Keri O'Brien

From: Carol Prahinski <prahinski@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 8, 2026 10:15 AM
To: City Clerk External E-Mail
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Resolution #25

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Keri,

I'm writing to you about resolution proposal #25-4896, Adopting amended Rules of Procedure for City Commission meetings, amending Section 5(a) Meeting Times and Dates.

I am a Professional Registered Parliamentarian, which is the highest credential by the National Association of Parliamentarians. I express concerns about the content of proposed resolution #25-4896, although I appreciate organized resolutions relating to meeting conduct. Here are some initial thoughts:

- Section 1b, An appeals process is needed if a commissioner doesn't agree with the Mayor's decision.
- Section 1c, Which version of Robert's Rules of Order? The current edition is called Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, 12th edition. It should be specified in the resolution.
- Section 4a, what if a citizen wants speak on more than one topic? The rule is written with the assumption that each speaker will focus on only one topic.
- Section 5, When the City Council shifted to two meetings, there was an understanding that the second meeting would enable the working population (e.g., 9-5 pm employees) to join the afternoon session. This resolution doesn't cater to those citizens at all.
- Section 6a, Agenda. The addition of items to the agenda within the five-day limit limits the ability of City Commissioners to investigate and research an item before voting.
- Section 6a, a unanimous vote sounds ok, but it isn't. If a member or two are absent (e.g., a quorum is still present), those individuals do not have a voice on whether the item should be added or not. It is a violation of parliamentary law: limiting the rights of the absent members.
- Section 6c, delete the last sentence, which nullifies the other portions of 6c. The commissioners need sufficient time to deliberate motions with credible information.
- Section 6d should be a provisio since once it's complete, this segment will no longer be necessary.

P.S. On a similar topic of hearing the voice of the citizens, the limit of 700 characters in the online submission is not sufficient for meaningful dialogue. Also, please provide online guidance for the address formatting so a person can submit online comments, e.g., spell out Florida and do not include a period after St (street).

Best wishes,
Carol Prahinski, PhD, DTM
Professional Registered Parliamentarian