

TUCSON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Randi Dorman, Chairwoman  
Tom Burke  
Mark Crum  
Tannya Gaxiola (arrived at 5:34 p.m.)  
John Hinderaker  
Luke Knipe  
Leonard (Lenny) Porges  
Tom Prezelski (arrived at 5:10 p.m.)  
D. Grady Scott (arrived at 5:37 p.m.)  
John Springer  
Joe Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bruce Burke  
Joseph Howell  
Bonnie Poulos  
Jeff Rogers

TUCSON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS:

Roger Randolph, City Clerk  
Mike Rankin, City Attorney  
Deborah Rainone, Chief Deputy City Clerk  
Suzanne Mesich, Assistant City Clerk  
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office

Raphe Sonenshein, Facilitator

1 CHAIRWOMAN: Okay. The recorder is on and we have a  
2 quorum, so let's start. Let's start our meeting (**the meeting**  
3 **was called to order at 4:49 p.m.**). So, can you do the roll  
4 call, please.

5 CLERK: Mr. Bruce Burke is absent. Mr. Tom Burke.

6 MR. BURKE: Here.

1 CLERK: Mr. Crum.  
2 MR. BURKE: Here.  
3 CLERK: Ms. Dorman.  
4 MS. DORMAN: Here.  
5 CLERK: Ms. Gaxiola will be late. Mr. Hinderaker.  
6 MR. HINDERAKER: Here.  
7 CLERK: Mr. Howell is absent. Mr. Knipe.  
8 MR. KNIPE: Here.  
9 CLERK: Mr. Porges.  
10 MR. PORGES: Here.  
11 CLERK: Ms. Poulos is absent. Mr. Prezelski, absent.  
12 Mr. Rogers is absent. Mr. Scott is absent. Mr. Springer.  
13 MR. SPRINGER: Here.  
14 CLERK: And Mr. Yee.  
15 MR. YEE: Here.  
16 CLERK: We have a quorum.  
17 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Excellent. Thank you. Can I  
18 have a motion to approve the Minutes from the January 25th  
19 meeting.  
20 MR. KNIPE: So moved.  
21 MR. CRUM: Second.

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Any, any - do we have to  
2 discuss that at all, or not? Any discussion? No? Okay. All  
3 in favor?

4           (Affirmative.)

5           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Any opposed? Okay.  
6 Excellent. So, do we have any Call to the Audience cards? I  
7 don't think so. Okay. So let's go right to the discussion  
8 regarding the form of elections. I do just want to make one  
9 request.

10           The transcriber sometimes has a hard time  
11 understanding if you're not speaking loudly enough. So please  
12 make sure you're speaking loudly enough. And also, especially  
13 since we started a little late, we want to hear all of the  
14 comments, but let's try to keep them as succinct as possible as  
15 well. Okay. Mr. - Dr. Sonenshein.

16           DR. SONENSHEIN: Hello, Madam Chair.

17           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** The floor is yours.

18           DR. SONENSHEIN: Thank you very much. And also thank  
19 you all for changing the date of the meeting, making it easier  
20 for me to attend. I really appreciate that. (Inaudible)

21           I'd like to refer you to a page that was circulated at

1 my request to the Committee. Tending to be a visual learner, I  
2 find it easier to think in terms of sort of pictures of  
3 different alternatives, and at each meeting, I'm hoping to just  
4 keep going deeper into the choices you have.

5 We started just looking at the difference between at-  
6 large and district elections. Near the end of that meeting, I  
7 indicated that some cities have increasingly used a hybrid which  
8 is a different hybrid than the hybrid that Tucson uses. So it's  
9 actually two different kinds. I'm only gonna refer to the  
10 Tucson system as the Tucson system, a district election in the  
11 primary, and then a runoff election citywide.

12 The more common use of the term "hybrid" or "mixed  
13 system", as I indicated, was a, was a combination of at-large  
14 and district representatives. The impetus for this has gotten  
15 so much stronger because of a Department of Justice ruling  
16 several years ago that it was acceptable under the Voting Rights  
17 Act to do this, and as you can recall from the last meeting, the  
18 Voting Rights Act is the major part of this decision about  
19 whether to go for at-large or district elections.

20 What I wanted to show you is the unbelievable variety  
21 in this third system, and the consequences that has because as

1 you can see, different types of hybrids actually take you a very  
2 different place, and it's important to know that.

3 I chose to only include versions of this hybrid that  
4 are similar enough in size to the Tucson City Council. You'll  
5 find there's places that have many more Council Members than are  
6 here. Jacksonville, Florida has 14 district members, and five  
7 at-large members.

8 I sort of wanted to stay away from numbers that are  
9 much larger than what is the general framework here. But one of  
10 the points I wanted to get across is the balance, if you do  
11 decide to go that way, which is only one of the alternatives  
12 before you, the number of at-large relative to the number of  
13 districts changes the, the qualitative nature of the City  
14 Council in very significant ways.

15 And I tried to show that by saying where the number of  
16 at-large members comes close to the number of district members,  
17 you would see Hybrid Three, which is Boston on your right.  
18 You'll start to discover that the at-large people become very  
19 significant in the governance of a city. They're widely  
20 discussed as part of the leadership, and I would put it, in that  
21 sense, almost closer to an at-large system than the current

1 Tucson system.

2           If you make either of these changes, remember, you're  
3 breaking up the Tucson components into either more district or  
4 more at-large as opposed to the city district and at-large being  
5 in the same person, in the same office holder.

6           But if you go way over to the other side, Hybrid One,  
7 and you look at a city like Oakland which has only one at-large  
8 representative on the Council, the at-large role is somewhat  
9 more - somewhat less significant in terms of the functioning of  
10 the City Council.

11           Now interestingly enough, when you look at these  
12 cities, the at-large people quite often end up in leadership  
13 roles on the Council, where that's elected by the Council, such  
14 as Vice-Mayor or Council President. But I would indicate that  
15 when you have four at-large members, they often get seen as a  
16 group, almost as a block.

17           In fact, I was looking in, in Boston. And the Boston  
18 Globe, at one point, wrote an editorial about how great the four  
19 at-large representatives were, not one at a time but all four as  
20 if they were the kind of at-large block on the Board. You would  
21 not see that in Oakland where there's one at-large person. But

1 even that was, of course, a change.

2           The trend in Seattle, two of the newest ones, just  
3 within the last couple of election cycles, have seven district  
4 and two at-large which for them seem to be a reasonable balance,  
5 where the at-large person is not completely lonely, but it still  
6 has - these are both cities that went from a totally at-large  
7 system to a seven and two. So for them, it was a pretty big  
8 shift from a wholly at-large system to a seven to two district.  
9 But they felt comfortable keeping the two.

10           As I indicated last time, depending on which direction  
11 of these now six alternatives that I'm putting before you, and I  
12 would say regardless of what numbers you might pick, starting at  
13 the left, is to go all the way to district elections. On the  
14 right, all the way to at-large elections. And then going  
15 inward, something like Hybrid Three where you go to a mix, but  
16 the at-large has a very large component, relatively speaking.

17           Then go all the way to the left to one where you  
18 really have a district system, but one significant at-large  
19 person. And then there's all kinds of permutations in between.  
20 As I've indicated before, one of the great joys of Charter  
21 Reform is that there are guidelines, experiences and every city

1 can pick whatever number they want, whatever they're comfortable  
2 with. It certainly pays to know what the experiences have been.

3           Some of these, however, are kind of new to find out  
4 how it's, how it's gonna be working. Some of them elected their  
5 first in 2015, or 2013. There was ~~an~~ enthusiasm when they went  
6 to the voters. That's not the same as saying what it'll be like  
7 a number of years down the road.

8           But I would say that separate from the question of  
9 minority and neighborhood representation which is what's driving  
10 the district election debate, this is probably the newer model  
11 that is picking up popularity.

12           Again, I never would assume because it's picking up  
13 popularity it's something you should adopt. But it's the new  
14 kid on the block to a certain degree. Yeah?

15           MR. KNIPE: When you say minority representation, I  
16 assume you mean ethnic minority and -

17           MR. SONENSHEIN: I do.

18           MR. KNIPE: - political minority?

19           MR. SONENSHEIN: Yes. Well, of course, your situation  
20 is quite different because the lawsuit that you're dealing with  
21 is not about minority representation, but about political

1 representation which is not the general discussion about at-  
2 large and district elections. It's kind of a, a different take.  
3 But it builds on the argument about racial and ethnic  
4 representation.

5 MR. KNIPE: It's actually something that there seems  
6 to be some confusion about in our community and you, you will  
7 often hear people that are upset the Republicans aren't getting  
8 enough representation -

9 DR. SONENSHEIN: Right.

10 MR. KNIPE: - in Tucson (inaudible) Voting Rights Act  
11 as if the Voting Rights Act were created to protect political  
12 minorities, which it's not correct.

13 DR. SONENSHEIN: Correct. And I would, of course,  
14 defer to the City Attorney. I know there's an appeal going  
15 forward on the decision, and it will presumably depend on what  
16 higher courts say about that, about whether or not that applies.  
17 I mean that would have very general application if that were to  
18 apply, which would be quite a bit broader than what we know  
19 about the voting rights (inaudible)

20 MR. RANKIN: Yeah. I can confirm that. And as you're  
21 all aware of, we've talked about it a few times. Our Petition

1 for Rehearing is - remains pending. We haven't heard anything  
2 yet, so we let you know as soon as we get any word.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Porges had a question.

4 **MR. PORGES:** Dr. Sonenshein, question. The three  
5 hybrids that you've listed here still have an absolute majority  
6 in each case for district-elected Council Members. Are there  
7 any cities that you're aware of that are the other way around  
8 that, that have a majority citywide elected?

9 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** I'm not aware of any, and I think it  
10 would be if someone knows of one, I'd - do you know of one?

11 **MR. PORGES:** No, no.

12 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Oh. It's - it would be odd.

13 **MR. PORGES:** And there's a reason?

14 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** The re- -- the logic of it is, I  
15 think these are cities that basically prefer district  
16 representation, but did not want to lose virtues of at-large  
17 representation. Not cities that preferred at-large  
18 representation and wanted to build in some district  
19 representation.

20 The other problem is it's easier to satisfy the desire  
21 for at-large representation with a few seats than it is to

1 satisfy the desire for district representation. Imagine taking  
2 Tucson and having two or three district seats and, say, five or  
3 six at-large seats.

4           At a certain point, you'd say, "Why bother? Why  
5 bother? Why go to the trouble of having so few district seats?"  
6 It's a great question. The answer is it would almost always  
7 logically be this way.

8           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Hinderaker had a  
9 question.

10           **MR. HINDERAKER:** Are the examples you've given us, are  
11 the Mayors members of the Council, or they have a veto power or  
12 -

13           **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Well, it varies. And Boston has a  
14 very strong Mayor system, by the way, which goes a little bit  
15 against my arrows here, but Boston's had this system for a very  
16 long time. But nowadays, if you had this many at-large people,  
17 it would to some degree relatively weaken the Mayor, whereas  
18 here, it would strengthen the Mayor to have mostly district  
19 representatives.

20           But where you got an East Coast city with a tradition  
21 of strong Mayor, it's not gonna happen. So they (inaudible)

1 separate from. Seattle is separate.

2 MR. HINDERAKER: The Mayor is separate?

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: Yes. And the veto question, I, I was  
4 gonna dig into more when I had a sense of, of the interest level  
5 that people have in these different models. You can do - any of  
6 these models on here could be done with a Mayor as part of the  
7 Council. There is no necessity to remove the Mayor from the  
8 Council.

9 The question is, if you go to all district elections,  
10 though, the role of Mayor really does change significantly at  
11 that point. And sometimes you might want to ask for a veto, but  
12 it's, then the Mayor would not have a vote on the Council.

