



-
- 1. Call to Order - 6:30 p.m.**
 - 2. Roll Call**
 - 3. Approval of Agenda**
 - Motion to approve meeting minutes: October 23, 2025 Minutes January 22, 2026 Minutes
 - 4. Approval of Minutes**
 - Motion to approve the minutes for: -October 23, 2025 -January 22, 2026
 - a. Approval of the Minutes
 - Motion to approve the minutes for the following meetings:*
 - October 23, 2025*
 - January 22, 2026*
 - 5. Old Business**
 - a. Consideration of Changes to Rules of Procedure
 - b. Consideration of Changes to Charter Section 2
 - 6. New Business**
 - a. Discussion on Scheduling Another Meeting
 - 7. Adjournment**

Minutes of the Brooklyn Center Charter Commission Meeting on Thursday, October 23rd, 2025

Called to order by Chair Leino at 6:37pm

Secretary Bourque called the role.

Present:

- Stanley Leino *Chair 2025*
- Lee Bak
- Julie Bourque *Secretary 2025*
- Gretchen Enger *Public Relations Chair 2025*
- Andrew Johnson
- Jeff Lewis
- Robert Marvin
- Toby Phillips *Vice Chair 2025*
- Brian Smith
- Arvid (Bud) Sorenson
- Steve Shold *Audit Chair 2025*
- Gail Ebert
- Patty Mesenbrink
- Todd Henning

Absent:

- Donald Bumgarner – *Excused*

Guests:

- Shannon Pettit, *City Clerk*

Adoption of Agenda:

Chair Leino entertained a motion to adopt agenda. Commissioner Marvin motioned. PR Chair Enger seconded. Chair Leino asked for discussion. Commissioner Sorenson asked to review Section 4, the rules and procedures of the commission and Section 1, the purpose, either at the end of this meeting or at the beginning of the January meeting. Basically the rules for voting. Commissioner Sorenson noted that there a number of new members and things are slightly different than the council. Chair Leino noted that as time allows, it will be on the next agenda.

Chair Leino asked for any further discussion with that amendment

PR Chair Enger welcomed new members and noted that city council passed the commission code of conduct on September 22nd, so noted she wasn't sure if we wanted to talk about that.

Chair Leino noted it does not apply to this commission because we are an independent entity.

PR Chair Enger asked how to withdraw. Commissioner Marvin noted it wasn't seconded. Chair Leino asked if there was any other discussion. No discussion noted. Motion Carried.

Adoption of the Minutes:

Chair Leino asked to entertain a motion to approve the July 24th Minutes. Commissioner Marvin made motion. It was seconded by Commissioner Phillips. Chair Leino asked for Discussion. PR Chair Enger said yes. She noted it would be nice to have page numbers on the minutes. She said second, under old business, Section B under the report by the subcommittee, advertising the vacancies, Secretary Bourque noted herself as both Secretary and Commissioner Bourque. PR Chair Enger noted we need to have some consistency in labeling. She went on to note that on the next page, under Section B, it says Commissioner Ellgren and she was not at the meeting because she had resigned, so that should be her. Secretary Bourque confirmed the error. PR Chair Enger went on to note that in the second paragraph there are two instances of it and noted where there should be corrections. She said the same error is under New business B, under discussion, it notes, Commissioner Ellgren, it should be Commissioner Enger. She went on to note that on the last page, under miscellaneous business, there are two references to Commissioner Lee and it should be Commissioner Bak.

Chair Leino noted they were the best he has seen since he had tried to keep up with in 1999 and got critiqued whenever the nuance was correct. He thanked Secretary Bourque for the thorough minutes. Chair Leino asked for any other discussion about the minutes. Commissioner Sorenson noted it is very thorough, but is not necessary for minutes, a lot of it is nice but is not required. Chair Leino noted agreement and went on to note he would rather have too much than too little, so noted he was not going to complain too much. Chair Leino asked for a Motion. He then noted that Commissioner Marvin had motioned and Commissioner Phillips had seconded. Secretary Bourque asked for clarification about how to refer to herself in the minutes and noted that she had planned to ask for clarification about it but had forgotten to email prior to the meeting.

Chair Leino noted to refer to herself as Secretary. Secretary Bourque noted now, but noted she was just filling in last time and was voted in after the meeting, so she was not sure how to refer to herself. Chair Leino noted to refer to herself as Commissioner and then after the fact as Secretary.

Chair Leino asked for any further discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Business:

a. Requested City Clerk's presence and/or City Manager's presence to explain housekeeping changes proposed for City Charter Chapters 2, 4 and 5

Discussion: Chair Leino noted city clerk is in attendance. Chair Leino asked if city clerk would like to make presentation. City Clerk agreed and passed out documentation. (Attachment

City Clerk noted she believed the sections on the agenda were 4, 5, and 6. Chair Leino clarified that it was 4 and 5. Commissioner Sorenson asked what the difference was between this and what they were previously given. Chair Leino noted this goes back to a long time ago when they were going to come in and make a presentation about housekeeping changes that they wanted.

PR Chair Enger asked for clarification around chapters, asking if it was just 4 and 5.

City Clerk confirmed and noted that as she and Dr. Edwards sat down and looked at it there was a lot more extensive changes and as they started working through it, just talking out loud about, they came to the conclusion that they were not all necessary. City Clerk noted there are very few changes that she is proposing and it does not include Chapter 2. She said to begin with Chapter 4, they they looked at all the language proposed and that it was mainly just housekeeping, so it is not a lot, but it will be seen in the packets that were handed out, the blue text is what is changed or added. First section of Chapter 4 noted they are essentially going to follow MN State Law. She noted they opted to keep that in because they have to regardless and as far as elections go, they will keep that in there for clarification. What will be section 4.02, you will see by resolution. She noted they simply added that and noted they have always done it, every election year. They present to council the poling locations through resolution. So, it is something they have already always done, so they went ahead and added that text.

Commissioner Marvin noted that the lines are maybe not spelling mistakes and are just existent on the screen. City Clerk confirmed.

Chair Leino noted they are putting re-identifiers in there. City Clerk asked if he was referring to the red lines that are popping up and noted it is a program that is there to correct grammar and it isn't always right. She noted it is helpful when it wants to be, but that most of the time, it is just a nuisance. PR Chair Enger noted it is Microsoft, enough said.

City Clerk noted to move onto Chapter 5, and noted it is 5.02. She said again it is housekeeping, changing a word from pecuniary to monetary and also removing but and creating a new sentence. She then went on to note that in the fourth line down, it notes this should not prevent the committee from paying for legal advice and for incurring expenses for legal advice, which are essentially the same thing, but to be super clear, that's why they put it in there. City Clerk noted the rest, like in 5.04, there is a clarifying statement noting that petitions shall not be complete unless signed by a number of Brooklyn Center registered voters, so just clarifying that the voters have to be from Brooklyn Center.

PR Chair Enger noted a typo. She noted that where it says 5%, that is incorrect.

City Clerk noted she found one that should not be struck out. Chair Leino asked if they are eliminating the strike out on qualified. City Clerk confirmed.

City Clerk noted that in Section 5.05, they added cities, registered voters, and 5% of the total number of City of Brooklyn Center registered voters. Then in third paragraph, it is basically stating that once a petition and signature papers are filed, city clerk is allowed up to 10 days to review them and then noted that actually there was a strikethrough that she is removing that was actually good language that should stay.

Section 5.06, they added the city of Brooklyn Center. City Clerk noted another strike out that should not have been. City Clerk noted it was not nearly as extensive as first was anticipated after talking about it and going through it.

Chair Leino thanked City Clerk for making the presentation and asked if she could stick around for a few minutes in case there are any questions for discussion. City Clerk noted she will be around.

Commissioner Marvin noted working on these before and noted that they have to do a revisor and have a thing that says this is what we propose and pass it and then it goes to City Council and they have to pass it with 5 votes. It has to be unanimous and then basically it just goes through. Commissioner Marvin noted that we are going to need to have all this stuff so we can understand it to do that. He noted he was also thinking that some of the things that are really clear, with no disputing it at all, splitting them up into a couple little pieces, those would pass almost for sure by the City Council. But if any things are contentious, like changing numbers, then break them off into pieces to debate them. Commissioner Marvin noted collectively he did not know if we have much interest typographical errors in if there are typos, everyone will likely agree to that, but if you split it up into a couple little pieces than we can boil it all down to whether we are going to change a specific thing and talk about that. He noted, it sounds like there isn't a lot. He noted we also can't vote on or pass stuff that is being changed as we are going.

Chair Leino noted, Commissioner Ebert, correct me, in the past we have made these very slight housekeeping changes, we have presented each change as a section when asking the council. They did it piecemeal, one at a time, but did them each in sections and treated them as a stand alone. Commissioner Ebert confirmed.

Chair Leino called on Audit Chair Shold. He yielded noting that was where he was going.

Secretary Bourque asked clarifying question about the notes and asked how to refer to the City Clerk, if it should be by name or title as name is used in the space. Chair Leino noted to do City Clerk with last name, so by title. Secretary Bourque noted that the language is interchanged in the space, so she wanted to make sure. Chair Leino noted another housekeeping clarification that they should have established earlier is that it has always been assumed that these types of presentations are always attached to the minutes, so he wants to make sure that it is clear that there is a record. He noted they can be referenced how the Secretary prefers.

