

TUCSON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Bonnie Poulos, Chairwoman
Randi Dorman, Vice-Chairwoman (arrived at 6:00 p.m.)
Bruce Burke
Tom Burke (arrived at 4:38 p.m.)
Mark Crum
Tannya Gaxiola
John Hinderaker
B. Joseph Howell
Luke Knipe
Tom Prezelski (arrived at 4:40 p.m.)
Jeff Rogers
John Springer (arrived at 4:37 p.m.)
Joe Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Lenny Porges
Grady Scott

TUCSON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS:

Jonathan Rothschild, Mayor
Michael Ortega, City Manager
Roger Randolph, City Clerk
Mike Rankin, City Attorney
Suzanne Mesich, Assistant City Clerk
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office
~~Silvia Amparano, Finance Director~~

Raphe Sonenshein, Facilitator

=====

(TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE: THROUGHOUT THE TRANSCRIPT, WHEN THE CHAIRWOMAN REFERS TO "JOHN" AND DOESN'T DIFFERENTIATE WHETHER IT IS JOHN HINDERAKER OR JOHN SPRINGER, I REFER TO THEM ONLY AS "JOHN".)

1 **4:34 p.m. CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** I'd like to call this meeting to
2 order, please. Thank you. We are absent a couple of members,
3 but we do have a quorum, so I'm gonna go ahead and start the

 **CITY CLERK NOTE:** This transcript was amended to correct names of speakers and inaudibility. Transcript was corrected by Yolanda Lozano of the City Clerk's Office. RWR:DR:yl 3/07/16

1 meeting. May we please have the roll call. It's on, I think.

2 Are you hearing it?

3 FEMALE SPEAKER: I don't know. I'm just asking
4 (inaudible)

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: It's got a red light.

6 FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: It's on. Yes, it's on.

8 CLERK: Mr. Bruce Burke?

9 MR. BURKE: Here.

10 CLERK: Mr. Tom Burke? Mr. Crum?

11 MR. CRUM: Here.

12 CLERK: Ms. Dorman? Ms. Gaxiola?

13 MS. GAXIOLA: Here.

14 CLERK: Mr. Hinderaker?

15 MR. HINDERAKER: Here.

16 CLERK: Mr. Howell?

17 MR. HOWELL: Here.

18 CLERK: Mr. Knipe? Mr. Porges? Ms. Poulos?

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Present.

20 CLERK: Mr. Prezelski? Mr. Rogers?

21 MR. ROGERS: Here.

1 CLERK: Mr. Scott? Mr. Springer? Mr. Yee?

2 MR. YEE: Here.

3 CLERK: You have a quorum.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you. And Mr. Knipe just
5 showed up. All right. We have an approval of the Minutes of
6 the February 8th, 2016 meeting that was a verbatim Minutes that
7 was, were provided to us from - by Yolanda. I do not want to
8 make the Motion since I wasn't at the meeting, so if somebody'd
9 like to make the Motion for approval.

10 JOHN **HINDERAKER**: So moved.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you, John. Second?

12 MALE SPEAKER: Second.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: All those in favor?

14 (Affirmative.)

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Any opposed? Thank you.

16 This is a time for the Call to the Audience at the
17 beginning of our meeting, and, oh, we have Mr. Christopher Cole
18 (ph.) here to speak. You have three minutes to address us and
19 we may not respond to any of your comments.

20 MR. COLE: As a fair portion of you may remember, I
21 have advocated in the past on ward-only elections. At-large

1 elections run the risk of a small clique in one area managing to
2 have excessive influence through the election of at-large
3 members. "All politics is local." That's an old saying.

4 A local in the City of Tucson is the wards. What is
5 important to Ward 2 may not be important to Ward 5. Yes, there
6 is going to be some issue such as the city streets that are
7 important to every ward. But even then, the various wards are
8 gonna fight over which ward gets their streets repaired today
9 and which gets their streets repaired sometime in the future.

10 And at-large elections, you have the possibility,
11 perhaps even the probability, that a small group from one ward
12 is going to over-balance, and thus basically reduce the
13 influence, reduce the ability of other wards, other groups, to
14 have their say.

15 Now, on the issue of partisan versus non-partisan,
16 political parties are supposed to be a shorthand description of
17 a philosophy. I hate to say this, but unfortunately, that's no
18 longer true. Political parties, far too many people, are - it's
19 my tribe. They look at the D, the G, the L, the R, and that's
20 all they see. They don't look at or investigate whether or not
21 somebody else with a different letter is better for the City,

1 better for, better for them.

2 Politics is local, and unfortunately, it's become
3 tribal, which is why even though I am a very partisan person,
4 can't you tell? I would recommend going with a non-partisan
5 City election. Thank you.

6 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** You're welcome, Mr. Cole. Do we
7 have any other members of the audience who'd like to address us
8 at the beginning of the meeting? No? Okay.

9 Then Item No. 4 on the agenda is a revisit of some of
10 the financial issues. And when I read the Minutes from the last
11 meeting, it's -

12 **MAYOR ROTHSCHILD:** Excuse me. Bonnie?

13 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Yes.

14 **MAYOR ROTHSCHILD:** (Inaudible) But I have the poll
15 results, and I want to present them to you.

16 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay. So -

17 **MAYOR ROTHSCHILD:** And we have other -

18 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Business that you need to attend
19 to.

20 **MAYOR ROTHSCHILD:** We do have other business.

21 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay. I didn't know if that was

1 the case, so -

2 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: And, and it would, it would
3 probably guide, probably will help guide you -

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes.

5 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: - throughout what you do from here.

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And actually it was part of this
7 discussion because my understanding was that basically people
8 wanted to be updated about the poll results before we moved on
9 to making a decision about a recommendation concerning the sales
10 tax. So if the Committee is okay, I would like to turn this
11 over to the Honorable Mayor Rothschild, and City Manager Michael
12 Ortega.

13 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: And I also have with me Ron
14 ~~Schumaker (ph.) (inaudible)~~ **Shoopman from SALC** and he's gonna
15 make a, a few comments ~~(inaudible)~~ **if he may.**

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

17 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: I was gonna wait (sic). And so,
18 first of all, I want to thank all of you for serving on this
19 Commission. It's a challenging task, and we're willing to rely
20 on you to listen, ask questions, and bring your best thoughts to
21 the table.

1 Recently, the Southern Arizona Leadership Council
2 commissioned a poll, and you will have the results in front of
3 you momentarily. I'm gonna hold until I've spoken because I
4 know that once I hand them to you, all you're gonna do is look
5 (inaudible)

6 And we also (inaudible) from the pollster, which is
7 important. And our pollster was out of Washington, D.C. with a
8 group called Purple Stra- -- Purple Insight, I guess it's
9 called, and came to us nationally recommended.

10 But I want to thank SALC for coming through with the
11 funds to pay for this. Polling is not inexpensive, particularly
12 if you're gonna do it right. And there's really no reason to do
13 it if you aren't gonna do it right. And we had a conference
14 this morning with the pollster so I can answer some of the
15 background information that may or may not be here.

16 I'm gonna walk you through the poll, but let's just go
17 ahead and do that. So we're (inaudible) I'm not gonna go
18 through all of them, but basically, if you ask people, "Hey, the
19 City's considering -," this is Question 3, so (inaudible) "Hey,
20 the City's considering a (inaudible) **quarter cent** sales tax,"
21 I'm sorry, "half a percent sales tax, and that will take you 25

1 cents to - they'll pay an extra 25 cents for every \$50 you spend
2 on retail goods except food, 'cause we don't tax that," that
3 came out essentially 39% for and 52% against, okay?

4 But then you immediately ask the question thereafter,
5 "If the money were used for these things, would you be much more
6 likely, or more likely to vote for these things? To repair and
7 improve our roads?" 74% yes, "To keep the number of City
8 police and firefighters from declining?" 71% yes, "To keep
9 Tucson from cutting basic services?" 63% yes, "To make capital
10 improvements, to improve police cars and improve first responder
11 technology?" 62% yes.

12 There's a couple more, "To improve our public
13 transportation system?" 54% yes, "To improve local parks and
14 playgrounds?" 53% yes. Then they ask a question, just sort of
15 a, you know, the division question. "Taxes are high enough,
16 city government should live within its means, they waste money,"
17 49% yes. "Tucson's in desperate need of more resources just to
18 maintain what they have. If we all chip in, we can make Tucson
19 a better place," 46% yes. (Inaudible)

20 So then they go back and say - well, sometimes
21 overhearing things, people change their minds. "Now would you

1 be in favor of a, a sales tax?" 48% yes, 47% no. Property tax,
2 we only ask the question regarding (inaudible), 49% yes, 46% no.

3 The elections was - so that's maybe we'll talk a
4 little bit about how we can envision that. The elections, the
5 whole citywide primary and citywide general elections, 36% with
6 ward-only primaries, and ward-only general elections, 26%. The
7 system as it is, 16%. I'm not sure about this 23%. So that's
8 what that says.

9 This one, candidate's - and I don't know, I thought
10 you guys were gonna address this, but maybe not. Candidate's
11 political party should be printed on the ballot, 72%.
12 Candidate's political party should not **be** printed on the ballot,
13 18%. And I'm not sure about this 10%.

14 We polled 500 people. The polling was done by cell
15 phone and regular phone. And the demographics are in here, and
16 it's a little surprising, but it reflects our voter files as to
17 who votes, which is 69% Anglo, 21% Hispanic-Latino. Obviously,
18 you know there's a lot more Hispanic-Latinos in our community,
19 but that reflects the voter polls.

20 It also reflects the age which is - and I have to go
21 back and look at it, but it was essentially - somewhere, there

1 it is - 72% over the age of 50. And again, that seems
2 surprising but that's who votes in the City of Tucson.

3 So a couple things that I take from it, and then I'm
4 gonna hand this out and let Ron speak. But I think that people
5 - and it would not be easy work, but I think people are prepared
6 to look at a sales tax increase, but they clearly say, "We have
7 to know specifically what it goes to," and how far you guys want
8 to go in crafting that, but I know what I'm hearing is that it
9 has to be ~~these agencies~~ **things they can see.**

10 Roads is easy, right, every time you've gone down that
11 road. Police and fire, equipment, vehicles, more officers,
12 things they can see. Parks, we did a separate survey recently
13 on parks, and it came out overwhelmingly people were ~~(inaudible)~~
14 **activity for connectivity..**

15 In other words, bike paths, and walking paths, off the
16 road, you know, in the park system. It was in the County bond
17 election, and got lost in everything else - sports field
18 lighting, things like that.

19 Transit is a little harder to say you can see it, but
20 things like frequencies for upgrading quality with safety,
21 cleanliness and the like could be things could be looked at. So

1 for us on the election issue, and Mike can talk more to it, but
2 the fact of the matter is we're now sitting in a position where
3 we have no system. And if we put only one thing on the ballot,
4 even from these poll results, probably the voters vote against
5 it.

6 And we have an election next year, so we're gonna have
7 to give people an alternative of some kind. It is possible that
8 the result will come back, or it'll say (~~inaudible~~) **leave it all**
9 **alone**. But when you have a poll that says 16% of the people like
10 their current system, and the other 26% don't know, it might be
11 something to think about. Other than that, I'm gonna kind of
12 leave it to you. I'm gonna leave you with Margie's memo, and
13 just pass these things out. And there's -

14 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR RANDOLPH:** Mr. Mayor?

15 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: Yeah.

16 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR RANDOLPH:** They have a copy.

17 MALE SPEAKER: There's copies over there.

18 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: The poll (~~inaudible~~)

19 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR RANDOLPH:** Yes, sir.

20 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: Oh, guys are very - well, that
21 worked well after I said they (~~inaudible~~)

1 (Multiple speakers - inaudible conversation.)

2 MAYOR ROTHSCHILD: Anyway - so, Ron, do you want to
3 say a few words?

4 MR. ~~SCHUMAKER~~ **SHOOPMAN**: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.
5 I'm impressed. You all looked at them like you hadn't seen it.
6 It's wonderful.

7 I want to give Mayor Rothschild some credit for
8 approaching us about this poll. I think it's very important
9 that we start with facts and data on what's possible for this
10 community. All of you deserve a lot of credit for what you're
11 doing to try to make this a better place.

12 The business community, and a lot of other sectors,
13 wants Tucson to be great. And so we need to know what's
14 possible. Hopefully, what you read in this survey will help you
15 make better decisions about what we can do together.

16 We look back to November, the - your predecessors in
17 the first full Charter **Committee**. We, we passed every one of
18 the ones that were referred by the Council, thanks to your good
19 work. And I'm looking forward to us doing the same thing this
20 time.

21 So I wanted to thank you and let you know that also

1 even though these results by, in some corners, won't be viewed
2 as particularly positive, transparency and honesty are very
3 important. They're important to this organization and SALC, and
4 important to the Mayor. Again, to his credit, we're sharing it
5 openly with you, and with the press.

6 I do want to address the, the Charter issue in terms
7 of the election structure. I think it's very informative that
8 the 16% favor the current structure. But what's even more
9 interesting is almost one in four have - aren't sure about it,
10 don't really know what it means to have either ward-only,
11 citywide or a combination.

12 So we developed - in fact, it was Jim Kaiser (ph.),
13 who does some great work for SALC, prepared a comparison that we
14 will share with you that talks you through all of the strengths
15 of each of these. Use it as you wish, but I think you'll find
16 it to be very helpful. We're gonna have to find a way to
17 educate the general public on this if they're gonna make a
18 rational decision.

19 I will tell you from SALC's perspective; we're very
20 interested and concerned about annexation. We think this region
21 in this community can do great things if we become more

1 inclusive by bringing more of the region into, into our city.

2 And we believe that ward-only allows that, facilitates that best
3 because it gives those being annexed a voice.

4 So would a combination work? Probably. We would
5 probably be interested in supporting that. Would pure ward-only
6 work? We'd be most interested in that. We're less favorable
7 toward the citywide only because we think it would be a real
8 problem for annexation more than anything else. And there's
9 some in the community who feel disaffected by the, by the fact
10 that they won't feel like they have a voice for their particular
11 segment of the community.

