

**KETCHIKAN CHARTER COMMISSION**REGULAR MEETING & **PUBLIC HEARING**

August 13, 2004

The regular meeting of the Ketchikan Charter Commission commenced at 6:00 p.m., Friday, August 13, 2004, in the City Council Chambers.

**Roll Call**

PRESENT: OTTE, HARRINGTON, MCCARTY, FINNEY, PAINTER, KIFFER  
ABSENT: THOMPSON

**A: Pledge of Allegiance****B: Ceremonial Matters/Introductions**

NONE.

Vice-Chair PAINTER reminded everyone that there would be a Public Hearing at 7 pm.

**C: Public Comments**

NONE

HARRINGTON reminded the listening audience that there would be a Public Hearing in an hour.

**D. Informational Reports and/or Commission Presentations**

NONE

**E. Consent Calendar**

M/S PAINTER/HARRINGTON to approved the minutes of the July 29<sup>th</sup>, July 30<sup>th</sup>, and the August 6, 2004 regular Charter Commission meeting. (E-1, E-2 & E-3)

HARRINGTON pointed out that his comment about water services should have indicated NON-areawide rather than areawide in item E-3, the minutes of the.

The motion, with correction noted, passed by a roll-call vote of 6-0.

FOR: PAINTER, FINNEY, MCCARTY, OTTE, HARRINGTON, KIFFER

AGAINST:

ABSENT: THOMPSON

## **F. Vouchers**

M/S MCCARTY/HARRINGTON to authorize the payment of a voucher, as submitted, for a total of \$ 1,206.76.

A roll-call vote was taken on the motion.

FOR: FINNEY, KIFFER, HARRINGTON, OTTE, PAINTER, MCCARTY

AGAINST:

ABSENT: THOMPSON

The motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

## **G-1 Recess the meeting into worksession to consider the 2004 Draft Consolidation Petition, as well as the 2004 DRAFT Charter, as well as correspondence received addressing issues within the Petition and Exhibits.**

Note: Work sessions are informal discussion sessions held for the purpose of exchanging and gathering information. No action may be taken, formal rules of order are relaxed, and there is no requirement that minutes be kept.

M/S MCCARTY/HARRINGTON to recess in work session to consider the 2004 Draft Consolidation Petition.

A unanimous voice vote approved the recess into work session.

OTTE had a list of items for Commission discussion. They included:

FYI items distributed, Ms. Loughead's email

Copies of emails to Ms. Kheiry at the Daily News requesting clarifications from the news article had been distributed. The way it read sounded like the rural mill rate was increased, when the case was that the former nonareawide Library .93 mills was added to the areawide mill rate. Everyone except Saxman has been paying the .93 mills in addition to the Borough's mill levy, but now it's all in one place. The Clerks offices and the Library do not have copies of the Draft Petition to give out, just to review. If citizens want a copy, please contact OTTE at home, 225-7814 or via email to [charter@kpunet.net](mailto:charter@kpunet.net) or they can go to Sitnews and read it right on the Internet.

On the Commission's calendar it was discussed to have someone attend the KGB meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Edwards forwarded the information that the only reference to the Petition document was included in the Manager's report. She then read the section from that item. "This week we received the Draft Report on Consolidation and I urge you all to read it in detail and study it depth. Our staff is working with the City staff to see if the budget is adequate and that all items such as PERS and insurance costs have been fully considered. This is perhaps the most important document that you will be asked to review this year, as it effects every resident of the island, both now and in the future. I'm asking for direction from the Assembly as to how you want the staff to give input. Please note that this report must be submitted to the Boundary Commission in September, so time is critical for your review and comments." She indicated she thought the Commission should be a presence at the meeting and speak during the public comment period about the Petition and the Public Hearings.

The Mud Bight Service Area status is also on the Assembly agenda. She indicated that several Mud Bight Service Area members had come to speak to the Commission earlier in the process about how unhappy they were with what was going on in the service area. They have now formally asked the Borough to dissolve the service area. The agenda statement said that if the service area dissolves, they would still be a part of the North Tongass Service Area, however, there wouldn't be road powers in that area and that could be a major problem in the near future. The Commission may want to put something in the Draft document mentioning the fact that this service area is having problems and may dissolve prior to the final consolidation vote. PAINTER indicated that maybe some kind of disclaimer could be written in saying that the Draft Petition includes assumptions that may or may not continue after the document is submitted. There may be several things come up between the time the Draft petition is submitted and it actually comes to a vote.

