

PROCEEDINGS

A meeting of the Lancaster City Council was held in the Town Hall, Morecambe, at 6.00 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 April 2019, when the following Members were present:-

Andrew Kay (Mayor)	Claire Cozler (Deputy Mayor)
June Ashworth	Jon Barry
Stuart Bateson	Amara Betts-Patel
Alan Biddulph	Eileen Blamire
Carla Brayshaw	Dave Brookes
Tracy Brown	Abbott Bryning
Nathan Burns	Susie Charles
Darren Clifford	Ian Clift
Brett Cooper	Sheila Denwood
Rob Devey	Charlie Edwards
Kevin Frea	Andrew Gardiner
Nigel Goodrich	Mel Guilding
Janet Hall	Tim Hamilton-Cox
Janice Hanson	Colin Hartley
Helen Helme	Brendan Hughes
Caroline Jackson	Joan Jackson
Ronnie Kershaw	Roger Mace
Terrie Metcalfe	Abi Mills
Rebecca Novell	Jane Parkinson
Jean Parr	Margaret Pattison
Robert Redfern	John Reynolds
Peter Rivet	Oliver Robinson
Sylvia Rogerson	Ron Sands
Elizabeth Scott	Susan Sykes
Malcolm Thomas	Oscar Thynne
Andrew Warriner	David Whitaker
Anne Whitehead	John Wild
Nicholas Wilkinson	Peter Williamson
Phillippa Williamson	Peter Yates

153 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Geoff Knight and James Leyshon.

154 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 27 February and 13 March 2019 were signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

155 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members advised of the following personal, non-pecuniary, interests in item 15, the Standards Committee Investigation in Leaked Sensitive Information and Members' Conduct:

Councillor Clifford, as a person affected by the leak of sensitive information.

Councillors Gardiner, Yates and Wild as the subject members complained of.

(Minute No.166 refers.)

156 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor thanked all Members, whether standing for re-election on 2 May 2019 or not, for their contribution to the Council during their years as Councillors.

157 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11

The Mayor advised that no questions had been received from members of the public in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 11.

158 PETITIONS AND ADDRESSES

The Mayor informed Members that no petitions or requests to address Council had been received from members of the public.

159 LEADER'S REPORT

Councillor Blamire presented her final report as Leader of the Council, updating Members on various issues since her last report to Council. She thanked all Councillors, particularly the group leaders, for their support and co-operation during her years as Leader of the Council.

The Leader then responded to a number of questions from Councillors. She agreed to provide a written answer to Councillor Edwards, who asked why Lancaster City Council had not volunteered for the Voter ID pilot scheme.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

160 MAYOR'S ANNUAL REPORT

In accordance with Article 5.02(g) of the Constitution, the Mayor presented his Annual Report for 2018/19 and responded to questions.

Resolved:

That the report be received.

161 EXECUTIVE ANNUAL REPORT

In accordance with Article 7.06(k), the Leader and each Member of Cabinet had produced a written progress report for 2018/19.

The Leader presented her annual report and answered a number of questions.

Councillors Burns, Clifford, Hanson, Hughes, Pattison, Warriner and Whitehead then presented their annual reports and responded to Members' questions.

Resolved:

That the annual reports of the Leader and Cabinet Members be received.

162 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT

In accordance with Article 6.03(c) the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report for 2018/19 had been published and was presented to Council by the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Goodrich, and the Chairman of the Budget and Performance Panel, Councillor Brookes.

Resolved:

That the Overview & Scrutiny Annual Report be received.

163 AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

In accordance with Section 8.13 of Part 3 of the Council's Constitution, the Chairman, Councillor Abbott Bryning, presented the 2018/19 Annual Report of the Audit Committee.

Resolved:

That the report be received.

164 MEMBER CHAMPIONS ANNUAL REPORT

In accordance with Part 6, Section 5 of the Constitution, annual reports were presented to Council by the Member Champions: Councillor Scott (Veterans' Champion); Councillors Guilding and Cozler (Champions for the Disabled) and Councillor Brown (Champion for Children and Young People).

