
Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

Commission Members Present:

Alexa Scholl, Chairperson	City Manager
Jennifer Garcia	City Manager
Nicholas Nieri-Lang	City Manager
Laura Dent	City Manager
Agustin Urquidi	City Manager
Thomas Warne	City Manager

Commission Members Absent:

Greg Facey	City Manager
------------	--------------

Staff Members Present:

Dennis McLaughlin, City Attorney's Office
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office
Jesus Acedo, City Records Manager, City Clerk's Office
Rene Figueroa, Administrative Assistant, City Clerk's Office

=====

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: March 14th, 2023, and it is 5:33 P.M.
2 And this is a meeting of the City of Tucson Citizen Commission on
3 Public Service & Compensation. Can we do roll call, please?
4 MR. FIGUEROA: Laura Dent? Absent. Greg Facey? Absent.
5 Jennifer Garcia?
6 MS. GARCIA: Here.
7 MR. FIGUEROA: Nicholas Nieri-Lang?
8 MR. NIERI-LANG: Here.
9 MR. FIGUEROA: Alexa Scholl?
10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Here.
11 MR. FIGUEROA: Agustin Urquidi?
12 MR. URQUIDI: Here.
13 MR. FIGUEROA: Thomas Warne?
14 MR. WARNE: Here.

1 MR. FIGUEROA: And Laura Dent?

2 MS. DENT: Here.

3 MR. FIGUEROA: And with that, we have a quorum.

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Excellent. Moving on to Item 2.

5 Approval of the Legal Action Report from March 9th, 2023. Do I have a
6 Motion to Approve?

7 MR. WARNE: Motion to Approve.

8 MR. URQUIDI: I second.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: We have a motion and a second. All in
10 favor say "aye".

11 (Affirmative.)

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Any opposed? Passes six-zero. Item 3
13 is Call to the Audience. Does not look like we have anyone joining us
14 this evening. So, we'll move on to Item 4. Consideration and
15 Discussion of Public Input and Survey Results.

16 First, I just want to ask Dennis, do you have any
17 constraints? Do you want us to move you up?

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, Members, I do need to be
19 somewhere ideally at 6:30.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Well, then, why don't we jump
21 down to Item 6? It's all kind of related to each other, so, we might
22 - yeah. Okay. So, I did stir the pot a little and sent you guys an
23 alternative draft just to throw it out there based on Tom and I met
24 with Council Member Santa Cruz. And just kind of hearing and meeting
25 with the Ward Offices, it was just something that we had talked about

1 with Council Member Santa Cruz, and so I just thought I'd throw it out
2 there.

3 And that's, instead of tying it to the average salary for
4 Tucson MSA, just tying it to the Board of Supervisors. So, the
5 Council would make what the Board of Supervisors make which right now
6 is seventy-six six hundred. And then the Mayor would make one and a
7 half times.

8 And so, basically, that's the ceiling. Like per the
9 Charter, that's the max that we can recommend. So, I just thought I'd
10 throw it out there. I, you know, the will of the Commission is what
11 it is and I, and I just wanted to throw it out there before we made
12 our final recommendation. Yes, Tom.

13 MR. WARNE: Madam Chair, you know, it was a result of our
14 conversation the other day, and - but also, it was something we
15 mentioned early, and we compared all the budgets. You know, we saw
16 that the budget in Phoenix is a billion six. It's a billion two one
17 now. In Tucson, the budget for the County is less, the constituency
18 in the County is less, per se, outside.

19 And then in our meeting with Council Member Santa Cruz, we
20 discussed, you know, the, the fact that the constituents and the
21 demand on the constituents within the city limits and so on, and the
22 time that's put in, and it's just, it's a different role. And it's
23 also legally, it's a different role.

24 I think Council Member Fimbres' Office as Chief of Staff,
25 Mark Kerr mentioned that the difference between the County

1 Supervisors' legal role and the role of the Mayor and Council in
2 Tucson, even though we - it's a City-Manager, it's a County-Manager
3 form of government, it's a City-Manager form of government. There is
4 a difference.

5 So, we, we early on discussed that. I have some input in
6 that, Madam Chair, whenever you want it, so, -

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Other thoughts from the group?