OTTE went on about the Loring issue and the fact that the citizens have

approached the Borough about how to go about becoming a service area, but as of that date, there has been no formal move to do that. A paragraph indicating this may or may not happen would be appropriate, in her opinion. PAINTER said he'd feel more comfortable putting some kind of disclaimer in the Transition Plan or even in Exhibit E. MCCARTY said the Commission shouldn't go there at all. He said that it's understood that the Draft Petition is a picture taken at this time and that the situations may change in the interim. Changes probably will occur. OTTE said that someone should bring back verbiage relating to the service areas and bring that back for consideration at the next meeting.

The Borough also has a meeting date change item on their Monday night agenda, from September 20 to September 27. OTTE wanted to know if this would allow enough time for the formal pass of the Draft Petition to get it timely filed with the LBC. There was discussion and if the Commission has the Express Mail package ready and stamped, that would probably give enough time, since the Borough won't be changing anything in the document. OTTE said that other than the 27th

The G.O. bonds that are being contemplated for Schoenbar (\$3.5m) and Fawn Mountain (\$3m) schools should be included in the Draft document that they are going to be going to the voters. MCCARTY indicated that change should wait until the Commission's meeting after the Assembly's on the 16<sup>th</sup> to make certain that ordinance setting those for a public vote passes in second reading.

The Draft document went out to the Mayors and Assembly/Council, Clerks, Attorneys, Finance Directors, the Library, 6 service area boards, KIC, Cape Fox, Saxman, the Planning Commission and the School Board. The Planning Commission has invited a Charter Commission to their meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> to discuss the document. They were happy to be included in the process. The School Board was also very voluble in their praise to the Commission. Their next meeting is Wednesday, the 25<sup>th</sup>. OTTE indicated she'd given disks to the organizations so that if any members of their boards wanted the document emailed, it was ready to go. Gisele at the Borough's Public Works is the contact for the service area boards and has their meeting schedule.

Mr. Amylon indicated that there had been a chart in the prior Petition in Exhibit F with the budget that showed taxes now and taxes proposed with consolidation for the various service areas and areawide. He asked that be included with our petition and OTTE said she'd do that chart for inclusion with

the current Petition document. KIFFER said that chart or a condensed version should be published as an ad to get the information to the public. FINNEY said maybe something along the lines of taxes now, taxes without consolidation, and taxes with consolidation.... It was suggested that the taxes without consolidation could be indicated with a question mark and an up arrow.

OTTE indicated she could work on an ad. Both the Local Paper and the Daily News are set to print the second Public Hearing ads. That ad said No increase in property taxes and all residents have a voice in KPU. She said she'd also put the phrase "the Charter Commission wants YOU" and if she could have figured out a way to put the Uncle Sam figure in the ad, she would have.

OTTE said that thought should be given to the letter of transmittal to the Borough. She said it was a month away, but the Commission should decide what they want included in that letter. She also said that the laundry list needs to be worked on.

MCCARTY said that he'd heard from one of the municipal attorneys and one of the managers, and he said he would really strongly suggest reconsideration of not having areawide road powers. He said by doing things under the guise of another name, because there are limited powers, is liable to bite the community in the future. He said that there could be powers that are not used, but might be needed in the future. A major power that should be looked at is the Gravina situation. There is a lot of relatively flat land; a lot of waterfront property and access to several industrial sites and it's not a frequent situation where landowners with relatively small parcels can build the roads on their own. Financing is going to be necessary and sometimes, if nothing else, the bonding capacity or the resources of the local government help them help themselves. MCCARTY said it's not necessarily that the municipality would have to build the roads, but using the government's bond rating, things could be put together. The fear that somehow the State will suddenly abdicate any road powers, look at what's happened in Juneau and what has happened with the Feds. Some of that stuff is coming anyway, and maybe the municipality should be prepared ahead of time. If it's required to wait to either have a special election or the regular election cycle and the fairly cumbersome process to change the Charter to do things, a basic element of what government is supposed to provide, the basic infrastructure, not necessarily to build it, to facilitate it at least. MCCARTY said this was strongly urged by the several gentlemen he'd talked to. This should really be looked at. Within the Airport Reserve, maybe that's an Airport power, but if that's not a road that's for Airport purposes, it's really starting to stretch it, even if it is within the Airport Reserve. There could be some real problems with the bridge scenario as to

exactly how to get across Pennock to connect the bridges without road powers and what may be desired to be accomplished on that island. He said he wasn't going to make the motion because unless there were several people who were going to support it, he would be wasting everyone's time.

