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City of San Buenaventura

CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

John Baker, Member
Cheryl Collart, Member
Barbara Evans, Member
Peter A. Goldenring, Member
Lynn Jacobs, Vice-Chair
Suz Montgomery, Member

Jerry Morris, Alternate
Ross R. Olney, Member
Dennis Orrock, Chair
Andrew Prokopow, Member
Patrick Squires, Member
Chris Stephens, Member

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2015, 4:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, 501 POLI STREET, VENTURA
SANTA CRUZ CONFERENCE ROOM

ROLL CALL

INFORMATION ITEMS

None.

FORMAL ITEMS

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the February 11, 2015 Meeting of the Charter Review Committee

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Minutes of February 11, 2015 as submitted by the City Clerk.

2. Consideration and Discussion of the Issue of Retaining or Removing Provisions Relating to the School District from the Charter

RECOMMENDATION

That the Charter Review Committee take action as it deems appropriate. However, if the Charter Review Committee determines to recommend retaining the current Charter language pertaining to the School District, the City Attorney

March 11, 2015 Charter Review Committee Agenda
recommends removing the requirement that School Board members be elected at-large.

3. **Consideration of Items Requested to be Researched on Consultants and Additions to the Charter Review Committee’s Scope**

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Charter Review Committee review and discuss the information below and take action as the Committee deems appropriate.

4. **Committee Requests for Information Relating to the Direct Election of the Mayor and Any Term-Limits Applicable Thereto**

RECOMMENDATION

Members of the Charter Review Committee may indicate the types of information that they would find useful and/or helpful in preparing for the April 8, 2015 Charter Review Committee Meeting where the topic is scheduled to be whether or not the City should have a directly elected Mayor, the term, and term-limit (if any) for the Mayor. Also included will be consideration of the Deputy Mayor’s position, term, and term-limit (if any).

5. **Committee Requests for Information Relating to the City Council Districts and Options**

RECOMMENDATION

Members of the City Charter Review Committee may indicate the types of information that they would find useful and/or helpful in determining and preparing for the May 13 and June 10, 2015 Charter Review Committee Meetings where the topic is scheduled to be whether or not the City should change its current at-large method of electing Members of the City Council to City Council Districts where candidates run only in the district they live and are voted on only by voters in that District and what other options are available.
PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT

Administrative Reports relating to this agenda are available in the City Clerk’s Office, 501 Poli Street – Room 204, Ventura, during normal business hours. Materials related to an agenda item submitted after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public review in the City Clerk’s Office.

This agenda was posted on Thursday, March 5, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. in the City Clerk’s Office and on the City Hall Public Notices Board.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at 658-4787 or the California Relay Service. Notification by Monday, March 9, 2015, by 12:00 p.m. will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

Copies of this and all Agendas of the Charter Commission are available on the City’s website at:

http://www.cityofventura.net/page/public-meetings

To be added to the interested persons list for future announcements and information regarding the Charter Review Committee. Please email charterreviewcommittee@ci.ventura.ca.us with your contact information and you will be added to the list.
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City of San Buenaventura

CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

John Baker, Member
Cheryl Collart, Member
Barbara Evans, Member
Peter A. Goldenring, Member
Lynn Jacobs, Vice-Chair
Suz Montgomery, Member
Jerry Morris, Alternate
Ross R. Olney, Member
Dennis Orrock, Chair
Andrew Prokopow, Member
Patrick Squires, Member
Chris Stephens, Member

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 11, 2015

The Charter Review Committee met in special session in the City Hall Santa Cruz Conference Room, 501 Poli Street, Ventura at 4:10 p.m.

Due to the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, Member Baker nominated Cheryl Collart to serve as Chair. The vote was as follows:


NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

ROLL CALL


Absent: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart presided.
1. Consideration of the Minutes of the January 14, 2015 Meeting of the Charter Review Committee

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Minutes of January 14, 2015 as submitted by the City Clerk.

Member Prokopow moved to approve the minutes of January 14, 2015. Member Squires seconded. The vote was as follows:


NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

2. Review Draft Charter Amendment Language on City Council Compensation

RECOMMENDATION

Discuss, revise, and approve subject to later review following the Charter Review Committee's decisions on other issues.

Member Baker moved to direct staff to amend Section 601. - Compensation, Section (a) as follows:

1) Delete the word "biannual" and replace with every two years: "The compensation for the City Council and the Mayor set forth above is subject to adjustment on a biannual basis every two years to account for increases in the cost of living."

2) Add the following language after Consumer Price Index or CPI: "The cost of living shall be measured by using the Consumer Price Index or CPI – All Urban Consumers. Area: Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County – beginning with 2016 as the base year."

3) Add the following language to the end of the paragraph: No other compensation or benefits should be included.

Member Stephens seconded. The vote was as follows:

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

Member Prokopow moved to direct staff to amend Section 601. – Compensation, Section (a) to include the following language:

The Finance Director shall bring an ordinance to the City Council to adjust the compensation for the Mayor and City Council in June of odd numbered years. Member Baker seconded. The vote was as follows:


NOES: Members Evans and Squires.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

3. **Consideration and Discussion of the Issue of Term-Limits for City Council.**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Charter Review Committee discuss and determine if it wishes to recommend that the Charter be amended to include term limits for the City Council. If the Charter Review Committee determines to recommend term limits for the City Council, staff recommends that direction be provided on the following issues:

1. What is the proper length of a term for a City Council Member? Is it two years, four years, six years, etc.?

2. Is the limit on the number of terms a lifetime ban or a waiting period? By this, if an elected official has served two terms and the term limit is two terms, are they prohibited again from serving on the City Council (lifetime ban) or are they prohibited from serving again after some period of time (waiting period)? If it is a waiting period, what should the waiting period be?
3. If someone is elected or appointed to the City Council to fill a vacancy, when does the term limit apply to service for less than a full term? Should the standard be 50% plus one day of a full term count as a full term? Should one day in office count as a full term? Does it matter if the person was elected or appointed?

DOCUMENTS

PowerPoint.

Acting Chair Collart requested a straw vote to determine if there was a majority of support on this topic, which failed.

Member Goldenring moved to continue the discussion of term limits and the pros and cons of this topic. Member Evans seconded. The vote was as follows:


NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

Member Baker moved that the Committee not recommend term limits, but the topic can be further evaluated at the time the Committee discusses District Elections. Member Olney seconded. The vote was as follows:

AYES: Members Baker, Collart, Evans, Olney, Squires, and Stephens.

