



**BOARD OF ETHICS  
SPECIAL CALLED MEETING**

Steven A. Blaske, Chairman    Wade McGuffey, Vice-Chairman  
John Francis                     Janet Webb  
Wade McGuffey                 Wade Wright  
Taylor Harper                    Kevin Bahr

---

**MINUTES**

June 12, 2013

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**Chairman Blaske** – Good morning. This is a Special Called Meeting for the Board of Ethics for the City of Dunwoody. And before we call the roll we need to have the two new members, the alternates, sworn in. If Mayor Davis is available and would do that and then we can call the roll of everyone including the two new members.

*(Mayor Davis administered the oath of office to Kevin Bahr and Taylor Harper)*

**B. ROLL CALL**

**Chairman Blaske** – Thank you Mayor Davis. We'll call the roll. Mr. Wright?

*(Here)*

Mr. Taylor, I'm sorry, Mr. Harper?

*(Here)*

And Mr. Bahr.

*(Here)*

We do have a quorum today, despite the fact that Ms. Webb, who heard the initial hearing on this subject, the prior hearing on this subject, was not able to be here today and has notified us of that. But both of our newest members were present and so we do have a quorum to go forward.

**C. MINUTES**

**Chairman Blaske** – The first thing to do is to approve the minutes of that May 30<sup>th</sup> Board of Ethics Meeting and I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

**1. Approval of the May 30, 2013 Board of Ethics Meeting Minutes.**

**Board Member Wright** – So moved.

**Board Member Harper** – Second.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay. It's been moved and seconded. All in favor? All opposed?

*(The motion was voted and passed. For: 4; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 3.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – So the minutes are approved.

**D. ORGANIZATIONAL AND PROCEDURAL ITEMS**

**Chairman Blaske** – Are there any organizational or procedural items other than the swearing in this morning? Okay. Moving on.

**E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Chairman Blaske** – Unfinished business? Any unfinished business? Okay.

**F. NEW BUSINESS**

**Chairman Blaske** – Um. Okay. The new business is to deliberate and vote on the item, on the Ethics Complain, which was the subject of the May 30<sup>th</sup> meeting and for that purpose I would ask our hearing officer, Ms. Keaton, to come forward and give us her report.

**1. Deliberation and Vote on Count III of Stephen T. Chipka Ethics Complaint Against Dr. Adrian Bonser.**

**Hearing Officer Keaton** – Thank you. Let me give a quick update on where things stand. The hearing officer's report was written and submitted previously and I did want to make one disclosure to the Ethics Board that I was informed this morning that an ethics complaint was filed against me by Ms. Bonser. I don't believe that event changes in any way what is in this report and you are certainly well within your right to move forward with it. Any questions about that? I have not seen the complaint.

**Chairman Blaske** – As far as I know none of us has seen that.

**Hearing Officer Keaton** – That's fine. I'm more concerned that there might be a question about my impartiality as the Hearing Officer. Obviously, with an ethics complaint filed against me that will disqualify me from reviewing anything further with regard to the initial ethics complaint but another hearing officer will be appointed.

The narrow issue for this Ethics Board to focus on is to review the hearing officer's report and to make its own recommendation to the City Council. So the goal today is for you to have something to present as a recommendation to the City Council with regard to Count 3 of Mr. Chipka's ethics complaint. I believe each of you has a copy of the report, is that accurate? I'd quickly like to walk through the conclusions.

The conclusions begin on page 5. The narrow issue of count 3 of the complaint was addressing two emails between Ms. Bonser and Mr. Chipka. One dated July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 and the other in February of this year. The challenge to those emails was under two provisions of the Ethics Ordinance. The first dealing with subsection A and focusing on whether the email from Ms. Bonser, on either email, exemplified courtesy. The

second challenge of these two email was whether they were abusing or threatening in nature. At the hearing, the issue of whether the emails were timely was addressed and it is my conclusion that the July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 email was not timely and barred by the statute of limitations. The February 2013 email, however, was timely. Because it was timely it was properly before the Board for consideration and the next issue was whether that timely filed email was or was not threatening and abusive or lacked courtesy. It was my conclusion that the February 2013 email was not abusive or threatening in nature, however, the February 2013 email did not exemplify courtesy. As such, my conclusion was that the February 2013 email from Ms. Bonser to Mr. Chipka did violate the Ethics Ordinance.