8 MR. URQUIDI: I have no doubt that it's, it's fair -

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

10 MR. URQUIDI: - as far as the differences between the
11 County Board of Supervisors and City Council. But you have to take
12 into consideration reality, and it goes before the voters. It goes -

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

14 MR. URQUIDI: I have to keep on reminding, -

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

16 MR. URQUIDI: - you know?

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

18 MR. URQUIDI: Not reminding. It's just my opinion.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

20 MR. URQUIDI: That it goes before the voters. So, do I
21 think it's a fair situation to be pa- -- to, as equitable, to be paid
22 as far as what the Board of Supervisors - yes, I do. But is that
23 going to translate into a realistic situation? And I think it's our
24 responsibility to submit something that's realistic, palatable -

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MR. URQUIDI: - for the voters to approve.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

3 MR. URQUIDI: And I think that we have to take that into
4 consideration.

5 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

6 MS. DENT: I would like to echo the same sentiment. I
7 would, I would prefer to have this match with the County, but I don't
8 believe that it would have the traction that we think it would.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

10 MS. GARCIA: Can I ask a clarifying question -

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

12 MS. GARCIA: - before we dive right in? In terms of the -
13 can I better understand the Mayor moving into the one and half times
14 the Board of Sups' (sic) salary. Is that because it's the ceiling -

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

16 MS. GARCIA: - in the Charter? Okay.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: That's just what I was like throwing
18 out there.

19 MS. GARCIA: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Just - yeah. 'Cause that's what would
21 match the Charter.

22 MS. GARCIA: I see. Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

24 MS. GARCIA: Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Tom.

1 MR. WARNE: Well, you know, all of us got to know each
2 other and I totally respect everyone. I, I remember co-chairing the
3 half-cent sales tax for, for (inaudible) police, which would be, you
4 would think would be pretty popular. But also roads.

5 But we, we wanted to increase a tax, a half-cent sales tax,
6 and it was very shortly after the Bond Commission voted for the
7 various bonds. And I was on the Bond Commission about 16 years and,
8 obviously, I hoped - I wished that it did pass. Would be a very
9 different environment in southern Arizona if that had passed.

10 But I know the head of the Bond Commission at the time
11 thought that, you know, we - his - I'll just say his words. He said,
12 "Tom, are you guys crazy? And you, you signed up to be Co-Chair for
13 the - with the Mayor?" And I said "yeah". I said, you know, "We
14 gotta go for it. And we gotta campaign." And he - and I said, "I
15 think we can do it," you know.

16 We did a different campaign and we all did for the Bond
17 Commission at the time. And we really were on it and we ran it hard.
18 We were very sophisticated in the campaign as far as using all the
19 modern social media and everything else, polling, how we approached
20 it. And we did get 65, 64.5% of the vote. And everybody was thinking
21 if we won, we'd get 51 and we'd all do cartwheels.

22 So, my opinion is that if we have such a good argument,
23 it's gonna not be a special election, which is always dangerous. It's
24 gonna be part of the overall election. And, you know, it's a mayoral
25 election at the time.

1 And I, I think that, you know, if we can raise - if, not
2 we, the Commission, excuse me. Gotta be legal. If a committee is
3 formed after us, and after our, our duties are up, and a, and a strong
4 Campaign Commission is formed, and money is raised, and we do it
5 properly, I just - everyone I've asked, just wished some of them lived
6 in the City and not the County. But I mentioned it, and I'll be very,
7 you know, people know. So, it's not a secret.

8 My politics is a little bit different than a lot of my
9 developing - developer peers. And that's fine, we all respect each
10 other and work hard. But I've asked a lot people that are pretty
11 conservative about this, and they - a couple of them is just - their
12 just reaction was, "They should all make \$100,000 a year," without
13 thinking.

14 And so, they really see it, and they're almost embarrassed,
15 you know, a company comes to town and, and these, these site selectors
16 in these companies, they check everybody out. They want to know what
17 the Mayor makes, they want to know the background. They want to know
18 what the Council people make. They are very thorough, and, you know,
19 \$24,000 a year. Of course, none of us agree with that. It looks
20 terrible.