PR Chair Enger asked for clarification about how things would be presented to the council. She noted that the commission would say that here is all the changes for Chapter 4 and they approve them all in one fell swoop?

Chair Leino noted past isn't always prologue, so to take it for what it is worth, but in the past there were housekeeping changes, like in 4.24, that used to be \$2, but they changed it to \$25 so people would have some skin in the game, but they created a petition process for people who didn't want to pay the \$25, they can get the signatures. They don't want people that cannot afford it to be left out from running for city council. He went on to note that if we would have 3 or 4 changes like that, they presented each section separately to City Council. He noted that doesn't mean it has to be done that way and that a commissioner can note that they want to move forward with the whole thing, that can be moved forward for discussion.

Chair Leino noted his appreciation for the work being done, but going back to the revisor statutes language, he can say I like this language, but let's have a subcommittee hash it out a little bit. He noted that is what he and Audit Chair Shold did for the amendments that they had before. They noted they had a subcommittee that hammered things out.

Chair Leino noted that Commissioner Marvin was trying to make a point and if you come in with it all at one time and if one Council person has an issue with one word, the whole thing is thrown out. If you present them with ten options, and they all like the first seven, you are done and then

if the other three would go as a referendum if it doesn't pass. Compartmentalizing is the way he is trying to present it.

Commissioner Marvin noted he thinks the housekeeping should pass. He noted that there were a lot of people who would argue about things like specific changes, like changing from \$2 to \$25 and then they wouldn't pass it, so he was trying to make it so most of it would pass, but if there are really simple changes that are obvious, most of it should pass.

Audit Chair Shold noted clarification of it being a brief overview, but asked if there was anything contingent on another section where certain portions would have to go as a package. He asked if they could all stand alone. Clerk noted that she believes they can.

Chair Leino noted if we do it piecemeal, then we can weigh into each one.

Commissioner Ebert noted she would go for one at a time, then if city council objects to something we will know exactly which one.

Chair Leino asked if that is a motion. Commissioner Ebert noted she would like to motion. Chair Leino noted a motion by Commissioner Ebert, seconded by Commissioner Marvin that each housekeeping change be considered individually.

Chair Leino asked for discussion.

Commissioner Sorenson noted concern that this was not presented prior to this meeting so we could look at it. He went on to say that now we are being rushed.

Chair Leino clarified that this is just saying how we are going to approach the problem and clarified that we are not voting on whether we are adopting it or not.

Commissioner Marvin noted these arguments can be ugly.

Chair Leino noted that's why we have a vote discussion, so that if you want to argue against it, that is a position to take too.

Chair Leino asked for any further discussion.

Chair Leino noted we have a motion on the floor that we take recommended changes to Chapter 4, Chapter 5 as presented by the City Clerk as each individual item one at a time for future debate.

Audit Chair Shold suggested referring to them as amendment proposals. Chair Leino noted we could. Audit Chair Shold noted we don't have to but he does a lot of this for work and that is how they refer to them.

Commissioner Bak noted clarification that it is each change or each section. Commissioner Ebert noted each change.

Commissioner Bak noted that if there is a section with multiple changes, do we just do one change.

Commissioner Ebert noted baby steps, some will be easy.

Chair Leino called on Audit Chair Shold. He deferred to City Clerk Pettit

City Clerk Pettit asked if it would be easier if she made a simple one page grid with each section and change.

Chair Leino noted that if we proceed with this, because we haven't taken a vote yet, but he likes the idea because we could be debating late at night and all of a sudden we forget something.

Audit Chair Shold noted he does this day after day for work and that generally each section would go on a proposal as it's own thing. You would look at amending that section. Maybe the section would have one or two or three changes in it, but it keeps it pretty clean to say this section is proposing this, see the edited language. Red might be preferable to blue, but that is him being picky to make it a little more clear. Struck through language and then the other line red. It makes it really clean to go through.

Chair Leino asked for clarification if Audit Chair Shold is offering his own amendment or asking Commissioner Ebert to amend or is he making his own motion

Commissioner Ebert noted she would accept a friendly amendment. Chair Leino asked Commissioner Marvin if he accepts. Commissioner Marvin noted maybe and went on to say what he was thinking we were going to make a laundry basket of 80 things we decide to approve and we submit it to the City Council and they approve 78 of them and sends back 2.

Chair Leino asked how that is different than what is on the floor.

Commissioner Marvin noted he thinks that is what we are talking about and said that is what he is thinking. He noted that would make things really simple. Then we would only have 2 things to argue about and then we are done.

Chair Leino noted to hold on a second as we are going to get lost in the parliamentary procedure.

Audit Chair Shold suggested going by section because if you separate out a section that the change is in, and you accept one of the changes in a section and not the other, you may have inadvertently changed the whole section where it is no longer doing what you intended it to do. He noted each section has to go together if there is more than one change in a section. He noted the changes are pretty minor, but should anything else come up, each section needs to be taken into account.

Chair Leino noted we have Commissioner Ebert and Commissioner Marvin have accepted it as a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Sorenson made point of order noting procedure and noted they cannot do that. Commissioner Sorenson noted we have a motion on the floor and if they want to change it, because it was already presented to the floor, you have to make an amendment.

Chair Leino noted that is what he did. Commissioner Sorenson disagreed and noted they talked about it amongst themselves.

Chair Leino asked for discussion about a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Shoud made a motion to propose the friendly amendment. Another commissioner noted that it has been motioned and seconded already.

Vote was unanimous.

Secretary asked for clarification on who seconded the motion.

Clarification was asked about whether there needs to be a second to the friendly amendment.

Chair Leino noted Commissioner Bak had seconded the motion.

Commissioner Sorenson noted it is just an amendment whether it is friendly or not.

Chair Leino noted motion as it stands now is to consider each proposed change by its designated section in Chapter 4 or Chapter 5 of the City Charter.

Chair Leino asked if there is any discussion on that.

Commissioner Marvin noted it is just a slight change to what was originally proposed because it could be that you have three changes in one section and we are just saying we are not going to have 1, 2, 3 on that section, but is it still going to be a list. Then we will be voting on a list of changes and then submit that list and get approval from City Council by element.

Chair Leino said no, by section going on to say it would give a clear delineation of the issues they might be considering.

Commissioner Marvin noted Council could approve changes to 401 and not 402

Audit Chair Shold noted he would give each section more clarifying language regarding the sections and the changes if it was being graphed out.

Chair Leino noted that is likely what will happen and asked for further discussion.

Chair Leino asked for those in favor. Motion carries.

Chair Leino asked how we would like to proceed knowing that is the parameters and asked City Clerk Pettit to bring the grid with changes and noted it will be ten points referring to section and changes.

Vice Chair Phillips asked question of city clerk regarding the two sections where she would remove the strikethroughs – 5.05 and City Clerk Pettit noted the other was 5.04.

Commissioner Marvin noted enumerating these two things and then just have it automatically updated and also noted having a matrix of all the things would be nice.

Secretary Bourque asked for updated document. She noted that the handout has some discrepancies from what was presented on the screen. She asked for an updated document with corrections on the strikethroughs.

Chair Leino asked how the commission would like to proceed. Chair Leino noted take this home to review and vote on it or have another subcommittee go home and tweak it. He noted his opinion is that it would be kind of redundant to do that.

Commissioner Johnson asked if we can get consensus of group.

Chair Leino noted that is what he would like to do right now.

Commissioner Marvin noted these are all going to be simple changes and may not have a lot of argument so noted to propose it for the next meeting.

Chair Leino noted to support what Commissioner Marvin said that if there is ten sections, we could do a white ballot one at a time and need 2/3 approval with the floor to send to council for consideration.

Audit Chair Shold noted he is was not sure legality, could there be a global ask of is there any opposition to any of these and if not, vote, but if there is, then go through those and then go through each one to vote on the proposal.

Chair Leino noted he is hearing that people are saying to let City Clerk Pettit do her work and then come back.

Audit Chair Shold noted he presumed there is not time sensitivity, Chair Leino noted it has been like this for many years.

Commissioner Sorenson noted clarification that this will be presented to the group in the mail before the next meeting.

Chair Leino noted that it has to be in front of us 20 days prior and noted that we cannot vote on it because we haven't given public 20 days notice

Chair Leino asked for a motion. PR Chair Enger asked for clarification on the motion. Chair Leino noted that we will consider all of these proposed amendment changes at our next meeting.

Motion by PR Chair Enger, second by Commissioner Sorenson. Chair Leino asked for discussion.

Vice Chair Phillips noted the public has to get notice.

Chair Leino noted that the only formal requirement is asking the City Clerk Pettit to put it on the city website, the city newspaper and the bulletin board.

PR Chair Enger noted she can put it on the social media and make a coordinated effort.

Commissioner Marvin noted that might bring in protesters

Chair Leino noted that has happened, Commissioner Ebert agreed. Commissioner Marvin noted these are all simple changes. Chair Leino noted that someone may still have a weed about it.

Chair Leino took the vote. Motion carries unanimously.

Chair Leino asked if City Clerk Pettit was going to stay.

