



CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

Monday, January 25, 2016, 4:30 P.M.
City Hall Meeting Room (1st Floor)
City Hall, 255 W. Alameda
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Legal Action Report

1. Roll Call

Meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Bonnie Poulos at 4:30 p.m. Those present and absent were:

Present:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Bruce Burke (arrived at 4:40 p.m.) | Member, Mayor's Office |
| Tom Burke | Member, City Manager's Office |
| Mark Crum | Member, Ward 6 |
| Randi Dorman | Member, Ward 5 |
| John Hinderaker | Member, Ward 6 |
| B. Joseph Howell | Member, Ward 1 |
| Luke Knipe | Member, Ward 1 |
| Leonard (Lenny) Porges | Member, Ward 2 |
| Bonnie Poulos | Member, Ward 3 |
| Jeff Rogers | Member, Mayor's Office |
| D. Grady Scott | Member, Ward 5 |
| John Springer (arrived at 4:50 p.m.) | Member, Ward 4 |
| Moon Joe Yee | Member, Ward 4 |

Absent:

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Tannya Gaxiola | Member, Ward 3 |
| Tom Prezelski | Member, Ward 2 |

Staff Members Present:

Michael Rankin, City Attorney
Roger W. Randolph, City Clerk
Deborah Rainone, Chief Deputy City Clerk
Suzanne Mesich, Assistant City Clerk
Silvia Amparano, Finance Director
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office
Raphe Sonenshein, Facilitator

2. Introduction of Members and Staff

3. Approval of Minutes and Legal Action Report from January 4, 2016 and January 11, 2016

It was moved by Luke Knipe, duly seconded, and CARRIED by a voice vote of 11 to 0 (Committee Members Tannya Gaxiola, Tom Prezelski, and John Springer [arrived at 4:50 p.m.] absent), to approve the Minutes and Legal Action Reports from January 4, 2016 and January 11, 2016.

4. Call to the Audience

The following speakers addressed the Committee:

Ted Maxwell Ruth Beeker Arnold Urken

5. Discussion on Current and Proposed Charter Taxing and Bonding Limitations

Introductory comments were presented by Chairwoman Poulos regarding the Charter Amendment options for Sales Tax that were presented at the last meeting. She asked for clarification if the cap of 2% was removed entirely, was the Mayor and Council “free” to raise the tax to whatever amount they want without going back to the voters for approval.

Silvia Amparano, Finance Director, responded in the affirmative and recapped and clarified the City’s current position.

Discussion ensued regarding the options of leaving the cap, but increasing it to a higher amount and include the requirement that the Mayor and Council need voter approval for any increase in the sales tax or did the Committee want to remove the cap altogether, still with the idea that the Mayor and Council need voter approval for the increase.

Committee Member Knipe questioned what the arguments were, in favor of requiring the Mayor and Council to seek voter approval, to do what most cities and towns in Arizona did not have to do. He asked why Tucson had to face a unique legislative burden that limits their revenue options while other cities did not.

Committee Member Dorman stated she thought most people did not realize it was a unique restriction, but voting on an increase could make it more palpable.

Committee Member Rogers asked how many charter cities in Arizona had the limitation.

Michael Rankin, City Attorney, responded he was not familiar with everyone’s charter, but thought there was at least one other city that had a cap or voter requirement that applied to any tax issue. He said he would be careful of characterizing Tucson as being unique, but certainly unusual.

Mr. Knipe stated most Arizona incorporated municipalities were towns and not cities and did not have a Charter.

Mr. Rankin said there were 19 charter cities and 71 non-charter.

Chairwoman Poulos said that in the handouts from the last meeting, there was a list showing where each city was in terms of levying taxes. She said almost all larger cities in Arizona levied a 1.75% to 2% sales tax, and the City of Tucson was in line with other major cities.

Committee Member Bruce Burke asked if there was any limit proposed by State Statute on sales tax and by removing the cap in the Charter would it make it an open-ended legislative decision for the Council with no restrictions.

Mr. Rankin responded there was no limit in State Statute.

Committee Member Scott asked if there were any other cities in AZ that used revenue from other sources not just sales tax. He stated he did not feel the voters would approve removing the cap. He spoke about other options that could possibly generate revenue for the general fund.

Ms. Amparano responded it was usually a combination of revenues; sales tax was primarily the largest revenue source. Revenue was also generated through primary property tax, fees, fines, license/permits, etc. She said sales tax was the largest source in the City of Tucson. She also stated that there were restrictions, by State Statute, on the primary property tax, which limited the City on how much they could increase it year to year.