MCCARTY went on to say that similarly, the mill cap is a real problem. Looking at \_ mill is not that much money. It's between \$300 & \$500,000 that would be generated with \_ mill. It doesn't take much if something big happens; economy-wise or a disaster, or whatever, or a new Federal edict and there could be some real problems. Everyone says there could be an election to change it. Because of the structured deadlines, there have to be decisions before it's known what's really going to happen. Decisions would need to be made in February and March in order to approve the cap to finish up the budget in June. Either the cap needs to be higher and hope that the Assembly won't spend to the cap just because it's there or there needs to be some thought given...it's not them and us...it's them that's sitting at the table come from us. MCCARTY said that there's a price paid for whichever choice is made.

FINNEY asked for clarification from MCCARTY in that he thought there should be areawide road powers, but the power not be used.

OTTE said she concurred with both of MCCARTY's ideas. She said it would be appropriate if he were to get her something for an agenda statement similar to what he discussed, so it can be in hard copy and let's have the Commission vote on the areawide road powers. She said that as far as the mill cap, she said the alternative of requiring a 2/3 majority of the Assembly to vote for any mill rate increase is adequate for what is needed. The other way is too cumbersome; it will strangle the ability for the Manager to manage the operations of such a huge government because they are going to be so worried about trying to figure out what the budget is going to be doing and all of the little things that arise that they aren't going to have time to deal with the running of the government. She said she was really opposed to a mill cap.

KIFFER said that he supports the mill cap. He said he had all along and he hasn't changed his stance. He said he just couldn't see something coming up that couldn't be handled under an emergency ordinance. He said the Assembly knows when there are bad problems with the budget. He said we knew this year and last year and it had been projected the year before that. It just didn't spring upon the community. He said he agreed with MCCARTY in that yes, it is complicating the new Assembly's job. \$300,000 isn't much, but it's going to make them think and plan a little farther out and that if this community had been planning two or three years in advance, the community may have been in better shape than now, so he supports the mill cap.

KIFFER continued that he didn't agree with MCCARTY on the areawide road powers. There are too many things; there have been too many comments from the podium where folks are not happy with the situation of the roads. The State used to come out and plow the roads and then clear out the ditch-line so there wasn't a berm on the driveways. Currently that's not being done and if a person wants their driveway plowed, that person does it for himself or herself and it costs them more. When roads are discussed, everybody keys in on the building of a road or the improvement of a road, but road powers mean an awful lot more than just building or improving.

HARRINGTON said that it's not \$300,000 for \_ mill; it's more than \_ a million. He said that everyone lives within a budget and there is a limited amount of money. The Borough is the same. If they have a problem, it's called budgeting. You cut an area or you do something or you take it to the voters and give them the option. He said he didn't see any problem with a cap because it gets the voters involved. The Assembly is forced to be far more specific about what it is the people are going to get for their money when they lay it out for the voters for an election and that public information is vital to the well being of the Borough, generally.

HARRINGTON continued that he agreed in a lot of ways that there should be areawide road powers, except he said, he's not going to vote to put it in the Petition because there hasn't been the public process of identifying the values, identifying the costs and identifying what is involved. If those areawide road powers are desired, he said he thinks it's fine, but there needs to be a separate election to change the Petition either after it is established or if the Borough chooses to exercise areawide road powers even before this Petition is adopted, it would be assumed within the powers later. If the Borough wants to do areawide, they can take it to the voters. He said he's been very conservative as he approached this process. The less that's changed, the better. The more restrictions that can be put in the document on government, the better. Forcing the process to be public and a public vote process is the better this community will be.