Chair Leino asked for discretion for a moment.

Chair Leino noted if council has to give two weeks notice before they can consider it, let's pass this in January and send it on to them.

Commissioner Henning noted that according to the old business, 2, 4, and 5, City Clerk Pettit didn't tell us about it.

Secretary Bourque noted that 2 was us (referring to the subcommittee).

Commissioner Marvin noted the having the Secretary refer to all these things as exhibits and wants to move that we should leave it to the discretion of the secretary to determine how to accomplish things in how things are call.

Chair Leino noted there isn't a motion needed for that.

Philips asked for clarification about voting and if we could have voted about this tonight.

Chair Leino noted if we were going to consider and notice was not put out in the 20 day window, we can't vote on it that night. Chair Leino noted he will have it out way in advance, likely early December. City council when transmitted to them, when it goes on their agenda, they have to give the public 2 weeks notice.

Chair Leino asked if we are ready to move on to the next order of business, which is the subcommittee report.

b. Any report from Sub-Committee regarding advertising of vacancies and 1-Month Notice requirement

Chair Leino noted that he put the one month notice requirement in there, but he didn't have the opportunity to look at the subcommittee's language, so it was a very loose interpretation.

Chair Leino asked if one of the members of the subcommittee would like to discuss.

Discussion: Commissioner Johnson noted three handouts, one being a proposed change to section 2.02 of the charter. Commissioner Johnson reminded the goal was to create language around improving predictability, accessibility and transparency for residents with the Charter Commission and noted that it has also come up with other commissions.

Commissioner Johnson noted that this particular change was addressing that concern in the section we felt to be most appropriate in the Charter, so just printed to highlight that section.

Second item is the changes to the rules of procedure and the third is a summary document that outlines the changes being proposed. He noted he would be happy to elaborate or answer questions.

He noted the main changes are to change it to multi-channel outreach, where previous versions were limited in scope, so that would increase accessibility. Timelines and clarifications were also added to allow notice and applications to be considered and also language noting re-appointments not being automatic, so incumbents would be considered alongside new applicants, but clarifying that it is at the judge's discretion as noted in the state statute.

Commissioner Marvin noted differences in changes, that one is bi-laws and one is to the Charter.

Commissioner Marvin noted that we may want to follow a similar outline and asked about mixing it in with things.

Chair Leino clarified that City Council doesn't have anything to do with Charter bi-laws. And said no, would cloud the issue.

Audit Chair Shold asked question on 2.02. Likes tenor and tone, but is not sure how to enforce that regarding being clearly advertised

Commissioner Smith noted specifying things instead of to all appropriate to all official city platforms.

Audit Chair Shold noted he wasn't sure how many there are, but that maybe they need to be specified or current. If we list what they are, then if city changes that's a problem. So, whatever is current with the City, whatever parallel advertising that you would normally do, but it is hard to enforce.

Henning asked what is appropriate. Commissioner Smith noted that's why he likes official.

Commissioner Marvin noted there is some legal term or some kind of language that says whenever you do some kind of publication there is a term for that already.

Commissioner Marvin noted he thinks they want it to be consistent with how the city does it.

Commissioner Smith noted it seems that everything is fine until after it goes to and other appropriate, so can it be changed to city's official social media.

Chair Leino notes if you get too specific you have ways to get around it, and if it is too vague, it catches what it can catch. His concern with the language as it stands now, he agrees with Audit Chair Shold.

His concern is official is designation that comes from the city. He notes he would not get too specific around what other digital platforms would be because 20 years from now it could change.

Chair Leino noted that they have had to do this before with previous changes to positions, like city treasurer. Commissioner Ebert agreed. He says he is not against it, but is saying you have already covered your bases with official city stuff.

PR Chair Enger noted might we make it consistent with official city website, official city newspaper and official city platforms?

Chair Leino asked if the city says Facebook is the official city platform. City Clerk Pettit noted it does not.

Commissioner Henning asked if it could be changed from "and" other appropriate to "or". Chair Leino noted no because that leaves the option to opt out of the other official ones.

Audit Chair Shold noted language that including social media platforms.

Commissioner Smith noted that if the city has those things, it is official.

Chair Leino noted he wasn't sure.

Vice Chair Phillips noted he wasn't saying Facebook though.

Chair Leino added a lot of things change.

Commissioner Marvin noted that when you start using shall be, can be, etc we have to make it specific because there are so many of them, we don't want to require them to post them on all.

Chair Leino asked for clarification From Audit Chair Shold.

Audit Chair Shold noted he said "and social media platforms".

Secretary Bourque noted that there are social media platforms on the website.

Gretchen asked what happens if it changes.

Chair Leino noted that there was a time that it used to be posted on the City Hall door and that was it. Then it went to the official newspaper. Now we have an official website.

Commissioner Henning asked if it can be changed to "and" social media platforms.

Commissioner Smith noted it is really simple what we are trying to do.

Chair Leino noted understanding of that and said he doesn't have a problem with it. He also reminded that it is not being voted on tonight as it is a Charter change.

Commissioner Smith noted this one is so simple, not everything else being proposed, but this one is.

Chair Leino and Commissioner Ebert disagreed. PR Chair Enger noted this is part of the Charter this is not simple.

Chair Leino noted that we have to say we are voting on this. Commissioner Smith acknowledged that we have to give the notice. Chair Leino noted it is different for the bi-laws.

Commissioner Marvin noted that he was the admin for one of the social media platforms and he said the admins are changing all the time. He noted that it needs to be the designated ones or anyone can start a website.

PR Chair Enger noted that is not how the City of Brooklyn Center does it.

Secretary Bourque noted there are private webpages that citizens run and noted being an admin for one of them as well and then noted that there are City pages for the Police Department, Fire Department, Recreation Department and the City and those are different than Friends of Brooklyn Center or BC Released which are not official pages. She went on to noted those pages don't have any association with the city.

.Commissioner Sorenson noted forget social media He noted there is an official news paper and website and that should do it. Commissioner Ebert noted agreement. Secretary Bourque, Commissioner Smith, and other commissioners disagreed.

Commissioner Ebert asked what happens if you don't post it on something, because it says "and" then what happens.

Chair Leino noted he likes the language and doesn't think there will be any disagreement about the website, newspaper, or board outside of city hall. That is the base. He noted the social media thing is a nice idea, but asked if we are opening a can of worms on it.

Commissioner Johnson noted that he found a term about a verified account. He noted that he felt verified is a fairly recognized term in social media.

PR Chair Enger disagreed noting it is not.

Commissioner Johnson noted that someone has to claim the page that represents the city.

PR Chair Enger noted that doesn't mean it is verified.

Commissioner Johnson noted that someone has to claim the page and facebook would respect it if someone created a fake City of Brooklyn Center page.

PR Chair Enger noted Twitter verifies because you pay to verify. Facebook you do not pay to verify.

Commissioner Johnson noted that X recognizes government accounts.

Audit Chair Shold noted lets not let good be the enemy of perfect. He noted 21st Century, we have those who are older and those who are younger and social media is where we are at and he thinks it is good to get it out there. As any language has to be interpreted by the city clerk, someone would have to interpret what social media platforms are and said it someone wants to argue what the social media platforms are he notes that it would be up to the City Clerk Pettit to interpret what city platforms are in that situation.

Commissioner Messenbrink noted putting "s" in parentheses after platform just in case there is more than one.

PR Chair Enger proposed different language and then noted it would be more inclusive and formalize it.

Chair Leino noted that it would help.

PR Chair Enger noted that it is consistent with some of the other language.

Vice Chair Phillips asked if the language she read was acceptable.

Vice Chair Phillips asked if he can make a motion to accept the language PR Chair Enger noted, Chair Leino noted yes, but asked for clarification if it is being proposed as a Charter Amendment. Vice Chair Phillips confirmed.

Chair Leino noted that we will give notice so that if we want to vote on it that night, we can vote on it.

Vice Chair Phillips made a motion. Motion was seconded by Marvin.

Audit Chair Shold asked if a friendly amendment would be considered to use the word shall in place of must.

PR Chair Enger noted she had called that out because Commissioner Marvin had concerns about using must.

Chair Leino noted must and shall are pretty synonymous.

Audit Chair Shold noted he is not an attorney.

Chair Leino noted he can give the rules of statutory interpretation. He went on to say that shall gives a lot more leeway than must. Must is an obligation. Shall kind of sounds that way but he has seen people weasel out of things because it said shall instead of must.

Audit Chair Shold noted that shall was preferable to must. Chair Leino noted he preferred must. Audit Chair Shold yielded.

Vice Chair Phillips asked Commissioner Smith if he had something more to say.

Commissioner Smith noted that he wanted to make sure we had finished discussion

Chair Leino asked Audit Chair Shold if he was withdrawing the friendly amendment. He confirmed.

Commissioner Henning noted the last word was “and” and wanted clarification

Chair Leino and Commissioner Johnson and PR Chair Enger noted agreement.

PR Chair Enger read the proposed language.

“All board or commission vacancies including the Charter Commission must be advertised and posted publicly on the City of Brooklyn Center’s Official Website, City of Brooklyn Center’s Official Newspaper, City of Brooklyn Center’s City Hall Bulletin Board, City of Brooklyn Center’s Official Email, City of Brooklyn Center’s Official Newsletter, and City of Brooklyn Center’s Social Media Platforms at least 30 days prior to the closing date for applications.