Committee Member Crum spoke about voter perception, stating that by removing the cap on sales tax, some will look at that as giving the City an unlimited ability to tax and spend money.

Ms. Poulos pointed out that in some ways it was self-limiting because if a politician or a body of politicians raised taxes to a point where the public was dissatisfied, they would probably not be re-elected. However, the tax would already be in place and would need to be repealed once a new set of officials were elected.

Ms. Poulos spoke about a few different options. She said the City could raise the construction sales tax above 2% justified by the need for infrastructure and because of the new restrictions imposed by the State regarding impact fees. She said that impact fees could be reduced or eliminated and the City could levy a construction tax to replace those funds, giving the city greater flexibility on where to spend those tax dollars for infrastructure as a result of new development. She also spoke about an advertising tax, jet fuel tax, and sales tax on internet sales.

Mr. Knipe commented that there were no provisions in the Model City Tax Code for taxing internet sales and as far as jet fuel, with no airports within the City limits, was not possible.

Mr. Bruce Burke spoke about doing what was ideal vs. what was pragmatic. He said philosophically, the Committee needed to come up with something that had a realistic opportunity to pass. By removing or repealing the cap and the talk about voters "punishing" council members that exceeds its grasp in terms of too rich in tax, was a prescription for a campaign against the recommendation. He said the reality was that the City of Tucson had a cap, unique or not. He said he wanted to know how to approach the voters pragmatically and succeed in doing what everyone on the Committee believed in finding ways to increase revenues.

Ms. Dorman said that it seemed that the most pragmatic options were to remove the cap, remove the cap and require voter approval for increases or increase the cap to a level everyone was comfortable with and give the Mayor and Council the flexibility within that amount.

Committee Member Hinderaker stated he thought one of the options he heard was to limit the tax cap at 2% unless the voters approved an increase. He said that would essentially allow the Council to go to the voters for an increase without amending the Charter which he felt was a pragmatic approach.

Ms. Dorman stated that the Charter had to be amended regardless. The City was already at the cap of 2% as stated in the Charter. She said what needed to happen was to remove the cap and require voter approval for any increase, so that changes to the Charter would only be done once, or remove the cap and voter approval would be needed for any increases or increase the cap to 3½ or 4% and give the Mayor and Council flexibility within that manageable area.

Committee Member Yee said he thought the voters would not approve removing the cap regardless of their options. He stated he would like to receive information on how much or what portion of the current sales tax supported the City's operations. He presented some examples for various increases, the effects on the City's budgets and what it meant to the voter. He stated that the public needed to be educated on how much and where the revenue from each of the taxes was used in totality.

Mr. Crum asked if the cap could be increased by Charter Amendment on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Rankin responded that the cap could be increased by Charter Amendment but said he was not sure what Mr. Crum meant by a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Crum said the increase in the cap would be for a specific purpose such as roads. He stated what was troubling for him was not knowing where that increase went. He said he understood using it for capital improvements, maintenance work, or balancing the operating budget including contributions to certain purposes.

Ms. Poulos said she thought that as a Committee, it was not possible to really make recommendations or obtain clear information about each item that was taxed. She said she thought it would tie the hands of the Mayor and Council more so than it currently was. She stated it was the City Manager's and Council's responsibility, when the budget was approved, even though the Committee's recommendation was to increase the cap to 4%. She did not believe they would raise every tax by a half percent but could do so as they saw fit. She asked if she was correct in her thoughts.

Mr. Rankin stated that the Mayor and Council could establish a rate under that cap for the different categories in taxation under the Model Cities Tax Code.

Ms. Poulos clarified again that she felt it was the Manager's and Council's responsibility and what the Committee could do was recommend a change to the Charter that allowed them to function within that cap on each item they felt was important.

Mr. Rogers said he concurred completely, but said what he thought the Committee needed to do was put something on the ballot that had a good chance at passing. He stated the City was in dire financial straits and some things were totally out of their control such as public safety retirement contributions. He said he felt the cap should be raised but did not know to what amount.

Mr. Scott said he favored the idea of a cap that the Mayor and Council could take to the voters and not have to keep going back and forth with Charter amendments. He stated he thought people would start to get suspicious if every year, two years, something was put on the ballot changing the Charter. He suggested setting the cap at a higher level and if needed, the Mayor and Council could raise it with voter approval. This way it was still in the hands of the voters and the City is not continually going back and forth asking for Charter changes.

Mr. Crum clarified his comments by saying that the voters, not the Committee, would specify the purpose for the increase.

