

*Oct 14 2021 1:13 pm*

Legislative Affairs Meeting Minutes

October 12, 2021

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:05pm.

Present were Legislative Committee members Councilors Walsh (Chair), Schultz, Van Hazinga, and Zarrella. Councilor Couture was absent.

Present also were Councilor Beauchemin and Auditor Brooks.

**Public Comment:**

Councilor Beauchemin explained that he could not support petition

**Agenda:**

165-21. Councilors Marcus DiNatale, Marisa Fleming, and Bernard Shultz, to amend City Council rule 3.5 by removing “by unanimous consent” and inserting in its place “by simple majority vote of the City Council which shall be recorded by roll call”.

169-21 Councilors Anthony Zarrella and Bernard Schultz, to amend the City Council Rules as outlined in the enclosed Petition.

**Petition 165-21**

*Rule 3.5*

*After a motion is made and put by the Chair, it shall be deemed to be in the possession of the Council or committee and shall be disposed of by vote; provided however, that it may be withdrawn by its maker at any time prior to the commencement of voting or amendment.*

*Any member may make a motion to withdraw the pending motion notwithstanding the objection of its maker. Such subsidiary motion for withdrawal requires a second, is nondebatable, requires a two-thirds vote by Ayes and Nays, and is in order at any time that no other member is speaking.*

*The conforming amendment to Rule 3.6 was also proposed:*

*Rule 3.6*

*When a question is under debate, the Chair shall receive no motion, except*

*To adjourn,*

*To lay on the table,*

*For the previous question,*

*To withdraw the pending motion pursuant to Rule 3.5,*

*To commit or refer,*

*To postpone,*

*To amend,*

*which several motions shall have precedence in the above order.*

The motion to amend the original petition was unanimous, 4-0; the vote to approve 165-21, as amended, was approved 4-0.

***Petition 169-21 (see attached petition)***

Councilors Walsh and Van Hazinga agreed that the petition, as presented, limited discussion that could be informative to the Council and to the community, that it would be unwieldy to enforce, and that the limit of one question per councilor would result in a limiting and stilted discussion.

Councilors Zarrella and Schultz proposed the following amendment to 169-21:

**Rule 3.19**

No member shall be recognized more than twice on a single agenda item or main motion during a meeting of the full City Council.

Nothing in this rule or any other rule limiting speaking opportunities shall prevent a member from having at least one opportunity to speak on any debatable motion, provided recognition to the floor would otherwise be in order.

**Rule 3.20**

A member who has been recognized to the floor and who speaks solely to ask a bona fide, non-rhetorical question shall not be deemed to have expended one of that member's opportunities to speak pursuant to Rule 3.19. This shall apply whether or not the member has asked previous questions under this provision, and shall allow for such questions even if the member has otherwise exhausted that member's speaking opportunities. If, however, the speech includes rhetoric, framing, opinion, or editorial comment alongside the question, it shall be deemed a speaking opportunity.

**Rule 3.21**

A member shall not, in a single speech, repeat or reiterate points, other than in passing or in brief summation, nor shall subsequent speech on the same matter or a related matter make more than a passing reference to points already made on a previous occasion during the same meeting.

The motion to amend was approved 4-0; the motion to approve 169-21, as amended, was approved 4-0.

Motion was made to adjourn was approved 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:44pm.