisions that will ultimately dictate our futures.
- An engaged public will always give you better buy-in. During the campaign, many of you
- 20 mentioned that you and/or your neighbors did not feel heard at council meetings in the past, so I
- ask you, if you want your constituents to be heard, and feel heard, wouldn't it make more sense
- 22 to invite their comments rather than eliminate options for participation? If you want a more
- 23 robust conversation or a stronger buy-in, why would these proposed changes be coming out of a

- 1 private meeting rather than a public forum? I guess that's up to the council to talk about that part.
- 2 I urge you also to consider keeping the Statement of Intent as a standard agenda item for the
- 3 Council. There was a strong purpose behind initiating this. Do you want respect and civility at
- 4 the meetings? That's what that statement indicates, and it reminds us all at the beginning of the
- 5 meeting, that were here to do the business, we're here to work respectfully and civilly. We've
- 6 seen what it's like when it doesn't go that way. So why not keep it in, and keep that reminder in
- 7 front of us, that you are a civil and respectful body and that you expect that in return from us. I
- 8 think that could go a long way in both directions for sharing our ideas back and forth. I feel as
- 9 though we're going backwards if we adopted those two particular changes. Imagine, just
- imagine, you've got something big coming up, and you want, you feel very strongly about
- something, and it's going to impact your neighbors, and you, wouldn't you want full disclosure,
- open communication, full and robust, full and robust conversation regarding it, so that that way
- everyone feels a part, and everyone then has that buy-in. We build a stronger community when
- everyone is a part of that community. And that's why I think that virtual conversation is so
- impactful. And I know Martha said why she couldn't be here in person, but respectfully, that's no
- one's business. If I can't make it to the meeting, for whatever reason, I shouldn't have to share
- 17 that reasoning with anyone I don't want to share it with. I respect what you do, but I expect you
- 18 to respect what we do and what we as citizens have to offer. Imagine the things we could do to
- 19 together if we worked together. Thank you.
- 20 **Beise:** Alan Muller, would you like to speak on this? Alan, would you like to speak on this?
- 21 Alan Muller: Alan Muller 1110 West Avenue. A couple of preliminaries. The last time I stood at
- 22 this podium a few weeks ago, I commented that the hearing aid devices were not present. And
- 23 they still aren't. OK. I don't know why. If you look at the last page of the agenda, it states says

1 "hearing assistance devices are available during meetings." So I repeat my recommendation that

you find the ones we already own, or buy some new ones, or do whatever is necessary, to live up

3 to this accessibility point.

5 Second preliminary, I talked a little bit earlier about charging stations, and I hope I did not give

anyone the impression that I thought we don't need more charging stations. Electrification of

transport is a basic part of any serious effort to abate climate change. The issue is that utility

regulatory matters tend to be very complicated and mostly understood by the utilities themselves,

and the devil is in those details, and you need to make an effort to understand those before

10 commenting.

I'm really up here to talk about Agenda Item 10C. which is Rules of Order and Procedure. And like the previous witnesses, I think, I am kind of baffled as to why this council would want to deny people an opportunity to testify – virtually is the term used in the regulation. But it's ironic that we're discussing this on a night when we've got wet ice all over town, and I imagine that we all know someone who has fallen and broken their hip, or broken their head, by falling. Winter is a little dangerous in Minnesota in that respect, so just from that point of view, your proposal to not allow people to participate remotely is totally inappropriate. And I would truly appreciate knowing what the reasoning is, what the other side of the story is, if there is one. It just doesn't make any sense, unless one supposes that the intent of the council is to make public participation more difficult. And it does seem to me, I've lived in Red Wing for 15 years and I've commented fairly often to this Council, to the Charter Commission, and other bodies, about the importance of strengthening public participation. We live in times when democracy is under attack, and there

