

City of Tucson Charter Review Committee

Meeting 03/07/16

Minutes Approved 03/21/16

TUCSON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Bonnie Poulos, CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**
Randi Dorman, Vice-CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**
Bruce Burke
Tom Burke
Mark Crum
Tannya Gaxiola
John Hinderaker (arrived at 5:55 p.m.)
B. Joseph Howell
Luke Knipe
Tom Prezelski (arrived at 6:26 p.m.)
Jeff Rogers
D. Grady Scott (arrived at 4:37 p.m.)
John Springer (arrived at 4:41 p.m.)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Lenny Porges
Joe Yee

TUCSON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS:

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

Raphe Sonenshein, Facilitator

=====
(TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE: THE MARANTZ BACKUP RECORDING SYSTEM STOPPED RECORDING APPROXIMATELY 40 MINUTES INTO THE MEETING. SO AFTER THAT TIME, SOME MEMBERS' COMMENTS HAVE NUMEROUS INAUDIBLES.)

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS** : Okay. I'd like to call our
2 meeting to order. We have a quorum. Okay. I'm gonna call the
3 March 7th Citizen Charter Review Committee to order. May we
4 have a roll call, Yolanda?

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. *YL* RWR:DR:yl 3/21/16

1 CLERK: Mr. Bruce Burke?

2 MR. BURKE: Here.

3 CLERK: Mr. Tom Burke?

4 MR. BURKE: Here.

5 CLERK: Mr. Crum?

6 MR. CRUM: Here.

7 CLERK: Ms. Dorman?

8 MS. DORMAN: Here.

9 CLERK: Ms. Gaxiola?

10 MS. GAXIOLA: Here.

11 CLERK: Mr. Hinderaker. He'll be late. Mr. Howell?

12 MR. HOWELL: Here.

13 CLERK: Mr. Knipe?

14 MR. KNIPE: Here.

15 CLERK: Mr. Porges? Absent. Ms. Poulos?

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Present.

17 CLERK: Mr. Prezelski?

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: He said he would be late. We just

19 got a notice.

20 CLERK: Mr. Rogers?

1 MR. ROGERS: Present.

2 CLERK: Mr. Scott? Mr. Springer? And Mr. Yee.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: All right.

4 CLERK: We have a quorum.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you, Yolanda. We have both

6 the Minutes and Legal Action Report from the meeting of February

7 27th (sic), 2016. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes?

8 We'll do these separately.

9 MR. CRUM: So moved.

10 MS. DORMAN: Second.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you, Mark. Thank you,

12 Randi.

13 All those - are there any changes or corrections? All those in

14 favor of approval of the Minutes, please say "aye".

15 (Affirmative.)

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Any opposed? All right. Legal

17 Action Report from the last meeting. Do we have a motion to

18 approve?

19 MR. KNIPE: So moved.

20 MR. HOWELL: Second.

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you, Luke. Thank you, Joe,
2 for the second. Any corrections or comments? Seeing none, all
3 those in favor of approving the Legal Action Report, please say
4 "aye".

5 (Affirmative.)

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Any opposed? No. All right.
7 Thank you all. We have a Call to the Audience at both the
8 beginning and at the end of our discussion and deliberations.
9 We would ask the speaker to give their name so we can know who
10 you are, and we ask that you limit your comments to three
11 minutes, and we do want to hear from you. If three minutes is
12 not enough time, please submit your comments in writing, and we
13 will definitely read them. The first person I -

14 MS. DORMAN: And we're not allowed to respond.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And we are not allowed to respond
16 at a Call to the Audience. The first card I have is Mr. Richard
17 Hernandez. And if you'd like to come up to the table right in
18 front of us, that would be great.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Hello, everyone. My name is Richard
20 Hernandez. I live in the City of Tucson. I'm also a candidate

1 for the Board of Supervisors in District 2. The last time this
2 Commission convened, which was not too long ago, I was one of
3 those people who was denied entry into this room. Maybe some of
4 you remember. There's a few of you I see.

5 I came here to tell you the same thing I shared with
6 the last Commission, and that is that we needed to make a
7 decision last time on whether we go all-city or all-ward
8 election. Maybe some of you who were here last time recall that
9 I said that.

10 Now I want to reemphasize the fact that two out of
11 three Judges on the 9th Circuit are saying the same thing that I
12 was sharing with you, the old Commission, and there's lots of
13 faces here that were here then, that we needed to do that.

14 I was very unhappy with the results of the last
15 Commission. I want to be very clear about that because you
16 didn't do what you set out to do. You decided that you wanted
17 us to vote whether or not the City Council should get a raise.
18 Really?

19 I have some numbers I want to share with the Chair.
20 And let me share with you some thoughts with that. In my area

1 of the town which is south side, there's 31,521 Democrats.
2 There's 16,326 Republicans. And there's 27,560 Independents.
3 I'm an Independent. (~~Inaudible~~) **Univision** reports that 46% of
4 Hispanics in the State of Arizona are Independent.

5 When I look around this room, how many minorities are
6 there? Right? How many of you were appointed by a Republican?
7 How many of you were appointed by an Independent? The key to me
8 is that you're gonna have to step out of your comfort zone, and
9 you've got to do something.

10 So I'm gonna reiterate what I said the last time I was
11 here. I advocate for all-ward. The reason I do that is it will
12 hold your elected officials accountable to their constituents.
13 I don't know where you've been in this process, okay? I notice
14 that Bonnie thinks I'm funny, that smirk on her face. But this
15 is serious business.

16 I'm Hispanic, I'm LGBT. I'm an Independent. So I'm
17 asking you to step out of your comfort zone, make a decision
18 that's real important to all of us, what's in the best interest
19 of the voter, the people, the taxpayer, the minorities. The
20 same thing I asked you last time. Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I have one more card, and that is
2 for Ruth Beeker.

3 MS. BEEKER: Ruth Beeker. I'm speaking for myself,
4 but through the eyes of the Tucson Residents for Responsible
5 Government.

6 I read your materials looking for an interaction
7 between your task to select an election system and TRRG's
8 current focus on strengthening public participation. I found
9 none, except that more people vote when the election is
10 citywide. Maybe voting for seven is preferred to voting for two
11 or even four.

12 The only rationale for making our current election
13 system a major legal issue that I can think of is Republicans
14 want to win Ward 2 and 4. I served as a Ward 6 Neighborhood
15 Leader with both R's and D's in the ward office. I couldn't
16 tell the difference. They all were responsive to me as a
17 Neighborhood Leader.

18 I really wish that someone would point out specifics
19 on what would be better today had there been district elections
20 over the past ten years, something more than hypothetical

1 annexations.

2 This past election, the Arizona Daily Star interviewed
3 candidates before making its endorsements.

4 It suggested challengers of Ward 1 and 2 should serve
5 on City committees to become familiar with City government
6 before they ran to be on the Council. Let's hope the
7 Republicans have their A-Team waiting in the wings if we're
8 going to go to district elections.

9 Do I think City government could be better? You bet.

10 I recently visited the websites of the ten largest cities in
11 Arizona. How do we compare? First off, our website's
12 information on public participation is outdated and poorly
13 organized. That said, Tucson apparently is the only City
14 Council which gives the public no opportunity to address each
15 scheduled item as it is being discussed and voted on during
16 regular sessions.

17 Tucson is the only city, except Glendale, that does
18 not use committees in any way so that the public can hear
19 discussion of staff with the group of Mayor and Council. Tucson
20 has the least transparent process for appointments to boards,

1 committees and commissions.

2 How does changing the election system address any of
3 those concerns? That we have a more responsive government.
4 Which system would give us the strongest, smartest, the most
5 engaged Council? I don't know.

6 But I certainly hope that in your discussions today, I
7 come away with some feel that you're looking at the quality of
8 what we might have in City government as well as the process
9 that you choose. Thank you.

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you. Is there anyone else
11 in the audience who'd like to address us at the beginning of
12 this meeting? Seeing none, I'd like to move on to Item No. 4.
13 We're gonna discuss the form of City elections, and I'm going to
14 let our Facilitator, Dr. Sonenshein, explain how we're going to
15 do this. And we'll have some time for discussion before we go
16 into any voting. So, Dr. Sonenshein.

17 DR. SONENSHEIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. You have
18 before you an even larger spreadsheet than before. It's
19 actually no larger in content, it's just that the City staff
20 found a way to make it much more readable by doing it on a

1 larger piece of paper (inaudible)

2 Basically, at the last meeting, the Committee voted to
3 bring recommendations forward before April 1st. So I've spent
4 some time and spoken with the Chair and the Vice-Chair about the
5 best way to get from here to there in the next two meetings. I
6 think there is a way to do this, and that's what I want to
7 present to you.

8 It is at this meeting to have as the outcome, a
9 recommendation, a preliminary recommendation, not the final one,
10 to be made by the Committee to the community that would then be
11 voted on more formally in two weeks, which would be with some
12 public input that would come in in between those weeks.

13 But in order to get there, it's really necessary to
14 strip down the proposals a bit, and not put numbers of things in
15 there that would require far more deliberation, and to put those
16 over to the City - Mayor and Council for further discussion
17 along the way.

18 So what I've done is I've recast the choices to be
19 simpler in a way so that they stand out from each other. And
20 then I'd have a voting procedure that I mentioned to you in my

1 memo. But I'd like to just describe the rationale for that.

2 So let's first look at this document right here.

3 This document takes out issues that would require far more
4 deliberation before getting anywhere, but sticks to the things
5 that are basic differences (inaudible) And now there are four
6 alternatives instead of three.

7 And the reason is that the all at-large was discussed
8 at a meeting, but not at a final meeting like this. So I
9 believe it deserves another vote to be included, and that's why
10 there's four instead of three. So that's really for procedural
11 fairness as much as anything else.

12 And if you go across, clearly the current system is an
13 option, the Mayor plus six. The district system would be the
14 Mayor plus six, but then elected by district. The hybrid, and
15 the only one we're calling hybrid as I indicated before, is not
16 the current system which is also often called the hybrid, but
17 it's one where you have some district, and some at-large. So
18 the Mayor and eight Council Members, two elected at-large; six
19 elected by district.

20 And the last one is the Mayor and six Council Members

1 all elected at-large. And I think in terms of big broad
2 categories, these are the four options that have been before you
3 from the start.

4 And as you can see, the way they're elected is pretty
5 clear that in the hybrid, for example, the at-large members are,
6 of course, elected at-large and the others by district. We
7 assume that the elections remain partisan, not, not because this
8 has been widely discussed, but because that's a big topic and if
9 necessary would be left.

10 I'm trying to keep things as simple as possible, and
11 as, as few changes as possible from the current system so that
12 you're really voting on models rather than multiple changes.

13 Election dates - Right now, as you know, elections are
14 in odd-numbered years, Primary in September; General election in
15 November. On this chart, those all stay the same. That's one
16 of the things that would be kicked over to the Mayor and Council
17 for further discussion as they wish.

18 Election rules - Pretty much are traditional. The
19 winners, the formality, and sort of a very standard system.

20 Mayor and Council elections - The Mayor runs today

1 with three Council Members off- -- in the off-year when the
2 other three are elected. Here, I think you may want to discuss
3 a little bit only about the hybrid, and the at-large, but
4 especially about the hybrid.

5 I picked up from our conversation before that if
6 there's a hybrid system, that there **was** a sense of having the
7 Mayor elected with half the Council and then -

8 MS. DORMAN: Do you mean the ward -

9 DR. SONENSHEIN: - two years later -

10 MS. DORMAN: Do you mean the ward-only system?

11 DR. SONENSHEIN: Oh, no, I'm looking at the hybrid
12 because the, the district system -

13 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

14 DR. SONENSHEIN: - wouldn't - that would actually be a
15 further discussion. Simplicity would say you could do it the
16 same way you do it now, or switch that around. The hybrid, the
17 question would be, when would the Mayor and the at-large members
18 be elected?

19 And one way to do that is to elect the Mayor in one
20 year, and then two years later, elect the two at-large members

1 given that both of those would attract a large number of voters.
2 And you might not want to spend that all on one election. You
3 might want to have that at-large, those at-large races
4 (inaudible) consecutive elections.

5 Then a constituency service, I ~~try~~ **tried** to keep it
6 relatively similar except in the case of at-large where you
7 would not expect that the at-large members would need to have
8 offices in the community since they would not be district
9 representatives. But that would fall more on the Office of the
10 City Manager and, and City staff to organize those, and that's
11 where that one would be a little bit different.

12 Salaries - No change is recommended in the salaries
13 here, again to keep it simple because that's, that is a whole
14 other topic. Staffing costs - We have to do a little bit of
15 guessing here, and the City Clerk has been very helpful. We
16 have been calling and asking his advice on, on how things can
17 get calculated and what things are open to discussion.

18 One conclusion that, that really, based on his
19 knowledge, I don't want to put words in his mouth, but, but he
20 was calculating for me the share of the overall budget that is

1 dedicated to the Mayor and Council. And it's really, obviously
2 as you know, quite minuscule. So small changes may be of
3 concern in the community, but aren't gonna be a huge impact on
4 the budget.

5 However, under staffing costs, I would like to add the
6 word "possible increase" for two additional Council Members,
7 based on my discussion with the Vice-Chair about this. That
8 clearly it's, the cost of a Council Member is \$329,000 a year in
9 the last budget. Is that right?

10 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR RANDOLPH:** (Inaudible)

11 DR. SONENSHEIN: So in theory, without any other
12 changes, you'd be adding somewhere around \$658,000 to have two
13 additional members if everything operated the same, and there
14 were no adjustments made in other portions of the Mayor and
15 Council budget. And that could be open for discussion. So I, I
16 would just make sure that says "possible increase" to be
17 determined for additional members.

18 And just flipping over to the other side, given that
19 the Committee would like, and I think it's wise to keep the
20 campaign finance law as it is right now. We can speculate that

1 all-district elections would, in most cases, require a smaller
2 expenditure for campaign costs under the campaign finance law
3 just because district elections tend to be less expensive. And
4 being careful, I'm just gonna add "except in some
5 circumstances".

6 And I gave you the San Diego example where a debate by
7 developers suddenly drew tremendous amounts of money into a
8 single district, and made it suddenly a very expensive race.
9 But most the research shows that all other things being equal,
10 district elections are less expensive.

11 For the hybrid, that would probably mean that six of
12 the elections would be less expensive, and two of them would be
13 a little bit more expensive than current elections because both
14 the primary and the runoff and the general would be at-large.
15 Whereas, right now it's one each.

16 At-large, potentially this is one piece of that
17 proposal that might be more expensive since all the elections
18 for all the members would be at-large, both the primary and
19 general election. Overall cost of elections - All-district
20 elections might be a little bit less expensive to run. The

1 hybrid system would be, at most, probably a modest change.

2 At-large elections might actually be somewhat more
3 expensive, again because you now would be running, in effect,
4 seven citywide elections on a regular basis.