13 You can have a city where the Mayor has a veto and  
14 actually is still on the Council but doesn't vote. That's not  
15 out of the question. Pasadena, California has that particular  
16 system. So there's a million permutations of this. Yes?

17 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Oh. Mr. Prezelski.

18 MR. PREZELSKI: I, I apologize for being late.  
19 So, Madam Chair, Dr. Sonenshein, so are you saying if the Mayor  
20 is part of the Council but doesn't have a vote, does that mean  
21 the Mayor would function as, would basically have some

1 parliamentary function on the Council as in he could make  
2 motions. He might even be able to vote on certain motions, that  
3 sort of thing?

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: I only was referring to the case  
5 where a Mayor could have a veto and still be on the Council.  
6 And the only way the Mayor can have a veto and still be on the  
7 Council is to not have a vote because it would not make sense  
8 for the Mayor to be able to veto a measure on which the Mayor  
9 had a vote.

10 But if the Mayor does not have a veto, I think what  
11 this Committee did was very important in the last iteration  
12 which was to make sure the Mayor had equal voting rights with  
13 every member of the Council. So you would not, in my opinion,  
14 want to go back and weaken that. That, that, to me, was a, was  
15 a very significant step forward, all had to do with whether or  
16 not the Mayor has a veto.

17 The strongest Mayor does not sit on the Council, has a  
18 veto and has a major role in the administration of the  
19 government. That's a very major change. That's, that's a very,  
20 very big step (inaudible)

21 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Does anyone else have, have

1 questions, 'cause I, I have a couple of questions. This chart -  
2 so is this both on how the Council is structured as well as the  
3 way they are elected with the three hybrids in particular? So  
4 are the seven district people only elected by their district and  
5 the one at-large in Oakland elected at-large?

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: Correct.

7 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** And all of them are  
8 consistent in that if they represent a district, they're only  
9 elected by the district, and -

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: Correct.

11 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** - if it -

12 DR. SONENSHEIN: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to  
13 interrupt you. But, yes, -

14 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay.

15 DR. SONENSHEIN: - these are real district  
16 representatives.

17 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** So in, by the way, if anyone  
18 did not get a chance to read this pamphlet that we got last  
19 week, it's really informative. So it says here that there's 19  
20 Arizona Charter cities. Currently 13 cities nominate and elect  
21 the Council Members or Aldermen at-large. So they not - are

1 they all then at-large, or do they represent districts?

2 MR. RANKIN: They would be all at-large. They  
3 represent cities or towns at-large.

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: Are they numbered by district? Is  
5 that -

6 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: But, -

7 DR. SONENSHEIN: - correct?

8 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: So all the Council people in  
9 one of the cities, they would all represent the whole city?

10 They don't have responsibility for a certain area?

11 MR. RANKIN: Yes. As I understand it, yeah.

12 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: Is that the way

13 (inaudible) everyone does this?

14 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. PORGES: I can tell you that's the  
15 case in Prescott.

16 DR. SONENSHEIN: In a true at-large system, that is  
17 what (inaudible)

18 MR. KNIPE: Well, under state law when towns  
19 incorporate, unless the voters - unless something - unless an  
20 option is put before the voters. Otherwise, towns by default  
21 are represented at-large, or represented under that at-large

1 system. The majority of Arizona's towns are represented at-  
2 large.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. Mr. Crum.

4 MR. CRUM: However, the larger cities elect by  
5 district.

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: The largest American cities, or the  
7 largest cities -

8 MALE SPEAKER: In Arizona.

9 MR. CRUM: In Arizona.

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: - in Arizona (inaudible)

11 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mesa, Glendale, Peoria and  
12 Phoenix have Councils -

13 DR. SONENSHEIN: Uh-huh.

14 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** - that are elected by  
15 district.

16 DR. SONENSHEIN: And that's consistent with the  
17 general experience of large cities around the country is that it  
18 is unusual. Detroit is one of the last ones to switch  
19 (inaudible) 2013 switched to this system. But previously, they  
20 were one of the few very large cities with at-large elections.  
21 It's unusual for large cities.

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Prezelski.

2           MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair, and, and  
3 please forgive me if this has been mentioned already. Is there  
4 a difference between a Council Member and an Alderman other than  
5 the nomenclature?

6           DR. SONENSHEIN: No. The Council Members are used  
7 uniformly, I think, in the West and in the Southwest. Aldermen,  
8 I guess is mostly Chicago (inaudible) traditional cities. But,  
9 no, there's no difference.

10          **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** And I have another question.  
11 With the - when you have representatives at-large, what  
12 determines what they're in cha- -- each in charge of?

13          DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, actually under this system,  
14 they would not be in charge of anything in particular. They  
15 would be the same as another member of the City Council. They  
16 would vote on all matters the way the City Council Members do,  
17 and there would be no division or assignment of management or  
18 administrative authority to anybody on the Council. If that's  
19 what you're asking, or is it are there certain departments or  
20 functions that they would have?

21          **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Or areas. So if people have

1 neighborhood concerns in those systems that are completely at-  
2 large, to whom do they turn?

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: That's, that's a work, gonna be a  
4 work in progress for these newer cities that have adopted it  
5 that have had one vehicle or the other. Take Detroit, or  
6 Seattle, which had at-large for very many years. Now there are  
7 gonna be expectations that those will go to the district  
8 members, suddenly have that put on them.

9 If you had a district system that went the other way,  
10 then it would be a whole different culture. My guess is that in  
11 these mixed systems, the newer ones, that people will go with  
12 their direct problems to their district representative. And on  
13 larger policy problems, they'll go to everybody.

14 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** If there's a mix.

15 DR. SONENSHEIN: If there's a mix. With at-large  
16 systems, the odds are the City Administration is gonna play a  
17 much bigger role in responding to things and neighborhood  
18 participation. That's why I put on this arrow that the farther  
19 you go to at-large, you have to answer that question a whole lot  
20 more, which can either be neighborhood Councils, neighborhood  
21 bodies. The City has to invest in administrative structures

1 that will respond.

2 I have to tell you, you know, a hundred years ago when  
3 at-large systems were first going around, cities really didn't  
4 respond that much. The notion that the City government should  
5 respond to people is a modern notion in terms of service  
6 delivery and complaints and customer services are a relatively  
7 new term. You know, 30, 40 years.

8 So the at-large systems, if they're gonna survive,  
9 have to find a way to do what the district Council Members would  
10 do in at-large (~~inaudible~~) **a more traditional** system. So that's  
11 why you (~~inaudible~~) much, much more development on this side of  
12 that.

13 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Hinderaker had a  
14 question, and then Mr. Knipe.

15 **MR. HINDERAKER:** It's two questions. One, if, if we  
16 move to an at-large system, would that likely mean that the  
17 Council Members who currently have offices throughout the City  
18 in their various wards would come downtown to City Hall, is my  
19 first question.

20 My second question is one I asked you at the end of  
21 the last meeting which I thought was interesting. And that is

1 what would a ballot look like for an at-large election?

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: It - let's do the second one first.  
3 One of the things that I'm gonna recommend, if you see the list  
4 here, is that I'm gonna recommend that whatever you come up  
5 with, you come up with a whole package of how things are gonna  
6 work. Otherwise, you'll have voters wanting to know how this is  
7 gonna work, what's gonna happen.

8 You could elect an at-large Council in at least two  
9 different ways. One is everybody can run and the top three  
10 people in that election get elected. Or the top five people run  
11 off, and then the top three people get elected. What you can  
12 also do is you can create numbered offices and have a separate  
13 candidacy for each of those offices, but they're all elected at-  
14 large. That could be done as well.

15 Now they both have problems that can be addressed.  
16 The biggest problem in the first one, I don't know (~~inaudible~~)  
17 **what you would** call it, the weird candidate syndrome where you  
18 have some fairly reasonable human beings, and then (inaudible)  
19 shows up, the outlier who, because of their quirks of being the  
20 votes divided the way they're divided somehow is able to sneak  
21 in and you have to deal with that person for years.

1           The problem that sometimes occurs with office numbers  
2 is you may have an office that not enough people run for. Some  
3 of it has to do with timing. Obviously, it has to do with open  
4 seats, becomes a very important question as well. So there are  
5 ways to do it.

6           There are also all kinds of new fangled, or old  
7 fangled voting systems that are discussed but not often adopted  
8 like (inaudible) the voting, approval voting. A number of ways  
9 where you have multi-candidates. Preference voting, so that  
10 people can register a first choice and a second choice. Those  
11 are all possibilities.

12           I, I think it takes a lot of time to go through them,  
13 and it's usually a stretch for the voters. It seems rather  
14 exotic. The thing is you can design it, but it's any system you  
15 design is gonna have those same problems, which is not enough  
16 good candidates for the right number of offices. And make sure  
17 the voters' choice is really heard.

18           I would also recommend, by the way, that given the  
19 nature of the lawsuit, you may want to actually consider the  
20 consequences on politics of these different alternatives if you  
21 played out who would get elected given that you're dealing with

1 a quirk (sic).

2 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Knipe.

3 MR. KNIPE: I think my question is similar to the  
4 first part of John's question, and that's about these  
5 neighborhood ward offices that we have in the City of Tucson.

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible) going to get to that,  
7 yeah.

8 MR. KNIPE: I presume they have them in other cities  
9 as well. This periodically becomes an item of contention when  
10 we have these big discussions about the structure of City  
11 governance, just because there is some expense associated with  
12 having separate ward offices all over the city.

13 I, I, I would assume that a, that a completely at-  
14 large system would, if not eliminate that, would at least reduce  
15 the need for that. But what can you tell us about what other  
16 cities have?

17 DR. SONENSHEIN: Here's what I can tell you is the  
18 thinking in cities these days is you cannot do too much to be  
19 responsive to constituent concerns.

20 MR. KNIPE: Uh-huh.

21 DR. SONENSHEIN: That if it's expensive, there's a lot

1 of different ways to do it. Some of that is by elected  
2 officials, and some of it is by City staff. But you can no  
3 longer operate in an atmosphere where the City kind of pulls  
4 everything into City Hall and says, "If you want help, come on  
5 down. You know, we're here for (inaudible) hours that we're  
6 here, and come, come take your chances."

7           And even the most customer friendly City Hall, I think  
8 the tendency now, forgetting even Council Offices or District  
9 Offices, if those disappeared, you would still have to have  
10 Community Service Centers in the community. You just - I think  
11 that's, that's the future in so many ways.

12           And to try to reduce the need to come to City Hall if  
13 you possibly can. I'd say that. So that's why I'm thinking  
14 that the at-large one, in both cases you're gonna be spending  
15 money on this, I guess, is what I'm saying. You're gonna be  
16 spending different money.

17           And the truth is, to go back to this question that  
18 you're following up on indeed if you had an at-large system, you  
19 don't need Council District Offices unless you decide, which I  
20 think, I'm not sure it'd be much of an improvement, if you then  
21 assign districts to the Council Members, you're kind of back

1 where you were which is already representing a district or at-  
2 large.

3           But that will create a void. And that void must be  
4 filled, and my read of the voters is the voters don't like to  
5 spend public funds unless that public money is being spent to  
6 make their experience of government substantially better and  
7 demonstrably better. So as you know, people don't necessarily  
8 think more City Council Members makes their experience  
9 demonstrably better.

10           But more community service people who are responding  
11 to needs is usually pretty popular. So I say if you've got  
12 those offices now, whether they're run by City Council Members  
13 or somebody else, don't shut them down. It's a long answer, but  
14 that's -

15           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** ~~Time~~ ~~Tom~~ **did you have a to do**  
16 ~~that~~ question?

