



# City of Gahanna

200 S. Hamilton Road  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

## Meeting Minutes

### Charter Review

*Ethan Barnhardt, Chair*  
*Carrin Wester, Vice Chair*  
*Jamie Belisle*  
*Edward A. Hill, Jr.*  
*Richard Maxwell*  
*Raymond J. Mularski*  
*Karen Reynolds*

*Jeremy A. VanMeter, Clerk of Council*

---

Thursday, April 23, 2026

6:30 PM

Council Chambers, City Hall

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER: Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call.**

*Chair Ethan Barnhardt called the regular meeting of the Gahanna Charter Review Commission to order on April 23, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. and led members in the Pledge of Allegiance. The agenda was published on April 17, 2026.*

**Present** 5 - Ethan Barnhardt, Jamie Belisle, Edward A. Hill Jr., Raymond J. Mularski, and Carrin Wester

**Absent** 2 - Richard Maxwell, and Karen Reynolds

**B. ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA.**

None.

**C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.**

[2026-0076](#)

Charter Review Commission Minutes 2026-04-09

**A motion was made by Hill, seconded by Belisle, that the Minutes be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 5 - Barnhardt, Belisle, Hill, Mularski and Wester

**Absent:** 2 - Maxwell and Reynolds

**D. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

None.

**E. NEW BUSINESS.**

**Proposal Inventory Review and Deliberation**

[2026-0050](#)

## Draft Charter Amendment Proposals for Charter Review Commission 2026

Chair Barnhardt introduced the next agenda item, Proposal Inventory Review. He explained that the Commission had largely completed the formal engagement phase and would transition into deliberations. He stated that he had circulated an updated proposal log and deliberations memorandum on April 17 to guide the discussion. Chair Barnhardt reported that the Commission had received 27 proposals, which had been consolidated into 14 draft ballot measures organized by charter article and subject matter. He explained that the Commission would now deliberate on these draft ballot measures rather than individual proposals due to Ohio law requiring each ballot issue to address a single subject and use plain language.

Chair Barnhardt presented a recommended refinement to the Commission's process architecture. He explained that the previous distinction between structural and housekeeping items had been helpful during proposal intake but that applying a single scoring matrix to all draft ballot measures would provide a clearer and more consistent analytical approach moving forward. He invited discussion and indicated that adopting this refinement would require a motion.

Vice Chair Wester asked for clarification on the proposed change. Chair Barnhardt explained that, instead of separating items into categories with different evaluation methods, the Commission would apply a uniform scoring matrix to all measures after determining which items met initial thresholds. He stated that this approach would provide a quantitative basis to prioritize proposals and guide decisions on which measures to advance for drafting.

Commissioner Mularski asked whether the Commission would discuss all items or exclude lower-ranked ones. Chair Barnhardt responded that the Commission would discuss all items. He outlined a two-step threshold process: first, the Commission would determine whether each item constituted a charter-level issue; second, the Commission would identify items requiring additional education or information before scoring. He explained that items passing both thresholds would proceed to scoring and further deliberation.

Commissioner Belisle asked whether the goal was to complete the scoring matrix by the next meeting. Chair Barnhardt responded that this was the optimistic goal.

Chair Barnhardt stated that, due to the absence of two commissioners, he did not recommend that the Commission begin voting during the meeting. He suggested that the Commission could begin discussions and allow members to score items individually, with the understanding that missing commissioners could provide their scores at the next meeting. He emphasized that the Commission should reserve voting until it completed deliberations and had full participation.

Commissioner Belisle asked when the Commission would obtain additional education for items requiring further information. Chair Barnhardt responded that the Commission could identify such items during the meeting and work to secure speakers or subject matter experts for a future meeting. He noted that the Commission could also schedule special meetings if necessary to accommodate additional discussion and education.

Vice Chair Wester expressed agreement and emphasized the importance of allowing absent commissioners the opportunity to participate in discussions at a public meeting, despite their prior written comments.

Commissioner Belisle suggested the Commission table the vote on the proposed matrix change until after the evening's discussion and to revisit the scoring approach at the next meeting. Chair Barnhardt agreed with the proposal and expressed flexibility regarding adjustments to the process. Commissioner Hill clarified that the Commission's decision involved two components: whether to adopt the revised scoring process and how to proceed with prioritization afterward. Commissioner Belisle reiterated her recommendation to wait to proceed on voting on the matrix, due to member absences.

