

MINUTES OF THE
WORKSHOP - CITY COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 18, 2006

The workshop of the City Council of the City of Benicia was called to order by Mayor Steve Messina at 8:02 a.m. on Saturday, November 18, 2006, in the Dona Benicia Room, Benicia Public Library, 150 East L Street, complete proceedings of which are recorded on tape.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Council Members Hughes, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Absent: Council Member Patterson

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mayor Messina led the pledge to the flag.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS:

A plaque stating the Fundamental Rights of each member of the public is posted at the entrance to the meeting room per Section 4.04.030 of City of Benicia Ordinance No. 05-6 (Open Government Ordinance).

Mayor Messina stated that Mr. Steve Churchwell, a partner in DLA Piper's Government Affairs group concentrates his practice on campaign finance laws, ballot measures, state regulatory issues, ethics and conflicts of interest. Mr. Churchwell began his legal career with a fellowship in public interest litigation. Since then, he has spent 12 years as a government lawyer and ten years in private practice. From 1993 to 2000, he served as the general counsel to the California Fair Political Practices Commission. For more information on Mr. Churchwell's background, please pick up the handout on the back table.

Carol Langford is an Adjunct Professor of Law at the University of San Francisco and at Hastings College of Law. Ms. Langford's focus is in the area of Ethics, and her Curriculum Vitae, which is available on the back table, provides an extensive list of articles she has written on this topic. She has also co-authored two textbooks, *Legal Ethics in the Practice of Law* and the *Moral Compass of the American Lawyer*. She is a member of a number of legal groups, including the Bar Association of San Francisco Legal Ethics Committee.

Ms. Carol Langford reviewed her professional history and accomplishments.

Mr. Steve Churchwell reviewed his professional history and accomplishments.

Mayor Messina stated that the Council tabled some ordinances a few months ago. Council decided the ordinances were worthy of further consideration. It is Council's intent to gather the information the public brings forward today for consideration. It is Council's hope that it could gather the collective wisdom of the group to make changes to

the ordinances and bring those ordinances back at a future meeting for consideration. He was aware that there was some angst in the public regarding the noticing for today's workshop. This date was set a month or so ago. In terms of the legal noticing requirements – all requirements were followed. Mr. Erickson confirmed that the noticing was legally followed. The meeting was noticed four days prior to the meeting. The City is legally required to notice three days prior to the meeting. Notices were posted outside City Hall, in local newspapers, emails, and on the City's website. There was plenty of notice this week. However, he wished we had gotten something out earlier. He knows that the notice was legally compliant. There were two front-page articles about the meeting in the Benicia Herald. There was a lot of notice this week. Mayor Messina stated there would be ample opportunity for the public to provide input on this issue; at future meetings, in writing, etc.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

WRITTEN:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

STUDY SESSION ITEM:

Voluntary Code of Fair Campaign Practices:

Ms. Langford stated that she liked the idea of having a code. The code has seven provisions (refer to code for details). The provisions themselves are a good idea to have. There are some issues that need to be discussed in the code itself such as wording, for example 'coercion'. The City wants to make sure the code complies with the First Amendment. Any ethics code would be subject to challenge. It should be drafted as loophole free as possible. Regarding repudiation, it is good to have. There is one other big issue, which is that this is a voluntary code, but there is some reimbursement for costs if you comply with it. The City has to decide if it wants to have the reimbursement of the costs in the code. She would support the code, but the wording needs some tweaking.

Mayor Messina asked how the City would stay current with State law if the code were adopted. Ms. Langford stated that was not necessary. Usually, they are kept for eight years or so. After some time, the code is updated, tweaked, etc. It could be updated as often as the Council wants to do so.

Public Comment:

1. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox stated that at the last election, there was a lot of nastiness and negativity that took place. It was not by the candidates. The negativity implied certain things. She would like it to be broader than covering just the candidates. You can't regulate implications. People have a right to say what they want. Part of what she wants to do when she tweaks the language will address that. They do not want it challenged under the First Amendment. People have a right to their opinion; however, the issue of slander applies.