17           MR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible)

18           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. Mr. Porges.

19           MR. PORGES: That seems counter-intuitive in a certain  
20 way to me. We're in the 21st Century. Doesn't technology  
21 obviate the need for people to walk into a community center to

1 get help from City Council, or from the City government? They  
2 don't need to go downtown. They don't need to walk into a  
3 building to get the help they need.

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: In time, that will be true.

5 MR. PORGES: Right.

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: We're not quite there yet.

7 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Is there any other -

8 DR. SONENSHEIN: And for the people who need the help  
9 the most, we're definitely not there yet. And I've gone to - I  
10 mean this is a big debate in city - in urban government. I've  
11 gone to a lot of meetings where presentations are made by the  
12 tech people who say, "You don't need this stuff anymore because  
13 let me show you how this works." And they're all pretty  
14 education persons. And I look at that, and I say, "Is there  
15 somebody I can call? I don't know what it is I'm supposed to  
16 do."

17 And, and I think we're a ways away. I think that the  
18 things aren't very together. The tech stuff, for example,  
19 operates by decentralizing the tech to a place where people can  
20 go use it ~~(sic)~~, not to assume people can use it. And once  
21 again, the people who need the resources the most are best

1 reached by human beings that they can talk to.

2           By the way, this is, you know, the collective wisdom  
3 in politics now with all the years spent on fancy TV ads and,  
4 and glorious mailers with all kinds of glossy things. Nothing  
5 matters as much as a person who talks to you either on the phone  
6 or at your doorstep or in a community setting.

7           So, I, I think this is one of the old-fashioned  
8 varieties of local government that you would ignore - you'd be  
9 making a mistake to miss by pulling back. You know, it's like  
10 you're pulling the troops back into the headquarters and they,  
11 and they really need to be out there as much as possible, if you  
12 can afford it.

13           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Burke.

14           **MR. TOM BURKE:** I have a question about the - on the  
15 lefthand side of the district elections. As you get close to  
16 that, it says it enhances the management structure of the Mayor,  
17 or the Manager. Well **So**, in the, in the cities that have  
18 district elections only, what is the role of the Mayor versus  
19 the Manager? You - do you need both?

20           **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Now this actually says that you  
21 should enhance. Doesn't necessarily say it automatically

1 enhances it because the indication here is that these are gaps  
2 that are formed by going to one level or the other. So if you  
3 go to at-large, you need to strengthen your neighborhood  
4 connections 'cause you're gonna be pulling back those Council  
5 District Offices.

6           If you go to district elections, the district members  
7 won't necessarily be sort of seeing themselves as part of the  
8 city's management team, as sort of part of a collective entity  
9 that is, you know, doing the budget together and figuring out  
10 what the priorities are. That puts a greater burden on the  
11 Mayor and/or the Manager.

12           In the largest cities, the Mayor is way more important  
13 than the Manager, especially on the East Coast and the Midwest.  
14 In the West, Managers or CAO's have become very significant even  
15 in large cities. And the Mayor, in a district election system,  
16 will often be more closely aligned with the Manager or the CAO  
17 because they will be the two people with the strongest citywide  
18 perspective.

19           And one of the things that came up in our previous  
20 iteration was when we talk about strengthening executive  
21 authority; it doesn't always have to be the Mayor; doesn't

1 always have to be the Manager. It could be the Mayor, the  
2 Manager or both, depending on the relationship. I would say in  
3 the context of Tucson, and cities in the Southwest and West, you  
4 want it to be something that draws on both the Mayor and the  
5 Manager.

6 I don't think you're gonna easily create sort of these  
7 dominant Mayor systems where, you know, the Manager is just kind  
8 of a, an assistant for the Mayor. That would be kind of a, a  
9 waste of talent, not to mention resources. So, long answer, but  
10 I think in my guess here would be Mayor and/or Manager  
11 collaboratively seen as the more significant citywide forces.

12 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Anymore questions?

13 DR. SONENSHEIN: Can I also just throw in that I'm  
14 sure that all -

15 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Keep throwing.

16 DR. SONENSHEIN: - everything on here is a choice,  
17 including the choice to make no change. And I want to remind  
18 you of that, that the case is on appeal, and again, I didn't go  
19 to law school, so I'm not gonna pretend to say what happens in a  
20 case. A case can change. But in any case, no matter what  
21 decision is made, you would probably want to know what you

1 believe the City should do in any case as opposed to starting  
2 from scratch.

3           And in addition, this also gives you an opportunity,  
4 necessity being the mother of invention; you may decide that  
5 these alternatives are actually better regardless of what goes  
6 on with the court case. But you do have the option to continue  
7 the current system.

8           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Knipe.

9           MR. KNIPE: I had a question about campaign finance in  
10 hybrid systems.

11           DR. SONENSHEIN: Yes.

12           MR. KNIPE: What do you do about matching funds when  
13 you have a hybrid system?

14           DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, this is a great question. And  
15 if I could, could I include that in this next piece -

16           MR. KNIPE: Please.

17           DR. SONENSHEIN: - about the package? 'Cause the  
18 finance is part of that.

19           MR. KNIPE: Yeah, I wasn't -

20           DR. SONENSHEIN: It's a great question.

21           MR. KNIPE: I wasn't sure if that was -

1 DR. SONENSHEIN: It's right here.

2 MR. KNIPE: Okay.

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: 'Cause what I wanted to suggest, and  
4 what I'm hoping tonight that would be helpful for me, is your  
5 direction on - as we did last time with the previous Committee,  
6 things you just aren't interested in. You know, those aren't  
7 gonna work, and you've thought about it and that, that just  
8 isn't gonna fly.

9 And then it sort of narrows as you ~~(inaudible)~~ **recall**  
10 you can narrow this so that I can dig much more deeply into that  
11 because what you're gonna have to do is have a package that  
12 includes at least the following elements, one of which is  
13 campaign finance. One is the form itself, which of these  
14 alternatives - that's the basic question is which form interests  
15 you?

16 I'm here to tell you whichever these forms you pick  
17 can be made to work. These are all workable forms, and not  
18 gigantic changes from this current structure of the city that  
19 would be cataclysmic. Wouldn't be going to New York's 51  
20 Council Members, for example, which would be (inaudible) you'd  
21 imagine.

1           The number of members would be a very important design  
2 question, once you settle on a few of these that you're really  
3 interested in. You want to think about the fact that you want  
4 to have a number of members so that you have an odd number for  
5 casting votes, which has a lot to do with whether the Mayor has  
6 a vote.

7           If you only have six Council Members and the Mayor has  
8 a vote, then you have an odd number. If you start adding a  
9 member or two, and they all have a vote, then you want to think  
10 about how that might end up and whether the Mayor has a vote or  
11 not.

12           Election dates. Because this is an elections package  
13 that you're talking about, and among the issues to talk about  
14 are what election dates and systems as, as was being asked here,  
15 would interest the voters, inform the voters, and cause them to  
16 want to vote. (Inaudible) a reasonable question.

17           And one of the questions that was raised at the last  
18 meeting was, what's going on with vote by mail elections? And I  
19 got a - asked for a little primer from the City Clerk on how it  
20 works here, which is really quite interesting, and that there's  
21 legislation in the state to -

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Interesting or -

2           DR. SONENSHEIN: Oh, no. (Inaudible) in a good way.

3 It's, it's an interesting situation because there's only a few  
4 states that have gone to vote by mail. Oregon, which always  
5 seems to be kind of the head of everything right now. Also the  
6 first automatic registration this last year.

7           Washington did it. But Washington did it in an  
8 interesting way that tells you a little bit about - 'cause a  
9 question was asked, "Why is it kind of taking - why isn't it  
10 sort of taking off?" Washington did it a county at a time and  
11 got a whole bunch of counties doing it. And now I think they've  
12 got down to two counties left before those two said, "What the  
13 heck? We might as well." So there's a lot of experimentation.  
14 California had one county, San Mateo, as doing an experiment on  
15 it for several election cycles.

16           So those people are dipping their toes kind of in the  
17 water and seeing if it's cold. But I think it'll be - continue  
18 to grow as more people vote absentee. Then it'll re- -- it  
19 reaches kind of a critical stage where if it gets past 50 or  
20 60%. So that's certainly being discussed.

21           Obviously, whichever one you pick, I would recommend

1 you think about whether there should be changes to either  
2 neighborhood structures or citywide managerial structures. And  
3 then the question of campaign finance. It is clear that  
4 district elections, at least in the short run, are cheaper to  
5 run than citywide elections.

6           The reason I say in the short run is as you get used  
7 to a system over time, more and more organized forces get active  
8 in races that seemed earlier that they wouldn't be very  
9 interesting. This is what happening to school board races in  
10 big cities. That used to be nobody cared about. But now  
11 suddenly there's kind of large campaign donations coming in in  
12 cities - big battles over it.

13           But from a reasonable standpoint for today, you can  
14 assume a citywide race needs a whole lot more opportunity to  
15 raise money than a district race. And in my view, and I think  
16 you'll find this in these cities, you can align a system where  
17 the citywide campaigns have a different system, in effect, than  
18 the district candidates. Logically no reason (inaudible)  
19 shouldn't be able to do that. And, in fact, you don't  
20 necessarily want to treat district races as something that you  
21 expect will have colossal amounts of money raised.

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** And - oh, Tom. Mr.

2 Prezelski.

3           MR. PREZELSKI: Madam Chair, Madam Chair, I, I think  
4 this really a question for the City Attorney. Changes in the  
5 campaign finances would also require Charter changes, is that  
6 correct?

7           MR. RANKIN: Correct.

8           MR. PREZELSKI: So under the State Constitution, would  
9 those campaign finance changes be on the same ballot line item  
10 as the systemic changes to the Council, or could - would they  
11 have to be separate?

12           MR. RANKIN: They could be separate.

13           MR. KNIPE: Could they be together?

14           MR. RANKIN: They could be together. So you're  
15 thinking of either the single subject or separate amendment  
16 rule. And the separate amendment rule applies to Arizona  
17 constitutional amendments. And then the single subject rule  
18 actually applies to the State legislature in terms of how  
19 legislation is supposed to be packaged (inaudible)

20           But with respect to the Charter, our own Charter  
21 doesn't put any kind of requirement for separate questions, and

1 the Constitution doesn't either. So you could package them as  
2 part of a single question or multiple questions.

3 MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you.

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Porges.

5 MR. PORGES: Out of the blue. Are primary elections a  
6 requirement under state or federal law? And the corollary to  
7 that is, does that mean that in order to be elected you have to  
8 get more than 50% of the cast vote? Or can it simply be the top  
9 vote getters?

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: I'm not aware of anything that  
11 requires a 50% vote. Are you aware of anything that requires -

12 MR. RANKIN: In a count for election, no.

13 DR. SONENSHEIN: In a partisan system, though.

14 MR. ~~PORGES~~ **RANDOLPH:** In ~~an at-large~~ state (inaudible)  
15 **the State of Arizona**, at-large elections, you have to get more  
16 than 50% of the vote in order to be declared elected. If you  
17 don't, then it goes to a runoff in the general.

18 (Multiple speakers - inaudible conversation.)

19 MR. RANKIN: Our Charter would control.

20 DR. SONENSHEIN: That is generally considered  
21 desirable to have provisions that require a majority to be

1 attained. I don't think, you know, just in terms of not wanting  
2 someone with 25% of the vote, who's the fifth candidate and  
3 there's five seats. But I, I don't think you can prevent that  
4 if you design it that way.

5 But as you can see, it raises really thorny design  
6 questions that in a way, once you sort of settle on what you  
7 want to do, the design questions are not impossible. They'll  
8 take a little time, just so that you walk around it a little bit  
9 and say, "That would work if we elected them this way. But it  
10 wouldn't work if we elected them that way." That's what I think  
11 you need to walk through a little bit.

