

**SAUGUS CHARTER COMMISSION**  
**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**OCTOBER 9, 2008**

The thirty-eighth meeting of the Saugus Charter Commission was held on Thursday, October 9, 2008. The meeting was held in the Town Hall Auditorium. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Peter Manoogian, at 7:30 P.M.

***Completion of STEP 4: SELECT THE BEST POSSIBLE SOLUTION(S)***

**ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Seven members of the nine member committee were present at roll call: Karen Cote, Eugene Decareau, Karla J. de Steuben, Joan Fowler, Peter Manoogian, Sr., Debra Panetta and Thomas Stewart.

Cam Cicolini and Albert W. Diotte, Jr. had informed the Chairman that they would not be in attendance.

**READING OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING (October 2, 2008)**

Minutes were distributed to all Commission Members for review before the next meeting.

**ACCEPTANCE OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (September 25, 2008)**

Ms. de Steuben made a motion to accept the Minutes of September 25, 2008 as amended. The Chairman seconded the motion.

The motion passed **7-0**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None at this time.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The Chairman noted the Commission's progress, stating that the list of Areas of Apparent Consensus has grown from 11 to 17 items, and restated the list as follows:

1. A professional administrator with the title of Manager
2. A screening committee to be used in the process of hiring a manager
3. Having policy reside in the hand of elected officials
4. An auditing function within the structure of town government
5. Auditing and enhanced financial oversight of the School Department
6. 25 to 35 member legislative body
7. Keeping quantity of 10 precincts
8. A mixture of at large and precinct specific representatives
9. Appointments to policy making boards would be by elected officials
10. Staggered terms
11. Provision for ethics or conflict of interest
12. The proposal or initiation of a master / comprehensive plan should reside with elected official / officials.

13. An initiative process
14. Continue with a referendum process
15. Retain recall in the Charter lowering the percentage to 15% for town wide elections in 25 days, and for precinct specific offices, 20% of registered voters in that precinct.
16. Barring an elected official from obtaining a town position after their term has ended, or after they resign, for an amount of time to be determined.
17. Having a conflict of interest provision for the legislative body

Ms. Panetta suggested changing item #16 to include “during their term”

The Chairman noted that Mr. Decareau will not be with the Commission in the month of November, and that Ms. Panetta had agreed to act as Treasurer in his absence.

Mr. Decareau made a motion to officially appoint Debra Panetta as Assistant Treasurer, and for her to serve as Assistant Treasurer in his absence.

The Chairman seconded the motion.

The motion passed **7-0**

#### **TREASURER’S REPORT**

The Treasurer, Eugene Decareau, made a motion for the Commission to accept the current balance of \$26,774.08

The Chairman seconded the Motion.

The Motion Passed **7-0**

#### **COMMITTEE REPORT**

None at this time.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

None at this time.

#### **NEW BUSINESS (order to be determined by members)**

- **Input from Mr. Curran**

Mr. Curran noted that he did send some Material to the Commission Members following last week’s discussion.

The Chairman noted three documents:

- Planning in the Newton Home Rule Charter
- Free Petition and Initiative
- Finance and Fiscal Procedures

#### **Planning in the Newton Home Rule Charter**

Referring to the first document, Mr. Manoogian stated that in Newton the Mayor, the elected executive, makes the proposal for a comprehensive plan to the Board of

Aldermen who, then, seek advice from the Planning Department. Upon receipt of that advice, the Board of Aldermen will take action.

Mr. Manoogian stated that he likes the idea that a single elected individual, that has accountability to the electorate, can campaign on a platform of what the community would look like, and put forth that idea to a legislative body, in this case, the Board of Aldermen. It does address the matter of the role of the Planning Board, because under Chapter 40, in a town form of government, they are responsible for doing the master plan, although the Commission Members could say otherwise if they desire. He went on to say that it goes back to the question of what the town's executive will look like, but regardless, it is appealing to him, as one Member, the idea of having somebody be the moving party on the appearance of the community; housing, zoning, infrastructure, etc.