NOES: Members Goldenring and Prokopow.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

4. **Consideration of Items Requested to be Researched on Consultants and Additions to the Charter Review Committee’s Scope**

RECOMMENDATION

That the Charter Review Committee continue this item to your next regularly scheduled meeting so that a complete report can be prepared.

DOCUMENTS

February 11, 2015 Charter Review Committee Minutes DRAFT
Memorandum dated February 11, 2015, from City Attorney Gregory G. Diaz.

Member Goldenring moved to continue this item to the Committee’s next regularly scheduled meeting so that a complete report can be prepared. Member Stephens seconded. The vote was as follows:


NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

5. Committee Requests for Information Relating to Whether or Not the School District Provisions Should Remain in the Charter

RECOMMENDATION

Members of the Charter Review Committee may indicate the types of information that they would find useful and/or helpful in preparing for the March 11, 2015 Charter Review Committee Meeting where the topic is scheduled to be whether the Charter provisions relating to the school district should remain in the Charter.

Member Prokopow moved to discuss this item at the next Committee meeting scheduled for March 11, 2015. Member Goldenring seconded. The vote was as follows:


NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Montgomery, Vice Chair Jacobs, and Chair Orrock.

Acting Chair Collart declared the motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.
CITY OF VENTURA

CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.: 2
Meeting Date: 3/11/2015

DATE: February 18, 2015
TO: Charter Review Committee
FROM: Gregory G. Diaz, City Attorney

SUBJECT: Consideration of Whether or Not to Retain Within the Charter Provisions Relating to the School District

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Charter Review Committee take action as it deems appropriate. However, if the Charter Review Committee determines to recommend retaining the current Charter language pertaining to the School District, the City Attorney recommends removing the requirement that School Board members be elected at-large.

DISCUSSION:

The current Charter of the City of San Buenaventura includes Article XI pertaining to the Board of Education. This Article has been interpreted to apply to the Ventura Unified School District. Article XI provides as follows:

"ARTICLE XI. - BOARD OF EDUCATION

Section 1100. - Board of Education.

The control of the Public School District of the City shall be vested in a Board of Education which shall consist of five members elected from the District at-large, provided however, that all qualified electors of the Ventura Unified School District shall have the right to vote for members of the Board of Education."
Section 1101. - Powers and Duties.

The powers and duties of the Board of Education shall be such as are prescribed by the Constitution and laws of the State of California.

Section 1102. - Eligibility.

Only qualified electors of the Ventura Unified School District shall be eligible for election to, or to hold office on the Board of Education.

Section 1103. - Nomination.

The mode of nomination of candidates for the Board of Education shall be as prescribed in Section 504 hereof except that each candidate shall be proposed by not less than five nor more than ten qualified electors of the District.

Section 1104. - Election and Term.

Each member of the Board of Education shall serve for four years from and after the first regular meeting in December following election and until a successor is elected and qualified.

At each General Municipal Election, as defined in Section 500 of this Charter members of the Board of Education shall be elected to take the places of members whose terms are about to expire, to fill a vacancy and also to fill the place of any members appointed to fill a vacancy. In the election of members of the Board of Education where full terms and one or more unexpired terms are to be filled, no distinction shall be made in nomination or voting between the full terms and the unexpired terms, but the person or persons elected by the highest number of votes shall be elected for the full term or terms and the person receiving the next highest vote shall be elected for the unexpired term or terms, as the case may be.

Section 1105. - Vacancies.

All vacancies on the Board of Education shall be filled by a majority vote of the remaining members and the person so appointed shall serve until his successor is elected at the
next succeeding General Municipal Election and qualified. In the event that three or more vacancies exist in the Board at one time, the Council shall appoint enough members to give the Board of Education three members qualified to act. Such appointees shall hold office until the next succeeding General Municipal Election and until their successors are elected and qualified.

Section 1106. - Secretary of the Board.

The Superintendent of the District shall be ex-officio Secretary and Clerk of the Board of Education."

This Article has been in the Charter since its adoption. It has been modified in non-substantive ways over the years. The City Council’s charge to the Charter Review Committee includes consideration of whether or not the provisions relating to the School District should remain in the Charter.

Legal Authority:

The California Constitution provides in Article IX, sec. 16 as follows:

"(a) It shall be competent, in all charters framed under the authority given by Section 5 of Article XI, to provide, in addition to those provisions allowable by this Constitution, and by the laws of the State for the manner in which, the times at which, and the terms for which the members of boards of education shall be elected or appointed, for their qualifications, compensation and removal, and for the number which shall constitute any one of such boards."

Survey Charter Cities:

The 11 charter cities that have been surveyed on other issues have also been surveyed for this issue by reviewing their charters to determine if these cities have provisions relating to school districts and if so, what do the provisions provide. Below is the chart indicating what the survey charter cities charters provide:
|---------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Berkeley            | Yes                                      | 1. Process to elect/remove Board President  
|                     |                                          | 2. Requires City to provide Board meeting space  
|                     |                                          | 3. Establishes quorum as 3 of 5 members |
| Carlsbad            | No                                       | Repealed in 2007                 |
| Merced              | No                                       |                                  |
| Modesto             | Yes                                      | 1. Sets number of Trustees at 7  
|                     |                                          | 2. Sets at-large elections for Trustees  
|                     |                                          | 3. Sets 30 days to appoint to fill vacancy, subject to voters petitioning to hold election  
|                     |                                          | 4. Voters in district, outside of city, deemed city voters for Charter amendments impacting district |
| Newport Beach       | No                                       |                                  |
| Pasadena            | Yes                                      | 1. Establishes nominating and general election for Trustee elections  
|                     |                                          | 2. Establishes Trustee elections by geographic districts (live in and elected from)  
|                     |                                          | 3. Establishes candidate nominating papers required to be signed by 25 registered voters in the Trustee district  
|                     |                                          | 4. Requires annual address by President of Board on goals and objectives for the year |
| Santa Barbara       | No                                       |                                  |
| Santa Clara         | No                                       |                                  |
| Santa Maria         | No                                       |                                  |
| Santa Monica        | Yes                                      | 1. Sets number of Trustees at 7  
|                     |                                          | 2. Establishes Trustee election by geographic districts (live in and elected from)  
<p>|                     |                                          | 3. Prohibits compensation to Trustees for services |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4. Vacancies filled only until next election, then election for balance of term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Requires at-large Trustee elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the event a quorum of the Board does not exist because of vacancies, City Council can appoint until a quorum exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires at-large Trustee elections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the 11 survey charter cities, staff also contacted a number of other city attorneys in charter cities to determine if any of these cities found a compelling reason to exercise the authority granted by Article IX, Section 16 of the State Constitution. There were no compelling reasons provided.