12 So I thank you for the time. Thank you for the
13 opportunity to present to you, and I'll pass these out. Once
14 again, good luck, and thanks for what you're doing.

15 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Thank you, Mr. ~~Schumaker~~ **Shoopman.**
16 I, I think we have a lot of discussion for tonight, but while we
17 have these three individuals in the room, are there questions
18 from the Committee Members that you would like to ask any of
19 these people about the poll or about the financing mechanisms?

20 Okay. Well, then we won't keep you all. Thank you
21 for addressing us, and thanks Southern Arizona Leadership

1 Council for providing the funding for the polling so that we
2 would have some information to base our decisions on.

3 Do we want to go into a discussion about the sales tax
4 now or would you like to bring that back to the next meeting
5 when you've had a chance to go through the poll results and make
6 some of your own conclusions? I'm open to either continuing
7 this discussion tonight or putting it on next month's agenda.

8 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: My (inaudible) would be to look at
9 the poll thing.

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Mr. Burke is thinking we
11 would like to look at the results first. Are there other people
12 in agreement with that? I see several nodding of heads. So if
13 it's okay with everyone, we will, we will go ahead and put this
14 for more in-depth discussion at our very next meeting. Is that
15 okay with you, Mike, as well? And Luke?

16 MR. KNIPE: I had a question for the Chair, and I
17 suppose for the Clerk. Mayor and Council has directed this
18 Committee to give a recommendation by a date in April, is that
19 correct?

20 MR. RANKIN: Yes.

21 MR. RANDOLPH: Yes.

1 MR. KNIPE: What's that date?

2 MR. RANDOLPH: April 1st.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: What I'm considering, and it's why
4 one of the reasons I asked for the schedule of future meetings
5 to be put on the agenda is that Dr. Sonenshein has indicated
6 that he can really help us the most in discussing our elections.

7 And so if we want a more in-depth discussion about the
8 sales tax, I'm wondering if we want to schedule a meeting just
9 for that discussion at a time when perhaps Dr. Sonenshein won't
10 be present. And that way we won't be using his time for our
11 discussion on finances. So we'll discuss that when we get to
12 Item No. 6. But if it's okay, we're gonna move on to Item No.
13 5, discussion on the form of City elections.

14 I did go through the Minutes, all 94 pages of them,
15 from the last meeting. So I think I'm a little bit up to speed,
16 and I think I'm gonna turn this over to Raphe and let him go
17 ahead and present some of the new information to us.

18 DR. SONENSHEIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I hope you
19 all have in front of you this gigantic piece of paper, this two-
20 sided Excel spreadsheet.

21 What I had in mind, just so you know the direction I'm

1 kind of trying to help with is to go a little bit at a time and
2 keep pushing forward with constant feedback from the Committee
3 about where you are, and then bring it back in a form that maybe
4 is implied by where you said you were. It may seem like it's
5 going a little fast, but keep in mind you always go backwards.
6 You can always say, "Put something back on here, that we weren't
7 so sure about last time."

8 But in doing that, I've been putting this together
9 based on our previous discussion when we went around the room,
10 and everybody said what their first and second, even third
11 choices were. And it seemed at that time that the at-large only
12 model had considerably the least, the least support by a
13 considerable margin. Doesn't mean it can't come back.

14 But what seemed to emerge the most was three
15 alternatives; the current system, a ward-only system, and the in
16 particular hybrid system which was at-large elections, plus two
17 at-large Members. Rather than trying to analyze that hybrid
18 into three different alternatives that were (inaudible) the
19 first time, I'm trying to sort of use a funnel and just keep
20 narrowing it. But remember, you can always blow up a funnel and
21 go back and say we need to talk about the four at-large, or one

1 at-large. These seem to be the consensus choices.

2 I want to talk a little bit about the assumptions for
3 this presentation and hopefully for our discussion. And these
4 are (inaudible) have been implicit, so I wanted to make them
5 explicit and make sure that you're okay with this.

6 The first one is that all these alternatives,
7 including the current one, have a price tag. And I don't want
8 the Committee to get caught in a situation where you make a
9 proposal and somebody comes at you and says, "This is gonna cost
10 "X" amount of money," and you haven't already considered what
11 the costs are for various alternatives.

12 You'll discover it's doable to try to figure out the
13 cost. It's also doable in whatever alternative you choose to
14 make adjustments that would reduce costs. So I think I would
15 suggest to you that the more seriously you take costs, the less
16 vulnerable you will be. I've often heard in these debates, when
17 it gets out onto the street, both pro and con making very
18 extravagant claims about cost.

19 Usually the pro side says it won't cost anything, or
20 you'll make money. And the con side says we're all gonna go
21 bankrupt. And there's no data that people are drawing on.

1 Anyway, you'll see tonight there is data that, that you'll be
2 able to use, and that's one of the reports I've attached to show
3 you how cities do that.

4 Number two, you have to keep in mind that perhaps
5 unlike anything you, that the previous Commission took up, or
6 the previous Committee took up, external factors could drop in
7 in the middle and cause all sorts of confusion, court decisions
8 at higher levels on the initial case, for example. That would
9 obviously change things dramatically one way or the other.

10 I'm told that there are measures being proposed at the
11 State Legislature that could affect local election. Is that, is
12 that under discussion about having a ~~jungle~~ ~~(sic)~~ (inaudible)
13 primary that would be required to do?

14 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. RANDOLPH:** I don't think that any,
15 any of those type of things have moved.

16 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** They haven't moved yet. Okay. But
17 just keep in mind not only here but around the country; State
18 Legislatures are increasing their interest in local elections.
19 It's not just Arizona, it's happening in a lot of places. So
20 external factors could come into play; New court cases, anything
21 is possible.

1 Thirdly, I wanted to throw out one criteria, that when
2 you're gonna make even the possibility of a change in the
3 system, minimal change is probably the preferable one. And you
4 know its pretty common sense that that one extra straw you add
5 breaks the camel's back. One extra change you think that would
6 be really desirable, it's hard to change a lot of things at
7 once, especially when the voters have already approved a set of
8 Charter changes not that long ago.

9 So, doesn't mean you can't make more changes, but all
10 other things being equal, it would pay to build on the reforms
11 made by the first iteration of the Committee, and then add other
12 things that you think - but remember, those were all visited
13 very, very strongly all the time.

14 Number four is a reminder that effectiveness of the
15 government and responsiveness to the community which you might
16 call the inside and the outside game are both critically
17 important here, and more important to this Committee than to the
18 previous Committee, which was focused much more on the first
19 one, which is governmental effectiveness.

20 This one, the selling point for any change is going to
21 be responsiveness to the public. That's gonna, that's gonna be

1 the (~~inaudible~~) **overarching** public appeal, and along with that,
2 as long as you're doing this, it would pay to keep in mind any
3 ways to increase voter participation that could be part of this
4 process.

5 So those are my, my assumptions. And I want to make
6 sure those are all okay for you 'cause that sort of drives the
7 rest of what I'm proposing. If anybody has any amendments or
8 assumptions to add to that, I, I'd love to know, or if you're
9 okay with these.

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Think you see a lot of nodding of
11 heads.

12 DR. SONENSHEIN: Okay.

13 ~~MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)~~

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: The mike won't pick that up.

15 DR. SONENSHEIN: Okay. We're actually gonna talk
16 later about alternative voting systems which will go beyond the
17 nodding of the heads. You'll see there's some real interesting
18 ways to, to collect your views on three different alternatives.
19 So what (~~inaudible~~) **I put here**, reading across is, is to try to
20 simplify what's in front of you. Current system, all -- all-
21 ward, I guess we'll start calling it, and the hybrid.

1 And the only term we're gonna use for hybrid for a
2 while now is this one, the Mayor and two at-large Council
3 Members and six members elected by district. So the way this
4 reads, Mayor, plus eight Council Members, two of whom are
5 elected at-large. We're gonna call that the "hybrid".

6 Now the problem is, your current system is called the
7 hybrid. And there were three other hybrids that were listed.
8 So just, we call the current system, "the current system".
9 Otherwise you're gonna lose your minds, and I'm gonna lose my
10 mind. All-ward and hybrid.

11 So looking across, some of these will be obvious, some
12 of them are gonna be a little bit - take a little bit more time.
13 You notice, of course, on the doctrine of minimal change, on the
14 first category (~~inaudible~~) **you're going with** the same, exact
15 same number of elected officials. Mayor, plus six Council
16 Members; Mayor, plus six Council Members, and the only
17 difference on the hybrid is two more Council Members. So keep
18 looking at level of change, you'll be thinking about cost, but
19 also value, perhaps added value.

20 Didn't go more than six and didn't go lower than six.
21 I think on a city of this size, when you go lower than six, your

1 districts are gonna get too large. If you go well over six,
2 you're introducing a whole new argument about cost, the only
3 justification for which is its different kinds of Council
4 Members, namely, at-large Council Members.

5 Now if you go to the next line, you know the current
6 system - primary election by district, runoff citywide, partisan
7 elections. Now my recollection from last meeting is that there
8 was a sense of addressing non-partisan elections a bit, but not
9 getting overwhelming attention. The poll is certain informative
10 on that, that it may be something that gets taken up later on.

11 But I'm gonna assume, based on that discussion and
12 that new polling, that's probably not gonna be the main topic of
13 our conversation. Again, if you do this (inaudible) I've gotta
14 get back to it. But at least it's listed here.

15 Now the second one is obvious. Mayor elected
16 citywide, Council elected by district. And then the hybrid,
17 Mayor and at-large Council Members elected at-large, which right
18 away, you're gonna, I know you're gonna start thinking about
19 some things that are coming (inaudible) When will they be
20 elected, because obviously it'd be very important. And then six
21 elected by district.

1 Election dates. Right now you have odd-numbered
2 years, primary in September, general election in November. And
3 here's where you can make some choices, at least to think about.
4 These were not in the poll, but they're things to think about.
5 Keep the same calendar that you have, or we had discussed the
6 possibility that has been raised before moving to even-numbered
7 election years, which you could take, take or not. But it's
8 something you can consider. And we could come back and, and
9 take your questions.

10 As I'm going, by the way, if you have any questions,
11 I, I can either go through the whole thing or I can take your
12 comments, but now you go to election rules, and your current
13 system is essentially a - either a first past the post, you
14 might call it, or winner take all. Whoever finishes first wins
15 the primary. And then you have a runoff partisan runoff
16 election where you'll always have a majority.

17 You could have pretty much the same system for the
18 district. And for the hybrid, you could have the same district
19 system for the - you could really have it for everybody. It
20 partly depends if you're gonna stick with partisan elections.
21 It would depend how many candidates you get. But you do have

1 the options of exploring other voting systems for those other
2 at-large districts.

3 Now rather than explain them all now, I'm gonna give
4 you an example that having these three alternatives is actually
5 an ideal way to explain alternative voting systems like rank
6 choice voting and approval voting. When you have three choices,
7 and you're not too sure what the most popular choice is, you can
8 actually use these to evaluate these three. I'll show you how
9 it's done when you get to that.

10 It allows you to get, to get some mention of your
11 second choice, and even some mention of your third choice, and
12 have that as part of the tabulation. See if it matches up with
13 a straight one, two, three vote.

14 Now, right now you know that the Mayor runs with the
15 three Council Members, and then in the off year, the other three
16 Council Members are elected. And it seems to matter a great
17 deal which of those three wards is run at the same time as the
18 Mayor's election.

19 Not too surprisingly because the partisan makeup of
20 the wards is really quite different, and that's an interesting
21 question, and it's at least in part a political question, but

1 it's an interesting question.

2 We talked, **if** in going to a different system, or in
3 fact, even with the same system, you could elect the whole
4 Council every four years and elect the Mayor and the other
5 (inaudible). It's worth a discussion because it seems to be an
6 issue in terms of local, local politics and governance.

7 It gets a little bit more complicated when you go to
8 the hybrid model which is, when do you elect the at-large
9 Council Members? It's a pretty easy one to say that electing
10 the Mayor and Council is probably not that different in these
11 two, first two models. But it's a somewhat different question
12 when you're looking at the other two. You could, for example,
13 elect two at-large Members in one year, and the Mayor in the
14 next.

15 One advantage of separating them is that the - if you
16 do go to that model, the at-large races will attract
17 considerable attention. They're kind of mobilizers in a way.
18 And separating your two mobilizers has the possible virtue of
19 jacking up turnout two consecutive election cycles.

20 Now if you run them all together, it's - it can be
21 quite interesting as well. I mean you'll have a lot of interest

1 if you run them all together, a great deal of interest. And, of
2 course, because you have partisan elections, they'll kind of be
3 running as a ticket every four years. I mean that's something
4 to think about.

5 Now, we're gonna come back, so you don't decide that
6 now. That's a really important question how you do that, in
7 terms of the whole character of those elections.

8 Now let's get to the questions about how it would work
9 in terms of governance. How would constituency services best be
10 provided and responsiveness to constituents in these ~~(inaudible)~~
11 **systems**. If you go to the award system, it's pretty likely that
12 Council Members elected by ward will want to have a physical
13 presence in their ward. I mean it's hard for me to imagine how
14 that couldn't happen.

15 Now you should really right away be thinking about
16 money, and whether or not that means that there could be a city
17 facility in each ward that's already doing certain things. And
18 there's an office in there for the Council Member. You know,
19 you should see what happens. I mean this can really get out of
20 hand, you know. If you think of it as a Council (inaudible)
21 office, oh, my God, before you know it, they tend to explode.

1 But if it's a City service operation of maybe of
2 almost any department, and there's always this one that - is one
3 that's known to the people, the Council Members are not gonna
4 want to be sitting at City Hall.

5 Now I'd have to say on the third model, the at-large
6 members do not need district offices. And if they tell you they
7 do, I would tell them to take a hike. ~~(Inaudible)~~ **If they come**
8 **in and** say, "Well, we're at-large people. We need to have a
9 presence in all six wards just to keep an eye on the Council
10 Member."