- are lots of things we can do. So why have you rolled out this document which attempts to put us
- 2 in reverse. And I'm not going to go through all the objectionable phrasing here, but some of the
- 3 things that I've mentioned in the past is a good faith public notice means put it on the website, it
- 4 doesn't mean posted on a bulletin board in the attic of this building or something like that. And
- 5 there are lots of other examples, Carol has identified some of them and maybe she's going to talk
- 6 about that some more. But I would urge you not to move ahead with the adoption of this
- 7 resolution which would alter the Rules of Procedure and Order and weaken the ability of Red
- 8 Wing residents to participate in their own government. That's disgraceful. Frankly, the authors of
- 9 this document, in my opinion, should be ashamed of themselves. Common sense tells us that it's
- a step in the wrong direction. So I'm done, unless anybody has any questions.
- 11 **Biese:** Thank you, Alan.
- 12 **Kliewer:** I see a hand up.
- 13 **Biese:** Thank you. Carol Overland, if you'd like to unmute yourself.
- 14 **Carol Overland:** You bet I would, Carol Overland, Ward 2, oh, there we go. I first want to state
- that at the last meeting that you had, which I attended virtually, we were up at a cabin at Lake
- Vermillion State Park. I participate remotely often, at the Public Utilities Commission, court
- 17 hearings are now virtual, also Public Service Commission in Wisconsin, Minnesota here, so
- much is virtual now, and it really does help people weigh in. And so I saw this, and as you know
- 19 I had been part of the Citizens Assembly that suggested many specific things to increase
- 20 participation, to open meetings up, and to have "better meetings," that was a goal. So many of
- 21 the City's plans now, plans that you should know of, specifically seek to encourage and increase
- 22 public participation. So what the heck are you doing? You're turning it around. We have a
- 23 situation here where four self-appointed arbiters of participation drew up this resolution. From

- what I can see, there's not even input from our Community Engagement Specialist, that is the
- 2 title of Michelle Liese's job. I think that you should ask her to weigh in on this, because that's the
- 3 job. "Community Engagement Specialist." You are meeting in private, and you didn't move
- 4 forward with any of the things that would facilitate participation. All you've done is write up a
- 5 resolution prohibiting virtual comment, eliminating the Statement of Intent, making it more
- 6 difficult. And while previous speakers, who I would like to underline what they said, they're very
- 7 generous in their, discussing what they think is happening here, From a lawyerly standpoint, and
- 8 looking at inferences, it's pretty clear to me that what you're trying to do is limit public
- 9 participation, especially following the attempt to eliminate virtual meetings completely. This is,
- 10 yes, as Alan said, this is disgraceful. It's crucial that comment be allowed in any way possible.
- 11 You remember in the comments, in the proposals I made, I stressed that it would be good to have
- 12 a written clear option encouraging people to send emails before the meeting so that you would
- have time to think about it, rather than spring things on you on the spur of the moment during the
- meeting. And you know, it's just a common sense kind of thing, trying to make clear ahead of
- 15 time so people can figure out where they stand on something. But anyway, this proposal, just
- 16 wow, and just no. Because it looks very clear to me that the intent is to shut people down, and to
- 17 limit participation, and that's not OK, not OK. Thank you.
- 18 **Biese:** Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on this? Would you like to go
- through the changes line by line, or what would you like to do? Evan?
- 20 **Brown:** I'd like to add something, I guess I heard here, Rules of Procedure are for the entire
- 21 council. They're our Rules of Procedure. I don't think it's appropriate to have a situation in
- 22 which that discussion happens with a group of people and not the entire council as a body. I think
- 23 that is inappropriate. It bothers me a lot, it bothers me a lot. Those are not... that's our, all our

- 1 rules of procedure, we all operate under, we all have a voice in, and we all need to talk real time,
- with each other, about those changes. I don't think that that's a lot to ask. I really do think that is
- 3 very, very important. So procedurally, I'm already irritated.
- 4 **Biese:** Thank you. It's no different than how I was treated for four years. I was left out of a lot of
- 5 things, so... We haven't made a decision here, that's why we're here to vote on it tonight. If we
- 6 don't want to vote on it, we don't have to vote on it.

