



CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA

Work Session - Charter Review Initiative

This meeting will be held in-person and virtual.

**25 Crescent Road
Greenbelt, MD 20770**

OR

Virtual Participation

Zoom Webinar Attendees:

**Please submit your request in writing via email to questions@greenbeltmd.gov
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81023646838?pwd=gR8usCgey2MB73tGI4aUbcWmtjSht.1>**

Dial-in: 301 715 8592

Webinar ID: 810 2364 6838

Passcode: 232227

Wednesday, July 10, 2024

7:30 PM

Work Session Packet - Charter Review Initiative

Work Session - Charter Review Initiative

Suggested Action:

Agenda

- Introductions - 15 minutes (7:30 - 7:45 pm)
- Council Discussion - 60 minutes (7:45 - 8:45 pm)
- Questions and Answers - 15 minutes (8:45 - 9:00 pm)
- Other Items - 30 minutes (9:00 - 9:30 pm)
 - Informational Items

[City Charter Review Working Group v3.pdf](#)

City Council Work Session Agenda Item Report

Meeting Date: July 10, 2024

Submitted by: Shaniya Lashley-Mullen

Submitting Department: Administration

Item Type: Work Session Item

Agenda Section: Work Session Packet - Charter Review Initiative

Subject:

Work Session - Charter Review Initiative

Suggested Action:

Agenda

- Introductions - 15 minutes (7:30 - 7:45 pm)
- Council Discussion - 60 minutes (7:45 - 8:45 pm)
- Questions and Answers - 15 minutes (8:45 - 9:00 pm)
- Other Items - 30 minutes (9:00 - 9:30 pm)
 - Informational Items

Attachments:

[City Charter Review Working Group v3.pdf](#)

CITY OF GREENBELT, MARYLAND

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

25 CRESCENT ROAD, GREENBELT, MD. 20770



MEMORANDUM

To: Josué Salmerón
From: Tim George
RE: City Charter Review Working Group
Date: April 19, 2024

When we discussed this issue with Jason DeLoach, it was recommended that the City should approach the Charter rewrite from two perspectives. The first perspective would have the City Solicitor review the Charter through a legal lens, particularly focusing on any changes to state or federal law that impact the Charter. The second perspective is through an administrative/functional lens to assess if the Charter is up to date with current best practices and approaches. In doing research on Best Practices, I believe we should add a third review lens, that being a larger Community Review Commission of residents, businesses and Advisory Board members.

A lot has changed over the last 4-5 decades in terms of technology, social norms, and other practices/processes and we recognized the significant scope of the task. Because of the task before us, we should focus on the Charter first, and at the recommendation of the Employee Relations Board (ERB), focus on a review of Section 13 (Personnel) of the Code. The remaining sections of the Code will be addressed in a subsequent review phase. However, the process described below is for the Charter Review itself. The review and recommendations for updating Section 13 of the Code (a.k.a. COPAR) should be separate from this process and will be described in a subsequent memo.

Three-part Approach. The Charter Review/Update process should have a three-part approach: 1) legal review; 2) staff review; and, 3) Committee review and input. All three components would occur concurrently with the findings of the legal and staff review coming more quickly and informing the Commission review process. After the work and preliminary findings are complete, the Advisory Boards would be provided the opportunity to review and comment. Each component is described briefly below.

- 1) Legal Review. This first component will have the City Solicitor, or another outside legal counsel, review the Charter from a legal/compliance perspective. Their main function will be ensuring that the Charter document is in compliance with state and county laws that have been implemented since the Charter's initial drafting. The review should also ensure that any amendments or changes over the years are compliant.
- 2) Staff Review. Staff from all departments within the City, as well as a Council representative, will review the Charter from a City operational standpoint. Staff have a more intimate knowledge of City operations and will have the time/capacity for the deep dive review required. The larger Commission will have an important role in reviewing the Charter and the findings of Legal and Staff review.

A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

PHONE: (301) 474-8000 www.greenbeltmd.gov

- 3) Community/Board Review. A larger “commission” of community members and Advisory Board members (one from each board) should review the Charter from a community standpoint. This Commission will review the Charter itself as well as the the deep dive findings of the legal review and staff review. This three prong approach will ensure that we are reviewing the Charter holistically, seeing all perspectives and hearing all stakeholder voices. The Commission process will also include public meetings, focus groups and other public input.

Advisory Board Review. As with many of the City’s initiatives, the findings and recommendations of the Charter review process would be submitted to select Advisory Boards for their input. We would not be asking the Boards to do a full Charter review, but to review the preliminary findings and recommendations of the Commission. I thought of including Boards in the Commission itself, but that made the size of the Commission a bit unwieldy. Potential Advisory Boards to be included in the review are: APB, CRAB, Elections, Ethics, GreenACES, and PRAB.

The following group memberships are recommended. To keep the groups manageable, a Staff Review Team of eleven (11) is recommended and a Community Commission of to conduct the primary review with the understanding that there will be numerous opportunities for the full Council, residents and relevant Advisory Boards to play a role in the review and redrafting process through the Charter Review Commission.

Staff Review Team (11)

- City Manager
- Assistant City Manager
- Council members (3)
- Planning/Code
- Human Resources
- Finance
- Police
- CARES
- DEI Officer

Community Commission (15-20)

- Residents (3)
- Businesses (3)
- Staff (3)
- Council (3)
- Boards and Commissions (4)

I am happy to discuss/modify the approach laid out above.