2. Sabina Yates – Ms. Yates asked about the issue of reimbursement of cost. Ms. Langford read the section that applies to cost.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman discussed the issue raised by Ms. Fox regarding outside entities bringing negativity into the campaigns. Mr. Churchwell discussed third party groups providing comments on candidates/elections. It is pretty impossible to control what the third party groups say about candidates. It is up to the citizens to decide what to believe. Ms. Fox asked if this code would not have changed what took place during the last election. Ms. Langford stated that this is a voluntary code. If it were mandatory, it would be different. Mandatory codes are usually for things such as licensing. You have to be careful with the First Amendment. It is better to have people comply with a voluntary ethics code. Ms. Fox asked if the ethics code could apply to outside groups. Council Member Hughes asked about #6 – during the last election, there was literature put out by a third party – if that supported him but was against another candidate, if he did not agree, would he be required to publicly state that he did not agree? Ms. Langford confirmed that he would. Council Member Hughes stated that the City could not limit independent expenditures. However, if this moved forward, it would require the candidate to come out publicly stated that they did not agree with the statements that are made. Ms. Fox wanted to know why the City could not include the independent groups in the code and ask that they voluntarily sign the code at elections. Ms. Langford and Mr. Churchwell stated that the City could not make this mandatory for independent groups. It is dangerous if the government starts regulating these things.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that it did not sound like this could be legislated as ‘mandatory.’ Ms. Langford stated that she wanted to take all the comments from Council, Staff, and the citizens, and come up with a code that worked.

Public Comment:

1. Kitty Griffin – Ms. Griffin stated that she had looked up something the League of Women Voters put out during the last election. The history of misleading statements goes back to the beginning of time. The point was to win the election or win your point. She does not know of any candidate that has ever said that they were not ethical. Saying that they are ethical on a voluntary basis is silly. Almost anything a candidate says has a degree of truth in it. She has seen some outrageous examples of misleading truths in past elections. You can’t stop that. If a corporation puts out some tricky information, they will put it out at the last minute so the candidate does not have time to respond. There needs to be a bottom up sort of thing. There needs to be a huge voter education thing. What is said is never going to be regulated. Ms. Langford stated that she agrees and disagrees with some of Ms. Griffin’s statements. There is a code that states that you can’t discriminate in a law firm. It is hard to enforce that type of thing. Some of these provisions could be enforced. By having this called ‘voluntary’ it is a good thing. Regarding voter education – that is very true. What she does is go out and educate the clerks, bailiffs, etc. on ethics. Ms. Griffin stated that she did not think the City would see a change in behaviors as a result of this. It should come in a form of a resolution stating the City’s wishes. Ms. Langford stated the City

could do both. This should not be mandated. Having something in writing can be very powerful. It would encourage compliance.

2. Bonnie Silveria – Ms. Silveria stated that she has seen great changes in how campaigns in Benicia are run. If this discussion goes further, she would like to see both (code and resolution). If the message is out there that the candidates have signed on to the ethics code, it will encourage the outside parties to play the game. She believes the candidates did not know what occurred at the last minute during the last election. The candidate has to carry the message.
3. Bob Craft – Mr. Craft stated this type of code could only help, it can't hurt. He thinks having something like this properly worded with the right legal ease can only help.
4. Jon Van Landschoot – Mr. Van Landschoot discussed #6. The City needs to put in something about substantial notice. There were a lot of things said at the end of the last election. He is not sure if doing this on a voluntary basis will work. He would like the wording more detailed. People have to get the information or written notices put out regarding repugnant statements that they don't agree with.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that he did not know if that would work. If something was put out the day before the election, the candidate may not be able to refute statements. Costs could be high and the candidate may be forced to spend money they don't have. Ms. Langford stated that it would have to be worded as 'reasonable.'