5 Now, just to point out what would get removed, and
6 what I mean by removed is when you make a recommendation to
7 Mayor and Council, you could say these are some matters for
8 Mayor and Council to consider down the road, either with this
9 Committee, another committee, the Council, City staff, however
10 they want to do it.

11 One is the question of moving election dates to even-
12 numbered years. It's a very important question. It takes, I
13 think, a long time to kind of work your way through. But
14 there's nothing wrong with a committee in transmitting its
15 report highlighting those as kind of next-road that ought to be
16 looked at.

17 Clearly, the question of the actual cost if something
18 goes on the ballot is gonna have to be worked out in much
19 greater detail. Now the City staff has already - I've been very
20 well situated if the Mayor and Council have questions about

1 that, to do a kind of report about various options, if it was
2 taken more from here, and more from there, how can the cost be
3 kept down on many of the options?

4 And, of course, the question we already talked about
5 is, what's the best way of aligning mayoral, at-large, and
6 district elections? I, I think it's probably gonna be beyond
7 our scope to do tonight and, and the next week. But it is, in
8 my view, not beyond the scope of the Committee to reach a
9 general consensus about which of these alternatives are most
10 preferred.

11 Madam Chair, we could stop and discuss the proposals
12 and then let me know when you want me to discuss what I'm
13 proposing as the voting system for tonight.

14 MS. DORMAN: Can I ask Mike a question?

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Sure. Go right ahead.

16 MS. DORMAN: I have a question for Mr. Rankin. Is
17 there an update on the lawsuit regarding the electoral system?

18 MR. RANKIN: Nothing new.

19 MS. DORMAN: Nothing new.

20 MR. RANKIN: Just waiting for the 9th Circuit to let

1 us know if they are going to re-hear the case or not.

2 MS. DORMAN: And can you just confirm that in their
3 ruling, their default position was that our system, to be
4 constitutional, should be an at-large system, not, not a ward-
5 only? Wasn't that the direction that they went in?

6 MR. RANKIN: I, I can't, can't go that far with, in
7 characterizing the decision. But certainly the, the
8 constitutional flaw that the 9th Circuit (inaudible) was more in
9 the exclusion of participation in the primary election versus
10 the inclusion of citywide in the general.

11 But the Court, in its decision, at least part of its
12 decision noted that, that the City can do one or the other, but
13 we couldn't have the two elections being, you know, different.
14 Either ward-only, ward-only, or at-large, at-large.

15 But when you drill down into the analysis of the
16 decision, really the defect that the Court found was excluding
17 voters from participating in the primary versus the inclusion of
18 all voters in the, in the general election.

19 MS. DORMAN: So if nothing was done, if we didn't put
20 something to the voters, or if they rejected what we put forth

1 and the ruling came in that the, the current system's
2 unconstitutional, what would happen?

3 MR. RANKIN: In that instance, my recommendation to
4 the Mayor and Council would be to have a citywide, citywide
5 because that would, from my reading of the case, be
6 constitutionally compliant with the, the Court decision,
7 assuming it doesn't change (inaudible)

8 MS. DORMAN: Right. Based on what they said.

9 MR. RANKIN: And it would be, in my estimation, the
10 most consistent with the Charter. Obviously would still
11 conflict with the requirement in the Charter that the party -
12 that the candidates are nominated by ward, but it would comply
13 with the Charter requirement that they're elected at-large. And
14 I think how the, how the representative officials of the City
15 are elected is the more fundamental issue than how they're
16 nominated, so that's how I would (inaudible)

17 MS. DORMAN: Thank you. That's ~~(inaudible)~~ **very**
18 **helpful.**

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Before we go into this, I want to
20 answer Raphe's question. What I'd like to do is if there are

1 questions right now, let's go ahead and ask them. But if you
2 have comments, I'd like you to wait until we go around the
3 table, or if you have an issue that you think really needs to be
4 addressed before we do the voting.

5 And then after the questions, I would like Raphe to
6 talk about how we're going to do the voting because I think that
7 might shape our discussion. And then I'm keeping an eye on the
8 clock because I really want to be able for us to go one-by-one
9 to explain why we have a number one choice and the number two
10 choice, and to give ourselves time to at least go through that
11 process. So if you have questions, Jeff and then Mike.

12 MR. ROGERS: I have a question for, for Mr. Rankin,
13 just a couple questions. One, has there been any increase in
14 the number of jurisdictions that have joined in our request for
15 the ~~(inaudible)~~ **en banc** review? You know, before, you'd said
16 that several jurisdictions would have been Washington State had
17 joined with us because they do it the same way?

18 MR. RANKIN: The Washington State jurisdictions joined
19 as ~~(inaudible)~~ **amicus** on the side of the city. I don't believe
20 we've had any others after that point (inaudible)

1 MR. ROGERS: Okay. And the second question was, you
2 know, I've been shopping this around with political people and,
3 and some of the Mayor and Council Members over the past month.
4 And some people are concerned that if we just put one
5 alternative on the ballot and it fails, we're kind of, as you
6 said we're sort of screwed and we end up with the at-large,
7 which didn't seem to have a great deal of consensus in favor of
8 it.

9 So is it possible to put something on the ballot that
10 is an either/or question that, that asks the voters to choose
11 one of these two options, and obviously the greater amount
12 picking one of them wins. I mean that's an interesting hybrid
13 kind of question on the ballot. I couldn't find anything
14 forbidding such a question on the ballot, but then, then again,
15 I couldn't find any legal support for an either/or question on
16 the ballot as well.

17 MR. RANKIN: Right.

18 MR. ROGERS: So I'm, I'm kind of - well, I'm legally
19 scratching my head going, "I don't know."

20 MR. RANKIN: Right. And, so two things on that, I

1 think you, in, in any kind of election question, something
2 you're going to put on the ballot, you want to be able to point
3 to ~~(inaudible)~~ **plain statutory authority** that lets you do it
4 that way. And so in the absence of express authority to put
5 something on the ballot, you're, you're taking a risk.

6 Secondly, and, and the Clerk and I were discussing
7 this a little bit, I need to research it a little more. I think
8 the form of the ballot question requires us to present the
9 questions to the voters as a "yes" or "no". And, and the
10 requirements that the ballot itself then have to explain what's
11 the effect of a "yes" vote, and what's the effect of a "no"
12 vote.

13 And there's no authority that I can find that says,
14 you know, you can give a, a multiple choice type of question to
15 the voters. And it's an important question because it's, I know
16 it's something that, that the Council's gonna discuss that
17 you're discussing, is, you know, if you put multiple questions
18 on the ballot, you know, how are those going to affect one
19 another with the voters who come out to consider which, if any,
20 of those proposals to vote in favor.

1 I can tell you, at least this much, if, if two
2 proposals were put on the ballot, and they both passed, then the
3 one that got the most votes and passed, would be the one that
4 would control. However, if they both failed to get plurality,
5 50%, you can't just say, "Oh, but this one got the most." So it
6 actually has to affirmatively be approved by the voters. So in
7 that instance, they would both fail, and our Charter would
8 remain unchanged.

9 MR. ROGERS: And then I have one question for Dr.
10 Sonenshein. In my discussions with Mayor and some Council
11 Members over the past - since our last meeting, I told them
12 about the hybrid, that we were kind maybe developing a little
13 bit of a consensus here.

14 And the - there was some concern about the two people
15 who are at-large whether or not they sort of become, one or the
16 other or both become a sort of oppositional force with the
17 Mayor, that they become, you know, do we need three mayors out
18 there (inaudible)

19 Does the Mayor need two people out there challenging
20 everything the Mayor says and does as if (inaudible) just you,

1 we represent the whole city. Those people only represent wards.

2 And then, and what has been the experience with that in other
3 cities that have that?

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: It's a very reasonable concern that
5 that would happen. From what I've looked at - now remember some
6 of these systems are very new. Seattle, Detroit, for example,
7 very, very new. Some of the older ones, like Boston, I don't
8 think you see that developing. ~~(Inaudible)~~ **Partly** the Mayor's
9 role is so strong in Boston, that they're really not a serious
10 threat.

11 In New York, there are positions like this that
12 sometimes are challenging, that are elected citywide. They're
13 not members of the City Council. It depends who the people are
14 and it depends who elects them. In other words, if they're
15 elected from a completely different constituency than the Mayor,
16 then one could imagine some conflict.

17 But if they're not, they're more likely to have the
18 opposite problem from the standpoint that the other Council
19 Members **who** will probably feel that the Mayor is very closely
20 allied with the other two citywide people, and might actually

1 complain about quite the opposite. So it depends a little bit
2 on who they are, and what brought them there.

3 So far, I haven't seen this generating that kind of
4 problem. It's a very legitimate concern because it does change
5 the chemistry. However, I'd point out now that in some ways you
6 already have, you have a Council that's elected citywide. You
7 actually have more than two who have to run citywide. And it
8 does not appear that by virtue of their winning a citywide
9 election that, necessarily that's been created. So it actually
10 might ~~(inaudible)~~ **be lessor.**

11 If you didn't have the current system, if you were
12 talking about going from districts to districts plus two, you'd
13 be adding two people with citywide. Here, with the hybrid,
14 you'd actually be removing the citywide status from six and
15 adding two. So, of course, all these things, as you can
16 imagine, no matter how you design it, depends a lot on the
17 people who hold the offices.

18 It's also been my experience is if you have a Council
19 Member who wants to behave as the opposition, they will behave
20 as the opposition as a district member or as an at-large member.

1 They'll find an exceptionally good platform on specific projects
2 and issues to bludgeon the Mayor at any time. Long answer, but-

3 MR. ROGERS: Appreciate it. Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Mike had a comment, and then,
5 Luke, did you have a question?

6 MR. KNIPE: (Inaudible)

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

8 MR. RANKIN: This was just a follow-up in trying to
9 tie the knot on the question that Randi had asked earlier about
10 what would happen if the Court case doesn't change and the
11 Charter doesn't change?

12 Ultimately, the case would get remanded back down to
13 the District Court, the, the first level of court that would
14 hear - that heard the case, to fashion a remedy consistent with
15 the Court's decision.

16 And it would be at that point in the proceedings that,
17 you know, we would present to the Court what we believed would
18 be the compliant system going forward assuming that the Charter
19 doesn't change. So we'd hope to get some direction from the
20 Court, and not just rely on the opinion of the (inaudible)

1 MS. DORMAN: Thank you.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: All right. Any other ques- --

3 MR. ~~KNIFE~~ **HOWELL**: (Inaudible) question. Is there a
4 timeline that we know about how the Court ruling will play out?
5 So effectively, we could put this before the citizens for a vote
6 and then the Court could rule after that? What happens then?

7 MR. RANKIN: There is no set timeline. The Court
8 doesn't have to act within a timeline. I was hopeful that we
9 would get word one way or another on whether they would re-hear
10 the ~~(inaudible)~~ **consider to** or re-hear the case right about now,
11 because the Court typically only meets ~~on (inaudible)~~ **en banc**
12 when they get eleven Judges together to re-hear a case maybe
13 three times a year because it's hard to coordinate those types
14 of events and get all that, that number of Judges together in
15 one place.

16 And they typically do that in the spring, the summer
17 and the fall. They meet ~~(inaudible)~~ **right** around March, July
18 and November, historically. So I was hoping that if they were
19 gonna have a re-hearing ~~(inaudible)~~ **en banc in** March or April,
20 we would be hearing about right now. But there are many

1 examples where the 9th Circuit hasn't decided on a request for
2 re-hearing for more than nine months. So (inaudible)

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So we shouldn't, bottom line is we
4 shouldn't base our decision on what the Court is gonna decide to
5 do?

6 MR. RANKIN: Right. (Inaudible) many times -

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Randi and then Luke.

8 MR. RANKIN: - decided based on what you think is the
9 best system for a charter to include.

10 MS. DORMAN: I have a timing comment, and I'd love to
11 hear if Jeff has heard the same thing, but I spoke to a couple
12 of Council people who said that the April date really didn't
13 matter because they were much more likely to put it on the
14 November ballot than on any special election. Did you hear the
15 same thing?

16 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, I heard the same thing.

17 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

18 MR. ROGERS: That the, that the impetus we had to
19 hurry this thing up to get done by April 1st is probably not as
20 necessary as we thought last time.

1 MS. DORMAN: Yeah. They -

2 MR. ROGERS: We might be able to squeeze a few more
3 weeks, at least, out of it.

4 MS. DORMAN: And I'm not saying that we should. I'm
5 just saying that the people that, the Council people that I
6 spoke to said that if we need extra time, all we need to do is
7 ask them for extra time because it will most likely go on the
8 November ballot, not a special election.

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Luke.

10 MR. KNIPE: I just wanted to verify the City
11 Attorney's concurrence with three of the options presented in
12 this chart - the all-district option, the hybrid district plus
13 at-large option, and then the, the at-large option.

14 All three of these options, it's my understanding,
15 would mitigate the defects found by the 9th Circuit. The first
16 option with keeping things the way they are, would not, but the
17 other three would, correct?

18 MR. RANKIN: Yes, I think so. I mean clearly the all-
19 district clearly is the at-large. And then under the hybrid
20 model, we've got the district who would be the primary and

1 general both being in the district and the at-large.

2 MR. KNIPE: Okay.

3 MR. RANKIN: So I, I think it would be - of course, I
4 thought our system was constitutional, too, so -

5 MR. KNIPE: Thank you.

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Raphe, if you'd like to
7 talk about how we're gonna do this voting, and what it means
8 and-

9 DR. SONENSHEIN: There are ways of voting that are
10 well suited for when you have three or four alternatives, and
11 your goal is not just to win an election, but to reach something
12 closer to consensus.

13 And the method I'm gonna propose to you this evening
14 is not what I would necessarily recommend for a City election
15 for candidates for office. We really try to simply identify
16 where. But for a Committee that is trying to come out in a
17 place that you're comfortable, that you put forward something
18 that responds to the widest consensus on the body, there are
19 versions of rank choice voting on which what I'm proposing
20 tonight is a kind of simple modification around what you're

1 trying to accomplish.

2 If you don't mind my just taking a minute or two to
3 explain it because it, it's - I think this one is a, is much
4 (inaudible) than the ones that you often hear about that
5 sometimes you feel like you need a statistical expert to explain
6 that everybody gives up after a ~~(inaudible)~~ **half way through the**
7 explanation.

8 The closest thing I can say is if your family just
9 tried one night to decide where to have dinner, and there's more
10 than four people in the room. You may end up eating at home
11 because you don't have a decision to rule that allows you to
12 find the widest possible consensus among everybody. Where
13 people get, I call this the Rolling Stones' rule, which I've
14 mentioned before which is you can't always get your first
15 choice, but if you try, you might get your second choice.

16 And if somebody in your family says, "I only like
17 Italian food," then you know what you're facing that night.
18 If you end up going somewhere other than an Italian restaurant,
19 there's one person who's glaring at you the whole time, picking
20 at their food and kind of miserable.

1 But if you can get people to say, "I really love
2 Italian food, but I also like seafood," and if everybody does
3 that, your odds of having a nice evening have multiplied really
4 very dramatically.