PAINTER said that on the tax cap issue, the voters want government control on spending and their ability to participate. On the road powers, PAINTER said he was never a strong advocate of that. He said in the past the State has come onto their own budget woes and DOT staffing levels got cut, the budget got cut and the threat of not plowing the road to the Point Higgins School. The State takes care of the maintenance on Tongass Highway, even Tongass Avenue through town and they do some arterial roads. He said he wasn't just talking about plowing snow, he said he was referring to keeping the ditches clean and

the culverts clean and the like. He said as a resident of Shoreline, a new City area that it used to be that the neighbors pitched in and volunteered the ditches would get cleaned out before the monsoon season so the culverts didn't plug up. Contrary to the testimony the Commission heard from an upset Shoreliner awhile back, he said he'd talked to Harvey Hansen, the City Public Works Director and explained the situation and asked him if that was the responsibility of the property owners to take care of the ditches, etc. Hansen said he'd send someone out there to take a look at it and see what they could do. Since the volunteer neighborhood has sort of dissolved. PAINTER said he'd be in favor of either road powers going into service area powers (they are already was interjected), then, he said, he misunderstood MCCARTY. He thought they road powers were areawide.

PAINTER wanted to know what the difference was between nonareawide road powers and service area road powers. MCCARTY said that the area that could be drawn from for the resources to put it together would be the resources of the entire borough for backup and whatever was used for funding sources. (That's areawide was interjected.) In a service area there are limited resources to draw from.

KIFFER said that was right, but the issue with that is when the snow comes at 6 am when they go out and start plowing the snow, the Gateway Service Area is going to get plowed. There aren't enough, nor are enough affordable plow equipment on the entire island to plow the streets areawide. The issue is the Gateway Service Area is going to get plowed because that's where all the people are. (The hospital and schools was interjected.) KIFFER continued that they would get to Cascade Road when they get to it. It isn't going to be that same day, but probably the day after when they get to it. He said he wasn't against areawide road powers, because it simplifies issues like the Gravina project that's going on, but he said he wanted to see where it's actually going to work and he said he wanted to see a plan of what it's going to cost before he supports it.

PAINTER asked MCCARTY that under the scenario of road powers being left in the service areas as it is currently, then would the burden of plowing North Point Higgins to the school fall to the North Tongass Fire & EMS Service Area? MCCARTY said that first of all, the service area has to have road powers. Those powers have to be adopted and even before that, there has to be a service area. A large part of the borough is not in a service area. As to who is going to do that, he said he thinks that it's optimistic to think that whether or not we have road powers is going to effect whether the State is going to do some of the maintenance due to the cutbacks in their budget and staffing.



MCCARTY said there are certain things that government is expected to provide or at least be in a position to provide if there is a capacity to do so. PAINTER said that if it were switched to nonareawide road powers...MCCARTY said that is what we have. He said he was obviously in the minority and that's why he hasn't come forward with any motions or any language to change it.

FINNEY said there were pros and cons on both sides. He said he'd probably go along with HARRINGTON and propose that if road powers were to be taken areawide, he said it sounded like a pretty good bite to add it into the document right now. PAINTER said it would increase taxes. FINNEY said then, no. If there's a tax increase, no. PAINTER said he was in favor of keeping it at status quo as much as possible.

FINNEY said that if the tax cap is unworkable, couldn't the new Assembly put it to the voters to raise it? They could change it. PAINTER said the problem that MCCARTY has with it is looking from a management standpoint is because of the State's legislated time frame, there would need to be an election by the first part of April of every year, or any year that they could see down the road far enough that they were going to have to increase the taxes. FINNEY said that all the Assembly would have to do is convince the public that's a problem and put it out for election and let the public vote on it and they (the public) will say okay. PAINTER said there is a 3-year balanced budget plan attached to the Petition and if they operate within that guise. He said he was aware that it would require a bit of tweaking here and there.

HARRINGTON said that he'd just checked on the LID process and if there were an emergency and there needs to be a road built, the LID process is a very rapid process. All it takes is a resolution to establish it and that the Municipality could start it or the landowners could start it. In most of the areas that are being discussed, there aren't roads now and in those areas where there are roads, if road powers are needed for maintenance or construction, those people can be starting that at any time to have those powers. HARRINGTON said he just didn't see the need for areawide road powers at this point.