Vice Chair Wester anticipated that the Commission would likely need to schedule a special meeting and preferred to complete more work earlier in May rather than later. Commissioner Hill agreed.

Chair Barnhardt stated that he supported scheduling at least one special

meeting in early May to continue deliberations, particularly given the reduced attendance at the current meeting. He asked whether staff could coordinate availability for such a meeting. Clerk VanMeter responded that staff would review calendars and confirm availability of commissioners, the Law Department, the Clerk, and meeting space. Chair Barnhardt suggested considering a special meeting as early as the following week or, at minimum, during the week of May 11. He then asked about the required public notice period for scheduling a meeting. Commissioners discussed scheduling constraints and noted that a second special meeting would likely occur after the already scheduled May 7 meeting. Commissioners clarified that potential additional meeting dates included April 30 and May 14, while also remaining open to alternative days beyond Thursdays. Chair Barnhardt agreed to explore availability and determine what worked best for the group. Chair Barnhardt returned to the pending motion to postpone the vote on the matrix proposal.

**A motion was made by Belisle, seconded by Wester, to postpone amendment of the Charter Review Commission's adopted Process Architecture until the next meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 5 - Barnhardt, Belisle, Hill, Mularski and Wester

**Absent:** 2 - Maxwell and Reynolds

Chair Barnhardt proceeded to the next phase of deliberations and introduced the first guiding question: whether any of the 14 draft ballot measures addressed matters that did not belong in the City Charter. He explained that the Charter should establish structure, authority, and processes, rather than administrative or procedural matters better suited for ordinances or policies.

Vice Chair Wester initiated discussion regarding proposals labeled CRC 013 through 016, which addressed real estate transactions and development agreements. She stated that these items appeared to reflect existing administrative practices and did not require inclusion in the Charter. Several commissioners agreed with her assessment.

Chair Barnhardt noted that these proposals reflected best practices more appropriate for council rules or administrative procedures.

**A motion was made by Wester, seconded by Hill, to remove items CRC 013, 014, 015, and 016 from Charter Review consideration. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 5 - Barnhardt, Belisle, Hill, Mularski and Wester

**Absent:** 2 - Maxwell and Reynolds

Commissioner Belisle then raised proposal CRC 019, which suggested defining excused absences for the Planning Commission. She stated that such a definition fell outside the Charter's scope and should remain within the authority of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hill suggested expanding the discussion to include proposals 017 through 020, noting that they involved procedural matters similar in nature.

Commissioner Belisle asked whether proposal number 18 addressed a situation in which the Planning Commission lacked flexibility due to automatic removal provisions in the Charter. She noted that, while these matters were typically handled within the Planning Commission, the Charter's current language limited their ability to make such decisions.

Chair Barnhardt explained that the Charter currently prescribed a fixed number of allowable absences, which restricted flexibility and would require a Charter amendment to change. He asked the City Attorney to confirm this interpretation.

City Attorney Tamilarasan confirmed that the Charter set a specific number of absences that could trigger automatic removal, regardless of whether absences were excused. She explained that the provision did not allow commissions to distinguish between excused and unexcused absences and recommended that the Commission consider revising Section 11.02 to allow greater flexibility, potentially by delegating rulemaking authority to the commission itself.

Chair Barnhardt added that the administration had suggested draft language that would delegate decision-making authority to the Planning Commission regarding attendance rules.

Vice Chair Wester expressed a preference for less prescriptive Charter language and stated that overly specific provisions could improperly control administrative processes. She suggested that the Charter should instead defer to the Planning Commission's rules of procedure. Other commissioners agreed with this perspective.

Chair Barnhardt summarized that the issue appeared to be appropriate for Charter consideration but required careful drafting rather than removal. He stated that the Commission should not strike the item at that stage but instead evaluate it through prioritization.

Commissioner Belisle stated that proposal number 019 should still be removed because it focused on defining excused absences, which would impose unnecessary restrictions.

**A motion was made by Belisle, seconded by Wester, to remove item CRC 019 from Charter Review consideration. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 5 - Barnhardt, Belisle, Hill, Mularski and Wester

**Absent:** 2 - Maxwell and Reynolds

Chair Barnhardt asked whether any additional items should be identified as not belonging in the Charter.