5 In fact, I'm thinking of trying this in my own
6 household later this week. I, for one, always want barbecue, so
7 I have to remember to have a second choice so that I don't
8 violate the rule I'm talking about tonight.

9 So what you want to do is set a goal to have an
10 alternative that the greatest number of people in the room would
11 consider either their first choice or their second choice. And
12 when you do that, you're actually in a pretty good spot toward
13 having something that you're comfortable with.

14 Some people will not give either choice, but the
15 process is one where everybody gets to make two choices among
16 the four alternatives, and they get calculated in sequence, but
17 you only vote one time.

18 Now you have to see where the numbers come out
19 afterwards and then decide if you do need to do more, such as
20 when you're done with all this and you find you're in a dead

1 heat, you're probably gonna need to have some further
2 discussion. But at least you'll know what the, the two most
3 favorite alternatives are.

4 So what I'm gonna ask everybody to do, with your
5 permission, if you're comfortable with this, I have discussed
6 this with the Chair and the Vice-Chair that I could at least
7 present it to you and see how you feel about it, is as we go
8 around the room, for everybody to put out their first choice.
9 The one they would absolutely like above all else, but also
10 their second choice, the seafood option.

11 And then what we'll do, and I've alerted the, the
12 Clerk's Office on this to, to - how we're gonna count this.
13 First what you do is you count up all the first choice votes,
14 and see where that leads you. It's just useful to know that
15 information.

16 But then you go through all the second choice votes,
17 and you allocate them. You add them to those that were cast on
18 the first choice. And then what you have is which alternative
19 had the most first and second choice votes. It may turn out not
20 very different.

1 I mean, that's one of the things about this is you
2 don't ever know what it will uncover, but it does give people
3 who, for example, might pick a choice that's not gonna win, but
4 still would like to have a voice in what's going on, and by
5 having a second choice, they're actually gonna get heard in the
6 debate, even though it's possible that their first choice may
7 not get heard.

8 And as you can see, if you only cast first choice
9 votes, then right away several people are, in effect, almost
10 left out of the rest of the conversations because their choice
11 didn't get into the kind of finals.

12 So first of all, does anybody have any questions or
13 complaints or quibbles or discomfort (inaudible), this is, this
14 is a, a - we're stripping down a lot of things tonight in order
15 to move a decision forward. But one of them is that this right
16 choice one doesn't require a lot of the elaborate things.

17 San Francisco uses it to elect its office holders, and
18 some people love it, and some people find it involves advanced
19 computing that, that has people quite confused. This should not
20 be confusing at all.

1 And it'll help me **answer** any questions about this, but
2 it does tend to become a useful option when you have three or
3 four options and want to reach consensus. That's, that's what
4 the purpose of it is.

5 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay. So do we want further
6 discussion, or do we just want to go around the room, talk about
7 which are our first and second options? If there is a qualifier
8 for that option, let us know.

9 I know we're trying to keep it simple, but if there's
10 something else that might be changed that would convince you
11 that an alternative would be something you could support, then
12 we want to hear about it upfront. And I guess, is there anyone
13 who'd like to start? And wherever start, we'll go around in
14 that direction.

15 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR ROGERS:** Can I ask a quick question
16 first?

17 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Sure.

18 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR ROGERS:** John Hinderaker, is he
19 supposed to be here late or not at all?

20 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** John will be here around 6:00.

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

2 CHAIRWOMAN POULOS: Unfortunately, we do have four
3 members that aren't here right now, but I, I don't think we
4 should hold this up for that reason. And this is not a final
5 vote. It is really not the motion that we may make next week
6 when we try and wrap things up, but I think it will bring us
7 closer to understanding where we, as a Commission think we'd
8 like to send our recommendation. So is there anyone who'd like
9 to start?

10 MR. KNIPE: I started last time.

11 MR. ROGERS: I'm gonna be happy to start, and I'd make
12 it actually in the form of a motion. John and I have been
13 shopping this hybrid thing around town all - since our last
14 meeting. I mean we've gone to Republicans, quite a few
15 Republicans, and I've talked to, talked to several different
16 business groups, including the Chamber of Commerce, and Southern
17 Arizona Leadership Council.

18 There seems to be a broad based backing for the hybrid
19 system that we talked about last time. And I, and for that
20 reason, you know, I would move that we adopt that as one of the

1 alternatives, and let me kind of be specific about what, what I
2 would offer. And that would be the hybrid Mayor and Council,
3 with eight Council Members, six by ward-only, two at-large
4 leaving the wards the same as they are now, retaining part of
5 some elections which we've fought for legally and are legally
6 entitled to do.

7 But I would also eliminate staggered elections but
8 leave it in the odd-numbered years. The reason for that is
9 several-fold. One, we'll maximize city turnout by having
10 everybody on the ballot in one single election. Two, we would
11 save \$1.2 million in election costs, which would more than pay
12 the \$660,000 for the two new seats.

13 Thirdly, we would eliminate election fatigue. We're
14 one of the few places in the nation that has an election every
15 year. I mean every year for four years, we, we do presidential
16 elections. And once ~~(inaudible)~~ **on odd number years**, we do some
17 statewide offices, and, and legislation the other even-numbered
18 years. And then the two odd-numbered years, we have city
19 election. I mean it's just fatigue.

20 Lastly, putting my political hat back on from my

1 multiple years working for a political organization, the problem
2 is, is that when, when you've got candidates out there competing
3 for campaign dollars to be donations, and you're competing in a
4 presidential year or a gubernatorial year, you are competing
5 with people donating money.

6 And it makes it very difficult to raise money for, for
7 all of the candidates, particularly those who are more
8 economically challenged. I mean if you can call up Jim Click
9 and get huge donations, that's different than if you have to
10 knock on doors and get five-dollar contributions and ten-dollar
11 contributions.

12 And lastly, we'll be at the bottom of a long ballot.
13 And typically, in even-numbered years, we're gonna see some
14 kinds of things on the ballot, statewide initiatives and
15 referendums. And this coming one is gonna be astonishingly
16 long. It's gonna be the longest probably in my 36-year history
17 of living in the city. So, but, but then we, we - and we would
18 be at the bottom of all of that ballot language.

19 And so I, I think it's only fair to, to have an
20 election where people who really give a damn about the city are

1 the ones voting. And that's in odd-numbered years, and if we
2 eliminate staggered elections, we maximize turnout.

3 And then finally, and this is a - Dr. Sonenshein spoke
4 to this a little bit, but I think we probably would save money
5 in election finance. We would increase - there would be two
6 more seats seeking public financing probably, although some
7 people - the Mayor ran a traditional first time around.

8 But, but the wards-only, you would likely need less
9 money. You could theoretically raise the same amount money and
10 get the same matching funds, and there might some people who do
11 that were great fundraisers like Regina. But the likely outcome
12 would be you would need less money, and therefore, probably seek
13 less money from the public.

14 So, for those reasons, that's what I would support
15 and, and I believe it's, I believe it's really, really a strong
16 possibility in the community from, from all of outreach that
17 I've done throughout this community since we last kind of
18 proposed the idea. I think it could not only pass, but it would
19 re- -- I, I can't see that there would be - I haven't found
20 anybody who opposes it.

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay, Jeff, I appreciate that.

2 I'm going -

3 MR. ROGERS: The Mayor was a little aggravated by my
4 saying I don't know if I'd like to have two more Mayors out
5 there, but you know (inaudible)

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: John, I see your hand, but I am,
7 I'm going to say that we can make a motion, but it's not my
8 desirability right now. But I will not take a vote on that
9 motion until we have gone around the table.

10 ~~MR. SPRINGER~~ MR. ROGERS: (Inaudible) **ok, so let me**
11 **just throw that out there and I can rescind my motion.**

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So what I would like, what I would
13 like is your second choice.

14 MR. ROGERS: Boy. So, so you're (inaudible)

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Go ahead. Go ahead, John.

16 MR. ROGERS: I mean I love this idea of the, of the
17 this ranked voting.

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Wait, wait a second, Jeff.

19 MR. SPRINGER: Are we going to vote on the four
20 choices that we have -

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. You have -

2 MR. SPRINGER: - or are we going to create something
3 different than what (inaudible)

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: No, no, no. We have four
5 alternatives.

6 MR. SPRINGER: Well, that's not what he, he created a
7 fifth (inaudible)

8 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: No, not really. We have the
9 hybrid. This is the hybrid, this is number three. What he did
10 was put some conditions on it that he felt were important for
11 that to be an effective solution.

12 MR. SPRINGER: Well, in the hybrid has the members be
13 chosen in the district, not at-large.

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay, but -

15 MR. SPRINGER: So that's the (inaudible)

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. So, so we have, we have
17 four alternatives.

18 MR. SPRINGER: Right.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: We have our current system which
20 is primary election by district. Everyone gets elected at-

1 large, six Council Members. We have the ward-only elections
2 which would remain at six Council Members, the primary and the
3 general would be by district. Mayor would still be elected at-
4 large.

5 MS. DORMAN: And on this chart, it's called "all-
6 district".

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: All-district, yes. Ward-only,
8 All-district. The hybrid system that Jeff just supported would
9 be six Council Members elected by district, primary and general.
10 And two additional Council Members which, who would be elected
11 at-large, both in the primary and in the general. And then the
12 Mayor would also be elected at-large.

13 ~~DR. SONENSHEIN~~ **MR. SPRINGER**: So that's (inaudible)

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: The last alter- --

15 ~~DR. SONENSHEIN~~ **MR. SPRINGER**: - choice.

16 MS. DORMAN: No, that's third choice.

17 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. SPRINGER**: Because here they're
18 elected at-large, not by district.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: No, no, no. The, the six Council
20 Members in the hybrid would be elected by district. And then we

1 would have two at-large Council Members, and six ward-only
2 Council Members.

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: I could have written this more
4 clearly on here. (Inaudible)

5 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. ROGERS: Yeah, I see what it should
6 say. Where it says Council by district it should be rest of
7 Council.

8 DR. SONENSHEIN: Yeah. Should just say Mayor and two
9 at-large Council Members -

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

11 DR. SONENSHEIN: - elected at-large. Six Council
12 Members elected by district (inaudible) much clearer. I'm
13 sorry.

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. I'm sorry for that
15 confusion. And then the fourth alternative is we would retain
16 the six Council Members and the Mayor. All elections would be
17 at-large.

18 MR. ROGERS: If I had to make a second choice, I would
19 stick with the system as it is because I, I'm, I'm deeply
20 concerned about having six ward-only people only who, who really

1 have a, might have a tendency to give a damn only about their
2 ward and not the city at-large. That has always been the part
3 of ward-only that has, that has bothered me. And so I, I would
4 stick with the system we've got as being the second best.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. And I said we were gonna go
6 around this way. So, Luke, you are next.

7 MR. KNIPE: Okay. Well, in general, I concur with
8 Jeff's proposal, both on the descriptions given here on our
9 table, on, on our handout, as well as some of the caveats that
10 Jeff mentioned.

11 I - to the point of switching to a single election
12 cycle for all members, reducing election costs, it would - it's
13 important to remember, though, that there are operational costs
14 that come with adding members to the Council. I don't know if
15 those would be offsetting. It sounds like they probably
16 wouldn't, but in general, that option, as described, would be my
17 first choice.

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. You probably don't want to
19 hear from the Chair yet.

20 DR. SONENSHEIN: Was there a second choice?

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Oh, the second choice.

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: Was there a second?

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I'm sorry. Oh, your second choice
4 is the system as it is.

5 MR. KNIPE: No. My second choice is definitely not
6 the system as it is.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Oh, okay.

8 MR. KNIPE: My second choice would be ward-only, or
9 all-ward. It would be my preference that in these discussions,
10 we could get into the habit of using the word "ward". That's
11 the word that we've been using in the city throughout its
12 history, and I know that some places say "district", but we
13 don't. And that doesn't sound like we're gonna start, so -

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And is the election cycle
15 important to you on that?

16 MR. KNIPE: The election cycle is important to me. I,
17 I understand that it's kind of a contentious proposal, but I
18 think that the idea of moving all of the wards to a single
19 election cycle is one that has great merit, and I support it.

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. All right. Randi.

1 MS. DORMAN: Well, I look at the - our overall goals
2 as a Committee that we set out a long time ago with a high
3 importance on trust, transparency, proper representation. But I
4 also place a big value on the ability for our elected officials
5 to move Tucson forward.

6 So in studying all of these, I support the hybrid
7 system because I like the balance of giving people proper
8 representation, almost more importantly making them feel like
9 they have proper representation, as well as balancing that with
10 concerns for the overall community. So that would be my first
11 choice.

12 And, you know, my second choice would be the current
13 system because the ward-only system, my big fear is that we
14 would not have the votes to do the big things that Tucson needs
15 to move forward. And when I look back on issues like the
16 streetcar, the ~~(inaudible)~~ **GPLET** which has really facilitated so
17 much development downtown, I don't know that Council people
18 elected by ward-only would be as in favor of those bigger ideas
19 that would impact the city as a whole if they only really had to
20 be concerned with being elected by their - the people in their

1 own ward, many of whom might not be directly impacted in the
2 short term.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

4 MS. DORMAN: My other, my other fear with the ward-
5 only system without having it inextricably linked to having all
6 of the elections in one year is the, the problem of having the
7 Mayor elected with Wards 1, 2 and 4 only, and having only people
8 show up who are interested in those wards. And I think we then
9 caused a bigger problem than we're solving.

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you, Randi. Tannya.

11 MS. GAXIOLA: So I think Randi pretty much said it
12 almost exactly for me.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I heard that, yeah.

14 MS. GAXIOLA: Good job. I would support as my first
15 choice district, plus at-large for all the reasons she said.
16 And I would just add that important for me is making sure that
17 we're preserving the strong neighborhood tradition that we have
18 in Tucson, as I think a building block of our city is something
19 that is important for the character and functioning of our
20 community.

1 And so I think that the, the hybrid system would
2 preserve that, but would add, I think to Randi's point, the
3 ability for at-large members to take a more ~~(inaudible)~~
4 **strategic** view of the city as opposed to a more parochial view.

5 So my second choice would be the current system for
6 those same reasons. I would be concerned by the all-district
7 system or the ward-only system because of the same reasons Randi
8 said. And I would be concerned by the at-large system because I
9 don't think it would preserve that strong neighborhood
10 tradition, and that local representation that's so important in
11 our community. So I'd go for Options 3 and 1.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Thank you. Tom.

13 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Well, I would prefer the all-ward
14 district, or the all-ward approach almost exclusively. It's the
15 - for several reasons. One is in my view it's the closest to
16 what we currently have. We have six districts and we would be
17 electing six districts. As soon as you start to add more to it,
18 it complicates things.

19 I have worked for 25 years in the County under an all-
20 district system, and I've seen in 25 years virtually all the

1 people who have representatives care about the County as a
2 whole, though some argue more in favor of one than the other, I
3 think that the fear that a Council person would only be
4 concerned, or be so concerned about their ward, they would be at
5 a disadvantage to the city probably won't have it.