**Legal Issue:**

The only significant legal issue or concern that the City Attorney has with Article XI of the City Charter is the language in Section 1100 which mandates that the School District's Board of Education be elected “at-large.” To the extent that a legal challenge is brought under the California Voting Rights Act against the at-large election system in the School District, the City faces the potential of being included in this litigation based on the existing Charter language. Should the Charter Review Committee decide to retain Article XI, it would be the recommendation of the City Attorney that the mandate of at-large elections for School Board members be deleted from the Charter. This would leave the issue of how the School District's Board of Education is elected to the School District.

**Some Arguments for Retaining the Present Charter Language:**

1. **It is specifically authorized in the State Constitution.** The provisions in the City's Charter that relate to the School District are specifically authorized by the State Constitution and it allows the City and the City Council to exercise some degree of control over the School District. This was the opinion of a former Mayor of a larger California charter city as expressed by its former City Attorney who declined to be named. In practice, what it means is that the City and the School District must communicate and coordinate on at least those matters listed in the Charter.
2. It promotes communication and coordination between the City and the School District. As noted above, with certain requirements in the City's Charter that pertain to the School Board, the City and the District must communicate on these items. This is true; however, many charter cities without school district provisions in their charters and many general law cities have excellent relationships with the school districts that share territory. Having a provision in the Charter is not a guarantee of good communication between the City and the School District.

3. It promotes local control over schools. While the provisions in the City's Charter are locally defined, virtually all of those provisions are also available to local school districts who are not associated with a charter city.

Some Arguments Against Retaining the Present Charter Language:

1. It is Costly to the City Whenever a School District Related Provision in the Charter Needs to be Amended. The provision of the California Constitution found in Article IX, sec. 16 which authorizes the current Charter provisions pertaining to the School District also requires that any amendment to the school district provisions be submitted to the voters of the entire school district for consideration. This is why the City in its most recent charter amendment to go to even number year elections had to submit the matter to not only City voters, but to the voters of the entire school district as the timing of the City Council's elections triggered when the School District's election would be held. If the measure does not pass in the school district (which includes territory outside the City of San Buenaventura), it is not effective—even if a majority of voters in the City approve it. Consequently, each time there is a need to amend the School District provisions due to desire of the community or as a result of legislation or court decisions, the voters of the entire school district need to vote on the measure. This is costly to the City.

2. The At-Large Requirement for Voting for Members of the School Board puts the City at Risk of Legal Challenge. To the extent that a legal challenge is brought under the California Voting Rights Act against the at-large election system of electing School Board members in the School District, the City faces the potential of being included in this litigation based on the existing Charter language. The City could be included either by the attorneys representing someone suing the School District based on the existing Charter language or by the School District who may try to defend the case by point to the City as the source of the requirement for at-large voting.
3. The Current Charter Provisions are a Relic from the Days When Cities had a Role in Education. The current Charter’s language dates back to the days before the State of California took such a prominent role in public education and to when cities had a more significant role. With the virtual elimination of a municipal role in public education, retaining the provisions of the current Charter may no longer serve the City’s interests.

The School District’s Position:

On February 11, 2015, the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, and City Manager met with the President of the School Board, a Trustee, and the Superintendent to discuss a number of issues impacting both entities. The City Manager updated the School District regarding the City’s Charter and the fact that this Committee was specifically charged with analyzing whether or not the provisions of the existing Charter relating the School District should remain in the Charter. He indicated that the City would be interested to know of the District’s position on the issue and that the Charter Review Committee would be meeting on March 11, 2015 to discuss this issue. The City Manager extended an invitation for a representative of the School District to attend.

Chairman Orrock sent a letter to Ventura Unified School District’s Superintendent Dr. Trudy Tuttle Arriaga inviting her or a representative of the District to attend this meeting. A copy of Chair Orrock’s letter is attached as Exhibit “1” hereto. In addition, the staff in the City Attorney’s Office sent a copy of this report to Superintendent Tuttle Arriaga shortly after it was sent to the Committee and followed up with a telephone call to the Superintendent’s Office reiterating the invitation.

Financial Issue:

As mentioned earlier, while all of the Charter amendments will require voter approval, the California Constitution provides in Article IX, sec. 16 that where a charter city’s charter contains provisions relating to school districts and the territory of the school district extends beyond the territory of the city, that a vote of the school district’s voters must be taken to amend or repeal those provisions. This requires a separate election to be held within the territory of the school district. As such, if the Charter Review Committee recommends deleting the provisions pertaining to schools, only one more election will need to be held. If, however, the Charter Review Committee recommends retaining the language with any modifications, at least one and likely more elections will be required to be held whenever these provisions are amended or modified. The City will likely have to pay for the costs of these elections.
ATTACHMENTS:
February 18, 2015

Dr. Trudy Tuttle Arriaga  
Superintendent  
Ventura Unified School District  
255 West Stanley Avenue, Suite 100  
Ventura, California  93001

RE: Invitation to Attend Charter Review Committee’s Discussion on Whether or Not to Retain the Provisions of the Charter Regarding the Ventura Unified School District

Dear Dr. Tuttle Arriaga:

On behalf of the City of Ventura's Charter Review Committee, I wanted to extend an invitation to you and to the Ventura Unified School District to attend the Committee’s March 11, 2015 meeting. The meeting will be held at 4:00 p.m. at Ventura City Hall in the Santa Cruz Conference Room at 501 Poli Street, Ventura, California. The specific agenda item for this meeting is whether or not to retain the provisions of the existing City Charter, copy attached, which pertain to the Ventura Unified School District.

We have extended this invitation to you, or another representative of the District, to attend to provide us with the School District’s perspective on this issue. The Committee is very interested in learning the School District’s opinion so that we can make an informed recommendation to the City Council. The agenda and backup materials are generally available a week in advance of the meeting. Copies may be obtained from the City's website at: www.cityofventura.net/page/public-meetings. You may also contact the City Clerk's Office and request that the agenda materials be emailed to you. The City Clerk's Division can be reached at (805) 654-4787.