Before proceeding, Commissioner Hill asked for clarification that, if the remaining related items advanced, the Commission would develop or request revised language to address them. Chair Barnhardt confirmed that any advancement would focus on appropriate Charter-level language for those areas.

Chair Barnhardt asked whether there were any additional draft ballot measures that did not belong at the Charter level.

Vice Chair Wester raised concerns regarding proposal CRC 025, which addressed ward composition. She stated that restructuring wards constituted a significant issue and expressed concern that the Commission, as a limited deliberative body, might lack sufficient input to make such a decision. She indicated that the proposal warranted broader consideration and additional perspectives. Chair Barnhardt asked whether the concern related to whether the proposal was Charter-level or whether it required additional education before evaluation. Wester stated that the issue could fall under either category but emphasized concern that the Commission alone should not determine such a significant change. She questioned the data supporting the proposal and noted inconsistencies between population data, which is based on census estimates, and voter registration data, which is updated more frequently. She also questioned what problem the proposal sought to address, noting that residents already had access to

multiple representatives regardless of ward boundaries.

Commissioner Mularski explained that ward structures aimed to balance the number of voters rather than the number of residents. He stated that equalizing residents rather than voters could create unequal voting influence among wards.

Commissioner Belisle expressed a differing view and stated that, based on research and personal perspective, population-based representation aligned with language used in other legal contexts. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that all residents, including nonvoters, received equitable consideration under the Charter. She stated that the issue related to inclusivity and dignity within the community and supported further consideration of the proposal.

Commissioner Hill agreed and appreciated the intent of the proposal. He raised the question of whether the Charter is a guiding document or a specific document, adding that the proposal including non-voters in ward calculations was one that fit into a guiding document.

Chair Barnhardt appreciated the sentiment of the proposal. However, he felt it lacked sufficient information about how ward boundaries would change if the proposal were adopted. He indicated that he could not support advancing the proposal without understanding its practical impact and whether the City could model potential changes.

City Attorney Tamarasan advised that the Commission should first determine whether the proposal qualified as a Charter-level issue and then consider whether additional education was necessary. She suggested that the Board of Elections or other sources be contacted to obtain relevant information.

Chair Barnhardt stated that he preferred to avoid unintended consequences and supported gathering additional information before deciding. He indicated that he did not support striking the proposal at that time and favored retaining it for further consideration pending additional research.

Vice Chair Wester reiterated concerns about the proposal, stating that representation already existed through a majority of council members

regardless of ward. She expressed concern that shifting to a population-based system could create disparities in campaign dynamics and representation, particularly in areas with transient populations or differing voter registration rates. She emphasized that such changes could significantly affect elections and representation.

Commissioner Belisle stated she supported obtaining additional education regarding the potential impacts of changes to ward composition. She added that, if analysis showed minimal impact, she would still favor a more inclusive approach in principle but wanted further information before deciding.

Chair Barnhardt agreed and noted that the Commission had reached a general consensus to seek additional education on the matter. He directed that the item be placed on hold for further review at a future meeting. Chair Barnhardt then invited discussion of additional items that might require further education.

Commissioner Belisle stated that she did not necessarily require additional education but encouraged members of the public to provide input, data, or opinions regarding a potential change in the city's form of government from a mayoral system to a city manager system. She indicated that, without additional information, she would not support advancing the proposal.

Commissioner Mularski noted that the Commission had not received significant public support for such a change.

Vice Chair Wester discussed the lack of clarity regarding the problem that a change in government structure would address.

Commissioner Hill characterized the proposal as a major undertaking and noted that it had not been clearly presented as a Charter amendment during the engagement process. He expressed willingness to receive educational information but not to pursue the change without stronger justification.

Chair Barnhardt stated that he interpreted prior comments from Councilmember Padova as a request for education rather than an endorsement of the change itself. He supported providing additional

education on the topic, including inviting subject matter experts, but expressed significant hesitation about advancing such a major change within the Commission's limited timeframe. Barnhardt emphasized that the Commission's charge required it to submit recommendations to City Council by July 1 and stated that changing the form of government within that timeframe would be difficult to accomplish responsibly. He also noted the longstanding nature of the current form of government and expressed concern about making such a significant change without sufficient analysis. Barnhardt asked whether the Commission agreed to pursue additional education on the topic before further deliberation.