6 I think that the current system does not allow
7 minority groups to be represented, and I think that an at-large
8 system just continues that problem. So I would reluctantly say
9 that my second choice would be the hybrid which would at least
10 let a group of people feel represented even if they don't, are
11 not part of the majority party, though, of the whole city.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: All right. Thank you. Joseph.

13 MR. HOWELL: ~~And~~ **You know**, I've wrestled with this for
14 quite some time, and again, I'll (inaudible) the at-large
15 system, kind of just be (inaudible) Our current system
16 (inaudible) I, I very much support our current system given
17 that the legal climate in the system that we're going through
18 with the courts, you know, it just, it seems like the new hybrid
19 just, not that it would be less serving of our citizens
20 (inaudible) It would maintain a lot of the same characteristics

1 and ideals that we have currently with the current system
2 (inaudible) So - okay, so sorry. Those are the (inaudible)
3 Therefore, my first choice is the hybrid, and my second choice
4 is the current.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Mark.

6 MR. CRUM: Well, I'm gonna the different (inaudible) I
7 like barbecue. But short of that, I continue to (inaudible) my
8 number one choice the current system ~~that~~ **and** I understand **that**.
9 But I'm not going to stand in the way of a consensus as we talk
10 more about this. My (inaudible) by all-district or all-ward.

11 But largely the reason why I feel that way is ~~if~~ **in**
12 being familiar with the ward that I'm in, Ward 6, where there's
13 a lot of (inaudible) downtown to University (inaudible) over 30
14 neighborhoods, and there are other distinct neighborhoods, and
15 there are other wards that have even greater (inaudible) And I
16 really think it's hard enough to get a handle on, on a ward
17 (inaudible) handle on the entire city.

18 And second of all, there are certain issues, and I've
19 said this before, that are going to be citywide regardless of
20 whether or not you have people who are representing just their

1 district, and that includes public safety, a bunch of things
2 that are not inclusive of everything. Okay. Thank you.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you, Mark.

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: I'm sorry. What was the first, the
5 first choice?

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Current system.

7 MR. CRUM: (Inaudible) **Current system.**

8 DR. SONENSHEIN: Current. And the second was ward-
9 only?

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Uh-huh.

11 DR. SONENSHEIN: All right. Okay.

12 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. CRUM**: All-ward.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Grady.

14 MR. SCOTT: My first choice is ward-only. I believe
15 it's the most (inaudible) system that we have. (Inaudible) you
16 have representatives. Those representatives are responsible to
17 the people. I'm more concerned when you have at-large elections
18 that you don't have that personal responsibility that if I don't
19 support this area, that I could lose my seat. So my first
20 choice is ward-only, and then my second choice would be the

1 current system.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Bruce. You're next.

3 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Well, I guess the best way to
4 characterize my views is that Tom and I both have appetizers
5 before dinner. I, I come down favoring ward-only as my first
6 choice for all the reasons that Tom said. And I come to the
7 reluctant conclusions for the hybrid (inaudible) concerns that
8 Tom expressed about (inaudible) disenfranchised by it.
9 (Inaudible)

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So, I'm sorry. Your first choice
11 is ward-only?

12 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Ward-only.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And your second choice is -

14 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Hybrid.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: The hybrid. Thank you. John,
16 we're around to you.

17 MR. SPRINGER: Well, my number one is the current
18 system that we have now. And I know we're not supposed to be
19 concerned about cost of things, but I, I don't see us going to
20 put something on the ballot that's gonna increase the Council

1 Members by two with the City's departments being asked to cut
2 back with the budget deficit that they have right now.

3 So my - I could support the hybrid if we reduce the
4 current Council Members to four and then two of them are elected
5 at-large. I would support that. But as it is now, my second
6 choice would be the hybrid. But if you want to save any money
7 and not increase it, redraw the, the wards. Have four wards and
8 two member elected by at-large.

9 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** So we're gonna put down the
10 current system as your number one choice, and the hybrid as your

11 -

12 **MR. SPRINGER:** Yes.

13 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** - second choice.

14 **MR. SPRINGER:** Very strong choice, number one.

15 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay. Okay. I have been a strong
16 supporter of the current system of elections. I think that over
17 the years, we have learned what's wrong with at-large systems.
18 We have had some notable examples of what goes wrong when you
19 have district elections, and there is no citywide view of
20 projects that are best for everyone.

1 And I think that our system, whether it was by
2 accident or not, I think that instead of being considered
3 illogical, or odd, I think of us as ahead of the curve because
4 we took both systems and we tried to make the best of both
5 worlds.

6 And so I say that because in the primary, the district
7 does have the opportunity to choose who is gonna run to
8 represent us. And simply because in the general election, the
9 Republicans may not get the candidate that they want elected
10 doesn't tell me that that ward is not being represented by
11 somebody that they chose because in the primary, the ward is the
12 one who changed that.

13 I do think, though, that the current system might
14 benefit from having all of our elected officials elected at the
15 same time. We would save money. We would eliminate the
16 question of whether or not the mayoral election is influenced by
17 the conservative voters in Wards 2 and 4 because they are always
18 elected at the same time. I think having all the elections at
19 one time would bring out more voters, and I like the idea of
20 leaving them as odd-numbered years.

1 My second choice is a little bit more difficult, and I
2 guess I was going between the hybrid system and the ward-only
3 system. As someone who's voted in Tucson for many decades, I
4 personally don't like the idea of being able to go from voting
5 for six members of the Council and my Mayor, to one Council
6 Member and the Mayor.

7 In some ways, that feels very much like you're taking
8 votes away from me and you're taking away my ability to be
9 having a choice as to what direction our Council is going to go
10 in because it's not one person on the Council that sets the
11 direction, it's a group of people who build a coalition together
12 that move things ahead.

13 But when you look at costs, I did a little back of the
14 envelope kind of calculation. So if you consider the numbers
15 that Roger gave us, for our Mayor, if you consider the Mayor to
16 have a budget of about \$450,000, and each Council Office to have
17 \$350,000, we're talking about \$2.5 million divided by 600,000
18 residents in the City of Tucson. So basically, each resident
19 pays \$4.25 per year to keep our Council Offices and our Mayor in
20 business.

1 If we were to add two members to the Council, and we
2 assume that they'll each have another \$350,000 that brings our
3 total up to \$5.42 per resident to pay for Mayor and Council. So
4 if you look at it in those terms instead of saying, "Oh, two
5 more Council Members are gonna be three-quarters of a million
6 dollars," if you look at it in terms of what it costs you, the
7 voter, to add two more seats, it doesn't seem to me that it's
8 all that much.

9 And I feel like the hybrid system does, in the words
10 of Jeff's motion, go a long way in trying to satisfy the whole
11 idea of having people as our Council Members who represent the
12 city at-large.

13 So my first choice is keep it the way it is. My
14 second choice is the hybrid system. Regardless, I think it's
15 important that we change when we elect our officials to all be
16 elected in the same cycle, odd-numbered years.

17 And I do think that my biggest problem with the hybrid
18 system is if you're gonna go to the voters, why do we need two
19 more members of the Council? What is their job going to be, and
20 how is that job going to be different than the Council Member

1 that you have right now?

2 And I think if we go with the hybrid system, we need
3 to answer that question, and we need to have an answer ready for
4 the public when they ask us why we need two more people in
5 office. So, we can total up the votes here.

6 DR. SONENSHEIN: The City Clerk is the official
7 authority. I'm not messing with this.

8 MR. RANDOLPH: So the current system has three number
9 one votes, five number two. The ward-only has three number one
10 votes and two number twos. The hybrid has five number ones, and
11 four number twos. And at-large is (inaudible) **zero**.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: (Inaudible) Okay. So we add up
13 first and second, is that what we're doing?

14 DR. SONENSHEIN: So we're sort of doing this in steps,
15 and we're sort of inching toward consensus. And I don't want
16 to, I don't want to keep you here all night, but I don't want to
17 rush it. So let me say where I think it goes next now.

18 First of all, you've eliminated one of the four
19 options which was a decision that had to formally be made I
20 think by this body. What you have now is that for nine people,

1 the hybrid system is their first or second choice.

2 For eight people, the current system is their first or
3 second choice. Even though a few more people picked hybrid than
4 current, what we're trying to do is find a situation where
5 you're having a chance of getting your first or second choice.
6 And the ward-only system has five people for whom it is their
7 first or second choice.

8 I mean it's, it's not a runaway by any means, and I
9 think you want to think first of all what have you said so far?
10 If I'm reading it from the outside, what I'm hearing is that the
11 current system and the hybrid have the strongest support on the
12 Committee. I want to make sure that's how you're reading it,
13 but that if there were two options, that those are the strongest
14 right now.

15 But in a little while, though, you're gonna have to
16 get to the point of taking a motion where perhaps there's some
17 debate and discussion between those two. And at a certain
18 point, there has to be a majority vote. But we're trying to
19 sort of get to where things are. I don't know if that's an
20 accurate interpretation. (Inaudible) make sure that it is.

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Sure. Randi, and then Tom.

2 MS. DORMAN: So my question is, given that one of the
3 top two systems is our current system, which (~~inaudible~~) **based**
4 **on what** we said earlier, it's kind of the choice that has to
5 stay on the - it's a "yes" or "no". So we wouldn't choose to
6 put the current system on the ballot. We would be choosing an
7 alternate.

8 DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, this is not -

9 MS. DORMAN: Right?

10 DR. SONENSHEIN: - yet a question about what should
11 appear on the ballot. This is what is your recommendation of
12 the best system that you think the City should adopt.

13 MS. DORMAN: Okay.

14 DR. SONENSHEIN: When you think about the ballot and
15 the questions you raised are really important, if you put two
16 similar things on the ballot, one of the dynamics is a lot of
17 people will think that they want the one they prefer to pass,
18 and they're gonna vote "no" on the other one, and visa versa.

19 (Inaudible) 40% for each one, and they both fail. It is
20 sometimes better to just take a risk and say, "This is our best

1 shot. Here's our argument."

2 But we're not quite there yet. I mean what we're
3 hearing is that a significant number of people - and remember we
4 said from the start, you have the option to say there should be
5 no change, and take your chances with the court case. Things
6 would happen if the court case was adverse to the City. But
7 that's certainly an option on the table.

8 So I think at some point, you're gonna have to have a
9 debate between those two alternatives, which should you make a
10 change at all, and you know, you have to motion on that. But I
11 think - the other thing I'd point out is that at-large was not
12 successful, but some version of district elections has a
13 significant amount of support. 'Cause another way to read the
14 numbers is that eight and five - thirteen - I'm sorry, that nine
15 and eight - seventeen votes first and second choices were for -
16 I'm sorry. Wrong one.

17 Between ward and hybrid, between ward-only and hybrid,
18 there's a total of 14 first and second place. But that doesn't
19 determine which of those you'd want to choose. I think you're
20 gonna have to now debate, I think, between the hybrid and the

1 current (~~inaudible~~) **in other words whether to make** no
2 recommendation for change for - but that's a way to go. I don't
3 want to push you farther than you're ready to go. But I think
4 you're narrowing your choices which is what you have to do in
5 order to get to where you want to get to.

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom?

7 MR. **TOM BURKE**: And I appreciate this as a very good
8 approach to try and bring us together. But had this been an
9 actual election, I probably would have either abstained or voted
10 against the hybrid 'cause I'm so strongly opposed to the idea
11 of, of the City as a whole voting for people - I don't think
12 that's appropriate.

13 I really do believe that a lot of people feel
14 disenfranchised by it and will - and, but I don't think that
15 would necessarily make it - I would go for it as opposed to the
16 current. I think the bigger problem we're gonna end up with is
17 adding new Council people.

18 I think that's such a change, that that kind of
19 approach of you're gonna make government even bigger, it's gonna
20 be a very hard hurdle for anybody to get over, as opposed to

1 shifting from the, the lines we currently have for the wards,
2 and just changing how we elect the person.

3 If you especially go for the route of making only four
4 people elected by ward, you're - I have (inaudible) time to
5 figure out how you're gonna divide that up. I can't imagine
6 that (inaudible)

7 But, but what, what I guess I'd like to say is, is
8 overall, I think that, that the, the - if we're all against the
9 at-large, and the belief is that if the Court were to rule
10 against us, then they would become at-large, I'm thinking we
11 need to move away from the current, and choose one of those
12 other two methods.

13 My preference is ward-only, but I can understand it's
14 closer to being representative of everybody if it's ward, plus
15 some, some at-large. So I, I would sort of suggest that we
16 choose - we sort of decide to leave the current as a
17 recommendation, and choose one of the other two.

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Bruce.

19 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: I, you know, find myself in
20 remarkable agreement with Tom on this because to me this, this

1 hybrid has a lot of moving parts. And my sense of the
2 electorate is that you want to have something that's pretty
3 clear, something they're familiar with, and shifting them to -
4 if you're gonna make a change, that it's not too complex.

5 And this one seems very complex to me. It, it
6 introduces a whole array of debate points that I think present
7 obstacles to passage, including why are we electing two at-large
8 when you're got a Mayor? Why are we adding that expense? Why
9 are we creating a system that has, that is based on a ward-only,
10 and an overlay of at-large? It's, I think, a very hard sell.
11 And I think it (~~inaudible~~) **bodes** poorly for its chances.

12 On the other hand, a ward-only system is simple to
13 understand. It essentially is something the public is familiar
14 with at least at some level during each election cycle for the
15 City, and is a change that I think moves away from the problems
16 that the 9th Circuit has identified. Whether or not that's -
17 that opinion survives, I think the tone has been set for the
18 current system, and there's a lot of complaint about it.

19 MR. ROGERS: The only thing I was gonna add -

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Go ahead, Jeff.

1 MR. ROGERS: - was that I think our - what we had
2 hoped, aspired to do in this group was to come up with what we
3 thought were the better - best forms of government, not what we
4 thought would actually sell. We could figure out selling it
5 later, but -

6 And I would concur. It's not gonna be an easy sell,
7 but you know, I tried to look very hard at this, not at what's
8 politically the right thing politically saleable, but what is,
9 what is the right form of governance to make the City as well
10 governed as possible.

11 And I think that I would concur with what you said
12 about the, if we stick with the current system, we at least
13 recommend that they could eliminate staggered elections. Makes
14 no sense at all in today's day and age.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Randi.

16 MS. DORMAN: I think that given that what we've heard
17 over the last year that it's important that we put forth an
18 option for the voters to decide. And as Jeff said, our
19 responsibility was to figure out what is the best for the
20 community.

1 Regarding it being a more complex system, it is more
2 complex slightly, but it's not that difficult to explain. And
3 there are options that we've discussed where it could be cost
4 neutral because if you have the wards that now are really only
5 responsible for their wards, perhaps you can take some money
6 from each of those budgets to fund two additional seats that
7 would be housed in City Hall.

8 And if you're going from six people who are
9 accountable to the entire city, to just one person, I think it's
10 not that difficult to explain that you'd want perhaps two more
11 to be accountable towards the City.