The Champions responded to questions from Councillors.

Resolved:

That the reports be received.

165 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Pages 9 - 14)

The Mayor reminded Council that it had been recommended to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information.

Councillor Thomas moved that press and public be excluded from the meeting, however he withdrew his proposition.

Councillor Edwards then moved to exclude press and public, seconded by Councillor Parkinson. Councillor Edwards requested a recorded vote, however he did not receive the required support from members to enable this, in accordance with council procedure rule 19.4.

There was some debate on the motion at this point. Legal advice was sought from, and provided by, the Deputy Monitoring Officer, before a vote was taken and, with 14 Councillors voting 'for' and many against, the motion was clearly lost.

Members of the press and public were permitted to remain in the Chamber for the following item and the exemption was therefore lifted on the report.

The report is now attached to these minutes as a public report.

166 INVESTIGATION INTO LEAKED SENSITIVE INFORMATION AND MEMBERS' CONDUCT

(Having previously declared an interest, Councillor Clifford left the meeting at this point.)

The Standards Committee submitted a report on the outcome of the Single Purpose Standards Committee (SPSC) hearing held on 6 March 2019. Councillor Whitehead, as Chairman of the Committee, presented the report, which set out the SPSC's findings and recommendations.

Members asked a number of questions, which Councillor Whitehead and the Deputy Monitoring Officer (Legal) responded to. In response to a question about the cost of the enquiry, the Monitoring Officer said this had cost £4,500.

The report was simply for noting.

(Council adjourned for a comfort break at 8pm, in accordance with council procedure rule 10.1. The meeting re-convened at 8.15pm.)

167 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Mayor noted that one of the appendices to the report was exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. He reminded Members that there was a recommendation to move into private session if discussions centred on the legal advice provided. In view of this, Councillor Whitehead, seconded by Councillor Edwards, proposed:

"That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds

that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A of that Act.”

The Monitoring Officer was asked why the appendix in question was exempt from publication. He explained that the document contained legal advice provided to the Council and was subject to legal professional privilege.

A vote was then taken on the proposition to exclude press and public, which was clearly carried.

Resolved:

That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

(Members of the press and public left the chamber at this point.)

168 DIGITAL CONSTITUTION 2019

Councillor Whitehead, Chairman of the Constitution Working Group, introduced the report and thanked the officers who had assisted the Group with the review of the Constitution. The Monitoring Officer demonstrated the online functionality of the document to council using a laptop device and a large screen television.

It was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had asked for clarification from the Monitoring Officer about two issues they had raised in August 2018:

- (i) Clarification of what should be referred to Cabinet or Council regarding spending of the City Council's reserves.
- (ii) Request the Constitution Working Group to consider additional parameters should be set on the amount Cabinet can spend from the City Council's Reserves.

Councillor Whitehead explained that there was a limit of £150k for individual Cabinet Members; any spend over £150k could only take place after consultation with the relevant Director or the Chief Executive. The Monitoring Officer showed the page onscreen where this was set out in the Constitution (Cabinet Procedure Rules paragraph 3 number 4).

Councillor Whitehead and the Monitoring Officer responded to a number of questions from Councillors.

In regard to recommendation (1) in the report, Councillor Whitehead proposed that:

“That a decision on the issue regarding Members' Access to Information be postponed until after the May elections.”

Councillor Mace seconded the proposition, which was clearly carried when put to the vote.

Councillor Whitehead proposed a new local method of calculating political balance, set out in Appendix B of the report, and appended to these minutes. Councillor Mace seconded the proposition.

Before calling for a vote, the Mayor informed Councillors that a unanimous vote was

required, in law, to adopt a local method of calculating political balance. A vote was then taken, and the result was a unanimous decision to adopt the new method.