I next evaluated the severity of the infraction in making the recommendations to you as to what corrective measure might be proper or appropriate; those begin on page 10. I made three recommendations. The first was a public reprimand of Ms. Bonser for failing to be courteous to a citizen on February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013. The second recommendation was a revocation of email privileges with the City of Dunwoody's email account and server. The third was the issuance of a strong letter of encouragement to Ms. Bonser to make a private written apology to the complainant for failing to be courteous to him on February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 with a pledge to act with courtesy, towards him specifically, in the future. Also in that issuance of a strong letter of encouragement was encouragement for her to attend the City of Dunwoody's Police Academy or other training opportunities with an eye towards learning effective communication techniques in adversarial or confrontational situations so that she may be better equipped to react productively to situations she perceives to be harassing or annoying from citizens.

In summation, we are looking at one email and whether it was courteous; and in light of the fact that I concluded it was not, what to do about it. Are there questions from the Board?

Thank you.

*(Council Member Bonser raised her hand.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – Councilwoman Bonser, I see that you are raising your hand. I'm not sure what it is that would be appropriate for you to do now.

*(Council Member Bonser responded, her response cannot be heard on the recording)*

**Chairman Blaske** – I think the hearing on that claim is over and I don't think it is appropriate, at this time, to discuss that.

*(Council Member Bonser replied, her response cannot be heard on the recording)*

**Chairman Blake** – Alright. Let me consult with the Board for a minute.

*(To the Board)*

That is a discussion that we had in the hearing room, but apparently she was not aware of it. Would it be fair for me to characterize how the issue of courtesy came into the deliberations? Does anybody have a problem with me explaining that?

**Board Member Bahr** – *(difficult to hear on recording)* Count 3 is the reason we are

here, which is referenced in sections a-k. I think the focus of the discussion of the hearing related to what Mr. Chipka alleged in his complaint: code sections a-k.

*(Council Member Bonser response from the audience. Her comments cannot be heard on the recording.)*

**Board Member Bahr** – Can you speak into the mike?

**Council Member Bonser** – Our ethics ordinance requires that you have to quote the specific – first of all you have to quote the specific part of the ethics ordinance that was broken, or that they are claiming was broken. And you have to provide the specific reason, your specific evidence, and his specific evidence was only the July 3<sup>rd</sup> email. He never said anything about the February 3<sup>rd</sup> email. He only brought that up because he thought that extended his statute of limitations for the July 3<sup>rd</sup> email but he never complained. This complaint was not, he did not present the February 3<sup>rd</sup> email as something he thought was discourteous. You have to go by the evidence he presented and the preponderance of the evidence is on him. This brief, has actually been filed with the City Clerk, it was filed two days ago, it's a Brief of Respondent and this will explain exactly what I am talking about. If I may present this, please. And also, because I was not made aware that this was part of his ethics complaint, the Board has not received the email that he sent to me that I responded to and I think that's absolutely important. Because the hearing officer claims that I was discourteous and did not respond to his concerns it is important for the Board to read the email he sent me. He did not share any concerns that I can see, it was all threats. The entire email was all threats. And I think that is absolutely important evidence to consider. I was just responding to the fact that he was attacking me and saying that he was working with state authorities to have my license taken away.

**Chairman Blaske** – I think that we did, in fact, see that email.

**Hearing Officer Keaton** – The email was attached to Mr. Chipka's complaint as an Exhibit.

**Council Member Bonser** – I don't think so because, as a matter of fact, he sends so many emails a day he'll start at 11pm and send another one at 11:30pm and then 1 o'clock and 3 o'clock in the morning so he might send 8 emails before I ever open up my email box so he could have presented any one of those to you. So I would like to present the one that I know, for a fact, was the one I responded to. To make sure you have the right one.

This is a completely separate ethics complaint. He actually, according to our ordinance, needs to submit a new, if he want to address the February 3<sup>rd</sup> email, he's required by our Ethics Ordinance to submit a new complaint. Our Ethics Ordinance does not allow you to address anything except the July 3<sup>rd</sup> email, in fact.