12 So it's - I, I hear what is being said about it being
13 more complex, but I think it's only slightly more complex. And
14 I think that there are things that we can do in messaging to
15 mitigate that for what I think is the best system to put forth
16 for the City.

17 Quite frankly, for me personally, I like our current
18 system. But I understand that people don't feel that it, it's
19 representative for them. So I feel that there - we need to put
20 forth a responsible choice that'll move the City forward in the

1 way that we'd like it to. And I think the hybrid system does
2 that.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Grady, Tom and then Tannya.

4 MR. SCOTT: Doesn't **it** assume that the Council person
5 would not represent the entire city if we have to add a at-
6 large, an at-large Council person? My thinking is that if you
7 represent your ward, you also live in the city that that ward
8 is, is in. And I'm wondering whether we're making an assumption
9 that a person that's elected in Ward 5 or Ward 4, is only gonna
10 think of Ward 5 or Ward 4, which may not include downtown.

11 However, if downtown is ~~(inaudible)~~ **good for the entire in our**
12 city, seems like a Council person would take that into account.

13 MS. DORMAN: If, if I can - can I just comment on it
14 because in one of the past meetings, and I'm not sure if you
15 were there, Raphe talked about many cities that have both
16 district representatives and at-large representatives. So
17 that's where we started with this, but it's a successful model
18 in many cities, and one that was an option for us to ~~input~~
19 **emulate.**

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom, Tannya and then Luke.

1 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Mine is just a brief one for the
2 people who are in favor of adding at-large on top of ward. It's
3 just being able to explain to what end because, you know, if,
4 if, if I have a Council person representing me, I expect them to
5 represent me for all my interests in the city, not just what's
6 in my neighborhood. And, 'cause what happens across town
7 impacts me as well. So, I, I would just, as a citizen, want to
8 try to figure out what would the extra people do?

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tannya.

10 MR. **TOM BURKE**: If that's gonna be a big issue.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tannya.

12 MS. GAXIOLA: I would just like to echo the statement
13 from earlier about our job was really to come up with the best
14 option here and not really think about how we are going to sell
15 it. And I, and I, and I have the same worry about if we keep
16 our current system, and then the Court (inaudible) **rules** back,
17 and we have to go to an at-large system, which is something none
18 of us want, not even as our second choice, that that puts us in
19 a dangerous position.

20 So I, I, I, personally, I also like our current

1 system, and I like that it gives us, it gives us Council Members
2 who are, who do have to be responsive to their ward, who do have
3 to look for the interests of their, of their constituents in the
4 ward, but do also have to think citywide.

5 And I'm concerned that if we go to a model where it's
6 ward-only, that then you would end up with folks who aren't
7 accountable to a citywide base where they're not being elected
8 citywide in any shape or form. And so they would be - they
9 wouldn't necessarily have any incentive to, to look at things
10 that way.

11 And I also add that I'm not really concerned about
12 somebody else's job to sell whatever option we come up with, if
13 it is the hybrid. I'm not really concerned with that because
14 there are these other cities where that option has been
15 presented, explained and sold successfully. So if they can do
16 it, we can do it, too. That doesn't, that doesn't concern me.

17 I think for me the concern is maintaining that balance
18 between the responsiveness to the local community, to the wards,
19 to the neighborhoods, but also making sure that we're insuring
20 people are going to have a citywide view, and not leaving it up

1 to the personality of that individual to say, "I'm gonna
2 represent my ward, but also take the citywide view even though
3 I'm elected only by my ward." I think we need to make sure that
4 we put in that interest structurally.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke.

6 MR. **KNIPE**: No recommendation is going to be without
7 complexity, and no recommendation is going to be without
8 challenges when it comes to how we are going to explain this to
9 the public. No recommendation is going to be without
10 implications that haven't been discussed much.

11 Ward-only sounds simple, but if we did that without
12 changing the staggering elections, and without changing the
13 campaign finance system, we'd be spending much more in public
14 funds per voter on, on matching funds than we would in the
15 system that we have now.

16 If we were going to recommend doing nothing, keeping
17 the system that we have, I think a lot of people would be
18 wondering why we went through this exercise in the first place.
19 And then, of course, the recommendation with the proposal that
20 has the strongest consensus before this Committee, the hybrid

1 system, yeah, it's gonna come with challenges. But anything
2 that we do is gonna come with challenges.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Raphe.

4 DR. SONENSHEIN: It's very complicated. But here's,
5 here's some ways to maybe cut through it a little bit. As to
6 the current system, you don't actually have to vote on that in a
7 sense because it exists. And it exists unless and until the
8 Courts make a decision. It's not that you have to put a measure
9 on the ballot to keep the current system. The current system is
10 on unless it's changed by the voters.

11 I'm just trying to think what I'm hearing as the sense
12 of the Committee. Tell me if this is wrong. That you don't
13 hate the current system, you know, there's at least eight people
14 for whom it is their first or second choice to have the current
15 system.

16 But you are recognizing that you may not be able to
17 keep the current system, and want to be able to make a choice
18 (inaudible) to replace it. And some people don't like the
19 system. But it's not as if you came together out of a loathing
20 of the current system separate from what the Court is doing.

1 And I think that's probably correct, and that's kind of what
2 these numbers say.

3 First of all, that can be expressed as part of your
4 recommen- -- as part of your communication to the City Council
5 without it having to be a competitive thing with the other
6 alternatives. That's number one.

7 Number two, what I'm hearing is that although the
8 Court did offer, in fact, two alternatives, at-large and
9 district, that the Committee did not support going to at-large
10 as an alternative, and that that's kind of a voice of the
11 Committee based on your deliberations. That's the second area.

12 A third area that I'm hearing is that although there
13 is disagreement between ward-only and hybrid activists, active
14 voices on the Committee, those two overlap in the area of
15 consensus in having six members of the City Council elected by
16 district. I'm looking for areas as you sort of build a pyramid
17 of, of what most people are willing to say.

18 So, you don't dislike the current system. You could
19 live with it if you were allowed to continue to live with it.
20 But you may not be able to. If you can't continue with that

1 system, you're not at all interested in having an at-large
2 system, but there's strong interest on the Committee for there
3 being district representation in the City Council, some
4 disagreement as to which is the better form of those two,
5 whether it's the ward-only or the hybrid. I mean, I'm thinking
6 that's what I'm hearing.

7 So current doesn't have to be seen as a competitive
8 alternative so much as something about which you can express
9 your sentiment and have expressed, that you're not miserable
10 with the current system, but you may not have that as an option.

11 So I think this, this conversation between ward and
12 the hybrid is the right conversation to have. That seems to be
13 what you have to settle. You do have the option to say what I
14 just said to the community, and say that there is consensus,
15 super majority consensus on some version of district
16 representations.

17 And then you could even vote between the two models
18 and then express what that vote - it doesn't have to be
19 completely won tonight, 'cause you've actually made, you've
20 moved down, you moved the vote very far forward towards a

1 decision.

2 What I don't want you to do is make a decision so
3 quickly that it passes by one vote between those two, or sort of
4 depending on who's in the room, and then you have sort of that
5 feeling about it.

6 It's possible - I think you should continue to hash
7 out those two alternatives and not rule out the possibility that
8 in the next two weeks, you can get feedback on it and then come
9 back and decide which of those to put forward, and maybe change
10 some minds on the Committee one way or the other. That's my
11 reading of this sort of pyramid toward consensus; we don't have
12 necessarily winning by a small amount. I want to know what you
13 think.

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: John, I know you came in late, and
15 I don't want to put you on the spot, but I know you -

16 MR. ~~HINDERAKER~~ **ROGERS**: ~~(Inaudible)~~ **I was just trying**
17 **to update him a little bit.**

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I know you have some strong
19 feelings about our form of elections. And what we did was we
20 considered the four alternatives. The current system, ward-

1 only, the hybrid with six and two at-large, six ward-only, two
2 at-large, and the totally at-large system.

3 We went around the room. We did a first and second
4 choice. I think you've heard a lot of the arguments already,
5 and I'd like to give you the opportunity to let us know where
6 you stand on those two alt- -- or those four alternatives, if
7 you had a first and second choice. And that will add to our
8 discussion.

9 MR. HINDERAKER: My first choice would be the hybrid
10 model. And my second choice would be ward-only.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you.

12 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Bonnie? **My sense is that ...**

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes. Bruce.

14 MR. BURKE: Raphe, you're doing an excellent job on
15 kind of consolidating (inaudible) I thought that description, I
16 was nodding "yes" all the way through it. As I was looking
17 around the room, I think I'm seeing others with similar, having
18 a similar view. I guess we need to make that consensus
19 decision.

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So I was giving us until 6:15

1 today.

2 MR. BURKE **SONENSHEIN**: You have a question, Bonnie.

3 MR. CRUM: No question.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Mark.

5 MR. CRUM: I'd like to comment on, as with Tannya, I'm
6 not interested in the complexities in trying to explain **these**,
7 ~~(inaudible)~~ because people like to say I'm kicking the can down
8 to voters. (Inaudible)

9 I like what Raphe did say about we like the current
10 system, and I like the current system, and here's why. However,
11 short of that, I like ward-only. ~~I'm aware of~~ **over** - I'm sorry.
12 All-ward. Get my terms straight. (Inaudible) but not for the
13 reasons that it's gonna be hard to explain. Simply because
14 that's what I like. So there.

15 DR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible) barbecue.

16 MR. CRUM: And barbecue is (inaudible) **simple**.

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Raphe.

18 DR. SONENSHEIN: You want to be done with this by
19 6:15, right?

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Raphe. And then we will come back

1 with a motion on somebody - I mean if we want to make a motion
2 tonight, we can. But what I wanted was for people to really
3 think hard about this, and come back with one or two motions
4 next week that we can hash out what would be the best
5 recommendation to send to Mayor and Council. Tom and then
6 Raphe.

7 MR. TOM BURKE: I want to make a comment about, I know
8 Jeff started with a motion, and thank you for all the detail.
9 But I think there's, that we've seem to have gotten real far in
10 deciding there's some kind of a ward election. But one of the
11 things that you brought up was the time of the election, and it
12 got folded into a lot of people's comments.

13 I really think that we ought to look at that as a
14 separate item, whether we go with either one of these. And I'm
15 sort of hearing consensus that most people are leaning towards
16 a, a single day, whether it's on an odd-numbered day or an even-
17 number. I, I hear the arguments and I'd consider either one.

18 But I think that's really an important issue. Maybe
19 we could even resolve that tonight if there's enough consensus
20 in the room that we should go in that direction.

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Raphe and then Jeff.

2 DR. SONENSHEIN: I was gonna suggest that the, that
3 the Minutes could reflect kind of what we've been talking about,
4 then the community can, can ~~(inaudible)~~ **react to them**. But I
5 would suggest a couple of straw votes tonight. only straw votes,
6 not binding votes, but straw votes.

7 The first one would be something along the lines of
8 should it be impossible to retain the current system? The
9 motion is to move toward some version of district elections,
10 just some version, not **to** say which version, so you can sort of
11 measure - that could just be a, you know, a hands-raised, just a
12 quick motion.

13 Then within that, a straw vote between the two
14 alternatives, but only a straw vote that following what you're
15 saying, which I think is really good, as to then identify what
16 those issues are and give people **an** opportunity to change their
17 minds between now and two weeks from now. But, but you would be
18 almost there at that point.

19 But I think the first motion's very important because
20 anytime you can express the sense of the body, and I don't like

1 that. I think it's actually quite important. So I would just
2 recommend that. I didn't want to interrupt (inaudible) **somebody**
3 **else.**

4 MR. ROGERS: I'm just gonna agree (inaudible)

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. (Inaudible) Jeff and -

6 MR. ROGERS: I do think there's an emerging consensus
7 that, you know, there, there doesn't seem to be real compelling
8 reasons for staggered elections anymore, and in that takes \$1.2
9 million back in, you know, into the City budget, that's **enough a**
10 ~~(inaudible)~~ reason for me.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Joseph and then Luke.

12 MR. HOWELL: (Inaudible) Raphe, in your expertise and
13 your knowledge, is there any fear - my concern is loss of
14 institutional knowledge when an entire governing body is
15 essentially turning over. And what, what do you have to say to
16 that?

17 DR. SONENSHEIN: Well, that's a legitimate concern. I
18 think the cost thing is great and, and even the turnout thing is
19 great. However, when you're elected by district, there's a
20 couple of concerns that are less likely. One is, you don't get

1 the big turnover where sort of a completely different
2 philosophical wave comes in, 'cause everybody's elected in
3 different districts.

4 But as to institutional knowledge, it's probably a
5 bigger problem to have very strict term limits on that than
6 having elections every four years, I think in some ways, because
7 without very strict term limits, people do serve for a
8 considerably long period of time. And I don't think it turns
9 over every four years.

10 So I'm just trying to think of cases where, you know,
11 entire City Councils have turned over. And it's unusual,
12 especially in a district system. Now in an at-large system, you
13 could easily imagine it, 'cause a whole wave could come in and
14 just knock everybody out. So I guess I wouldn't be as concerned
15 about that. That's it.

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Luke?

17 MR. KNIPE: I had a question for the City Attorney
18 that has, I think, possibly implications for the hybrid system.
19 And this concerns the State's resign to run laws. If I were a
20 Council Member, let's say I represented Ward 2 or 3, or

1 whatever, and I decided that in the next cycle I wanted to run
2 for one of the at-large seats rather than my own ward, would I
3 be required to resign my current seat before filing? Or would I
4 be able to -

5 MR. RANKIN: So, so the resign to run law would apply
6 if you were running for a different office than the one that
7 you're currently holding. But the statutes were amended, what,
8 two years ago?

9 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ MR. KNIPE: Yeah. It was two years ago.

10 MR. RANKIN: Such that the triggering of that it used
11 to be an either/or. Either, you know, you (inaudible) your
12 papers (inaudible) You've made what we've deemed to be a formal
13 declaration that you're running for that office. Well, that
14 second part is no longer part of the (inaudible) **equation**. So
15 the triggering event isn't necessarily gonna happen (inaudible)

16 MR. KNIPE: Okay. Thanks.

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Randi?

18 MS. DORMAN: Sorry.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: That's okay.

20 MS. DORMAN: I have a question that goes to Tom's

1 point of the election cycle. So for me, it would be very
2 challenging to support a ward-only system without all of the
3 elections happening at the same time. So from a process
4 standpoint, I would find it very difficult to support a pure
5 ward-only system if we still had staggered elections. So from a
6 process standpoint, how do we tackle that?

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Well, I think, I think that the
8 first thing we can do is do the straw vote that Raphe
9 recommended. And then when we have to choose between a couple
10 of alternatives, if there are conditions that need to be added
11 to that, for us to feel that it's a good form of system of
12 representation, then I think we need to include that in the
13 motion.