5. Citizen - The citizen stated that he would prefer the first part of the meeting be a question/answer session, and then go on with discussion. He wanted to know how this code would be monitored. Ms. Langford stated that was something that needed to be looked into and discussed in more detail.
6. T.J. Firpo – Mr. Firpo wanted to discuss the noticing issue. The public notice could be that the City could put out a notice stating the campaign expenditures in the newspapers. Mayor Messina stated the City has to be careful spending money for the public good. We can't appear to be biased in the election.
7. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox discussed that there should be a cutoff for all media by a certain date for an election. That way, the last minute barrage could be repudiated.
8. Mr. Churchwell stated that the Courts have been very clear that the timing issues could not be enforced. It is not legal. The courts have said that although you can't cut off the free speech, but you can require disclaimers. They could be required to disclose the source of the information. Ms. Fox reiterated that the City could request that all groups stop putting literature out past a certain date.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that he thought the candidates might adhere to such a request, but was not sure if the outside groups would. Perhaps the voluntary ordinance and code would do some good. During the last election, neither he nor Mr. Hughes knew what the outside groups did. He does not know how to regulate that. If they look for support from groups, they could let those groups know about the code/resolution and tell them they have to comply with it.

9. Kitty Griffin – Ms. Griffin stated that the more the voters know the last minute stuff would be coming out; the better they could ignore it. Voters need to know what their votes will and will not achieve. She feels as if we are kidding ourselves if we think this will make a big difference.
10. Bonnie Silveria – Ms. Silveria discussed when John Silva was a City Council candidate. At that time, candidates had to stop on the Sunday before the election. This would not level the playing field, but she believes that if the message is clear that Benicia wants a different kind campaign it will happen.

Council Member Whitney asked Ms. Langford if the City should sunset the code and resolution. Ms. Langford stated it should not be sunsetted, but regularly reviewed.

Council Member Whitney stated he would like this reviewed every two years or so.

Public Comment:

1. Rosemary Moore – Ms. Moore stated that having an ordinance reviewed every so often would work, just to make sure it is working. Then, the review times could go further once the kinks are worked out.
2. David Ernst – Mr. Ernst stated that he felt there was a lack of leadership after the last election. There was no condemnation about what took place during the last election.

Ms. Langford stated that she and Mr. Churchwell would take all today's comments into consideration and spend hours trying to incorporate them into a new code. She believed there was a misunderstanding that when she was saying 'she and Steve' she was referring to the Mayor. When in fact, she was referring to Mr. Steve Churchwell.

3. Citizen – The citizen stated that a code like this would not be effective for what took place during the last election. This would be inadequate.
4. John Van Landschoot – Mr. Van Landschoot asked that this not be on the 12/5 agenda. They need more time to fix it. He would like it brought back some time in January. He would like to see the reworked product on the City's website.

Mayor Messina stated that there would be ample time for the public to have input and time to look at it. Ms. Langford stated that public input is what will make this a better code. Mayor Messina stated that written comments should be submitted to the City Attorney, and would be forwarded to Ms. Langford and Mr. Churchwell.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that the new election season starts January 1st. It would be helpful to have this in place by then.

Voluntary Expenditure Limits - Page IV-A-3:

Mr. Churchwell discussed the history of voluntary campaign expenditure limits. Spending limits in campaigns have to be voluntary. You cannot limit them. It costs a lot to campaign. This adjusts for that by having it at \$1 per citizen. As the population grows, this would grow with that. The State changes it per the CPI. The City should consider how often it wants to adjust the cost per voter. He suggested doing it every odd numbered

year. He discussed how candidates would commit to comply. He read the statement on page IV-A-4 – we may want to be more specific on what the declaration/statement that is filed with the clerk says. He suggested having a grace period. Candidates may change their minds on how much they will spend. If there is a wealthy candidate, they may want to spend more. There should be a way to lift the limits. It is pretty rare that people exceed the limit, but it does happen. A lot of communities incentivize the limit. You could use a ‘carrot’ saying that if they accept the limits, we will put a statement by the name on the ballot saying you agreed to the voluntary expenditure limits. The State allows candidates to purchase space stating what they have done.

Mayor Messina stated that he was interested in the public’s feelings on a dollar amount that candidates should spend on campaigns.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that he wanted to hear about that too. Regarding the declaration, it needs to be refined. Having a grace period, initially, is a good idea. He wanted to verify if legally, there could be limits placed on candidate’s personal expenditures. If you are not aware of that, you can’t limit a wealthy candidate from spending personal funds. He thought \$1/citizen was reasonable – it is half of what he spent on his election. He went back to 1992 records and monies that were spent. Even though there were ups and downs on moneys spent, the trend is up. In 2003, \$78,000 was spent on the Council candidates’ elections. In 2001, it was \$58,000 that was spent. The dollar limit has to be reasonable. Regarding limiting time spent on fundraising that depends on the candidate, what their support is, etc. He did not spend a lot of time on fundraising. Regarding the \$1 – it allows room for growth. With cost going up, it allows more room. He thought it would be a good start. Allowing for future increases – the future increases would not start for 5 years. Then, the increase could be looked at.