OTTE asked if anyone had any area they'd found in the Draft document that needed correcting. She indicated she'd found one in Exhibit L, page 2 that was just a typo (too many words left in). She said she'd correct that item. OTTE said that regarding putting out any updates to the documents, there was concern expressed to make sure she knew where they were going so that everyone got the updates. She said that removing the excess listed exhibit names from Exhibit L is not going to warrant a frantic paper push to give everyone new pages. That's a tweak. PAINTER said that OTTE needed to keep track of who has the Petition binders and she indicated she did know who

had them.

MCCARTY said that the simple hard-copy one is just to have an errata-type sheet with what is being replaced, when it's an editorial change rather than something of substance, they pages should be replaced. Some would be with instructions to take out page # and insert new page # dated this date.

## **G-2 Reconvene Into Regular Session**

M/S MCCARTY/HARRINGTON to reconvene the meeting into regular session. A unanimous voice vote passed the motion to reconvene into regular session and take a break until the Public Hearing time of 7 pm.

## **H: Unfinished/Old Business**

NONE

A break was taken between 6:51 and 7 pm.

## **I: New Business – PUBLIC HEARING 7 PM.**

**I-1 Recess the meeting into Public Hearing.** Note: During the time set aside for the Public Hearing, the Commissioners may discuss items concerning the Draft Petition and Exhibits, assign specific tasks or work on individual assigned tasks when there is no one testifying. As with a work session, no action may be taken and formal rules of order are relaxed.

M/S OTTE/FINNEY to recess into Public Hearing in order for the citizens of the community to bring their comments and concerns regarding the Commission's draft Petition to the Commission.

A unanimous voice vote was taken on the motion and the Commission went into Public Hearing.

Ron Stout, 796 Kayan Street, said he'd been checking on what the Commission had been doing and he said he thought the Commission has done a remarkable job and his opinion is that if people don't vote for consolidation, he said he thinks they either don't know what's going on, or they are part of the problem. He said he couldn't see why it shouldn't go through and he said, again, that he thought the Commission had done a remarkable

Ketchikan Charter Commission Minutes August 13, 2004

job and he thought there should be praise for that. Mr. Stout said this community needs it (consolidation). He said he believed that the people need it. He indicated that a lot of people call him an outsider because he's only in Ketchikan 6 months out of the year, but he said it gives him a little better perspective on what everyone up here does compared to what's down south and being in this community just for that six months, there is a totally different attitude than a lot of people do and deal with a lot more and it just seems to him that this community deserves something without having to have all the hassles that everyone's had to go through.

Marvin Hill, 808 Forest Park Drive, said having attended almost as many meetings as the Commissioners, he said he appreciated the time and effort and the amount of work that has gone into it. It's an undertaking where most people don't realize how much time you've spent and he said good work and thank you.

OTTE asked Mr. Hill if he had any specific opinions about any of the things that have been discussed. He said he hadn't gone all the way through the Draft Petition yet. He said he was sure the Commission would hear from him if he finds something to comment on.

FINNEY thanks Mr. Hill for his input and for sitting through most of the meetings with the Commission.

PAINTER reminded Mr. Hill that this was only the first of three Public Hearings.

Tom Caffrey, 929 Stedman Street, said he only had a couple of comments to address to the Commission. First, he said he and his wife were in favor of consolidation, as many of the City residents were as was seen in the past and for a lot of the same reasons. The thing that was concerning him a little bit that the built-in tax increase that was figured into the process and he felt that there had been a lot of pressure on the Commission to do this, but he said that would be a major hurdle in the deal.

PAINTER and OTTE both indicated to Mr. Caffrey that the newspaper made it sound like there was a tax increase outside the City, but it was the Library tax of .93 that has been nonareawide and collected separately, just added into the areawide mill levy. PAINTER said there would be a clarification to the newspaper article. He also added that under the current structure, Saxman does not contribute to the nonareawide .93 tax for funding the Library, but after consolidation, the tax will be areawide and everyone will contribute to the Library. Mr. Caffrey said that in his opinion, no new taxes is the way the Commission should go to get it sold.