14 If it turns out that - well, I think we should take
15 the first straw vote, and that is should we not be able to
16 retain the current form of elections that we have where we have
17 a hybrid system, but they're all embodied in the same people.
18 Is - should we not be able to retain that, my sense is that this
19 Committee would go with some form of district election, and not
20 an at-large election. Is that correct? And if you agree with

1 that statement, raise your hand.

2 MALE SPEAKER: I don't understand. I don't understand
3 that. Could you repeat that?

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. The question is, should we
5 not be able to retain our form of elections, we could go with
6 the district election or an at-large. And my sense from this
7 Committee is that no one wanted to go with an at-large.
8 Everyone thought that some form of district elections would be
9 what we would support in the event that we didn't get our first
10 choice, if that were - leaving the way it is. All those who
11 think that district elections would be the preferred alternative
12 -

13 MS. DORMAN: A form of district election.

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: A form of district election.

15 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: **Either** (Inaudible) ward-
16 only or hybrid?

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes. Correct. Raise your hand.
18 So I see no dissension. So again, we've reiterated as we did
19 previously that we don't really support at-large elections.

20 For those of us who truly believe that the system we

1 have now is something we want to support, we need to all
2 recognize that should that be voted down by the Courts, an at-
3 large election is probably what would result from that decision
4 that we make, okay? Okay. So, ward-only and ward-only with
5 hybrid. Bruce.

6 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: Do you not feel there's a consensus
7 in not moving all of the - just having one election for Mayor
8 and Council?

9 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. The sense is that we all
10 feel that it would be to the City's advantage regardless of what
11 form of election we choose, to do away with staggered elections
12 and have Mayor and Council all elected at the same time. If you
13 agree with that statement, raise your hand. So we have
14 unanimous agreement on that as well.

15 ~~MR. BURKE~~ MR. **SONENSHEIN**: I'm feeling of a lot of
16 consensus.

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Just wait.

18 (Multiple speakers - inaudible discussion.)

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yeah. I guess we'll have to
20 decide if we want barbecue tonight. Luke?

1 MR. KNIPE: No, I was raising my hand for barbecue.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Oh, for barbecue. Okay. I got a
3 sense from, from the vote, the vote that we took by going around
4 the table that the hybrid system with two additional, two
5 additional at-large Council Members was a preferable system.

6 But anyone who chose that, the hybrid system, having
7 heard the discussion, does anybody want to support one of the
8 two forms of district elections over another?

9 And if we have two competing viewpoints, the district-
10 only without adding any new members, the hybrid, do we have
11 somebody who'd like to speak in favor of each of those?

12 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: I'll speak in favor of that.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. John in favor of the
14 hybrid. Do we have someone who'll speak in favor of - all
15 right. I'll speak in favor of the district. Go ahead, John.

16 **MR. TOM BURKE**: I'll speak in (inaudible)

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Oh, Tom. All right. Go ahead,
18 John.

19 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: I think there's lots of reasons
20 to recommend the hybrid. One in particular is that I think it

1 has the potential to be sort of a consensus pick for the
2 community. I think there's gonna be strong opposition from
3 within some quarters against ward-only elections. So I think
4 the hybrid, I've come to conclude, is the one option that the
5 entire community might be able to get behind and push across the
6 finish line.

7 (Inaudible) **I think if** we go with the ward-only,
8 there's going to be a strong faction within our community that
9 will rise up and actively oppose the ward-only which will
10 complicate things. So that's just sort of a pragmatic reason
11 why I support the hybrid.

12 I also think that the hybrid system balances the best
13 of both worlds, gives us the, the representation at the ward
14 level, so people have an elected official that they can go to
15 that represents their own ward. And so that institution is in
16 place and allows us to maintain that and continue **that, and it**
17 **works.** (inaudible)

18 Since, if we move away from the current system, the
19 concern is now that the representatives are not going to be as
20 concerned about the interests of the community as a whole. So

1 that's a valid concern, I think, and I think the way we balance
2 that in the hybrid system in adding two at-large members, we
3 then are representing the City as a whole. And so I think it
4 achieves a better balance than ward-only does. For that reason,
5 I think it is improvement.

6 Lastly, I think the concern is, well, it's more
7 complicated, that's true. The concern is that it's gonna add
8 cost. But I think if we, if we consolidate the elections, my
9 understanding is the costs roughly ~~(inaudible)~~ **a wash, so** we can
10 get around the cost issue, and I think if everybody in the
11 community can get behind it, maybe the Republican Party, the
12 Democratic Party, business community, we can get this across the
13 finish line, we can actually effect important change for our
14 community. And I think if we go with the ward-only for now,
15 we're gonna end up with a battle (inaudible)

16 MR. ROGERS: I only have one thing. I can't remember
17 the margin. This has been defeated twice, the ward-only. And I
18 think the last time it was a wide margin, didn't even come
19 close.

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And, Jeff, I, I, I agree with you

1 on that, but I think -

2 MR. ROGERS: (Inaudible)

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: - every time that we've had a
4 ward-only election, it has been on the same ballot issue for
5 Charter change as a number of other unrelated issues. So I
6 don't know, I mean, yes, I've kind of hung my hat on that as
7 well saying, "Well, people in Ward 2 and 4 may want district-
8 only, but the rest of the City has always said 'no'."

9 But the reality is it's never stood alone by itself on
10 a ballot for us to be able to make that statement with
11 assurance.

12 MR. ROGERS: (Inaudible)

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: I mean it may, it may be in
14 reality that that's true, but I think each time it's been
15 defeated, there were other issues that may have lent to the
16 defeat of that Charter change ballot initiative.

17 MR. ROGERS **HOWELL**: So you're saying (inaudible)

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes.

19 MR. ROGERS **HOWELL**: Within the same question there
20 were other issues?

1 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: In the, in the past, it has been
2 the tendency to put all the Charter changes in one proposition.

3 MR. **ROGERS HOWELL**: Okay.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And we have a handout from the
5 last reiteration of this Committee where we looked at what the
6 ballot initiatives were. And perhaps we can get staff to send
7 that out to us so that people can look through the history of
8 Charter change initiatives, and you can see which ones were on
9 the same ballot, and when we passed and when we didn't pass.

10 MR. **KNIPE**: There's actually a section in our binders.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: There is. Okay. All right.
12 Okay. No, no other questions. Tom, you're gonna defend the
13 ward-only without the hybrid, without the at-large.

14 MR. **TOM BURKE**: (Inaudible) propose. Well, I believe
15 the ward-only is the most common form of government that's out
16 there. We, we elect our representatives that way for the State.
17 I don't think that my State Senator, or my State Representative
18 only care about my district. I think he or she cares about the
19 state as a whole.

20 My experience through, through 25 years of working for

1 the County is that even though there are, at times, district
2 supervisors who are elected who don't represent my view, they
3 represent somebody's view who elected them. And as a, as a
4 rule, there's usually not a concern that a particular
5 supervisor, or particular, in our case, Council person wouldn't
6 be concerned about the city as a whole.

7 I think that, that it sort of - well, I'll say,
8 disrespectful to the person who represents the ward that they
9 wouldn't care about the city as a whole. The fire, the police,
10 the roads, the water affect the whole city, and I don't think
11 that, that this idea that, if I don't have somebody who's
12 accountable to the city as a whole, they won't be, they won't
13 care about the city as a whole.

14 Essentially, what it (inaudible) is that it's, in my
15 view, it's still trying to cling onto the current system of
16 electing people at-large which - and, and I'm a member of, a
17 member of the Democratic Party, 'cause that question got asked
18 before. And I still feel that my Republican friends are
19 disadvantaged because they can't elect somebody.

20 And I think that we need to have it where it is the

1 majority of the people that choose in their districts, and if,
2 and if we all trust that group to work, oh, don't worry, we'll
3 have an at-large to, to care about the rest of you.

4 So I appreciate your comment about you won't be able
5 to vote for as many people, but you know, I come from a Chicago
6 family and we know about voting for many people.

7 DR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible)

8 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Or maybe not. But, but I just think
9 that, that it is the most common form of government that most
10 people understand that I elect somebody to represent my area for
11 the group.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Any other comments before we take
13 another straw vote on a form of ward-only elections?

14 MR. **TOM BURKE**: I will make one more comment.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

16 MR. **TOM BURKE**: Only that before we sort of suggested
17 that we shouldn't care about whether something will pass or not,
18 but John was kind enough to point the best part of the issue is
19 we shouldn't recommend something that we think has no chance.

20 I do think that adding more Council people in the

1 current climate of the world, the United States, about
2 government is saying we're making a bigger, a larger government.
3 And I just really think that there'll be a lot of pushback on
4 that concept, even if you try to manipulate, say, oh, it won't
5 cost more, will only cost a few dollars more, it's still more.
6 And, and that, I think itself will, will cause a chance that
7 it'll be defeated.

8 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Raphe, did you have a comment?

9 DR. SONENSHEIN: (Inaudible) I think you're in a great
10 position, remembering it's a straw vote. And the whole point of
11 this is that every single person casting a vote is completely
12 free in two weeks to cast a completely different vote. It does
13 provide a community information about where you are with two
14 very clear sets of arguments made on either side.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. I guess my only comment is,
16 I, too, agree that people seem to want less government. They
17 don't seem to want to pay for the government that they vote for.
18 And I think adding two Council Members without having a real
19 compelling reason as to what job they would do, that it would be
20 a very hard sell in this community to add two Council Members.

1 And so in my mind, if I had to choose between two
2 different forms that I think would have the greatest chance of
3 passing at the ballot, and would give equal representation at a
4 partisan level as well as at an ethnically diverse level, I
5 would have to go with ward-only and not a hybrid, which is a
6 change from what I just said a little while ago, so **that goes to**
7 **show you.** (inaudible)

8 Okay. So let's do a straw vote, and then we're gonna
9 move on to the next item on the agenda which is the sales tax.
10 So all those who would be in favor - okay, so we were unanimous
11 in that we do not agree that at-large elections will give us
12 good representation, and we were unanimous in saying that the
13 time for staggered elections is over. We feel like they should
14 all be done at the same time.

15 How many of you would be in support of the hybrid
16 system as a good form of representative government to put before
17 the voters? Please raise your hand. One, two, three, four,
18 five, six, seven. I see seven hands.

19 Those who would be in favor of a ward-only election,
20 keeping the current number of six Council Members, no one at-

1 large except the Mayor, please raise your hand. One, two,
2 three, four, five. So we have a majority in favor of the
3 hybrid, but we are not really at a point where we have
4 consensus.

5 So for next meeting, I am going to come up with a
6 motion. Jeff, if you, or anybody else on this Commission who
7 would like to come up with a motion in the form of a
8 recommendation to Mayor and Council, hopefully we will get some
9 more feedback from the public through the ~~(inaudible)~~ **web mail**
10 that Roger has been sending to us, or possibly at the next Call
11 to the Audience and the one at the next meeting.

12 So if everyone's okay, we're gonna move on. Oh, John
13 and then Raphe.

14 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER:** So the one question I don't
15 think you asked that (inaudible) **I would be interested in**
16 **finding out is** where the group stands is, what if the 9th
17 Circuit does decide to reverse its current decision, and so
18 therefore, the current system is deemed constitutional? Is
19 there a desire within the body to still move to a different form
20 of government? And I don't know if that's been discussed while

1 I was away or -

2 MALE SPEAKER: Good question. That's a good question.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: That's a good question. Does
4 anybody want to attempt an answer for John? Randi and then
5 Luke.

6 MS. DORMAN: Luke had his hand up first.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

8 MR. KNIPE: ~~(Inaudible)~~ **Mines a quick one.** The
9 formation of this Committee, like the formation of (inaudible)
10 previous, prior to it, was an outgrowth of community interest,
11 not of what's going on at the 9th Circuit. We're not here
12 because of the 9th Circuit. We're, we're here because there is
13 ongoing interest in making improvements to our City Charter,
14 that's our charge.

15 And my - the, the recommendations that I'm gonna
16 support as a member of this Committee have nothing to do with
17 what the Court's doing. I'm, I'm here to try to make
18 recommendations that are best for the City regardless of that.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Randi?

20 MS. DORMAN: I primarily agree with what Luke just

1 said, but for me, it would make a difference because I could
2 support the current system or the hybrid system. It'd be very
3 challenging for me to go to ward-only. So if the action were
4 ward-only, or nothing, that I, I would have to really think hard
5 about that.

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: For me, as a member of this
7 Commission, I think I would like to offer a well-thought-out
8 recommendation to Mayor and Council that is different from the
9 current system that we have. At the ballot box, I don't know
10 that I would support it.

11 MS. DORMAN: Right.

12 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: No, I'm serious. I mean think as,
13 as -

14 MS. DORMAN: (Inaudible)

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: - an individual who has voted in
16 this election system, I feel like it is a good system. But I
17 think for the purpose of this Commission, what we're doing is
18 trying to provide a recommendation that the Mayor and Council
19 can consider seriously if they want to make a recommendation for
20 changing our form of elections, regardless of the court case.

1 I mean we can bring up this court case, and I guess it
2 only takes one, but how many times have we been taken to court
3 and our system of elec- -- or form of elections have been upheld
4 by the courts?

5 And so I, I do think that this is really, in my mind,
6 what kind of recommendation can we give the Council that should
7 we need to change our form of elections, and can we provide
8 better representation for people who don't feel that they're
9 being represented now? And I'd like to give them a
10 recommendation that they can really work with, so - Randi.

11 MS. DORMAN: But you just said "should we need to
12 change -"

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: That's what I (inaudible) **mean**.

14 MS. DORMAN: "- the elections." So the question was -

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: The Mayor and Council -

16 MS. DORMAN: - if you didn't have to. Because I
17 agree. I, I think that the people want another - they want an
18 option. They want something to vote for. The option -

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And I think the Mayor and Council,
20 to be honest, are being pressured to put something on the ballot

1 that deals with our form of elections, not just because of the
2 court case.

3 MS. DORMAN: Right.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: But I think there's a lot of
5 pressure from other members of our community who really feel
6 that the time has come to have some form of district elections.
7 And I think that our goal as this Commission, regardless of your
8 personal views is, what's the best recommendation we can give to
9 Mayor and Council should they choose to change the form of
10 elections that we have and put that before the voters. So does
11 that -

12 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: I think the only thing
13 I, I would add to that is like on the polling that we got, the
14 current system polled at 60% as the least popular system. So I
15 do think there's a desire for change in our community. And I'm
16 glad to hear that other people (inaudible)

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. So if, if Jeff and Tom and
18 a couple of other people, John, you've really given ~~us~~ **this** a
19 lot of thought. Come back next week with the form of a motion,
20 we'll hash out a couple of motions and see if we can really

1 reach some consensus for a recommendation to Mayor and Council.

2 Raphe.

3 DR. SONENSHEIN: Last thing. Oh, and by the way, with
4 regard to this last thing. In the almost 20 years I've been
5 working with Charter Reform, I've never seen a committee in a
6 situation ~~they have~~ **that had** to grapple like you are with sort
7 of Donald Rumsfeld (inaudible) **unknown, unknown.**

8 This is a really interesting and difficult position to
9 be in. And I agree. The safest thing is to pretend you're not
10 in this position at all, and just sort of go forward, because
11 whatever happens, everyone will have another option to react
12 when and if the Court makes a decision. And I mean nothing is
13 set in concrete.