On behalf of the Charter Review Committee, we look forward to hearing from you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

DENNIS ORROCK
Chair  
Charter Review Committee

GGD/DO/as  
Enclosure  
CC: Members of the Charter Review Committee  
Gregory G. Diaz, City Attorney  
Cynthia M. Rodriguez, City Clerk

501 Poli Street • P.O. Box 99 • Ventura, California 93002

Printed on 100% post-consumer

Exhibit "1"
ARTICLE XI. - BOARD OF EDUCATION
Section 1100. - Board of education.
   The control of the Public School District of the City shall be vested in a Board of Education which shall consist of five members elected from the District at-large, provided however, that all qualified electors of the Ventura Unified School District shall have the right to vote for members of the Board of Education.

Section 1101. - Powers and duties.
   The powers and duties of the Board of Education shall be such as are prescribed by the Constitution and laws of the State of California.

Section 1102. - Eligibility.
   Only qualified electors of the Ventura Unified School District shall be eligible for election to, or to hold office on the Board of Education.

Section 1103. - Nomination.
   The mode of nomination of candidates for the Board of Education shall be as prescribed in Section 504 hereof except that each candidate shall be proposed by not less than five nor more than ten qualified electors of the District.

Section 1104. - Election and term.
   Each member of the Board of Education shall serve for four years from and after the first regular meeting in December following election and until a successor is elected and qualified.

   At each General Municipal Election, as defined in Section 500 of this Charter members of the Board of Education shall be elected to take the places of members whose terms are about to expire, to fill a vacancy and also to fill the place of any members appointed to fill a vacancy. In the election of members of the Board of Education where full terms and one or more unexpired terms are to be filled, no distinction shall be made in nomination or voting between the full terms and the unexpired terms, but the person or persons elected by the highest number of votes shall be elected for the full term or terms and the person receiving the next highest vote shall be elected for the unexpired term or terms, as the case may be.

Section 1105. - Vacancies.
   All vacancies on the Board of Education shall be filled by a majority vote of the remaining members and the person so appointed shall serve until his successor is elected at the next succeeding General Municipal Election and qualified. In the event that three or more vacancies exist in the Board at one time, the Council shall appoint enough members to give the Board of Education three members qualified to act. Such appointees shall hold office until the next succeeding General Municipal Election and until their successors are elected and qualified.

Section 1106. - Secretary of the board.
   The Superintendent of the District shall be ex-officio Secretary and Clerk of the Board of Education.
DATE: March 3, 2015

TO: Charter Review Committee

FROM: Gregory G. Diaz, City Attorney

SUBJECT: Consideration of Items Requested to be Researched on Consultants and Additions to the Charter Review Committee's Scope

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Charter Review Committee review and discuss the information below and take action as the Committee deems appropriate.

DISCUSSION:

At the Charter Review Committee's January 14, 2015 meeting, the Committee discussed two related, but separate items. The first item was whether or not the Committee wanted to request that the City Council provide a supplemental appropriation so that the Committee could retain experts and consultants to review several areas within the charge given to the Committee by the City Council. The second item was what areas beyond the current charge that the Committee wanted to request authority from the City Council to add to its charge. Staff was directed to research and bring back to the Committee some idea of the types of experts and consultants that are available for the governmental structure issues and the City Council districting issue.

Consultants:

1. Governmental Structure. Staff understands this to include the types of structure that cities, including charter cities, in California utilize to provide services. This includes the City Council/City Manager form of government where the Mayor is selected from among the City Council as well as the Mayor/City Council/City Manager form of government where the Mayor is directly elected by the people and has those powers and duties that are provided for in the Charter. Finally, staff understands this to also include the concept of a “strong” Mayor form of government where the Mayor is the chief executive of the City and there is unlikely to be a traditional City Manager.
This request initially seemed like it would be a quick and easy assignment with a number of potential consultants and experts from industry and universities throughout the State available. It has proven particularly challenging to find the right type of consultant with the background and experience to provide the Committee with solid information from which to make a decision. Staff has reached out to the following institutions to determine if faculty had the experience to be of assistance:

- Political Science, Government, or Public Policy/Public Administration undergraduate and graduate faculty at:
  - Price School of Public Affairs at the University of Southern California
  - Claremont-McKenna College (The Rose Institute)
  - California Lutheran College
  - California State University, Long Beach and Channel Islands

- Similar contacts at the University of California, both the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara campuses as well as by contacting a former colleague who worked for the Chancellor for U.C. Merced

After exploring a number of options without significant success, I was able to reach a faculty member at the University of San Francisco. The faculty member is JoAnne Speers who was the General Counsel for the League of California Cities for 17 years and was the Executive Director of the Institute for Local Government for 14 years before retiring and becoming a faculty member at U.S.F. She has both the experience professionally with working with all cities in California, has been a strong promoter of open and ethical government, and has the academic background to provide the Committee with the information you have requested. A copy of Ms. Speers' professional resume is attached at Exhibit “1” to this Administrative Report.

In discussing what the Committee's needs and objectives are with Ms. Speers, she believes she can provide you with both a written analysis of the governmental structures available to cities as well as the legal and practical impacts of both. She is also available to make a presentation on this issue to the Committee. A proposed budget for this would be $15,000 for her research and preparation with an additional $1,000 for travel and expenses for the presentation. Her hourly rate would be $300 per hour which is similar to what the City has been paying outside attorneys with her level of expertise and experience.

2. City Council Districts and Other Options. Staff understands this request to include finding consultants and/or other experts to assist you with the issue of whether or not the City should form geographic districts where candidates must live in the district and only the voters in that district are eligible to vote. The consultants and/or experts would...
be tasked with providing information on when geographic districts are mandated, what are the benefits and downsides of districts, what criteria is required to form districts, how issues such as voting trading or “district privilege” can be avoided, and what other options are available to address real or perceived issues with retaining at-large elections, as well as exploring other electoral options such as a mix of at-large and geographic districts and other remedies such as cumulative voting.

Consultants and experts in the districting process were easier to find given the recent amount of litigation in this area. There are two types of consultants and experts you should consider. The first is one that can provide the legal overview of the California Voting Rights Act along with implications under the Federal Voting Rights Act. This type of consultant would generally be an attorney with substantial experience in this area. The second type of consultant and expert you should consider is a political scientist who is also a demographer.

For the overview of both the law in this area and options that comply with the California Voting Rights Act, staff recommends that the Committee consider Christopher Skinnell of the law firm of Nielsen Merksamer, a leading firm in election law and districting issues. A copy of Mr. Skinnell’s professional profile is attached as Exhibit “2” hereto. Mr. Skinnell estimates that a presentation to the Committee on the California Voting Rights Act that includes both districts and other options would cost about $7,500 plus travel time and travel expenses. To work with a demographer and do a more complete analysis of the City of Ventura’s situation, he estimates that an additional $10,000 to $20,000 would be required. These costs do not include the costs for a demographer.