21 So, I, I just think - and Lane Santa Cruz, I was shocked.
22 And she described in her own personal situation which has nothing to
23 do with what we're trying to do here which is, is very open. And I,
24 you know, totally empathized with her. But she looked me in the eye,
25 and she looked at Alexa, and she said, you know, she said, "I think we

1 should go for it. And it really means a lot to me. And if it fails,
2 that means we can change the Charter, and we can do it again, and we
3 can go for it again."

4 So, she was willing to take the hit and lose, and I just
5 throw that out. And I totally respected that. I mean I was really
6 kind of moved by it. But I just thought, "Hey, wait," you know.
7 She's really saying, "Hey, we need to get to where we need to be."

8 And I just think if the campaign's run properly, that
9 there's a great chance of winning. You never count the votes until
10 they vote, but it's just my input.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Well, Dennis, do you want to share
12 with us what you've worked on since we talked last related to kind of
13 where we seem to be headed with the average salary?

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sure.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank - thank you, Madam Chair, Members.
17 I gave you an E form, PDF, thanks to Jesus, thank you, this afternoon
18 some draft ballot language. Again, caveats, this is tentative and for
19 illustration and discussion. But I think this is pretty close to what
20 you would end up with -

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - on ballot language, you know, just
23 speaking from experience. This is on the first recommendation, I'll
24 make clear.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And on the alternative recommendation,
2 I'll just say that when I read the alternative and compare it to the
3 original, I say, "Well, this would be a piece of cake, right?"
4 Because it would be, it would actually, every - just think of
5 everything shorter -

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yup.

7 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - here. And the, the 50 words easier to,
8 to get to. And, but, but seriously, it would - it's basically gonna
9 be a simplified form of what you have here.

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, all I would say is, I think this is
12 pretty close -

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - to what you would be dealing with if you
15 went with the original recommendation, which is totally up to you. Or
16 the alternative would, would be kind of a riff on this. It'd be -

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - just come off it, and would be fairly
19 easy to do. And if you decide to change anything, we can, we can
20 obviously work with that. But you, you may not be formed as we're
21 working on it.

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: If that makes any sense.

24 MS. GARCIA: (Inaudible)

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: If there, and if there's - I'm open to,
2 you know, con- -- people telling me a different way to write it.
3 It's, it's the, it's the multiple concepts, and if there's a simpler
4 way to write, then, then great.

5 (Multiple speakers.)

6 MS. DENT: I feel like that was a little more acceptable.
7 Maybe we could because it was similar index.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: The ballot language from last time?

9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm passing you - it was, but it wasn't
10 trying to do as many concepts. It was going to a flat amount, and it
11 was saying it's gonna be indexed for inflation. It's - and you're -
12 I'm, I'm, I'm the first to tell you if there's ways to simplify, I'm
13 open to it. And I'm not saying this is in any way like, "Oh,
14 perfect," and, "Look what a good boy am I."

15 But that, it's the, the doing the statistical average of
16 the salary that is - that's the additional description. So, but if
17 the "yes" can be written more simply, then I'm very open to it. But I
18 think for the voters to know what they're voting on, you're gonna have
19 to have those concepts in there.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

21 MS. DENT: Right.

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: That's - so, I'll shut up and happy to
23 answer questions or it's - yeah.

24 MS. DENT: And that's been my concern, too, is - it is very
25 intricate. And there's, it, it just feels like there's way too many

1 moving parts in the suggestion. And, and I do like the simpler
2 version of your alternative -

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

4 MS. DENT: - recommendation. I just worry about the
5 opposed salaries.

6 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. I am (inaudible) You know, it's just
7 reality. If we want consideration that we want something realistic we
8 approved, that it's, it's really better - we're better off with the
9 first also.

10 MR. WARNE: I just - Madam Chair.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

12 MR. WARNE: I just respectfully disagree because I think
13 there's a great argument, per se, the fact that we have the precedent
14 of the, of the Supervisors' salary, and we have the precedent
15 (inaudible) thinking about the campaign. You know, we have the budget
16 precedent, we have the precedent of the Supervisors' salary, and if
17 this can be simplified.

18 And then there's another thought that, you know, maybe
19 there's discussion and the way this was written, and I'm just really
20 glad that the Chair gave us comparison after our meeting yesterday.

21 You know, the one thing that does scare me, you know,
22 Agustin, and Jennifer, is - well, no. It doesn't scare me because it
23 doesn't mention it. It just mentions what the Mayor would make. The
24 only thing on the recommendation, I would, I would switch fiscal year
25 in July 1, 2024. So, but that's just a matter of semantics.