Mr. Curran stated that another interesting point is that it requires the legislative branch, in this case the Board of Aldermen, to adopt the master plan. It's not just the executive proposes and the legislative disposes. All of their actions involving zoning ordinances are supposed to make reference to the master plan, as stated in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph C of section 7-3. He went on to say that it is an interesting concept to require the town meeting, if that is what the Commission stays with to, officially take into consideration, the master plan, when acting on zoning proposals or any other land use, because, effectively they are amending the master plan by their actions.

The Chairman read from Section 7-3, Paragraph C, "Upon adopting any such ordinance, the Board of Aldermen shall make findings and report on the relationship between the ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan." Mr. Manoogian then stated that obviously it would be a written finding, something recorded in the minutes as a matter of record. He then asked, if there was an aggrieved party to a zoning action, if that particular language could be cited in a court proceeding.

Mr. Curran replied, yes, but he didn't think it has promoted any extensive litigation in Newton, but could find out.

The Chairman said that he wasn't suggesting that it has promoted litigation, but if it's ignored, would it enhance litigation.

Mr. Curran responded that it's a requirement. It's a step that has to be taken, and if it isn't, any court would certainly take that into account.

Mr. Decareau asked if there should be a time limit, because even though it says it has to be done, it doesn't mention if that means 30 days, 60 days, 90 days or a year.

Mr. Curran responded that the Zoning Law, Chapter 40A, has time periods set out in it as to when action has to be taken on zoning matters.

The Chairman noted that certain procedural elements, particularly in the initiative process that the Commission will be getting to, where partitions would have to be taken up, and if citizens propose zoning changes, then there would be a time requirement. Mr. Manoogian continued that, on the concept of a comprehensive plan, however, it would appear that they are silent as to when the Mayor has to make that proposal. In Newton that Mayor is accountable to the voters, and if he / she neglects to do it, accountability questions would be raised by the Aldermen or citizens. Also, if the Aldermen refused to act on a proposal, the mayor would point that out as well. He went on to state that he is not suggesting that Saugus have a mayor, but what is

attractive, to him, is the idea of having one person being accountable for making the proposal or “pitch.”

Mr. Curran explained that even back 40 years ago, when this charter was written, they had a Planning Department in Newton, and the Mayor appointed the City Planner. The Mayor is not preparing the plan his / herself. It is the City Planner who actually creates the plan, subject to the Mayor who appointed him / her.

Mr. Stewart, addressing the issue of how long the Mayor, in Newton, gets to present the Comprehensive Plan, stated that he reads the silence on a time limit as saying that, perhaps, the Comprehensive Plan does not change as frequently as the Mayor’s post. An incoming mayor that was in agreement with the current comprehensive plan being followed, would not propose a new plan, but would let modifications happen as they come. He stated that he like the silence.

The Chairman asked Mr. Stewart if he could envision an issue coming up in an election year, for example, if Newton wanted to ride the biotech wave that is coming to Massachusetts, and someone campaigned on how to bring that about to enhance the comprehensive plan, or if it is already in there, how to support it. Mr. Manoogian said that he thinks it opens up the type of public conversation that is so vitally important. He also noted that Saugus, at this time, does not have a comprehensive plan, or any hope for one in the near future.

The Chairman went on to state that he feel the Members are pretty much in unison that it’s a problem that needs to be dealt with as much as financial accountability; the accountability of the town’s land and how to use it.

Ms. de Steuben, seeking clarification on the language, stated that, as she understands it, the Mayor gets to propose the Comprehensive Plan, or modification to the existing plan. Then it states that the Board of Aldermen may thereafter from time to time modify the Comprehensive Plan. She asked if, before the Aldermen modified the plan, would they have to submit that modification to the Planning Board.

The Chairman read section 7-2, B, “Adoption – Upon receipt from the Mayor of a proposed Comprehensive Plan or a proposed modification of the existing plan, the Board of Aldermen shall refer such proposal to the Planning and Development Board, which shall within a time specified by the Board of Aldermen, report its recommendations thereon. After receipt of the recommendations of the Planning and Development Board, the Board of Aldermen shall hold a public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan or the proposed modification thereof and shall by resolution adopt the same with or without amendment. The Board of Aldermen may thereafter from time to time modify the Comprehensive Plan.”

Mr. Manoogian then stated that Ms. de Steuben was referring to the last sentence “The Board of Aldermen may thereafter from time to time modify the Comprehensive Plan.”

