



MINUTES
VILLAGE OF BOSQUE FARMS
RULES OF PROCEDURE
SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2026, AT 9:00 A.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

1. **Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance**

Meeting started at 9:01

2. **Roll Call/Determination of Quorum**

RW	✓	ED	✓	JB	✓	MZ	✓
Quorum present		Yes	No				

3. **Council to Review and Take Action On Rules of Procedure Open Meetings Act Resolution 1081-26.**

The Governing Body convened to conduct a working review of the proposed revisions to the Rules of Procedure, incorporating red-line changes that had been compiled from individual council members' suggestions prior to the meeting. Mayor Pro Tem De Smet compiled the red-lined changes from Councilor Bruhn and Councilor Zamora in one document. She did not receive red-line changes from Councilor Wood. Clerk/Administrator Martinez asked Mayor Pro Tem De Smet for a copy of the compiled red-lines for Mayor Gillespie, Councilor Wood and herself, as they did not receive them. It took approximately thirty minutes for the meeting to start, for the correct copies to be made. It was decided they were going to go through everything as Councilor Woods red-line changes were not in the compiled document. The discussion centered on improving clarity, communication, agenda-setting procedures, public comment rules, and alignment with state law and existing ordinances.

Article 1 – General Provisions

Section 1.1 – Meetings

Letter A – Annual Open Meetings Act Resolution: Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed striking "December" and replacing it with "January" regarding the timing of the annual Open Meetings Act (OMA) resolution approval. The rationale offered was that approving the OMA resolution in December

1 Special Meeting
2 06/03/2026 Page 2
3

4 could allow outgoing council members to set meeting rules for an incoming governing body. Changing
5 the timing to January would ensure the newly seated governing body has the opportunity to make that
6 determination. It was noted, however, that care must be taken to ensure the New Year's Day holiday is
7 still approved for employees in advance, as it falls within the period before the January OMA resolution
8 would be adopted. The suggestion was accepted with no objection.

9 Letter B – Meeting Location: The reference to "Bosque Farms Senior Center" was updated to
10 "Community Center," consistent with a change that had already been made in the previously adopted
11 OMA resolution.

12 Letter C – Special Meetings: A proposed change had reduced the threshold for calling a special meeting
13 to "any 2 members of the governing body." After discussion, it was agreed that the correct threshold
14 should be a majority of the governing body, which constitutes 3 members, not 2. There was no changes
15 made.

16 Letter D: No changes were proposed or adopted.

17 Letter E – Recessed/Reconvened Meetings: Revised language was proposed to add greater specificity
18 regarding the procedures for recessing and reconvening meetings. The revision clarified that the mayor,
19 as presiding officer, shall announce the reconvened meeting and cause posting of the notice of the date,
20 time, and place, subject to majority vote of the governing body. It was also noted that a reference to
21 standard posting locations designated under Section 1.1(b) had been inadvertently omitted from the
22 proposed revision and should be reinserted.

23 Letter F – Work Sessions: The phrase "or work study meetings" was struck, leaving only "work sessions."
24 A proposed change would allow public input at work sessions. The guest attendee suggested that a
25 more structured framework for public comment—with defined times and methods—would be
26 preferable to open-ended discretion. Council acknowledged this perspective but noted that the existing
27 language already ties public input procedures providing sufficient structure. Additionally, language
28 regarding the availability of materials provided to the public after work sessions was revised. The
29 original language required materials to be provided in hard copy. After discussion, the governing body
30 agreed that requiring physical copies was impractical. The language was amended to read that such
31 materials shall be accessible electronically through the village's website within 10 days after the
32 meeting, consistent with the timeframe used for draft minutes under the Open Meetings Act.

33 Letter G – Town Hall Meetings: Language was added to clarify that town hall meetings may or may not
34 have a quorum present, reflecting the informal and community input-oriented nature of such
35 gatherings. It was discussed that town hall meetings are intended to gather public ideas and input
36 informally, without formal action being taken, and therefore a quorum is not a requirement.