MCCARTY said that to a large extent, the Commission has been trying not to make a lot of differences in the prior petition and even more to the point, of trying to maintain the status quo. He said the Commission didn't want to try to create something dramatically different from what is currently being done unless there was an area where there seemed to be a lot of pressure for the Commission to address a problem and change it.

Mr. Caffrey thanked the Commission for the good work.

George Tipton, 2429 Fifth Avenue and member of the Borough Assembly, indicated he had forgotten his list of notes at home, so wouldn't be speaking long at this Public Hearing. Mr. Tipton said that he is confused about the Petition, page 4; it talks about tax types areawide. The first questions that are going to come up are where does the 8.43 mill property tax come from and how does the 3.75% sales tax come into being. He said he knew where to look for the explanation, but it would help everyone if there were something right at the front to see what the current tax levels are and what they will be under consolidation, with a reference as to where explanatory information can be found in the rest of the document. Mr. Tipton said he knew the explanations, but he thought a quick break-down showing where the 1.5% Public Works Sales Tax was reduced to 1.25% and the .25% was carried to the areawide sales tax would be beneficial for those who won't be reading the whole document. He said the biggest thing that will sell the effort is the money.

OTTE said that it had been discussed to put a small chart in the paper as an ad for the Public Hearings and that could also probably be the base for the insert into the Petition.

Mr. Tipton wanted to know how many people would go beyond looking at the Petition and the budget. He said that the other stuff is semantic things that the Commission has spent a long time trying to get ideal and a small percentage will look at that for the legalese or for it personally would affect them, but the overall perspective is that the important things are the Petition and the budget.

PAINTER said that if the equation of existing 7.5 plus the nonareawide .93 were indicated and then shown together in another column, it would explain a lot to people. He also indicated that there would be a clarification in the newspaper on the misconception that was fostered in the article that Friday.

MCCARTY said that basically what could be done is right where it says Borough Areawide Real and Personal Tax; you could put below that in parenthesis, current 7.5 plus .93 Library now 8.43. Mr. Tipton said that there

was the other side of the City at 6.4 and where does the deficit 6.4 to 7.5 come. He said he understands, but a lot of people won't, and when the bulk of the voters are on the City side and are looking at the larger increased side of why and where the variance comes into play.

HARRINGTON said that it is clear that the only tax increase that is there is a minor is the areawide sales tax outside the Gateway Service Area increases the .25% and the Gateway Service Area's Public Works Sales Tax decreases from 1.5% to 1.25%. And the Hospital 1% sales tax goes areawide. Those are the only increases outside the Gateway Service Area.

MCCARTY said that might be something to put right there is to say the only increase in taxes proposed is the switch of the 1.25% sales tax to areawide.

Mr. Tipton wanted to know if there was currently a little example past the Petition where there could be a reference to a certain Exhibit and page that would be something as simple as showing an example of the current sales tax revenue for both the City and the Borough. Then take the same example and show the tax revenue for the Gateway Service Area and the Municipality and why the new number will generate a similar amount for the government. People have a hard time understanding that differentiation because one is both sides and one is not.

OTTE asked Mr. Tipton to email Chair THOMPSON, who was not in attendance at the meeting, and explaining what he envisioned for the document. Tipton said that the Commission got the gist of what he was saying and that anything relating to numbers should have more clarity, examples and/or definitions. A lot of people will only look at what they know and what they deal with, but trying to deal with government accounting, as everyone there knows, is a whole different entity.

PAINTER pointed out that in Exhibit F, page 7, under Gateway Service Area, says revenues earned by the "Ketchikan" Service Area (needs to be changed to Gateway) and also the written words for one and one-quarter had an additional couple of words.

MCCARTY said that looking back to Mr. Tipton's comments and some other people picking up on it, there are two ways, he said, to do that. One is in the document, so research isn't needed, to put in a short one line that says see also...and reference wherever in the document the explanation or further information on that tax could be found. Also, there should be another Exhibit to the budget with a sheet just explaining the taxes, both property and sales. There is a definite benefit to having that information condensed and put right

into the Petition. As Mr. Tipton said, how many people are going to want to take the time to thumb through to see that information. It would be right there in front of them. The other part would be to facilitate the public in looking further into the document with references.