12 And there's tons of alternatives, ~~because~~ **but those**  
13 alternatives don't make sense in isolation from the type of  
14 system that you want to create, I guess, especially the  
15 (inaudible) **balance** between district and at-large, would totally  
16 affect your campaign finance system, to go back to your  
17 question, primary question.

18 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Any other questions?

19 MR. HINDERAKER: I have a question.

20 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Hinderaker.

21 MR. HINDERAKER: One of the, one of the questions you

1 raised is election dates. And there has been some discussion  
2 about going from one election day, or from two, which we  
3 presently have every four years (inaudible) Do we have a sense  
4 for kind of savings would be created if we just had one  
5 consolidated election for all, all the members of the Council?  
6 (Inaudible)

7 **MR. RANDOLPH: About \$500,000 or more**

8 **MR. HINDERAKER: For Elections**

9 **MR. RANDOLPH: It's about \$450,000 to \$500,000 per**  
10 **election, city wide.**

11 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** If I could just point out something  
12 that when you (inaudible), the advantage of the first round of  
13 an election is it sometimes makes it easier to get to ultimate  
14 majority alternatives. And the alternative to that, if you do  
15 just one election, is then you begin to think a little bit about  
16 the systems like preference voting and others where you're  
17 actually taking two elections and putting them together because  
18 you're having your second choice counted after the first choices  
19 have been counted. That's the way those come in there.

20 **MR. HINDERAKER:** To be clear, my question was  
21 currently we have, we elect half the Council - well, one

1 election cycle, and two years later. So mine was just put them  
2 all on the same level cycle, and not consolidate primaries. I'm  
3 not suggesting -

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: Okay.

5 MR. HINDERAKER: - getting rid of the cycles.

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: Oh, so you mean skip the, skip the  
7 interim -

8 MR. HINDERAKER: Yes.

9 DR. SONENSHEIN: - election period, right?

10 MR. HINDERAKER: We save, we save, generally we save  
11 (inaudible) **some savings.**

12 DR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible)

13 MR. ~~HINDERAKER~~ **RANDOLPH**: I think you, if you, if you  
14 elected them all together, then it'd be a million dollar saving  
15 (inaudible) **for us, a million dollar savings.**

16 **MR. HINDERAKER: A million dollar savings?**

17 DR. SONENSHEIN: Every two years.

18 MR. ~~HINDERAKER~~ **RANDOLPH**: Right.

19 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN**: Any - Mr. Burke.

20 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Well, and my thoughts on that is it  
21 also, if you choose it on a presidential election, you actually

1 get more voters. And if the goal is to have more people voting  
2 in the election, having it happen on a presidential election,  
3 they will get a better turnout than we get on the (inaudible)

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Knipe.

5 MR. KNIPE: Yeah. To Mr. Burke's question, I suppose  
6 you do get more voters, more cards cast in a presidential year.  
7 But you also, I, I - and this, I guess, is a question for Roger.  
8 On your, your presidential cycle, your City Council Members, if  
9 you were to do it that way, would be pretty far down on a pretty  
10 long ballot. And so I would anticipate probably a higher under-  
11 vote, which would be equivalent to a lack of participation. I  
12 mean -

13 MR. RANDOLPH: We have - the way the state law  
14 currently reads is it goes, naturally goes Federal races first,  
15 then the County races and then the City races would go under  
16 that. So definitely on a long ballot ~~(inaudible)~~ **the Mayor and**  
17 **Council would be quite a ways down.**

18 MR. KNIPE: The point that I'm trying to make here is,  
19 is that, yes, indeed, you might have a scenario where there are  
20 more voters. I don't know that that is tantamount to more  
21 interest, or even more votes.

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Burke.

2           MR. **TOM BURKE:** Madam Chair, would, would you have  
3 records from (inaudible) already do that where every other  
4 election we have it on a presidential (inaudible) we see what  
5 kind of - the numbers are for voters, 'cause we already had that  
6 situation where we are at the end of it.

7           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** We're in odd years.

8           MR. **TOM BURKE:** Never on a (inaudible)

9           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Never on a presidential.

10          MR. **TOM BURKE:** Do other cities have, do we have other  
11 cities in, in Arizona that do it on the even years?

12           (Multiple speakers - inaudible conversation.)

13          MR. **TOM BURKE:** It's a very valid point that if we  
14 don't have people voting because they're tired by the time they  
15 get to the (inaudible) **end of the page.**

16          ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. HINDERAKER:** So, just - are we an  
17 outlier then in the sense of being an odd number years  
18 (inaudible) **for elections.**

19          **MR. RANDOLPH:** Tucson and the City of Phoenix.

20          ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. RANKIN:** And that's why we have that  
21 other litigation with, with Phoenix, because we were the two

1 cities (inaudible)

2           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** So, Dr. Sonenshein, what I  
3 struggle with is we have all of these options in front of us.  
4 And I'm gonna simplify this into the way that I think about it,  
5 and please feel free to correct me or add afterwards.

6           But with our current system, there were - there are  
7 many people who feel that we don't have adequate representation  
8 in the district. So that's kind of the bigger issue. If we go  
9 to a district, if we go to an election by district, then we have  
10 an issue of perhaps not enough citywide representation for  
11 issues. And then also the election cycle, that the Mayor would  
12 be elected with only three wards, and how would that skew people  
13 coming to the polls and how the, the Mayor would be elected.

14           If we go to completely at-large, how do you take care  
15 of the neighborhood issues and neighborhood representation? And  
16 something that we haven't spoken to you specifically about, but  
17 I know people have brought up in the past with the hybrid  
18 system, I, for one, am wary of adding new Council people because  
19 of the, the actual expense, the perceived - and the perceived  
20 expense, even though a perfect system for us might be current  
21 district representation with two more at-large Council people

1 and, and the Mayor.

2           That might **make** tons of sense for this community, but  
3 I don't - I think that might be hard to get people to pay for.  
4 So how do we ~~(inaudible) our ties~~ **prioritize** and sort through,  
5 when those are kind of the issues with each of the systems? And  
6 how can you help us with that?

7           DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, first of all, I think that was  
8 a very clear and accurate analysis of all this material that  
9 seems to be adding up the strengths and weaknesses. And almost  
10 you're looking at these two ends of a seesaw that take you in  
11 these opposite directions. And you're sort of in a tough spot  
12 because you're right in the middle of the seesaw, like neither  
13 here nor there, and that's, you know, kind of what has developed  
14 out of it. The question of expense is certainly less of a  
15 problem if you went to the at-large because you could elect six-

16           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

17           DR. SONENSHEIN: - six members. Now campaigns would  
18 be more expensive, but they wouldn't necessarily be much more  
19 expensive to the voters (inaudible) on how you did the campaign  
20 finance system. But you'd have the same number of elected  
21 officials. So that's probably the - I think you have to look

1 at, like one of the commenters (sic) earlier on said, "Think  
2 about your objectives and, and sort of with the pros and cons."

3           On the cost side, that's the easiest sell in a certain  
4 sense, but it's the hardest sell in terms of what the voters get  
5 out of it from the standpoint of representation. And I really  
6 think that voters hate paying for elected officials. There's no  
7 question about it. Voters really want better representation.

8           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

9           **DR. SONENSHEIN:** So, in a certain sense, you may have  
10 a political tradeoff to make rather than a single answer that  
11 would - you laid out the dilemma perfectly, I think, which is  
12 the more you add - among other things that you can do if you end  
13 up, say a district system you add a couple. You - of course, at  
14 either end, you might not really have to add anybody. The  
15 district election would be at-large. It's the simplest in a way  
16 in terms of cost.

17           But new costs develop in both of those systems. In  
18 the at-large, you suddenly have six people who are on the  
19 stature of the Mayor, who are at-large elected officials with  
20 big ambitions. And they're gonna want support. They're not  
21 gonna want to have to call the Mayor or the Manager to, to do

1 anything. They're gonna want to have something that is  
2 equivalent to what they see as their new stature, which will be  
3 very large.

4 District representative, when they're really district  
5 representatives, are gonna want the resources to be able to  
6 respond in their districts. So the problem is some of the costs  
7 are obvious upfront, and some of them are things that I just  
8 know are gonna develop anytime you change the system.

9 But the tradeoff has to be better service. And I  
10 think that the more you think about whatever you propose, how is  
11 it going to enhance service to people in their community?

12 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

13 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** That's your, that's your safety belt.  
14 I think you've stated very well what the considerations are.

15 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Porges. And then if you  
16 could just maybe think a little more about what you can do to  
17 help us work through those things.

18 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Good.

19 **MR. PORGES:** If you try and visualize the last chart  
20 that looked like this that Dr. Sonenshein provided last year  
21 about strengthening the powers of the Mayor, -

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

2           MR. PORGES: - where we were sort of in the middle of  
3 between a strong Mayor and a, and a weak Mayor. And it was  
4 suggested, and we came to the conclusion that we didn't want to  
5 make the Mayor too strong. We didn't want to go too far to one  
6 end or the other. And we came to a good consensus that we found  
7 something in the middle.

8           I think if you look at this chart in the same way, we  
9 are currently sort of in the middle of these now six  
10 possibilities. And because what we really have are people that  
11 we have district representatives and we have at-large  
12 representatives. It just happens to be the same person.

13           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

14           MR. PORGES: So if we were able to split them, I could  
15 envision the least change that we make to our system is actually  
16 having the combination of district and at-large Council Members.  
17 And that's sort of where I'm leaning at the moment, the exact  
18 number still to be discussed.

19           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Any other questions? Mr.  
20 Prezelski.

21           MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm gonna

1 throw this out to either Mr. Sonenshein or the City Attorney.

2 Folks, folks, I know, **who** are concerned about annexation issues.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Can you talk a little louder.

4 **MR. PREZELSKI:** Oh, I'm sorry. I'm recovering from  
5 yet another cold. But folks who are concerned about annexation  
6 issues are talking about how folks in neighborhoods where  
7 they're - that they're approaching ~~(inaudible)~~ **potential**  
8 annexations are concerned about not being represented on the  
9 City Council.

10 And one of the things I'm wondering, is, is there a  
11 way to give the Charter some flexibility so it's easier to add  
12 seats to the Council if we, if we annex an area large enough.  
13 For example, you could say they, you know, if you guys agree to  
14 be part of the city, you'll get your own ward, you'll be able to  
15 elect your own representative.

16 ~~DR. SONENSHEIN~~ **MR. KNIPE:** Like **With** a threshold?

17 **MR. PREZELSKI:** Yeah.

18 **MR. RANKIN:** I think the answer's "yes". You could  
19 have population thresholds, you know, the city reaches a certain  
20 size, or each ward or district reaches a certain size, then  
21 there shall be created another district. You'd have to think

1 about what those - the triggering events would be such that you  
2 could honestly tell those folks that if they're the ones that  
3 ~~are~~ **were** annexed, you know, that they're gonna have their own  
4 district. So I don't know exactly how it would read or how it  
5 would ~~(inaudible)~~ **look**, but I can see you doing that.

6 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Knipe.

7 **MR. KNIPE:** I was wondering if Dr. Sonenshein could  
8 give us just perhaps a little bit of background about how  
9 decisions about how many districts per unit of population, and  
10 what is the right amount of districts for cities in general.  
11 How, how, how are those decisions?

12 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Ohh. I didn't mean to sigh.

13 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** That's on the record, I'm  
14 just telling you.

15 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** These decisions can get really awful.  
16 Just really awful, and I've gone through it. For years in L.A.,  
17 this was the single, ultimately most contentious issue that a  
18 two-year Charter Reform is how big the City Council should be.  
19 And it turned out there was no real ideal number. But what  
20 people decided was that there are some districts that are just  
21 too big.

