CITY OF TUCSON

CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON PUBLIC SERVICE AND COMPENSATION

MEETING - JUNE 23, 2021

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

- Laura Dent (Chairperson)
- Alfredo Araiza
- Patrick Burns
- Kelly Griffith
- Joy Noriega
- Claire Knipe
- Gregory Facey

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

- None

STAFF PRESENT:

-	Roger W. Randolph	City Clerk
_	Suzanne Mesich	Chief Deputy City Clerk
_	Ana Marrufo	Management Assistant
		City Clerk's Office
_	Jesus Acedo	Management Assistant
		City Clerk's Office
_	Dennis McLaughlin	City Attorney's Office
_	Jennifer Stash	City Attorney's Office

LOCATION:

Meeting held virtually/remotely via Microsoft Teams

MS. MARRUFO: Okay. So, I went ahead and started the recording. The time is 6:02.

And I will go ahead and do roll call. Fred Araiza?

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Here.

MS. MARRUFO: Patrick Burns?

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Sorry. Here.

MS. MARRUFO: Okay. Laura Dent?

6

1

2

3

4

5

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Here. 1 2 MS. MARRUFO: Greg Facey? 3 COMMISSIONER FACEY: Present. 4 MS. MARRUFO: Kelly Griffith? 5 COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: Present. MS. MARRUFO: Claire Knipe? 6 7 COMMISSIONER KNIPE: Here. 8 MS. MARRUFO: And Joy Noriega? 9 COMMISSIONER NORIEGA: Here. 10 MS. MARRUFO: Thank you, everyone. Chair Dent, we 11 have quorum. 12 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Exciting. Good evening, 13 It's great to see you all on our last meeting Looking forward to wrapping this up and moving us 14 15 forward. So, I'll be transparent in my goal and intention of closing us out by 7:00 p.m. tonight so you can all get to dinner 16 17 or whatever comes next for us in our day (audio cuts out). 18 So, with that, I will entertain a motion to approve the 19 Legal Action Report of June 16th and the Minutes of June 9th. Is 20 there a motion? 21 COMMISSIONER KNIPE: I motion. 22 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you. Is there a second? 23 COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: Second. I second. 24 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. All those in favor, say 25 aye.

(Aye responses from all Commission members.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: All those opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. Thank you so much.

So, we'll move on now to Call to the Audience. At this time, citizens may address the board with their concerns.

Citizens are asked to address the board, not a specific member.

Each citizen is limited to three minutes. I don't see anyone here from the public, but I will defer to Clerk's Staff if I'm missing something here.

MS. MARRUFO: I did not receive any requests for Call to the Audience as well.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Cool. Let us power forward then. Great. So, Item 4 is the Final Report and Recommendation. So, I dropped this document into the chat -- which is what Ana circulated I believe on Friday of last week -- which is the draft language that we've entertained. I'm going to put it one more time since Commissioner Noriega has joined since then. So, what I'd like to do is just walk us through this language -- and if folks can again continuing using their hand functions to flag any question marks or concerns -- but, hopefully, this captures the spirit of what we embraced last week.

And for the benefit of Commissioner Burns who was unable to join us last week, we did indeed move forward with a

compromised recommendation around a compensation increase of \$12,000 for both members of the Council and for Mayor, as well as a link to index future wage increases to the CPI, which is inflation; and that is also the same way that the Arizona minimum wage is now increased following the board approved minimum wage increase of 2016. So, it's -- it's nice because we're referencing something that our voters have already seen and approved.

So, with that, I will move us through the document. Is there any reflections or concerns folks have in relation to the opening language? And if Dennis is on the line, I did want to make sure that this language looked appropriate to you -- or maybe Jennifer from the Attorney's Office.

MS. STASH: Dennis, you want to talk about it?
You're muted.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm -- I'm sorry. I'm a little confused, Chair Dent. Are you talking about the report language?

CHAIRPERSON DENT: I am talking about the draft ballot language that we circulated and I also dropped a link in the chat. At the top, it basically shows what the voter is going to look at when they make the decision on the proposal that this commission is moving forward. And if you need a minute, we can come back to that as well.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I'm -- I -- I have -- I've seen the language. It's a little -- it's a little tricky because

I really haven't had time to do any drafting on this and -- and the -- it's going to be useful to have this, but I'm going to have to look at a lot of sources on my drafting. It's not like I can say, well, this looks great and -- so I -- I'm not quite sure what to tell you. So, Jen, do you have anything to add?

MS. STASH: Well, I think it's -- my understanding is it's the role of the City Attorney's Office to actually be the drafter of the ballot language; that the commission is the one who gives us the recommendation and kind of tells us what the ballot -- what the intention of the ballot initiative is and what your commission decides; and then we use that information to draft in line with your opinions. So, part of the reason why we do that is to make sure that it stays as neutral as possible and complies with the requirement -- there's certain word requirements that we're bound to, word counts kind of things.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Got it. Okay. This is helpful information. Thank you for that.

So, then, let us move forward to an area that I just feel like we have some discretion given -- the 2015, 2017, and 2019 language had a different -- kind of array of how salaries were presented; I believe Kelly brought that up at a previous meeting. So, I did want to direct folks to the box in red around how we want to illustrate what the Mayor and Council's salaries looks like. And I would just like to open the floor at this time if folks have thoughts around what is a relatable reference

point.

I -- I look to salary at an annual scale kind of more than anything, but I recognize that not everybody is going to think that way. And so I do want to make sure if folks have thoughts on this, we get a chance to (audio cuts out).

