

**CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SACHSE
JULY 7, 2022, MEETING MINUTES**

The Charter Review Commission of the City of Sachse held a regular meeting on Thursday, July 7, 2022, at 6 p.m. at the Michael J. Felix Community Center, 3815-E Sachse Road. Members present were Vice-Chairperson Billy George; Commissioners Ed Brown, Marcia Harris-Daniel, Matthew Holboke, Butch Kemper, Jeanie Marten, Jim Mathis, Karlos McGee, and Paul Watkins; Assistant City Manager Lauren Rose; City Attorney Kevin Laughlin; City Secretary Leah Granger, and Assistant to the City Manager Amanda Chi.

Members absent: Scott McMurdie, Charles Elk, Eric Dominguez, and Kirk Wood.

Vice Chairperson George called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Invocation and Pledges of Allegiance to the US and Texas Flags.

Vice Chairperson George led the invocation and pledges.

Public Comment.

There were no comments.

Consider approval of the June 2, 2022, meeting minutes.

Mr. Kemper made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Watkins seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Review and discuss the recommendation and summary report of the changes to the City of Sachse's home rule Charter to be presented to Council.

Ms. Rose reminded the Commission that they requested more information related to treating board members of the Economic Development Corporation (EDC) and the Municipal Development District (MDD) in the same manner as all of the other City Boards. Mr. Laughlin explained when dealing with non-profit corporations, such as the EDC and MDD, cities are limited where state law is concerned. Cities may not pass amendments, ordinances, etc. that conflict with state law. Imposing additional restrictions would be in conflict with state law. Mr. Holboke asked for clarification that the restrictions on how Council treats members may not be added to the Charter, but could they still do it. Mr. Laughlin responded that the members are not entitled to special treatment and no rules or policies may be enacted that conflict with state law, but if they decided as a group at will to act in a way that goes beyond the requirements, they may at their discretion. State law is more about the rights of the board member rather than the power of the Council.

Ms. Rose summarized what was presented to Council in regards to Council liaisons and the general consensus was to leave it undefined or very loosely defined. Mr. Kemper noted that he is not in favor of the Council liaison program but would prefer the staff liaison to provide information to the Council as needed. Mr. McGhee countered that it could be helpful to boards to get the sentiment of the Council. Ms. Marten said it needs to either be eliminated or defined and then be held to that standard. She is bothered that boards may be influenced or intimidated by Council in their decision

making. Ms. Harris-Daniel explained that she always has assumed the input the board she is a member of has received is that person's opinion rather than that of the entire Council. She sees value by having the liaison and suggested that the boards can gain insight to the general attitude of Council with their input. Mr. Watkins thought it was best to leave it out of the Charter but to not remain silent on the subject. He recommended including a summary of the recommendation in the report to Council.

After continued discussion, Mr. Holboke made a motion to keep the Council liaison program, continue discussion, and to specifically not prohibit the program in the Charter. Mr. McGhee seconded the motion, and it passed 7-2 with Mr. Kemper and Mr. Watkins voting against it.

Mr. Watkins made a motion to not alter the Charter in relation to Council liaisons but include a recommendation in the summary report to Council. Ms. Marten seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Ms. Marten read an example of a definition and structure for Council liaisons from another city:

“Duties and Expectations of a Council Liaison

1. A Councilmember acting as a liaison to a Council advisory committee or other body (a “Committee”) is not a member of the Committee. Rather, the Councilmember is a positive resource to support the Committee in the completion of its work subject to the rules stated below.
2. A Councilmember liaison is acting as a representative of the full Council and, as such, has no authority to provide any direction or guidance to the Committee other than direction or guidance that clearly represents direction or guidance of the full Council.
3. Generally put, the Councilmember liaison shall not attempt to influence the work or recommendations of the Committee. More specifically, • the Councilmember shall not take part in the Committee’s deliberations or discussions unless (a) the Committee requests the Councilmember’s participation in a particular discussion (in this situation, the Councilmember must expressly state that she or he is speaking for her or himself, not for the entire Council) or (b) the Councilmember determines that he or she must speak up in order to remind the Committee of Council direction, City policies, or laws including the Open Public Meetings Act and the Public Records Act; and • the Councilmember shall not take part in any votes or decision making of the Committee.
4. The Councilmember liaison shall work to ensure that the Committee is only taking actions or doing work that is within the scope of the Committee’s work as determined or approved by Council. The liaison can do this by, for example, reminding the Committee as needed of the scope of work that the Council set for the Committee.
5. The Councilmember liaison shall bring to the Council any requests from the Committee, such as the following: (a) questions raised by a Committee about the Committee’s scope of work; (b) requests from the Committee to change the Committee’s scope of work; (c) requests for expenditures of City resources to further the Committee’s work (money, staff time, or other resources); and (d) requests from the Committee to place an item on a Council meeting agenda.
6. The Councilmember liaison shall work to ensure that the Council is regularly updated on the work of the Committee. To that end, the Council shall on a periodic basis revisit

the work plan of each Committee and hear from each Committee's liaison a report on the Committee's progress on the work plan.”

Mr. George liked the first part but was less inclined to agree with the prescriptive items indicating what they must do. Ms. Harris-Daniel felt like it was a lot and maybe only needed the definition. Commissioners suggested letting Council read the example to consider which parts, if any they may agree with.

Mr. Brown made a motion to send Ms. Marten's recommendation to Council in the report for them to consider. Ms. Marten seconded the motion and it passed 5-4. Ms. Marten, Mr. Kemper, Mr. Brown, Mr. Watkins, and Mr. McGhee voted for the measure, and Mr. George, Mr. Mathis, Mr. Holboke, and Ms. Harris-Daniel voted against it.

Mr. George explained the structure and procedure moving forward. Ms. Marten made a motion to approve the Charter redlines as they are presented. Mr. McGhee seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Kemper asked if a joint meeting between the Commission and the Council could be considered. There was general consensus on the report framework Mr. McMurdie presented for the Commission. Ms. Rose emphasized that Mr. McMurdie would be preparing the report and summary for the Council rather than City staff.

Adjournment.

Vice Chairperson George adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

APPROVE:

Scott McMurdie, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Billy George, Vice-Chairperson