1           So, L.A. districts were about 240,000 people per  
2 district. And people basically felt that was just too many  
3 people. But then we made charts of all the different cities and  
4 it was all over the place, what would be considered a reasonable  
5 amount.

6           It would seem to me your harder question is how many  
7 elected officials rather than how large the districts are,  
8 because the cities that have the very, very large City Councils  
9 have very small districts, like New York and Chicago.

10           But those are cities with the tradition of people  
11 voting all the time to have more politicians. I know it's hard  
12 to under- -- hard to believe it's true, but it's just a whole  
13 different political culture. It was not out of the question for  
14 New York to go from 35 to 51 in 1989.

15           If you tried that out here, you'd have a revolution on  
16 your hands. And the number, what I'm saying is the number of  
17 the people in a district won't affect people so much as your  
18 assurance that you're gonna serve the people in those districts  
19 better than if it was done at-large.

20           But in a city of, what, half a million, six districts  
21 is not unreasonable. You know, that puts it below a hundred

1 thousand per district. That's, that's within the range. You  
2 don't have to get way lower than that, which some cities have  
3 tried to do at the cost of, you know, rebellions when they try  
4 to put too many politicians in. The voters just sense that.

5 Two hundred thousand is a lot. But again, that's why,  
6 for example, I wouldn't recommend this city having three  
7 districts in a city of 500,000. That's too few. But I think  
8 you'd, you'd want to be under a hundred thousand, I would say,  
9 per district if you possibly can.

10 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Yee has a question. I  
11 just have one quick question for Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Randolph.  
12 Currently, are wards fairly evenly split population-wise? I  
13 just can't remember. Yeah?

14 **MR. RANDOLPH:** They're roughly (inaudible)

15 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. Thank you. Mr. Yee.

16 **MR. YEE:** Mr. Rankin, whatever we ~~that~~ decide as a  
17 Committee, whatever recommendations we have for the Council,  
18 they have to okay (inaudible), is that right?

19 **MR. RANKIN:** That's correct.

20 **MR. YEE:** Okay. So, you know, as I listened to all of  
21 these different combinations, we try to do, to create less

1 **what's** optimum combination of, of a political (inaudible) **set**  
2 **up, what's** best for the city. But I, I'm kind of, you know, I  
3 have five children, so, so I (inaudible) **am very pragmatic** what  
4 is, what is ideal, what is (inaudible)**doable**. So it seems to me  
5 the first (inaudible) **test we are going to find out to keep in**  
6 **mind is what is the appetite** for the Council to approve one of  
7 the recommendations we come up with (inaudible) first obstacle.

8           Secondly, if we would enlarge the number of, of office  
9 holders, then, you know, the City had its structural  
10 (inaudible)**deficit** financial problem. So we could incur more  
11 expenses because of offices, and office holders. And then  
12 therefore, you know, we have to find out where this money comes  
13 from. That's a part of advertising. The Council Member would  
14 have to consider to put whatever decision (inaudible) onto the  
15 ballot.

16           And still another thing (inaudible) we pay peanuts to  
17 our office holders. We (inaudible) enlarge the number of office  
18 holders, and we have structural financial problems, how are we  
19 going to pay enough to these people who work full time and, and  
20 (inaudible) part time on this and get abused? How are we gonna  
21 get a (inaudible), you know, of office holders to participate?

1           And another thing is this, you know, is Mr.  
2 Sonenshein, he mentioned the fact that if we go into at-large,  
3 it sounds good that we don't have, you know, to, to, to maintain  
4 the district office and whatnot.

5           But that's, that's not gonna be true because the  
6 neighbors, they still have their needs, they're neighborhoods.  
7 They still have their needs and wants. They're gonna form some  
8 kind of political action group of committees and they're gonna  
9 try to lobby and do different things.

10           So again, so the City has to (inaudible) So  
11 therefore, they would have less (inaudible) to, to, to the  
12 demands and the, and the requests from these different  
13 constituents in different areas of the city. And that would  
14 cost money, you know.

15           So all of these things that we hear is - I'm saying  
16 that because I couldn't (inaudible) I know what part is the  
17 best, you know, to, to help the city grow (inaudible) Well,  
18 does the Mayor and Council advertise to make that kind of  
19 changes? And how (inaudible) **you have to be ready for**  
20 **longevity.** You have to consider that, you know, just like you  
21 (inaudible) so we gonna take that into consideration whatever we

1 do. And so, but anyway, you (inaudible) **want me to keep it**  
2 **short** and you want me to talk louder so I talk louder.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Well, good.

4 MR. YEE: You know, in that case -

5 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you.

6 MR. YEE: - I, I think (inaudible)

7 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Nicely done. So I, I have a,  
8 a question. We're trying to get to this ~~kind of~~ April  
9 recommendation on the financial issues and electoral issues. In  
10 particular with the electoral issues, it seems that public  
11 feedback would be so important to gauge the appetite for  
12 different options.

13 Is there a scenario where we extend, especially the  
14 electoral issues, and really get some public feedback? Perhaps  
15 we create two or three options to present to the community and  
16 discuss the pros and cons, and get feedback.

17 You know, perhaps one option is the hybrid with two  
18 at-large, district with two at-large and a Mayor, and one is  
19 just district. And one is something else and get feedback on  
20 it.

21 MR. KNIPE: You say for - present to Madam Chair. You

1 say present to the community and get feedback. How do you  
2 envision this presentation being made and how do you envision  
3 the feedback being measured?

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Very much like we did in the  
5 last round. We had several community meetings all throughout  
6 the city. There was a short presentation upfront that explained  
7 the background as well as what we were thinking of. And then  
8 there was a Call to the Audience and we got feedback from  
9 people.

10 So that's what we did last time, and I was assuming we  
11 would do the same thing this time. I guess my concern is that  
12 with some of these issues being so complex in the electoral  
13 process, that we may need beyond April.

14 And in addition, you know, it's one thing to have a  
15 special election for a sales tax, but something like an  
16 electoral process, Bonnie and I were discussing that. I think  
17 it's very - makes me uncomfortable to have a decision like that  
18 made in a special election versus a general election where you  
19 would likely have more voters. I think something like our  
20 electoral process, we need as much participation as, as  
21 possible.

1           So I guess some of that question is to Dr. Sonenshein  
2 about the success of presenting several options as opposed to  
3 one option that we agree with. And then the second part of the  
4 question would be to Mr. Rankin regarding timing.

5           DR. SONENSHEIN: Let me answer that question second,  
6 because (inaudible)

7           MR. RANKIN: So in terms of the timing, the action  
8 that the Mayor and Council took to reconstitute this Committee,  
9 they directed for the recommendations to be delivered April 1st.  
10 The Council can extend that time. So there's that ability.

11           I'm certain that (inaudible) I would imagine that the  
12 Mayor and Council, once they receive your recommendations, if  
13 they're gonna put something on the ballot, they're gonna run  
14 some public process on their end, too, whether the - I'm certain  
15 it'll include a public hearing in a Council meeting. But they  
16 may well want to do Town Halls, etc., in their own individual  
17 wards.

18           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** They did not last time. It  
19 was - we did it, but if I recall correctly, the Council people  
20 did not do Town Halls, right?

21           MR. RANKIN: Individual Council Members had meetings

1 in their own wards. Maybe not all of them, but some of them,  
2 some of them did.

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: I'm sympathetic to the notion of a  
4 big election for a big subject, you know, but I don't know what  
5 the possibilities are of that happening. But that's - there's  
6 something to be said for that. This is a very big deal.

7 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: Yeah.

8 DR. SONENSHEIN: This is, this is a really big deal.  
9 As to reaching out to the public, I think it's very important to  
10 do it, but I have found that the public does better when it's  
11 presented with a narrower set of options to like or dislike.  
12 And I would say, if I can go back a bit 'cause you asked me how,  
13 how you could help me, or the Jerry McGuire thing, you know,  
14 (inaudible)

15 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: How do I help you?

16 DR. SONENSHEIN: - is the more I know about what you  
17 don't have interest in and are likely to be interested in, and I  
18 can help answer questions about those as you discuss those, even  
19 knowing you can change your mind. You can always change your  
20 minds.

21 But to know that we're not, you know, digging deep

1 into six different things, some of which are not gonna be that  
2 interesting. For example, I might ask you tonight if you could  
3 only have the one on the right, or the one on the left, are  
4 those both still in contention for you, or is only one?

5           If you - or, or the hybrid? And within that, where  
6 are you leaning? But you don't have to vote for it, but just a  
7 lean would help me to know, 'cause all these other related  
8 questions are gonna grow out of that.

9           I would say if you go to the public, it would pay to  
10 go with no more than two alternatives at the most. If you  
11 really believe in it, I'd go with one. And I'd go with one and  
12 say, "Tear it apart. Feel free to tear it apart. Tell us we're  
13 wrong."

14           I've never seen members of the community feel  
15 comfortable with more than one, or at, or at the most, two  
16 alternatives, and have the right to be negative about it, and be  
17 as negative as they want.

18           It's good practice to talk about it in the context of,  
19 "We did this for better representation. The goal of this was  
20 better representation. Did it for better access, for better  
21 democracy, for more of a feeling of solidarity with City Hall,

1 and what they do out in the community, etc." That's, that's  
2 gotta be the whole thing.

3           If you end up thinking after a few more sessions that  
4 there's one alternative you want, I, I would actually put it out  
5 to the community, and give them some time, and say, "We are  
6 still in business and we can change our minds before we go to  
7 the Council." I think that's legitimate.

8           And then I think people will weigh in. I mean I think  
9 people are gonna have opinions on this, I really do. But I  
10 think they expect the Committee to have done a lot of the - it's  
11 like a primary and a runoff. The primary is the Committee sort  
12 of weaning out something you think doesn't make sense, what I  
13 think.

14           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Knipe.

15           MR. KNIPE: I'm, I'm glad you asked the question. I  
16 had a que- -- I wanted to follow that with a question, I guess,  
17 for the Chair about our schedule and future agendas. We've been  
18 talking about this, these financial questions, and specifically  
19 the one unresolved question, which is the question about the two  
20 percent cap on the City's TPT.

21           We've voted on preliminary recommendations on the

1 other two questions, the one about property tax, and the one  
2 about pledging excise tax revenues. But I, I noticed that we  
3 don't have any financial items on the current agenda.

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** For today.

5 MR. KNIPE: Okay. Are we going to revisit that next  
6 time we meet?

7 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** I am unclear as to when the  
8 next time that we will be discussing financial issues are. In  
9 the last meeting, we had talked about asking for some more  
10 information regarding the implications of sales tax increases in  
11 the past to the, both the City and the business community. And  
12 we had put that out there, but I don't know that there was a  
13 specific vehicle for that information. Mr. Hinderaker.

14 MR. HINDERAKER: I thought we were waiting for polling  
15 results. I think there (inaudible)

16 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** And there was a poll going  
17 out as well.

18 MR. HINDERAKER: The idea was to wait until we got  
19 those results back and revisit that issue.

20 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** That is correct.

21 MR. KNIPE: Can anybody on staff give us an update

1 about what the status of that is?

2 MR. RANDOLPH **RANKIN**: No.

3 MR. KNIPE: Okay.

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN**: So far, next meeting -

5 MR. RANDOLPH: 'Cause we don't know. (Inaudible)

6 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN**: So for our next meeting, if

7 we could for sure have an update on - if the polling questions

8 have gone out, when -

9 MR. KNIPE: Okay.

10 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN**: - they're due back. An

11 update on that, that would be great. But what do you suggest

12 regarding getting information regarding the implications of a

13 sales tax increase to the City and the business community? So

14 on the revenue side, and to business owners what the

15 implications are, because in the past, I had often heard

16 business owners say, "Well, if you increase the sales tax, my

17 car buyer's gonna only buy it in the County, not in the City."

