

----- Original Message -----

ON THE TABLE 6/11/04

From: "Katy Suiter"

To: "Charter Commission"

Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 2004 11:13 AM

Subject: Comments

Hi Debby -

I have attached some comments on Harriett's memorandum regarding the charter. I don't think I really want to write a formal memorandum, but just wanted to throw a different perspective into the mix. She comes from the second-class perspective and I come from the home rule perspective, and we each have our own ways of doing things because of it. Feel free to pass this on to Glen and other charter commission members, if appropriate. I would have replied sooner, but because I was on vacation..... :)

Thanks, Katy

Comment on 2.05: This ties in with section 2.02(f), and unless this section specifically references November, I would recommend leaving it as is. Currently for the City of Ketchikan, election of a vice-mayor typically happens at the same time as certification of the election so there is no time lapse at all with regards to a vice-mayor. The Borough may do theirs differently, but there has been no problem with this on the City side of life.

Comment on 3.02(b): Requiring a public hearing on each and every ordinance (except emergency ordinances) can be a cumbersome process. Home rule munis have the opportunity to make the public process more streamlined with regard to ordinances (the Borough, by state law, currently has to follow the procedure as set out in Harriett's memo). Under current City practice, by not requiring a public hearing prior to consideration of each ordinance, the public is allowed to speak on any subject at the beginning of each Council meeting under Persons to be Heard. Many people would rather not hang around at the meeting until their ordinance comes up to be able to express their opinion (as is current Borough practice). The notice requirement as suggested by Harriett on issues that affect the public to a greater degree, such as budget amendments and rate changes, can be addressed in the Code that is adopted.

I agree with her assessment on 3.02(c) – there have been times when the 30-day effective date has been a concern for the City.

Comment on section 15.02: Harriett is correct that larger voter turnouts happen during the October elections. However, the Assembly (and voters, should an initiative be filed) needs the latitude to be able to set the date when it would be most appropriate for an election on a charter change to occur. I would suggest the following: "Proposed amendments shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the municipality at the next regular election, or at the next special election occurring more than forty-five days after adoption of the ordinance, the final report of the charter commission, or certification of the initiative petition."