**Chairman Blaske** – He may not have specifically addressed the email during the discussion, during the hearing, but he did attach it with him complaint. The email we're talking about, your response to him in February, was attached to his filing.

**Council Member Bonser** – Because he thought it would extend the statute of limitations, not because he thought it was discourteous. He never mentioned it in the hearing.

**Chairman Blaske** – Well, I would agree with you that he did not mention discourtesy, he mentioned threats and abuse, but he did attach it and the Board did determine that we could consider it. So I don't think we can have another hearing on that subject at this stage.

**Council Member Bonser** – Could I also read what my attorney wrote? That a purported violation of section 222-2(a) is not a proper finding. The hearing officer found that Bonser's did not violate section 222-2(k) which requires a showing of behavior that was threatening or abusive in nature. Rather, the hearing officer found a violation occurred under 222-2(a), literally citing dictionary.com for her support. However, this is improper. Section 2-222-2(a) sets forth 12 different grounds in which public conduct may rise to a violation of the Ethics Code. For instance, 1: intentionally giving someone special treatment; 2: intentionally using or permitting the use of public property; 3: participating in a matter with a financial interest, etc. Section 222-2(a) is not itself a violation and merely contains language that provides prohibited conduct of each such public servant shall include but not be limited to...then it goes into the 12 things. You could read this and you would understand the legalese better than I do. Here an enumeration was required to be listed and 222-2(a) was not a violation. So, in other words...

**Chairman Blaske** – That's what the a-k is if I remember correctly, I don't have it in front of me. I understand what you're saying and I don't think it's appropriate for us to have a hearing for you to present evidence at this point but I do think that is something we can take into account in our deliberations.

**Council Member Bonser** – First of all, I do object to the hearing because if you read my response it says the volumes of emails, and I provided those emails, and those were never given to you, that's very important. My evidence has been withheld from this Board. There has been an ongoing dialogue that deteriorated after I told Mr. Chipka that I discussed it with Chief, I reviewed all of his information and that this situation was very complicated and I recommended that he seek legal counsel. That's when things started deteriorating. He was very angry and then he even accused me of not responding to him and I said "Mr. Chipka, I did respond to you and I recommended that you seek legal counsel." And then the attacks started. That's when the attacks started.

**Chairman Blaske** – Well, there was a hearing. You were present. The parties were offered 30 minutes to discuss it. I think that neither party limited themselves to 30 minutes so we had a substantial hearing and I'm giving you leeway at this point –

**Council Member Bonser** – I know.

**Chairman Blaske** – because, perhaps the complaint was not as well enumerated in saying the words and whatnot and that's something that we had to take into account, the referencing a-k instead of using actual words to allege an actual violation because you are right, the word courtesy did not appear in the prose that he sent us. In part of his complaint he did reference the section, however, and that's an issue that we have to discuss and will hear today, I think. But we can't really reopen the hearing at this stage, in my view, to accommodate you having further argument because then we would have to open it again for Mr. Chipka –

**Council Member Bonser** – That would be fine because I never had a chance to defend myself on that complaint, that was not part of the ethics complaint.

**Chairman Blaske** – Well that is the issue, whether or not it was part of it and the hearing officer's report suggests that, in her view, it was part of it by referencing that section and one of those does reference the need to be courteous.

**Council Member Bonser** – This sounds like a fishing expedition to me, to be honest with you. Because she's trying to find something, just as she's been instructed to, to stick and ethics charge on me and that's wholly inappropriate. I don't give up my right to free speech to respond to something where someone is attacking me about my profession outside of City Council. I am able to respond to those and I would appreciate if I could provide this brief to all of you and the email to which I was responding when I responded to Mr. Chipka. Because in the hearing report that the hearing officer provided, she said that I didn't address his concerns but I didn't see any concerns in there and I think that that is pertinent.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay, hold on for just a second.

**Council Member Bonser** – Could I also say that when she brought up and asked me why did you call him a "funny man" I have no idea where that came from. She took it completely out of context, I couldn't even remember the email, it wasn't part of the complaint. That came out of nowhere. And you haven't even looked at any of his emails and what I was trying to deal with and respond to.