37 Section 1.2 – Attendance

38 Proposed revisions to the attendance section added specificity regarding the notification process when a
39 council member or the mayor would be unable to attend a meeting. The revised language provides that
40 the absent member shall make reasonable effort to notify the Village Clerk, and that the Clerk will in
41 turn notify all members of the absence. The requirement that notification be made "in writing" and the
42 word "shall" were struck, as council members noted that circumstances—such as working on a military
43 base without phone access—may make written notification impractical. The guest attendee noted that

1 Special Meeting
2 06/03/2026 Page 3
3

4 written communication, including text and email, is generally the standard method of communication
5 with the clerk. The revisions as discussed were accepted.

6 Section 1.3 – Duties of the Mayor

7 At the outset of discussion, Councilor Zamora and Councilor Bruhn spoke about the need for agenda
8 flexibility so that recurring resident concerns could be addressed publicly. They emphasized that not
9 every resident inquiry should become an agenda item, but that repeated questions from multiple
10 residents on the same issue should be elevated for discussion so the public could receive an answer and
11 see that the matter was being addressed. Mayor Gillespie noted that, in some cases, such matters could
12 also be acknowledged during the mayor's report even when formal action could not be taken.

13 Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed adding a duty requiring the mayor to keep the mayor pro tem
14 regularly informed on significant village projects, contracts, negotiations, and ongoing business.
15 Discussion followed regarding whether such communication should flow only through the mayor pro
16 tem or more broadly to all councilors. Clerk/Administrator Martinez noted that councilors could seek
17 one-on-one communication directly with the mayor, while Councilor Zamora and Mayor Pro Tem De
18 Smet stated that more regular, structured communication was needed because it had not been
19 occurring consistently. The discussion evolved toward the idea of a regular written or emailed update to
20 all councilors rather than relying solely on meetings between the mayor and mayor pro tem. After
21 discussion, the proposed frequency for this communication was revised from weekly to biweekly.

22 The body then reviewed language relating to the mayor pro tem's role and duties. After discussing
23 whether some of the proposed language duplicated other provisions, members agreed to revert
24 portions of the text back to the original document where the newly added biweekly communication
25 provision made additional language unnecessary.

26 Under councilor responsibilities, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed language clarifying that councilors
27 share responsibility for ensuring meetings are conducted efficiently, transparently, and in compliance
28 with the Rules of Procedure and the Open Meetings Act. She also proposed adding express language
29 recognizing the council's role in appointing the mayor pro tem. Mayor Gillespie noted that this authority
30 is already addressed in state law, but members agreed it was still appropriate to include it in the rules.
31 The wording was refined to state that councilors shall nominate and select from among council
32 members a mayor pro tem.

33 The Governing Body reviewed language on initiation of legislation and agenda requests. Mayor Pro Tem
34 De Smet stated that the prior draft appeared to make staff assistance a prerequisite for placing
35 legislation on an agenda, which she opposed. Mayor Gillespie recommended retaining the sentence that
36 requests for initiation of legislation shall be directed to the village administrator, followed by language
37 preserving a councilor's ability to introduce ordinances, resolutions, or motions. The body generally
38 agreed with that approach.

39 The discussion then turned to communications with outside entities. Mayor Pro Temp De Smet
40 questioned whether councilors should be required to inform the mayor of significant communications
41 initiated by them, arguing that such a requirement could be burdensome and unnecessary given that
42 councilors cannot commit the Village to contracts. Mayor Gillespie and Clerk/Administrator Martinez
43 emphasized the need to distinguish between legislative and administrative roles and expressed concern

1 Special Meeting
2 06/03/2026 Page 4
3

4 about councilors inadvertently crossing into administrative functions. Councilor Bruhn explained that
5 council members' outside contacts can sometimes help the Village obtain better pricing or useful
6 information, even though final authority remains with the Village. After substantial discussion, the body
7 agreed to strike the section requiring councilors to ensure the mayor is informed of such
8 communications, finding the concept was either already addressed elsewhere or risked creating
9 unnecessary complications.

10 Mayor Pro Tem De Smet also proposed adding authority for the Governing Body to establish
11 committees, including standing committees, special committees, advisory committees, task forces, and
12 working groups, by majority vote at a duly noticed public meeting. She explained that committees could
13 assist with updating outdated ordinances and addressing specialized areas such as finance. The
14 discussion reflected support for the concept, while also noting the need for legal review and thoughtful
15 consideration of qualifications and structure.