Vice Chair Phillips moved and Commissioner Marvin seconded.

Commissioner Sorenson asked to amend the amendment to add the city’s email and the city’s newsletter. Corrected language reflected above.

Commissioner Bak seconded.

Chair Leino asked for discussion on the friendly amendment. No discussion.

Motion carries.

Chair Leino noted we are now back to motion as amended.

Commissioner Marvin noted the social media is what the city says is their social media.

PR Chair Enger noted it is the communications department.

Audit Chair Shold said thank you to the subcommittee.

Chair Leino took the roll. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Leino this will be on the agenda then along with the other one brought by city staff for the January meeting.

Commissioner Marvin noted it sounds like we have hashed this one out already. Chair Leino disagreed noting he has heard at least one person who has issue with some of the language.

Chair Leino moved onto the bi-law changes and noted they are completely in-house and is not something that has to go to City Council, but still requires 2/3 vote and no less than 8 to pass. He noted he would leave to the body on how to proceed.

Commissioner Marvin noted we review and then discuss element by element.

Commissioner Marvin noted that we should do them in an order.

Commissioner Sorenson asked about who the changes are for.

Chair Leino noted they are for us.

Commissioner Sorenson asked why we are adding this and noted there has to be some other purpose than that.

PR Chair Enger asked purpose and what the problem is that we are trying to solve and what the intent and purpose is of changing the document.

Commissioner Smith noted as part of the committee, these have been addressed in the previous two meetings and noted that most of the commission would be aware of why and went on to noted it is part of an evolutionary process as we have had stuff be the same for so long and this is an attempt for clarification and to evolve some things and come into the 21st century on some things, but more than anything it is about how we want to be perceived as members of the commission and how we communicate with the public and how we let them know what we do and discuss term limits. He noted that the body has the right to look at them and say that there are things worth discussion or say absolutely not.

Commissioner Smith noted there was robust discussion around it previously.

Commissioner Smith noted hopefulness that people who have been here a while and who are newer could discuss things and noted that it didn't just drop out of the ether.

PR Chair Enger noted a point of clarification that there are two new commissioners here so there is assumption made that this was brought up at two previous meetings, but when we have two new commissioners it is always nice to give a succinct introduction about why we are doing this to catch them up rather than making an assumptions that everyone knows why we are doing this.

Commissioner Smith noted that was why he said what he said and he didn't make an assumption. PR Chair Enger disagreed.

PR Chair Enger noted that everyone is entitled to their own opinion. Commissioner Smith noted and not their own facts. Thanks

Chair Leino said people get in habits and they stay there until there is a reason to get out of their comfort zone and the reason he thought the subcommittee was a good idea was he didn't know where to start with this. He noted they brought forth some good ideas before this was presented today and noted that he thought this was worth exploring. He noted that doesn't mean that he will go along with all of them and that's why we discuss them.

Chair Leino noted that there are some he is on board with and some that he doesn't. He Acknowledged the work. He noted that we have to decide how we want to proceed.

Chair Leino noted that his recommendation is that we come back and digest this.

Chair Leino asked about scheduling a special meeting because we don't need notice and this is in house so don't have to give notice.

Audit Chair Shold asked if this goes into such detail that the attorney would need to review the language.

Chair Leino noted that we could ask for it, but it is internal, so isn't necessary. Audit Chair Shold noted that state pre-emption would trump it.

Commissioner Ebert noted clarification asking if everything in red is changes and went on to note it may take a few meetings.

Commissioner Smith noted his only suggestion and was asking for discussion.

Commissioner Smith noted that the subcommittee made it a point that we made sure that we didn't address or touch anything that would be pre-empted by state law.

Commissioner Smith noted he is ok with having another set of eyes on it as we can miss things as a committee and a body.

Chair Leino noted on initial readthrough, committee stayed inside our wheelhouse.

Commissioner Smith confirmed.

Vice Chair Phillips has question – page 3 expiration of term. He sees a new number 2 and then sees black expiration of term and then nothing else black in the rest of the section and a new number 3. He asked if there was something else in number 2 prior to this.

Commissioner Johnson noted that it was note previously broken down into any additional letters. He noted it was just a standalone item previously.

Chair Leino noted there was not previously a heading.

PR Chair Enger noted it was expanded.

Chair Leino noted that the 2 in the proposal should have been 1.

Vice Chair Phillips asked if removal was already in there as well.

Audit Chair Shold asked if we are digging into things. He asked if it needs to say formal application or can we just say application. He noted it is referenced a few times.

Also noted on item 3ac, on page 2, wondering if we should remove rationale so it is more directive. Commissioner Ebert concurred.

Commissioner Smith note the reason we said formal was that one of the things that we have done in the past, is that if a commissioner term expires, instead of going through the formal process, we have not always had that be the case. He noted that previously some incumbents just expressed interest and they were put back on. Commissioner Smith noted that we are trying to make sure that the same formal process is happening for everyone.

Audit Chair Shold asked if that was a Brooklyn Center thing or the judge.

Commissioner Smith noted it has been both.

Audit Chair Shold asked if those were uncontested situations.

Chair Leino noted there can be times where there is only one application.

Commissioner Ebert noted confirmation.

Commissioner Ebert noted that incumbants have to go through the same process and fill out an application and be interviewed.

Secretary Bourque noted the issue was that if there was a term expiring there was no language about how anyone else could apply for that seat. She noted that she had asked about it at the first meeting and there was not specificity around timelines for applying and for them to be able to apply for incumbent seats because there was not advertising or window of when a person should apply. Wanting to make the process more equitable by making it clear about how to apply.

Commissioner Sorenson asked for clarification about why, noting it is up to the judge not us.

Commissioner Bourque noted that is up to us in the bi-laws about if there is a term expiring, that people have x amount of days to be considered for the seat. The subcommittee is trying to specify timelines so it is clear how to apply.

Chair Leino asked for clarification from Commissioner Sorenson regarding his previous statement.

Commissioner Sorenson noted the judge doesn't have to go by these rules.

Secretary Bourque noted that we have to allow people to have opportunity to apply. She noted part of the reason for the advertising piece is to allow people to have the opportunity to apply because it is not clear. She went on to say if it is not clear for the public to be able to apply for positions, only the people who know someone in the commission know how to do that, so the goal is to make the process more equitable.

Commissioner Smith noted he is "putting it where the goats can get it", meaning making it really plane.

Commissioner Smith noted his term expires in 2027 and that as much as he may want to continue that he shouldn't just get to because he expressed interest and did the application.. He noted that what are we trying to do is ensure that the judge can look at other candidates as well to give other people the opportunity to serve in the space and to be able to make decisions for the

city. Get back in the pool and if it happens it happens and if it doesn't it doesn't. He noted the judge will choose from who we present.

Commissioner Smith noted that we want to ensure that there is opportunity to have a pool of applicants instead of having the same person over and over again.

Chair Leino noted that we are not presenting anything to the judge. The applicant is the one who does that on their own. He noted we have no control over what a citizen submits to the chief judge. He noted that he doesn't know unless someone tells him that they are applying for a seat. He noted the two newcomers on the commission, he did not know about until he was notified we had two new members.

Secretary Bourque noted that there is language in the bi-laws that notes that the Chair is notified by the incumbent that they want their seat and that the Chair notifies the judge. She noted that there are other parts of the process the subcommittee tried to clean up to make things more clear as there were different ways that people were applying previously. She noted there are different directions in the bi-laws than on the city website and she noted that the subcommittee is trying to make the process clear and streamlined across the board whether it is an incumbent or someone coming in that is new.

Commissioner Bak noted that the process that is hoped for is already happening. He noted that when he went for his interview the judge was explicit that she would be interviewing other candidates.

Commissioner Ebert noted that the process is that you fill out the form and give it to the city clerk and they pass it to the judge.

Secretary Bourque noted that some apply directly to the judge and not through the city clerk and noted that it had come out in the last meeting that it had happened and that was part of the reason we are trying to clarify the process.

Chair Leino noted that he cannot remember what has happened in each and every instance.

Secretary Bourque agreed and noted that is why the subcommittee is trying to clarify the process so it is equitable and clear and consistent.

Commissioner Sorenson noted he just went through this and he went through the city clerk and the city clerk gave him the clerk of court's information and he then applied through her because that is what he was instructed to do.

Secretary Bourque acknowledged his response and noted that not everyone is getting the same instruction and noted that the clerk has changed.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted that she sent it to the city clerk and the judge's clerk Ivy at the same time and noted Commissioner Henning noted he also sent it to Ivy and the City Clerk.

Secretary Bourque asked how they knew to send it to Ivy and noted that has been part of the complexity of the process is that the Hennepin County website is very clunky and it can be difficult to find the right person, judges can have multiple clerks, and so we are trying to make the process clear. So, if it goes through the city clerk and the city clerk sends it, cool, if it is supposed to go through somewhere else, there is a clear designation of how you access that so that everyone is doing the same thing because right now we are not.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted she got the information off the city website.