18 Instead of anecdote, it would be great to have actual~~ly~~ data.

19 How, how would we get that?

20 MR. RANDOLPH **RANKIN**: Again, it's hard. I don't know

21 what we, the staff, would be asking the community to provide

1 feedback on right now if there's not a recommendation that  
2 you've, you know, been discussing.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Well, would it be worthwhile  
4 to have a presentation from the Chamber of Commerce or - Mr.  
5 Knipe?

6 **MR. KNIPE:** Well, it's my understanding that this  
7 Committee was given some sort of direction from Mayor and  
8 Council to forward recommendation on the financial items by  
9 sometime in April, right? And if our, if our moving forward in  
10 that is contingent on this poll, or something else that we are  
11 awaiting from the community, we're gonna potentially have  
12 trouble sticking to that schedule. I want to make sure that  
13 we're addressing that before it becomes a problem.

14 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** **Absolutely,** Mr. Hinderaker.

15 **MR. HINDERAKER:** I think I'd like to follow up on your  
16 question, Randi. That is, is the April 1st deadline really, is  
17 that a hard deadline or is it - what is, what are the  
18 constraints on the Council if they got it a little later in the  
19 process? Could they still get it on the ballot (inaudible)

20 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** So - and I guess my  
21 understanding is that the April date was to have an August

1 special election, is that correct?

2           **MR. RANDOLPH RANKIN:** It didn't come - the April 1st  
3 deadline was - for the recommendation report was included in the  
4 resolution extending the functions of the Committee. So, again,  
5 that can be changed but it was included in the direction from  
6 the Mayor and Council. That doesn't necessarily mean that it  
7 would - any change to the Charter that would go in front of the  
8 voters would be in August or non-November election. But it  
9 would preserve the options.

10           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. Is there any thoughts  
11 on -

12           **MR. RANDOLPH RANKIN:** And when we hear more on the  
13 polling information, we'll, we'll share it with you. It just we  
14 haven't had any updates.

15           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. What other information  
16 does the Committee feel that we need in order to make an  
17 informed decision on the sales tax issue?

18           **MR. KNIPE:** I have, I have all the information I need.

19           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Yeah. Ms. Gaxiola.

20           **MS. GAXIOLA:** I don't know that we need to wait. I  
21 mean I feel like polling data would be nice to have 'cause that

1 will let us know where the community's at. But I think that we  
2 are (inaudible) **a bunch of** reasoned people in here who have  
3 given the issue a lot of thought.

4 And if polling data is not available, then I think  
5 it's our responsibility to, you know, take it upon ourselves to  
6 make what we think is the best decision and the best  
7 recommendation that we can to the City Council. So I don't  
8 think that we should say, "Well, we can't hit April 1 because we  
9 don't have polling data."

10 I think if we can get polling data - fantastic, 'cause  
11 that would, you know, add more information to our decision-  
12 making process. But I don't, I don't think that we should pass  
13 the buck that way. I think we, you know, hold ourselves to the  
14 deadline that we were given and, and let's make some decisions,  
15 let's make some recommendations.

16 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** I think that some of the  
17 issues regarding the sales tax were, do we totally erase the  
18 cap? Do we increase the cap? If we do increase the cap, to  
19 what percent? And then, do we keep it at two percent in the  
20 Charter with the ability to raise it with voter approval?

21 **MR. RANDOLPH RANKIN:** And I'm just gonna interrupt

1 because the conversation's been fine about how we're gonna  
2 structure the meetings going forward and what your deadline is.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** But it's not on our agenda.

4 **MR. RANDOLPH RANKIN:** It's not on the agenda for the  
5 specific discussion on the tax issue tonight.

6 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Okay. We'll make  
7 sure it gets on another agenda. If you could perhaps find out  
8 when the polling data is going to be available before we make  
9 the next agenda, I think that would be helpful.

10 Okay. So back to electoral issues and how Dr.  
11 Sonenshein's gonna help us navigate.

12 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** I guess what I would ask is to the  
13 extent, without forcing people, to the extent that people can do  
14 (inaudible) which is just basically say, "Here's kind of where I  
15 am," and just see, just as a preliminary draft. That's all it  
16 is, and you can change your mind anytime. But it just gives me  
17 a sense of where we are and where I should be digging deeper  
18 (inaudible)

19 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Should we do a -

20 **MALE SPEAKER:** Yeah.

21 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Do you have another question

1 before that?

2 MALE SPEAKER: No. I'm willing to jump in.

3 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: All right. Mr. Burke, did  
4 you have a question before that?

5 MR. BURKE: No. I wouldn't - no. The, the Council  
6 (inaudible)

7 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: Okay. Great. Mr. Porges,  
8 would you like to begin?

9 MR. PORGES: I'll start. Absolutely. So to try and  
10 make your life a little simpler, as I understand your request,  
11 my preference would be some sort of hybrid of district and at-  
12 large members. Otherwise I could accept all at-large. I don't  
13 think district-only elections are something that I'm interested  
14 in at the moment.

15 MR. HINDERAKER: My preference would be hybrid as  
16 well. I think it keeps in place a form of government that we're  
17 already familiar with, and it also doesn't mean that we have to  
18 reinvent the way we reach out to the neighborhoods and get  
19 representation for them, which is appealing to me.

20 When we raised this last time the idea of adding at-  
21 large members, the one arguing against it was the cost. And so

1 I think the way that we can arguably address the cost issue is  
2 through the questions that I was alluding to earlier, and that  
3 is to consolidate the elections under one date.

4           And that would - and I think it might be helpful if we  
5 got some feedback from staff about how much it would actually  
6 cost to add at-large offices. And then how much it would  
7 actually save to, A, consolidate it on one election every four  
8 years with the Council Members and perhaps there might be  
9 additional savings if we moved to a even numbered year when  
10 there's already a federal election in place.

11           But I think what I was hearing that the cost of  
12 consolidating elections, the savings from that would offset any  
13 additional costs adding two new members, which I think is what  
14 we should do, is add two at-large members. And so that's,  
15 that's what I favor. If we have to go in one direction or the  
16 other, I would favor ward elections.

17           MR. PREZELSKI: The hybrid system is intriguing, and I  
18 think that's a potentially good, good political compromise for  
19 folks who, who like the at-large system. The one modification I  
20 would, I would think is worth discussing is if you have an at-  
21 large, if you have some, say, two seats, as Mr. Hinderaker

1 suggests, one seat would have to be someone from the east side,  
2 one seat would have to be someone from the west side, 'cause  
3 even though they're elected at-large, they would still have to  
4 be from a given community, kind of like what we're, what we're  
5 doing right now.

6 I don't have a big problem with having a ward-only  
7 system as well an option (inaudible) proposed. (Inaudible) I  
8 think we do need to have two options on the ballot.

9 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Prezelski.  
10 Mr. Knipe.

11 **MR. KNIPE:** Well, first of all, I'm, I'm grateful for  
12 what input we have heard. I know that we've heard from  
13 representatives of the Chamber and of TRRIG, the SALC, the Pima  
14 County Libertarian Party. I'm probably leaving a few out, but  
15 the, the more, the more direct input this Committee has about  
16 what the consensus is among the stakeholders, the better of a  
17 decision we're gonna be able to make.

18 So far, just my own intuitive analysis of what I've  
19 heard leans toward ward-only. That seems to be what most of the  
20 voices out in the community are saying. Until I hear  
21 differently, that's where my intuitions are leading me at this

1 point.

2           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. I am trying to  
3 balance people feeling that they're being represented in  
4 district representation with citywide concerns that I think are  
5 the ones that's - the citywide decisions are the ones that are  
6 going to continue to move this community forward. I really  
7 favor the hybrid system keeping the six Council seats and adding  
8 two at-large members.

9           And it would be great to know how much it would cost  
10 to add two at-large members who would be housed in City Hall so  
11 they would not need whole separate offices, and we could even  
12 determine how much separate staff they would need. But that  
13 would be great to assess for the next meeting.

14           I have a lot of concerns with both an entirely at-  
15 large system and with a ward-only system. While I understand  
16 that many people are interested in ward-only, there's - often  
17 we've heard those requests because it's a change from the  
18 current system, and that they're not feeling represented. But  
19 if that were the choice, I think we'd hear a lot more on, on  
20 both sides. I don't think that either extreme is the right  
21 system for this community.

1 MS. GAXIOLA: Yeah, I think -

2 VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN: Ms. Gaxiola. I have to say  
3 it so they know on the -

4 MS. GAXIOLA: Oh, okay. I think I pretty much agree  
5 almost entirely with you, Randi. I, you know, Tucson has a  
6 strong tradition of, of the neighborhoods, and the neighborhoods  
7 being involved and, and connecting directly with the ward  
8 offices.

9 And even when the conversation has recently been  
10 about, you know, consolidating the ward offices into, into City  
11 Hall in order to save money, I've heard just absolute outrage  
12 and panic from neighbors that I, that I work with. And so that,  
13 I think for that reason, it would be really important to protect  
14 that tradition and to make sure that we do keep a strong - a  
15 system that has a strong district representation.

16 However, I would not be comfortable with the ward-only  
17 system. I think that in the long run, the incentive there, the,  
18 the dynamics that it causes for people to be too focused on  
19 their own ward at the expense of the benefit of the larger  
20 community is dangerous.

21 And so I would favor a system that was, you know, had

1 some district representation, and - or maintain our district  
2 representation that we have now, or wards, but added a couple of  
3 at-large members.

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Mr. Scott?

5 **MR. SCOTT:** If we have to ~~(inaudible)~~ **three** or two  
6 going all the way to the extreme of at-large, I don't favor  
7 that. A hybrid system probably would be better. But I don't  
8 have a lot of heartburn with ward-only elections. And if you  
9 talk with elected - if you talk with Council people, that's  
10 pretty much what they do now is they represent their ward. So I  
11 don't know that going all the way to at-large would have that  
12 same effect.

13 The other thing is, when you look at representation,  
14 who do you call if you don't have a district representative?  
15 One of the, one of the complaints I constantly hear is, "I have  
16 a problem with .. who **do** I call." And I think that's somewhat  
17 settled, or at least leans toward being settled when you have  
18 district-only elections.

19 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Springer?

20 **MR. SPRINGER:** Mine's pretty simple. I like the  
21 system we have.

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Anything you'd like to add?

2           MR. SPRINGER: I don't like at-large, or district, and  
3 I think the system that we have in place in Tucson works.

4           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. Mr. Crum?

5           MR. CRUM: You're pretty smart. I, I, I like the  
6 current system as well. But if for some reason that's not  
7 acceptable, I would, I would favor ward-only.

8           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Yee?

9           MR. YEE: I would prefer the hybrid. They have this,  
10 you know, the num- -- Hybrid Number Two. Maybe we can adjust  
11 the number of districts that we may have. So I guess the reason  
12 is (inaudible)

13          **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Mr. Burke?

14          MR. **TOM BURKE:** My preference is the ward-only. And I  
15 actually think that the, the people who run for ward offices are  
16 still concerned about the city as a whole. They speak out for  
17 the people who are in the neighborhoods in their wards when it's  
18 a neighborhood issue, but most people who run for office are  
19 concerned for the, for the entire community.

20                 And so I don't think that it's gonna be - I think that  
21 it takes care of the issue people who are not represented, most

1 people are comfortable with the majority rule. And so if you're  
2 in a district or a ward where you're in the minority from a  
3 political standpoint, you still feel that, you know, democracy  
4 is serving. (Bell ringing.) Excuse me. Somebody wants  
5 (inaudible) So my preference is that if not that, if you  
6 were the one, only one member at-large, (inaudible) so my  
7 preference would be ward election.