14 But I just wanted to say that if there's some
15 information you feel that I can provide for the next meeting, if
16 you could send, just send an e-mail to the Chair - you don't
17 mind, Bonnie, that that (inaudible)

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Uh-huh.

19 DR. SONENSHEIN: - let me know, 'cause if there's any,
20 any factual material that you think might help to decide between

1 the two alternatives, just let me know. I'll be happy to spend
2 some time looking for some things.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Any other discussion?
4 Okay. Then we're gonna move on to the sales tax. Item No. 5 on
5 the agenda, I think. Yes. We've already taken two conditional
6 votes that I think were unanimous with regard to pledging of
7 excise taxes and removing the cap on the secondary property tax
8 to Mayor and Council.

9 But we put off a recommendation about the sales tax
10 until we had the results of the poll. It seems to me that the
11 summary that we received and my reading of the responses that we
12 got at the last meeting, was that simply raising the sales tax
13 by half a percent would be a hard sell in this community. Might
14 or might not pass.

15 But that people were much more supportive of an
16 increase in the sales tax should it be tied to particular
17 projects or earmarked very specifically for certain things such
18 as police and fire equipment. What were a couple of the others?
19 Not putting off needed infrastructure improvements, repairing
20 our roadways. Parks and rec were real, I think, on the line in

1 terms of people wanting to support a sales tax.

2 What we had recommended in the first iteration of this
3 Committee was that we were going to recommend, and I have the
4 wording for that if you want it specifically, but that we were
5 going to recommend a change to the Charter to allow the Mayor
6 and Council, at their discretion, to take a sales tax increase
7 to the voters.

8 That would serve the purpose of leaving the cap in
9 place which is currently at two percent, and for which we are
10 currently maxed out. Most of our sales tax is at two percent
11 for pretty much all the items that were on that big list that we
12 got. But it would relieve the Mayor and Council of having to go
13 to the voters for a Charter change to increase the cap and then
14 change to what that cap would be to the voters.

15 So essentially, it freed them up to go to the voters
16 but it required voter approval for them in the future to be able
17 to raise the sales tax. The argument we heard from a good
18 number of people on this version of the Committee was that we
19 should unfetter the Mayor and Council and essentially remove the
20 cap, or allow them to recommend a higher cap with or without

1 voter approval.

2 So what I would like to do is try to go around the
3 table, and have people indicate unless you think we should just
4 have a discussion on this, but I think we need to come to some
5 kind of agreement about where we're headed in terms of whether
6 or not you feel that the recommendation which was very simple
7 from the last Committee, to simply give the Mayor and Council
8 the authority to go to the voters in the Charter. So where we
9 would add that to the Charter, and say Mayor and Council can
10 exceed this cap with voter approval.

11 The other option would be to remove the cap
12 altogether, and would we ask the Mayor and - or would we
13 recommend to Mayor and Council that they still go to voter - the
14 voters for any increase, but there would be no cap written into
15 the Charter.

16 The other option is to increase the cap in the Charter
17 with or without voter approval. So, I don't know where we're
18 at.

19 MR. CRUM: That's fine.

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. I'm gonna start it off

1 then. And we'll go around the room to my right. How's that?

2 MS. DORMAN: Can I ask a question first?

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Sure.

4 MS. DORMAN: So with the recommendation that we made
5 the last time, the cap stays at two percent. But with voter
6 approval, we can increase sales tax above two percent. With -
7 so anytime that we want to go above the two percent, if we want
8 to go higher, it's a Charter change as well as a vote? Or is it
9 -

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Right.

11 MS. DORMAN: But right now, if they want to increase
12 the sales tax, it's both a Charter change and a vote to increase
13 the sales tax. So there's two separate items on the ballot?

14 MR. RANKIN: You're asking the voters to approve a
15 higher tax and amend the Charter. And it's been tried a couple
16 of different ways over the years. It's been presented as a
17 single question where you're amending the Charter to allow for
18 the higher tax. Or it's been presented as two questions where
19 you amend the Charter to allow for a higher tax upon voter
20 approval and then the specific question for the tax.

1 So the recommendation from the last go-round would
2 have taken care of that first step such that any future proposal
3 could raise the sales tax above the two percent wouldn't have to
4 be put in front of the voters as a Charter change.

5 MS. DORMAN: Right.

6 MR. RANKIN: Or with any reference to the Charter. It
7 would just say, "Do you voters approve that the tax be increased
8 from two percent to two and a quarter percent for the next five
9 years to fund the following purposes?"

10 MS. DORMAN: And from a structural standpoint within
11 the City, is there any disadvantage to having the two percent
12 number in the Charter, remain in the Charter and vote our way
13 above that versus actually increasing the number?

14 MR. RANKIN: Just different implications. If you - so
15 having a number in the Charter, I mean is, it's the **cap**
16 ~~(inaudible)~~ you know (inaudible)

17 MS. DORMAN: Until you vote that it's not.

18 MR. RANKIN: And either change the Charter, or if you
19 change the Charter, to have that flexibility in it with the
20 unless otherwise approved by the voters. But I think what

1 you're also referencing is, is the other alternative of just
2 changing the cap in the Charter.

3 MS. DORMAN: Okay.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. I guess I, I understand the
5 problem with getting voters to vote to pay for services.
6 However, I do think that residents within the City of Tucson do
7 vote to tax themselves in order to pay for infrastructure. We
8 just did it a couple of years ago with our road bonds where we
9 wanted to repair our roads, and the voters said, "Yes, we're
10 gonna give you that ability to do that."

11 I think that the residents in the City of Tucson, if
12 they're given a good argument, will vote to provide the City
13 with the funds they need to operate the government. I think
14 it's important to have voter approval for tax increases. I
15 realize that it doesn't give the governing body as much
16 flexibility, but I think that for me as a voter and a taxpayer,
17 I would like to have that ability to say "yes" or "no" to an
18 increased tax.

19 So my feeling right now is that I would go with the
20 previous recommendation to add unless voter approval to exceed

1 the cap. And then that gives the Mayor and Council the ability
2 to go to the voters with whatever cap they feel like they need,
3 and to put it towards whatever infrastructure other needs they
4 feel they need to use that money for.

5 And, Tom, sorry. You just got in. If you'd like to
6 pass and come back around, but we're going to my right.

7 MR. PREZELSKI: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. But I,
8 I, I did - I'm familiar with the discussion of this issue. I
9 did look over the notes and I, I keep coming back to some of
10 what, what Mark had said the last time we discussed this back
11 last fall, I think, when we were talking about this issue before
12 - fall. No, it was last - it was about a year ago, right?

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Uh-huh. Almost exactly, yeah.

14 MR. PREZELSKI: Good grief. We been at this a while.
15 But, yeah, I, I, I would approve - I would support getting rid
16 of the cap altogether. As I said, you know, when, when Mark
17 tried to - told us about his, his efforts to find the history of
18 this cap, and what the reasons for this cap being put in place,
19 I believe it was back in the 1950's, you said?

20 Yeah, the reasons have apparently been completely

1 forgotten. They were entirely political, we can safely assume.
2 And obviously it's outlived its usefulness as a public policy
3 tool. No other jurisdiction in our region has it.

4 A few jurisdictions of the state have a cap like this,
5 and, yeah, people keep asking the question, "Well, why can't you
6 keep your roads nice and, nice and clean like, like Marana
7 does?" Well, Marana doesn't have a cap like this in place, and
8 they're able to charge more in sales taxes as a result.

9 So, you know, I would, I would approve just simply
10 getting rid of the cap altogether, giving the Council
11 flexibility to come back to the voters and, and ask for a, a
12 sales tax increase and, and make that argument as it comes
13 forward rather than, than putting these limits on, on our - on
14 not only the elected officials, but also on the electorate
15 itself.

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Thank you. Luke.

17 MR. KNIPE: I've spoken vociferously to this Committee
18 on this issue in the past. I am going to speak vociferously
19 again now. I don't think that we need a cap. The Town of
20 Marana doesn't have a cap. The Town of Oro Valley doesn't have

1 a cap. The Town of Sahuarita doesn't have a cap. The City of
2 South Tucson doesn't have a cap. The City of Phoenix doesn't
3 have a cap.

4 There's a long list of cities that don't have caps,
5 and they don't have them for good reason. It's the reason that
6 we have elected officials. And I trust them to make the
7 decisions that are right for our community about taxation. And
8 if they don't, I trust the community to vote them out.

9 The Pima County Board of Supervisors doesn't need to
10 go to the voters when they approve a property tax increase,
11 which they do all the time. I, I just don't, don't see why we
12 need to impose rules on our elected officials that tell them to
13 tell the community that we don't trust them.

14 I feel the same way about putting provisions in the
15 Charter that say that we need to go to the voters to increase
16 the sales tax. ~~(Inaudible)~~ **Bottom line**, I trust the Council. I
17 trust our elected officials. I would rather see us eliminate
18 the cap altogether than, than simply increase the cap, but
19 ~~(inaudible)~~ **foregoing** that, I would rather increase the cap.

20 Requiring voter approval is the option that I suppose

1 I would support the least. But I am going to support the
2 consensus of this Committee regardless (inaudible) **one of** those
3 options reaches. Thanks.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Jeff?

5 MR. ROGERS: I completely agree with Luke. The fact
6 is, is that I'll support anything we come up with here. We got,
7 we gotta figure out some way to raise more revenue. And I think
8 the Mayor and Council are cognitive of this poll, that they're
9 gonna have to tie the revenue source to something. And whether
10 it's public safety, roads or some combination.

11 So, you know, whatever we come up here, I will
12 support. The iteration of what you recommended was fine with
13 me. Theoretically, I'd like to go farther and just can the cap
14 altogether, 'cause it's not practical.

15 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: What about voter approval?

16 MR. ROGERS: I don't like the idea of it, but I think
17 we probably are gonna have to do it (inaudible)

18 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So you feel it's not -

19 MR. ROGERS: I don't think it - it's a waste of time
20 to take it to the voters if we eliminate the voter approval.

1 It's just a waste. Won't pass.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: John.

3 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: Last time around I didn't
4 support the change on sales tax. But I'm ready to support the,
5 the same thing that we, we approved last time around. I'm not
6 ready to go the next step and just eliminate the cap altogether.
7 I do think it's important that the voters have a say in whether
8 or not we're gonna increase the, the taxes above two percent.

9 I say that because although there's a longer list of
10 municipalities and towns that don't have this cap, there's a
11 list of, of municipalities and towns that do have the cap. And
12 when I looked at the table, the City of Tucson is at the upper
13 end of the range in terms of sales tax, almost straight across
14 the board.

15 So it's not as though we're at the low end of the
16 sales tax. I think we're at the upper end, and if we want to go
17 up above that, I think it's prudent to let the voters have a
18 say.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. John.

20 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. SPRINGER**: I'm pretty simple. Remove the,

1 remove the cap and **with** voter approval.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: With voter approval?

3 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. SPRINGER**: Right.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

5 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. SPRINGER**: With the Mayor - the Council,
6 Mayor and Council going to the voters for any increases.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Bruce.

8 **MR. BRUCE BURKE**: I, I see it as imperative that we
9 find a way to recommend a ~~(inaudible)~~ **an additional revenue**
10 **stream for the** City Council, and this is the one that I think
11 is, the only one that's gonna really make a difference to them.
12 I'm also continually pragmatic and see that there's, you know,
13 we have to live with what we start with. We have, we have in
14 place a cap that's inadequate. And so to ask to remove it and
15 eliminate it, I think, is not gonna succeed.

16 So I therefore think that we need to have a means by
17 which the Council can raise the cap and identify those sources
18 of, those areas of the budget where these new revenues can be
19 applied.

20 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Do you think the need for voter

1 approval is an obstacle?

2 MR. **BRUCE** BURKE: I think that's a requirement of the
3 practical matter.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Grady.

5 MR. SCOTT: I support removal of the cap. I think
6 Charter changes should be rare and if we don't remove the cap,
7 we'll be ~~(inaudible)~~ **revisit this again**. There'll be another
8 time down the road we'll need a source of revenue. And if we
9 have a cap, we'll have to come back to voters and say, "We need
10 to increase the cap." So I believe that we should remove it and
11 we'll ~~(inaudible)~~ **it will allow** Council to - for votes of the
12 people what the sales tax will be.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So do you think voter approval is
14 a necessary thing to retain or not?

15 MR. SCOTT: Absolutely, yeah.

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay.

17 ~~MALE SPEAKER~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: While we're talking
18 about this, just because I think there may be confusion. Are we
19 really talking about - I think what we're trying to get to is a
20 place where we don't have to have future Charter amendments.

1 We're saying there's a - we can raise the taxes up to two
2 percent, and if you want to go above two percent, it's just a
3 straight vote, no Charter change required. So that's a sort of
4 middle ground that I've, that I thought I was supporting.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. All right. Mark.

6 MR. CRUM: Well, I remember what Jeff said a long time
7 ago. And it was he thought to go to the voters to raise the
8 cap, then go to the voters to ask them to say, "And this is how
9 we would elect to spend that money should you raise the cap."

10 It's redundant. In talking to folks out there, I
11 think there's a fair number of people that would agree with
12 that. I don't. I feel that you need to make it as hard as you
13 can to raise taxes. And therefore, I'm not willing to eliminate
14 the cap altogether. I think it should be, but I guess it would
15 be in the code that says wherever - I don't know where you put
16 it, but where it says you don't have to go to, you know, a
17 Charter change each time that you raise the cap. That's number
18 one.

19 Number two. How the Mayor and Council want to spend
20 that money, I think they should have that flexibility. The

1 (~~inaudible~~) **voters** have said, or the people who were polled who
2 have said, "We'd like to know where." But I don't necessarily
3 feel that it's our job to tell them where. They should be
4 allowed to do that themselves and work out their own
5 methodology.

6 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So, Mark, are you essentially
7 supporting our previous recommendation we leave the cap alone
8 and simply provide a mechanism for going to the voters for any
9 increase above that?

10 MR. CRUM: Correct.

11 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. CRUM: But not having the cap as a part
13 (~~inaudible~~) remain as a part of the Charter.

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: No, that's what (~~inaudible~~)

15 MR. CRUM: No. Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Clear as mud, right? **Yes**, Joe.

17 MR. HOWELL: I agree that Charter changes need to come
18 as infrequently as possible just because they (~~inaudible~~) like
19 my mom who's my sounding board on all of this. If my mom gets
20 it, then it's pretty common, right? However -

1 MS. DORMAN: We won't tell her you said that.

2 MR. HOWELL: I have a lot of faith in ~~the~~ government,
3 and I think a lot of people in town have faith in our
4 government, and so that means that I think removing all caps
5 altogether, all voter requirements would be the easiest way to
6 give our elected officials the authority to do what we, what we
7 elect them to do. However, that being said, any increase, I
8 think we all agree that there needs to be an increase and I
9 would support any increase (inaudible)

10 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And do you think voter approval is
11 something that's necessary or an obstacle to -

12 MR. HOWELL: I think it's an obstacle. We've already
13 -I mean in my opinion, we've already elected them to, to cover
14 it, right? And so if this is what our elected officials see
15 that they need to do is ~~(inaudible)~~ **governing**, they increase the
16 tax.