Hi, Kelly, please go ahead.

that it looks. I think people can definitely relate to an hourly wage and so I think that it's fine. Also, given that there's potentially another wage initiative going to be on the ballot, I think that it -- it's consistent and it might help voters who understand, you know, in a different way than if this other wage initiative wasn't on the ballot. So I think it makes sense; actually, I think it's brilliant.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Right. Thank you, Kelly.

I see Joy and Alfredo in the stack if you want to go right ahead.

think -- I really like the way that it's set up in that hourly chart. And I'm hoping that when it is drafted officially, we can use it as -- it says, "for committee reference only," but I think if possible, if that could be on the ballot information I think that would be really be helpful. Just a thought. I don't know if that can happen but --

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Joy.

I see Alfredo and Jennifer.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Well, I just wanted to -- I agree with both Kelly and Joy, but I think people will -- it'll be more palatable for them to see how it's broken down and it's more relatable to the -- to the voters. I don't know, maybe Jennifer would disagree with that. But it -- but it's -- it's -- it's -- if it's broken down by hours, it's something that the voters will understand more so than big vast numbers for the year. I think that's something they can't completely understand or at least relate to.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Alfredo.

Please go ahead, Jennifer.

MS. STASH: I think Dennis and I talked about this a little bit today, too, and I really align and agree with -- I understand why you have broken it down that way. The issue that I think from the City perspective that we have with it is that that's not how the Council people are paid. So, it -- there are no set hours that they're required to work.

So, one Council member -- Council member A might work 30 hours and Council member B might work 50 hours that week, but at the end of the day their paycheck is going to be the exactly the same. And we don't ask the Council members or the Mayor to account for their time like a traditional hourly employee would account for it. And, you know, they don't get -- their benefits are a little bit different, like sick leave and pay -- they're

not treated as a regular City employee, they're treated as an elected official.

So, I think the confusion, if it were to be presented from the City, is that we're paying them per hour and that is not the case. So, that would be -- I think it's a persuasive thing that you could potentially use, you know, as an individual when you're -- if -- once you're off the commission, if you're -- as an individual talking about this. But, as a published thing from the City, we have some concerns about the perception of it.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Jennifer, for that.

Yeah, we're really trying to dispel the rumor that Mayor and

Council is part-time, because we think that's part of what's been perpetuating this cycle of under-compensation.

I see Claire in the stack. Please (audio cuts out).

COMMISSIONER KNIPE: Yeah, I just wanted to ask if we would still then be able to include like the bi-weekly or monthly pay, like is that still an option? Is the hourly the only one that's kind of an issue for the City?

MS. STASH: I think you could -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Dennis -- but that's how they get paid, like they get paid, you know, whatever it is, like \$2,000 a week -- or -- or \$2,000 every two weeks or \$1,500. I don't know the exact numbers, but --

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, it is stated as a per-month salary I think.

MS. STASH: Yeah.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, it's either per month or per year. I -- I think it's per month or per year, it's paid every two weeks or something like that as you say. That is how we do it.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: I see Kelly in the stack. Please go ahead.

get paid every -- if they're salaried, the 1st and the 15th, something to that effect, at least that's been my experience as a salaried employee over decades. So, if they do -- if they do get paid twice a month, then it seems to me that then it wouldn't be a problem to break it down at least to that increment. I don't know -- I mean, I can -- I can see why there's -- why -- why there's some push back on the hourly component of it.

My concern is -- and maybe it's like too bad, so sad, but my concern is is that voters are not really -- they're going to read that and -- and that's all they're going to read really. That's all they're really going to see are those big numbers and they're not going to -- it'll be harder for them to relate to. And so we're going to continue to perpetuate this myth that -- that our public servants are making a boatload of money and not working very much.

The other thing that -- Pat I think was the one that raised this, and I didn't see it anywhere in the documents -- is

that -- having this go into effect after the next election cycle so that voters are not voting technically on I don't like this Council person or this Mayor or whatever, and so I'm going to vote no on a raise; rather -- rather, hopefully -- hopefully, putting it to them in a way that you're voting for the position, not the person. So that's just another sidebar. But if there is any way that we could find a way to get this broken down so that voters can wrap their brains around it when they read it, I strongly recommend that we do that because of the past history of these initiatives failing.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Kelly.

And I see Pat in the stack. Please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Thanks. I have my camera turned off just because I think my internet connection's a little shaky. I'm on vacation in rural West Virginia right now.

But a couple of things. If -- yeah, if we can't include the hourly breakdown -- and I understand why we can't because, you know, these folks aren't necessarily punching a clock -- it still would be nice to make some sort of a reference that says like, you know, well, this -- you know, and -- and for full-time employees they're still making less than current Arizona minimum wage and not attach any numbers to it. I don't know if that's possible, but I'm just kind of trying to bounce some other ideas off.

And, yeah, the other point that Kelly made, you know, I

-- I -- personally, I'd still like to see some sort of thing where it takes into -- where it goes into effect a little bit later. It might free up the current Council members to speak a little more freely about the work they do and how the pay is kind of tough and how -- you know, to kind of get their perspective; so they're not asking for a raise on their own behalf but really a raise for future councils. So just some thoughts of mine.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Pat.