Council Member Hughes stated that he agreed with most of what Vice Mayor Schwartzman said. He is not sure if he agrees with the \$1/citizen. It seems somewhat arbitrary. He heard that ‘money always wins the election.’ That is not true. 40% of the time, the person that spent the most was not elected. He is fine with coming up with some reasonable limits. He did not spend a lot of time fundraising. He sent letters out twice. Most of his time was spent walking the precincts.

Public Comment:

1. Mary McGill – Ms. McGill stated that the time limit kicked off something for her. Wal Mart put \$49,000 into Antioch’s election. We have Valero and Wal Mart biting at our heels. She tends to think that \$.075 would be better for a cost/voter.
2. Citizen – The citizen stated that he would like to have more meetings. This was not enough time. The limit should be achievable. If it does not apply to independent expenditures, it won’t work. We have to find a model that takes into account the disproportion of the large corporations. Council Member Hughes stated that we have to be careful with that, as we might see more independent expenditures.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that it was the spending limit that drives this. It would take out those large contributions from corporations. Mr. Churchwell stated that the City couldn't mandate expenditures.

Public Comment:

1. David Lockwood – Mr. Lockwood stated that regarding the spending limits, it should be based on the number of registered voters. He thinks the limit should be higher than what is being discussed. What is at stake is our taxes, civility within the community. He thinks \$1/voter is way too low. It should be \$5-\$10/voter.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that if it were \$1/registered voter, it would not be reasonable. He would be open to Mr. Lockwood's suggestion, but the registered voter count will lapse/wane.

2. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox stated that no one is talking about mandating anything. She is suggesting that the City 'request' that people comply. Mr. Churchwell stated that this has never been done. It's a good idea, but there is no way for the City to enforce or draft that. The independent groups do not register with the City. Ms. Fox suggested publishing the actual request and the names of the independent groups that have agreed to the voluntary limits in the local newspaper. Mayor Messina stated that this could not be regulated. The independent groups do not have the rules.
3. Sabina Yates – Ms. Yates stated that Council Members Hughes Schwartzman stated they did not do any fundraising. She wondered if the donations made to their campaigns were known to them personally, and was the limit over \$100 for any of the checks. Mayor Messina stated that would be the next item.
4. Bob Craft – Mr. Craft stated that he perceives a desire for incremental improvement. We are not going to solve this all today. If we look at it as being improved on an incremental basis, it would be better. While he dislikes the idea of outside corporations donating large amounts of money – however, if the information assists his decision – he may need to look at that. We have to be careful about that kind of regulation. He suggested \$1/voter (with the notion of incremental improvement) is fine.
5. John Woods – Mr. Woods stated that spending limits is commonly referred to as candidate protection plan. He feels that the economics of it will control this. It does not cost him anything for others to run. However, if he runs, it will cost him. How much does he need to raise? That should be his decision – how much to raise/spend. People should be able to spend what they want.
6. Kitty Griffin – Ms. Griffin stated that the people who are pushing for the ordinance are not thinking that way. A lot of people don't watch channel 27 – she was interested in what 'reasonable' is. What is reasonable for a person to be able to raise. A person, who has friends with money, will have more money donated. They don't really have to raise money, it is already there. The other candidates will have to work harder to raise money. What do you spend your money on? How many mailers did Vice Mayor Schwartzman send out? He did three mailers. He spent money on campaign consultant and a website – things he may not have

done if there was an expenditure limit. The cost varies between consultants and goes up every year.

7. Jon Van Landschoot – Mr. Van Landschoot stated that he would like to see a limit that encourages candidates to get out and go to neighborhoods to talk to citizens. If we want to preserve the small town feel, they have to get out there and walk the precincts. He suggested \$1/voter who voted last election.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that there were 8000 households in town. You cannot reach all homes door to door. The three mailers are probably needed. Each mailer is about \$5,000. It does not take a lot to get to the range that he is suggesting.