8 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Does that help?

9 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** It helps a great deal. I mean also  
10 'cause of your thought processes, not just the answers but kind  
11 of it's giving a much greater sense of what, of what your  
12 (inaudible) I think we're gonna want to give the rest of the  
13 Committee that's not here tonight a chance to, to weigh in maybe  
14 at the beginning of the next meeting with a very, very brief  
15 just catch-up so that they're able to - everybody can be heard.  
16 And then everybody can change their vote when we next get  
17 together, if you want.

18 But I think it would pay to kind of feed back a little  
19 bit what I'm hearing so far, and just see if it's accurate which  
20 is that the at-large -

21 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. PORGES:** I'm the outlier again, but

1 I'm used to it.

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: You've been here before. You've been  
3 here before, but you stand your ground.

4 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. PORGES:** I do.

5 DR. SONENSHEIN: That's the great thing about it. But  
6 it would seem like we hear from more Committee Members that it's  
7 possible that the fully at-large isn't going to have as much  
8 support going forward on the Committee. I, I think that that's  
9 kind of what I'm hearing.

10 Most I'm hearing that people have first choices and  
11 second choices, which is really a good thing, by the way, given  
12 the deliberations that lie ahead of you because you're gonna  
13 hear more and more about each of these. And you may decide your  
14 second choice is better than you thought, or decide that it's  
15 horrible now, you want to stick to your first one no matter  
16 what. It's really good that two people spoke up with the first  
17 choice being the current system. It's a reminder that that  
18 option is not off the table. It's not forced off the table  
19 until, literally until the legal process is completely  
20 exhausted.

21 It also suggested it may be very possible for us to

1 come up with two options among us that have pretty broad support  
2 after a lot more discussion, it would seem. And I think that  
3 would be a really useful thing.

4 I take a few things from this. One is that there's a  
5 lot of details that would help you determine whether or not the  
6 thing you thought up is your first or second choice holds up,  
7 some of that being cost. Some of that being some resolution  
8 about how elections would be done, which I think is pretty  
9 important to know.

10 It seems to me that based on this for the next time, I  
11 can consolidate the hybrids back into an alternative without  
12 necessarily getting into a question about how many would be at-  
13 large and make that - 'cause I think I can now dig into that. I  
14 mean I didn't know whether it would have zero - gonna be zero  
15 interest, in which case I would certainly put it to the side.

16 But the hybrid model can be dug into all by itself  
17 without - I didn't hear a lot of people saying they wanted four  
18 at-large members. So it seemed like Hybrid One and Two, for  
19 those who are interested in hybrid (inaudible) pretty close.

20 I'm also hearing people say that the minimum change  
21 from the present is of value in the sense that if it, if it has

1 in common things that are already happening, that's probably a  
2 good value, and I completely support that.

3 I think that's really good judgment and you could  
4 actually change the system pretty dramatically without changing  
5 the system really dramatically, 'cause as we've talked about, if  
6 you change the incentives that - how people represent, the  
7 numbers can be fairly similar and you've really got, you know,  
8 maybe a different kind of system that you might feel good about.

9 Ward-only has pretty decent support. It also has some  
10 pretty strong objections. Probably more support than strong  
11 objections, but strong objections need to be taken very  
12 seriously, 'cause that, that can really get in the way of it  
13 being a good alternative.

14 I think, I think we can come up with a couple of  
15 alternatives and really now dig through them. But again, to  
16 give the Committee next time a chance to - for everybody to be  
17 heard -

18 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Uh-huh.

19 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** - to do this before closing the book  
20 on anything. I just want to make sure. Is that kind of an  
21 accurate read of what, of what people are saying? I mean, I was

1 actually very happy that people have gone down the road of  
2 really knowing what they want 'cause without that, we'd be  
3 really lost, I think. So next time, I'm gonna pool the hybrids  
4 into one thing called "hybrid".

5 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay.

6 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** And I think that's gonna be a lot  
7 easier. I have the feeling from tonight I should be giving you  
8 some guidance about how elections work in these different  
9 models, 'cause that's what we're really getting down to whether  
10 it's workable or not.

11 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Yes.

12 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Election dates, how many are elected,  
13 what voting systems are gonna be used. It'll take a while, but  
14 I think it will help you clarify in your mind whether - where  
15 your comfort level is with your choices. The only question I  
16 have is, is what - how can I help? Beyond that, we gotta sort  
17 of frame these.

18 But I think we're getting down to the possibility,  
19 which I hope of having a couple. I do want to indicate, though,  
20 I really want to support your comment about getting input from  
21 the stakeholders. I, I didn't want to neglect that because this

1 is a little different than your usual charter issue like in a  
2 lot of ways. I mean this is really -

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** This is big.

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: - gonna be of interest not just to  
5 voters and members of the community, but to people who are very,  
6 very active in politics. This is gonna be way important. And  
7 I'm not saying they'll get in the way of a good alternative by  
8 any means, but they will want to be heard. And they'll want to  
9 be heard relatively early, middle and late - but early as well.

10 So it could be that once you have a rough idea as a  
11 whole Committee of a few of the alternatives, it might pay to  
12 invite people to come and either yell at us, or say, "Thank  
13 you", or, or something in between. That's - I really support  
14 that.

15 MR. KNIPE: Well, thank you. And Madam Chair, if I  
16 could just -

17 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Yes, Mr. Knipe.

18 MR. KNIPE: - make a remark on the back of that. I  
19 would - I don't want to get too much into the habit of  
20 admonishing my fellow Committee Members, but I would admonish  
21 everybody here in this room to encourage the participation of

1 everybody that you know that has an opinion about this issue.

2 This is a rare opportunity that we have in front of us.

3           We're fortunate to have Dr. Sonenshein's services, and  
4 to have the services of our Clerk's Office, and our City  
5 Attorney's Office, and all of the resources that go into this.  
6 It's not something that the City can easily just do over and  
7 over and over again.

8           And for this process to lead to an outcome that will  
9 do some lasting good would certainly make a dream of mine come  
10 true. And the more, the more, the more we hear from everybody  
11 involved, everybody that cares, the better. So that's my two  
12 cents.

13           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Mr. Scott.

14           MR. SCOTT: Remembering from last time, though, it  
15 depends on where you have it. If you have it on the east side  
16 of town, that was the only issue, even though that's not why we  
17 were meeting. Everybody that came wanted to talk. And everyone  
18 from the public want - or almost everyone from the public wanted  
19 to talk about the election process.

20           When it was held on the south side of town, the  
21 question didn't even come up. So of lot of it's going to depend

1 on where we have the meetings. So how many meetings do we have?

2 That's going to be critical also.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Sorry. Mr. Springer.

4 **MR. SPRINGER:** Going back to the meeting we had at  
5 Udall, I kept track of who the speakers were, and if you  
6 remember, most of them were from the County. We had very few  
7 people from the City at that meeting discuss (inaudible)

8 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right. Yes. It's a good  
9 point. Anyone else? Mr. - Dr. Sonenshein?

10 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** The flip side of this is you're gonna  
11 hear a lot of comments, and it'll be very strong and very  
12 intense and very well thought out. And I would still encourage  
13 the Committee at the end of the day to pick one or two  
14 alternatives that you really believe are right because things  
15 change. People change, attitudes change, organizations go back  
16 and talk about it after they've heard a discussion with the  
17 Committee.

18 And this Committee will have a lot of moral force,  
19 'cause you will have examined it. And you'll be the only people  
20 who have really examined it. So it's a great balance of getting  
21 more comment than you're ever gonna imagine. It's gonna be

1 great. I think it's gonna be really outstanding comment.

2 At the same time, it doesn't have to determine  
3 everything. I still think you can make the best, the best  
4 recommendation. Besides, you've got a bunch of elected  
5 officials who will make the decision of what goes on the ballot  
6 and they're no slouches at weighing public input as well. So  
7 you can rest assured that they'll have their own channels to  
8 know whether it's a good recommendation or not. But I'm very  
9 encouraged.

10 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** I've got a question for the  
11 Committee. We have a list of issues pertaining to the electoral  
12 process. And I just want to make sure that we're covering the  
13 ones that people are interested in because -

14 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Yes.

15 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** - initially we talked about  
16 partisan versus non-partisan elections. And we haven't really  
17 discussed that as a group. So is there a desire to dig into  
18 that more deeply, and if so, how would we like to accomplish  
19 that? Mr. Hinderaker.

20 **MR. HINDERAKER:** I think it's something we should  
21 discuss. When we've talked about - and this is why (inaudible)

1 city is a true outlier. There's no other city in Arizona that  
2 has partisan elections. So we should discuss it.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Prezelski.

4 MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would say  
5 that that's not the case. The last city election in Flagstaff  
6 was a partisan election. There was a Republican candidate, and  
7 there was a Democratic candidate.

8 The last city election in Phoenix was certainly a  
9 partisan election. Greg Stanton (ph.) was opposed by a  
10 Republican candidate who ran on a Republican platform. His  
11 opponents on the City Council are both Republican.

12 The - Tempe's last election was a partisan election.  
13 The fact that the party affiliation does not appear on the  
14 ballot does not make it non-partisan. It's just - Tucson is an  
15 outlier in that we are the only jurisdiction - we're the only  
16 city in, in the state of Arizona that's actually honest about  
17 the fact that these elections are partisan.

18 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Hinderaker.

19 MR. HINDERAKER: Yeah. But I mean I think the  
20 definition of a non-partisan election, there's no labels on  
21 ballots, so -

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

2           MR. HINDERAKER: - it is true to say that we're the  
3 only partisan election in the state.

4           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Mr. Knipe?

5           MR. KNIPE: Are we just going around the room?

6           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** No. You look like you  
7 wanted, like you wanted to say something. Well, I feel like we  
8 have that communication going on right now.

9           MR. KNIPE: This, this, this is a topic where I really  
10 do want to offer a measured response. But you know, I've been  
11 following these things pretty closely for the last decade or so.  
12 And I just don't see any evidence that this community is ever  
13 gonna support non-partisan elections -

14           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Does that mean we don't want  
15 to -

16           MR. KNIPE: - for, for the City.

17           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** - discuss it?

18           MR. KNIPE: Well, discuss it all we want, but I, I  
19 still don't think the support is there.

20           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Are you, on this side of the  
21 room, interested at all in discussing non-partisan elections?

1 Mr. Burke.

2 MR. **TOM BURKE**: I'm not interested because I believe  
3 that whether you call somebody a, by a political party or not,  
4 everybody knows which party they're gonna be representing. So  
5 I, I don't see any benefit in trying to not say which  
6 affiliation a person is who's running for a political office.

7 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN**: Is it possible to take an  
8 unofficial vote, like just count hands of how many people are  
9 interested in at least digging further into non-partisan  
10 elections? Can we do that?

11 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR PORGES**: You're the boss. You can do  
12 anything you want.

13 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN**: I like being the boss. I'd  
14 love to see a show of hands about who is interested in at least  
15 learning more, getting more information about non-partisan  
16 elections.

17 So, there's at least four of us. I mean I think it  
18 would be helpful to at least get kind of a primer on non-  
19 partisan elections.

20 **MR. KNIPE**: Well, a show of hands, four hands were  
21 raised. What would a roll call - you want to do a roll call

1 vote on that?

2 MS. GAXIOLA: To what end?

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Yeah. To what end?

4 MR. KNIPE: Well, you're - on, on whether to explore  
5 the issue of non-partisan elections.

6 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** To get, to get some basic  
7 information? But what's the difference?