It sounds like we're hearing that the desire would be to address the annual salary, as well as maybe full-time equivalent of X amount of hourly rate so we're not referencing that the Council works on an hourly basis, but that would be the equivalent of their salary, because I do think it's powerful to see that the Council doesn't even make (audio cuts out). So, perhaps, we can make that recommendation and then City Staff can go in to wordsmith as needed.

And in terms of the voting for future candidates as opposed to this one, we did not take a vote on that. I -- I personally feel that it's kind of hard to -- I -- I feel like it's a little bit dismissive of the current Council's work to say that, you know, this is something for a future Council as opposed to them. Because the idea behind this is hopefully nonpartisan, so like no matter who you are you can get behind the fact that like we need good quality folks in office and you're not going to get that from any background. But I definitely welcome more

thoughts. If folks want to take action on that, we can certainly entertain a motion to put that into the (audio cuts out).

And I believe Alfredo had his hand up. Oh, maybe not. I'm sorry. Dennis, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: I -- I think Dennis put it down. But I think Kelly -- Kelly and -- and Pat make a good point. And I actually had it in my notes that maybe -- even though this Council and this Mayor all -- all are working very hard, I think -- I -- I can't stress how much I think that people's perception is going to be influenced by all -- this whole thing. And if -- the perception is going to be harder to overcome than -- and, you know, as it is we're having to get over the perception of them working full-time (sic) -- perception of them working part-time, when in fact it's probably more than likely full-time.

So, I have trouble with -- yeah, as much -- I think that they should get paid as soon as possible. I think that if it's delayed somehow for maybe two years or four years, then I think that's something (audio cuts out) palatable because then the voters can say, well, at least (audio cuts out) but maybe they won't. I don't know. I -- I just have a hard time with -- with the -- these -- the perception of these people getting -- giving themselves a raise and that's not (audio cuts out) going on.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Alfredo.

And just for clarification points, my understanding is that the Mayor and Council has no input on the recommendation that we make. This recommendation goes directly to the ballot. So they can't necessarily say we're supporting of this, we're not supporting of this, it really doesn't matter. I just wanted to put that out for context. We're not having to ask them to refer anything, which also alleviates more of the pressure from our electives.

Please go ahead, Dennis.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, thank you. What you said is absolutely correct just then, that it does go straight to the ballot. They're obviously free to weigh in for or against, you know, at their -- at their discretion.

The other thing I was going to say is just to state the obvious on the hourly issue. You're free in your report to be as elaborate and as argumentative as you want about the hourly issue, it's just a matter of there may be limits on -- on how that shows up on the ballot; if that makes any sense. I'm probably stating the obvious but just wanted to say that.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Dennis.

And I see Joy and then Kelly, please go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER NORIEGA: I wanted to comment on the thought about having this start for the next Council. I personally -- you know, I do want this current Council and Mayor to get obviously adequately compensated, but I do think in terms

of optics, you know, that it would be good to start the wage increase in two years, right? I think two years is when the next election happens for the Mayor and Council. So that's what I think. Personally, I like the idea of waiting those two years just -- just because I know that we all were recommended for this commission and so -- probably by some of the people working within the Council and I just think it would be best if we waited two years.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: So, Chair Dent, and members of this commission, I would like nothing better than to recommend a \$20,000 raise effective immediately and I'd like to just do it with the stroke of a pen. I -- I -- it's shameful where we are, in my opinion.

However, I feel that from a political, strategic point of view that, unfortunately, we're going to have to take as -- as pragmatic of an approach as we can if we want to get this before the voters and passed by the voters. And, unfortunately, voters are going to -- some voters are going to look at this and they're going to say I don't like X person; therefore, they should not have a raise; therefore, I'm going to vote no. And I wish that that weren't true. But in my conversations with people, even people who are pretty tied in to policy and politics have given in to that temptation of just being upset at something that the Council has done and voting no on the -- the suggestion of -- of the commission.

So, from a pragmatic point of view, I think we're going to have to find a way to make it not be a vote for or against the current Council and Mayor, and the only way I can think of to do that, unless there's another way, is to postpone it until after the next election cycle so that people are voting for the position and not the person. And I think that also has to be stated in the report, even though I'm really concerned that voters aren't going to read the report or -- you know, I think they're going to read it and they're going to vote quickly. But, that being said, if they do read it, it needs to be stated in there somehow.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. Thank you, Kelly.

And for -- if folks have made comments and want to drop your hands, I just want to make sure I'm getting to the folks that haven't spoken to the issue yet. And I see our Clerk.

Please go ahead, Roger.

MR. RANDOLPH: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do have one concern about delaying the recommended start time for this. If you delay this for two years, that will be the election that the next commission will be reviewing salaries and making a recommendation for a ballot measure. You could very well be tying their hands and not giving them the opportunity to make an informed decision on that matter as well. So, I -- I'm not sure that this commission has the ability -- and I'll leave that up to the attorneys to provide some advice on that -- but to make a

decision that would automatically tie the hands of a future commission from using their due diligence under the Charter.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Yeah, thank you, Roger. We've had some -- I feel like mixed feedback on that. I don't know if -- around the powers of the commission for future -- I don't know if Dennis or Jennifer would like to speak to that at this point.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, it's -- it's -- I -- I share Roger's concern, but I also think the -- the Charter gives the commission the power to recommend what it would like to recommend, and it would be up to the next commission to have that as -- as the -- assuming it was voted in -- as their reality. It's -- it's a difficult thing on these delays because the Charter says every two years there will be this commission; and so it -- it creates exactly the problem that Roger's talking about.

So I'm not sure that there's a clear answer legally.