11 You're gonna have warfare on the Council, first of
12 all. The smart at-large member is gonna pay - is not gonna walk
13 into the territory of a Council Member without, I don't know, a
14 pass, or permission of some kind.

15 So think about the fact that the district one, there
16 will be an expectation of a Council presence. Maybe that
17 produces some costs at City Hall. But you have to start
18 thinking about, about costs now. Now salary's always a happy
19 topic in (inaudible) especially given that the voters turned
20 down just this November a measure to increase salary. You know
21 in the Charter it hasn't been changed since 1999. Mayor at

1 \$3500 a month, Council \$2000 a month.

2 There's clearly no change when you get on that to go
3 to the district system unless you decided to make a change. I
4 don't see any reason to pay the at-large members more than you
5 pay the other Council Members. I think they're already gonna
6 have a lot of stature. I mean I don't think, I don't think
7 necessarily to spend more money.

8 But you can calculate how much the cost would be here.
9 I would imagine this would not be the best time to put a salary
10 increase along with a change that increased any of the numbers
11 of elected officials. That's, that's already kind of, kind of a
12 stretch.

13 Stamping costs, I spent some time looking at the
14 Tucson adopted budget for 2016 just to show you where you can
15 find some of these items. It's Attachments D-3 through D-9 in
16 the budget that show you the positions in the offices of the
17 elected officials, including their own positions, their
18 salaries, the costs. And there is costs that - in the City
19 Manager's Office relative to the Council.

20 What I'm getting at is it's findable. I mean it's not
21 the end of the world. We can all work together. I can work

1 with the City Staff on finding that information, and trying to
2 figure out how if you adopt either of the other two
3 alternatives, how you can do it in a cost-effective manner.
4 Better to look at it now. So now that includes questions like,
5 "How much staff is required under the three different models for
6 everybody?"

7 Right off the bat, I'm not convinced it needs a lot
8 more staff between the three alternatives. But if you leave
9 that for further discussion, it'll just sort of happen. But I
10 think you can actually sort of determine.

11 I would not recommend, however, making a promise of
12 revenue neutrality in this, 'cause if there are benefits to the
13 community of either of these alternatives, and the argument in
14 nature of Mayor responsiveness; that's worth paying some money
15 for. So I'd just be realistic about how hard you would try to
16 cut costs.

17 But, but **if** no one (inaudible) revenue to travel, and
18 it's perfectly possible that you can't get some of those
19 responsiveness benefits if you don't spend a penny on maybe a
20 little bit of outreach (inaudible) **staff**, maybe in the City
21 Manager's Office. Maybe some of it should be within the City

1 Manager, not necessarily in the Council Office. People pay a
2 lot of attention to that.

3 Voter turnout: A couple of items like all-mail
4 elections which is not in the Charter, but was introduced by
5 ordinance (inaudible) It's not a Charter provision. It's
6 certainly something - wasn't polled here, but it's certainly
7 something to think about.

8 The election dates; These are two things that are now
9 pretty well known to increase voter turnout. And they've been
10 experimenting with stuff forever. Now as it turns out, all-mail
11 elections does increase turnout, but it doesn't always increase
12 it, doesn't always increase it over a long period of time,
13 especially in the highest visibility races. But it can do
14 pretty well in the lower visibility ones where the convenience
15 really turns out to be a factor.

16 Certainly even-numbered years, and the standard
17 complaint which is a valid one is, will people pay less
18 attention to the City election if it's, if it's down below the
19 judges? And it's certainly a possibility that they will.

20 At the same time, turnouts in City elections across
21 the country are getting so low now that it's almost getting

1 harder to argue that there's a lot of attention to City
2 elections that would be jeopardized by, by any kind of change.
3 So it's kind of maybe a wash of those two things, but worth your
4 thinking about.

5 Next to last is campaign finance. Now I'm not an
6 expert on the campaign finance law here, but it did appear that
7 if you - if spending is lower than the lower cost to the City,
8 and the candidates are basically spending less money in terms of
9 matching funds (inaudible) So to the extent that candidates
10 spend less money, and it appears there's a dollar-for-dollar
11 matching program, right?

12 MR. RANKIN: Yes. Yes, it is.

13 DR. SONENSHEIN: Okay. So for qualifying
14 contributions, not for any contribution, but the qualifying
15 contribution, if you accept partnership in the, in the program
16 and its limitations, you - actually, these alternatives do have
17 some effect on the cost of campaigns. And that could affect
18 City costs in terms of matching funds, 'cause I'm, I'm trying to
19 keep you attuned to the notion that you may find savings where
20 you least expect it if you look at the whole thing as a packet.
21 So let's take, for example, district elections.

1 Most of the evidence is that district elections are
2 cheaper but not always. Let me, let me tell you - I'm trying to
3 be a careful political scientist here. I've got some studies
4 here -

5 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: Can I interrupt you -

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: Yeah.

7 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: - for a second, and ask a
8 question of Mike? What, what do you think people, what do you -
9 can you give me an estimate, and maybe you could chime in here.
10 What do you think people running ward-only would get instead of
11 the current, what, \$50,000 or so, plus the 50 they raise? What
12 do you think they would get if they were running ward-only?

13 MR. RANKIN RANDOLPH: Right now a Council Member gets
14 up to \$110,000.

15 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: Yeah.

16 MR. RANKIN RANDOLPH: They raise fifty -

17 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: Fifty-five thousand.

18 MR. RANKIN RANDOLPH: Fifty-five and then they 55.

19 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: Okay. So that the two
20 (inaudible) went to like a hybrid, the two at-large would still
21 get that? (Inaudible)

1 MR. ~~RANKIN~~ RANDOLPH: Right.

2 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: And what would, what would
3 be your best estimate of what people would get in the ward-only?
4 (Inaudible)

5 MR. ~~RANKIN~~ RANDOLPH: Well So, right now the way it's
6 said in the Charter (~~inaudible~~) its 20 cents per voter, adjusted
7 annually by the CPI. So if you did that by ward-only -

8 (Multiple speakers - inaudible discussion.)

9 MR. RANKIN: You continue to base it on the number of
10 registered voters and use the ward as opposed to the City then
11 you're gonna reduce it by two one-sixths.

12 MR. KNIPE: Well, would it be different, depending on
13 the ward, because each of the wards has a different number of
14 voters. And so you would have certain candidates being - I mean
15 every candidate would be eligible for a distinct number that
16 would be different from all of other candidates.

17 MR. RANKIN: Yeah, if you do it per - you have a fixed
18 rate per registered voter, and if you find (~~inaudible~~) the
19 geographic unit as the ward, then that's how it would calculate
20 out.

21 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR KNIPE: So Ward 2 would be eligible

1 for more matching funds than Ward (inaudible) because there are
2 more voters there?

3 MR. RANKIN: Well, as part of your discussion, what
4 I'm assuming is, is that if you, you decide to recommend a
5 change that you might want to consider recommending changes to
6 the campaign finance to track and address those types of issues.

7 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. BRUCE BURKE: Wouldn't we have to
8 (inaudible)

9 MR. RANKIN: You would want to, for sure, right.

10 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. BRUCE BURKE: Couldn't, couldn't
11 change that part without having public financing (inaudible)

12 MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Sort of go hand-in-hand.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: So does in most communities where
14 they do have district elections, does everyone normally get the
15 same matching funds in Arizona?

16 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. RANDOLPH: Tucson is the only
17 jurisdiction in the state that has public funding.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Oh, really?

19 MR. PREZELSKI: (Inaudible)

20 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Go ahead, Tom.

21 MR. PREZELSKI: Madam Chair, the (inaudible) election

1 system, each district, regardless of what the turnout is like in
2 the district, you're still gonna get the same amount of money
3 from (inaudible) **clean** election system run in that district. So
4 even if you're from, let's say, I'm sorry, I'm going back years
5 and years, but the old District 14 in Central Phoenix where,
6 which had the lowest turnout in the entire state, when Jack
7 Campbell would still get \$30,000 to run in that district,
8 whereas in Scottsdale, the district that includes Scottsdale,
9 has the highest turnout in the whole state, that candidate would
10 also have \$30,000 to spend in that district, under -

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Correct.

12 MR. PREZELSKI: - that system.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So we would conceivably have to
14 make a change to the Charter if we wanted to do that in district
15 elections. That's what I was driving at was that under the
16 current system, you're counting all the voters for all the
17 races. So we would have to have a different mechanism. Okay.
18 Is everybody clear? Okay.

19 DR. SONENSHEIN: So what the research tends to show is
20 that cities with district elections, that the campaigns cost
21 less, which is not a really big surprise. That essentially that

1 the voter contact is substantially smaller. There's not even
2 serious consideration of, of trying to get on the air somehow
3 or, or doing extremely elaborate things. Organized efforts,
4 friends and neighbors, direct contact, a lot of volunteers and a
5 lot of mail will get used very significantly.

6 Compared to a citywide race, which is really a whole
7 different animal, and yet in some cities, not a lot of cities,
8 but in some cities, there can be extremely costly district
9 elections. An example, just so, for full disclosure, what the
10 overall research shows that district elections cost less. And
11 that's, a good survey of that is the first research study that
12 I, that I put down here.

13 San Diego had a recent election after they switched to
14 district elections, and generally had assumed, and generally
15 costs were lower, but suddenly what emerged was a tremendous
16 battle over a big development.

17 And everybody just jumped in like crazy, and made it
18 almost the significance of a Mayoral race because of needing to
19 win that Council seat on that particular issue. Just want you
20 to know that, that it's not a guarantee that the races will
21 always be cheaper.

1 However, if you've ever worked on or volunteered in a
2 citywide campaign, you know that running by district is
3 generally gonna be substantially less expensive, and will really
4 require further change in the system.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom?

6 MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. (Inaudible)
7 sounds like, a little like what ends up happening at the federal
8 level with Congressional elections where a specific district
9 will get targeted by our national interests and essentially they
10 end up walking away - end up dominating discussion, and they
11 can't even talk about what's actually going on in their local
12 community. But you're talking about a rather extreme case,
13 right? I mean this is -

14 DR. SONENSHEIN: I just want to make sure you knew
15 that there's no absolute in this. That you -

16 MR. PREZELSKI: Okay.

17 DR. SONENSHEIN: An extreme case on it is exactly what
18 you just said which is that there is a pivotal seat at a moment
19 in time with a key decision to be made, and suddenly people
20 decide it's the most important election, you know, in the last
21 ten years.

1 I would say that's relatively rare. It's not the
2 normal election. I would say that cities that pay a full-time
3 salary to the Members of the City Council where people can
4 essentially treat it as a, a step in their career, you know,
5 it's very much a seat worth, you know, raising tons of money, I
6 mean your entire kind of livelihood is at stake. That's not
7 true here, so I do think you would most likely get the benefits
8 of lower spending, lower (inaudible) except in some cases.

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Jeff and then Tom.

10 MR. ROGERS: I echo Tom's concerns, and here's my
11 concern is that, you know, when you divide the city into six
12 wards, even if we went hybrid in six wards, -

13 DR. SONENSHEIN: Uh-huh.

14 MR. ROGERS: ~~(Inaudible)~~ **If these people** were getting
15 \$20,000 less in matching funds, my concern is that they're gonna
16 have a huge incentive like we have with clean elections in the
17 legislature, to ignore the public financing system altogether,
18 because of the fact that some local, oh, let's say, car dealer
19 comes in and gives 50 or 60 or \$80,000 to one candidate and one
20 party, and overwhelms that ward. I mean that's a genuine risk
21 that we face (inaudible) **because there are some deep pockets**

1 that could do that.

2 And then, then you're forced to basically fight,
3 fight, you know, fight against the same (inaudible) **community**
4 and you're gonna opt out. And then I think (inaudible) clean
5 city elections is something we've always been kind of proud of,
6 and this runs a real risk of kind of wiping it out.

7 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Tom and then -

8 **MR. ROGERS:** If, if not legally, (inaudible)

9 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Tom, did you have a comment?

10 **MR. PREZELSKI:** Well, yeah. (Inaudible)

11 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay.

12 **MR. PREZELSKI:** Well, I guess the, the, the question I
13 had was, was kind of building on what, what Jeff has said, which
14 is that in the San Diego example, I don't know if San Diego has
15 a public financing system. But again, were you talking about a
16 situation where there's a lot of money being raised within that
17 district, or was that money coming in from outside, and
18 basically outside the regulated, the normal regulated flow of
19 campaign money?

20 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Oh, I don't, I don't have any answer.
21 That's a good question, though. In general, of course, public

1 campaign finances are suffering everywhere in the country now
2 because of the openness of outside funding, making it more and
3 more a tough question whether to participate in the public
4 system.

5 And you'd hope that more and more candidates will be
6 able to participate in the system, but it's getting tougher and
7 tougher with the ease of bringing outside money in just about
8 everywhere.

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke?

10 MR. KNIPE: Well, so in our current system, there is
11 a, a cap. And that cap is the available amount of matching
12 funds. It's not unusual at all for candidates to go out and
13 raise that amount.

14 DR. SONENSHEIN: Uh-huh.

15 MR. KNIPE: That's not gonna change if we lower the
16 amount of available matching funds. What will happen is the
17 established candidates will opt out of that system. New folks
18 might come along and opt in, and then new competition from the
19 outside is also gonna come in and, and run dirty, as they say,
20 or without traditional (inaudible) traditional. It's, it's not
21 something the consequences of which should be considered trivial

1 (inaudible)

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: Of course, you can set the match- --
3 if you do amend the campaign finance rules, you don't have to
4 set the limit at one-sixth of the citywide limit. You could
5 pick any limit that you want, and that you felt was reasonable
6 to avoid what seems like a very serious problem, which is making
7 it so low that it would only be in the rare circumstance that
8 you'd be wise to follow them. So I think it's a great - and in
9 this case, you wouldn't want to be penny wise and pound foolish
10 and try to cut the cost so much that you actually destroy the
11 system. I agree with that.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Good point. Do we have - okay. I
13 guess I'd like to look at this from the perspective that you
14 discussed earlier in terms of better work presentation.