PAINTER said that the entire document was available for public view, but he didn't know if a hard copy was going to be able to be placed in the hands of every resident that decides they want the document just simply because of the cost of printing and the copying. OTTE pointed out that it would be on the Internet. PAINTER said that as far as a printed copy, it's pretty thick document.

MCCARTY said that Petition copies could be made readily available and on that page there could be the brief description of the taxes and for those people who really want to delve into crunching the numbers, reading all the pages, there could be another section for them to specifically refer to. If they don't have the whole document, it would be really easy for them to call up and ask for a specific section.

HARRINGTON said the Commission needed to be doing some advertising anyway for the next couple of Public Hearings. He said one of those advertisements is a chart of the proposed taxes to go along with the advertising for the Public Hearing to lay out exactly what there is in the document. He said another advertising point could be the powers question as to what will remain in the Gateway Service Area and what will be areawide. If the word could be spread as to what the Commission has done regarding the powers, it would help the effort to educate the public. So, if we could be advertising at least those two things as part of the process of the next Public Hearing.

FINNEY said just a little buzz thing about what's in the Petition and what's not.

MCCARTY said that one of the things we talked about specifically on the taxes, not necessarily brackets or whatever, but he said, indicating what is a change from what is currently in place as far as the powers would be a very good one. Basically this is what we have, if there is something that is a change, that's probably one to point out. These are changes and then if they have questions, they can come talk to us, or we can maybe do more explanations.

PAINTER said the taxes are the meat and potatoes of the deal.

MCCARTY said he thought powers were, too. He said, look at with Fire & EMS. There were a lot of people up front saying that EMS does, but then there's the cautionary comments about well, fire's a problem, but not EMS so much, but we have to keep the two together so we came back to where we are now. He

said he thought the deal to make or break for a lot of people was that power thing, what's this doing to me? Oh, it's pretty much what we have right now, I can live with that. Taxes seem to be pretty much what there is now, shaped a little different, and then here's the explanation. Those are the two areas most people, unless they're going to read the whole thing, are going to make their decisions.

Mr. Caffrey came forward with the suggestion that instead of making paper copies for distribution to the public, the Commission could burn copies of the files onto CD's and distribute it that way. The Commission thanked him for his suggestion, since it would be a less expensive means of distributing the document.

OTTE indicated that the entire document is available on Sitnews and that each permutation of the document will be posted as changes are made. She thanked Mr. Caffrey again for his excellent suggestion.

### **I-2 Reconvene to regular session**

M/S MCCARTY/OTTE that seeing no further citizens desiring to testify at the Public Hearing to reconvene into regular session to consider the suggestions and comments received from the community during the Public Hearing.

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote. HARRINGTON indicated that if anyone were to come in, they would be allowed to testify and the Commission concurred.

### **I-3- Commission Discussion of Public Hearing Comments (if necessary)**

MCCARTY indicated that unless any of the Commission had any areas they wished to change, he suggested that the meeting move into Commission Comments. There was no objection.

### **J: Commission Comments**

MCCARTY said the Commission has worked hard. There was a little bit better turnout tonight and there were some very good ideas brought up. Some of these things seem like small details, like burning to a CD, and Mr. Tipton provided some insightful analysis. He said not major changes, but those are

the things that need to be done and the Commission needs to hear from people how the document is coming across. He said that questions needed to be asked and he thanked Mr. Tipton for his advise.

OTTE thanked the public for coming.

PAINTER thanked the audience for their comments. He said he'd like to re-iterate the calendar and a brief discussion on upcoming meetings. OTTE pointed out that in the conveyance letter to the Chamber indicated that the Commission was aware there was someone else scheduled and there wouldn't be much time taken by the Commission. Perhaps some CD's could be made to take there to hand out. Attendance at the Borough and City meetings would be under the Persons to be Heard sections of their meetings. There has not been any response from Saxman, and as soon as anything is known, she said she'd pass it along.

HARRINGTON, KIFFER and FINNEY indicated they wouldn't be at the meeting of the 20<sup>th</sup>. It was decided that there could be a Public Hearing without a quorum since that has been advertised and it wouldn't have to be convened as a meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:25 p.m.