Jen can -- can disagree or agree. You -- I think you can do what you do, but you need to be aware that -- that it may well tie hands and it may also be something that other committees or commissions are going to react to or try to undo. I don't -- I don't know if that helps at all. It's a -- it's a difficult -- excuse me -- a difficult knot to untangle.

MS. STASH: I would agree. I think -- I think legally you have the ability to do it. I don't -- to my knowledge that I can see, but it is -- yeah, it's just the future

groups, so I think it's your guys' decision.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: And we understand that it's not a purely legal decision, it's also a political and pragmatic decision which is why there's a commission.

MS. STASH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Very good. Thank you.

Alfredo, do you have a comment? And then after that I'd like to go to Claire and Greg if they have reflections to add as well.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Well, it seems to me that
the past commissions have -- have made valid arrangements to give
the past City Council and Mayor a raise and they've all failed.
So why not try something different? Why not do -- why not do
something that the other committees or commissions have not done
and see what happens? Because if -- maybe -- maybe if we do give
it to them in two years, maybe that's something that the voters
will approve of. And -- but I don't -- you know, whether it's
legal or not, I mean, I don't know, but I think we should just
give it a try and we'll -- we'll -- we'll just be doing something
different that other commissioners have not done. And I don't
know why -- you know, if it has to be undone by somebody else,
then let them do it.

But I think -- we don't have much time. We've had less time than anybody else to discuss this whole thing. And so we haven't had the opportunity to kind of go out into the public and

-- because -- because, number one, of the pandemic and the -- the
-- as it's -- even though it's subsided, we don't have the luxury
of having a lot of time and the ability to go see a lot of people
to kind of get a feel for what voters want to do. And, because
of that, I think we're going to have to think out of box and we
have to do something that no one else has ever tried to do. And
-- and, you know, why not? We've had the least amount of time.
We've had the least amount of ability to go into the public and
do -- and get some input. But why not try something different?
What -- what harm can it do? But -- and, again, it could be
pretty bad, too. But I -- I think that's -- I think it's worth a
shot. It's something that -- because no one else has done it,
why can't we try it?

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Alfredo. It sounds like we've got some critical mass around this idea, so I do want to entertain a motion to move this recommendation forward.

And before we do that, I -- not to put you on the spot, Claire or Greg, I just want to make sure if you have thoughts on this, that you get a chance to weigh in. So is there anymore reflections on this?

COMMISSIONER KNIPE: Yeah, I think my only reflection would be -- so when -- I want to echo a lot of what Alfredo just said, I agree with a lot of that, especially since I know one of the things we're trying to do is actually get this passed. But I also think the other thing is that there is often

this perception that Mayor and Council do have some sort of input, even if we understand that that's not the case, even if there's language that says so, I think that it's still really a common perception; so this may be one of the ways to come back. So, I'm all for doing -- you know, postponing it for two years if that's what we agree on.

COMMISSIONER FACEY: Yeah, I would have to agree with a lot of what was put on there, especially what Kelly was saying, like if we could, you know, just stroke of a pen sign and give everyone a \$20,000 increase, I would be all for that in that capacity. But I also want to -- you know, as sobering as that, I want us to keep in mind that -- you know, that when we set this up, we don't want to tie their hands for the future commission that's coming forth. But this kind of sets a framework for them by giving that delayed process and also giving an opportunity to say, hey, this is what we've -- this is what we were able to get to pass and this is the reality of it now.

This also allows, like I said from the very first meeting, to bring in some new blood as a whole within the commission and even into the Mayor's seat potentially. At the end of the day, you know, when -- when someone feels that they're able to -- to do their job and do their service with a fair salary, that's a good thing. And I think even doing the delay process, if we go that route, that's something that we could realistically do and give that opportunity to somebody else to

serve and be able to still provide for their family at the same time.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. Thank you, Clair and Greq.

So, at this time, I'd like to entertain a motion. It sounds like -- it sounds like we've got some good interest there. Is there (audio cuts out)?

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Hello?

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Hi, is that you, Pat?

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Oh, sorry. My computer froze it. Yeah, I'll make a motion to delay the beginning of the salary increases by -- by two years if -- if they were to be approved by the voters.

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Thank you. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER NORIEGA: I second.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: I second.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Very good. Okay. So this is the final discussion -- I feel like we've had a lot of really good discussion about it already, so I -- I just feel -- I feel really sad that we would not entertain providing this Mayor and Council a raise. I think something different that we might do as a group is run a campaign. And, unfortunately, in doing that

research and just being a voter in this community, I recognize that, you know, there hasn't been that investment in educating a very sophisticated electorate, which is an off-year municipal electorate around why this is so important.

So, I -- I would say that that is our opportunity to lead and really kind of model that this isn't about who is in power now, but the structural change we want to make to the lives of all of us by having, you know strong leaders in our community. But I understand that it can be (audio cuts out) to invite that for the next group of leaders.

So we have a motion and a second. All those in favors, please say aye.

(Aye responses from all the commission members.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: All those opposed, please say nay.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. The motion carries. Thank you all.

So, to continue moving us forward, we also have on the second component of the recommendation -- this is something that came in all of the templates that Ana shared with us -- our consideration and rationale. We'll need to update the recommendation to the start date in two years for this increase. But I just want to make sure that there's nothing missing here in the consideration and rationale. This is reflective of the

conversations we had, as well as some of the proposals that have been included in past recommendations. I'm not sure if this comes before Mayor and Council or if this is produced in the voter guide, but this is just something that I saw in the materials and I thought it would be helpful for us to also include.