15 And I don't have a sense that ward-only elections are
16 necessarily more representative of the people than the current
17 system that we have now. And I see a problem with making too
18 many changes, which a hybrid system would necessitate, a lot of
19 changes. And I guess I feel like what people have been
20 clamoring for is let's take a vote on ward-only elections.

21 And I have a sense that although a hybrid would be

1 more, would be something that I would favor more; I think it
2 would cost more. It would require more changes, and it would
3 require a lot of, from what the poll results showed, educating
4 the public on what we have now and what we're trying to change
5 it to.

6 And so after this (inaudible) that you just gave, Dr.
7 Sonenshein, I'm almost leaning away from a hybrid system because
8 of the inability to try and get it sold to the public. Any
9 comments on that? Trying to generate some discussion here.

10 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, Bonnie?

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Jeff?

12 MR. ROGERS: Well, except for the problem that I just
13 brought up which for me is a significant problem, it really is.
14 I mean I - but before I thought of that and helped us think of
15 that, I had actually been checking around the community and have
16 spoken to some really important people in the Republican Party
17 who were prepared to basically say they believed that they could
18 sell to their people the hybrid system with the two, adding two
19 seats at-large going to ward-only and - but I think this public
20 finance thing really, really pokes a hole in that.

21 I think we could sell it, I mean if everybody were,

1 were to embrace it. And I think they, they would eventually.
2 They see it as, you know, two-thirds of a loaf for them, but,
3 but I think the public finance thing is very, very troubling and
4 it, and it's such a can of worms that I don't think there's a
5 simple solution, do you?

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: No. There really isn't.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke?

8 MR. KNIPE: Well, I think the challenge before us in a
9 lot of ways is to take as much complexity as we possibly can out
10 of whatever it is that we're, we're going to do, and we got the
11 sense at the last meeting that the will of this Committee was
12 leaning in the direction of ward-only, if only a little.

13 And we see in our polling data now that, that that
14 sense is, that (inaudible) some extent out there in the
15 community. But to deliver on that in a meaningful way is going
16 to require settling some of these more obscure questions, like
17 the question of campaign finance, the question of what to do
18 with the staggering elections. How, how can we, how can we make
19 that simple enough, palatable for voters? It's gonna be hard to-

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Bruce, did you have a comment?

21 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Well, I'm old enough to remember

1 the, the election that passed the public financing component of
2 the City, and it was a different era. I'm just having this
3 really uncomfortable thought that putting this on the ballot and
4 necessitating a change in the campaign finance law draws a whole
5 different dynamic into the race. And it's really problematic.
6 I hadn't thought through with how you sell that (inaudible)

7 The dynamic, when this was adopted was this **is was** a
8 (inaudible) **foreign** idea, its common cause at the time, you
9 know, (inaudible) the common cause. But now you've got citizens
10 united, you've got huge money flowing in, and I can see this
11 motivating the, the efforts to sabotage the whole the thing
12 could be focused on the campaign money that's asked for
13 (inaudible)

14 I don't know where that leaves us. I think we have to
15 touch it if we're gonna go to any different system. But it's
16 gonna be a real educational nightmare.

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And I guess I have a question,
18 too. One of the speakers earlier on brought up the issue of
19 annexation. And I've heard that in the last reiteration of this
20 Committee and again, at almost every meeting that we've had
21 where we talk about elections is that we could annex more people

1 if we gave - if we had ward-only elections because they would
2 feel that they could nominate and elect their own
3 representative.

4 But in my mind, and this is where I'd like some
5 information from Mr. Randolph, or staff, is it seems to me most
6 of the lucrative, important annexations are commercial
7 annexations. They're not annexing of residential properties
8 where you're bringing in numbers of voters.

9 And the only way I could see that as a financial
10 benefit to bring in all these residences with all their aging
11 infrastructure, and all the other issues, I'm thinking Casas
12 Adobes, off the top of my head, is that you might get more money
13 from the State because now they're in an incorporated area
14 instead of an unincorporated area. But I don't think there's
15 any guarantee that the State's gonna give us any more money if
16 they don't have to.

17 MR. RANDOLPH: Actually the State (inaudible) **shared**
18 revenues is based on population. So we would get that money -

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: You would.

20 MR. RANDOLPH: - based on (inaudible)

21 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: They wouldn't find a way to take -

1 MR. RANDOLPH: - the increase in the property tax,
2 which is not (inaudible) **I've heard it** is not dramatic, but it
3 would be those (inaudible) **increases**. The concept of now you
4 have this more in the Catalina Foothills that's special to those
5 people doesn't necessarily (inaudible) because you would still
6 go back to the Redistricting Committee that has specific rules
7 that they have to follow from maximum population densities,
8 densities of Hispanic population within the wards. So you'd
9 have to look - they'd have to look at all of those. That
10 annexation area may be split between several different wards.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Right. But I think what the
12 business community that I'm hearing from is saying is that if
13 they knew they were going into a city that had district
14 elections, they would have more control over who was elected for
15 their - to represent their area than the current system we have
16 now.

17 So one question, I don't know if you can answer that,
18 is where is our focus in terms of annexation in the City of
19 Tucson? Is it commercial, is it residential? Is it a
20 combination of the two equally?

21 MR. RANDOLPH: I believe that the City's looking

1 across the board on annexations. We've annexed a lot of vacant
2 land. We're looking - we've annexed portions of the Auto Mall.
3 We're looking at annexations of, of residential, so I think the
4 City's got a pretty aggressive - has had a pretty aggressive
5 annexation group out there right now looking at various
6 annexation (inaudible)

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I saw Tom and Luke and then Mark.

8 MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. To, to that
9 point, I've been talking to someone who's working as a
10 consultant on the annexation project. And he has said that in
11 the case of at least one of the neighborhoods that he's working
12 with, this question has actually come up, and it is a
13 residential neighborhood.

14 And it's also a situation where the, the City not only
15 needs that, that land because they, they need the, the residents
16 and they need the tax base, but also it's an issue of kind of
17 making, making it easy, easier to govern the City if there
18 aren't these holes and strange pockets in, in the, in the limits
19 of the City like, something like the Palo Verde Corridor.

20 But this, this is, this is a different neighborhood.
21 But that's an issue that comes up whenever he meets with the

1 neighborhood. It's like, well, you guys, you know, our
2 representatives are essentially elected by other people. What
3 happens? So that is an issue that's come up in terms of
4 residential annexation.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Luke?

6 MR. KNIPE: Yeah. I just wanted to comment that much
7 of the success that the City has had with the annexation of the
8 current era has been the result of annexing relatively small
9 areas that are part of bigger annexation goals.

10 So just because you are annexing residential property
11 in one instance of an annexation, or vacant land or whatever,
12 that doesn't necessarily mean that your strategy is to go after
13 residential property or vacant land. It's just that you are
14 taking one piece of a larger vessel.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Mark.

16 MR. CRUM: Unresponsiveness of government like Raphe
17 was talking about, I've been talking to folks as well. And a
18 lot of those folks who agree to be annexed feel that the City is
19 really ~~(inaudible)~~ **is** responsive to their needs than the County
20 regardless of the ~~(inaudible)~~ **type of election system.**

21 DR. SONENSHEIN: Madam Chair?

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes.

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: If I could just comment on the
3 responsiveness thing as well. I think that's in some ways the
4 key to the whole thing which is to the extent that whatever you
5 decide to do is ultimately more responsive. It's gonna answer
6 many possible objections.

7 Sometimes responsiveness comes at a cost such as
8 efficiency or effectiveness. But evidence is pretty clear that,
9 at least on the responsiveness piece, people think that the
10 district model is more responsive.

11 Now, but the reason has two values here,
12 responsiveness and effectiveness. And sometimes people who look
13 at the effectiveness side complain that there's the danger that
14 the budget will be broken up into six pieces that you can make
15 sure that every district gets their share which is not a good
16 way to do budgeting (~~inaudible~~) **at all**.

17 It means the areas of need don't get served by need,
18 but only by politics. That's a big problem. At the same time,
19 having a presence in the district, physical presence and an
20 elected presence just generally does seem to make a great
21 difference to people which is part of the appeal of that. I

1 guess what I'm saying, that's not all there is, 'cause if you
2 design it at the cost of effectiveness such as in the budget and
3 in other citywide issues, you'll have other problems to worry
4 about.

5 But I think that the test of all this stuff is what
6 people see in their neighborhood. Do they see City services as
7 a result of whatever change you're doing being more accessible?
8 Is City Hall more accessible 'cause they could be accessed in
9 their neighborhood through somebody they know who they have
10 elected?

11 Now that's, that's a matter of making it work. I mean
12 you could adopt the system, and then not accomplish that. Then
13 you don't really have - you promise something you're not
14 delivering. But it is the selling point, I think, of those two
15 models, as long as you deal with the cost of the efficiency
16 part, which is ~~(inaudible)~~ **always worrisome.**

17 And cities who struggle with avoiding (inaudible) on
18 the budget, and I know a number of, in a number of cities, there
19 was a period when they really did divvy up everything by the
20 number of Council districts.

21 They're trying - the feds don't like that, you know,

1 and they come in and they punch you out for doing that, for not
2 going to (inaudible) It's a learning process to make sure to
3 avoid that. So it's not simple, but it does have that appeal
4 anyway.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I also had a question. We were
6 gonna dis- -- we were going to discuss partisan versus non-
7 partisan elections. And I'd just like to ask whether or not
8 what you hear all the time about non-partisan elections
9 depressing the vote is generally correct or is it just something
10 that was noticed at one time, and it's out there as some kind of
11 myth?

12 DR. SONENSHEIN: Going back to what you just said, for
13 a long time it was pretty well established that non-partisan
14 elections suppressed the vote. But they don't suppress votes in
15 equal numbers among different members of the community.

16 They, historically, in non-partisan cities, you saw
17 lower vote, lower, lower voting turnout by working class
18 communities, by minority communities, and by those with less
19 education were usually disadvantaged by non-partisan systems.

20 It's not always true today. Partly the, the turnout
21 is going so badly everywhere in the country that even in cities

1 with partisan elections, you're seeing pretty big (inaudible)
2 **declines**. So party elections aren't what they used to be either.

3 Or if you have a city like Chicago that has
4 technically non-partisan elections, but they're really - I mean
5 the party is so strong in Chicago. They're starting to
6 experiment more with elections where everybody runs together,
7 which California is doing now, which is what some people are
8 discussing, called a jungle primary. And it doesn't look like
9 its helping. Turned out, in fact, it may be hurting it because
10 of voter confusion about how to strategically decide how to cast
11 your vote.

12 Even with party labels on the ballot, putting
13 everybody together and then the top two run off, which is almost
14 like a non-partisan election. L.A.'s elections are non-
15 partisan, and have historically had pretty low turnout.

16 So I think from the turnout side, there are lots of
17 good things about non-partisan elections. I don't, I don't
18 think turnout is one of them.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

20 DR. SONENSHEIN: I think it's the price you pay for
21 trying to get partisanship out of your election. I don't think

1 there's a benefit in turnout. It's a long answer, but -

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Do things such as - and
3 Luke, I saw your hand up. Do things such as automatic
4 registration increase voter turnout?

5 DR. SONENSHEIN: Yes.

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: It does?

7 DR. SONENSHEIN: It does. We're at the early stages
8 of experimenting with that (inaudible)

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And who's experimenting with that?

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: Oregon has adopted it. California
11 has now adopted it. It's not yet ready to go into effect.
12 Generally speaking, any time you make registration easier, you
13 do increase voting, but you don't increase voting turnout,
14 'cause turnout is a percentage of those that are registered to
15 vote.

16 So you actually may have appear to have a lower
17 turnout, but with more people voting. So it's one of the things
18 that drives people crazy, 'cause you've increased the pool of
19 registered.

20 We have a tremendous number of eligible voters who are
21 not registered to vote in this country. And it's just the

1 numbers are really pretty staggering. Automatic registration in
2 the short run would make a turnout as a percentage go down, but
3 voting go up.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

5 DR. SONENSHEIN: More people would vote. I, I think
6 it's pretty clear that would be effective.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Are there any places who are doing
8 automatic registration who have all-mail ballots?

9 DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, Oregon.

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

11 DR. SONENSHEIN: Now it's, it's, it's kind of a
12 confusion in Oregon 'cause the Northwest has always tended to
13 have high voter participation anyway, and they're doing very
14 well with both of those. But the automatic registration is
15 quite new in Oregon. The all-mail ballot they've had for quite
16 a while. And -

17 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR BRUCE BURKE**: Could you explain -

18 DR. SONENSHEIN: - the numbers went - I'm sorry?

19 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR BRUCE BURKE**: I'm, I'm sorry. I
20 didn't mean -

21 DR. SONENSHEIN: No, go ahead.

1 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR BRUCE BURKE:** I was curious to
2 understand automatic registration.

3 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Oh. Historically, we've assumed that
4 the voters should bear the burden of registration. That's
5 actually not necessarily the natural way of doing things. With
6 a system of automatic registration, when you turn 18, the State,
7 or the City, or whoever, takes upon themselves the burden of
8 registering you to vote, or to make it, in effect, to send you
9 an application for registration. But in a real automatic
10 registration system, you can literally just register people,
11 unless they choose to opt out, which nowadays, lots of people
12 would probably do.

13 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** And do they not register you for a
14 party? I mean do they register (inaudible) **you as an**
15 **independent?**

16 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Oh, no. They're not gonna you for a
17 party.

18 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay. So they register you as no
19 party.

20 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** You'll have to choose. You have to
21 get the option to choose to sign up for a party or not which, of

1 course, fewer and fewer people are. More and more people aren't
2 inclined to say. But what it does - now California's is a
3 modified version of Oregon's. Oregon's is a stronger automatic
4 registration than California.

5 But in the long run, what it says is just like, you
6 know, you get a notice to register for Selective Service. I
7 mean, you get a notice that's, you know, time to be registered
8 to vote, and it sort of gets the ball rolling with you.

9 In fact, there are even programs to pre-register
10 people in high school so that when they turn 18, they become
11 registered voters. That's an experimental thing.

12 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR BRUCE BURKE:** Can you put this in the
13 Charter?

