## 2020 Charter Review Ad Hoc Committee Report

Committee Members:<br>Toby Hammett Futrell, Chair<br>Philip Ramirez, Vice-Chair<br>Chad Magill<br>Oscar Martinez<br>Rick Milby<br>Aaron Munoz<br>Shirley Thornton<br>Bob White<br>John Wilson

## Introduction

- Council Appointed 9-Member Committee in May 2020
- 11 Months of Deliberation
- Considered Over 30 Potential Charter Revisions
- Presenting 6 Potential Propositions
- Submitting 4 Recommendations, Conscious of What Belongs in the Charter and What Doesn't
- Items Under Consideration were Organized by:
- Areas of Council Interest
- Areas of Administrative Interest
- Areas of Interest from Committee Members \& Citizens


## Methodology

## - Objective:

To Judiciously Recommend Charter Revisions that Consider National Best Practices and are Value Added in Both Governing, as well as Operating Our City

## - Guiding Values:

- Improving Operational Efficiency
- Advancing Public Accountability
- Respecting Our Council/Manager Form of Government


History \& Research Pros \& Cons Advisory \& Interactive Web Page
\& Costs Minority Opinions

## TIMELINE

- May - July
- July - May
- Late May
- June
- July

Council Created Charter Committee $\& \in$ Gave Direction
Committee Worked Issues \& Drafted a Preliminary Report
Preliminary Report Put on City Web Page for Public Comment Polished Report

Worked on Draft Ballot Language $\&$ Actual Text Amendments 6/23/20 Council Report Presentation

Scheduled $1^{\text {st }}$ Reading on 7/14/20 (Deadline 7/28/20)
Scheduled 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Reading on 7/21/20 (Deadline 8/11/20)
November 3, 2020
General Election, Including Charter Ballot Propositions

Let's Start with the Backdrop for the Most Complicated $\&$ Interrelated Proposition the Committee Undertook

Proposition \#1:<br>Longer Staggered Council Terms Combined with Single Member Districts

## Longer Council Terms Are Considered Almost Every Two Years, But Not Brought Forward: <br> WHY?

- $76 \%$ of Cities Nationally Have Longer than 2 Year Terms Compared to Only $33 \%$ of Texas Cities
- Texas State Constitutional Requirements for Moving Past 2 Year Terms:
- Mandatory Elections for Vacancies
- Resign to Run
- Majority Vote
- Texas State Requirements Not Duplicated in Most Other States \& Also Not Required of Other Local Elected Officials in Texas
- Majority Vote: Impact on Our 1983 Federal Court Order

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Discovery \& Discussion Leads to Recommendation \#1 } \\
& \text { On Removing Barriers to Longer Terms }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Recommendation \#1: Removing Barriers to Longer Terms

- Keeping our current mixed election system with 2-year non-staggered terms
- Exploring a State Constitutional Amendment through the City’s future legislative agendas \& Texas Municipal League to eliminate the constitutional requirements Tied to longer terms


## Fast Forward to Separate, Later Discussion of Single Member Districts

- Mitigates Impact on 1983 Federal Court Order \& Reopens Discussion on Longer Terms
- Hard Fought 5-4 Committee Decision To Create Proposition \#1 to Combine Single Member Districts with 4 -Year Staggered Terms
- Recommendation \#1 re: removing barriers to longer terms becomes a fall back if the Council decides against putting Proposition \#1 on the ballot or if voters reject Proposition \#1 at the ballot box
- Proposition \#1: Single Member Districts with Staggered 4-Year Council Terms
- Change our current mixed election system with 2-Year Non-Staggered Terms
- Move to a new election system of 8 single member districts each elected by majority vote of their district voters and our Mayor elected at large, all with staggered 4-year terms.

Summary of Public Feedback

## - Proposition \#3: Term Limits

- Establishes lifetime City Council term limits, Removing Consecutive Service and Sitting Out Period
- No person shall serve more than 8 years as Council Member, or more than 8 years as Mayor or more than 12 years in any combination
- Any time served prior to the approval of this proposition shall count towards the lifetime term limit
- This provision shall not prohibit any Council Member or Mayor from beginning or completing any term that begins in 2020 or 2021
- No Person Shall be Eligible to Run for Election to a Term if Completion of that Term Would Cause that Person to Exceed the Lifetime Term Limit

Summary of Public Feedback, Including Public Confusion Over the Committee's Proposal

# Interrelated Elements of Term Length, Staggered Terms, Term Limits \& Definition of a Term 

- A Struggle to Craft Interrelated Ballot Language and Actual Text Amendments for Propositions \#1 \& \#3 as Envisioned
- Propositions \#1 \& \#3 Do Not Stand Alone Without First Knowing the Council's \& then the Voters' Answers to the Questions Framed by Both Propositions
- Options:
- Combine Propositions \#1 \& \#3-An All or Nothing Proposition Which Limits Voter Options


## Or

- Uncouple the Term-Related Questions - Taking Them to the Voters One at a Time Sequentially


## Proposition \#2: Mayor and Council Compensation

- Double the Mayor's salary from $\$ 9,000$ to $\$ 18,000$
- Double the City Council Members' salary from \$6,000 to \$12,000
- Include an escalator every 2 years by that year's unadjusted U.S. All Items Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Urban Consumers
- 37 Years Ago a Flat Council Salary was Put in the Charter Without an Escalator \& Has Never Changed
- Council is Making Less Today than the Council Who Served in 1983
- Despite City Population growth of Over 100,000 \& Increasingly Complex Challenges
- Proposal Doesn’t Fully Keep Up with the Present Value of Salaries Set Almost 4 Decades Ago
- Escalator Doesn’t Fully Keep Up with Future Inflation
- But It's a Start
- Proposition \#4: Initiative/Referendum Signature Requirement. Clarify that signatures are required on the statements of intent to commence either initiative or referendum proceedings.
- Mirrors City's current practice
- Consistent with State's requirement
- Proposition \#5: Consistent Zoning Approval. Delete the requirement that zoning ordinances presented for Council approval require a two-third affirmative vote during the 30 days before a regular election and extending until newly elected council members take office.
- These same items require a simple majority vote any other time of the year.


## Proposition \#6: Removing a Council Member from Office

- Deletes provision that allows as few as 5 registered voters to initiate a Council action to remove a council member from office.
- Citizens have a Prescribed Recall Process in the Charter
- Requires 6 affirmative votes of other council members to remove an elected council member from office.
- Currently, Only Requires a Simple Majority Vote of Council


## Recommendations

- Previously Discussed Recommendation \#1: Removing Barriers to Longer Terms
- Recommendation \#2: Financial Transparency with IntraDepartmental Budget Transfers. Amend City Financial Policy to require intra-departmental budget transfers within the same fund to be included in the City's Quarterly Budget Report which is presented to Council every 3 months and maintained on the City's web site for public review.
- Recommendation \#3: Financial Transparency with City

Contracts. Expand the reporting of contracts under $\$ 50,000$ for greater scrutiny through a City Financial Policy Amendment. Lower the threshold of \$50,000 to include more city contracts reported and maintained in searchable format on the City website.

- Recommendation \#4: Council Staff Support. The provision of dedicated, paid staff resources to support council members is better handled as a policy issue through the annual budget process rather than through a charter requirement.

We'd Like to Recognize the Hard Work of the Your Staff Who Supported this Work: Peter Zanoni
Rebecca Huerta
Miles Risley
Lisa Aguilar
Kim Womack
With a Very Special Recognition of Norma Duran

## Questions?