Commissioner Mularski noted that potential changes to the form of government could have broader implications, including impacts on Council terms, ward structures, and voting dynamics. He emphasized the need to consider these interconnected effects when evaluating such a proposal.

Chair Barnhardt stated that, if the issue required more extensive evaluation than the Commission could provide, City Council could convene a separate group to study the matter further, as had been done in the past. He suggested that the Commission could pursue additional education by inviting a speaker to a future meeting and indicated he would attempt to arrange for someone to attend the next meeting so that more commissioners could participate in the discussion. Commissioners expressed interest in hearing multiple perspectives.

Vice Chair Wester stated that she did not oppose further discussion but distinguished between understanding the differences between forms of government and identifying a specific problem within the city that such a change would address. She emphasized that determining the underlying issue remained the more important question.

Commissioner Belisle agreed and suggested that, rather than actively seeking additional presenters, the Commission could remain open to receiving further input if it emerged. She stated that previous presentations had already provided sufficient background information.

Chair Barnhardt asked how the Commission wished to proceed and suggested continuing to table the item for further discussion at the next meeting, allowing the full Commission to participate. He noted that one

absent commissioner had commented on the issue and expressed a desire to ensure all members had the opportunity to contribute. Commissioners agreed to keep the item tabled and revisit it at the next meeting.

The Commission then moved to identify additional items requiring further education. Vice Chair Wester referenced prior correspondence with the City Attorney and raised a question regarding proposal CRC number 010, which addressed special meeting requests under Section 4.11. She questioned whether the Charter language should specify all parties authorized to request special meetings, including the City Attorney, or whether doing so could create issues of exclusion if certain parties were not listed. City Attorney Tamilarasan explained that the current Charter allowed Council to establish rules governing special meetings and, in the absence of such rules, specified that the Clerk of Council must call a meeting upon written request from the Mayor, the President of Council, or any three council members. She noted that the Commission could consider revising the language to clarify or expand who may request special meetings or defer entirely to Council rules. Wester asked whether the Commission could recommend revising the Charter language to leave the authority to call special meetings entirely to Council's rules of procedure. City Attorney Tamilarasan explained that the Charter already allowed for that approach but also included default provisions in the absence of such rules. She stated that the Commission could either remove the default language and defer entirely to Council rules or retain the list and add the City Attorney as an authorized party to request special meetings. Wester expressed concern about overly specific Charter language and noted that excessive detail could limit flexibility in future circumstances. She acknowledged the importance of allowing the City Attorney to request special meetings but questioned whether simplification or specificity would be preferable.

Chair Barnhardt stated that he had sufficient information to retain the item for prioritization and scoring. Chair Barnhardt then referenced a prior question raised by Vice Chair Wester regarding Section 4.10 and the location of meetings. Vice Chair Wester explained that differing interpretations existed regarding whether committee meetings must be held in Council Chambers under the Charter's current language. City Attorney Tamilarasan clarified that the Charter required only regular and special meetings to be held in Council Chambers, while Committee of

the Whole meetings could be held elsewhere if properly noticed and accessible. Vice Chair Wester asked whether the language should be clarified, noting that some believed the Charter restricted committee meeting locations. Barnhardt asked what legally distinguished a Committee of the Whole meeting from a Regular City Council meeting. City Attorney Tamilarasan explained that committee meetings were governed by Council rules rather than the Charter and typically involved discussion rather than formal legislative action. She added that official actions must occur during regular or special meetings, while committees served specific purposes and could include standing or ad hoc groups. City Attorney Tamilarasan explained that committees created by Council operated under rules or motions established by the President of Council and were not bound by Charter requirements governing the location of regular or special meetings. She stated that committee meetings could occur in different locations, but substantive action would need to occur during a properly noticed regular or special meeting. Commissioners discussed whether committee meetings could take substantive action and agreed that, under current practice, any such action would require designation as a regular or special meeting. City Attorney Tamilarasan confirmed that, in Gahanna's practice, committee meetings had not taken substantive action unless they were also noticed as a regular or special meeting. Commissioners then discussed the possibility of holding offsite meetings, such as retreats. City Attorney Tamilarasan stated that offsite committee meetings could occur as long as no substantive action was taken. She further explained that public comment was currently limited to regular and special meetings and was not permitted at committee meetings unless invited.