14 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** No. I think it would have to be
15 statewide. But me let Luke ask his question first, and then
16 we'll go back.

17 **MR. KNIPE:** Well, it was on that. I don't think that
18 any type of jurisdiction, other than the State itself has the
19 legal authority -

20 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay.

21 **MR. KNIPE:** - to impose compulsive registration, or

1 automatic registration. If they did, I think it would be
2 preempted pretty quickly.

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: It's gonna take a long time for this
4 to spread around, I will tell you that much. Everything happens
5 in the Northwest first when it comes to all this. Oregon,
6 Washington, they do all kinds of stuff. And just, for example,
7 looking at the hybrid systems, there's more of them in the State
8 of Washington than any other place I can find in the country.
9 They just have fun with this stuff.

10 And it takes a long time to spread, though. And they
11 start off real fast and then it takes quite a while for people
12 to decide its okay. But those are the two big ones, along with
13 election dates. Those three are, are getting quite a bit of
14 traction these days.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And when you say election dates,
16 you mean?

17 DR. SONENSHEIN: Synchronizing with state and federal
18 elections. I mean it's partly a sign of desperation in holding
19 elections of trying to grab onto the only train that seems to be
20 going anywhere with voter turnout. But it is increasingly
21 popular.

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Are there any other options at a
2 local level that people can take to increase voter turnout? I
3 mean I thought the City going to all-mail ballots, even though a
4 lot of people complain 'cause they like going to the polls, it
5 really did seem to be a really great move in that direction.
6 Are there other local things that people can do? Luke?

7 MR. KNIPE: Well, if, if I could set that aside for a,
8 for a minute here. One concern that I wanted to bring to this
9 Committee's attention on the subject all-mail elections is the
10 management of elections. That's not on the list here. I don't
11 think that's been discussed. But when City - when Mayor and
12 Council made the change in 2011 to switch to an all-mail
13 election system where everybody got a ballot in the mail from
14 the City, the City Clerk started running City elections. And
15 that meant that it was the City Clerk's Office that sat down
16 with the ballots and counted, counted votes, did all of the work
17 associated with managing the election.

18 Now prior to that, the City of Tucson was contracting
19 with Pima County, and Pima County Division of Elections to do
20 that work. They do not conduct all-mail elections. And I'm not
21 even sure they have the authority to do that under State law.

1 So the question whether you want to do all-mail
2 elections is tied to the question of who do you want to run your
3 elections? Do you want the City to do it? Do you want the
4 County to do it? If the County's gonna do it, they'd have to do
5 it under different rules.

6 And when you - if we were to switch to having City
7 elections in either the presidential cycle or the gubernatorial
8 cycle, mid-term cycle on an even-numbered year, if the City
9 weren't to run the election, but the election were being held on
10 the same day, would create quite a lot of confusion because you
11 would have County ballots and County polling places, and County
12 rules, which is not all-mail elections. And then you have - you
13 would be getting your City ballot separately, and you really
14 want to think about who's running the election when you're
15 thinking about what the rules ought to be.

16 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** But in the last bond election that
17 we had, the City just used the County polling places.

18 **MR. KNIPE:** They did. They (inaudible) the procedure
19 that they created in 2011.

20 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay.

21 **MR. KNIPE:** They undid it. But again, there's that,

1 there's that question.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes, Roger.

3 MR. RANDOLPH: Just let me clarify a little bit. The
4 City Clerk's Office has been running the City's elections for at
5 least 30 years, okay? Even prior to vote by mail, we did
6 polling places just like everyone else.

7 Our elections have always been the odd years, so we
8 didn't have to deal with the County issues. There have been a
9 number of times over the years, more recently than in the past,
10 that we had the issues like we did with the bond election where
11 our election came up with the County, and we've asked the County
12 to run our election.

13 Typically, we run our own elections. There have been
14 occasions where we've had cross-line jurisdictions running
15 elections at the same time. So Pima County would be running an
16 election for a school district, Flowing Wells or one of the
17 school districts, and we would be running a citywide election.
18 Logistic problems with people sending in the wrong ballot and
19 (inaudible) together work with Pima County and, and are able to
20 deal with those different types of things.

21 If you decided to change the Charter to go to even-

1 numbered years, you still have the option of our office running
2 the elections. Yes, it would be in conflict, with the County
3 would be running elections, and we'd be running elections. But
4 we have already - we anticipated doing that this past election
5 anyway. And Council changed ~~their election~~ **that direction** at
6 the last moment.

7 We have procedures in place to distinguish our
8 election from the County's election. And we have a good working
9 relationship with the County to exchange that - those ballots
10 back and forth should they get sent to the wrong (inaudible)
11 **jurisdiction.**

12 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Okay. John?

13 **JOHN MR. HINDERAKER:** So, if I'm not mistaken, we're
14 one of the two jurisdictions that does City elections on odd
15 years. How do all the other cities and jurisdictions in the
16 State of Arizona do it when they do it on even-numbered years
17 (inaudible)

18 MR. RANDOLPH: So the City of Phoenix and the City of
19 Tucson are the only two that run in odd-numbered years. Both
20 jurisdictions run their own elections. Every other jurisdiction
21 in the state contracts with the counties to run their own

1 elections.

2 JOHN MR. HINDERAKER: So isn't that the simple
3 solution to that (inaudible)

4 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Is it cost-effective to have both
5 jurisdictions running the elections? Is it a wash? Is it -

6 MR. RANDOLPH: No. If you have both jurisdictions
7 running, then, yes, -

8 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: It does cost. Okay.

9 MR. RANDOLPH: - the cost is gonna be more expensive
10 that way.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Go ahead, John, if you want to
12 follow up. And Tom, I gotcha.

13 JOHN MR. HINDERAKER: Is, is there a cost savings then
14 if you have the County run the elections of the City?

15 MR. RANDOLPH: Small.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Okay. Tom?

17 MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. And to that
18 point, I think it needs to be noted that some of those cities
19 that we're talking about are - you have cities like Winkleman,
20 or Jerome, or Patagonia who simply couldn't - would not ever
21 have the capacity to run their own elections.

1 I'm not sure what the threshold is of a city
2 population-wise, resource-wise, for a city to be able to run its
3 own elections. But I mean, Tucson and Phoenix are running their
4 own elections because we are capable of running our own
5 elections. And most cities in Arizona simply don't have the,
6 the capacity to do so. And so it's not just a matter of policy
7 choices. There's, there's more to it than that.

8 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Jeff?

9 MR. ROGERS: Roger, Mike might be the better person to
10 ask this, but he's not here. I think you're gonna know the
11 answer. Wasn't it up until a few years ago a lot of other
12 cities ran in odd-numbered years just because they wanted the
13 focus to be on the City election.

14 Or wasn't there a legislation passed by the State that
15 basically tried to force everybody into the even-numbered years,
16 and even to certain dates? And, and then we fought it because
17 we're a Charter city. And Charter cities have the right to set
18 up their own election procedures, as did Phoenix (inaudible) Is
19 that a fair summary?

20 MR. RANDOLPH: Yes. That's absolutely correct. There
21 was a large number of cities that ran in odd-numbered years.

1 The State consolidated election dates and put them all in even-
2 numbered years. The City of Tucson and the City of Phoenix sued
3 and was successful.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: What's the problem with running
5 your Mayor and all your Council Members in the same election?
6 Is there a problem?

7 DR. SONENSHEIN: Once every four years?

8 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yeah. Once every four years, but
9 everybody goes up for election at the same time.

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: I would say there's less of a problem
11 in a district system where you would get basically six different
12 points of view, no matter what. In your current system, it's a
13 little bit more complicated because you have a lot of
14 (inaudible) can happen in one year that would affect everybody.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I'm thinking if we changed to -

16 DR. SONENSHEIN: If you changed, if you changed the
17 system -

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: - to either ward or hybrid.

19 DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, it's certainly less expensive
20 (inaudible)

21 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: But it would also increase turnout

1 for the district elections, wouldn't it?

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: If it was - if everybody was elected
3 at the same time. Yeah, and people do sort of seem to expect to
4 vote every two years to have that option. That might be the
5 biggest obstacle is that people would say, "I don't want to
6 elect this person for four years and not have a look at any of
7 these people for four years."

8 And even in a presidential, you have a mid-term
9 election which is usually seen as a referendum on the President,
10 people get used to that. So it would save money, but it might,
11 it might worry people.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Luke?

13 MR. KNIPE: I'd just like to point out that we elect
14 all five members of our County Board of Supervisors that way.
15 We elect all of our County (inaudible) Officers that way. We
16 elect all 90 members of our State Legislature that way. We
17 elect a lot of people that way.

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Yeah. And I just heard
19 that, oh, you don't want this massive turnover of everyone all
20 at once, and it seems to me that's a fairly low -

21 ~~MALE SPEAKER:~~ (Inaudible)

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes.

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: There's a lower -

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Possibly.

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: - chance of turnover in a district
5 system than there would be if you -

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Correct.

7 DR. SONENSHEIN: - if you put the at-large one back on
8 the table, then there's the chance of -

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Correct.

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: - the Mayor and six completely new
11 people. That's certainly a possibility.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom?

13 MR. PREZELSKI: And Madam Chair, I just want to
14 mention that when I, when I brought up that concern, that was
15 exactly my concern was if you had an at-large system, you could
16 completely turn over - a district system, that's not gonna
17 happen unless there's some kind of crisis where things really
18 need to change.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So has anybody changed their mind
20 about what kind of election system they prefer, based on this
21 discussion?

1 MR. ROGERS: I'll go first since I -

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay, Jeff, you go first. I
3 wasn't either, so -

4 MR. ROGERS: - wasn't here the last meeting. I did
5 read the entire transcript, so I know -

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: You, you got it.

7 MR. ROGERS: - they took a kind of a poll of what
8 everybody thought. And I read what all of you who were here
9 said. And I'll tell you I came into this meeting today thinking
10 that, that the best thing was the hybrid system, and going to -
11 and saving money by going to a four-year, everybody on the same
12 cycle, no staggered elections, and adding two at-large seats.

13 I believe that's both sellable and I thought it would
14 probably be a solution. But I just think that the public
15 finance card is untenable, makes it so complex that I'm sure we
16 could pull that off in this Committee and that we could sell it
17 to the public. And Bruce points out big, you know, times have
18 changed and this, this public financing might not be as popular.
19 And our, our just bringing it up and retooling it might cause
20 the whole package to fail.

21 And so that, for that reason, I'm probably leaning

1 maybe towards sticking with what we've got because it at least
2 has some advantages of exposing people to, people to the entire
3 city, and having some connection to the ward at the same time.

4 And I, I definitely don't think all; all at-large is
5 fair. I just don't think it's fair to various groups in the
6 city, including Republicans. So for that reason, I'm against
7 that.

8 So if we could think of a way to solve simply,
9 saliently, the, the problem with campaign finance, then I would
10 be in be charge (sic) of adding two at-large and going to, to
11 ward-only. That's, I think that's where I'm at unless somebody
12 has an idea that can convince me otherwise.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Raphe, and then, John, you had a
14 question.

15 DR. SONENSHEIN: Yeah. I, I think the campaign
16 finance discussion's sort of morphed in a way that probably took
17 on more than it could. It started out as a potential way that
18 it might just cost less money, which was not originally - what
19 originally I was interested in is it might just spend more, not
20 that it would change any of the provisions in that.

21 And unless it was essential to change provisions in

1 the campaign finance law, I think you're entirely correct that
2 it's better not to bring up, or to implicate that. To me, it
3 was only a possible cost-saver. But I would, I would think that
4 unless that has to stay on the table, that, that the notion of
5 changing it (inaudible) **is broader.**

6 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. RANDOLPH:** If you didn't change the
7 provisions of campaign finance and you went to a district system
8 that would mean that every person in each district would be able
9 to spend more than \$110,000, \$55,000 (inaudible) **per election**
10 within the district.

11 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** They would, however, have to raise
12 their matching (inaudible)

13 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. RANDOLPH:** They would have to, they would
14 have to -

15 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** Yeah.

16 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. RANDOLPH:** ~~(Inaudible)~~ **they would have to**
17 **raise their matching funds.**

18 **DR. SONENSHEIN:** So it's possible that the cost-saving
19 is that they would not raise, or spend that kind of money for
20 the race so, in any case, I think you're better off not going
21 down the road of amending your campaign finance law and, but

1 doing a cost analysis. What might happen -

2 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** I'm, I'm confused. Can you
3 clarify that, because I'm under the impression that what you
4 and, and Mike were saying was that we - if we kept the current
5 system as it is, and just changed to ward-only, added two spots,
6 that, that, that the wards would get one-sixth as much money.
7 They could raise one-sixth as much, and, and receive one-sixth
8 as much. Am I misunderstanding that?

9 **MR. RANDOLPH:** That would be what - the change that
10 you could recommend. But the way that the Charter currently
11 states is a member running for Council gets 20 cents per
12 registered, City of Tucson registered voter (inaudible)

13 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** Ah. So it does (inaudible)
14 **it wouldn't be** in their ward.

15 **MR. RANDOLPH:** It does not -

16 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** (Inaudible)

17 **MR. RANDOLPH:** So if you wanted to limit them with the
18 amount of money that they could spend, you would have to change
19 (inaudible)

20 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** So, so -

21 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** That changes my feeling a

1 little bit here.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. So, so let's give John a
3 chance, and then Luke, and we go back to Jeff, and then Bruce.
4 John?

5 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: So I think, I think your
6 comment, I think they're good comments. But one of the things
7 we have to keep in mind here is that we've got this case in the
8 Ninth Circuit that strikes down the (inaudible) **City's system** as
9 unconstitutional. So the current system may not be an option -
10 may end up being an option.

11 But I also think we have to remember that this is a
12 potential catalyst for change because if, if, if it holds, it's
13 gonna force the City to adopt something new. And I think in a
14 way, this is a unique opportunity for the City, if in fact that
15 holds up, to make a more bold and perhaps progressive change to
16 the system.