16 In reviewing the provisions on amendment of the rules themselves, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed
17 language making clear that Rules of Procedure may be adopted, amended, or repealed only by majority
18 vote of the Governing Body at a duly noticed public meeting; that the mayor may propose changes but
19 cannot unilaterally implement them; and that all adopted rules must comply with the Open Meetings
20 Act. The body generally agreed with combining portions of the original and revised text to make that
21 point more specific.

22 The Governing Body also discussed public access, livestreaming, and transparency. Councilor Bruhn
23 supported adding language to allow livestreaming and posting on the village website or another public
24 platform, noting that this could reduce public records requests and improve transparency. Members
25 recognized that current technology and budget limitations may prevent immediate implementation, and
26 they agreed the language should make clear that temporary technology failures would not invalidate a
27 meeting or action, provided Open Meetings Act requirements were otherwise met.

28 Under agenda preparation, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed changing the clerk's role from acting
29 "with the approval of the mayor" to acting "under the direction of the mayor," which was accepted in
30 principle as a more appropriate phrasing. The body also discussed who may place items on the agenda,
31 agreeing that references allowing the village attorney to do so directly should be removed because such
32 requests should instead come through village administration. Department heads were discussed as
33 possible requestors of agenda items, generally through written or emailed communication to the clerk.

34 Significant time was spent discussing council requests for future agenda items. Mayor Pro Tem De Smet
35 objected to requiring councilors to use a formal agenda item request form and objected to language
36 allowing the mayor to deny a councilor's request. She explained that in her experience, requests had
37 sometimes not been placed on the agenda. The body supported replacing that process with language
38 allowing any councilor, the mayor, or staff to state an item they wish to have included on a future
39 agenda, with the clerk directed to place such requested items on the next available agenda that meets
40 statutory notice requirements, and that requests made in writing or during the "announcements and
41 future agenda items" portion should not be unreasonably denied.

42 The body also discussed packet deadlines and supporting materials. A practical concern was raised that
43 if materials are due to the clerk at the same time they must be posted or distributed, compliance is not
44 feasible. Members discussed whether some deadlines should be changed. The agenda needs to be

1 Special Meeting
2 06/03/2026 Page 5

3
4 posted 72 hours before a meeting for the public. If council wants something on the agenda it needs to
5 be turned in 96 hours before a meeting. Packets should be available to council 48 hours before a
6 meeting. They discussed whether exceptions should be recognized when supporting materials are not
7 yet available. The clerk noted that agenda posting and packet completion do not always occur
8 simultaneously due to late-arriving backup materials. Members asked that the legal or statutory
9 requirements be confirmed so the language can be adjusted accordingly.

10 The treasurer's report and supporting financial materials were discussed at length during this portion of
11 the meeting. Clerk/Administrator Martinez explained the challenge of assembling treasurer's report on
12 time. She will continue the one-page financial report she had been preparing. Councilors expressed a
13 preference for the new report, with more detailed backup or quarterly reporting used when needed.
14 They asked for a report from P&Z in their packet.

15 On minutes, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed returning to a former format that more clearly reflected
16 who was present, who voted, and how each member voted on action items. She stated that the public
17 should be able to tell from the minutes how each official voted. She also proposed that minutes identify
18 speakers during public comment and include a brief summary of their remarks. The body generally
19 supported more detailed, transparent minutes. Because the consent agenda was later proposed for
20 elimination, language tying approval of minutes to a consent agenda was revisited.

21 A major portion of the discussion addressed the order of business and the consent agenda. Mayor Pro
22 Tem De Smet opposed the use of a consent agenda, stating that it can allow significant matters to be
23 approved without adequate attention because multiple items are condensed into a single vote. She
24 expressed a preference for handling items individually, even if that takes more time. The body agreed to
25 remove the consent agenda and the corresponding "items removed from consent agenda" section from
26 the order of business. Members also clarified order-of-business terminology, including changing
27 "councilors forum" to "councilors report" and using "announcements and future agenda items" than
28 "adjournment."