Ms. Dorman stated that any tax increase had implications, both negative and positive. She said the Committee's goal was to give the City flexibility to increase revenues which were desperately needed, but whenever sales taxes were raised, it had negative implications for businesses in that people would go to the County to purchase their vehicles and many other things.

Ms. Dorman stated she wanted to receive additional information from the business community or the finance department about what the past implications in tax increases were. She said it would help the Committee make a decision on what number to use. She said she did not think that just removing the cap was the right solution and felt it would probably not be approved. She commented that if the cap was removed with voter approval for any increase,

then the Charter would not have to be changed and the voters could vote on specific areas of increase as the Mayor and Council deem necessary.

Ms. Amparano commented that eliminating the cap and still having any increases be approved by the voters was an option with wording that it be dedicated to a specific area/function. It just all depended on how the question to the voters was written.

Ms. Dorman asked for clarification if a stipulation could be put in the charter that the cap was 2% but any increase above that would need voter approval not charter change approval.

Mr. Rankin stated she was correct and thought that was the recommendation the first time round. He reiterated that in the Charter the cap was at 2%, however, the Mayor and Council were authorized to impose a tax above 2% if it was first approved by the voters.

Mr. Bruce Burke said for the most part, his take on the discussions was that there was a need of more revenue, the source of the revenue, and how the Committee got there to get it passed. He said Mr. Rogers' proposal of finding the percentage worked.

Mr. Rogers stated that the only problem he saw was that if it was passed in November, the City had to wait until the following November to reap the benefits.

Ms. Poulos asked if currently the city had a sales tax on construction contracting, what the impacts were in state law regarding impact fees, and did anyone have a sense of how the business community would feel if there was an increase to the construction tax and elimination of the impact fees.

Mr. Rankin responded that State legislature fundamentally changed cities authority to impose impact fees, the process in which you had to follow to establish an impact fee, and how those fees could be expended. He said State law now makes it very clear that if a city increases its construction sales tax, they had to then provide an offset against its impact fees before the new revenues are brought in through the construction sales tax.

Mr. Rankin said one thing that was previously discussed by the Committee was the potential for the City to have the ability to raise construction sales tax above the 2% to substitute for what we currently collected through impact fees. He said it was a more flexible revenue source than development impact fees because under the statutes you could only spend development impact fees for specific categories of public infrastructure, which was a pain-staking process to establish what those projects were. He stated construction sales tax would just come into the general fund and could be expended on an annual basis through the budget appropriation process.

Ms. Poulos asked if the impact fees were enacted by an ordinance or was it specified somewhere in the Charter and if it was by an ordinance did that require a Charter change if the Mayor and Council chose to eliminate impact fees. She also asked how much money was generated by those fees.

Mr. Rankin stated it was by an ordinance and the Mayor and Council could choose not to impose impact fees by repealing the ordinance.

Ms. Amparano stated construction sales tax, in the past, use to generate about ten to eleven million dollars a year and was now down to eight million dollars the previous year and lower currently with the changes in the legislation regarding how they are reported. She said impact fees vary from year to year and was uncertain on the amount.

Ms. Poulos said she sensed from the discussions that by simply removing the cap was not on the table. She said if the cap was removed requiring voter approval for instituting a tax was an option on the table. She commented that the problem with that option might still be seen by voters as giving the City more chances for taxes to be raised. She said the other two options to consider were to leave the 2% cap and encourage and authorize the Mayor and Council to seek voter approval for any increases on all taxes, city wide, above 2% or second, to raise the cap by some percent, 1/2 to one percent, making the cap 2 1/2 to 3 % and not necessarily require any voter approval until the cap is exceeded.

Mr. Knipe asked about the poll that was authorized by the Mayor and Council that was supposed to take place that would measure community support for a tax increase of 1/2 percent.

Ms. Amparano responded that the poll had not begun yet and would be probably a couple more weeks. She said the 1/2 sales tax was one of the options to the Mayor and Council or three 1/5 sales tax.

Mr. Scott asked about the 1/2 sales tax question posed to the voters a few years back.

Mr. Knipe responded that it was in 2010 referred to as the Core Tax which was defeated by the voters.

Mr. Hinderaker stated he wanted to make a motion. It was moved by Committee Member Hinderaker, duly seconded, to recommend an amendment to the Charter that left the 2% cap in place, but allowed the Mayor and Council to exceed the 2% cap with voter approval and without having to go back to the voters to amend the Charter.