Secretary Bourque noted that Ivy's information is not on the city's website.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted she would have to go through her emails to find out who sent her that.

Secretary Bourque noted that is where we are trying to ensure. She noted the judge's clerks change also, so who you send it to would change, but if it is going to the city clerk and then the city clerk is sending those in, it's a clear process so that everyone is doing the same thing so there isn't a question from the public about the discrepancies. She went on to note that transparency is important in processes.

Chair Leino noted that he has always sent his to the clerk and the judge's clerk to make sure it didn't get lost. He acknowledged that may be "inside baseball" noting that he had inside information.

Audit Chair Shold noted that he liked the idea of things being clear with people being able to see. He noted that there is a bit of institutional knowledge to do certain things to get on commissions. He noted that he was trying to understand where the issue is with the process.

Commissioner Smith noted we have all talked about the process and each of our processes have had variations. In order to avoid that moving forward, if we present something clearly stated, then we never have to worry about that moving forward because the process is spelled out in greater detail and we have a process to measure it moving forward. He noted right now there is not a lot of detail and noted that he has known people who wanted to get on the commission and their applications did not go through even though they were sent to the same person in the city and sometimes it seemed applications went through based on familiarity, who knew people and we want to avoid that so that there cannot be any accusations of favoritism, so we want to create something we can all agree on so all have the same process.

Secretary Bourque noted that her applications have been lost multiple times and not turned in.

Vice Chair Phillips asked if expiring terms are handled differently than open terms in terms of notification to the judge.

Chair Leino noted confirmation that they were and noted that usually if someone moved, resigned or didn't renew and it was deemed an opening and the judge was notified of that and it went into the newsletter and that kind of thing. Expiring was handled differently. Not saying ubiquitously. It usually involved a person being told their term was expiring and being asked if they were going to renew. Sometimes they said no. Sometimes they said yes, thank you for the reminder and they went back. He said he doesn't know beyond that what happened behind the scenes.

Chair Leino noted when it all came up two meetings ago, he partially agreed that from the outside it can look like there was an incumbency advantage. He noted that is his overbroad characterization. So he noted that yes, the way it anecdotally playe out, handled differently would apply....behind the scenes it was handled differently, but once it got to the judge's desk it was the same.

Vice Chair Phillips noted that there is a change to it being 45 days versus 30 days for an incumbent to submit a new application. He noted he was not sure why we would penalize an incombant and way you have to get yours in 45 days before someone else has to get theirs in.

Commissioner Johnson added context from statute, which we were working around— 4.10.05 subdivision 2 is the only statutory timeline that is imposed on the judge for re-appointment and that one is 60 days and anything specified in the proposed language does not conflict with that.

PR Chair Enger noted she had a similar question about what the justification was in changing things from 30 days to 90 days for an incumbent to notify the Chair.

Secretary Bourque noted there were individuals sitting at the table with the commission who had terms that were expired at the first meeting she attended as a Commissioner. She noted she does not recall the reason for the specificity of choosing 90 days, but that ultimately it was to give enough notice to the incumbent that their term is expiring so the Chair knows whether to count that as a vacancy so it can be advertised.

Commissioner Smith noted that at his first meeting there was someone there whose term was already expired, so it is really to get a heads up to the Commission, the Chair, so they can start the process to advertise an upcoming vacancy. He went on to note that he wasn't aware he wasn't on a four year term himself.

PR Chair Enger asked if it is the Chair's responsibility to know 90 days in advance.

Chair Leino noted it was not and he noted he doesn't typically notify people. He says there has been occasions where he has seen the Chair ask an individual if they were going to renew.

Commissioner Enger asked Commissioner Messenbrink and Commissioner Henning how they knew if there were openings.

Commissioner Messenbrink noted that she saw it in the newsletter and other commissioners had mentioned it. Commissioner Henning noted it was the same for him. Commissioner Messenbrink noted she also saw it in the email that comes out.

Commissioner Marvin noted that in the past the city clerk would notify people or ask them or send an email to give a reminder.

Commissioner Marvin noted that it is like a job application and you are supposed to send an application into the judge by one of these methods, but the Charter Commission doesn't have control over the judge. He went on to note that we don't even know who the judge is because there are like four of them and they rotate all the time, so all we do is we submit the application and they prefer certain things, like having been on the commission before, so it is up to the judge.

Chair Leino noted there has been a robust discussion and clock is ticking. He noted he sees pros and cons to this and noted he would like to consider it at a future meeting to have discussion.

Vice Chair Phillips agreed that January meeting is looking full, but he doesn't want it to have to wait another 3 months. He asked appetite for calling a special meeting for the purpose of discussing this specifically.

Commissioner Marvin predicts that a lot of the other stuff will go pretty easy, but predicts this one will be argued a lot. He said it is splitting hairs about things and putting numbers on things and to him this is a bigger project.

PR Chair Enger noted agreement with Vice Chair Phillips and noted thanks for taking the time to do this, but also agrees with Commissioner Marvin that it is going to take a lot of discussion, but

also doesn't want to wait until January knowing that January is going to be busy and that this is important.

Commissioner Smith notes that there is time to think about things and asked for clarification of thoughts on timing.

Chair Leino notes that if someone moves to make this a separate meeting that it would be the only thing on the agenda.

Commissioner Smith made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Phillips to make a separate meeting on December 4th at 6:30pm.

Chair Leino noted that attendance has to be at least 8 to vote.

Secretary Bourque asked for clarification about if the special meeting would require a vote or if it could just be discussed at that meeting.

Chair Leino noted people seem to want a resolution though.

PR Chair Enger asked for clarification about if the Charter change would be part of it as well.

Chair Leino noted he would get it on the calendar first.

Commissioner Marvin noted there should be a master summary of proposed changes with logic of it.

Chair Leino pointed out that there was a handout with that.

Commissioner Marvin noted his opinion that he doesn't feel there is a problem.

Commissioner Smith noted that the subcommittee does not take offense to disagreement.

Commissioner Johnson noted that there is a requirement of a twenty day prior written notice to all commission members outlining proposed changes in relation to the rules and procedures.

Chair Leino noted we don't have to publish that part of it.

Commissioner Johnson noted that there has to be 20 days notice of changes.

Commissioner Sorenson read the section of it.

Chair Leino noted we cannot come to the meeting in December and say I have new stuff I want to bring forward, it has to be what was presented tonight.

Commissioner Sorenson asked if thing would change for the Charter Amendment.

Commissioner Smith noted that it is more redundancy.

Secretary Bourque noted that we have capacity as a body to change how we operate in this space, regardless of how the Council votes. but we can still make a decision as a body to be more transparent and equitable in processes and ensure that there is clarity around what the processes look like and how they are carried out.

Commissioner Marvin noted that on this one, the council says no, then it can go on the ballot in November if we want.

Commissioner Smith noted hopefully we don't have to do that.

PR Chair Enger noted that the bilaws and changes that some of the language can translate to the bi-laws, to help with some of the transparency to kill two birds with one stone, so that could be part of the desire for us.

Chair Leino noted that proposed Charter language whether it passes or not and bilaw changes have to be handled in a different way but discussions will overlap significantly, but they don't have to go together. Motion needs to be voted on.

Commissioner Sorenson noted that if the meeting is in December, he cannot make it.

Chair Leino asked if he would like to propose an alternative date.

Commissioner Sorenson suggested January.

Other commissioners noted difficulties they have with December and discussed alternate dates.

Commissioner Smith noted we check calendars and decide later.

Commissioner Leino noted it has to be public

Commissioners suggested more dates.

Chair Leino noted there is a motion on the floor.

Commissioner Smith withdraws the motion

Commissioner Sorenson noted to just vote.

Chair Leino took vote for December 4th. Chair says division.

Chair Leino notes it just needs a simple majority.

Chair asked for vote by hands. In favor of December 4th– 4 in favor, 6 voted, 4 abstentions. Motion failed.

PR Chair Enger made a motion to meet Thursday, January 8th to discuss the changes to the Brooklyn Center Home Rule Charter Commission Rules and Procedures at 6:30pm. Seconded by Marvin.

Commissioners discussed dates. Secretary Bourque asked for discussion without a motion to get a date on the calendar. Secretary Bourque proposed February. More dates were proposed by commissioners.

Chair Leino noted we need to pick a date even if all cannot be there for it.

Commissioners discussed more dates.

Vice Chair Phillips made a motion that we meet February 12th at 6:30pm for the purpose of discussing the changes to the rules of procedure for the Charter Commissioner. Seconded by Enger. Chair Leino asked for discussion. No discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Leino noted he does not want to put it off by February.

Commissioner Smith noted we will have a term expiring by then.

New Business

a. Any new business for Commission?

Chair Leino asked for any future new business for the future meeting on the 22nd and noted a reminder that the Audit chair will present a report and we will also nominate new officers. – Audit Chair Shold noted he will not be presenting a report because he will not be at the next meeting.

Chair Leino asked if anyone would like to step forward to take his place. Chair Leino clarified responsibility and Commissioner Marvin volunteered.