A discussion followed considering the necessity of that sentence, and the confusion that it seemed to be causing. Mr. Curran noted that he, himself, didn’t understand the implications of that same sentence. The Members agreed to delete it from the paragraph.

Mr. Decareau expressed his concern that Saugus, as a community, does not have a plan, and thinks that something has to be put into the charter that, upon acceptance of said Charter, a plan must be established and voted on with 18 months or 2 years. He

realizes that it will take time to hire a planner and get the work done, and he knows it's not something that can be done in 30 days.

Mr. Curran stated that is something that could be done in the transitional provision, but with today's economy, it might not be a good idea. There have been at times in the past when money was available for towns to do components of the master planning, grants, etc., but doesn't feel that there is going to be any available for awhile.

The Chairman noted that this is an important discussion, because it speaks to the larger issue of accountability and who's going to be responsible for this. He said that he could envision, for example, a selectman running for office and saying that the town needs a master plan, and if elected will make sure the town manager does it. Then you get into the whole accountability factor if the town manager says they don't have the resources to do it. The message of the Comprehensive Plan becomes distant and vague during an election cycle, and doesn't seem like it would have any type of mandate on the selectman being elected. Therefore, it can be conveniently put aside for whatever the transient cause is at the moment. Mr. Manoogian continued that, if you have an individual that's elected that's responsible, and this was on their plate, if they receive a mandate based on that issue, then certainly those resources would become available because it would now be a budget priority, because that is what the voters said they wanted. Mr. Manoogian said that this language is good, but you can get diluted in the process of what the executive branch ends up looking like, or how it's constituted. Mr. Manoogian stated that he likes the language so far, but it would probably be more effective with a singular moving party on it.

Ms. Cote asked, seeing as the Members have not yet decided what the legislative or executive branches are going to look like, what singular party Mr. Manoogian is referring to, someone in the legislative or executive branch.

The Chairman responded that it would be the executive, noting that Mr. Stewart proposed a mayor, Mr. Decareau and others have proposed five selectmen and would be comfortable with it residing in those five, Ms. de Steuben was looking at an elected council leader, and some have talked about a separately elected chairman of the board of selectmen, there was also a proposal for a singularly elected steering committee chairman. He continued that there are a number of proposals where that could fit, and the question is, whether it is a singular executive role or a multiple executive role.

Ms. Cote stated that the town does need a comprehensive plan, and this language could be modified, but she agrees with Mr. Decareau, that there has to be some sort of time line to initiate that first comprehensive plan. She went on to say that, although it is going to cost money, she thinks they need to set a goal. If it is going to be in the Charter, she doesn't want to see it sitting on the books and never getting done. It needs to be acted on in a timely manner, otherwise it will never get done.

Mr. Curran responded that the longest journey starts with a single step, and there are many steps involved in a comprehensive plan, as the Members saw, in the list that was in Statute 81D that he had sent. There are parts of it that are more important than others, for example, the development along Route 1, so one thing that could be tackled first is a master plan for the development of Route 1, designing the zoning

and so forth, and that's one element of the master plan. Somebody has to make a decision as to what's the most important thing.

A discussion followed as to the pros / cons of a timeline, with Ms. de Steuben stating that she doesn't think a timeline is necessary and could be problematic because there are too many unknowns for the Members right now, as to getting a comprehensive plan put together. Ms. Cote stated that she doesn't want to see it sit on the books for 20 years and nothing get done. Ms. de Steuben suggested a provision for an annual report on the status of the comprehensive plan, and if nothing has been done, the reason / reasons would have to be included in the report.

After further discussion, the Members agreed to add #18 to the Areas of Apparent Consensus as follows: A comprehensive plan would be proposed by an elected executive, (individual or multiple member body), and would be adopted by a legislative branch after recommendation of the planning board is obtained. There would be an annual report on the status of the comprehensive plan. There would be transitional provisions in the charter.

### **8-5 Free Petition – (a) Individual Petition, (b) Group Petition**

Mr. Curran stated that sometimes it is easier to look at other actual town charters to see how it works. This one is from Winthrop and is a town council form of government, but could be adapted.