17 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. Tom, you're up.

18 MR. **TOM BURKE**: I'm gonna make a comment first about
19 your question was, I think, was unfair. Is it an obstacle? I
20 think that - I don't think it's an obstacle so much as it's very

1 complicated. And to just go out and ask, you know, for voters
2 to figure out financing is not the easiest thing. So I didn't
3 think it was an obstacle.

4 But going back to my view on all this, I think Luke
5 summed it up perfectly. So, you know, I think there shouldn't
6 be caps. We elect people to make decisions. If we don't like
7 the decisions we (sic) make, we vote them out of office, or we
8 run for office ourselves.

9 And so I would suggest no cap but, but I would agree
10 if the consensus was with voter approval because I think that we
11 need to raise additional funds to deal with the structural
12 deficit. I just think that, you know, if we elect these people
13 to represent us, we should let them represent us.

14 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tannya.

15 MS. GAXIOLA: **So**, I trust the Council, but that's not
16 the same as saying I trust everybody that could possibly be
17 elected, especially in this environment (~~inaudible~~) **currently**.
18 So, and I think that there are a lot of things that we, while we
19 elect our elected officials to govern, and we trust them to do
20 that, there are a lot of things that we still ask them to come

1 check with us about. Charter changes, for example.

2 So, so I don't think that it's unfair to say that we
3 would like them to check with us when they're going to do
4 certain things like increasing taxes. That said, I think the
5 cap is ridiculously low, and we need to find a way to give the
6 City a lot more flexibility. So I would not be in favor of
7 eliminating the cap, but I would be in favor of increasing the
8 cap with consultation with the voters.

9 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Randi.

10 **MS. DORMAN:** I agree with most of what Tannya said.
11 And my first preference would be to increase the cap with voter
12 approval. But I also would be open to eliminating the cap, but
13 with voter approval.

14 If it were not already on the higher end of taxes, I'd
15 be more willing to give free rein. But given that we're already
16 at the two percent cap in most instances, I don't think it's
17 unreasonable to ask Mayor and Council to consult with the
18 voters.

19 **CHAIRWOMAN POULOS:** Okay. I can't, I can't do this in
20 my head very quickly, but I can say that removing the cap seems

1 to have a majority of people that would be in favor of that.

2 I guess the other issue that we need to look at before
3 we send these recommendations to Mayor and Council after our
4 next meeting is whether or not we would make any recommendation
5 to Mayor and Council about separating the financial items as
6 separate ballot issues, or if we want to include them as a
7 single ballot.

8 My personal feeling is that really if we go to voters
9 and say we want to remove the cap, but we'll come back and ask
10 you if we want to raise it later on, I just, I just don't get a
11 sense that our voters are gonna support that.

12 But I'm not gonna stand in the way of a recommendation
13 by this Committee by not supporting that, as one is there's
14 voter approval for a tax that they would propose. So if we want
15 to go with removing or increasing the cap, I think that's fine.
16 But in my mind, it's gonna be a hard sell to push me off the
17 need for voter approval. Jeff.

18 MR. ROGERS: You know, I, I'm flexible on that. As I
19 said before, I'm, I'm practical on this. I know we need to get
20 something passed, but, but these things have to all be separate.

1 They have to - we, we got (inaudible) **burned**. We had three
2 items that had 70% approval rating, we worked awfully hard on,
3 and we stuck one poison pill in there, and lost.

4 And so I think these things have to all be separate,
5 because I don't want one, I don't one group coming out, you
6 know, defeating the other two things that we both need, the
7 pledging of the, of tax money for bonds and the secondary tax
8 rate. I don't think I'll - they're all wonderful things, but I
9 just don't think they should go ~~on the other~~ (inaudible)
10 **together**.

11 MS. DORMAN: I agree.

12 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: I have a question.

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: John.

14 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER**: If we remove the cap, but
15 require voter approval, how does that work exactly? Does that
16 mean any tax increase, whether it's below - 'cause doesn't
17 having a two percent cap give the Council more flexibility
18 because they have the ability to move within that range below
19 two percent?

20 MS. DORMAN: Well, we're not already up to two

1 percent.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: But I think we're at two percent for
3 everything.

4 MR. RANKIN: ~~(Inaudible)~~ **We have** a couple of
5 categories in sales tax that we currently don't impose the tax.
6 So tax on advertising, for example.

7 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Right.

8 MR. RANKIN: Is one example. So that's exactly right.
9 **And In** that **instance** ~~(inaudible)~~ **if** we changed it so that you
10 take the cap out altogether and just say any increase above the
11 levels that were imposed in, you know, June 1st of 2016 would
12 require voter approval. That would mean that the Council
13 couldn't even decide to impose that two percent **tax** on
14 advertising (inaudible) But there aren't a lot of categories
15 like that.

16 ~~JOHN~~ **MR. HINDERAKER-**: And if you had a Council at
17 some point that dropped taxes, you don't need voter approval to
18 do that, would then subsequent increases be - it would be
19 subject to a vote which concerns me.

20 MR. PREZELSKI: Well, that -

1 MS DORMAN: It's a gray point.

2 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Tom?

3 MR. PREZELSKI: Sorry, Madam Chair.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: No. That's quite all right.

5 (Inaudible)

6 MR. PREZELSKI: Yeah. Actually the legislature is in
7 a similar situation to that because we, we have - there's some
8 unfortunate language that was put into the State Constitution
9 20 years ago and said that any tax increase, and the way they
10 define a tax increase was rather broad, requires a two-thirds
11 vote of the legislature.

12 So the legislature can cut taxes all they want, but
13 they can't raise that revenue ever again essentially, because
14 it's impossible to get two-thirds of the legislature to agree on
15 anything.

16 And it starts to get - because of the way it was
17 broadly defined, it starts to get really dicey when you have
18 things like, does an increase, does a fee increase constitute a
19 tax increase? And so there'll actually be these kind of
20 (inaudible) **pedantic** Jesuit seminarian arguments in, in the

1 legislature about whether or not an increase in fees should
2 cover it. Certain costs is actually a tax increase, and that
3 (inaudible) So yeah, that's exactly the sort of arguing you get
4 into when you limit things that way.

5 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes. Mark.

6 MR. CRUM: And just a little bit on history. I can
7 see why it was written the way, it was originally written is
8 (inaudible) the voters, how would we possibly need more than two
9 percent on their sales tax? Well, in an economic downturn.
10 That's where we need the money, and that's what we're faced with
11 right, right now. So I'm, historically I, I can see the reason
12 for it.

13 But what would be most helpful to me, and to see how
14 it would be written on the ballot in its various forms **as**
15 **presented** (inaudible) to the voters, inexperienced ones, because
16 obviously I, I, I'm not able to state it for myself, let alone
17 for someone else. But I am curious how it could appear on the
18 ballot (inaudible) **in its various forms** ~~just~~ in general. And is
19 that possible, Mike.

20 MR. RANKIN: It's possible. You know, I didn't want

1 to - we talked about this, the inception of the broader
2 conversation about not getting bogged down in the specific
3 language, that you're (inaudible) really to talk about the
4 concepts and the proposals and the recommendations for the Mayor
5 and Council. It's easy to start getting to, you know, word
6 smithing among a group of 15. It's hard enough to, you know,
7 **between me and the clerk.** (inaudible)

8 MR. CRUM: And I'll tell you specifically where I am.
9 And it keeps getting more and more detailed as I go along. I'm
10 not willing to eliminate the cap altogether without voter
11 approval each time. Is that where you stand?

12 MR. RANKIN: Probably not. I, I, there are different
13 examples to crib from, you know, some of the charters in other
14 cities (inaudible) **say** unless otherwise approved by the voters,
15 you know, that tax shall not exceed X. Or you could just add
16 its own sentence or two that says sales tax proposal that is
17 approved by the voters is exempt from (inaudible) and election
18 acts. I think that's probably the easiest way.

19 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Okay. We - okay, thank you.
20 We're at five minutes to 7:00. We have a Call to the Audience.

1 I don't know that we need to go over the schedule again. We did
2 agree that we needed to wrap this up at the next meeting, and
3 forward our recommendations to Mayor and Council.

4 So what I'd like to do is take your question, and then
5 I'd like to close this item for tonight with the idea that
6 somebody needs to formulate a motion that they think will pass.
7 I can give you a tally of what people said tonight if you want,
8 you know, just basically cap, no cap; voter approval, no voter
9 approval. And then we'll close this, hopefully, in the next 10
10 or 15 minutes. Tom.

11 MR. PREZELSKI: Madam Chair, you're asking me for
12 brevity, and I don't know if I can do that. But - so if once
13 you say - once you put in language like "unless otherwise
14 approved by voters", doesn't that really negate the purpose for
15 having a cap?

16 MR. RANKIN: Except that by having the cap, it, it
17 provides the authority to assess or impose a tax up to that cap
18 without having to get voter approval beforehand.

19 So you can look at it from the other side and say it's
20 actually ~~(inaudible)~~ **an enabling** provision to say. Up to two

1 percent, you can impose a tax without having voter approval.

2 Anything above that, you need voter approval.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: So that was why some people were
4 looking at increasing the cap by a half percent, or one percent
5 so that Mayor and Council would not have to go back to the
6 voters if they wanted to implement that in certain categories.
7 Okay.

8 All right. Do we need to review the schedule for the
9 next meeting, or shall we just agree that we are gonna finish
10 up? And if we have to go until 7:30 or 8 o'clock next time, we
11 will? How does that sound to everyone?

12 MS. DORMAN: And it's the 21st?

13 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: And that meeting is the 21st,
14 correct. Two weeks from now.

15 MS. DORMAN: Bring snacks?

16 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Yes. I brought flowers this time
17 because I want to give **people**, I wanted people to smell **smile** -
18 I thought it was gonna be a difficult meeting. And what I'd
19 like to ask you to do is whoever would like to take flowers
20 home, please do because I have another 30 of them in my house

1 already. So, please, take flowers home and, okay, we have a
2 Call to the Audience.

3 I do not have any new speaker cards, but we are going
4 to hold you to the same three-minute limit. And we would ask
5 again that you give us your name if - when you come up, just so
6 we know who you are. And I see Richard's hand.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Let me come up here so you can see me
8 and I'm kind of a chunky guy. I have some thoughts for you
9 ~~(inaudible)~~ **listening to you today**. First of all, I want to talk
10 about cost. I don't think the 9th Circuit is gonna be concerned
11 what this costs the City of Tucson. They're gonna make the
12 right judgment.

13 So I don't think you should ever, and yet I heard that
14 ~~(inaudible)~~ that word thrown out there a lot today. What will
15 it cost? What is the cost of democracy? The cornerstone of
16 American democracy is a process of election. What is the cost?
17 ~~(Inaudible)~~ **which should be...** I'm really, when I hear that from
18 many you, big red flag.

19 The next thing I want to share with you is these time
20 restraints. You may be making a recommendation for something

1 that will make a difference for decades, if not generations.

2 Why do you have to worry?

3 If you took this appointment, you realized what was
4 involved. Why are you limiting people to three minutes, or even
5 yourselves to one hour? Makes no sense whatsoever. Not if
6 you're trying to do the right thing, which led to lots of
7 comments of trying, trying to do the right thing.

8 Well, I have a couple of thoughts there, too. First
9 of all, it will be the voters who decide what the right thing
10 is. We can't second-guess because nobody knows. Look at this
11 last bond election that failed miserably, and it was sold as a
12 latte. It's only a latte. You can afford a latte, but it
13 failed. Very clearly, as I move around the community, people do
14 not want their taxes to go up.

15 Something else I want to share with you having to do
16 with money. And that would be, you know, there is a limit in
17 the County. Somebody said supervisors (inaudible) There is a
18 limit. I'll tell you what it is. Just give me a second, and
19 I'll give you those numbers 'cause I don't want to mislead you.

20 But there is a limit, and there must be a limit on the

1 City. The State legislature's put one on the County 'cause if
2 you don't, you're gonna find the legislature put one on the
3 City. That's what you're gonna find.

4 Well, let me tell you what that is so you know. The
5 limit for a Pima County Board of Supervisor in the County,
6 property tax cannot be more than one percent of the assessed
7 value, or a maximum of \$10 for every \$100 assessed. To leave it
8 just open will be an error.

9 To just believe that elected officials are honest and
10 trustworthy, look at the national scene. Look at schools in the
11 State of Arizona. Didn't the voters approve money every year to
12 offset inflation, and yet it wasn't given. You can't count on
13 that.

14 So I would encourage you to set limits and visit with
15 the idea, you know, that we don't have to be in a hurry. You
16 don't have to present this if you're not ready. And lastly, I
17 hope you'll go out there like you did the last Commission and
18 actually go out in the community and talk to people.

19 Stay away from the politicians because at the end of
20 day, who makes that decision will be a voter. That's what

1 you're gonna have to solve whether you like it or not. Those
2 are my comments. Thank you.

3 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Thank you. Anybody else who'd
4 like to address us?

5 MR. GLENN: My name is ~~Barney~~ **Brian** Glenn (ph.), and
6 I'm a Tucson resident, native Tucsonan. And I believe we need
7 to go all-ward elections because our current politicians, I
8 don't trust any of them. They're not doing their job.

9 Yes, they represent the entire city. But you think
10 that they're gonna just represent one area? That's not gonna be
11 their job. They're gonna represent the entire city whether
12 they're elected in the ward or not. We need to do all-ward
13 elections.

14 And taxes? I will never, and my family will never
15 vote for a tax increase. You can forget it. We are not
16 interested in that. Because why give the City money if they're
17 just gonna blow it on stupid projects. You're already \$45
18 million in debt, and you want us to pay for that mess that you
19 created? I don't think so. We're not interested at all.

20 I just think the City needs to get their act together,

1 need to clean up the garbage that they've already made, and
2 don't expect us to come and clean it up because it's something
3 they created. I didn't create this mess. They did. Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN **POULOS**: Anybody else from the audience?
5 Okay. Then I think we can call for an adjournment. Is it okay
6 with - all right. I'll probably send out another homework
7 assignment. Think about your motions because March 21st is our
8 last meeting.

9 (Meeting was adjourned.) **Meeting was adjourned at**
10 **7:05 p.m.**

1
2

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: 03/15/16

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kathleen R. Krassow", is written over a horizontal line.

KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner
M&M Typing Service

**City of Tucson, Arizona
Charter Review Committee
Meeting of March 7, 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Randolph', written over a horizontal line.

**Roger W. Randolph
City Clerk**

Date: 03/21/16