Chair Leino asked for a motion to allow Commissioner Marvin to fill out the remainder of Audit Chair Shold's term as audit chair. Motioned by PR Chair Enger, seconded by Vice Chair Phillips. Chair Leino asked for discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

Secretary Bourque gave clarification about the minutes. She noted she was purposely detailed because of the difficulty people have had accessing the space and the questions about what has been happening in the space and also owned that they may have been overly detailed as she is learning and will work to be less detailed moving forward. She went on to note that this commission has been the most difficult for people to access unless they can get here in person and the notes have also been difficult to access because they have not been posted, so she is wanting to ensure that what happens in the space is captured as it is important. She noted this space is deciding the rules of the city and how policies are made and she thinks it is important that the public have clarification about how decisions were made.

Commissioner Marvin pointed out the Zoom.

Secretary Bourque noted that the Zoom is not accessible after the meeting and noted that the Zoom has not been consistently accessible.

Chair Leino noted that a previous criticism was that notes were too vague, so he is not bothered by defaulting on the side of being meticulous. He noted that back in the 90s they did have a secretary that did them.

Commissioner Messenbrink asked for a copy of the minutes from the last meeting so she can get caught up. It was noted by someone in the space that they are on the website. Commissioner Messenbrink noted that she can never access them there and that she has been trying to access them and the agenda that way through LaserFiche with no luck.

Chair Leino noted that she can informally ask the Secretary to send them to her. Chair Leino clarified the limitations of communication via email.

Commissioner Sorenson noted there is a problem with Laserfiche because it requires cookies and it shouldn't.

PR Chair Enger noted that there was no agenda on civic portal and asked the City Clerk Pettit if she can publish the agendas there. City Clerk Pettit noted the goal is to get all the commissions there, but it hasn't happened.

Secretary Bourque asked for clarification around corrections of the minutes and who to send them to.

Chair Leino instructed to send to the City Clerk.

Audit Chair Shold noted thanks and said his term will end on the tenth.

Chair Leino thanked Audit Chair Shold for his work.

Secretary Bourque asked if it needs to be advertised then.

Chair Leino noted that we can notify now that we know we have an opening, but we don't have to, but is going to follow the proposed rules as a good idea.

Adjournment

Chair Leino requested motion to adjourn. Motion moved by Commissioner Marvin, seconded by PR Chair Enger. Motion carries unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.

Minutes of the Brooklyn Center Charter Commission Meeting on Thursday, January 22nd, 2026

Called to order by Chair Leino at 6:37pm

Secretary Bourque called the role.

Present:

- Stanley Leino *Chair 2025*
- Lee Bak
- Julie Bourque *Secretary 2025*
- Gretchen Enger *Public Relations Chair 2025*
- Andrew Johnson
- Jeff Lewis
- Robert Marvin
- Toby Phillips *Vice Chair 2025*
- Brian Smith
- Arvid (Bud) Sorenson
- Gail Ebert
- Patty Mesenbrink
- Todd Henning
- Sabra Love
- Donald Bumgarner

1. Adoption of Agenda:

Chair Leino entertained a motion to adopt agenda.

Motion: Marvin approved, seconded by Ebert.

Discussion: Commissioner Sorenson noted at the last meeting he asked to do a review of 1 and 4. Chair Leino asked what he would like to do moving forward.

Commissioner Sorenson noted he would like it for new business and address at next meeting.

Chair Leino noted that Commissioner Sorenson has asked to add C to the new business, section 4.01 to review since we have a number of members who have been appointed in the last year.

Chair Leino asked for any further discussion. None noted. Chair Leino took the role. Motion carries unanimously.

2. Approval of the Minutes of October 23, 2025 Meeting:

a. Corrections:

Commissioner Enger asked for the appropriate way to acknowledge commissioners in the meeting minutes? Is everyone specified as the role, or should it be commissioner. Chair Leino gave clarification. Commissioner Enger noted mistakes in minutes.

Commissioner Sorenson asked about motion that started on page 5 and ended on 7 and questioned if what was noted was what really happened.

Secretary Bourque asked about if corrections can be made between meetings and noted she keeps the recordings in the event there are questions. She noted that that motion was confusing to keep track of due to the discussion.

Commissioner Sorenson noted that having this much detail can make things hard to follow.

Commissioner Bourque asked if it would help to put Motions in bold.

Commissioner Enger noted the last meeting was when the City Clerk walked through housekeeping changes.

Commissioner Bumgarner asked for more sparse minutes, asking if they could be kept to two pages max with bullet points.

Chair Leino noted that may be too sparse.

Commissioner Sorenson asked where the request was for having this detailed of minutes.

Commissioner Smith noted we have gone from sparse to quite a bit and that we need to give it time because nuance is important and can miss things if you don't have it and he would much rather err on the side of more details than not and as we learn what we really want and need is to dial things back. He noted if we stop with some of the meandering soliloquy it would help as well as there wouldn't be as much to catch.

Commissioner Enger asked for clarification on meandering soliloquy. Commissioner Smith noted we sometimes go on and on.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted that she is the secretary for a couple of boards and they usually bullet point it and usually have a topic, the motion, approved by, and what the motion was with the change. She noted this is a lot to go through and keep it all straight and it is confusing and thinks 2 to 3 pages would be sufficient for people to find what they are looking for and noted that all the conversation isn't necessary to have in the minutes.

Commissioner Sorenson noted that it is not in Robert's Rules of Orders and we are to be using Robert's Rules of Order, not whatever the city council does.

Commissioner Ebert noted she was reading and there was something she disagreed about noted and she is not clear what that was referencing and noted that it is confusing.

Secretary Bourque noted that when she started in this role, she had noted that part of the reason for the detail of the minutes was because of the lack of access to the space outside of the space. She noted understanding that this commission is not the city council, but we are a body that is making decisions that impact everything in our city and part of what she had heard and even experienced herself was even figuring out what was happening in the space was very difficult and the discussions happening here are important. She went on to note that if we are talking

about we cannot change a word because of the impact of changing a word, the discussion around why that word matters in the end. She noted she can change how she is formatting it and is learning as she goes and she noted that she did cut some things because it is cumbersome but it can be hard to know because every word matters in here and in the decisions that are made and for the transparency for anyone who wants the information for what is happening in here, the words matter.

Commissioner Enger asked if the Zoom is recorded.

Secretary Bourque noted that the Zooms have not been accessible up until now and noted that this is the first time the public has been able to get in.

Commissioner Enger noted that was not what she was asking and noted she wanted to know if they were recorded or if there needs to be. She noted she has started using AI everyday.

Commissioner Bourque noted the Zooms are not posted and noted that if she is going to type all the notes, she is going to use them.

Commissioner Enger noted to use AI to put themes together. She also noted that this writer could use some of those tools to upload the recording to type notes and provide a transcript.

Commissioner Bourque noted that she would need to ask City Clerk Pettit about it because she had asked previously and was told there was something with how the recorder connects that was a barrier to doing that. She went on to note that if we could have the Zooms posted, she would be ok not doing as thorough of the minutes and that has not been a choice for any of the commissions. She noted you have to physically ask for the Zoom and sometimes it has not been given to people who have asked for it.

Marvin noted most of it is copied and posted permanently, but it's not. He noted that he would assume they may not be easily obtained, but are copied and available somehow.

Chair Leino noted he noted that he has seen things be too little and that he thinks there is a happy medium. He noted to try to model it on the minutes other city bodies possibly use and noted how the planning commission records.

Chair Leino noted that he has seen a City clerk complain about things being too sparse and she had to get a legal opinion about it. Chair Leino asked if Secretary Bourque is on a learning curve.

Secretary Bourque noted that what is supposed to be done and what has actually been happening are two very different things. She noted that it is dependent on the city liaison and that she learned through the last city clerk that if minutes were missing she needed to contact the staff liaison because they were responsible for getting for putting them in and it would get passed back to the city clerk and minutes remained missing. She noted that there are some commissions that stuff is missing, that there are not folders to find them and there are some that are very detailed and all up to date.

Chair Leino noted that there is a file cabinet somewhere with our minutes. He noted that he never heard anyone complain that things were missing.

Secretary Bourque noted that there was actually and that she had to get them from the previous Secretary because they were missing in Laserfiche and she actually sent them to the new city clerk and asked they be published.

Chair Leino noted it dismays him to hear that because we go through a regular routine of approving minutes and someone put a lot of work into them and they should be stored somewhere that they can be reviewed.

Commissioner Marvin noted that he does a lot of videos and they do transcripts all the time. He notes that we don't need to put everything in them.

Chair Leino noted they shouldn't be circumscribing the duties of the Secretary, but it is ok to recommend how the minutes are done.

Commissioner Love said thank you for the detail as she is new and it helps her and she noted that she is with Commissioner Smith regarding having too much and not enough, especially in regards to what is important right now to the public and that is transparency. She noted that she can now use it to take it home to see what was being previously discussed. She noted she is on a learning curve herself. Her only suggestion is to put it in an outline format, versus in a page as it is currently. She noted to work to put discussion points in an outline it and put it into chat GPT and say please transcribe this into a template. She noted clarification in us being an oversight body versus a governing body. She noted what we do is important and impacts the public and we want to be transparent. She noted the age of the Charter and that the older it gets and that the technology is different and they want things done differently as well and that there is evolving in this space. She noted it is important to have details, it just needs to be formatted differently.