Committee Member Porges said he disagreed with the basic premise that many of the Committee members had voiced, which was that they had to come up with something that would get passed by the voters. He said he felt the Committee's

job was to come up with the best possible recommendation(s), for the best possible Charter for the City of Tucson. He stated it was their job to use their expertise using the information presented to come up with what was best for the City.

Mr. Porges stated he agreed with Mr. Knipe that if they wanted to empower the Mayor and Council to make decisions, then they should be empowering them which was one of the goals of the Committee. He said he was going to vote to remove the cap and not require any voter approval for anything because he believed that was what the City needed.

Mr. Knipe clarified his position that he would support removing the cap altogether and did not think there was a good argument to be made that the City of Tucson should face a financial burden that other cities did not. He said he trusted the Mayor and Council and voters to do the right thing. He said he would also support something weaker, that they pick a number that would get voter support or increase the cap to 2 ½% . He said he could not support the motion on the floor because leaving the cap as is placed a unique burden that had a potential to interfere with the City's credit rating and revenue goals. He stated the City needed flexibility.

Mr. Rogers again asked about the timeline for the poll and felt that they were at a good place with the discussion of the item until the results of the poll were received.

It was moved by Committee Member Rogers to continue the item until the results of the poll were in that could help to further educate the Committee.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Bruce Burke stated that the more information the Committee had the better off they would be so long as they did not have any time constraints. He asked what the timeframe was to come up with a recommendation for the Mayor and Council.

Roger W. Randolph, City Clerk, responded that the Mayor and Council voted, as part of the adopting Ordinance, to have a recommendation back from the Committee in April.

Mr. Hinderaker stated he felt that any increase on taxes should have voter approval. He then withdrew his motion.

Mr. Crum asked for clarification on whether or not Mr. Rogers made a motion to continue the item. There was not a second to Mr. Rogers' motion at that time.

Ms. Poulos said the motion had been withdrawn and that the item would be continued to a meeting in March once the poll results were received.

Committee Member Tom Burke asked if prior to the next meeting he could receive information from Finance on the impact fees or what it meant on the various changes, .i.e., 1/4% , 1/2%, three 1/5 %.

Ms. Amparano responded that the information was shared with the Committee at the last meeting. She said a 1/2 cent sales tax would yield approximately \$40 million. She offered to answer any questions Mr. Burke had after he reviewed the materials from the previous meetings since he was recently appointed to the Committee and did not have time to review everything.

Discussion continued regarding the impacts of the 1/2 cent sales tax, budget deficits, and challenges the City faced for the next five years.

Mr. Scott asked what the restrictions were in State law regarding property taxes.

Ms. Amparano responded State law restricts increases to 2% per year, which the City does but was not yielding much revenue. She said a restriction on the limited property value that went into effect this year states that it cannot be increased more than 5% annually.

Ms. Poulos commented that if the cap was removed from the secondary tax and only levied on the primary tax, it would give a lot more flexibility to the City for raising the primary tax because it was not even close to the cap that was being applied to both the primary and secondary tax.

Ms. Amparano confirmed Ms. Poulos' statement. She said the State limitation was the one that limited the City because the tax cannot be increased by more than 2% annually. She said eliminating the cap off of the combined gave the City more bonding capacity.

6. Discussion Regarding Form of Elections

a. Presentation by Dr. Sonenshein regarding trends in Charter Reform relating to the Structure of Local Elections

Information was provided by Raphe Sonenshein, who fielded and answered questions regarding the various forms of elections. He spoke about how inter-connected everything was regarding decisions about elections.

He said the current model used by the City of Tucson for mayor and council elections was an unusual one referred to as a hybrid election. He said there were two kinds of hybrid elections and the City's was called a most unusual hybrid where candidates are nominated in their ward for the primary election and then voted to the council city-wide.

He spoke about four different election systems:

- 1) Tucson Hybrid system – current system being used by the City of Tucson,
- 2) At-large system – every candidate runs city-wide,
- 3) District/Ward system – elected by their district/ward, and
- 4) Mixed system – a district system with some additional members of the council elected at large

Mr. Sonenshein spoke about what the different trends were on these systems and what the differences were between the life of a City with district elections vs. the life of a City with at-large elections. He said the differences were very significant. He explained that the original form of government, in the United States, was a very traditional mayor/council district, partisan election, in the 19th century all the way up to the first part of the 20th century.