1 But my, my point is, I think that since it's there, and if
2 it's simple and then we - the campaign hammers home that it's already
3 a precedent, it's already there and nothing's happened since 1997,
4 right? Nine. Excuse me. I was, I was thinking of the Final Four
5 in '97.

6 But if we came back, I feel that, you know, the simplified
7 that, you know, we could - we have a great, great chance, I mean. The
8 last three issues that we've gone out with, the bonds for the half-
9 cent sales tax increase and then police, fire, and roads. And then we
10 went out again. The second election which didn't get as many votes.

11 So, Ward 5 and, and Ward, Ward 1 were terrific as far as
12 getting huge plurality. But we didn't do as well as we did on the
13 police, fire and roads. We got 55 or 56%.

14 And then this last time continuing the half-cent sales tax,
15 and of course, neighborhood roads are important, we got almost 75%.
16 We knocked out of the, out of the ball park.

17 And so, you know, I think that it's still about how the
18 election's run, how the campaign's run, and we're dealing with only
19 people in the City, and if we can just convince them, you know.
20 That's my input.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes. Yes.

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, Members. I just want to say
23 one thing and, and that is, this - which of these you pick is
24 absolutely up to you. I have no position on that. I will tell you

1 one thing from experience, and it relates to what Laura was just
2 talking about. This is very complicated in how it's written.

3 My experience in writing these, 'cause I've written a lot
4 of these ballot provisions, is, and I'm - this is not in any way about
5 this individually. The more complicated the provisions that you
6 present the voters with, the more they are likely to say, "Somebody's
7 trying to put something over on me," or something like that.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: "And I'm not voting for this." Simpler is
10 better. And here, I think the dilemma is what's simpler maybe is more
11 - what's more complicated may be more politically feasible to pass.

12 That's, again, up to you, but the simpler, even though it's
13 maybe more difficult to argue for, also may be simpler for the voters
14 to understand, if that makes any sense.

15 So, I just throw that out there from prior experience.
16 Nothing to do with this specifically, and no position on which one
17 you wanted to do.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Nico, do you have any thoughts?

19 MR. NIERI-LANG: I, I was just thinking - that's what I was
20 kind of thinking exactly is they both kind of have their pros and
21 cons, I guess. I appreciated hearing what you guys learned from Vice-
22 Mayor Santa Cruz because that was, I mean, sort of the same thing.

23 Kind of inspiring to hear, but also I sort of share the same
24 concerns as a few others that just - I want to make sure that we are

1 proposing something that gets passed. And so, I do worry about this
2 one that ties it to the Board of Supervisors in that sense.

3 MS. DENT: I would prefer it to be a lot simpler.

4 MS. GARCIA: This, this language I feel very strongly, like
5 similarly to what you - like this is just not a starter. Like I have
6 been talking about this for weeks. And it would take me multiple
7 reads to feel like, "I know what this is."

8 And we just don't have that kind of luxury with the voters.
9 So, this to me doesn't feel like a good idea, generally speaking.

10 MR. WARNE: We just hope the voters show up.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: This doesn't feel like a good idea the
12 way it's written or going with that recommendation?

13 MS. DENT: Well, I mean, I don't know how much luxury we
14 have to like wordsmith something. But just if this is the, if this is
15 the package in which the recommendation moves forward, this doesn't
16 feel like (inaudible)

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm open to -

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - people inputting. Absolutely.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: But I, I think it is - there are
21 several pieces that are going to have to be in there in some capacity.

22 So, the "yes" vote shall - is gonna be pretty long, even if
23 we try to make it more readable to, you know, the average person who
24 doesn't know what the Bureau of Economic Analysis is, or the Tucson
25 MSA, or -

1 MR. URQUIDI: So, you know, there's legal consideration.
2 So, we have to defer to you to get the legal language in there. So,
3 like Laura said, I don't know how much leeway we have in changing it.
4 So, that's gonna be the parameters that we're working with.