**Board Member Bahr** – I need clarification from you on a couple of things. You read a passage from your lawyer. Are you represented by counsel on this matter or are you waiving that representation?

**Council Member Bonser** – I don't understand. Today, I am only here by myself and I have a brief of respondent that I think is important for you to read and I was also going to provide the email that Mr. Chipka sent me that I was accused of not responding to his concerns. And I'll be honest with you, he did not ask me to have a pothole fixed in his neighborhood, he didn't tell me that he was having trouble getting a permit, if there have been a problem, I have addressed his problems to the best of my ability and I cannot do any more and so has the Chief. Mr. Chipka has also gone to the GBI, he has gone to the State, he has gone to the Atlanta Police Department. He has tried to, I don't know what he wants, I don't know if he wants the charges dropped, this was an extremely difficult issue to deal with and sometimes you run into problems with people, sometimes you have that trouble with patients, as an RN if someone was being abusive we just switched nurses, but I can't do that in this situation. He just kept coming and coming and over 100 emails, over 100 emails that were withheld from you, and it would give you a much better idea of what I was dealing with. I wasn't laughing at him, I was laughing at the fact that he thought that he thought I would believe that he could take away my dental license. I've been a dentist for 23 years, I know what I need to do to maintain my license, and I thought it was ridiculous, I thought it was silly that he believed I thought he was working to take my license away. He said he was working also to have my right to use the word Doctor taken away. That was when I wrote that I have a doctorate, I have a degree, you can't take it away from me.

**Board Member Wright** – Dr. Bonser, with all due respect, we have had the hearing, and the Chairman has been generous in giving you time this morning, I think we can all appreciate that, but we can't do that hearing again. You do have recourse, you've already initiated that in your proceedings.

**Council Member Bonser** – Did you also receive the email where I turned an appeal of the process in to Sharon on Monday, June 6. Did you receive that?

**Board Member Wright** – The June 3<sup>rd</sup> appeal?

**Council Member Bonser** – Right, well, it wasn't an appeal, was it June 3<sup>rd</sup>? June 3<sup>rd</sup>. Okay. I turned it in before the hearing officer...may I provide this brief and also the email?

**Board Member Wright** – I'm not sure that's appropriate at this time. At the next step it would seem more appropriate.

**Chairman Blaske** – There is a procedure beyond this one and we did close the hearing. If we open to you that ability we would be, in effect, hearing it and we haven't reached a decision based on the hearing that we held so I think that continuing to file new documents would be a problem. I do think that if you go beyond this stage and you wait to raise the fact that you provided emails that were not provided to us it would certainly be within your right to do that.

**Council member Bonser** – Under our Ethics Ordinance if he wants you to consider the February 3<sup>rd</sup> count he would have to refile another complaint. He would be required to submit a new ethics complaint.

**Chairman Blaske** – That's a decision, with all due respect, for us to decide because the issue is he did not address it in words but he did attach it and you make a valid argument that that may be an issue for us and we can discuss that here today but I don't think we can take new submissions. I think we've all heard your concerns and that we are all appreciative of the fact that you've raised them and that you feel like the process hasn't worked as it should.

**Council Member Bonser** - You didn't receive my evidence and that is very concerning. You received Mr. Chipka's evidence but not mine.

**Chairman Blaske** – I think we've all heard you and the issue that you're raising but I don't think it would be appropriate for us to take new document submissions at this point.

**Council Member Bonser** – But the email he provided to you was the incorrect email. The email that Mr. Chipka provided for my response was not the email – he didn't even address the February 3<sup>rd</sup> email –

**Board Member Harper** – If I may, if we make a decision today based on evidence or facts that you think are incorrect then you have a means of recourse after that. But right now, I don't feel like it is the time to be addressing these issues.

**Chairman Blaske** – I think we have before us what we need to make a decision specifically on what we've been asked to decide. Now, if you feel that we haven't been given the evidence or that there has been some other impropriety or insufficient handling of this matter then you have your rights to pursue that and you're invited to do that. I have given you leeway and I think we've gone about as far as we can go.

**Council Member Bonser** – I appreciate that but my evidence has been withheld and I want to make sure that that is part of the record. I talked about the volumes of emails that I provided but they were not provided to you.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay. I think we've all heard you.