Mr. Sonenshein stated that at the beginning of the 20th century, when people began to critique the election system, they critiqued every piece of the system not just one piece at a time which resulted in a number of inter-related issues. He said at-large elections, the council/manager form of government, and non-partisanship were all supposed to flow together and in charter reform, every city could mix and match whatever they wanted to do, which was what was being done today.

Mr. Sonenshein said in the 1950's and 1960's, especially up to the 70's and 80's, there was a lot of push back against some of those issues which led to waves of charter reform in many cities. He said among the things that began the change, one was the belief that partisan elections were not always the end of the world and did not necessarily lead to corruption in city government. He said non-partisanship proved to be a very hearty survivor of the original movement. In the 1960's, strengthening mayors, either by keeping their role the same or increasing it, became a very big part of charter reform.

Mr. Sonenshein said in the 1970's and 80's there was a real revolution that took hold in district and at-large elections that had to do with minority representation. A lawsuit was filed in 1986 arguing that at-large elections discriminated against racial minorities in terms of representation. He said for any group that was not geographically dispersed, at-large elections, might actually bring better opportunities for representation.

Mr. Sonenshein commented that district elections had a better reputation than they did before but did not necessarily solve every problem in the universe and at large elections had a less than better reputation. He said district and at-large representatives were completely different and in Tucson it was obscured because both of those characteristics were in the same person because of the form of election the City had. He stated at-large representatives will have spent considerably more money for the election than the district representative; they may have a number of different supporters around the city, and they might be part of the city's leadership team in terms of big, city-wide projects.

Mr. Sonenshein said they were considered important because they were elected at-large just as the mayor was considered important. He said, one thing about the mayor by definition, was not quite as super prominent in the at-large system as in a system where the council members were elected by district and the mayor was elected city-wide. He stated that everyone elected at-large was almost like a “team” that addressed various projects and concerns. He said if the voters liked that system, they tended to say they had six different people they could go to with a problem. He said on the flip side, if you had a city council that was elected by district, the district representative might say, “when everybody represents you, no body represents you,” because nobody has your corner of the city in mind. District representatives usually spend less money to get elected and they are the “Gods” of their district.

Mr. Sonenshein said that at-large systems missed things that were small and important which sometimes resulted in big revolts because that little neighborhood protest that did not seem like a big deal, turned out to be something that, six months later, electrified ten neighborhoods who were ready to head down to City Hall to fight with the City and the people at City Hall were wondering how that all happened. Conversely, he said, the district system might sometimes miss things in terms of the overall value to the community, such as a new project that is really upsetting in their district and should it be blocked by that representative.

Mr. Sonenshein said there were strengths and weaknesses in both systems. The role of the mayor would change significantly in a district election and any change affected the culture of City Hall. He said whichever way the Committee wished to go would be different from what the City currently had. He said council members, in the at-large system, would no longer be able to say that because they ran by district in the Primary, they were assigned to that district; they would be more of a city-wide council.

Mr. Sonenshein urged the Committee to think about the type of representation or system they wanted to have rather than deciding too quickly on which of the four systems was better. In other words, what did they want to accomplish, what did they want City Hall to look like, and what kind of elected official did they want in City Hall.

Mr. Hinderaker asked if the pros and cons discussed changed depending on the size of the city.

Mr. Sonenshein responded with absolutely. He said he thought the question of districts became sort of critical in cities with populations of 150,000 or 200,000 and at which point you started to see a big switch in the percentage of cities using district elections.

Mr. Knipe asked if district voting vs. at-large voting impacted voter turnout.

Mr. Sonenshein stated he doubted there was be a big improvement with one or the other. He said, what he thought changed, was the people's sense of how they were represented, not necessarily turnout.

Mr. Bruce Burke asked for his thoughts on what worked to make things better, what is considered better.

Mr. Sonenshein said when it came to elections; there were two values that should be better: a sense of representation and the reasonable effectiveness of city government. He said those were the two things needed to be balanced. He said representation was not always something that was objective, but subjective where people felt connected to city government. He stated this was something that was measurable by conducting surveys with specific questions like such as:

- Do you feel that people like yourself can be heard at city hall?
- Do you recognize any of the following people as people you might go to if there was a problem?
- If you had a problem at city hall over city government, whom would you ask?

Mr. Sonenshein said some other things a city should want to know were how did the current election system help people get access to city hall and do they feel decisions being made are legitimate? He stated there was not an easy measurement for both, but certainly the size of the city was a factor and the ability of the city, in the past to operate effectively, usually meant that whatever system was adopted would not hurt too badly. He said if the system was changed, there could also be some checks to ensure those things were happening.