17 So I really think we should consider the hybrid system
18 very seriously. If we don't, we could, we could just keep
19 finance, campaign finance the way it is. Another way we could
20 do it is we could say campaign finance for the individual wards
21 would go to half of what it is with the at-large members.

1 And if my math is correct, that would probably save
2 some money. But it would still provide a pretty good chunk of
3 change for the ward members to run their elections, 'cause if
4 you do the math, **I did it but I'm** a lawyer, so I'm not gonna say
5 it's perfect, but it looks to me like it's about (inaudible)
6 **even** less.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke?

8 MR. KNIPE: I, I'd like to highlight that the, the
9 groups that we've heard from, and the consensus among - and I'm
10 talking about the SALC and the Tucson Metro Chamber and the Pima
11 County Libertarian Party, and the folks who were polled in this
12 data that was presented to us, there, there is support for ward-
13 only coming from all of those places. I also want to thank the
14 SALC for their participation in this, and also for investing in
15 (inaudible)

16 We're - this Committee is getting support and
17 direction from a lot of places. And I think that we have an
18 obligation to be responsive and try to do something. And to
19 that end, I'm in favor of doing something.

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Bruce, you were gonna talk
21 about campaign finance.

1 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Well, I, I'm getting lost in **the**
2 detail here, and I'm curious (inaudible) Was I hearing that we
3 could switch to an all-ward system without tampering with the
4 campaign finance system?

5 MR. RANDOLPH: You can.

6 MR. BURKE: Tell us how.

7 MR. RANDOLPH: So you can, but what that would mean is
8 that currently each candidate running for Council has to raise
9 \$55,000, and the City will match it by \$55,000. If you don't
10 change the provisions of campaign finance, and you go to an all-
11 ward system, then in each respective ward, those candidates
12 would still be under that same rule, which would be \$55,000 and
13 we would match \$55,000 for just a ward election instead of for
14 citywide.

15 MR. **TOM** BURKE: But there's still only six elections.
16 I mean does it change the dollar amount? It just changes where
17 you spend it?

18 MR. RANDOLPH: It could definitely change -

19 (Inaudible discussion.)

20 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: What I'm hearing is
21 that we need, need to have a briefing on this (inaudible) **clear**

1 **this up**, because this is a dynamic that we need to understand.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. I have one question about
3 campaign finance, and then I'll let you do that. So does a
4 candidate have to raise \$55,000 before they get any matching
5 funds, or can they get up to \$55,000 in matching funds?

6 MR. RANDOLPH: Yes. If you'd like some more
7 information (inaudible) **campaign finance, I am the campaign**
8 **finance administrator, and this is the guru, she tells me what**
9 **to tell the candidates.**

10 (Inaudible discussion.)

11 MR. RANDOLPH: Between the two of us, we should be
12 able to answer your question. So I can give you a real quick
13 101 (inaudible) **campaign finance.**

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Sure. Why don't you?

15 MR. RANDOLPH: So our campaign finance program was the
16 second-oldest in the United States. New York's was the only one
17 that was older. So we've been around, it was put into place in
18 1985, went into effect in 1987. Since that time, we've had one
19 candidate that didn't participate in public matching funds
20 program that actually won (inaudible), everyone else did a
21 public funding (inaudible) **candidate.**

1 That one candidate was the Mayor the first time he
2 ran. The second time he ran, he signed a contract to be a
3 public funding candidate. So that tells you a little bit right
4 off the bat about our public funding program (inaudible) to the
5 City of Tucson.

6 So the way this program works is if you want to do
7 that, you sign a contract with the City, agree to limit the
8 expenditures that you will make during your campaign. And for
9 Mayor, it's different than it is for Council. The Mayor gets
10 twice as much as the Council, 'cause he's running at-large both
11 election cycles instead of just the primary election, just the
12 general election.

13 So before they can get any money from the City, a
14 Council Member running for - or someone running for Council, has
15 to receive 200, 200 contributions of \$10 or more from city
16 residents. So that's the first step that they have to take.

17 Once they've got those 200 contributions of \$10 or
18 more, they file a statement to establish their eligibility with
19 my office, and we audit their campaign. We look at those
20 contributions, we make sure that they are city residents; we
21 make sure that the people actually made the contribution; we

1 audit the campaign and look at the expenditures. We're making
2 sure that they're doing everything according to the rules of the
3 program so that we know that we can trust them when we give them
4 City money to take care of the City's money that we're giving
5 them.

6 Once we say, "Okay, you're qualified," then we will
7 match them dollar-for-dollar up to that contribution limit.
8 This year was \$55,000 for Council candidates. So we would give
9 them up to \$55,000. That limits them for their campaign for
10 primary and general, the entire campaign period, to that
11 \$110,000.

12 Now there are some caveats in there. We don't match
13 contributions from political parties or political committees.
14 We don't match contributions from family members beyond certain
15 limits. So there are some caveats in there that are built into
16 the program. We don't match the candidates' contributions, and
17 we limit how much they can contribute to their own campaign up
18 to three percent of that contribution that's (inaudible) So
19 that's the down and dirty, real quick and easy on that campaign
20 finance.

21 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** So do you see, at this point, if

1 we were to recommend a hybrid system where we added two at-large
2 Council Members that they would be eligible for the same amount
3 of matching funds as the Mayor currently is because they're
4 running both elections at-large?

5 MR. RANDOLPH: That's what I would see taking place.

6 ~~MS. GAXIOLA~~ MS. MESICH: I don't know that the Charter
7 doesn't address (inaudible)

8 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Right.

9 ~~MS. GAXIOLA~~ MS. MESICH: - a Council candidate as
10 opposed to a Mayoral candidate which is specified in the
11 Charter, so -

12 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: So they're all eligible for -

13 ~~MS. GAXIOLA~~ MS. MESICH: The same amount.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: - the same top amount of matching
15 funds, and they all have to have 200 \$10 or more contributions
16 to qualify?

17 MR. RANDOLPH: Yes.

18 MR. HOWELL: Does that (inaudible)

19 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Go ahead, yes, Joseph.

20 MR. HOWELL: - that 200 individual contributions, does
21 that double for the Mayor (inaudible) the Mayor's getting a

1 double amount?

2 MR. RANDOLPH: The Mayor has to have 300.

3 MR. HOWELL: Three hundred.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom.

5 MR. PREZELSKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think, I
6 think the, I think the question we really need to look at is, is
7 what is the, what is a reasonable amount for people to get to
8 run a campaign? If the public policy purpose of the campaign
9 finance system is so that there, so that anybody who runs and
10 has a modicum of community support can run incredible campaign
11 so they can get their message out and have a fair shot at
12 winning, we need to get some information about what that base
13 amount is.

14 I mean there's, there's probably certain fixed cost
15 associated with campaigning in the City, and there are - and as
16 Luke said, I mean if you would divide this up, you'd end up with
17 \$20,000. Is \$20,000 a reasonable amount to run in a ward that
18 potentially has about 200,000 people? Probably not.

19 (Inaudible) a ward's generally about the same size as
20 a legislative district at the state level and the amount that
21 you get from clean elections is over \$30,000. So I think we

1 need to talk to people who are actually in the political
2 consulting business and ask them what that amount might be.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: But another option - oh, go ahead,
4 Mr. Burke. Tom.

5 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Well, on elected, I sort of - my view
6 of this is if we're gonna get support from the electorate, we
7 have to make as few changes as possible.

8 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Right.

9 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Six people and a Mayor are currently
10 elected through this hybrid system, and you know, ~~(inaudible)~~ **my**
11 **thing**, my belief is that if we just shift that to six people,
12 five people at ward-only, and Mayor at, at-large, it's less of a
13 change, without touching the finance law at all. What's, you
14 know, I'd like to get some kind of a statement as what happens
15 if we do nothing to change any of the finance, campaign
16 financing does that - it means a little bit more in a \$1.2
17 million budget, you know, what's the impact? I think it's gonna
18 be relatively small because we're already spending the money for
19 six people and Mayor.

20 If we have six people and a Mayor and I don't see
21 that, that the cost would be all that much different. And I

1 think if we shift to that conversation, we're gonna get lost in
2 campaign financing which I agree with Mr. Burke, it's gonna be a
3 hot topic that, that distracts everybody from what the real
4 issue is, is how do we elect our officials?

5 MR. RANDOLPH: And that's, and that's a hard number to
6 kind of justify. Some elections we have every candidate max out
7 on their contributions. We have other ones where people don't
8 take anything. The Mayor this year signed a contract, didn't
9 take a dollar. But we've also had years where the Mayoral
10 candidates have taken every dollar, so it's hard to say. It
11 depends on competition that's out there against the candidate at
12 the time.

13 ~~MS. GAXIOLA~~ MS. MESICH: And vote by mail has changed
14 the strategies quite a bit, so that is something to keep in
15 mind.

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So my feeling, after hearing all
17 this conversation about campaign finance, is except for knowing
18 what costs might increase under a hybrid system is we should
19 leave it alone. And if the hybrid system passes, and the
20 politicians find they don't have enough money, or they can't
21 raise enough money because they're only raising money in their

1 own district, that we may actually be spending less money on
2 district elections because they're not going to the entire city
3 for that, for their financing.

4 And maybe if we do recommend a hybrid election, we
5 should just leave campaign finance alone and deal with it at a
6 future time when we know what the kind of cost to the budget is
7 going to be, or if there's a savings. I don't know how other
8 people feel about that, but it seems to me we might be able to
9 possibly put that aside if we move to a recommendation for a
10 hybrid system. Luke, and then John.

11 MR. KNIPE: A question -

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And then Tom.

13 MR. KNIPE: - to the Clerk. If we were to put such a
14 recommendation forward, we would still have to change the
15 campaign finance provisions in the Charter because there are no
16 provisions for an at-large Council Member, isn't that right?

17 MR. RANDOLPH: It doesn't address the at-large Council
18 Member, but as Suzanne brought out, it does address Council
19 Members ~~(inaudible)~~ **which these** would still be a Council
20 Members, so they would still fall within that category and would
21 receive funding that's - so they would actually be getting less

1 because they would be running an at-large primary and an at-
2 large general under basically the current system.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yeah.

4 MR. RANDOLPH: So -

5 MR. KNIPE: In other words, the current rules could
6 accommodate -

7 MR. RANDOLPH: It could.

8 MR. KNIPE: - at-large.

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Did you want to say
10 something before I these next two questions?

11 DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, I definitely think, if you
12 don't mind my jumping in, that you're definitely going on the
13 right track to make as little change as possible. And in
14 effect, this is the virtue of your current system which is
15 they're both at-large and district representatives already,
16 they're already running at-large for half, half (inaudible)

17 You could also argue that (inaudible) running a
18 district election. It just seems to me that you might - I
19 didn't want to interrupt what you were gonna say, but I, I think
20 that it might be the answer, just say you've got a whole bunch
21 of Council Members, and kick that one down the road a little

1 bit. It seems like it's not enough money, but I think you're
2 all on the right track (inaudible) this is, I think the earlier
3 point of that straw that breaks the camel's back is the
4 introducing it as (inaudible) **an amendment to the campaign**
5 **finance is what's worrisome.**

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. John and then Tannya.

7 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: I was just gonna say I agree
8 with you, and I think we can be confident that an at-large
9 person's gonna have enough money with the \$110,000 because
10 effectively now the Council Members are running at-large
11 elections anyway.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tannya?

13 **MS. GAXIOLA**: Yeah. I was gonna say pretty much what
14 Raphe said, that the benefit of the system now is that they're
15 already doing that, so I had sort of the same comment.

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

17 **MS. GAXIOLA**: I would, I would, I would be in favor of
18 us leaving this one alone for now.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So I would like to just get a
20 sense. Is there anyone here who still thinks we should address
21 campaign financing? If not, we'll take it off the list. Yes,

1 Tom?

2 MR. PREZELSKI: Well, look at Ward 5. Do you actually
3 think that you're gonna easily be able to raise \$55,000 in Ward
4 5 from the residents of Ward 5?

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: But do you need to?

6 (Inaudible discussion.)

7 MR. PREZELSKI: Okay. I was trying to speak up for
8 the south side.

9 MR. RANDOLPH: Fifty-five thousand is the maximum that
10 they can receive. If they, if they raise \$2,000 with ten \$200
11 contributions, we're gonna match the totality (inaudible)

12 MR. PREZELSKI: All right.

13 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. BRUCE BURKE**: So, so am I hearing
14 this dynamic in play that we could go to a ward-only, or a
15 hybrid ward without an amendment to campaign finance? So that's
16 really a big step.

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Well, and I think it's a good idea
18 because I think once that system would be in effect for a while,
19 the people who are running for those seats will know whether or
20 not they need to lobby for changing in the campaign finance laws
21 rather than us trying to do it here.

1 Okay. So with that, I'm gonna take that off our list
2 and if someone wants to bring it up under another guise, you can
3 do that, but okay, so we made some progress. Let's see, some of
4 these other topics that were on our list, where do we want to
5 go?

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: I was gonna ask if you - if it's
7 possible for a discussion point to try to now think about
8 whether you can visualize any of these in kind of an integrated
9 manner. Like, what would it look like to have either a district
10 system or a hybrid system in terms of when the election would be
11 held, would they all run at the same time or not, and just start
12 thinking about what kind of constituency base that other things
13 would have to happen. Cause you know the current system, you
14 know the resources you have in the current system. But I think
15 what I was hoping to, to sort of push us ~~(inaudible)~~ **toward** a
16 little bit is think of each one as a system of its own, which is
17 - and I think the hardest one is the hybrid one.

18 I think because the district one is a little bit, you
19 know, kind of just not that big a shift in terms of structure
20 from, except for how you do a constituency service. That really
21 would be a big deal. But could you visualize the hybrid system?

1 That's an important kind of threshold to know when you
2 want to go there, which is what would it look like? Would they
3 all be elected - I mean I would start with, would they all be
4 elected at the same time, or would you stagger?

5 And then I'd say if you had it, what would be the
6 roles of the at-large people, any kind of different role. I
7 mean they're regular Council Members, they would have a vote. I
8 think the first question is do you think they would all be
9 elected at the same time, or would you stagger it?