Council Member Hughes stated that he did not know what he was getting into when he started. He tried to get to all the households, but it was not possible. He did not have the name recognition that the incumbents had. He had to do more to get his name out there. He put out 3 or 4 mailers. The signs are very expensive. It costs a lot more than he ever imagined.

Public Comment:

1. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox wanted to discuss the myth that campaign expenditure limits were incumbent protection plans. Over time, more of the challengers are winning. This is because it is usually the challengers that have a harder time getting donations. If you have no ceiling, the incumbents will get way more contributions than the challengers. If there were a limit, it would level the playing field. Regarding what is reasonable in our small town, we do not need the campaign tactics that the big cities do. We have our little newspaper that can be used, public access TV station where televised forums could be held; there could be recurring notices in the papers regarding the forums, etc. There are many free ways to get information out. We don't need to spend megabucks for consultants. The mailers could be on plain paper, not high glossy paper. She would be happy to go back to the \$.050/population so the limit is around \$14,000.

Council Member Whitney stated that from his perspective, his number one goal is to have fair elections. Fair does not always equate to the same chance. He has been in three elections; he lost one and won two. He personally knocked on 3000 doors. It is a back breaker. The reality is that you don't make a decision in a vacuum. Be very careful for what you wish for. He cautioned that if you start setting limits (he will go with what everyone wants), it is not about the money the current council member raised, we are barking at the moon. The reality is that if you start really limiting this, you will create campaign organizations that start running the elections. You want free and open elections.

Public Comment:

1. David Ernst – Mr. Ernst suggested publicly funded elections. Why don't we be a model to the rest of the state?

Council Member Whitney stated that was something the people needed to discuss. He is open to any of the ideas. Just be careful about making decisions in a vacuum.

2. David Lockwood – Mr. Lockwood stated that a regular coke at McDonalds costs \$1.49 – we are talking about limiting the cost to \$1? If our campaigns are not worth the cost of a coke, we are in trouble. He thinks all of this brings us down to a point that whatever we do is blowing into the wind. Regarding the ethics, there may be some things that could be done. Regarding expenditure limits, we are dead in the water and we are doing a disservice to the candidates. Disclosure is another issue. His benchmark of \$1.49 is ridiculous.
3. Citizen – The citizen stated that Rosie Switzer spent less than \$2,500 on her School Board election. There is something about people such as Vice Mayor Schwartzman wanting to be seen as a quality candidate. Just make the limit number simple. The whole thing it comes down to is the independent donations, which we cannot control. She suggested \$20,000 limit for candidates. She is in retail – she wants signage, etc. to look nice and professional.
4. Bonnie Silveria – Ms. Silveria stated that seven or eight years ago, you could run for \$7,000-\$8,000. You can't do that any more. You do need a website these days. It has to be fair. Someone should not be kept from running because of cost. When the issue of walking was discussed, some people cannot walk, should they not run? She suggested \$1/resident.
5. T.J. Firpo – Mr. Firpo stated that the big issue is fair elections. On the control of independent expenditures, they have said that the State has the right. Humboldt passed Measure T – stating local corporations could not donate to local elections. They have not had any elections since that was adopted. Mr. Churchwell discussed state law on this issue.

Mayor Messina talked about the City of Humboldt's local laws. Mr. Churchwell stated that there were a lot of local laws that are unconstitutional.

Ms. Langford stated that sometimes the State Bar would maintain a position that is unconstitutional. They know the client may not have the money to challenge it.

Public Comment:

1. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox stated that the Humboldt County people would probably disagree that what they did was blatantly unconstitutional. In our last election, more than 40% of the money spent was by independent groups that were not based in our area. Other jurisdictions have laws based on corporations that are based outside their district. We need to expand these ordinances to include the independent groups and the out of district independent groups. It should be limited to no more than 25%.
2. Kitty Griffin – Ms. Griffin stated that she would guess that the majority of Benicia citizens would not want Valero or the Garbage Company influencing the elections. If the City passed an ordinance on this, it would be all over the newspapers. It would work against them.

3. Bob Craft – Mr. Craft stated that he wants to improve these things, but wants to be realistic. He does not want to put a law into place that is likely to be struck down in court.