The section on Individual Petitions (8-5a) states, "The town council shall receive all petitions which are addressed to it and signed by a voter and may, in its discretion, take such action with regard to each petition as it deems necessary and appropriate." He went on to explain that people will take notice of whether the council seriously considers voter petitions or not.

Mr. Curran went on to read the section on Group Petitions (8-5b): "The town council shall hold a public hearing and act by taking a vote on the merits of every petition which is addressed to it and which is signed by at least fifty voters." (in this case) "The hearing shall be held by the town council, or by a committee or subcommittee thereof. The town council shall vote on the merits of the petition not later than three months after the petition is filed with the town clerk."

He went on to explain that the next paragraph says that they may hold hearings on two or more petitions at the same time, and must give notice to the petitioners and public that they are going to hold a public hearing.

A discussion followed on Section 8-5 (a) and (b). Mr. Manoogian noted that in (a) there is no requirement that the single voter has the right to be heard by that legislative body, would like public participation (citizen's forum) linked to the petition. Ms. Cote noted that, with the single petition, the council is not required to take any action, and believes there should be some type of time limit for a response stating when and if they are going to act. Ms. de Steuben referred to the last sentence in (b): "No hearing shall be required to be held upon any one subject more than once in any given twelve month period notwithstanding the filing of additional petitions during such period." Also referring to (b), Mr. Decareau stated that he liked the 50 required signatures, stating that on an important issue, 50 signatures is not a lot, and also, he / she would need that kind of support when going before a council. The Chairman stated his concern that some people may object to 50 signatures, because

under the current Charter, they can get an article into the Annual Town Meeting with only 10 signatures. He also stated that he didn't want to make accessibility more difficult for the voter, as accessibility is one of the Members' criteria. Ms. de Steuben asked for clarification of the phrase "on the merits of every petition," and Mr. Curran explained that the council has to vote on it, and not dispose of it by passing it on to someone else. Ms. de Steuben noted the difference between that and the current Town Meeting. Still referring to (b), Mr. Manoogian noted that there is nothing that prevents that council from amending the petition, or referring it to another party. Ms. Panetta stated that, with the ability to amend, it becomes more of a discussion, or working session, which is more than can be done in the current Town Meeting.

After discussion, the Chairman stated that he felt a comfort level amongst the Members with 8-5 (b), Group Petition. He suggested changing 8-5 (a), from a petition being signed by a single voter, to a petition signed by 10 voters, and requiring that the petitioner has the right to be heard, without a formal public hearing. It would have the familiarity of the current Town Meeting, and assure formal access to the legislative body. There would still be a requirement for citizen's forum, or the right for a citizen to be heard at a public meeting.

After continued discussion the Chairman outlined the three access points for citizens to access a decision: Citizen's Forum, Individual Petition, Group Petition.

The Members agreed that Citizen's Forum should be added to the Areas of Apparent Consensus. However, when the Chairman asked if that should be for all elected boards, there was some disagreement amongst the Members. There was discussion of problems that have arisen in the past during the time of contract negotiations, when public meetings became heated and out of control, and the public forum was abused. There was also discussion of a citizen's First Amendment Right to speak on any topic during a public forum, and the legal obligation of Committee Members not to respond to anything regarding the contract negotiations. The statute that prevents anybody from disrupting a public meeting was discussed, as well as the possibility of having public forum, except during the time of negotiation.

A recess was called at 9:10 P.M.  
The meeting resumed at 9:19 P.M.

The Members decided to table the issue of Citizen's Forum.

Discussion resumed on Section 8-5 (a), Individual Petitions

The Members agreed to add it , as #19, to the list of Areas of Apparent Consensus as Follows: The right of Individual Petition that can take place with either 1 or 10 signatures (See Section 8-5 (a) of the October 6<sup>th</sup> Discussion Draft submitted by Mr. Curran)

Discussion proceeded on Section 8-5 (b) Group Petitions.

The Chairman recapped this section, Action Required, a petition signed by at least 50 voters, and there must be an action within three months from the time the petition is filed with the town clerk. He went on to explain that the public would be notified, there would be a notice in the newspaper. Mr. Manoogian asked Mr. Curran if the petitioners could be asked for the advertising.

Mr. Curran responded, no, not the way that this is drafted. It specifically states that notice by publication shall be at public expense.