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Could I make a suggestion? Is
11 that we all do some homework for the next meeting, and that we
12 can start this discussion with around - going around the table,
13 and pick a system you think you could support, and then address
14 those issues, especially what Raphe just mentioned ~~that~~ about
15 whether or not you'd see them being all elected at the same
16 time, or staggering the at-larges from whatever their roles.

 I also think constituent services is important 'cause
that's going to be a financial consideration. But I think
perhaps if we could all think about clearly which one of these
we would support, based on what these conditions are.

 And the other thing I'd like to bring up is I have a

hard time figuring out what the role of the Mayor would be in the hybrid system if the Mayor and the at-large people all have the same standing on the Committee, which is kind of what we moved to with the last Charter change was making the Mayor part of the Council. And would, would there be a need to change the role of the Mayor if we went to a hybrid system, because I think for me, that's a big question.

And so - and I will contact the members who were unable to be here tonight, encourage them to read the Minutes and come prepared to go around the table so we can get a sense of where we're at with that. Luke?

MR. KNIPE: Just a quick -

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And then Bruce.

MR. KNIPE: - one for the - quick money question for the Clerk. What do we save by moving everybody onto the, the single cycle, eliminating staggered elections?

MR. RANDOLPH: We spend roughly \$1 to \$1.2 million for a Mayoral election.

~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: ~~And a lot of those~~ **Along those lines** - another question, Madam Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes, I think Bruce - oh, go ahead,

John, and then -

~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER:** Are there any savings by moving to even-numbered elections versus odd-numbered elections? Is there a way to figure out what those would be if there are?

MR. RANDOLPH: I can tell you that this year when the County ran a general election and they saved **us about** \$500,000 for the general.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Bruce?

MR. BRUCE BURKE: Well, I'm confessing to have not read the last set of Minutes. Missed the meeting, so I - that's a true confession just to get us on the table. What's the dynamic, help me understand it, in terms of having an at-large candidate or two who would race in the same cycle as the Mayor, or does that, I mean are they running as, you know, in opposition to the Mayor, or are they running their own platform? What, what's the dynamic that drives a Mayor to run and two at-large Members to run?

DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, remember you have partisan elections that changes things a lot. If you had a non-partisan system, you could easily imagine the at-large people running almost appositionally, you know, to try to get into the

government and become kind of the government in exile, or the head of the opposition.

It's probably a little bit different if you've got everybody running on the same ballot, and you've got party primaries. You might assume the possibility that all three people from one party are gonna win the general election. It'll be almost like (inaudible) But they might not all win, in which case one of the other party would become the most sort of prominent, maybe challenger to the Mayor.

It varies from city-to-city. Honestly, it depends on the local politics. All I can say is that the at-large people would be seen as the most likely people to run for Mayor in a future election over and above any Member of the City Council, but not uniformly. In a number of cities, a Council Member can end up more prominent than the citywide person.

But these at-large people do become significant figures, and they, 'cause they kind of roll on policy. But I don't think they necessarily become a thorn in the side of the Mayor. I think Mayors tend to have more trouble with kind of elected auditors and controllers, you know, who are sort of rooting through the City budget and departments and finding

things.

They often end up in a leadership role in the Council simply by virtue of the fact that he can sort of agree on them. It also depends whether they're good at staying out of the district so the Council Members (inaudible) and not getting in trouble with (inaudible) But I'm sorry, this varies so much city to city.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke, you had a comment, and then I'd like to close this topic for tonight, and address our schedule. Go ahead.

MR. KNIPE: I just had a couple of very silly questions for Dr. Sonenshein and maybe for the Clerk as well. If we were to add two at-large Council Members to the Tucson City Council, in what order would they vote in a roll call vote, and where would they sit?

MR. RANDOLPH: Well, in our chambers if we added two additional Council Members, we would remodel our chambers -

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So there would be an added cost.

MR. RANDOLPH: - at the cost of a million dollars, and so we don't have that (inaudible) And in roll call votes, we've actually gone to a random roll call, so I have a sheet of

different things and ~~have her~~ **never** call the Council in the same order during roll call. (Inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Is that your only question?

MR. KNIPE: Yeah.

COUNCILWOMAN: Raphe and then John and then we'll close.

DR. SONENSHEIN: Before you end this topic, I, I would like to have some homework that I can bring back in. If I can just throw out a few things (inaudible) add to the list. The last question about the at-large member, sounds like something I could really dig into for the next meeting (inaudible), 'cause as long as this is staying on here, as long as it's not getting booted off, you get to know more about the kind of life and environment and impact of at-large members. Would that be somewhat helpful?

And it sounds like the role of the Mayor in those systems doesn't change. I mean Seattle went through this. Detroit went through this basically. Those two things seem like big questions that people want to know about. But is there more on the list that I can follow up on based on tonight? Yeah.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** I, I think, my, my opinion

is, is that we don't mess with the role of the Mayor this time around, that we're biting off more than we can chew. I'd love to challenge that at another round of these.

The other thing is, is, is that, you know, we, we would have to give some kind of design- -- think about this - designation what those seats are called, because we still have partisan, we're likely gonna have partisan, and we're gonna have primaries. And so (inaudible) **we usually** have to be somebody to funnel candidates into (inaudible) **those, so** do we just call them No. 7 and 8, but they don't have, they don't necessarily have a district, or what do we -

DR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible)

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** - At-Large 1 and At-Large 2?

DR. SONENSHEIN: What other cities do is they list that there's an at-large, that you're running for an at-large seat. It's very clearly stated, and every ballot has an at-large seat, and one district seat -

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** Right.

DR. SONENSHEIN: - on their ballot, especially if they're all (inaudible)

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS:** But here we only have two

at-large seats. So, so in order to have a primary, in each one, would we have At-Large 1, or "A", and At-Large 2, or "B"?

DR. SONENSHEIN: You would have to have numbered seats.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: Yeah. Okay.

DR. SONENSHEIN: Which you would probably number them after the wards, just to avoid confusion. So one through six -

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: So -

DR. SONENSHEIN: - and then seven and eight -

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: - seven and eight.

DR. SONENSHEIN: - would be the at-large.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Okay. John, you did, and then you had one? And then Tannya, and then Tom.

~~JOHN~~ MR. HINDERAKER: So my question's pretty quick. Madam Chair, would it be possible for us to get some concrete numbers either from City Staff or from Raphe that tell us sort of what it costs to add these two at-large members? What's it gonna cost to staff them? Right now it's sort of a (inaudible) I think it would be helpful if we knew a little bit better.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: And it will probably depend on where they're housed and - but let's assume for, for the sake

getting some numbers if they were housed at City Hall, either downtown City Hall or south side City Hall. What would those costs be to add two at-large positions?

MR. RANDOLPH: You're, you're, you're gonna talk about an interesting conundrum there because if they are going to receive the same staffing, or if they're gonna have staff, so those are totally different numbers. The, the cost for a building in the ward is not as dramatic as you might think because we own the building, so we pay utilities. So those costs are low.

Currently right now, a Council Member's budget is \$329,000 per Council office. That covers their staff, their salary, insurance benefits and basic office supplies and travel.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And that's -

~~JOHN~~ MR. **HINDERAKER**: (Inaudible)

MR. RANDOLPH: Three hundred and twenty-nine thousand.

~~JOHN~~ MR. **HINDERAKER**: So would we expect the same number to hold true for an at-large?

MR. RANDOLPH: I would think so.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Well, we were assuming that for the time being it probably would.

~~JOHN~~ **MR. HOWELL:** If I'm not mistaken, does the Mayor get a larger staff budget because he is at-large only because of that, or is it -

MR. RANDOLPH: Mayor gets 455,000 and it's not necessarily because he's at-large, but he does a lot of the ceremonial things. So all the certificates and proclamations and all of that -

~~JOHN~~ **MR. HOWELL:** Okay.

MR. RANDOLPH: - stuff comes out of his budget. He does more travel on behalf of the City -

~~JOHN~~ **MR. HOWELL:** The speaker mentioned (inaudible) Okay.

MR. RANDOLPH: - than the Council Members do.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Tannya and then Tom and then we really do need to - oh, Randi.

MS. DORMAN: I haven't said anything.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Since you've come in late (inaudible) you haven't said anything. We'll do those three and then we'll run a little late. I'm sorry, guys. Tannya?

MS. GAXIOLA: I'm just following up on John's question about money, and sort of wanting to get a better understanding

about the constituency services offices, what that looks like, what that costs. Just, just get a better understanding of it 'cause it sounded like he said they'd have all of City Hall in their wards. I'm just not clear on that. It seems like it would definitely imply, imply a cost change as well. So if you could help us understand that better next time, Raphe, that'd be great.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom and -

MR. PREZELSKI: My question's been answered.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Your question's been answered.

Randi.

MS. DORMAN: So one thing I want us to keep in mind that as we look at the budgets for each Council office, there is also an opportunity to perhaps shave some of the district office budgets since they won't have as much at-large representa- -- responsibilities in a, in a hybrid system.

So it is possible to shift some of the cost from the current district offices into an at-large office. So I wouldn't necessarily think of it as an entire - two entire budgets. We might be able to shift it around, and that might be important creating a compelling argument, if that's what we put forward.

And another thing I just wanted to mention was that when we talked about shifting to all the elections happening at once, it was really to mitigate the concern in a district-only system of having the Mayor elected with three wards and not the other three wards.

So in a hybrid system, I don't know that that is as necessary, because you could do the Mayor and three wards, and two at-large, and three wards. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we, as we move forward.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

MS. DORMAN: And sorry for being late.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: We knew you (inaudible) **you'd be late.** Okay. So our next meeting is March 7th. The meeting after that is the 21st, and then we have no other meetings, and we're supposed to come up with some recommendations on April 1st, which is a Friday. But we've also had no public meetings at all.

So what I'd like to know is how we want to deal with the financial issues. Do we want to take up Raphe's time while we have that discussion? Would we, at the next meeting, like to look at a day the following week where we could meet for an hour

and a half perhaps, set all the financial issues, and get a recommendation to Mayor and Council on the financial recommendation and at the same time, ask them for more time on the electoral.

And then if they say "no", we still have the meeting on March 21st to try and finalize that. Does that appeal to people in terms of making the most use of everyone's time?

MS. DORMAN: I'm not here the week of March 14th, and I just want to reiterate what I said before that this April deadline that was set by the Mayor and Council I think is somewhat artificial. And that it is more important for us to do our job properly which is why we reassembled in the first place, than to meet what is to me a somewhat arbitrary timeline.

So unless there is something super critical about April 1st, I think it's much more important that we get the information (inaudible) **that we need to have** discussions that we need to make a thoughtful recommendation.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So, is that something you could put in the form of a motion that -

MR. RANDOLPH: ~~(Inaudible)~~ **Madam Chair?**

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: - we could take to Mayor - what?

MR. RANDOLPH: Can I just, can I just make -

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Oh. Sure.

MR. RANDOLPH: - one clarification? The reason that Mayor and Council gave the April 1st deadline is they have not decided yet whether or not they want this on - to put this on an August election or November election.

For them to put it on an August election, they have to tell me by May 2nd. You're giving them 30 days to make a pretty major decision what to put before the voters.

If they go with the general election, that's still only by beginning of July. So they would like to have their time to be able to review that as well as get public input (inaudible) as well. So that's, that's why they gave that deadline.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Randi?

MS. DORMAN: So I, I understand that, and, you know, we've had some discussions in the past about perhaps getting a financial recommendation by that date (inaudible), but I think it would be absolutely unconscionable to put these electoral issues on a separate election that's gonna get poor voter turnout, and that I would not be able to make that

recommendation.

We need as many people - this is gonna impact the City forever until someone changes it, and I think it needs to put on when the most people possible would have a say in the outcome.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. So perhaps we don't need a motion, but I'll, I'll make an attempt that we'd like to ask Mayor and Council to consider providing us with another six or eight weeks to deliberate, which would put us to the middle, or end of May. And we realize that that means they would not make an August election.

However, we could possibly get them a recommendation on financial considerations, 'cause we've already taken a preliminary vote. However, it would probably not have the benefit of a public meeting. Did you get that as a motion? Okay. Okay. Is there a second to that motion?

MS. DORMAN: I'll, I'll second that motion.

MR. KNIPE: Wasn't it your motion?

MS. DORMAN: (Inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Well, -

MS. DORMAN: - supposed to be my motion, I'll make that motion.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Okay. So moved by Randi, seconded by John. Is there any discussion on that motion?

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. HOWELL: Yeah. I, I worry that they just won't support it. The Mayor and Council just won't support it.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: If they don't, then we know that we have to be done by March -

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. HOWELL: (Inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: - 31st. Yes?

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. TOM BURKE: If we were to make this motion, how soon does the Mayor and Council have a chance to consider extending (inaudible)

MR. RANDOLPH: March 8th.

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: So we would not know at our next meeting. Yes, Jeff.

MR. ROGERS: I think we're making rather tremendous progress. I mean we're arriving in the consensus on quite a few things. I'm kind of optimistic that we're gonna be able to get this done by April 1st before (inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: I'd still like to know if Mayor and Council would consider it because I don't think we have time

for the public meetings.

MS. DORMAN: Right. It's the public (inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And I think we need at least a couple public meetings -

MR. ~~KNIFE~~ **HINDERAKER**: I think that's really important.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: - on this issue.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. ROGERS**: Okay. I support it.

CHAIRWOMAN ~~POULOS~~: Okay.

MS. GAXIOLA: If I may?

CHAIRWOMAN ~~POULOS~~: Yes, Tannya?

MS. GAXIOLA: I don't, I don't like the idea of asking for more time. Mayor and Council had a reason for why they decided that this was the timing that they needed. And I think that if we attempt to change that, then we're taking some of the decision-making power out of their hands when we've been tasked just to come up with a recommendation.

I think if we need to make - have public meetings, let's - we're pretty close - like we're not that far away from coming to a consensus on something.

It doesn't feel like we're really all that, all over the map. So I think that we could probably come up with a consensus really quick next time, and get a meeting or two in, and make a decision, and make a recommendation.