So is there anything missing here that folks want to add around why we're making these recommendations? It sounds like one might be the idea of the two year start delay to kind of neutralize folks' concerns around -- you know, your political idea around who this Council is. Does that sound right to folks?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Great. Is there any more that we want to add here before we move into community education?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. Okay. Well, hearing none, team of the Clerk's Office and the City Attorney's Office, I hope you have a good understanding of where this group and body is at on our recommendation and, hopefully, this material can be a helpful resource moving forward.

So, talking about community education, I would love to know from you all like how are we going to let the public know about what's going on? I don't know if folks have some initial reflections or thoughts or have already -- interest in doing some

education around this. I certainly think some media is important and do perhaps an editorial board meeting with the Arizona Daily
Star. I don't know, Alfredo, if you like know anybody there but I would love to hear thoughts on how we can start to build that education.

that -- that they haven't really gotten back into their office yet, so as far as the editorial board I think they're working from their own homes. But if you -- if you -- you can -- you can contact any one of them. And I can think of Sarah Gassen right off the top of my head as the -- as a good person to talk to.

Their -- the other editorial reporter, I have no idea who it is. He's a new person. But I think Sarah has been an advocate for the Mayor and Council to have a raise in the past based on -- in fact, I had a conversation with her about -- about the working full-time/part-time myth. And she said she couldn't find it anywhere either where they're considered part-time. So I think that's a good way to approach it. Sarah would, I think most certainly, be a good advocate for what I think we've come across and what we've agreed on so far.

I -- personally, I would feel uncomfortable to be asking her to do it. And I think that since you're -- Laura, since you're the -- the Chair, I think it might be best for -- for you to do that. But you could certainly tell her that I recommended you to be the one to talk to her.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: I'll drop your name, Alfredo. Okay. Great.

If folks also could drop in the chat if you have interest in (unintelligible) that conversation, please do. And I see Joy and Kelly.

COMMISSIONER NORIEGA: So, I don't know if this is possible, if it's too -- sorry, I'm trying to lower my hand -- if it's too modeled or weird, but I know sometimes the City, like on their Facebook and Instagram, they'll post -- you know, like the Reid Park survey they posted -- the surveys for people to take. I know I just received an email for a First Avenue survey because I live in that area. And so I don't know if that's something that we're able to sort of put out -- like the City of Tucson's Citizen Commission came up with this recommendation -- just out on the City's social media. I don't know what -- how that looks, if that's a good thing or if that's like too -- I don't know. That's just my thought is the City's social media.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: So, I have a question for Staff because I'm -- I'm a little muddled in my mind about where the boundaries are with what we can do as a commission, as a body, officially. And then what has to be done as individuals or as our respective representatives of organizations or private citizens or whatever. I don't quite know -- I feel like I'm kind of -- we're kind of in a gray area on this topic and I don't know where the lines are, so I have a question about that.

I can also reach out to Sarah Gassen and/or we could have Sarah do her own piece and just, you know, give her some background information. She would -- there's no problem she would do that. So I think that -- I agree with Alfredo that -- that that's a pretty good outlet and it may be better coming from her rather than from us. I don't know what makes the most sense optic-wise.

And then the other question -- along the lines of those boundaries, I just have a question -- yeah, there's going to be this -- possibly be another initiative on the -- for voters to vote on -- and these \$220 organizational or individual letters of support outside of the commission. Is there any legal reason why an organization can't on their own pay their money and link the two in some sort of a letter? I'm just curious. Hypothetically, if one were talking about wage increases -- if -- if -- if somebody submitted a letter, does it have to be specific to that initiative or can you blend the two?

MS. STASH: I think -- and, Roger, correct me if I'm wrong -- they get posted in each, like there's -- there would be a section in the voter pamphlet about this initiative; and then another section about the other one, right? There's no crossover in the actual voter pamphlet that goes out, right?

MR. RANDOLPH: That's correct.

MS. STASH: Okay. But a letter to the editor, you could round it all up.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: Sure. But my question is -- is then what's the line -- where are the lines? You know, I mean, usually my tendency is to talk political strategy and really try and figure out how we're going to move into a persuasive mode. But as a commissioner and as a commission, I don't know where the line is. Is there a line and what is it?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, can I address that?
CHAIRPERSON DENT: Please, yes.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Madam Chair and Kelly. So, as a commission, you are created by the Mayor and Council and you're considered to be part of the City, which means that there are limits what you can as a commission do in electioneering; that is, saying that something should be passed or not passed.

Now, you'll write a report which is free to contain whatever, you know, you want and it'll be informational. At some point the commission is going to stop being a commission because your report will be in and you'll effectively be dissolved and you'll be individual members. At that point you can do whatever you want to, with -- with just a couple of minor caveats, to -- to further this. And you can -- in promoting it, you can say, "I was a member of this commission and I'm very much in favor of this," and these are -- and -- and -- in whatever you're doing.