Mr. Manoogian then asked if the entire petition had to be published in the newspaper, or if there could be a reference to it, stating that it's in the town clerk's office. He cited as an example, if someone wanted to revise the Town's Harbor and Waterways Commission, the Town's longest by-law, it would cost thousands of dollars to advertise in the newspaper, and said that he wouldn't want to see the treasury drained by huge legal ads.

Ms. de Steuben noted the trend for towns to start including in charters and by-laws that things are published on their websites, and suggested putting in something that states that it would be available at the clerk's office and on the website as well.

The Chairman questioned whether or not there would be "websites" twenty years from now, and asked what the correct language would be, suggesting perhaps, "electronic means." With technology moving so fast, the provision could be antiquated in no time, but agreed that there should be a way to promote the "non-paper" communication of information.

Mr. Manoogian asked Mr. Curran if you could use language like "public access."

Mr. Curran cited an example of the language that could be used, referring to page three of the Finance and Fiscal Procedures document: "Copies of the warrant and report to voters shall be placed on file and be available for distribution to the public at the office of the board of selectmen, at the office of the planning board, and at the office of the town clerk in the Town Hall, at the school administration building, at the police station, at fire station #2, at the highway or public works department, at the research desk at the Swansea Public Library, and on the town web site (if any), not later than the seventh (7<sup>th</sup>) day.."

The Members agreed to add, as #20 on the list of Areas of Apparent Consensus, Group Petitions – Action Required as follows: There will be a group petition process with 50 signatures, and an action required not later than 90 days.

The Chairman asked Mr. Curran, when he finally drafts the charter, how he will make sure that times are consistent, whether it be months, days, holidays, etc.

Mr. Curran stated that he will read aloud, the provisions of the draft that the Members are going to adopt, line by line. The Members will be able to stop him at any time to ask questions, change language, etc.

## **8-6 Citizen Initiative Measures**

The Chairman recapped the section, signed by at least 50 voters, the process of referring it to the town attorney for consideration, and there must be an action on it by the legislature, and even if they amend it, it can be considered to be a rejection, and the committee of petitioners would have the right to bring it forward for a ballot



question. He asked the Members if they had an opportunity to look at it in detail, stating that it is definitely more specific than what the town currently has. He asked Mr. Curran how he felt about this language.

Mr. Curran responded that it is true initiative, with certain safeguards built into it. If the citizen committee that is the original sponsor feels that the legislative body has done the right thing by either adopting a different measure, or by rejecting the measure, then that is the end of it. They can't go forward. However, if the committee feels that the proposal they made was not given sufficient consideration by the legislative body, then they can get an additional number of signatures and take their original matter to the voters for a final determination.

Mr. Manoogian referred to Page 3, lines 73 and 74, "The passage of a measure which is in lieu of an initiative measure shall be deemed to be a rejection of the initiative measure," stating that it's possible that the petitioners are satisfied with the "in lieu of."

Mr. Curran referred to lines 83-85, "but only by persons constituting the original petitioners' committee." He went on to explain that the first 10 of the 50 people signing the petition constitute the petitioners' committee. They are the ones that make the decision whether or not there will be a supplementary petition.

The Members discussed the percentage of voters required to sign the petition and supplemental petition and in Sections 8-6 (c) and (e), 5% of the registered voters, and then an additional 5% for the supplemental petition. They considered changing the percentage for the supplemental petition to 10%.

Mr. Curran stated that the Members didn't have to be concerned with the numbers at this point, but the concept.

The Members agreed to add Citizen's Initiative as item #21 to the list of Areas of Apparent Consensus as follows: Include citizen initiative measures, (as outlined in "Section 8-6: Citizen Initiative Measures" of the October 6th Discussion Draft submitted by Mr. Curran), but may want to go back and address the percentages.

### **Finance and Fiscal Procedures**

The Chairman suggested using the last few minutes of the meeting to begin discussion on the third document that Mr. Curran had provided.

Mr. Manoogian noted that there were some things in the document that the Members had already discussed, including an upfront process where the school department would be involved with the budget.

Ms. de Steuben noted the last sentence in Section 6-2, "The report shall provide the basis for the preliminary spending guidelines of the town for the ensuing fiscal year."

