

**KALAMA CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP – RULES OF PROCEDURES
JULY 2, 2020 @ 6PM**

Mayor Mike Reuter opened the City Council workshop at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was held in a virtual format via Zoom. All enter in a mute status and will be unmuted when either called on or can raise their hand, or send a note via chat to make comments. Please have video on for all Councilmembers and staff so that any hearing-impaired persons have the ability to read lips.

Councilmembers present were Jon Stanfill, Sandra Macias, Wendy Conradi, Steve Kallio, and Matthew Merz. City staff present were City Administrator Adam Smee, Clerk/Treasurer Coni McMaster, and Police Chief Ralph Herrera. City Attorney Sam Satterfield was also present. Members of the public present are listed on the sign-in sheet.

The workshop is to discuss and review the draft Rules of Procedure for the City Council.

City Attorney Sam Satterfield explained these are a draft to address conduct for meetings, placing items on the agenda, and general interaction among staff and council. The Social media policy was included, but could be done separately. The draft is based on the standard of Robert's Rules of Order which govern how meetings are ran across all industries and business. This is draft language and the Council is able to add, change or ask for additional examples to work up a final document the Council can adopt. Councilmember Jon Stanfill asked what the process would be for changes and the procedure for making those changes as during a workshop, it can't be voted on. Clerk/Treasurer Coni McMaster responded that the Council can make recommendations for changes which can then be included into a final draft which will come back to the Council to review for final approval.

Councilmember Stanfill addressed Rule 1 – Meetings Section H (3) which addressed when public comments would be made. It appeared the public comment would be before the Council discussion and experience is that it is reversed that Council discusses the issue before public comment. He also addressed Rule 7 – Communications Section D (3) to correct the wording of two to one regarding email exchanges. He had previously suggested that the social media section be separated but realized he has only a couple of questions for clarification. First, what is the distinction between personal and official accounts and how that can be blurred between the two for example how it pertains to promotion of a business or private issue on a personal account. Attorney Satterfield noted that yes there is a line and the official City site would be for city business and but the critical issue here is avoiding violating the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA). City sites need to be under the direction of the City and avoid creating a meeting by having multiple councilmembers respond on a site. Using a personal account and identifying as a city official or councilmember may make the posting subject to public record, but as long as it isn't multi councilmembers, then it wouldn't violate the OPMA. So advertising for a business on a personal account would not be an issue, but if three councilmembers were to comment on a personal account regarding an issue that is City business related, then it becomes a quorum of the Council discussing an City issue or a meeting which could violate the OPMA. So the things to want to be aware of are: Are you identifying yourself as a Councilmember – if so becomes a public record and if more than two Councilmembers are involved in a conversation/discussion of an issue that will be discussed by the Council it becomes a potential OPMA. Councilmembers are supposed to maintain a record of personal sites if they address city business on those sites. Councilmember Stanfill also asked about the political limitations in Rule 7 Communications E (3). You can post your personal opinion and support an

issue on your personal site as long as it clearly your opinion and not related to your position as a Councilmember. He suggested that for the agenda process, it might be nice to have items forwarded to committees or an agenda committee to vet the items.

Councilmember Sandra Macias noted that Jon had addressed most of her questions. She suggested that under Rule 2 – Conduct of meetings B – the description of behaviors be listed as bullet points for better clarification.

Councilmember Wendy Conradi addressed Rule 1 – Meetings B – noting we need to include the more modern ways of communication of meeting notices such as the website and Facebook. Under section H she noted there were some discrepancies in how the meetings are conducted including a reference to sign-in cards which we don't use. She noted under Rule 3 – Council Agenda preparation that perhaps the number of days prior to a meeting might be better than listing actual days, so if the meeting changes in the future, the rules would still be applied. Under Rule 7 – Communications A, she asked if the sharing of Council correspondence out on social media was an issue or would violate this rule. City Attorney Satterfield noted that if the item has already been released by the City then it is public and would not violate this section but the councilmembers should be aware that making comments on such a posting could become an issue if several councilmembers do so. A confidential email would be different and prior to posting anything it should be clear that no personal or private information is released.

Councilmember Steve Kallio addressed Rule 3 Council Agenda Preparation B Members of the public which says that the public can request an item be on the agenda, but that it can be denied. The section doesn't outline the criteria for a denial. Attorney Satterfield noted criteria could be added. Under section E addressing the removal of items from the agenda and that he felt it should be by majority vote. It was noted that this is applicable only to the "changes to the agenda" item on the agenda. This can be done as a majority rule. Under Rule 6 Motions and Voting a motion to table only requires a second and not a vote, and he believed that should be by a majority vote as well. He also agreed that the Social Media portion of the rules be removed to be a separate item rather than included in these rules as it is a more complex issue.

Councilmember Matthew Merz addressed Rule 1 Meetings sections H 2 and 4 – he would recommend increasing the time from 3 minutes to 5 minutes for public comments. Section H (8) he would like to have the majority of the Council requirement removed and have a Councilmember able to bring forth and read any item on the agenda. He requested that under Rule 2 Conduct of Meetings F be removed as it is not applicable to a Code city such as Kalama. Attorney Sam Satterfield noted that this is something the Council can adopt and he would research the appropriate RCW's to ensure this legal. These are intended for enforcement during council meetings and not for removal from office. Rule 3 Council Agenda preparation A – he proposed that the Mayor or any Councilmember be able to add any item to the agenda without submitting it to the Mayor, City Administrator or Clerk. Councilmember Merz asked if the requirement for a speaker to identify themselves was legally binding. Attorney Satterfield noted that this is for the purpose of the official record of the meeting for the minutes. Mayor Reuter asked if it could only be for a City of Kalama resident. Attorney Satterfield noted that it is better to have an address for varication. It was noted the concern is that if addresses are included, it could be a danger to the speaker if they identify themselves or a privacy issue. It was noted that the address is sometimes needed if the person wished to be contacted, if on the sign in sheet, the address doesn't have to be included in the minutes. He addressed Rule 7 2 (a) regarding the forwarding of email to an account which isn't noted. Clerk/Treasurer McMaster noted this is being worked on and will be included. Under the social media policy he recommended sections 2 and 3 be removed in their entirety so that anything can be

said on social media. He did have some concerns regarding the political section. Attorney Satterfield noted that Councilmembers are supposed to be neutral and not use their official capacity to endorse any candidate or position.

City Attorney Satterfield and Clerk/Treasurer McMaster would draft a new version of the rules to incorporate the changes and suggestions into a revised version to be brought back to the Council for review and finalize a version for final adoption.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 pm.

These minutes are not verbatim and a recording of the meeting may reviewed upon request.



Mayor Mike Reuter



Coni McMaster, Clerk/Treasurer.