For the work of a political scientist and demographer, especially for the larger project, there are three resources that can be reviewed. The first is a company called National Demographics. Information about this company is attached as Exhibit “3” to this Administrative Report. National Demographics estimates that the cost to evaluate the situation in the City of Ventura would be $18,000.

Another demographer with substantial credibility is Q2 Data and Research. This is the company retained by the Citizens Redistricting Commission that drew the most recent legislative and congressional district lines for California. The principal of the firm is Karin MacDonald who also heads U.C. Berkeley’s Election Administration Research Center. Ms. MacDonald’s professional credentials are attached as Exhibit “4” to this Administrative Report. Staff is still awaiting an estimate from Q2 Data and Research and will provide an update if available at your meeting.

Also attached to this Administrative Report is information the City received after inquiring about this project with officials at California Lutheran University. The City was put into contact with Bob Braitman who is an instructor in the Master in Public Policy

and Administration program. Mr. Braitman served as the Executive Officer for the Ventura County Local Agency Formation Commission, a body that determines local agency formations and boundary changes. He indicates his professional experience includes directing staff that prepared the redistricting process for Ventura County on two different occasions over ten years apart. Mr. Braitman charges $200 per hour for his services. A copy of Mr. Braitman's professional qualifications is attached as Exhibit "5" hereto.

The City Attorney would like to express his appreciation to Kelly Flanders, Senior Management Analyst in the City Manager’s office for her assistance in contacting various universities and consultants.

Issues to Request Inclusion in the Committee’s Scope of Work:

At the Charter Review Committee’s meeting of January 14, 2015, the Committee voted to request that the authorization to expand the scope of the City Council’s charge to the Committee be sought from the City Council for two issues. The first issue is to revise the Charter to make it “gender neutral.” The second issue has to do with the term of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor which under the existing Charter is two years cycling in the odd numbered years with City Council elections now in the even numbered years. The Charter Review Committee’s request is to add true up the term of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor with the even year election cycle for the City Council.

Potential Item for Clarification:

Since the Committee’s discussion of what issues to request authority to add to your charge from the City Council has occurred, several members of the Committee have contacted staff regarding what is included/expected by the City Council regarding the City Council districts issue. While staff believes the charge is to make a recommendation on whether the City should switch to City Council Districts or retain to current at-large election system, some members of the Committee have viewed this issue as broader -- from actually drawing lines on the one hand to developing criteria through which the lines could be drawn if districts are recommended. The Committee may wish to ask the City Council for clarification on this issue.

Should the Committee’s Work Continue Pending the City Council’s Decision or Should it be on Hold?:

A practical issue for the Committee to consider is should staff continue to prepare for your April meeting where the scheduled issue is the direct election of the Mayor or should we put this and districting on hold pending a decision by the City Council on the funding of experts and consultants? Staff raises this issue as the earliest this matter will be on the City Council’s Agenda is April 13th and your April meeting is scheduled for
April 8th. If approved by the City Council for the consultants/experts requested, both staff and the Committee will likely be duplicating efforts to be undertaken by the consultants. Staff is not averse to preparing the materials for your April meeting; however, we are attempting to respectful of the Committee members other obligations.
JoAnne Speers
ADJUNCT PROFESSOR

JoAnne teaches Legal Issues Affecting Nonprofit Organizations, in addition to courses in USF's Public Administration program. She brings over 25 years of nonprofit and public administration experience to her teaching, having served as general counsel to the League of California Cities and chief executive of the Institute for Local Government. In addition to the nonprofit sector, she has worked for the California Legislature and the federal courts. Over the course of her career, JoAnne has written extensively on legal, ethics and management topics.

Her publications include the definitive guide for local officials and their counsel on public service ethics laws, Understanding the Basics of Public Service Ethics. She also had a bi-monthly column on public service ethics issues while at the Institute for Local Government. She is also interested in inter-sectoral collaboration, which is why she wrote "Pondering Public/Nonprofit Collaborations: What a Form 990 Says about a Nonprofit."

JoAnne is passionate about helping the public, the media, and newly elected officials understand local government. Her publications can be found in the "local government basics" section of the Institute's website. In 1999, the California Bar's Public Law Section recognized JoAnne's work with the Public Lawyer of the Year designation. The American Association for Public Administration recognized JoAnne's work through the Institute for Local Government in 2009 with its Public Integrity Award. In 2014, Hastings College of the Law designated JoAnne an affiliated scholar. JoAnne is a member of the California Bar and the American Society for Public Administration.

http://www.usfca.edu/facultydetails.aspx?id=6442494149
JoAnne Speers  
1825 Garden Highway  
Sacramento, CA 95833-9737  
Land Line: 916/646-5534; Mobile: 916/849-8163  
Home Email: jospeers@gmail.com; Work Email: jspeers@usfca.edu

---

Work Experience

**UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO**  
San Francisco, California  
1/14 - present

- **Adjunct Professor, School of Management:** Currently teaching in nonprofit administration (law of nonprofit organizations course) and public administration (leadership ethics course) programs.

**LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES**  
Sacramento, California  
4/89 - 5/14

- **Executive Director, Institute for Local Government:** Oversaw the work and provided strategic direction for the League's and California State Association of Counties' 501(c)(3) research arm, as well as a sister organization, the Cities-Counties-Schools Partnership. Supervised team of 13 as well as various independent contractors. Frequent speaker and author on good governance issues, including legal issues, transparency, public engagement, collaboration and ethics. Continued to serve on League management team.  
  1/98 - Present

- **General Counsel:** Provided in-house counsel services to non-profit association of California cities. Served on the League’s management committee. Supervised two attorneys. Unit responsibilities also included: managing annual update of the California Municipal Law Handbook; facilitating the League’s amicus brief program; planning three State Bar-certified city attorney training programs each year; and contributing to the League’s monthly magazine.  
  4/89 – 12/06

- **Assistant Director, Customer Services:** Supervised the work of the League’s then-customer services unit (15 people), which included the League’s functional departments (city managers, planning officials, etc.) and regional divisions, contract services, publications work, inquiry services, southern California office and Western City magazine.  
  4/94 - 2000
JoAnne Speers
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ORRICK, HERRINGTON AND SUTCLIFFE
Sacramento, California

- Associate: Participated in firm's general civil practice with an emphasis on litigation, government and regulatory law.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
The Honorable Milton L. Schwartz
Sacramento, California

- Law Clerk: Prepared bench memoranda for law and motion calendar; also drafted orders, supervised law student externs and junior law clerk, managed calendar and handled attorney inquiries regarding court procedures.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

- Assembly Fellow: Worked for Assembly Energy and Natural Resources Committee and north coast assembly member, with an emphasis on the public trust doctrine and utility issues. (Also worked for Assembly Office of Research during graduate school summers.)