5 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, Members. Exactly. It's -
6 there's, there's some play there, but the concepts, I think, have to
7 be in there.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And I don't, I don't like how complicated
10 it has to be in language -

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - either, but -

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

14 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible) this experience once where it went
15 to the Supreme Court of Arizona. It's when the City asked me to
16 represent them, if you will, on the - with the high-rise dorms. And
17 so, they - the high-rise dorms were passed by Mayor and Council after
18 it had several votes, all the majority. Most of them seven-oh, except
19 for a couple.

20 Then, the neighborhoods came and they, they went ahead and
21 they protested and got all these signatures. So, think it would be
22 similar to a ballot. And the sig- -- and the way they - what they
23 did, and what they left out, they, then, you know, it went to the -
24 they challenged it, of course.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MR. WARNE: They had 30 days to do that. They did it. And
2 it went to Superior Court, and got voted down. Went to the Appellate
3 Court, Judges voted it down. And then it went to the Supreme Court of
4 Arizona, and it got voted down. Not, not the zoning, but the appeal.

5 And it was all in the basic, one of the basic reasons for
6 that was the language. And all three courts just voted it down. So,
7 you can see why it's so important.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right. So, Dennis, I have a couple
9 hypotheticals. I have been concerned with the, the way it's currently
10 written. You know, I was not able to find the table that was
11 referenced. And then I did find another document.

12 But I am concerned like if those aren't regularly updated,
13 or if somehow that's like the Bureau of Labor statistics no longer
14 publishes that specific piece of data that we need. Like what would
15 happen in that situation?

16 And then two, on the flip side of the other recommendation,
17 it, you know, it mentions the state statute related to County
18 Supervisor salaries.

19 If something were to happen and that, that statute went
20 away, what would the consequences be? Like of basically tying our
21 recommendations to some outside source.

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Uh-huh. So, as to your first question,
23 actually if you look at the highlighting in the middle of the official
24 title, I tried to cover that by saying "the most recent".

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And I frankly don't know exactly how often
2 this table was updated either.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Somebody with more experience as a labor
5 economist could, could tell us that, but, but not me. So, that, that
6 is a concern but I do try to just say "the most recent", which -

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - I think would cover it.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

10 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Then on the statute, that's a really
11 interesting one, because that is your ceiling, basically.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Is, is equal to 1.5. If the statute goes
14 away, I guess you simply lose your ceiling. You, you don't have that
15 ceiling anymore.

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right.

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: But that's not, at the time you - the
18 voters voted, there was the ceiling.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: It's not like you were doing anything.
21 It's not like that's your fault that it goes away. So, I think to try
22 - I'm trying to answer your question. You, you simply would, would
23 not have that ceiling anymore. But it's not gonna make it somehow
24 invalid.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. There just would have to be
2 some legal process to figure out what then - 'cause the way it's, the
3 way that I have the, the alternative recommendation drafted is that
4 Mayor and Council's salaries would be adjusted in accordance with the
5 salary adjustments in that statute because in 2025, I think they'll
6 get a raise to 96,000.

7 So, if something happens and like that statute goes away
8 and there's some other reference point that's used for Supervisors'
9 salaries, how would then the Mayor and Council's salaries be adjusted?
10 Would they no longer be adjusted because that statute doesn't exist?

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: This is on the alternative?

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. I'm not sure how you would adjust -

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - them if that statute went away. I don't
16 have a sense that that statute is going anywhere.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I don't think so either, but I feel
18 like nowadays, you just never know.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: But it's a good question. And, -

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

21 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - and I think the short answer is, if that
22 somehow, if we hypothesize that was repealed, there - you, you really
23 would have no basis to -

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - figure it out. There'd have to be some
2 sort of amendment to do that.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Well, luckily, I guess, this
4 Commission, by Charter, has to come together every two years.

5 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, if something happened, there would
7 be a Commission coming together relatively -

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - shortly. And they could -

10 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. (Inaudible)

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: But maybe they would be asked - they
12 would be tasked with -

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - figuring out something.

15 MS. DENT: I just wanted to make sure I'm clear. So, the
16 Board of Supervisors' statute is - or Board of Supervisors' salaries
17 is set by state statute that already has like a, like an escalation in
18 place into the future, or -

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. There's - well, the, the - when
20 I looked it up, it has one escalation. So, I think until the end of
21 2024, they'll make seventy-six six.

