

City of Gahanna Charter Review Commission

Commission Work Plan Framework

Statement of Intent

The Charter Review Commission is committed to conducting a transparent, inclusive, and data-informed review of the City Charter.

The following phased framework is adopted to guide the Commission's work through the submission of its final recommendations to the City Council.

Phase One

Organization and Education

Timeframe

February 2026

Purpose

Establish shared knowledge, procedural clarity, and a neutral foundation for the Commission's work.

Goals

- Organizational Meeting
- Election of Chair and Co-chair
- Set meeting calendar
- Commission Review of City Charter
- Our Gahanna Strategic Plan Update
- Local Government 101 Session
- Adoption of Prioritization Methodologies

Phase Two

Proposal Gathering

Timeframe

March – April 2026

Purpose

Ensure broad input from elected officials, administration, and the public before deliberation begins.

Goals

- Interview the Mayor and Administration
- Interview City Council
- Engage Boards and Commissions as Appropriate
- Consistent Public Engagement

Phase Three

Deliberation, Prioritization, and Public Feedback

Timeframe

April – May 2026

Purpose

Evaluate proposals using adopted methodologies and assess alignment with stakeholder and community input.

Goals

- Apply two-track classification to all proposals; evaluate Track One proposals using prioritization matrix and Track Two proposals using housekeeping criteria
- Conduct additional public engagements (survey and/or input sessions)
- Determine which proposals advance to drafting

Phase Four

Proposal and Report Development

Timeframe

May – June 2026

Purpose

Translate vetted concepts into clear, legally sound amendment language and formal recommendations.

Goals

- Draft proposed amendment language
- Conduct legal and technical review
- Develop final CRC Recommendation Report
- Prepare Council presentation materials

Phase Five

Submission and Council Consideration

Timeframe

July 2026

Purpose

Transparently transmit recommendations to Council and the public for final legislative and electoral consideration.

Goals

- Submit final CRC Recommendation Report
- Present recommendations to Council
- Facilitate Council consideration and resolution submission

City of Gahanna Charter Review Commission

Commission Amendment Prioritization Framework

Two-Track Evaluation Approach

The Commission recognizes that proposed Charter amendments may vary in scope and impact.

Accordingly, the Commission adopts a two-track evaluation approach to ensure both substantive and technical amendments are considered appropriately and efficiently.

Track One

Structural or Substantive Amendments

- Proposals that materially affect governance structure, authority, powers, elections, or public accountability shall be evaluated using the adopted Prioritization Matrix.
- The matrix is intended to guide structured deliberation and assess whether a proposal is appropriate and ready for ballot consideration.
- Advancement of any such proposal requires a motion and majority vote of the Commission.

Track Two

Housekeeping or Technical Amendments

- Proposals that are limited to clarification, modernization, correction of inconsistencies, or alignment with current law or practice, and that do not materially alter governance structure, authority, or policy, shall not require scoring under the Prioritization Matrix.
- A proposal may be advanced under this track if the Commission determines that it:
 - Improves clarity, consistency, or readability of the Charter;
 - Aligns the Charter with current law or established practice; and
 - Does not create a substantive change in governmental authority or structure.
 - Such proposals may be advanced to drafting by motion and majority vote of the Commission.
- If there is disagreement regarding classification, the Commission shall deliberate and determine the appropriate track by majority vote.
 - If classified as Track One, the proposal shall then be evaluated using the Prioritization Matrix before any vote on advancement.

City of Gahanna Charter Review Commission Prioritization Matrix

This scoring tool is advisory and intended to guide structured deliberation; advancement of any amendment requires a motion and majority vote of the Commission.

	Score (1-5)
<i>Governance Relevance</i>	
<i>Public Impact</i>	
<i>Governance Clarity & Effectiveness</i>	
<i>Legal / Risk Alignment</i>	
<i>Readiness for Ballot Consideration</i>	
Final Score:	out of 25

Score Interpretation Guide	
21-25	<i>Strong Candidate</i>
17-20	<i>Worth Serious Consideration</i>
13-16	<i>Requires Further Deliberation</i>
12 or Below	<i>Not Recommended at this Time</i>

Criteria Definitions	
<i>Governance Relevance</i>	<p>Does the proposal address a core Charter-level governance issue?</p> <p>High Score (5): Directly relates to governance structure or authority established in the Charter. Low Score (1): Relates primarily to policy, administration, or matters better suited for ordinance or practice.</p>
<i>Public Impact</i>	<p>Does this meaningfully impact residents or accountability?</p> <p>High Score (5): Meaningfully affects residents' rights, transparency, or accountability. Low Score (1): Has little to no effect on residents or public-facing governance.</p>
<i>Governance Clarity & Effectiveness</i>	<p>Does this improve clarity or effectiveness?</p> <p>High Score (5): Substantially improves clarity, eliminates ambiguity, or strengthens operational effectiveness. Low Score (1): Provides minimal or purely cosmetic improvement to clarity or function.</p>
<i>Legal / Risk Alignment</i>	<p>Is this legally necessary or risk-reducing?</p> <p>High Score (5): Corrects a legal conflict, compliance issue, or significant risk exposure. Low Score (1): Addresses no known legal concern or risk.</p>
<i>Readiness for Ballot Consideration</i>	<p>Is this understandable and realistically implementable?</p> <p>High Score (5): Is clearly defined, well-supported by evidence or stakeholder input, and can be responsibly presented to voters. Low Score (1): Is underdeveloped, lacks supporting information, or is not ready for voter consideration.</p>