Councillor Whitehead, seconded by Councillor Mace, then proposed, in relation to recommendations (3) to (6):

- “(3) That the new digital Constitution, revised in line with the resolutions of Council made on 13 March 2019, be approved.
- (4) That the new Constitution comes into force from Monday 6 May.
- (5) That officers be requested to complete formatting and proof-reading the digital document for uploading to the Council’s website in time for the commencement date.
- (6) The Monitoring Officer may make minor consequential editing and grammatical amendments to the text and correct typographical, referencing and consistency errors.”

Councillor Brookes proposed an amendment to the propositions, by way of addendum, to add the words “That an automated log be set up to monitor all changes to the Constitution, which identifies who made the changes.”

Councillor Barry seconded Councillor Brookes’ amendment.

Initially, this was not accepted as a friendly amendment by Councillor Whitehead, who sought advice from the Monitoring Officer on the feasibility of such a log. After discussion with Councillor Brookes, Councillor Whitehead and her seconder agreed to accept the following wording as a friendly amendment:

“That officers investigate including an automatic log to monitor all changes to the Constitution, which identifies who made the changes.”

Councillor Edwards then proposed that the role definition for non-executive champions be retained in the new Constitution to allow the new Council to appoint champions as it wished, without the need for any amendment to the Constitution. Councillor Brookes seconded this proposition, however it was clearly lost when put to the vote.

There was then further lengthy debate on the Constitution before the Mayor acceded to a request, from Councillor Goodrich, to move to the vote.

The proposition was clearly carried.

Resolved (resolution (2) was unanimous):

- (1) That a decision on the issue regarding Members’ Access to Information be postponed until after the May elections.
- (2) That Council adopts the new method of calculating political balance, set out in Appendix B of the report, and appended to these minutes.
- (3) That the new digital Constitution, revised in line with the resolutions of Council made on 13 March 2019, be approved.
- (4) That the new Constitution comes into force from Monday 6 May.

- (5) That officers be requested to complete formatting and proof-reading the digital document for uploading to the Council's website in time for the commencement date.
- (6) The Monitoring Officer may make minor consequential editing and grammatical amendments to the text and correct typographical, referencing and consistency errors.
- (7) That officers investigate including an automatic log to monitor all changes to the Constitution, which identifies who made the changes.

(The press and public were re-admitted at this point.)

169 WENNINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – ADOPTION (MAKING) OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor Hanson presented the report of the Director for Economic Growth and Regeneration on the adoption of the Wennington Neighbourhood Plan.

There were no questions. Councillor Hanson, seconded by Councillor Blamire, proposed that the recommendation, as set out in the report, be approved.

The proposition was clearly carried.

Resolved:

That the Council, under section 38A(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, formally make the Wennington Neighbourhood Plan with immediate effect, with the consequence that it becomes part of the statutory Development Plan for the area.

170 DESIGNATION OF MONITORING OFFICER

(The Acting Head of Legal Services left the meeting at this point, as he was named in the following report.)

Council considered a report of the Chief Executive, to enable Members to designate an officer to be Monitoring Officer with effect from 11 April 2019.

It was noted that the current Monitoring Officer, Mr David Brown, was leaving Lancaster City Council, his last day of work being 10 April 2019. It was therefore necessary to appoint a new Monitoring Officer. Mr Rephael Walmsley, current Acting Head of Legal Services, was recommended to Council for appointment.

Councillor Barry, seconded by Councillor Mace proposed that the recommendation, as set out in the report, be approved.

Councillor Mace thanked Mr Brown for the work he had done for the Council during his time as Interim Head of Legal and Democratic Services.

Resolved:

That the Acting Head of Legal Services, Mr Rephael Walmsley, be designated as the Council's Monitoring Officer with effect from 11 April 2019.

171 QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

The Mayor advised that one question had been received by the Chief Executive in accordance with Council Procedure Rules, from Councillor Mace to Councillor Blamire.

Councillor Mace asked:

“Has the Leader received confirmation from Mike Hardy, the Chairman of the Trustees of the Grand Theatre, that he is now able to proceed without delay to apply for funding?”