22 And then in '25, they'll automatically make ninety-six
23 seven, or something like that. So, the way I have it contemplated in
24 the alternative recommendation is it would adjust with those salaries,
25 yeah.

1 MS. DENT: And so that's, that's just like the foresight of
2 the lawmakers to say, "In this year, -"

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

4 MS. DENT: "- it'll go up, or it's not like a formula, per
5 se, that (inaudible)"

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I don't think so.

7 MS. DENT: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

9 MR. WARNE: It was 75, 76, way, way back. I mean I can
10 remember Supervisor Eckstrom (ph.), and others, and their salary was
11 75 - 75,000 16 years ago, you know. So, it's kind of not - it's
12 almost been like the Mayor and Council where it hasn't changed for all
13 these years.

14 MS. DENT: Got it. Okay.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair?

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: A question for you since you're looked at
18 it and I haven't. On the statute, I think what you're saying is it's
19 not indexed. It's not automatically indexed. It's up to legislative
20 action periodically.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Yeah. So, basically, it has
22 for, for each county different positions. So, Attorney, Assessor,
23 Recorder, all the, all the elected officials for the County has an
24 annual salary. And then through the end of '24, they'll make seventy-
25 six six. And then beginning January of 2025, it'll go 96.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN (Inaudible). Right. Got it. As you say,
2 a lot like our situation.

3 MR. WARNE: Right.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: One other question, and this is, this is -
5 I, I throw it out there. I sort of asked this question last week, but
6 I wanted to ask it in a slightly different way.

7 Do you know if this table that's the av- -- what I call the
8 average Tucson salary, is that already adjusting for inflation? Like
9 is that incorporating?

10 'Cause I know you said last week, you wanted both of these.
11 And I have it written that both are in there. The adjustment for
12 inflation based on cost of living. But is it in then nature of that
13 average salary that they're already somewhat doing that?

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I -

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: No? Not even implicit. I, I, I'm just
16 asking (inaudible)

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Well, it could be. I mean, I guess it
18 could be, 'cause basically what it says is as the summary presents a
19 sampling of economic information for the area, supplemental data are
20 provided for regions in the nation.

21 In the nation, all data are not season- -- seasonally
22 adjusted and some may be subject, subject to revision. So, this
23 specific document was updated on the 10th of February, and represents
24 average weekly wages for all industries for the second quarter of
25 2022.

1 MR. WARNE: Madam Chair?

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

3 MR. WARNE: I believe another way to look at it is that if
4 we went into a severe recession, or almost a depression, and that wage
5 went from roughly 57,000, whatever it is, down to 42,000, the, the
6 economic analysis, and we're in the San Francisco region, we're in the
7 west region, the Fed would come out and say, "Okay. The salary's
8 42,000," and go down.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

10 MR. WARNE: So, it's not - it only goes - if salaries go up
11 because of inflation, it's, it's a result of that, but it's not
12 indexed.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Okay.

14 MR. WARNE: Yeah. It's different.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm, I'm just - my - to, to get my concern
16 out there, and it's, it's, again, totally up to you. Is someone going
17 to argue against you that your - it's already indexed to some extent
18 through what employers do.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And then you're double-dipping on the
21 indexing through the -

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - cost of living adjustment. Just, just
24 asking. I, I'm not a labor economist and I don't know how it's

1 calculated. So, it's - but I raise that as an issue that, that
2 opponents could use.

3 MS. DENT: I have a question, Dennis, and I want to be
4 mindful of your time. If we did move into this alternative language,
5 do you believe that the language could be as simple as a "yes" vote
6 shall have the effect of tying Mayor and Council's salaries to the
7 Pima County Board of Supervisors?

8 MR. WARNE: Just stated above.

9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Probably in the descriptive title, in
10 terms of the official and the "yes" vote, -

11 MS. DENT: (Inaudible)

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - I might want it to be a little more
13 complicated.

14 MS. DENT: Yes. That makes total sense. I'm just, -

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: But, but -

16 MS. DENT: I'm, I'm really kind of honing in on the, -

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah.

18 MS. DENT: - what the vote is.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: That, that could be, I think, simplified.