**Chairman Blaske** – It is our duty now, as I understand it, for us to deliberate and for us to make a decision as to what our recommendations are, which can agree completely, partially, or not at all with the hearing officers' so I would open this to discussion and I will turn my mike off if somebody else has some comments and wants to begin deliberations.

**Board Member Wright** – it's really unfortunate that we can't conduct our business in a civil fashion and common courtesy being the rule of the day. The citizen has a right to say or do pretty much whatever he or she decides, within the bounds of the legal process and guided by their personal code of conduct and common decency, courtesy, on the other hand, our public servants are held to much higher standards and it's very clear what that standard is and it is also very clear, in black and white, that courtesy was lacking on the part of both people, but we're here to talk about the public servant and it's in black and white. There was less than courteous response to the citizen, whatever the reason, whatever the frustrations, it's there in black and white. I agree with that finding.

**Chairman Blaske** – anyone else have comments?

**Board Member Bahr** – We have the complaint of Mr. Chipka. Count 3 references prohibited conduct cited in section 2-222(a)(k). He gave us that, before us, an allegation referenced in the body of the packet but also referenced in the specific section for review. Dr. Bonser responded May 6 with a written response, with exhibits, she provided a supplemental response, which was tendered June 3, where she filed an appeal of the Board of Ethics hearing, which I've seen and I assume the rest of the Board has been. For the matter of this June 3<sup>rd</sup> appeal, there is notice; I don't know how many more emails we needed to see back and forth between Mr. Chipka and Dr. Bonser to understand that a discourse that, provided with the emails Mr. Chipka says violated a section of the ordinance. I agree that a public reprimand by the City Council. I agree with item three which is the issuance of a strong letter of encouragement and training opportunities with respect to conflict management. I disagree with item #2.

**Chairman Blaske** – Kevin, thank you. Mr. Harper, do you have any comments?

**Board Member Bahr** – Only that I would concur with Mr. Bahr.

**Chairman Blaske** – I have a couple of comments, if I can. First of all, I do think that the context is important and that you do have to look at the emails back and forth and I think that we've done that and I think it would be fair to say that we did not find what you could call courtesy on either side. Now, I'm in favor of civility as much as anybody, I think, and it is certainly called for by the public servants. I think that's not what's happening in America now; I think that's not what's happening in the City. I think that this can be considered in the context of prior ethics hearing in which the Board found that repeatedly asking someone to resign might rise to the level of threatening or abusive so, I have some understanding of the fact that Dr. Bonser felt threatened or abused and sort of lashed out back with



what we found not to be threatening or abusing, what the hearing officer found not to be threatening or abusive but did find to be discourteous. I can't say that the respondent's emails, in particular the February 3<sup>rd</sup> one could be described as courteous, I think that would be a stretch and so I have to agree that this represented discourtesy. It was in the face of extreme discourtesy but we're not here, there has been no charge against Mr. Chipka and I guess there couldn't be since he is not a public servant. But if there could be, and he were, I guess we would find at least discourtesy.

But that is not before the Board. What is before the Board was discourtesy and I understand Ms. Bonser believes that is not before us because it was not argued in the brief, in the words of that section, but the section was referenced, the email was attached, and I think the feeling here is that we can consider that. So, I have to agree with all the other members here and say that I think there was a technical breach of the Ethics Code as to courtesy. That doesn't say that I don't understand why it happened in the context of all the emails back and forth and everything, but, whether that is true or not, we are trying to hold our public servants to the highest possible standards of courtesy. Courtesy was included in the Code so I don't think we can get away from that. I do agree with the idea that revocation of email privileges is inappropriate, I'm not sure I can even agree that we should tell Councilwoman Bonser that she needs to go to the same training as a police officer does, that might be a step too far. Certainly, if that's available to her and the City would offer that to her, anybody would probably benefit from that, I suspect, including her, but I am appreciative of the fact that she spends a lot of time, gives a lot of time, to the City in addition to having a career, and in addition to fighting other issues now, medical issues and whatnot, so I would tend to think that the recommendations might be a little harsh. But I think that, technically speaking, it would be appropriate for the City Council to file a reprimand. I don't think that affects her position, I don't think her email privileges would be affected, and I think it's up to her to decide whether she needs to apologize. I think she's already told the Board at the last hearing that she just simply doesn't expect to communicate with Mr. Chipka anymore and, under the circumstances, I'm not sure that that's not the nicest or the best thing to do. In effect, we would be asking her to break that vow by asking her to write to him and apologize. She might feel like that would be a good step, I don't know, she's obviously an educated woman who can decide for herself, in my view, whether or not she needs to apologize. But I do believe that it would be appropriate for the City Council to note the fact that she ought to, in effect what would be a reprimand, to say that we ought to treat all our citizens with courtesy irrespective of whether they are being courteous to us. So that would be my contribution.