Councillor Blamire replied:

Not directly, however the Council can say that it is fully supportive of the Grand Theatre proposals to extend its foyer and improve its facilities. The Council has written to Mike Hardy at the Grand Theatre to confirm its intention to facilitate proposed works and enter into a lease agreement to extend the existing car park.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Mace gave the example of the note left for David Cameron by Gordon Brown when Mr Cameron took over as Prime Minister. He asked:

“Will the Leader leave a note for her successor to say that the Grand Theatre is no less valuable than the Dukes, yet receives no funding?”

Councillor Blamire spoke at length about her constant support for the arts over the last 32 years, saying that both theatres were valuable and much needed and that museums and the arts were one of the things that made life worth living.

172 MINUTES OF CABINET

Council considered the Cabinet minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2019. No questions were raised.

Resolved:

That the minutes be noted.

Mayor

(The meeting finished at 9.50 p.m.)

**Any queries regarding these minutes,
please contact Debbie Chambers, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582057 or email
dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk**

Council

**INVESTIGATION INTO LEAKED SENSITIVE INFORMATION
AND MEMBERS' CONDUCT
10 April 2019**

Report of the Standards Committee

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report on the outcome of the Single Purpose Standards Committee hearing dated 6 March 2019.

This report is public.

FOR NOTING

- (1) **To note the findings of the Single Purpose Standards Committee in respect of Cllrs Gardiner, Wild and Yates**
- (2) **To note the recommendation of the SPSC that the investigation into the leak of sensitive information be continued.**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 On 18 December 2018 Council considered the Standards Committee's request that a Single Purpose Standards Committee (SPSC) be set up to determine (1) allegations of misconduct by Cllrs Gardiner, Wild and Yates; and (2) the issue of sensitive information, provided to a Standards Committee, being leaked to the Media. Council agreed that a SPSC should be constituted to consider these matters.

2.0 SPSC hearing

- 1.2 On 6 March 2019 the SPSC met to consider the allegations of misconduct by the Councillors. Only Cllr Yates attended the hearing. Cllr Gardiner and Cllr Wilds failed to attend.
- 1.3 The Committee considered at the outset an application to adjourn by Cllr Yates and Cllr Wild (submitted in writing). It was determined that the application to adjourn should be denied on the basis that the Councillors had had sufficient notice of the hearing and sufficient time to prepare their cases.
- 1.4 The Committee subsequently considered the representations and evidence relied

upon by independent Counsel, Mr Joseph Hart. This included hearing from other Councillors and from the Council's internal investigator. Cllr Yates, being in attendance, also presented his case. Correspondence received from, or on behalf of Cllr Gardiner and Cllr Wild, were also considered by the Committee.

1.5 Decision on the issue of breach

1.6 The Committee having considered all relevant material on the matter determined that:

1.4.1 Cllr Yates had brought the office of Councillor and the Council into disrepute by misleading Council officers.

1.4.2 Cllr Gardiner had brought the office of Councillor and the Council into disrepute by misleading officers and failing to take part in the data leak investigation. It was also found that Cllr Gardiner had sought to intimidate those involved in the investigation process or in its administration.

1.4.3 Cllr Wild had brought the office of Councillor and the Council into dispute by misleading officers. Furthermore it was found that the Councillor had bullied a junior officer contrary to the Members Code of Conduct.

1.7 Having determined that the Councillors were in breach of the Members code of Conduct the Committee adjourned the hearing to 11 March 2019 to allow the Councillors to make submissions in respect of sanctions.

1.8 Decision notices were sent to all three Councillors on the evening of 6 March 2019. A summary of the Committee's findings are attached at **Appendix 1**.

1.9 Sanctions

1.10 On 11 March 2019 the SPSC met again to consider the issue of sanctions. The Committee were provided with copies of representations made by the Councillors or by persons on their behalf. The further representations were considered by the Committee prior to the determination of sanctions.