- 8 Kliewer: I take offense of the fact that people in the public are under the impression there was a
- 9 secret meeting, there was an agenda meeting which is an open meeting and to the public, you
- 10 could have been there if you wanted to, you know when it is, anybody could have been there on
- this council. This document, we'd received the changes, recommended changes, referred to legal
- 12 counsel for review, we came back to the agenda meeting, and we went through it line by line and
- made whatever agreed or disagreed with the, the, with what our legal counsel thought. So there's
- 14 nothing secretive about it, and it's open for discussion. Talk about it.
- 15 **Brown:** I have never, ever, seen an agenda item that went through line by line review of the
- 16 resolution, I've never seen that. Never seen that.
- 17 **Kuhlman:** I just want to clarify, it was the Agenda team, but it wasn't as part of the agenda
- meeting, we did that in a separate meeting.
- 19 Kliewer: Yes. OK.
- Norton: So it was a separate, not a publicly noticed meeting...then..
- 21 **Kuhlman:** Correct.
- 22 Kliewer: I stand corrected.
- Norton: We couldn't all attend because it's not a publicly noticed meeting.

- 1 **Kliewer:** Well, there's nothing, I mean, it's open for discussion, so, share your thoughts. .
- 2 **Norton:** Well, my question I'll start, with whatever, my question is, why, help, the committee,
- 3 apparently a committee, did we discuss creating a committee to review these? As a Council, we
- 4 do that, from time to time, talk about creating ad hoc committees to do a study, or a dive. Was
- 5 there a conversation that happened that I just missed somehow?
- 6 Kliewer: There's no committee, it was the leadership team that dealt with it. I mean we simply
- 7 went through the documentation, I think you received the same thing.
- 8 **Norton:** I'm still asking, did we as a Council establish a committee to review this?
- 9 **Kliewer:** That's what we're doing right now.
- Norton: No, we're having a public discussion right now. I'm asking if we had a committee, I'm
- asking President Biese, if we have a committee.
- 12 **Biese:** No, we did not.
- Norton: OK. Thank you, that was the question I'm asking. So having said that, it does say in the
- write up, a committee of Council members met on this and made some recommendations. My
- 15 questions are, to the committee, to explain why these decisions were made. I'd like to know why
- the Intent is optional, the other, some of them are obviously clean up things, I'd like to know
- why the virtual meeting is changed, and I'd like to know what conversation took place regarding
- 18 Ms. Overland's comments, I mean, none of her comments are incorporated into this, and so I feel
- 19 like I'm really left out of that conversation, and I feel I'm really left out of that, and I'd like to
- 20 start there.
- 21 Farrar: I don't mind making a couple comments on that, so I'm on the statement of Intent, I
- 22 think many of us believe, and I'll speak for myself, I don't intend to speak for Kim or Don, but
- 23 you know, in my experience in the last year, if you guys made the statement of intent, I didn't see

a lot of respect and dignity happening, so I kind of felt it was a lot of words and maybe not

2 actually happening, and I felt it made sense for the President of each committee or commission

to decide if they want to do it or not, what was best for their group of people, so I'll stick with

that one.

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

3

4

6 And second, on the virtual, I believe that the Council is here to do business, public comment is

7 not legally binding, we have done our gracious part of allowing and asking for public

8 participation and public comment, but we're here to do business, in my opinion. And so we have

9 public comment, they can email, they can come to the stand and speak to us, but in my opinion,

in watching, again, for the last year, the virtual content is not extremely useful, or business-like,

it doesn't work well. And I just think, in this day and age, virtual participation engagement is

awful, I think we all know from COVID, which with virtual, it started in COVID, we haven't

been doing this for like 15 years, virtual and going on screen is not conducive to good

engagement. I would rather have a face to face with people being here, or a true community

group talking to each other, one on one, talking to each other and really seeing each other's faces,

body language, and that to me is public participation. And I forget what the last one, the last

17 question?