**Board Member Wright** – I'm not sure what a public reprimand does, above and beyond a public announcement of the decision in the case, I don't feel as strongly about that. Revocation of email privileges, I absolutely don't agree with that. A written apology – appropriate – and Dr. Bonser, as I recall in the hearing, did give a verbal apology of sorts so I don't think it is too much of a stretch to ask for a letter of apology to Mr. Chipka. As far as attending training courses, I agree with Mr. Blaske, Dr. Bonser is an educated person; she knows what she needs to do and what she doesn't need to do. She knows what the bounds of courtesy and decency are. I just don't agree with that. So, the bottom line is that I would recommend that a letter of apology be written to Mr. Chipka.

**Chairman Blaske** – At this stage, if there is not further discussion, I guess we can

vote. Yes?

**Hearing Officer Keaton** – I would like to make one clarification on the recommendations that I made. Ms. Bonser is not an employee, so what can we do? We can issue a public reprimand. But we cannot direct her, for example, to issue a letter of apology.

**Chairman Blaske** – Thank you. At this point, we've never done a jury deliberation before, which is what the new statute is, as it has recently been reconstructed; the new ordinance, as it has been reconstructed, asks us to do. Generally we work by motion but I'm not so sure that's appropriate. I think maybe what we can do is vote on the recommendations one by one and come to some conclusion and see what we can reach an agreement. First of all, overall, do we agree that there has been a violation of the section that calls for courtesy? All in favor?

*(All members indicated favor)*

**Chairman Blaske** – All opposed?

*(None showed opposition)*

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay, so we believe there was, actually, a technical violation of the Ethics Ordinance. And then, moving on to what would be the appropriate steps, does anyone disagree with a public reprimand by the Council to Councilwoman Bonser?

*(Board Member Wright indicated that he disagrees with the idea of a public reprimand.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay. I have a hard time with it myself, given the background, so I think I would abstain from that one. Revocation of email privileges? What I think I heard is that nobody seems to think that's appropriate, is there anyone who thinks we ought to do that?

*(None showed favor for the revocation of email privileges.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay, so there certainly is no agreement as to that. Issuance of a strong letter of encouragement to make a private apology. Who would be in favor of issuing that letter? Because that's all it can be, as the hearing officer has, correctly, pointed out; a letter of encouragement. Who among us thinks that we ought to write a letter to Councilwoman Bonser encouraging her to apologize?

*(Board Member Wright and Board Member Bahr indicated that think the Board should write a letter of encouragement to Dr. Bonser for her to write a letter of apology to Mr. Chipka.)*

*(Board Member Harper indicated that he does not support writing a letter to Dr. Bonser and Chairman Blaske concurred.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – I do not. And who among us thinks that we should encourage Dr. Bonser to attend the police department public academy?

*(None of the Board indicated support for having Dr. Bonser attend training.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay, so I guess we're left, really, with, the only one that there's not complete agreement on is the public reprimand and, as I see it, we have two people who think that's appropriate, one who thinks that's not, and one that can't decide and abstains, I guess. I'm deciding that, I'm not sure if I have that right or not, but that is how I feel. I can't in good conscience recommend a public reprimand, given the history of this Board and what has happened, but, on the other hand, I can't say that it's wholly inappropriate either. I understand her position. I think that concludes our opinions, but I'm open to any comments that anybody would have.

**Board Member Bahr** – Would you go back and talk again about who is for the public reprimand and who is against and who is abstaining?