1.11 Having read the Councillors' further representations, and bearing in mind all the facts of the case, the SPSC determined that the Councillors were to be sanctioned as following:

1.11.1 The outcome in relation to the Standards hearing was to be reported to Council (on a confidential basis).

1.11.2 Cllr Yates was to be removed the Standards Committee

1.11.3 Cllr Wild was to be formally censured in the minutes of the hearing

1.11.4 Cllr Gardiner was to be formally censured in the minutes of the hearing.

1.12 The three Councillors were notified, in writing, about the SPSC's decision after the hearing on 9 March 2019.

1.13 Continuation of Investigation

- 1.14 The SPSC has recommended and requested the continuation of the investigation into the leak of sensitive information from the Standards Committee.
- 1.15 Officers are currently reviewing the evidence and the findings of the SPSC. Upon review of the evidence officers will report back to the Committee Chair and the Independent Person.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT (including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing): This report is for noting and does not involve the need for impact assessment.	
LEGAL IMPLICATIONS There are no legal implications stemming from this report.	
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS There are no financial implications stemming from this report.	
OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, such as Human Resources, Information Services, Property, Open Spaces: There are no resource issues stemming from this report.	
SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS Has no comments to make on this report.	
MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS Has no comments to make on this report.	
BACKGROUND PAPERS Summary of SPSC decision (Appendix 1)	Contact Officer: Rephael Walmsley Telephone: 01524 582021 E-mail: rwalmsley@lancaster.gov.uk Ref:

Summary of findings

Councillor Yates

The Committee found that Cllr Yates had brought the Council into disrepute by misleading the Council's investigators.

In particular, the Committee concluded that Cllr Yates misled officers during his interview on 23 August 2018. The Councillor informed officers at the interview that he was in the Isle of Man on the weekend of 11 & 12 of August 2018. This was re-iterated by the Councillor in a signed statement which contained a statement of truth.

The Committee did not accept that the Councillor, at the time of the interview, mixed up his visit to the Isle of Man in mid-July with his whereabouts on 11 & 12 August 2018. The visit and the weekend of 11 & 12 August were a month apart and the Committee found that it was unlikely, given the long duration between the two dates, that the Councillor got the visit and the weekend mixed up. Moreover, given that the interview with officers took place only 10 days after the weekend of the 11 & 12 August, the Committee found it unlikely that the Councillor would forget that he was at home as oppose to being on the Isle of Man.

The Committee found Cllr Yates' account of events to be inconsistent. On the one hand the Councillor maintained that he was particular about detail and on the other hand he maintained that he signed his statement without really reading the contents of the same. Moreover, under cross-examination the Councillor was asked why, if he believed that the statement was correct at the time, did he shortly after the interview, have cause to doubt the dates given in the statement. The Councillor could not give an adequate explanation to this inconsistency and he maintained that it was simply his mind playing tricks on him.

The Committee determined that Cllr Yates should be removed from the Standards Committee.

Councillor Gardiner

The Committee found that Cllr Gardiner had (1) brought the Council into disrepute by misleading the Council's investigators and by his failure to take part in the investigation and (2) that he has been guilty of conduct that amounted to intimidation of a person who is likely to be involved in the investigation or in its administration. This involved intimidation of the Chief Executive Office and intimidation during the interview with Cllr Wild.

In particular, the Committee concluded that Cllr Gardiner misled officers during the investigation into the leak of sensitive data. The Councillor emailed the Council's Monitoring Officer on 9 September 2018 stating that he did not know anything about the standards hearing scheduled for 13 August 2018 until it was published by the Daily Mail (the 16&17 August 2018). The Committee did not accept the Councillor's assertion. The Committee concluded, taking into account the evidence of Cllr Mace, that the Councillor knew about the subject matter by 14 August 2018.

The Councillor was invited to attend an interview about his knowledge concerning the data leak by the Monitoring Officer on 6 and 11 September 2018. The Councillor failed to cooperate with the reasonable requests of the Monitoring Officer and on the 12 September 2018 stated that "I do not have time sorry I will not TAKE PART IN THIS DEBARCLE (sic)"

The Committee found that the Councillor's misleading statement and failure co-operate with the Council's Monitoring Officer was a course of conduct that offended against the principles of accountability, openness and honesty. As such they were found to be actions or omissions that brought the office of Councillor and the Council into disrepute.