18 **Norton:** What are the results of the recommendations of Ms. Overland...

19 Farrar: Well, we went and took Carol's and took our legal counsel, and went one by one and

took our time to do that, and everybody got Carol's comments, and anybody else that would have

commented on the subject, and I don't think one person in our community was taken more

highly or at a lower end than anybody else.

Norton: I don't understand what you're saying...

- 1 Farrar: I don't understand why Carol's comments on this would make any difference, than
- 2 anybody else's, than Patricia's or Martha's or anybody's. So we were given that, all of us as a
- 3 Council, Carol's comments, so we took our legal counsel and Carol's comments together with
- 4 our current rules of Order, one by one, and decided, I believe we did take a couple of her
- 5 comments, and again, she helped us see some clarity, and maybe some misunderstandings, so I
- do believe we took a couple of her ideas, I don't have my notes exactly which two, we took a lot
- of time to do this, mainly because we are the Executive Leadership Committee, we were elected
- 8 in a majority way, and that was our direction. I know that council member Biese, our President, I
- 9 think spoke with each of you. You guys knew that when you're President this is what happens.
- 10 You get to decide how things are going to be done.
- Norton: I don't follow, you spoke with each of us about what?
- 12 **Farrar:** That might be the wrong way of saying it. But in the absence of, you know, whether it's
- the Statement of Intent, or something, these are going to be decided tonight, we're going to talk
- about it in the group, that's why we're here tonight, nobody's limiting discussion.
- 15 **Norton:** Is there an Executive Committee?
- 16 **Beise:** No.
- 17 **Farrar:** I maybe missed... we used to call it an Executive Committee on the School Board, you
- 18 know, like a, an Agenda Committee to me is like an Executive Committee. So it might be
- 19 misusing words.
- Norton: The agenda committee is the committee that meets to go over the agenda. That's it.
- 21 **Farrar:** Is that traditionally, it's been done in the past...
- 22 Norton: Yes.
- 23 Farrar: Yes.

- 1 Kliewer: I would add that, you know, for the most part, a lot of, most virtual meetings ended
- with COVID, and that is over with. You know, the main thing to me, is I think, I think, a person
- 3 can relay a whole lot more to us standing at the lectern there than they can over virtual, and I
- 4 look at what, just how well virtuals worked for our school kids, and I think it's not that well. So
- 5 you know, I don't see it's that big a deal. We can communicate with people, they can write to us,
- 6 they can call us, there's many ways they can communicate with us if they want to. We're still
- 7 going be streaming. One of the other issues that I ran into is in trying to watch a lot of meetings
- 8 from the commissions, they have so much trouble getting people to be able to log on, I think that,
- 9 that, several times I witnessed where they just couldn't get them here. If it's a technical issue, I
- don't know, but I don't know that it's that critical.
- 11 **Brown:** My entire world...
- 12 **Biese:** Excuse me, Evan... Vicki Jo –
- Lambert: My um, in response to what I'm hearing people say, and I'm, I don't have the history
- here, so I see, I know, that when I ran for this one of the things that I wanted to do was to engage
- more people. And when I see us saying that we don't want to do this because this isn't what we
- used to do, I feel like that's saying "I don't want certain people to participate because they can't
- be here." And I know that there are a lot of people in my ward who don't have cars, but they
- have a cell phone, because everyone has a cell phone, so they can log on to a meeting and they
- can be present, even if they can't get here, because they walk everywhere. So if I can't get here,
- then I'm invited to not participate. I'm invited to not be part of this, and I think that yes, I agree,
- face to face is great, and I think that virtual participation is critical in this day and age. This isn't
- 22 exclusively virtual participation, this is both, and, this is in person AND virtual. Locking people
- 23 out, I think is, quite frankly, it bothers me a lot, and I feel like it's trying to silence voices of

1 people that maybe aren't able to be here, Even if they were here in person, you know, and I saw a