Commissioner Sorenson noted that we need to know what the amendment with the motion is and not all the discussion. He noted we need to know the final verdict of the motion.

Commissioner Bourque noted that she is on a learning curve in processing all the discussion and understanding what the final motions actually are as well and she was actually lost in some of the discussion and figured it was better to document all of it.

Commissioner Sorenson noted that it is important that the business is recorded and whatever the final version of the motion is, is what was approved and the rest doesn't belong in the minutes.

Commissioner Bak noted agreement with Commissioner Sorenson and noted that too much can also be inaccessible.

Chair Leino asked about looking at the format of the Planning commissions.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted that the video can be reviewed if people want to see what was being said.

Chair Leino noted there needs to be a process to find the video. He also noted that another alternative would be, like they did from 1997-2000, we had a hired Secretary. She took Minutes in the way the past secretaries have done. She charged a flat rate per meeting. If we were going to hire a Secretary, we would have to have a motion to hire such a person and there is likely a rule about the acquisition.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted she could answer that as she is a transcriptionist and owns a transcription company. She noted you can run it through AI, but you are going to get every single word.

Chair Leino noted he never heard a complaint when they had a hired Secretary.

Commissioner Mesenbrink noted it is about \$55 an hour. Chair Leino noted that we would have to have a motion to hire one and likely have it bid out.

Commissioner Phillips noted that he has some correction.

Chair entertains a motion to submit corrections to the minutes at a future meeting.

Motion:

Marvin moved, Commissioner Mesenbrink seconded that we approve or submit corrections to the minutes at a future meeting.

Discussion:

Commissioner Bourque asked to have corrections sent directly to her.

Chair Leino noted that I could highlight corrections for approval at the next meeting.

Commissioner Bourque noted asked for titles to be used in the space to make recording easier, rather than using first names.

Chair Leino noted discussion has ended and took the role. Motion carries unanimously.

3. Old Business

a. Consideration of changes to Charter Chapters presented by City Staff

Chair Leino asked Commissioner Johnson for clarification on what is being reviewed.

Commissioner Johnson noted that it is different than the subcommittee materials.

Chair Leino noted he does not see any provided. Numerous commissioners noted not having the materials.

Commissioner Bourque noted that there were corrections that she was walking through and was going to provide the updated document.

Commissioner Marvin noted that we should delay it to the next regular meeting that is available because we aren't ready to do it today.

Commissioner Johnson noted that his recollection was that we were going to come to this meeting prepared to comment on the changes given at the last meeting, which were sections 4 and 5 from the city clerk.

Chair Leino clarified that they were the changes being recommended were on the last handout.

Commissioner Bourque noted that the last copy was not correct though, so there were changes that needed to be made to the final copy and that was not received yet.

Commissioner Bourque noted in the minutes from the last meeting where the discussion around the changes were noted.

Motion: Chair Leino clarified motion from Commissioner Marvin to delay the consideration of 5A Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 revisions until the next regular meeting, not the special meeting we are having in February. Motion is seconded by Commissioner Smith.

Discussion: Commissioner Johnson asked clarifying question to Commissioner Enger regarding what was to be reviewed at the special meeting. Commissioner Enger and Commissioner Johnson discussed what is to be discussed. Chair Leino noted that the special meeting in February is to be about the suggestions that the subcommittee has brought.

Commissioner Johnson proposed updating the final red-lined copy.

Chair Leino took the role. Motion carries unanimously.

4. New Business:

a. Election of officers for 2026

Chair Leino noted we could do it by individual offices or propose the existing slate and noted that there has rarely been contested offices.

Commissioner Marvin noted he would offer the existing slate as the new one.

Chair Leino noted that we have offices of: PR Chair; Need new Audit Chair; Secretary; Vice Chair, and Chair.

Commissioner Marvin noted that he is temporarily the audit Chair. Chair Leino asked if he is wanting to step forward as the Audit Chair.

Motion: Commissioner Ebert moved that we take things one at a time, seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner.

Discussion: No discussion. Chair Leino took the role. Motion passed unanimously.

1. Chair

Commissioner Ebert nominated Stan Leino. Commissioner Marvin seconded. Commissioner Ebert asked if he was ready for the railroad.

Chair noted he is not wedded to this job. Chair Leino noted it is good to have new blood in this position and noted he had lobbied for someone else, but they didn't express interest.

Commissioner Phillips noted that Commissioner Smith had his hand up first, but Commissioner Ebert spoke first, so we went with her nomination, and was not sure how that should work.

Commissioner Smith noted that it happens a lot, noting Roberts Rules of Order, that people are to be recognized by the chair before they talk, but that only happens sometimes. Commissioner Marvin noted we are not doing that today. Commissioner Smith noted inconsistency.

Commissioner Smith nominated Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Johnson asked if you have to accept the nomination.

Chair Leino noted that if he is not interested, he would just say no.

Commissioner Johnson noted he does not have the capacity to give it the full time and attention.

Chair Leino apologized to apologize to Commissioner Smith noting that he tried to take everyone in order and it can be hard to tell at times.

Commissioner Marvin moved to close the nominations. Multiple people audibly objected.

Chair Leino noted that we need to ask for more nominations.

Commissioner Johnson asked for point of inquiry per the rules and procedure. Commissioner Johnson noted that in Section 7b that there is supposed to be a three member nominating committee.

Chair Leino noted yes.

Chair Marvin noted we have never done that.

Chair Leino noted there used to be a nominating committee, but it fell into disuse because they couldn't get three people to get together for a nominating committee.

Commissioner Johnson proposed reviewing keeping it in the rules and procedure or removing it if we are not using it.

Chair Leino noted that he didn't think we should remove it, but noted that at the October meeting, lets talk about it.

Commissioner Bourque asked if the commission can operate outside of the bylaws.

Commissioner Marvin noted, yes, we have done it before.

Commissioner Bourque asked if you can legally.

Chair Leino noted yes, because they are the rules to guide the commission internally. He noted that you could make a motion to delay all of this until a nominating committee meets.

Commissioner Marvin noted that there is already a motion on the floor.

Chair Leino noted that it is a nomination.

Commissioner Ebert noted that the one thing we would fall into is that the one meeting we are required to have every year is the meeting in January to elect officers, so we cannot put that off.

Commissioner Bumgarner is that no one answers the phone anymore and it just doesn't work.

Commissioner Smith asked what is a rule we have to follow and what is a rule we can circumvent without a process. He noted that usually as a body if you decide you are not going to follow a rule, the body gets together to make a decision about not following a certain rule for a certain reason and noted that we can't just operate off of something that happened or didn't happen 8 years ago.

Commissioner Bourque noted confusion about the idea of not following the rules, particularly since the meeting next time is to discuss changing the rules. She noted that if we do not follow them anyway, why do we have them.

Commissioner Marvin noted we are doing nominations for Chair right now and noted there have not been any other nominations for Chair, except Commissioner Johnson, but he declined. He noted that we should just move along and close out the nominations for Chair and that we don't need to keep circulating this.

Commissioner Johnson notes he tends to agree that we should follow the rules of procedure as they are and noted that there is a procedure in the rules and procedure that says we can choose to waive those, but we have to have a majority. A motion, a second, and a majority agreement.

Motion: Commissioner Marvin motioned to suspend the rules. Seconded by Commissioner Mesenbrink.

Discussion: Commissioner Love asked if anyone else wanted the job as chair.

Commissioner Bumgarner said to speak up about if anyone wants it. Chair Love noted this is a good time to voice that.

Chair Leino noted there is a motion on the floor to suspend the rules on the appointment of a nominating committee. Phillips noted he is in favor of this in this case, but he is in agreement that we should not have something on the rules that we bypass without talking about it or thinking about it.

Commissioner Phillips noted he is favor of this particular motion.

Chair noted part of this is on him and shared that he had difficulty finding people to meet and owned that he should have thrown it out in October and didn't.

Commissioner Ebert noted that she knows it was done in the past, as she has done it.

Commissioner Bumgarner noted he is in favor of getting rid of the rule.

Commissioner Smith left at 730pm at this point in the discussion.

Commissioner Lewis noted he heard that sometimes things can be waived in the rules. He asked what happened if you cannot get three people.

Chair Leino noted that you would go with whoever was willing to meet and it would likely need to be noted in the agenda.

Commissioner Sorenson noted we were voting to suspend the rules.

Chair Leino repeated for Secretary and noted we are voting to suspend the rules on article 7B of the bylaws.

Commissioner Marvin noted that his memory was that when they had the subcommittee and discussed it, they would come up with a slate and noted it is always the case that no one wants to be the Chair or the Secretary and noted that they have never had contested races.

Chair Leino noted that he has been on the commission for 25 years and does not remember any contested race for any offices.

Commissioner Sorenson offered clarification for the secretary that we are talking about rules and procedures for the Charter Commission.

Chair Leino asked for any further discussion.

Motion:

Chair Leino noted that the motion has been made by Commissioner Marvin and seconded by Commissioner Mesenbrink to suspend Article 7b of the bylaws.

Chair Leino asked for any further nominations. Commissioner Ebert moved to close nominations for Chair. Seconded by Commissioner Sorenson.