On the afternoon of 23 August 2018 Cllr Gardiner contacted the Council's Executive Office and demanded to speak with the Chief Executive about a Standards Committee matter. He reported that he felt that one of his colleagues was being mistreated or bullied. The Councillor threatened to go to the press if the matter was not resolved that day.

The threat of going to the press was inappropriate conduct by the Councillor and the Committee found that the threat made in respect of the Standards Committee matter amounted to intimidation of a person (the Chief Executive) involved in the administration of the investigation.

On 3 September 2018, following the complaint to the CE office, Cllr Gardiner attended the interview of Cllr Wild. It was explained to him that it was inappropriate for him to be in attendance by the Council's Monitoring Officer. Councillor Gardiner did not take any active part in the interview.

The Committee found, having carefully considered the evidence on the matter, that Cllr Gardiner's presence at the interview was a means of asserting control or influence over Cllr Wild. The Committee considered this to be inappropriate conduct and intimidation contrary to paragraph 3 of the Members Code of Conduct.

The Committee determined that Councillor Gardiner was to be censured in the minutes of the hearing.

Councillor Wild

The Committee found that the Cllr Wild had (1) brought the Council into disrepute by seeking sensitive information to pass onto members of the public and (2) that he did bully a member of staff on 13 August 2018.

In particular, the Committee concluded that Cllr Wild had telephoned the Council's democratic services department on the afternoon of 13 August 2018 and that the purpose of the Councillor's call was to seek confirmation as to the identity of a member of public connected to the Standards Committee case of 13 August 2018.

The Committee found that the telephone call was a misuse of the Councillor's powers in that the request to a junior member of staff was such as to undermine the junior officer. This is a course of behaviour defined as bullying in the Members Code of Conduct.

The Councillor was later interviewed by officers on 3 September 2018. Cllr Gardiner attended the interview in support of Cllr Wild. Towards the end of the interview Councillor Wild repeatedly asked officers for the name of the subject member of the public. He informed officers that he wanted the name to pass onto his customers.

The Committee found that the request, and the Councillor's stated motive for the same to be unacceptable behaviour.

The Councillor's inappropriate requests for information evidenced a lack of integrity. This being the case, the behaviour was such as to bring the office of Councillor or the Council into disrepute contrary to paragraph 5 of the Members Code of Conduct.

The Committee determined that Councillor Wild was to be censured in the minutes of the hearing.

**METHOD OF CALCULATION OF POLITICAL BALANCE AGREED BY
LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL 10 APRIL 2019**

- a.** For each committee and subcommittee individually, calculate the number of seats to be allocated to each political Group as follows:
- i. Multiply the number of committee seats by the number of councillors who belong to that political Group and divide by the total number of councillors. Keep four decimal places. Round to the nearest whole number (i.e. down if the residual is less than 0.5, up if the residual is 0.5 or more)
 - ii. Sum the calculated committee seats across political Groups. If this total is higher than the required number of seats, then subtract a seat from the Group with the lowest residual. In the case of a tie, subtract a seat from the political Group with the higher number of councillors. If the total is lower than the required number of seats, then add a seat to the Group with the highest residual. In the case of a tie, add a seat to the political Group with the higher number of councillors.
 - iii. In the event that the foregoing rules do not resolve the situation, the seat to be subtracted or added should be decided by drawing lots under the supervision of the Mayor.
- b.** Repeat the calculations in a. above for the following grouping of committees, which will give 60 committee seats in total.
- 1x15 (Planning)
1x10 (Licensing)
5x7 (Personnel, Audit, Appeals, Standards, Business)
- c.** For the committees specified in b. above, the calculation of seats for the grouping of committees takes precedence over the calculations for each individual committee. Consistent with the allocations obtained from b. above, the number of seats on the individual committees should be allocated as closely as possible to those calculated in a. above. Seats may need to be passed from one Group to another on one or more of the individual committees. The political Groups who need to pass seats to other Groups should choose which committee seats to pass on.