8 MR. KNIPE: Well, if we're trying to measure the  
9 consensus in the room, I just would be interested in how many of  
10 the members that are present support that.

11 MS. GAXIOLA: May I?

12 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Ms. Gaxiola?

13 MS. GAXIOLA: Thank you. I think that, you know,  
14 we've been charged by the Council to consider electoral issues  
15 in the community. And we would be remiss in not considering all  
16 the different aspects of it. So I think to say out of hand that  
17 we are going to take something off the table that could be  
18 potentially, potentially impactful on our, on our electoral  
19 system, we would be doing ourselves and our community a  
20 disservice.

21 So I would encourage my fellow Committee Members here

1 who would not - would like to not discuss it, to reconsider your  
2 decision. There will be - the worst that can happen is that we  
3 all learn a little bit, and decide to set the issue aside. But  
4 I think it's worth at least taking the time to learn a little  
5 bit about it.

6 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Burke, Mr. Scott, and  
7 then Mr. Yee.

8 **MR. TOM BURKE:** Well, I, I, I'll withdraw. I was  
9 gonna actually make a motion, but I believe that's a fair  
10 statement. And I don't know whether it would be (inaudible)  
11 where we are from a quorum, how many people are actually present  
12 from - and who's missing. So I, I withdraw my, my request.

13 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Scott.

14 **MR. SCOTT:** Given what we have to look at, though,  
15 could we limit the time that we spend on this, because we've got  
16 a lot of other issues. And I think the majority is saying  
17 that's not a priority.

18 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Yee?

19 **MR. YEE:** The only comment I, I make on this, because  
20 we only have half the Committee Member here, as a courtesy to  
21 other members, I think we should, you know, put that on the, on

1 the agenda in order to more fully (inaudible) Committee to  
2 decide what we gonna do.

3 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. So how about we don't  
4 have this issue on the agenda as a discussion topic on the next  
5 agenda? But the next time we meet, let's get a read from the  
6 other Committee Members about at least having it as a shorter  
7 discussion topic at a future meeting?

8 MS. GAXIOLA: Uh-huh.

9 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Does that sound good? Okay?  
10 Okay. I, I would feel more comfortable that way.

11 MS. GAXIOLA: Uh-huh.

12 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Because as Ms. Gaxiola said,  
13 when we asked for more time regarding electoral issues, it was  
14 really so that we could explore the breadth of issues. And I  
15 think that if it becomes apparent that that's not something that  
16 we want to pursue, we'll move on quickly. But to not address  
17 it, I think we, we would not be fulfilling the intention of this  
18 Committee. Are there any other - oh, Mr. Yee?

19 MR. YEE: Mr. Rankin, maybe do this. We don't put on  
20 agenda, maybe discuss the topic.

21 MR. RANKIN: Yeah. And we would agendize it to, to

1 give you the flexibility to do that. But as I understand, what  
2 the Chair was suggesting is the next meeting, when you hope to  
3 have the other members who aren't present today, they could  
4 weigh in in terms of how much time to devote to discuss the  
5 partisan/ non-partisan issue.

6 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Yes. Yes, Dr. Sonenshein?

7 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** There was a list of other items as  
8 well, such as residency and issues like that. Campaign  
9 financing we've already got on the list (inaudible)

10 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

11 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Would you like me to, as - try to do  
12 this sort of deeper dive into some of these alternatives, to try  
13 to at least include some mention of each of these alternatives?

14 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Well, that's what I'm trying  
15 to gauge because we were all sent the, the related issues. And  
16 so if they're issues that we're not currently planning on  
17 discussing, that members would like us to discuss now or before  
18 the next meeting is really the time to bring that up.

19 **MS. GAXIOLA:** So to be clear, everything that's on  
20 this list is what we will be discussing?

21 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** No. These were issues that

1 we - we made a large list of issues that we were potentially  
2 interested in.

3 MS. GAXIOLA: Right.

4 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** But I think that as we've  
5 gone through a number of weeks now, and have learned more, that  
6 some are more important than others. So in an effort to  
7 prioritize what, as a Committee, we're gonna be focusing on, I'm  
8 trying to gauge if there are other issues that we're not  
9 currently planning on discussing, but you think we should be  
10 discussing.

11 MS. GAXIOLA: So, so - sorry. Just to be clear. So  
12 is, is that the list - this list is what we will be discussing?  
13 So you're saying (inaudible)

14 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** No, this is a list that was  
15 created, and - of issues that we could potentially be interested  
16 in discussing.

17 MS. GAXIOLA: Yeah.

18 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** So we're not discussing every  
19 single thing in-depth.

20 MS. GAXIOLA: How do we know what we are and are not  
21 discussing?

1           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Like, like term limits. Do,  
2 do we want to discuss term limits?

3           MS. GAXIOLA: Yes.

4           **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** So residency requirements.  
5 There's - this is, I think the, maybe third meeting that we've  
6 had this list. And do we want to cover every single issue or  
7 not all of them? Mr. Crum had his hand up.

8           MR. CRUM: As I recall, that larger list came from  
9 sections listed in the City Charter.

10          MR. RANKIN: For the most part, I think Bonnie -

11          MS. GAXIOLA: We created it.

12          MR. RANKIN: - assembled (inaudible) from our prior  
13 discussions.

14          MR. CRUM: And there- -- and therefore, what Raphe's  
15 (inaudible) was, it's for information only, he would just  
16 provide a short narrative in terms of what each of these things  
17 meant, meant. And then if someone was intrigued by that, or  
18 not, we could do that later on.

19          DR. SONENSHEIN: It's almost what my offer was.  
20 Close. What I'm hoping to do is to, to consolidate your time as  
21 much as possible, is start to frame some (inaudible)

1 alternatives.

2 **VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Right.

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: But I thought I could use that list,  
4 if you think of this as an excel sheet where for each of those  
5 alternatives, you could say if term limits - here's the reason I  
6 say that. Your decision on something like term limits may  
7 depend on which of the alternatives you use. It's not, these  
8 decisions shouldn't stand all by themselves.

9 A decision on residency requirement, which is kind of  
10 an interesting question, by the way, has all kinds of  
11 implications, might be different if you had a ward system versus  
12 another kind of system. So what I thought I would do is pretty  
13 much what you're saying.

But I want to use this list as the lefthand column, so  
number of Council Members, role of the Mayor. Now you may say  
term limits, no, no, no, for each - or you may say, under Option  
One, maybe term limits, or if - that would be my way of helping  
to keep it within the framework of the sort of big choices that  
you're (inaudible)

MR. CRUM: Yes. That's what I meant to say.

DR. SONENSHEIN: Is that what you meant? I meant

exactly what you meant.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Mr. Porges.

MR. PORGES: No, that - I think that's been clarified now. We're good to go.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. Did you have a question?

MALE SPEAKER: No.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Okay. I would ask everyone before the next meeting, just be sure to review this list that's been our packet, so that if you see an issue that we're not discussing that you feel passionate about, please be sure to let the Committee know. How's that?

Okay. Should we do Call to the Aud- -- are there any Call to Audiences? Are there any - is there any member of the audience who would like to speak?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Do I need a card or -

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Don't need a card.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can you just -

MR. KNIPE: Tell us who you are.

MALE SPEAKER: And try to brief. I think it's an opportunity -

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Identify yourself.

MALE SPEAKER: - at this point to bring up -

CHAIRWOMAN: Can just say what your name is?

MR. URKEN: I'm Arnold Urken.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Hi, Arnold.

MR. URKEN: And I have a background in election methods and government. And I just wanted to make some suggestions that would it be reasonable to take account of. One is the connection between electoral systems and the finance problem. The County is (inaudible) possibility of looking more closely at the subsidies that government gives to parties in terms of (inaudible) that's sold and shared, and that's worth, depending on who you talk to, anywhere from hundreds of thousands of dollars to millions of dollars, depending where that information is actually distributed.

If that information were distributed in a more systematic way, with (inaudible) participation by citizens, the information, the value of the information could grow greatly, and would obviously have a impact on the revenue stream that you, you're considering with respect to the bigger budget. So instead of elections being a money-taker and we're always trying

to cut costs, elections could actually be a money-maker.

Secondly, I, I wanted to disagree strongly with the idea that election methods are necessarily complicated, and almost like a distraction from the main issues that you're focusing on. Particularly approval voting has some really nice features, and is quite understandable, and if you look at the way it's used around the world.

It also has a feature that takes account of the fact that election systems are not purely a matter of abstract preference. I mean, it's like saying you're gonna buy Car A or Car B. Well, depending on what you hope to get (inaudible) use of the car, it makes a difference which one you choose. And voting systems are like that, too.

If you're talking about better representation, people think the majority is magic. Anything less than a majority isn't. But, in fact, majority rule is quite distorting in terms of representing what people think. And approval voting has the property that if you were to ask something that's very difficult what people would prefer, candidate by candidate and binary choices, approval voting is most likely to choose the most representative choice in terms of creating better government.

So I think you, it would be worthwhile paying some attention to that as it's mixed into all other things that you're taking account of, because it, it has some very powerful consequences that would be beneficial for better government.

Thank you.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Anyone else?

MS. BEEKER: (Inaudible) Last week -

(Inaudible conversation.)

MS. BEEKER: Oh. I'm Ruth Beeker, and I'm here talking for myself. Just to share with you something. You were talking about the Council Offices being representative, and last year, I think I came and talked about the Council Offices as being repair and maintenance shops for the City, because basically that's where citizens go when they see something wrong with the government, or they see their streets not being fixed or something like that, that the ward staffs really much more than being involved in helping their Council person come up with policies and executive functions. They are doing repair and maintenance kinds of things.

At a meeting last week, we - well, it was a TRRIG meeting on Code enforcement. And we met with Andy Quigley

(ph.), who is head of Environmental Services. And Envir- - and Environmental Services has been - going to be given the Code enforcement function in this administration that we have now, the City Manager.

One of the things Andy said to us as head of Environmental Services, he wanted citizens to call his operation, not to go through City Council Offices. He did not think that was the job of City Council Offices to be taking care of whether your trash was being picked up properly, or if you had complaints about something. He wanted it to come to his place.

That really - if we have department heads who feel that way, it may make a difference as to what Michael Ortega's administration is going to take as a policy to (inaudible) how they want to run our City government. Thank you.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Thank you. Next on the agenda is the meeting schedule. And our next meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 25th, at - sorry. February - I'm sorry. Monday, February 22nd at 4:30 P.M.

First, I want to say I appreciate everyone making the

time and spending all this time at the meetings. We did have an issue today with quorum, so if you are not able to make a meeting, please make sure to let Yolanda know because we couldn't start today until 5:00 to get a quorum.

And even if you're gonna be late, like Tannya was able to let us know she was gonna be late. If you're gonna be late, please let Yolanda know. If we don't have a quorum for 4:30, but we'd have one at 5:00, we could perhaps adjust the meeting accordingly and not waste everyone's time.

I think that's it. Could I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MR. KNIPE: So moved.

MALE SPEAKER: I second it.

**VICE CHAIRWOMAN DORMAN:** So, thank you.

(Meeting adjourned.)

**Approved February 22, 2016**

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the original tape recorded conversation in the case referenced on page 1 above.

Transcription Completed: 02/15/16

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner  
M&M Typing Service

**City of Tucson, Arizona  
Charter Review Committee  
Meeting of February 8, 2016**

**Verbatim Transcript**

CITY CLERK NOTE: This transcript was prepared from a recording of the Charter Review Committee on the date shown. The transcript was prepared and certified by Kathleen R. Krassow, M&M Typing Service.



\_\_\_\_\_  
**Roger W. Randolph  
City Clerk**

**Date:** 2/22/16