Commissioner Mularski asked whether the limitation on public comment at committee meetings derived from Council rules. City Attorney Tamilarasan confirmed that it did and noted that Council could amend its rules if desired. Commissioner Belisle expressed concern that expanding public comment to committee meetings could create unintended consequences. Chair Barnhardt asked the City Attorney to follow up on the issue and confirm whether any Charter changes were necessary.

Vice Chair Wester then raised another item regarding Section 4.10 and proposal CRC 009, which suggested allowing flexibility in the date of the organizational meeting. She expressed concern about potential

unforeseen circumstances, particularly in years when newly elected officials might not yet be sworn in, and asked whether a delay in the organizational meeting could create issues for governance. City Attorney Tamilarasan responded that officials were not required to be sworn in during the organizational meeting and could take the oath in a private setting at any time, allowing them to assume office immediately. She further explained that the sitting City Attorney remained in office until a successor was sworn in, ensuring no gap in legal representation, though this provision did not apply to the Mayor or Councilmembers. City Attorney Tamilarasan clarified that the Charter provided that the Mayor's successor assumes office on January 2 and serves until a successor is elected and qualified, meaning sworn in. She explained that this language ensured continuity, as the sitting Mayor would remain in office until the successor took the oath, even if there were a delay.

Chair Barnhardt noted that the Charter's requirement for assuming office on January 2 could create tension if the organizational meeting date were moved later, raising concerns about a potential gap in executive authority during a crisis. City Attorney Tamilarasan acknowledged that such a scenario could occur, and commissioners expressed concern about the risk of a lapse in leadership if a newly elected Mayor had not yet been sworn in.

The Commission then discussed proposal CRC 005 regarding modernization of public notice requirements. Commissioner Hill questioned whether the Charter needed to be amended, noting that current language did not prohibit digital notices and that the City already provided notices online in practice. Commissioners discussed whether maintaining a physical notice requirement remained important and whether modernization should occur through Charter language or through ordinance or administrative rules. City Attorney Tamilarasan explained that the current Charter required notice to be posted in a conspicuous place within a municipal building but did not require online posting. She stated that modernization could involve explicitly requiring digital notice in addition to, or instead of, physical posting, depending on the Commission's policy preference.

Chair Barnhardt questioned whether formalizing a practice already widely implemented represented an effective use of ballot space. City Attorney Tamilarasan responded that the Commission was not limited by

a fixed number of ballot items and could include as many measures as it deemed appropriate.

Vice Chair Wester stated that, while increasing public engagement remained important, the Commission should consider whether adding detailed notice requirements to the Charter would meaningfully improve participation. She expressed concern that including too many specific requirements could make ballot language difficult for residents to understand and reduce the effectiveness of communication efforts.

Chair Barnhardt cautioned against overly prescriptive Charter language, noting that specifying particular methods of communication could limit flexibility as technology evolves. He emphasized that future methods of public communication could change, and the Charter should not restrict those possibilities. Chair Barnhardt asked whether there were additional items requiring further education.

Vice Chair Wester raised proposal CRC 024 regarding the non-discrimination clause and requested additional information. She stated that she wanted to better understand current administrative practices, legal considerations, and best practices for public employers, particularly regarding alignment between Charter language and existing policies. Wester expressed concern about potential unintended consequences from modifying the language and requested input from the administration on appropriate wording and whether the Charter should mirror existing equal employment opportunity policies.

Commissioner Belisle sought clarification on the request, asking whether the goal was to determine best practices for aligning city documents or to define the Charter's role relative to federal legal requirements. Vice Chair Wester confirmed that she sought guidance on best practices, including whether the Charter should include more specific language or remain aligned with broader legal standards. City Attorney Tamilarasan explained that legal protections operate at multiple levels, including federal, state, and local, and that the city could expand protections beyond those minimum requirements. She stated that existing city codes already included broader protected categories and that it remained within the Commission's authority to determine whether to expand the Charter's language accordingly. She added that the Commission was not considering removing the non-discrimination provision but rather

determining which categories should be included in the Charter. Commissioner Belisle added that the Commission could recommend placing such an expansion on the ballot and allow the electorate to decide, noting that doing so would not negatively affect existing protections. She further explained that, even if voters rejected the proposed Charter amendment, existing City policies and codes would remain in effect and would not become inconsistent with the Charter. She clarified that inconsistency would arise only if the Charter explicitly permitted conduct that City policies prohibited, not if it declined to expand protections.