2 lot of name calling from people from our community attacking the council, so I feel like

3 something, and I saw it, and it made me physically uncomfortable and sick, because people from

the community were yelling. This is important (holding up Statement of Intent). This is

important for us to remember, and to speak about every single time because repetition helps us

remember what we're here to do, and we are here to do the business. We are here to do the

business, to represent the public, with the public, and if we aren't including the public as part of

our process, we're missing the ball, and I think that we're becoming exclusive, and I'm not

interested in having a club that does business in secret. I'm not interested in being just here

alone. I'm interested in engaging the maximum number of people possible, and I think the

both/and proposition and for those reasons I do not support 5C changes, here, and I also think,

and I don't support changing 5d Statement of Intent. Because I think it's important that we

remember that we remember that we have to remind people that this is about all of us, it's not

about me, it's about all of us, any one of us or a small group of us that gets to make decisions. I

think in the case of this, we should have gone through this line by line as a group, and yes, it's

going to take some time. And I would have appreciated an invitation to that meeting, because I

would have come. But I wasn't invited. And I'm a member of the Council, and my voice is

important too. And I don't, I don't, I don't feel like I'm important, or valued, when a group of

people get together and they put together a proposal, a resolution, that I didn't get to have any

say or voice in. That's just me talking about, and I get to sit up here with all of y'all, and I don't

have this history and I don't feel comfortable with this being here like this and not having been

invited to this meeting. I would have gone. That's all I have.

23 **Beise:** Evan, go ahead...

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

**Brown:** In the case of the virtual meetings, my business has completely changed, the world has completely changed, and whether or not COVID is here or not, and we're going to disagree about that, but the world has changed. The technology has moved past it and the genie is out of the bottle. We do have this tool, and I think it makes, to Vicki's point, we should utilize it, why wouldn't we utilize it. Why, why, why would we go backwards, because it's not causing any problem, and to the degree that there are some minor problems at some, with a board or commission, in terms of reaching this body, which is where it really stands, where the interest really is, I see no reason to preclude a tool that has been utilized, and continues to be utilized. I mean it's like saying "Oh, you know, well we have landlines, but hey, you know these cell phones, they're just a fad, we should just move past those and go back to land lines," you know, and the technology has changed. Like it or not, my entire business is in, I don't even know how many, it's not a huge company, and we are in a bunch of states and countries, all over the country, and how do we communicate, how do we interact? We are all building product together, we are doing intense technical work, business together, and we can manage that online and I don't understand why we would take that tool away at all. **Goggin:** So the only concern I have is 5c as well. I do most of my work virtually, for my job. Most of the comments I've gotten about this issue, people want to have that availability to do this. But I would really like to see this be the exception rather than the rule that you would comment virtually. I think people should get here, people should get here from behind our keyboards, interact as individuals in the public, as we walk in the door, walk to the lobby, we're going to get other people's opinions, you can start talking, instead of just presenting, and what you want to say about a particular issue, you get to debate it with somebody else, either before or after the meeting, or whatever. So for me, I don't think that the virtual comments is something

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 1 that we should get rid of.
- 2 Biese: I talked to a lot of people at the conference this weekend. None of them are continuing to
- do virtual meeting, and I talked to more than 30 of them. They've all gone back to in person
- 4 meetings and eliminated virtual because of the staff issues they had, always staffing it as well as
- 5 they felt that you should be in person. And with that, I'll make a motion that we table this until
- 6 we can have a workshop and discuss and go through it, line by line.
- 7 **Brown:** Second
- 8 **Biese:** Motion by myself Kim and second, Evan, to table 10C until we can have a workshop and
- 9 go through it, line by line. All in favor?
- 10 **Brown:** 10C or the whole thing?
- 11 **Norton:** 10C is the whole thing.
- 12 **Biese:** All in favor? (Aye, Aye, Aye, Aye, Aye, Aye, Aye, Aye.) Opposed? Motion carried.