The things I would be careful of are getting together, having common -- I don't know whether it would be a letter signed by all five members -- where you start to look like, oh, there

still is a commission that -- that is part of the City, or speaking and saying, well, I know I speak for all the members of the committee, instead of saying I'm -- I'm -- I was a member and I'm -- I'm giving my individual views. If you stay away from those two caveats, making it look like there's still a commission and making it look like you're speaking for the whole commission, once you are an individual, you can do whatever you want on electioneering here. You can promote this as much as you want and in any way you want. I -- I don't know whether that helps answer your question. And I'm happy to answer questions about what I just said.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: Thank you. That actually was very helpful.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Yes, yes, Dennis, that is very helpful. Thank you.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: There was -- I will -- I will confess, there was a time 16 years ago when I wrote a memo which came back to haunt me, where I had said -- I hadn't said anything totally inconsistent with what I just said, but my recommendation was that individuals not actually get into the electioneering. And Mark Kimble, in 2019, wisely confronted me a little bit in a friendly way on that, and I was able to clarify that I'm much smarter now and I don't have nearly the wariness about that. So, you -- you are free, as individuals, to electioneer and to say

you were members of the committee, just do everything as an individual. And, obviously, the Clerk and I and Jen are here to answer specific questions as that goes along.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Mark Kimble does have a way of clearing things up.

MR. McLAUGHIN: Oh, yeah. It was -- it was -- it was a friendly conversation; but it was not comfortable for me, let me tell you.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Dennis.

I want to look to Suzanne in case she's got some more to share on behalf of the Clerk's Office.

MS. MESICH: Thank you. And I won't repeat what Dennis just said, but I do want to emphasize that he mentioned acting as individuals. If, at some point, you decide to get together and do basically group activities, anytime more than one of you make an expenditure by advertisements or start to take contributions -- I've got my campaign finance hat on now -- you start to -- you're acting as a political committee and would need to officially form it and file a Statement of Organization in our office. So, as individuals, fine, great, I agree with everything Dennis said, but if you start to get together, then there's a little more to it and you might need to do some reporting.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Yeah, I'm assuming that after we close the recommendation that we make, this commission no longer exists. I don't know if that's a fair statement or not,

but it feels like once our duty is done and we've made our recommendation to Council, that it should be neutralized and I would hope at that point we can resume being regular talking human beings.

I've seen Claire in the chat. I want to make sure she get a chance to (audio cuts out).

COMMISSIONER KNIPE: Yes. So, I think I actually have a clarifying question for Dennis before I get started. Kind of the one of the things on the agenda was really specifically this public education. Are we to talk to about that now to strategize what we will do post this commission on this call or is this not an appropriate time for that?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, I think that's -that's perfectly okay to do, that's an internal commission item,
so I have no problem with it. It's just a matter of don't -don't -- don't produce it immediately.

COMMISSIONER KNIPE: Okay. Thank you. Well, that's -- my kind of two suggestions would be, one, letters to the editor. We could all do those independently closer to election time. Just something to think about. And then the other one would be partnering or getting an endorsement from groups doing either similar initiatives or elected officials, like Fight For 15 is the first one that comes to mind, just reaching out to C.J. and saying like, hey, would you be interested in endorsing this, maybe throwing us on any of your

lit, anything like that. But those are my two kind of big suggestions for doing our best to get this passed.

have --

So -- but I also don't know if we have any issues with that getting on another candidate's or campaign's literature. I don't know what the campaign finance laws are. I only know how that pertains to candidates. And, typically, it's having at least two or three candidates on a piece of lit, and past that it is not considered an in-kind contribution. I don't know if that's the same for initiatives or what that looks like if the City will.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you, Claire. I agree and plus one. And I see Suzanne.

MS. MESICH: (No response.)

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Laura? Laura, I have -- I

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Oh, I'm sorry. Please go ahead, Alfredo.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Maybe there's a way to get

-- getting former Mayor Rothschild involved as well since this is
something that he may be able to put in a -- an editorial of his
own opinion about what the -- the Mayor and Council is from a
personal perspective and -- and maybe he could make some sort of
recommendation as well.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Yeah, I would agree with that, Alfredo. And maybe Pat can support us with that given his work

with the former Mayor. I also think that important due diligence on behalf of the former Mayor would be to work with business groups (audio cuts out) the Chamber has in the past supported this effort. And so I think it's going to be really important to make sure that voices from Southern Arizona Leadership and the Chamber and Greater Tucson Leadership are stepping up and saying why this is an issue (audio cuts out) and not just -- not a partisan question.

Suzanne, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

MS. MESICH: I would be happy to forward to the commission campaign finance guidelines on initiative and ballot issue campaigns if that would help, because the contribution limits and those types of things are much -- well, don't exist for this type of issue. So I'll forward those to you tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER DENT. Thank you. I do have a clarifying question around the report of the commission itself. I'm hearing references to like the report of the commission and I was not sure if that relates to the document that we developed in terms of like our rationale and our recommendation or what -- I'm assuming we get some space in the voter guide to be able to articulate our thoughts, but I want to make sure. Maybe Suzanne or Roger, you can share what the report looks like and what our role is in drafting that report, similar to the question with the legal team around are we providing language or are we providing the spirit of the recommendation (audio cuts out) from Staff. So

I -- I need some help understanding that.

MS. MESICH: I'll answer. I'm sure Roger doesn't mind. Madam Chair, the report and recommendation in the template that you drafted is printed exactly as the Final Report in the publicity pamphlet with your signatures and everything. So, any information or thoughts that you have to include in the recommendation should be included in -- in the report as you're going to finalize it.

MS. STASH: Suzanne, is it -- can you -- is it possible to share the last commission's report with them --

MS. MESICH: Mm-hmm.

MS. STASH: -- to have a template? Okay. Or just an idea to conceptualize it.