Education

Certificate, Executive Program for Nonprofit Management
Stanford University, School of Business (2009)

Juris Doctor and Member, California Bar
University of California, Berkeley, Boalt Hall School of Law (1985)

Masters of Public Policy
University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Public Policy (1984)
Honor: Regents' Fellowship

Bachelor of Arts, Political Science
University of California, Berkeley (1980)
Honors: Department Valedictorian
Phi Beta Kappa
Graduation with Highest Honors
Honors

2014 -- Affiliated Scholar, Hastings College of the Law
2009 -- American Public Administration Association, Public Integrity Award (for ILG’s Ethics Program)
1999 -- California State Bar, Public Law Section, Public Lawyer of the Year

University Speaking Experience

Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley
Speaker (Topic: Ethics and Social Media), Ethics and Governance Program for Government of India Officials (Summer 2014)

California Agricultural Leadership Foundation, University of California, Davis, Speaker, “Governing California’s Counties and Municipalities” (Spring 2014)


Hastings College of the Law, University of California, Speaker, Seminar: The Public Lawyer’s Role in Ensuring the Integrity of Public Institutions, Topic “Promoting a Culture of Ethics” (2009)

School of Law, University of California, Berkeley
  o Local Government Law Class—Guest Lecturer, Ethics Segment (2005, 2006, 2007)
  o Public Integrity Law Class—Guest Lecturer, Beyond Ethics Laws (2009)

Writing

Legal


Ethics

• “Everyday Ethics,” bi-monthly ethics column in Western City since 2002—all of which are available at www.ca-ilg.org/EverydayEthics).


• Promoting Personal and Organizational Ethics, Institute for Local Government, 2009 (available at www.ca-ilg.org/ppoe).


Management

• “Maximizing the Chief Executive/Elected Official Relationship,” (4 papers), Institute for Local Government 2012 (available at www.ca-ilg.org/Board-Chief-Executive-Relations).

Nonprofits

CHRISTOPHER SKINNELL | MARIN COUNTY OFFICE

Contact Information

Chris Skinnell is a partner practicing law and civil litigation relating to elections, state and local initiative and referenda, redistricting and voting rights, campaign finance, tribal gaming, and general constitutional and government law matters. He advises clients and litigates on a broad range of election, government, and political law related issues. Representative matters include:

- Mr. Skinnell served as counsel to the campaign for Proposition 14—the Top Two Candidate Open Primary Act—and since its adoption by the voters in June 2010, has successfully defended the measure against four separate lawsuits seeking to block implementation of the measure, including Field v. Bowen, 196 Cal. App. 4th 346 (1st Dist. 2011), and Charnness v. Bowen, 722 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2013).


- Lopez v. Merced County, 473 F. Supp. 2d 1072 (E.D. Cal. 2007) & later unpublished opinions, defeating multiple claims under Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act & obtaining summary judgment in Merced County’s favor.


- Community Coalition Against Beverage Taxes v. City of Richmond, Case No. 3:12-cv-04545-CRB (N.D. Cal. filed Aug. 3, 2012), obtaining a preliminary injunction against enforcement of burdensome disclaimer requirements on campaign mailings. The City’s ordinance was then amended to remove the offending provisions.

Mr. Skinnell also has considerable expertise in redistricting and voting rights matters. He has advised scores of counties, cities, school districts and special districts on compliance with state and federal laws governing redistricting; has counseled many additional public entity clients regarding the requirements of the California Voting Rights Act; and has represented public entity defendants in several leading CVRA cases. He also has extensive experience obtaining preclearance from the U.S. Department of Justice under Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act.

He has also served as counsel to a number of local ballot measure committees, independent expenditure committees, and political action committees.

A graduate of Claremont McKenna College (magna cum laude) and the University of Chicago Law School, he has published articles and written extensively on voting rights and redistricting, California political demographics, campaign finance and ethics compliance, and Native American issues, and has been a guest lecturer on redistricting issues at Claremont McKenna College. While at the University of Chicago he served as Editor-in-Chief of The University of Chicago Legal Forum.

Prior to joining the firm Mr. Skinnell worked as a political consultant to several California legislative and initiative campaigns, a research associate at the Rose Institute of State and Local Government, and chairman of a successful initiative campaign in Southern California.
In 2013 and 2014, Mr. Skinnell was selected for inclusion in *Northern California Super Lawyers* – *Rising Stars*, which recognizes no more than the top 2.5 percent of lawyers. The Rising Star category recognizes attorneys who are age 40 or less, or in the practice of law 10 years or less.

Clients | Ballot Measures | Litigation

Copyright © 2010-2015 Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni LLP.

http://web.nmgovlaw.com/professionals/christopher-skinnell/
No company has met the voting rights act-related demographic needs of more local governments than NDC.

The longer you put off receiving the expert assistance you need, the more you risk unnecessary and costly legal disputes. NDC's analysis will answer your questions regarding compliance with the California and Federal Voting Rights Acts. Our analysis provides you with the informed confidence you need to safely make the right decisions for your community. And NDC's experience ensures the smooth implementation of any needed changes. Contact NDC today.

NDC and the California Voting Right ACT (CVRA)
What is the California Voting Rights Act?
Is your jurisdiction at risk?
What can you do?
CVRA lawsuits are expensive
Additional Resources

http://ndc.wpengine.com/voting-rights-act-demographic-analy
Douglas Johnson

Experience
President, National Demographics Corporation
2006 – present

Senior Analyst, National Demographics Corporation
2001 – 2006

Fellow, Rose Institute of State and Local Government
2001 – present

Project Manager and Senior Manager at three internet startup companies
1999 – 2001

U.S. Representative Stephen Horn, Legislative Director and System Manager.
1993 – 1997

Coro Foundation, Fellowship in Public Affairs.
1992 – 1993

Rose Institute for State and Local Government, Student Manager
1989 – 1992

Education
UCLA Anderson Graduate School of Management, MBA, 1999.
Claremont McKenna College, BA, 1992.

Academic Honors
- Graduated Cum Laude from Claremont McKenna College.
- Phi Beta Kappa. Philip Roland Prize for Excellence in Public Policy.