Commissioner Mularski asked whether rejecting the amendment could create a conflict with existing equal employment opportunity policies. Commissioners and City Attorney Tamilarasan concurred that it would not, emphasizing that policies could continue to provide broader protections than the Charter. Commissioners discussed the relationship between Charter language and policy, noting that the Charter could include more specific protections but should not contradict existing policies.

Chair Barnhardt asked whether adding additional protected categories could create legal risk, particularly given the current political environment. City Attorney Tamilarasan responded that, while legal challenges could always be filed, adopting such language would not violate current state law. She explained that, if a future state law conflicted with Charter provisions, state law would control. She concluded that she did not identify any substantive legal risk in expanding the Charter's non-discrimination language at the present time.

Vice Chair Wester asked whether aligning the Charter's non-discrimination language with broader protections would represent best practice. City Attorney Tamilarasan stated that consistency across city documents would be best practice but emphasized that the decision remained a policy determination for the Commission and the electorate.

Chair Barnhardt asked for any additional items requiring further education.

Commissioner Belisle proposed additional discussion regarding residency requirements for the City Attorney position. She noted that the

role required specialized qualifications and that limiting the candidate pool through residency requirements could have unintended consequences. She requested further information on how other municipalities addressed this issue and suggested hearing from current city attorneys. Chair Barnhardt asked what form that additional education should take; Belisle clarified that she sought perspectives from legal professionals and comparative information from other jurisdictions.

Vice Chair Wester expressed openness to additional information but noted that residency requirements had been raised previously and would be revisited when all commissioners were present.

Commissioner Belisle offered to research practices in other municipalities.

Chair Barnhardt asked whether there were any additional items requiring clarification. Hearing none, he asked whether the Commission wished to continue deliberations or pause for the evening.

Vice Chair Wester summarized the Commission's progress, noting that members had removed certain items, identified others requiring additional information, and assigned follow-up tasks.

Chair Barnhardt suggested postponing further detailed discussion until the Commission determined how it would apply the prioritization matrix and noted the length of the meeting. He offered to update the list with the changes made during the meeting. Chair Barnhardt stated that the Commission would proceed with scheduling an additional meeting, pending availability, and anticipated holding a discussion at the next meeting regarding prioritization and adoption of the evaluation process. He noted that the Commission would likely revisit the form of government discussion and then proceed through remaining items individually.

City Attorney Tamilarasan informed the Commission that she would be absent from the May 7 meeting but available for possible special meetings on April 30 and May 14. She stated that Assistant City Attorney Matt Roth would attend in her place on May 7. She also offered to prepare a redlined version of Section 10 of the Charter addressing qualifications and responsibilities of the City Attorney as a formal recommendation for the Commission's consideration.

Commissioner Belisle asked how the Commission would handle additional proposals submitted after prioritization. Chair Barnhardt responded that the Commission had largely completed its engagement phase and that any new proposals would require group consideration before being added to the process. Commissioners discussed the importance of communicating that the Commission had moved beyond the proposal collection phase while still allowing public comment at meetings. They agreed that any new proposals introduced during public comment should be considered intentionally and likely require a vote to determine whether to include them.

**F. CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIONS.**

[2026-0061](#)

Charter Review Commission Correspondence Received via Clerk

Clerk VanMeter noted that Commissioners Maxwell and Reynolds had submitted written comments, which were included in the meeting materials.

**G. POLL MEMBERS FOR COMMENT.**

Commissioner Belisle appreciated the participation of members.

Commissioner Hill thanked fellow members for their engagement and commitment to serving the community.

Chair Barnhardt expressed appreciation for the Commission's work, noting the volume of material reviewed and the depth of discussion during the meeting. He commended commissioners for their engagement and thoughtful deliberation, emphasizing that the Commission's efforts reflected its commitment to serving the residents of Gahanna.

**H. ADJOURNMENT.**

*With no further business before the Commission, Chair Barnhardt adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.*

---

Jeremy A. VanMeter  
Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Charter Review, this  
day of 2026.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ethan Barnhardt**

DRAFT