Mr. Curran explained that this particular model was for a town form of government, where it would be the manager's responsibility to come up with the fiscal projections. He referred to Section 6-6: The Budget, "The budget shall provide a complete financial plan of all town funds and activities for the ensuing fiscal year and, except as required by law or this charter, shall be in such form as the town manager deems desirable or the advisory and finance committee may require for effective management and an understanding of the relationship between the budget

and the town's strategic goals." He noted that this is where it shows that some executive authority set the goals and objectives that the manager submits.

Discussion followed as to when public hearings should take place, and other opportunities for public input

The Chairman asked Mr. Curran to provide, for the next meeting, a chronology that lists the date and event of the budget process. Mr. Manoogian went on to state that there are some very good pieces in the document; goals, long term goals, income expenditure, etc., it's just a matter of seeing the sequence of times.

Mr. Decareau referred to the third paragraph of Section 6-2: Financial Projections, "Revenue and expenditure projections should be clearly stated and their basis explained, along with any policies related to the use, retention or accumulation of any reserves. The report shall provide the basis for the preliminary spending guidelines of the town for the ensuing fiscal year." Mr. Decareau stated that he liked the fact that it even mentions the reserves.

Mr. Manoogian noted that there was nothing on quarterly budget reports, to which Mr. Curran responded that he will send some information on the matter.

The question was also raised about a provision to transfer money, throughout the fiscal year, a subset or subcommittee of the legislative body, could perform a limited amount of transfers within the budget.

The Members agreed that Article 6 as submitted on October 6<sup>th</sup>, will be the workable framework for Finance and Fiscal Procedures. The Members are waiting to hear back from Mr. Curran on a timeline of budget events, language related to public input process, and language related to quarterly reporting to the elected body that establishes the budget. (As item #22 on the list of Areas of Apparent Consensus.)

- **Change of meeting location for October 30<sup>th</sup>**

The location of the October 30, 2008 meeting has been changed to the School Committee Room in the Roby Building.

#### **MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS / MOTIONS**

None at this time.

#### **PUBLIC FORUM**

None at this time.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Decareau moved to adjourn at 10:19 P.M.

The Chairman seconded the motion.

The motion passed **7-0**

**APPROVED ON** \_\_\_\_\_

**SUBMITTED BY** \_\_\_\_\_

## **Areas of Apparent Consensus**

1. **A professional administrator with the title of Manager**
2. **A screening committee to be used in the process of hiring a manager**
3. **Having policy reside in the hand of elected officials**
4. **An auditing function within the structure of town government**
5. **Auditing and enhanced financial oversight of the School Department**
6. **25 to 35 member legislative body**
7. **Keeping quantity of 10 precincts**
8. **A mixture of at large and precinct specific representatives**
9. **Appointments to policy making boards would be by elected officials**
10. **Staggered terms**
11. **Provision for ethics or conflict of interest**
12. **The proposal or initiation of a master / comprehensive plan should reside with elected official / officials.**
13. **An initiative process**
14. **Continue with a referendum process**
15. **Retain recall in the Charter lowering the percentage to 15% for town wide elections in 25 days, and for precinct specific offices, 20% of registered voters in that precinct.**
16. **Barring an elected official from obtaining a town position during his / her term, after their term has ended, or after they resign, for an amount of time to be determined.**
17. **Having a conflict of interest provision for the legislative body**
18. **A comprehensive plan would be proposed by an elected executive, (individual or multiple member body), and would be adopted by a legislative branch after recommendation of the planning board is obtained. There would be an annual report on the status of the comprehensive plan. There would be transitional provisions in the charter.**
19. **The right of Individual Petition that can take place with either 1 or 10 signatures (See Section 8-5 (a) of the October 6th Discussion Draft submitted by Mr. Curran)**

20. **There will be a group petition process with 50 signatures, and an action required not later than 90 days.**
21. **Include citizen initiative measures**, (as outlined in “Section 8-6: Citizen Initiative Measures” of the October 6th Discussion Draft submitted by Mr. Curran), **but may want to revisit the percentages.**
22. **Article 6 as submitted on October 6th, will be the workable framework for Finance and Fiscal Procedures.** (The Members are waiting to hear back from Mr. Curran on a timeline of budget events, language related to public input process, and language related to quarterly reporting to the elected body that establishes the budget.)