Publications
• Restoring the Competitive Edge: California’s Need for Redistricting Reform and the Likely Impact of Proposition 77. Rose Institute of State and Local Government, 2005.
• “Competitive Districts in California” Rose Institute of State and Local Government, 2005.
• Los Angeles Times Opinion Articles:
  • “Where a porn palace stood” (article on redevelopment), July 30, 2006.
  • “A Trojan horse primary for the GOP” February 25, 2007.
  • “A neighbor’s help on redistricting” June 24, 2007.

Speaker or Panelist
• National Conference of State Legislatures, Redistricting and Elections Standing Committee: 2009 Fall Forum, “The Key to Successful Redistricting.”
• National Conference of State Legislatures, Redistricting and Elections Standing Committee: 2010 Spring Forum, “Communities of Interest in Redistricting: A key to drawing 2011 plans (and for their defense).”
• National Conference of State Legislatures, Redistricting and Elections Standing Committee: 2011 Winter Forum, “Citizen Voting Age Data from a line-drawer’s viewpoint.”
• Luncheon Keynote Speaker, Santa Barbara’s Channel Cities Club, “California’s next experiment: independent, public redistricting.” January 18, 2011.
• Arizona Election Law 2010 Continuing Legal Education Conference, “Communities of interest and technology in redistricting,” sponsored by the Arizona State Bar Association, March 2010
• California’s New Independent Redistricting Commission, sponsored by the Irvine Foundation and the California Redistricting Collaborative, December 15, 2009
• Building a National Reform Movement, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2006, conference on redistricting reform hosted by the League of Women Voters, Campaign Legal Center, and The Council for Excellence in Government
• Texas Tech University, “A Symposium on Redistricting,” May, 2006

http://www.ndcresearch.com/douglas-johnson/
• California League of Cities, "Introduction to the California Voting Rights Act."
• Voices of Reform, a project of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco: multiple forums on redistricting and/or term limits, 2006 – 2007
• Classroom speaker at Pepperdine University, the University of La Verne, Pomona College and Claremont McKenna College

Racial Bloc Voting Consulting

Extensive experience with all racial bloc voting statistical methods: homogeneous precinct analysis, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression, Weighted OLS, Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SUR) and EZI ecological inference analysis.

Attorney-client privilege bars the listing of most of NDC's specific clients, but NDC has performed racial bloc voting analysis for clients of the following law firms:

• Law firm of Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello, Gross & Leoni: Compiled and analyzed data for over 120 different jurisdictions facing voting rights litigation;
• Law firm of Lozano, Smith: Performed/performing analysis of racial bloc voting in 4 separate jurisdictions.
• Law firm of Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo: Performed/performing on analysis of racial bloc voting in 3 separate jurisdictions.
• Law firm of Dooley, Herr & Pelzer
• Performed racial bloc voting analysis of 7 elections in 4 different election years. Also advised attorneys on rebuttal of plaintiff's racial bloc voting analysis.

RECENT NEWS

Supreme Court Upholds Ruling that CVRA applies to Charter Cities
On August 20, 2014, the
Read more

NDC quoted in California Voting Rights Act article
NDC President Douglas Johnson is prominently quoted in the Orange County Register's in-depth coverage of the California Voting Rights Act and the Act's impact on Orange County jurisdictions.
Read more
Karin Mac Donald, Director, Berkeley Law's Election Administration Research Center

Karin Mac Donald directs the Election Administration Research Center at Berkeley Law, as well as the Statewide Database, the redistricting database for the State of California. Her work and research centers on access to elections focusing on voting rights and representation via election administration and non-partisan, transparent districting processes. In 2012, she served as an election observer in the presidential election in Nagorno Karabagh, an unrecognized republic that broke away from the Republic of Azerbaijan. A political scientist, she worked previously as a researcher at UCDATA at UCB's Survey Research Center.

More at

Posts by Karin Mac Donald  RSS

10-31-14  Politics & Law: What's on your mind?  When a polling place is someone's garage, is a 'redesign' realistic?

10-29-14  Politics & Law: What's on your mind?  Pollworker 101: How a few crazy hats can make our democracy stronger

http://blogs.berkeley.edu/author/kmacdonald/

Exhibit "4"
February 24, 2015

Kelly Flanders
Senior Management Analyst
City Manager's Office
City of Ventura
PO Box 99
Ventura, California 93002-0099

Dear Ms. Flanders:

As a result of our discussions I am submitting information about my background and experience that the City might find to be useful in its current consideration of a charter amendment.

After being in the Ventura County Executive Office for 24 years I started a private consulting business. I am enclosing a resume of outlines the sorts of work I have been doing.

I had a number of assignments while working at the County. One of them – on two occasions ten years apart – was to provide staff for the redistricting process to determine the elective boundaries of the five County Supervisorial positions.

As you are aware from your conversation with Dr. Herbert Gooch I have also been an instructor in the California Lutheran University Master in Public Policy and Administration Program. I have taught there for 14 years. Among courses I have taught are Intergovernmental Relations, Administrative Theory, Public Budgeting and Finance and State and Urban Politics.

I also teach an occasional class for the UC Extension system (UC Davis, UCLA, UC Riverside, UCSB) regarding planning and implementing local government boundary changes in California.

My billing rate for consulting services is $200 an hour based on the actual time spent. We maintain detailed records and provide monthly statements with payment due in 30 days.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Bob Braitman

BOB BRAINTMAN
BOB BRAITMAN

Bob Braitman has 40 years of experience in California local government. He specializes in studies of the provision of public services by local agencies, fiscal analysis, local government reorganizations and jurisdictional relations.

He began his public service career in 1970 in the Ventura County Executive Office providing budget review and administrative analysis for many functions. Beginning in 1974 he also served as the Executive Officer for the Ventura Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), a public agency regulating local government boundaries and service extensions.

The consulting firm Braitman & Associates was founded in 1992 serving both public and private clients with primary emphasis on organizational changes such as city incorporations, special district formations and other local government changes.

Bob has served as Executive Officer of four LAFCOs: Ventura, Contra Costa, San Benito and Santa Barbara, and has provided consulting services for several other LAFCOs. He prepared numerous municipal service reviews, spheres of influence and SOI Updates for Fresno, Inyo, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and Ventura LAFCOs and many other local governmental studies.

He has provided consulting services for public agencies including cities and special districts and for private parties. A list of these agencies is available upon request.

Bob has analyzed and formulated recommendations for more than 1,500 boundary and governmental changes.

For several years has served on the Legislative Committee of the California Association of LAFCOs and previously served as the Executive Officer of the Association.