**Chairman Blaske** – Certainly. I am Steven Blaske and I am abstaining. And, I believe, if I heard correctly, that Mr. Wright has said that he thinks public reprimand is not appropriate. And I understand that you felt that it was appropriate and that Mr. Harper felt that it was appropriate. So it's two people who think it is, one that thinks it isn't, one that can't vote to recommend reprimand, but understands the concept.

*(Unintelligible speaking from side)*

I guess there is, I'm sorry, I guess there is. My mistake. I guess we should poll on that. Do you want to poll verbally, by name or how do you want to do that?

Board Member Bahr – Hand raising is fine.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay. Those who feel that a letter should be sent to the Councilwoman from the City encouraging her to make a private, written apology, if you are in favor of that letter being issues to Councilwoman Bonser then, I guess, raise your hand.

*(Board Member Wright and Board Member Bahr raise their hands.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay.

**Board Member Harper** – If I may say, my opinion on that is that a forced apology isn't truly an apology at all. If she is truly regretful or apologetic in some sense then she would be inclined to write her own letter.

**Board Member Wright** – I agree with Mr. Harper about the apology. But the letter is a recommendation, she doesn't have to do it.

**Board Member Bahr** – I think we can say that the Board is split on the recommendation regarding whether or not to.

**Chairman Blaske** – Yes, whether or not to send a letter to the Councilwoman encouraging her to send a letter to Mr. Chipka.

**Board Member Bahr** – I earlier had voted, or expressed my position in favor of item 3 but after comment from the Board I have changed my opinion and I agree that is something she can do on her own volition but that we don't need to

encourage anything in that regard.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay. So I think we've, probably, made our opinions' clear and have deliberated.

**Hearing Officer Keaton** – Um, as a Board you probably want to call a motion and have a vote based on that motion, based on what you've just reached consensus on so that it can be presented to the Board, that is your next step. It sounds like the motion would read something along the lines of a technical violation was found – citing the conduct and the section of the Code – and that your recommendation is no disciplinary or corrective measures.

**Chairman Blaske** – If somebody would want to make that motion, that seems appropriate. And I think what you probably meant was in order for the Council, for the Mayor and Council, to act. Correct? Okay. Does somebody want to word such a motion?

**Board Member Bahr** – I move that the Board recommend to City Council for a public reprimand of Dr. Bonser for conduct failing to meet the requirements of courtesy in relation to her February 3, 2013 email. That the further recommendations of the hearing officer, with respect to revocation of email privileges be not recommended and that the Board is split with respect to the issuance of a strong letter of encouragement to Dr. Bonser with respect to apologizing in writing to the complainant.

**Chairman Blaske** – Second to that motion?

**Board Member Wright** – Second.

**Chairman Blaske** – Any discussion?

**Board Member Harper** – Did we, in fact, determine there should be a public reprimand?

**Chairman Blaske** – Well, the vote seemed to be 2 for public reprimand, 1 against, and 1 abstention, so, I guess, 2 to 1 that would be the way to look at it. I was going to suggest that we amend your motion to indicate to the Council, so that they are aware of the fact, that it was a 2 to 1 with 1 abstention vote as opposed to unanimously suggesting a reprimand. Just for their additional information before they decide what to do because they are, ultimately, the ones who are going to decide what to do. Would you accept that amendment?

**Board Member Bahr** – That amendment makes sense to me.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay, then I think we can vote on the motion. All in favor of the motion?

*(All members voted in favor.)*

**Chairman Blaske** – All opposed?

*(There was no opposition.)*

*(The motion was voted and passed. For: 4; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 3)*

**Chairman Blaske** – I believe that concludes our new business as to count 3 of the Chipka complaint against Dr. Bonser.

**G. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Chairman Blaske** - Is there other business before the Board? Does anyone have any other business to raise?

*(No business was raised)*

**H. BOARD COMMENT**

**Chairman Blaske** - Any comments that the Board wishes to make?

*(No comments were made.)*

**I. ADJOURN**

**Chairman Blaske** - In that case, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

**Board Member Bahr** - I move to adjourn.

**Board Member Harper** – Second.

**Chairman Blaske** – Okay. It’s been moved and seconded that we adjourn. All in favor?

*(The motion was voted and passed. For: 4; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 3)*

**Chairman Blaske** – The meeting is adjourned.