20 MS. DENT: (Inaudible)

21 MR. URQUIDI: Is the voter going to see amounts in, in
22 terms of, okay, the Mayor and Council are making this amount, like it
23 says here, for the first proposal. And if it's tied into the Board of
24 Supervisors' salaries, are they going to see the, the, the actual
25 increase, or is it just going to say it's going to be tied into the

1 Supervisors? Are they gonna see the amounts because they're - if they
2 see the amounts that they're going to see, you know, it's - the, the
3 Council's going to increase from 24,000 to 76,000. So, they're,
4 they're going, they're going to see that.

5 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm asking you. Is that - so, I'm sorry.
6 I'm acknowledging. Is that, is that your question? That -

7 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah, that's the que- -- that's the question.

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And, and so, typical lawyer. I'm gonna
9 ask you a question back. Do you want them to see that amount, or do
10 you not want them to see that amount?

11 MR. URQUIDI: I personally am into transparency.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right.

13 MR. URQUIDI: So, I would like the voters to see what, you
14 know, because otherwise, I mean that's not - you're not telling them
15 what the increase is. They're not gonna know. A lot of them -

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sure.

17 MR. URQUIDI: - aren't gonna know.

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, I think the way it could be handled is
19 that in the choice is yours, there could be that information. And one
20 way for you to tie that in would be to have that as part of your
21 recommendation, not to create more issues but to say that the choice
22 is yours ought to give those amounts based on the sources.

23 So, whether or not you did, we could probably do that if
24 somebody said, "You know. The choice is yours ought to have those
25 amounts in there." But that would be a direct tie. I'm just, just -

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I, hear what you're saying. I worry,
2 though, that if we're wanting to be as simple as possible, just saying
3 with the least amount of words might be the simplest thing. But then
4 also there are - there will be the opportunities to submit, you know,
5 arguments against or for that are published in the pamphlet that all
6 voters get.

7 So, that could be, you know, as individuals, not Commission
8 Members, and we want to write something that alludes to that, but
9 there is that opportunity as well.

10 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And, and I think if there was a campaign
11 by a committee, for instance, they could provide informational
12 material that -

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - also had that material in it.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Just as that's another option.

17 MR. WARNE: Madam Chair. Because in this example, there is
18 no increase mentioned. You know, there's no amount, there's no
19 \$57,000 that's mentioned.

20 MR. URQUIDI: (Inaudible) I'm, you know, that's
21 (inaudible) which I'm not in favor of, but I'm just asking that
22 question.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Chair, Members. These are all great
25 questions. I'm glad you're asking them.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Other questions for Dennis?

2 MS. GARCIA: I guess how - when do you need to have this?
3 'Cause it sounds like we may take - there's a potential for a new
4 recommendation, and I'm, I'm trying to remember the time line Council
5 considers this, or refers us to the ballot, or are we up - we're up
6 against a pretty tight (inaudible)

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Well, we have to - our recommendation
8 has to be finalized by tomorrow.

9 MS. GARCIA: Okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, essentially, tonight we need to
11 make some sort of decision and we'll be signing a recommendation.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: But this, this goes directly through the -
13 from the Commission. It's, it's going to happen on the ballot.
14 We're, we're going to have to have some sort of call of it -

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - where they basically do the language.
17 But, Yolanda, are we - you have any idea what that - I'm, I'm just
18 trying to think. That's, for a November election, that is probably a
19 conservative (inaudible)

20 MS. LOZANO: (Inaudible) like in August?

21 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah.

22 MS. LOZANO: Yeah. Because -

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, -

24 MS. LOZANO: - June would be primary.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - there can be, if your question is, is
2 there time to try to wordsmith on the ballot language, I think there
3 is. Mostly the reason I wanted you to have it tonight is to have some
4 idea of what it might look like if you stopped right now. I don't
5 know if I (inaudible)

6 MR. WARNE: Coincides with the primary election, is that
7 right?

8 MS. DENT: (Inaudible)

9 MS. LOZANO: Let me backtrack that. That, that would have
10 to be earlier than that because I think we have to have ballot
11 language and prepare the ballot sometime in July, right? Jesus?
12 Because then we do arguments, get filed by the first part in August,
13 and then we ship those to the -

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: The printer, uh-huh.

15 MS. LOZANO: - company for the choice is yours. So, ballot
16 language has to be done for the general election by mid-July, I think.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: But there's still time. There's time.

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. It's not tomorrow which, -

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: "Oh my gosh."