You know, I don't - it doesn't - it's not out of the question. We don't need, you know - yeah, I think, think it's doable. So I would not support that motion.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Randi?

MS. DORMAN: I just want to remind that we have one more week left in February, and then there's March, and it's April 1st. So the scheduling of public meetings and then reassembling, making - getting the consensus on both the financial and electoral issues, scheduling public meetings, and then deliberating on results of those meetings and making (inaudible) recommendation by the 1st, I just think it's too soon.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tannya.

MS. GAXIOLA: I would also like to say that for the purpose of public meetings, we don't have to have a perfect solution. What we need is something for people to be able to react to. And I think that because we don't have that, that's

why we haven't had very much attendance or participation at these meetings.

We've had these folks who are very interested and are doing an amazing job of showing up always and making sure that they're getting the word out, but we've not had a huge crowd of people participating. And part of the reason why is because it's really not that helpful to sit here and listen to us deliberate.

It's gonna be really helpful once we come up with, even if it's a strawman for folks that have something to react to, and to give us feedback on. So if, if we, you know, I, I still don't - we don't need a perfect solution to have public meetings.

If we need to have public meetings, I think it could be done in this timeframe. It's gonna be a push, but also I don't want to spend two more months in here. I'm sorry. **It doesn't work for** ~~(Inaudible)~~ on my calendar.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke?

MR. KNIPE: I, I would just like to voice my agreement with Tannya, every single word that she said. (Inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. I would also like to point

out that it's possible that we could recommend the Mayor and Council hold those public meetings before they put anything on the ballot.

MR. KNIPE: They would have to.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So that would be something that would relieve us of having to do that and we would still have the month of March to arrange our decisions. But I'm gonna call the vote. All those in favor of requesting more time from the Mayor and Council, let's do a roll call.

CLERK: Mr. Bruce Burke?

MR. BURKE: No.

CLERK: Mr. Tom Burke?

MR. BURKE: No.

CLERK: Mr. Crum?

MR. CRUM: No.

CLERK: Ms. Dorman?

MS. DORMAN: Yes.

CLERK: Ms. Gaxiola?

MS. GAXIOLA: No.

CLERK: Mr. Hinderaker?

MR. HINDERAKER: Yes.

CLERK: Mr. Howell?

MR. HOWELL: No.

CLERK: Mr. Knipe?

MR. KNIPE: No.

CLERK: Mr. Porges is absent. Ms. Poulos?

CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Yes.

CLERK: Mr. Prezelski?

MR. PREZELSKI: Nay.

CLERK: Mr. Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Nay.

CLERK: Mr. Springer?

MR. SPRINGER: No.

CLERK: And Mr. Yee?

MR. YEE: No.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. So we're on a March schedule. Right now, our next two meetings are March 7th, March 21st of next month, both of those in this room, I think. And we have a Call to the Audience. I have no new cards, but based on our discussion, it looks like Mr. Cole would like to address us again, so come to the podium.

MR. COLE: And there are few of you express deep

concerns and deep worries over people trying to buy elections.

Based on what research I've done, buying elections is not as easy or as common as you might fear. It is a concern; it is something to be concerned about, but just to give two very public, very well-known recent examples.

In the Pima County bond election, the pro bond people out-spent the anti-bond people by approximately 30 to one. They couldn't buy the election. Jeb Bush, at the start of the Republican primary season, had a (inaudible) greater than every other member of the Republican Party who was running in the primaries. He spent over \$100 million. What good did it do?

If you really think that people can easily buy the elections, why don't you talk to former President Ross Perot? It is a concern; I'm not saying it's not. But I think the concern, to give a visual illustration, is like maybe a foot high, and the level of concern that has been expressed, and I've seen elsewhere, is like a mile high.

You should be concerned, but you should be concerned that foot high, because if you're going to be concerned more than that, you're wasting energy and resources, energy and resources that can be put to better use.

So, yes, campi- -- cam- -- (makes sound) I'll learn how to talk yet, campaign finance is definitely an issue to be looked at, and people trying to buy elections is something that can be looked at, it's not something to panic over. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: You're welcome. I just realized that I thought this meeting ended at 6:30, and I think we have until 7:00. So since we are short of time, do we want to adjourn and start over on March 7th, or do we want to talk a little bit - could we talk about sales tax?

MR. RANDOLPH: It's on the agenda, yes. (Inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Could we sit - does anybody want to talk about sales tax?

MALE SPEAKER: No. (Inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: All right. Then let's adjourn. We will meet back - yes?

MS. DORMAN: (Inaudible) ask one question of -

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes.

MS. DORMAN: - of Mr. Randolph. So I came in at two minutes after 6:00, and the door was locked, there's no way to get in. So if anyone wants to come to this meeting late, there's no way for them to come in.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: How did you get in?

MS. DORMAN: Someone was coming out, and I was like, "Hold that door, and hold it open." (Inaudible)

MR. PREZELSKI: That's been a problem before.

MS. DORMAN: So, you know, I'm just concerned that (inaudible) I'm so grateful for the five of you, but you know, for this to be an effective process; we really need more people coming, so the door, I think, is a problem.

And also have we reinvigorated the website, the area on the website with these meetings? And is there any other way that we could be publicizing what's going on? 'Cause it's really weird to me that this iss- -- the election issue, especially was so contentious last time, and to get so little public input at these public meetings is worrisome to me.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: It did go out on the news net.

MR. RANDOLPH: It is on all the news net. It is on the City's web page. We can do an e-mail blast to the groups that we e-mailed to last time if you'd like to give them heads up about the next few upcoming meetings.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And maybe tell them that we're on the verge of making some -

MS. DORMAN: Decisions.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: - decisions. Luke?

MR. KNIPE: You know, we can also all encourage the Council Members that appointed us to make people aware of this process and encourage their constituents (inaudible) **to come to these meetings.**

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. All right. And have we given Raphe enough homework to do for the next week?

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. BRUCE BURKE**: I did have a question. I didn't want to ask it, Bonnie, 'cause you told us that we were gonna (inaudible) **leave at 6:30.**

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I just applied for Medicare.

MALE SPEAKER: That's confusing enough.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. BRUCE BURKE**: You mentioned that the financial divvying up of the budget, so to speak, in the ward-only system is, is a consideration of a concern. Is there some means by which that can be ameliorated or addressed in any legislative or Charter (inaudible) **concept.**

DR. SONENSHEIN: That's a really hard question. It's, it's a hard thing to (inaudible) It doesn't, it doesn't turn out to be as bad as people fear, but there are times when it is.

Even in the best of cities there's times where one Council Member can just horse trade for, for their district above all else, and it hurts the budget.

I think the greater the Mayor and the Manager work together on things like the budget, and have kind of a citywide perspective and that that's known in the system, I don't think that could affect the Charter much on that. But you have to look at the budget as a citywide project.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. BRUCE BURKE:** Well, I was just thinking of whether there's a way to address that in this Committee or whether that's just a ~~(inaudible)~~ **fools end.**

DR. SONENSHEIN: It's not a ~~(inaudible)~~ **fools end** 'cause it's really important when it doesn't go well. But I think you already have a tradition of people in effect being halfway district members. I mean that's the virtue of the system you have. I've actually had experience with both systems.

And to the extent that you're able to get people focused on citywide things, even though they half represent a district and half represent at-large, it may not be as bad a problem as it is in some cities where it's been going on for

decades, and people only see themselves as protecting their district above all else.

But I do think that the role of the management structure in the City is really important to ameliorate that. I mean the higher the stature of that is, the less likely the individual Council Members are just (inaudible)

I mean in cities, in cities with dominant interfering Councils, you don't really have a strong CAO, or Manager or whatever. And I think that you, you have the opportunity to make sure those are protected here. That's how I would do it, you know, protect those roles.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom?

MR. **TOM BURKE**: I was the Finance Director for Pima County for 11 years, and set the budgets for the, for our Supervisors, and, and even though there's some contentions back, back-and-forth, so many things for the City, as with the County, are citywide services anyway.

So a Council Person's gonna want to make sure that, that the water systems are working right, the roads are working right. That fire and police are everywhere. So I, I think the, for the vast majority of the budget, there's no way to divvy it

up anyway. And it's only gonna be little things.

The County for years would divvy up \$400,000 to the various Supervisors for roads. They gave that ten years ago. And so now it's pretty much everything is countywide, and I think that in the City, there's very few functions that you have that could be focused in one ward only. So I really don't think it would be the type of problem that I would want to try to change a Charter for.

DR. SONENSHEIN: One of the reasons for optimism, by the way, to follow up on your point, is the increasing role of data in local government now, it's a huge improvement. In the days when nobody knew where anything was, and nobody was keeping a count, then the Council Members could just basically say, "Divide it by X number of seats," and that's the simplest way.

But the (inaudible) pressuring that we need to know what the need is, and needs to be shown by data is in some ways one of our greatest protections. And the finance officers, the managers are so sophisticated with that now.

I think a Council Member has more uphill battles saying, "I want you to redirect it away from the need that you've just shown me with data." So in this case, data can be a

real friend of good government.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Yes, Randi.

MS. DORMAN: Can I ask a practical question about scheduling public meetings, because basically our next meeting is March 7th. As a group, should we decide how many public meetings we want to have? I mean in the last process, they were invaluable. They would have to happen the week of March 14th for us to finalize a recommendation at the meeting on March 21st. So how many meetings do people, public meetings do people want to have?

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. KNIPE**: Aren't they all public meetings?

MS. DORMAN: Well, where we do out- -- I mean we went to three or four different locations, and did presentations on our recommendations and got feedback.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I have to say, Randi, I went to those. You went to them, too. And then we went to a few others that TRRIG put on, and I have to say, I don't believe that we got all that much feedback. I got - I felt like I got more feedback from the e-mails and people who had come to these meetings that we were at than I did at the public meetings. So

my feeling would be if we held the public meeting, I'd almost like it to just be one in some central location.

MS. DORMAN: You didn't feel like you got good feedback from like the one we had on the south side and the far east side.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I thought the one from the far east side, we got the most amount of feedback from. And most of those people did not live in the city. And I think, you know, down on the south side, I think we had four speakers. I just didn't feel like there was that much interest. Yes, Raphe.

DR. SONENSHEIN: Following on your motion about what you want, how you want to do that. I'm not sure you're gonna have the opportunity to do a set of hearings and be done on the 21st because -

MS. DORMAN: That was my point.

DR. SONENSHEIN: - it would seem to me one way to go is at the meeting of March 7th, you do kind of a rough draft, not a final vote, but you know - in fact, we'll try to put some meat on each of the three proposals and you could sort of say, "I think this is the one we want to go with," and then critique it a bit and then come back on the 21st. Those - all you have

time for really is those two meetings to make a proposal.

Now in theory, the Council could come back and ask this Committee to conduct some hearings afterwards, or conduct its own hearings on it. But, you know, but if you're gonna do that, you may want to invite people to attend those meetings and say, "This is, this is, this is the time this could really happen," and make sure those interests in town that need to be heard are alerted to that, because you don't want to feel like you missed an important - I didn't mean to interrupt.

MR. **TOM BURKE**: No, no, (inaudible)

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Go ahead, Tom. Yeah, because I already said maybe we can just in our motion say because of the timeframe we were unable to come to a recommendation in time to hold public meetings, and we recommend as part of our recommendation that the Mayor and Council hold those meetings before they put something on the ballot. Tom.

MR. **TOM BURKE**: My comment - I mean I know we're all very busy in our own careers and jobs and things, but you know, we're only planning two more meetings. Is there a reason we don't meet three times? I mean we could meet more than two more times between now and April 1st.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Uh-huh. Randi, you're not here the week March 14th. Are you here the week of March 28th?

MS. DORMAN: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I'm not here for most of it, but you don't need me. Okay. So there is a possibility. Is there - who else would have a conflict if we had an additional meeting the week of the 14th, or - yeah, the week of the 14th or the 28th? I know, Tannya, you don't want to go.

MS. GAXIOLA: I can do it in March. I, I -

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

MS. GAXIOLA: - can do the 14th and the 28th. I will be there.

MALE SPEAKER: I can't.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Can you?

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Do we have anybody else who has a conflict on the 14th or the 28th who is present today? You have a conflict. That's right. You cannot.

DR. SONENSHEIN: But you might be able to do the - separate the sales tax from the elections if you want to do that.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Right. And we would have to let you know that. Okay. Meeting on March 7th, we will decide if we're gonna have a third meeting, and when it will be. It will either be the 14th or the 28th. And one of those dates, Raphe will not be able to be here. So we'll figure either the 21st or the 28th. Can you leave both those dates open?

DR. SONENSHEIN: I'm okay the 7th and the 21st.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: But you're not okay the 28th. Okay. So if we meet on the 28th, it would probably be to make our final recommendations.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. BRUCE BURKE**: (Inaudible) Is that contemplating a hearing?

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I don't think we have time.

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. BRUCE BURKE**: (Inaudible) Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I think basically we've decided on this timeframe. We're not gonna have time. So those of you who represent other groups who know other groups are interested, we need to get the word out that they need to come to the next meeting, the meeting on the 21st, to let us know what they think at the Call to the Audience. Yes, Roger.

MR. RANDOLPH: Madam Chair, if the Committee does come

to a kind of consensus on the 7th with a basic recommendation, nothing solid, we can always put out an e-mail blast to the world like we did last time seeking comment on that, so you get-

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

MR. RANDOLPH: - at least that input back for the Committee.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Luke.

MR. KNIPE: Well, and, and comments on what we're doing here in this Committee can always be put in writing, in an e-mail to the Clerk's Office. You guys, you guys can make that part of the record and distribute it to us. I would assume in an e-mail blast, there would be instruction on not just how to show up, providing comments at Call to the Audience, but also to e-mail your comments or mail them into the Council.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay? We're good. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. KNIPE**: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. We're adjourned. **Meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.**

(Meeting was adjourned.)

Minutes approved on 03/07/16

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: 03/01/16



KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner
M&M Typing Service

**City of Tucson, Arizona
Charter Review Committee
Meeting of February 22, 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: 03/07/16