MS. MESICH: I think we've done that, but we will certainly send it again.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: Yeah, Ana -- Ana said that -- and -- and, Chair Dent, I'm sorry, Kelly speaking up -- Chair Dent, I think you're following the format perfectly.

MS. MARRUFO: I -- I just wanted to mention that we -- we do have it ready to share on the screen if you want us to. I ended up creating one for this commission. If you just want to -- if you want to just have an idea of what it's going to look like, we can share that now.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Sure. Thanks, Ana. MS. MARRUFO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: As we all are waiting, Suzanne, do we get free spot on the voter guide?

MS. MESICH: Your report and recommendation is printed free of charge.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

MS. MARRUFO: And, Jesus, do you have it up? I -- I'm still having my Wi-Fi issues here.

MR. ACEDO: Yeah, it's pulling up a little slow. There appears to be some connection issues here as well, but I'm getting there.

MS. MARRUFO: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Alfredo, do you want to share your comment while we wait?

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: No, that's okay.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Oh, great. Thank you, Jesus. And perhaps we can scroll down a little bit? Okay. Great. Yes, this is the template that we modeled off of that Ana did provide for us. So, that link in the draft hopefully can just be like an opportunity to populate some of the rationale and, of course, will need to include the recommendation that's come forward today around the -- the proposal taking action within two years when the next (audio cuts out). Thank you, Jesus. I think we can stop sharing for the time being.

Ana, I have a process question in terms of like final signature. Is that something that your team brings together

based on the materials we provide and then you circulate with us or -- I'm just cognizant of the fact that I believe this is our last meeting and --

MS. MARRUFO: Oh, since we've been meeting remotely, we've been accepting electronic signatures. So, I'll go ahead and defer to Suzanne or Roger to see if it's okay to get electronic signatures from everyone.

MS. MESICH: I would say yes. And if you want us to prepare a draft of the Final Recommendation using all the input and the document that Chair Dent created, we can do that. It will take a vote of the commission to approve the final. So, that would require either one more meeting or something to give you the opportunity to review it in its final form, make any changes or editorial remarks that you need to, and then approve it for signature.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. So we'll need to set another meeting?

MS. MESICH: Probably.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. What's your deadline, Suzanne, because I believe you have ballots to print?

MS. MESICH: We're going for July 2nd because we need to get it on the Mayor and Council agenda on the July 7th meeting; because it's the only meeting they hold in July, it -- granted it's an ministerial action that they take without any input or change to your recommendation, but that does have to

happen in July.

And then the arguments that go into the publicity pamphlet have to be filed the first Wednesday in August, which I believe is August 4th, the day after the primary election. So, we're stuck -- we're stuck to that statutory deadline for the arguments.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Understood. And when do you need the recommendation in order to provide Mayor and Council with it for their review and consideration on July 2nd?

MS. MESICH: As soon as possible. It would be delivered to them the Tuesday before their -- well, Wednesday -- so really next week, probably by Wednesday or --

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Right.

MS. MESICH: -- Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Sorry, you all. I thought we were going to be able to move this along. But I -- I understand the need to make sure everybody feels really strongly about the language.

I see our Clerk. I'm going to defer to him. Go ahead, Roger.

MR. RANDOLPH: Madam Chair, so since I believe the commission is due to terminate prior -- on July 1st, if the commission would like to continue with their Wednesday meetings, we could hold a Wednesday meeting on the 30th, make your final approval of the recommendation, and we'll deliver to Mayor and

Council the following day with materials for the July 7th 1 2 meeting. 3 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Thank you, Roger. 4 folks up for that? Ideally, I would request if we can of Staff 5 that we feel really good about the recommendation and share a 6 little bit in advance so that hopefully we can just get together, 7 make an approval and close out. But, with that, is the committee 8 comfortable with this time, 6:00 p.m., on June 30th to give the 9 final blessing for the recommendation? 10 (No audible responses.) 11 CHAIRPERSON DENT: I can't really see people's 12 faces, so I hope that's an affirmative. 13 COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Should we do a roll call? 14 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Sure. I see Joy is a yes. 15 Alfredo? 16 COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: I'm a -- I'm a yes. 17 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Kelly? 18 COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: I'm a yes. 19 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you. Claire? 20 COMMISSIONER KNIPE: Yes. 21 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Greq? 22 COMMISSIONER FACEY: Yes. 23 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you. And Pat? 24 COMMISSIONER BURNS: Yes. 25 CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Cool. We are going to

have a 15-minute meeting on June 30th. Thank you all so much for being open to that. And thank you City Staff for taking our ideas (audio cuts out).

So I see we have a couple more hands up in the chat. Joy, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER NORIEGA: I just have a question about the Mayor and Council meeting on July 7th. Are we presenting that as a commission or does the City do that?

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great question.

MR. RANDOLPH: So, Madam Chair, that will go forward to Mayor and Council as an agenda item, as they're aware that it will be a ministerial duty that they have to perform so — but there won't be any open discussion. It'll just be — the item will be announced, I will read it into the record and then there will be a vote.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Very good. Thank you to the Clerk.

Dennis, do you have your hand up or $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I do.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Oh, please go ahead.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I -- in the course of the meeting, I've looked at your ballot language and I want to briefly go back to that if I can just to -- first of all, I want to congratulate you on your good work on this. It's very well done. There is a -- well, from what I see, the

main issue -- and I do have a question that I'm going to finish with -- is there is -- there's a lot of mention at various places about the indexing. And I think you've done a very, very nice job on a lot of this language.