Bob graduated from Fresno State University with a degree in public administration. He taught in the Masters in Public Policy and Administration program at California Lutheran University (CLU) and provides intergovernmental courses for the UC Davis, UCLA, UCSB and UC Riverside Extensions.
**BOB BRAITMAN**

Partial List of Project Experience

**Local Government Boundary Changes** – As LAFCO staff or a private consultant assisted public agencies and private interests in processing numerous simple and complex city and special district creations and boundary changes.

**Municipal Service Reviews** - Prepared Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) for cities and special districts, and recommendations updating spheres of interest for cities and special districts in several counties.

**Spheres of Influence** - Prepared analyses and recommendations for the adoption or modification of various city and special district spheres of interest.

**Public Services, Resource Management and Land Use Policies** - Helped develop and implement programs to integrate countywide transportation, air and water quality and sphere of influence planning.

**City Incorporations** – As LAFCO staff, special LAFCO staff and private consultant helped manage procedures for incorporating cities in Goleta (Santa Barbara), Moorpark (Ventura), Oakhurst (Madera County), Oakley (Contra Costa), Pleasant Grove (Sutter) and Shasta Lake (Shasta).

**Comparative Municipal Tax Studies** - Compared sales, transient occupancy and property tax revenues among cities to evaluate relative reliance on these taxes to fund municipal services and the fiscal strength of cities on a per capita basis.

**Development Services Plan** - Assisted Ahmanson Land Company and Ventura County in developing a public service and financing plan for a master planned, mixed-use community.

**Reorganization of Sanitary Districts** - Prepared analysis and recommendations to consolidate the Meiners Oaks, Oak View and Ventura River Sanitary Districts, and concurrently annex the City of Ojai and transfer its sanitation facilities and responsibilities to the consolidated district.

**Reorganization of Water Services** - Prepared analyses and recommendations to reorganize water delivery services, including consolidation of four water districts in Simi Valley, concurrent detachment of territory from an existing district and the formation of a new district.
Establishment of Subsidiary Districts - Administered the establishment of subsidiary districts for water and sewer services and transferred governing authority from a county to a city.

Formation of Community Services Districts - Managed the formation of CSDs in Del Norte, Sutter and Ventura Counties, including the negotiation of complex special tax formulae to fund District services.

Transfer of Territory Between Counties - Managed the transfer of 5,900 acres of territory from Ventura County to Kern County with corresponding financial and appropriations limit adjustments and corresponding district boundary changes.

Government Options Study - Assisted the City of Ojai and a Local Government Options Committee to improve public services and controls in the Ojai Valley through a plan that would triple the incorporated population by annexing urban communities in the vicinity of the City.

Solid Waste Management - Prepared a comprehensive study of solid waste management issues and developed a reorganization of solid waste programs by creating a County Department of Solid Waste Management.

Property Tax Transfer Agreements – Negotiated numerous property tax transfer agreements between the county, cities and districts.

Resource Management Agency - Prepared the organizational analysis which led to the creation of an agency from several departments and resolved related staffing, fiscal, space, reporting and program coordination issues.

School Facilities Construction Financing - Facilitated negotiation between a city, elementary and high school districts, and landowners to finance facilities necessary to accommodate new students.

Fire Protection District Reorganizations – Evaluated and coordinated successful annexations, detachments and consolidations of several fire protection districts in Calaveras County.

Legislative Revisions – Served on task forces created by the Legislature to help rewrite the Community Services District Law and County Service Area Law.
DATE: February 18, 2015
TO: Charter Review Committee
FROM: Gregory G. Diaz, City Attorney
SUBJECT: Committee Requests for Information Relating to the Direct Election of the Mayor and Term Limits Applicable Thereto

Recommendation:

Members of the City Charter Review Committee may indicate the types of information that they would find useful and/or helpful in determining and preparing for the April 8, 2015 Charter Review Committee Meeting where the topic is scheduled to be whether or not the City should have a directly elected Mayor and the term and term-limit (if any) for the Mayor. Also included will be consideration of the Deputy Mayor’s position, term, and term-limit (if any).

DISCUSSION:

At the Committee’s First Meeting, Staff indicated we would include on every agenda the topic for the next meeting to provide Committee Members with the opportunity to request specific types of information you would find useful or helpful in addressing the next topic. This will assist staff in ensuring that the information provided is that which the Committee would find most useful and/or helpful. As such, this is the opportunity for Members of the Charter Review Committee to make such requests.
DATE: February 18, 2015
TO: Charter Review Committee
FROM: Gregory G. Diaz, City Attorney
SUBJECT: Committee Requests for Information Relating to the City Council Districts and Options

Recommendation:

Members of the City Charter Review Committee may indicate the types of information that they would find useful and/or helpful in determining and preparing for the May 13 and June 10, 2015 Charter Review Committee Meetings where the topic is scheduled to be whether or not the City should change its current at-large method of electing Members of the City Council to City Council Districts where candidates run only in the district they live and are voted on only by voters in that District and what other options are available.

DISCUSSION:

At the Committee’s First Meeting, Staff indicated we would include on every agenda the topic for the next meeting to provide Committee Members with the opportunity to request specific types of information you would find useful or helpful in addressing the next topic. Because a number of Committee Members have expressed an interest in this subject and a desire for information on it, staff in consultation with the Committee Chair felt it was appropriate to share what we are currently intending to provide the Committee and seek guidance as to any additional information you may want for your discussion of this issue. By providing this well in advance of the meeting, this will allow staff time to gather any additional information you would find helpful to your discussion and decision-making process. As such, this is the opportunity for Members of the Charter Review Committee to make such requests.

Staff is currently preparing the following information for the Committee:

- Maps:
  - Showing the City’s racial/ethnic composition based on 2010 census data

- Showing where City Council Members have lived for as far back as we can obtain data to help determine if City Council Members are concentrated in one part of the City or spread throughout the City

- **Racial/Ethnic Break Down of:**
  - Mayor and City Council Members
  - Candidates
  - Attempt to go as far back as 1975

- **Options:**
  - Retain at-large system
  - Geographic Districts
  - “Wards” – Where you must live in the district, but be elected by the voters of the entire city
  - Mix of Districts and At-Large City Council Districts
  - Cumulative Voting

- **Staff Analysis:**
  - Federal and California Voting Rights Act, what is required and is the City vulnerable to a legal challenge.

If there is information that the Committee would find helpful or useful that is not included above, it would be helpful to staff to identify this now so that it can be gathered in time for your meetings.