Mr. Sonenshein said, as an example, if the City switched to an at-large system, someone needed to quickly figure out what supplementary connection was needed to the neighborhoods since about half of their representation was being cut out. Conversely, he said, if a district system was used, systems at city hall would need to be strengthened with the realization that the mayor was the one person with the at-large perspective in the budget process along with the city manager. In charter reform, if you fix one area, you need to fix all other areas affected by the change.

Ms. Dorman asked what the end result would be on the ballot for the voters, was there only one question for or against or was there two options.

Mr. Sonenshein stated he had checked with the City Attorney and also knew that the tradition about the rules in city charters was that you could not give people a choice. He said the general form of ballot measures was a yes or no on a proposal.

Mr. Rogers asked, in ward only elections, if there was a trend where extremist from both sides of the spectrum were more likely to get elected. He said in literature he read, going non-partisan caused a rather significant drop in voter turnout.

Mr. Sonenshein said that in district and/or at-large elections it was not uncommon to elect extremist from both sides. He said he felt that was not due to the election system used but rather the low voter turnout in local elections. He said, invariably, in non-partisan elections the turnout was low among specific routes, among the working class voters, and minority voters. He said voters with less than a college degree were far less a significant part of the voting electorate than in partisan systems.

Mr. Sonenshein commented that one of the issues with non-partisan elections was that the voters did not know who the candidates were. He said problems with voter information were so serious that if it was a medical question, it would be like a crisis-treated epidemic. He said it was worth considering and recommended the Committee definitely consider holding public hearings on the subject.

Ms. Poulos asked for examples of what increased and/or decreased voter turnout.

Mr. Sonenshein replied he thought that dates had a lot to do with turnout, fewer and more consolidated elections, even year vs. odd year elections, voter registration, Tuesday voting, early voting, weekend voting, making it easier for people to vote, simplifying ballot measures, direct contact with voters (door-to-door, telephone contact), vote by mail, and shaming (finding out that your neighbors voted and you did not). He said a majority of it was restoring the notion that it was a personal activity that was doable within their daily lives.

Mr. Knipe commented on the Mayor and Council's decision, through an ordinance, to conduct all vote by mail elections in the City of Tucson. He asked if there were any other charter cities that required all vote by mail elections.

Mr. Sonenshein stated he was not sure but could easily find out. He said he knew that Oregon, state-wide, conducted vote by mail elections and the City of Los Angeles considered it but had not put anything into their charter.

Mr. Tom Burke asked if the City were to go to a district type of election, how the current staggering of terms for members would be affected.

Mr. Sonenshein stated he did not think it would necessarily change the timing of the elections. Currently, it was three and three every two years. He said a city should never elect its entire council at the same time.

Ms. Poulos asked if district elections were used for electing a council and staged them during a presidential election, when there was a greater turnout, and then stagger the mayoral election every two years, who usually turned out a higher electorate, might that have a higher voter turnout at both of those elections.

Mr. Sonenshein stated that was a possibility, but his research showed that mayoral elections, by themselves, did not attract any higher voter turnout, even in cities such as New York, Los Angeles and Chicago, who always had gigantic elections.

Mr. Bruce Burke asked if there was a higher voter turnout when the mayor was on the ballot, to which the response was yes.

Discussion continued regarding the impacts of the current system, changing the mayor's term, implementing term limits, and holding elections for part of the council during a presidential election.

Mr. Knipe asked about the difference between district and at-large elections in terms of the influence money. He also asked if one system was favorable to large special interests.

Mr. Sonenshein replied it was favorable to different special interests which was a slightly different answer to the question. He said in a city, that has a mayor and council system where the council is elected by district and the mayor city-wide, very often organized labor does better in the council races than in a city-wide race. He stated the business community did well in the city-wide especially with city-wide policy, but sometimes was not as successful in the politics of the district election. He said, in a small, well organized group, who was neither business nor labor, could do quite well in the council races.

Additional comments were made by Commissioner Yee on his feelings and thoughts about the various types of elections and how to get the voters to approve whatever proposal was put out.

- b. Discussion about the top issues the CRC will address relating to Tucson's electoral process

This item was not discussed and was continued to the next meeting.

7. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers.

8. Meeting Schedule

Introductory comments were made by Chairwoman Bonnie Poulos. Discussion was held.

By consensus, it was determined that the Charter Review Committee would meet on February 1 and 22, 2016 and March 7 and 21, 2016, at 4:30 p.m. in the 1st Floor Conference Room at City Hall. April meeting dates will be discussed at a later time.

9. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.