29 Councilor Bruhn announced he needed to leave.

30 The Governing Body then addressed public comment procedures in more detail. Members supported
31 setting the standard public comment time limit at three minutes rather than one and one-half minutes.
32 There was discussion about whether extensions of time should be granted by the mayor or by majority
33 vote of the Governing Body; that question was left for clarification. Members also supported limiting
34 public comments to village-related matters, while recognizing that speakers may sometimes use outside
35 examples for comparison. The body discussed allowing groups to designate a spokesperson and
36 reaffirmed that no action may be taken on matters raised during public comment if they are not listed
37 on the agenda. There was also discussion of adding explanatory language on the agenda so members of
38 the public understand that attendance at a meeting does not entitle them to speak on every agenda
39 item and that public comment is the proper time for such remarks.

40 In reviewing ordinance and resolution procedures, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed clarifying that
41 amendments offered at any stage that require additional notice or substantial revision should postpone
42 final action until a subsequent meeting. Mayor Gillespie noted that for some items, such postponement
43 is already legally required. Similar revisions were discussed for both ordinances and resolutions to
44 ensure consistency and compliance with notice requirements.

1 Special Meeting
2 03/06/2026 Page 6
3

4 With respect to appointments, approvals, revisions, boards, and committees, the body discussed adding
5 provisions for committees created by the Governing Body, while recognizing that the mayor's existing
6 authority over boards such as Planning and Zoning and the Library Board would remain unchanged
7 unless otherwise provided by ordinance.

8 In the section on motions, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed adding language clarifying that a second
9 does not signify agreement with a motion but merely opens the matter for discussion. She also
10 proposed requiring the mayor to call twice for a second before determining that a motion fails for lack
11 of one. No major objections were raised.

12 In the section on postponement and tabling, only minor wording revisions were discussed. Members
13 distinguished between postponement to a future meeting and tabling to later in the same meeting, and
14 they generally retained the structure of the original language.

15 The Governing Body then reviewed voting procedures. Members supported removing "show of hands"
16 from procedural voting language, preferring voice vote or roll call so the record is clearer. Discussion
17 also addressed recusal and conflicts of interest, with members noting that a councilor subject to a
18 conflict should leave the room during the item. A separate discussion arose about the mayor's voting
19 role when absences or recusals reduce the number of councilors participating.

20 They discussed adding two regular meetings a month. They agreed to have two regular meetings for the
21 remaining months of 2026, then revisit it.

22 During the decorum portion of the meeting, Mayor Pro Tem De Smet proposed striking language that
23 would allow the mayor to remove a disruptive councilor from a meeting, arguing that such authority
24 was too subjective and could be misused. Councilor Zamora agreed that disruption can be a matter of
25 perception and argued that if removal of a council member is considered, the Governing Body as a
26 whole should be involved in the decision. Mayor Gillespie stated that the chair must be able to maintain
27 order, but the discussion reflected broader concern about balancing meeting control with fairness.
28 Related provisions on points of order were revised to clarify that points of order may be raised by any
29 councilor, that the presiding officer shall rule promptly, and that rulings may be appealed to the
30 Governing Body for decision by majority vote.

31 The body also reviewed provisions related to public comment decorum, including slanderous or
32 disruptive remarks, warnings to speakers, and termination of a speaker's time after repeated warnings.
33 Members discussed changing some of that language so that the mayor would address disruption after it
34 is brought to the mayor's attention by the Governing Body, and that removal or termination of
35 comment time should involve majority support of the Governing Body rather than unilateral action.

36 In the quasi-judicial hearing provisions, members agreed that the mayor should be able to control
37 presentations to avoid repetition or irrelevant matters, but they expressed concern with allowing the
38 mayor to impose speaker time limits in those hearings. The time-limit language was therefore discussed
39 for removal while retaining the presiding officer's authority to manage relevance and repetition.
40 Duplicate or repetitive text in that section was also identified for cleanup.

41 The meeting concluded with direction for Mayor Pro Tem De Smet to provide her revised copy to Clerk
42 Administrator Martinez so a clean version incorporating the discussion could be prepared for further

1 Special Meeting
2 06/03/2026 Page 7
3

4 consideration. No formal motion or final vote on the revised Rules of Procedure/Open Meetings Act
5 Resolution 1081-26 was taken.

6
7 **ADJOURNMENT**
8 **2:13 PM**
9

10
11 **PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 17TH DAY OF JUNE 2026**
12
13

14
15 _____
16 Chris Gillespie, Mayor
17

18 (SEAL)
19
20
21
22

23 ATTEST:
24
25
26
27

28 _____
Erica A. Martinez, Clerk/Administrator
29
30