Discussion:

Chair Leino asked for discussion. None noted. Chair Leino abstained from vote. Remaining votes were unanimous. Motion passed.

Chair Leino was named Chair for 2026.

2. Vice Chair

Commissioner Mesenbrink nominated Commissioner Ebert. Commissioner Bourque nominated Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Johnson noted that he would let his name stand for that nomination.

Chair asked for any further nominations. None made.

Motion: Chair entertained motion to close nominations for Vice Chair.

Commissioner Marvin motioned and Commissioner Enger seconded.

Discussion: Chair Leino asked for discussion. None noted.

Motion passed unanimously.

Move to election:

Commissioner Bourque shared reason for nomination. Commissioner Henning requested explanation of role. Commissioner Leino noted he would be the back up Chair essentially. Commissioner Marvin noted his reason for nomination.

Vote held: 9 in favor of Ebert; 5 for Johnson.

Commissioner Ebert was named Vice Chair for 2026.

3. Secretary

Commissioner Bumgarner nominated Commissioner Phillips.

Commissioner Love nominated Commissioner Bourque. Commissioner Bourque noted acceptance of the nomination.

Commissioner Phillips nominated Commissioner Johnson. Commissioner Johnson noted he would let his name stand.

Chair Leino asked for any other nominations. Chair Leino asked for clarification from the Commissioner Sorenson if there has to be a majority to obtain an office, since there is a 3 way contest. Commissioner Sorenson noted that it is whoever gets the most votes.

Motion: Chair Leino entertained a motion to close nominations. Commissioner Marvin made a motion to close the nominations for secretary, seconded by Commissioner Bak.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ebert made point of order asking if they need to ask if they accept the nomination. It was noted that this was not needed.

Vote held: Five in favor of Commissioner Bourque; Five in favor of Commissioner Johnson; Four in favor of Commissioner Phillips.

Commissioner Phillips was eliminated.

New vote on two candidates: Five in favor of Commissioner Bourque; Nine in favor of Commissioner Johnson.

Commissioner Johnson was named Secretary for 2026.

4. Audit Chair

Commissioner Bourque requested clarification on the responsibilities.

Chair Leino noted that the Audit Chair works with the city clerk to bring back a line item budget on what has been spent in the last year out of the \$500 allotment. He noted it is usually postage and mailing and occasionally there is a legal bill in there.

Chair Leino noted that Commissioner Marvin has a budget to bring back for last year.

Commissioner Ebert nominated Commissioner Marvin.

Commissioner Bourque expressed interest in the position.

Commissioner Phillips nominated Commissioner Bourque.

Chair Leino asked for any other nominations.

Motion: Chair Leino entertained a motion to close nominations for Audit Chair. Commissioner Bak motioned. Seconded by Commissioner Marvin. Motion carries unanimously.

Discussion:

Commissioner Marvin noted clarification that he has to do the report for last year regardless of how the vote goes this year.

Vote held: Five in favor of Commissioner Bourque; Eight in favor of Commissioner Marvin. Commissioner Phillips abstained from the vote.

Commissioner Marvin is named Audit Chair for 2026.

5. PR Chair

Commissioner Bourque nominated by Commissioner Johnson.

Commissioner Love nominated herself.

Commissioner Mesenbrink nominated Commissioner Enger.

Chair Leino asked for other nominations.

Discussion:

Commissioner Marvin noted importance of the role of the PR Chair.

Commissioner Bak asked to hear from each of the three candidates.

Commissioner Love noted she has 30 years in PR and marketing and is an event planner.

Commissioner Enger noted she has a degree in PR and has worked in PR in her entire career and is used to presenting to stakeholders.

Commissioner Bourque noted interest and shared that she has been pushing for the commission to utilize the role in a more robust manner to advertise openings and communication around them.

Chair Leino noted he would support the notion of Commissioner Bourque and spoke to his reasoning for support.

Commissioner Love noted support for Commissioner Bourque as well and withdrew her name.

Commissioner Ebert put in a word for Commissioner Enger.

Commissioner Marvin noted he agrees with Commissioner Ebert.

Commissioner asked for clarification about the role.

Chair Leino noted that the PR Chair role is to submit articles to the website and newspaper and give information about what is happening in the Charter Commission. He noted that also when they have a referendum, we call upon them to draft the letter to the editor to explain our thinking position about it, but past PR chairs have called on the Chair to do it.

Commissioner Sorenson noted the role by reading the definition of the role from the bylaws.

Various commissioners noted support for both nominated commissioners.

Commissioner Mesenbrink asked about how things are managed for a press release and noted concern about the commissioner having them write things on their own and noted that some may throw their own opinion in.

Chair Leino noted that a press release is pretty fact based, but noted that if it a position paper, we delegate and go through a vetting process to make sure it reflects the thoughts of the commissioner and he noted he has written them himself as well.

Commissioner Ebert noted that in the past, when things needed to be put in the paper, that they were brought to the commission to review.

Discussion was had around use of social media. Commissioners expressed varied opinions about the use of social media.

Chair Enger noted PR Chair is specific role and noted role of the Commission.

Chair Enger noted that we should be partnering with city staff for communications.

Chair Enger noted needing to get back to the roles of the commission.

Motion: Commissioner Phillips moved to close discussion. Commissioner Enger seconded to close discussion. Motion carries unanimously.

Vote Held – Ten in favor of Commissioner Enger; Four in favor of Commissioner Bourque.

Commissioner Enger was named PR Chair for 2026.

Commissioner Ebert noted all the railroading is done now.

b. Next Meeting February 12th, 2026.

Chair Leino noted next meeting and agenda to discuss the subcommittees proposed changes to both the bylaws and the Charter.

Commissioner Marvin asked for updated information to review prior to arriving.

Commissioner Johnson asked clarification about how to send updated documentation.

Chair Leino instructed him to send to him and the City Clerk and he will send to the group.

Commissioner Enger noted clarification about how to discuss things to potentially change on the proposed changes.

Chair Leino noted to bring comments to the next meeting.

Commissioner Ebert asked where to send corrections. Chair Leino noted to send corrections to me.

Commissioner Bourque asked clarifying question about the minutes.

Commissioner Love asked if she can attend the special meeting via Zoom as she will be gone.

Chair Leino noted that she can participate in discussion as a member of the public, but not as a commissioner.

Commissioner Mesenbrink asked to table the meeting February meeting to the April meeting.

Chair Leino noted that she can make a motion if she wants to.

Discussion happened regarding delaying or keeping the meeting.

Chair Leino took a straw pole around changing the date – only 5 wanted to change it.

Commissioner Sorenson wants to discuss section 1 and 4 of the Charter regarding the rules and procedures.

Commissioner Bourque asked if Commissioner Sorenson can be nominated as the parliamentarian. Discussion was had by the group. Commissioner Bourque retracted her statement after learning of stipulations.

c. 2026 Meeting Dates

Chair Leino noted that technically we have our regular meetings – April, July, October and then the one in January.

Commissioner Marvin noted we tend to meet the 3rd Thursday of the month.

Commissioner Ebert noted that at one point there was a discussion with the Chair of the Arts Commissioner and they requested the 3rd Thursday.

Commissioner Phillips noted that we have actually been meeting the 4th Thursday in part to accommodate the planning commission.

Chair Leino noted if we are discussing a charter change we need to advertise it 20 days in advance. He noted the notice has to be out by March 3rd for a Charter change.

Motion:

Commissioner Marvin made a motion to move the following dates April 23rd, July 23rd, October 22nd, January 28th, 2027. Seconded by Commissioner Bak.

Discussion:

Commissioner Enger noted clarification about potential publishing needs for the next meeting. Commissioner Bourque noted that the previous minutes reflected that there was not a plan to have a vote on the Charter change at the next meeting. Commissioner Johnson confirmed.

Chair Leino asked if there was any further discussion.

Chair Leino called the role. Motion passed unanimously.

Dates for the new year are scheduled to be April 23rd, July 23rd, October 22nd, January 28th, 2027.

5. Adjournment

Motion: Chair Leino requested motion to adjourn. Motion moved by Commissioner Marvin, seconded by Commissioner Bak. Motion carries unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40pm.

Council Regular Meeting

DATE: 4/23/2026
TO: Housing Commission
FROM:
THROUGH:
BY: Kat Ellgren, Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: Consideration of Changes to Rules of Procedure

Requested Council Action:

Background:

Budget Issues:

Inclusive Community Engagement:

Antiracist/Equity Policy Effect:

Strategic Priorities and Values:

ATTACHMENTS:

None

Council Regular Meeting

DATE: 4/23/2026
TO: Housing Commission
FROM:
THROUGH:
BY: Kat Ellgren, Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: Consideration of Changes to Charter Section 2

Requested Council Action:

Background:

Budget Issues:

Inclusive Community Engagement:

Antiracist/Equity Policy Effect:

Strategic Priorities and Values:

ATTACHMENTS:

None

Council Regular Meeting

DATE: 4/23/2026
TO: Housing Commission
FROM:
THROUGH:
BY: Kat Ellgren, Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: Discussion on Scheduling Another Meeting

Requested Council Action:

Background:

Budget Issues:

Inclusive Community Engagement:

Antiracist/Equity Policy Effect:

Strategic Priorities and Values:

ATTACHMENTS:

None