Council Member Hughes stated that you could limit the contributions from out of district companies, but they will come back around stronger on the independent expenditures. You might see more money coming in the other side.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that in California, you can't have public financing. Mr. Churchwell stated that it is very convoluted. It takes a big mechanism to have it. They are finding out there is a lot to it in Arizona and Maine.

Ms. Langford wondered if there was a way to get part of the provisions that have been proposed. Mr. Churchwell stated that what has been proposed, as of today is a good start. He thinks it is a good first step. You have to walk before you can run.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman asked if it would be fair to say that money was for candidates. What we are doing here is much more reasonable than trying to put together public financing.

Council Member Whitney stated that he is interested in fair elections; no whining, no complaining, etc. The City is trying to determine what a fair election is. What is reasonable? State legislature was trying to create it at \$7,500 total. The burning question is 'what is reasonable.' Sometimes the fix can be more painful than the initial problem.

Clean Money Contributions and Reporting IV-A-8:

Mayor Messina stated that a lot of this ties into FPPC protocol. How does the City tie this into the changes that occur at the State level? Mr. Churchwell stated it was an age-old problem. It usually includes a state law reference. Ms. McLaughlin stated she supported that.

Council Member Hughes stated that the proposed ordinance is already being followed. It was taken from the FPPC's information.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman asked what this ordinance does over and above the State. Mr. Churchwell stated that essentially, it is recodifying state law. The provisions all already apply to the City of Benicia. You could have more than the state provisions, but not less.

Public Comment:

1. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox asked what the point was if it already does what state law does. If it were proposed to prevent what happened at the last election, it would need to be stronger. This meeting was supposed to go until 10:00 a.m. A lot of people have already left. Some people did not even know about it. She requested the workshop be continued and posted/advertised better, etc. Mayor Messina stated that the Herald has a circulation of 3,000-4,000, however not everyone reads it. The City had the room reserved until noon. There would be no problem

- continuing the meeting. Ms. Langford discussed the issue of calling it ‘clean money’. Mr. Churchwell stated that was up to the City as to what to call it.
2. John Woods – Mr. Woods stated that an unsophisticated individual would not get all the information he/she needs from the ordinance. They need to know that the final say is, the FPPC’s publication is the final say.
 3. T.J. Firpo – Mr. Firpo stated that ‘clean money’ has been adopted statewide as public financing.
 4. David Lockwood – Mr. Lockwood stated that in other law within the state, corporations are referred to as individuals. Is that so in this? Mr. Churchwell stated that an individual is not a corporation. It would be worth changing that to a ‘person.’ (Terminology). Mr. Lockwood asked if PAC’s and 527’s are considered ‘individuals’. Mr. Churchwell stated that it depended. 527’s report to the IRS.
 5. Jon Van Landschoot – Mr. Van Landschoot does not like the name ‘clean money ordinance’. It is deceptive.
 6. Norma Fox – Ms. Fox stated that the reality is that in this town, we are talking about one or two corporations. Mr. Churchwell stated that if you limit contributions to a PAC, the corporations that don’t have to raise money, you give them an enormous advantage. Those laws regulate contributions. He would not do that. We can’t have a ban on corporate contributions. In California, you can just write a check if you are a corporation. State law preempts you. Ms. Fox asked if we could prohibit interference in the jurisdictional elections from corporations outside our jurisdiction. Mayor Messina stated that doing something we know is illegal is counter to the purpose of what we are doing. Council took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and the State of California.
 7. T.J. Firpo – Mr. Firpo discussed Prop 89.
 8. David Ernst – Mr. Ernst stated that since the time of the scheduled meeting had passed, are we violating the Sunshine Ordinance? Ms. McLaughlin stated that the Sunshine Ordinance did not say meetings could not exceed the meeting time.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that if we are going to make the change, it has to go at the State level. He suggested that instead of ‘clean money contributions’ change it to ‘campaign contributions’. We should move forward on moving forward and getting this going.

Council Member Hughes thanked everyone for being here. He thought there were some great suggestions. The objectives are to promote the principles of (in proposed ordinance). We are now counting on Steve and Carol to bundle this up and come up with some suggestions.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Messina adjourned the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

Lisa Wolfe, City Clerk