I'll just tell you a couple of constraints we're under:

One is in the descriptive title, we only get 50 words, so there
may have to be some -- in theory, we could move some of the
language up, you know, that you have there, if -- if that's how
we draft it, but if we moved it into the official title, most of
that is already stated I think. So, my point is simply that this
is going to look a lot like what you're seeing, with minor
variations I think. I think you've done a really nice job on it.

I do have a question, though, on the indexing. Is -is it the commission's intent that the indexing be tracking the
state minimum wage index? Is it the National Consumer Price
Index?

CHAIRPERSON DENT: The state minimum wage is linked to the National CPI, and so I -- I'd like the reference to the state because it -- I think people are going to be like a little confused around what does inflation look like and I -- I think it's important to remind folks that this is how we do it already. So, it's really the same, but the idea would be to tie it to national inflation as something that folks are familiar with.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Because I could tell you also

that -- that in drafting up the Charter provision itself, it's very likely that we're going to have an index paragraph a lot like what you see in the state statute; if that makes any sense.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Yeah, I was hoping to avoid that, Dennis, honestly. Because I'm trying to recall what the -- the language looked like, like as a voter in 2016 when we were approving that minimum wage hike, because it wasn't that full piece of statute that was shared with us. Obviously, that's much more nuanced and goes into the obligations of organizations to pay paid leave and things of that nature and it's much more abbreviated on the ballot. So, I'm just wondering in the spirit of accessibility for voters how we can mirror that as best as possible. So if there's a way to get our hands on the 2016 ballot, that'd be great just to be able to try and replicate.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I think -- I think Suzanne -- and I'll yield to Suzanne -- she may -- she's been a genius and found I think this language, so I'll let her speak.

MS. MESICH: Thank you, Dennis and Madam Chair.

Yes, I did just find it since the meeting started and I will be happy to forward it to the commission. It's the 2016 General Election publicity pamphlet for the State. And that proposition was 206 and it starts on Page 58. So, you can skip a few pages before you start reading the ballot language. It comes after the description or the initiative language and the arguments (audio cuts out) against. It's one of the last pages of that

proposition.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, Madam Chair, I'll -- I will shut up because I'm making us go beyond 7:00 o'clock. But I appreciate that input and we -- we will obviously discuss this as -- as needed.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. Thank you. Hopefully, we'll have a little time to think about it also and review as commissioners (audio cuts out). Appreciate that.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. And -- and nice job on the language.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Thank you. So, to keep us moving forward, I want to reflect back what I think I heard around community-based education. And if folks have additions to that, please use their editorial board meeting. Kelly volunteered to lead on that. If you still feel comfortable, Kelly, I think that'd be fantastic.

LTEs that Claire described, perhaps all of us could commit to getting one LTE at least from individual organizations to share into the near future. I think Claire referenced working with organizations that are also moving similar initiatives or seeking endorsements from other organizations.

And, finally, Alfredo referenced working with Mayor Rothschild. Potentially, Pat could be a point person for that, if you feel comfortable with that, Pat, in terms of also (audio cuts out) our business community, make sure they're getting in

the voter guide, which I'm hearing is -- arguments are due August 4th. Does that sound right to folks?

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Yeah, that sounds good.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Great. Oh, Ana, I'm sorry, is your hand up?

MS. MARRUFO: No, I forgot to put it down. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Alfredo, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: I have a question for Suzanne. If we -- if we do write a letter to the editor with our -- our thoughts on the -- the ballot initiative, are we supposed to refer to -- and reveal to -- in -- in our letter to the editor that we were on the commission? Because by that time --

MS. MESICH: You're --

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: -- we'll no longer be commissioners, but do we mention that we were on the commission for this initiative?

MS. MESICH: I believe Dennis and Jennifer will agree that, yes, you can reference the fact that you were a member of the commission and as an individual or as a former member of the commission, you're supporting the ballot issue.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Okay.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, you don't have to but you certainly can.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Okay. I -- I think in terms of full disclosure, it would be more appropriate as -- as a

commissioner for this particular initiative that we -- we do disclose it, because if people find out that we were on the commission and -- they're going to question, well, why didn't you mention that you were on the commission? So, in interests of -- of full disclosure, I think it would be best if we do write a letter to the editor or use this to forward our ideas about the initiative, I think we should be more forward as to our participation in the whole process.

CHAIRPERSON DENT: I agree, Alfredo, lots of credibility with the time that folks on this call have invested in this (audio cuts out).

Is there anything more that we want to think about or consider before we close out and await final language for our approval (audio cuts out)?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DENT: Okay. Great. Well, if anything comes up, we can always think about it and discuss next week as well. But, hopefully, we all have a good chunk of work to do around community (audio cuts out) so we can move this proposal forward. Thank you everyone for your time.

COMMISSIONER ARAIZA: Thank you.

MS. MESICH: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BURNS: Thanks everyone.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITH: Thank you. Bye.

MR. RANDOLPH: Thank you.

City of Tucson - Citizens' Commission on Public Service and Compensation Meeting - 6/23/20211 (The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.) 2

1

CERTIFICATE

virtual/digitally-recorded City of Tucson Citizens' Commission on

Public Service and Compensation Meeting held on June 23rd, 2021.

foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the

Transcription completed: June 28th, 2021.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the

2

3

4 5

6

7

/s/ Danielle L. Krassow
DANIELLE L. KRASSOW
Legal Transcriptionist