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: We've got, we've got some time.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

24 MR. WARNE: So, our recommendation is that we have -

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes. Okay. Thank you, Dennis, -

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: My pleasure. And -

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - helping us get through our
3 confusion.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - I, I can - I, I'm around if, for, you
5 know, communicate with Jesus. He can get stuff, you know, questions
6 to me. We'll - we can be talking further. And I, again, remind
7 everybody that once the Commission has done what it's doing, you can
8 individually be campaigning and you can also be part of any new
9 committee that campaigns. Just, just telling you that that's, that's
10 there.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Great. Okay.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Thank you.

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I hope this was helpful.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: It was. (Inaudible) very helpful.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Good night.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Good night. Okay. Do we want to
18 backtrack a little bit and maybe talk about some of the public input
19 in the survey results?

20 MS. DENT: Yeah.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

22 MS. DENT: I think that's a good idea.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: It looks like we had a few additions.
24 It looks like we got like a hun- -- about 177 responses. And the
25 survey's now closed?

1 MR. ACEDO: It is. So, these results are through the 13th,
2 yesterday.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Great. And all the new
4 comments are below the line?

5 MR. ACEDO: Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

7 MR. ACEDO: Yeah.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Thank you. Kind of seems like a
9 different flavor of comments than last week.

10 MS. DENT: Good.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Any thoughts or questions or
12 reflections on - one thing that I'm struggling with a little bit is,
13 you know, coming out of the gate we seem to have a good idea of what
14 type of recommendation we wanted to make and so we based our survey on
15 that.

16 So, it is a little difficult - I mean the, the open-ended
17 question did provide - I'm, I'm actually pleasantly surprised with how
18 many people submitted like an extra comment. So, that can help, you
19 know, as we potentially think about this other recommendation.

20 MS. DENT: I really leaned into that question, and -

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

22 MS. DENT: - just seeing people's comments.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

24 MS. DENT: And I feel like even though we framed the survey
25 around its original recommendation, there were so many people that

1 were on either side of that, and the surprising number that were
2 really, you know, even encouraging higher.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

4 MS. DENT: So, I feel like we got a good flavor in that
5 question that makes, you know, will remain a useful tool.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Yeah. Any Spanish responses?

7 MR. ACEDO: No. We didn't receive any in Spanish.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Shoot. Okay.

9 MR. ACEDO: And I will add that I did submit a test just to
10 make sure that the -

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

12 MR. ACEDO: - link was working and everything, -

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

14 MR. ACEDO: - and it was. We just didn't -

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

16 MR. ACEDO: - receive any.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. It's a little unfortunate just
18 with the time line that this Commission is on. It really doesn't lend
19 itself to doing extensive public outreach, which is unfortunate. I
20 mean it was difficult just getting with all the Ward Offices in that
21 short amount of time. So, maybe a future Charter change is in order.

22 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. I, I sent it, I sent an e-mail to
23 PCOA, you know, to get the, you know, the senior vote. But I don't
24 know how, how many responses.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MR. URQUIDI: They didn't say one way or the other, -

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

3 MR. URQUIDI: - you know, it just got sent out, so, -

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Okay. And then in terms of
5 Item 5, which is our discussion of meetings with the Mayor and the
6 Ward Offices, the only that I had happen between our last meeting and
7 today was the one with Council Member Santa Cruz. So, I was able to
8 connect with everyone.

9 Unfortunately, wasn't - this timing didn't work with Ward 2
10 on kind of our time line. So, hoping maybe I can connect with his
11 office afterwards just to kind of talk about where we are. But, yeah,
12 the conversation yesterday was really, I think, enlightening, talking
13 to Council Member Santa Cruz.

14 So, I don't know. I mean I, I really feel like I could
15 lean one way or the other, but the ballot language isn't (inaudible)

16 MS. DENT: Yeah.

17 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Yeah.

19 MS. DENT: I mean I, I really think that we have to - we've
20 been doing a good job thinking holistically around the reception of
21 this recommendation. I think if we're being really mindful of what
22 people are presented, this feels like it's bound for failure -

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

24 MS. DENT: - to be honest. And so, I share the concerns
25 around viability. Believe me, I'm like very concerned about that.

1 But I do feel like if voters appreciate transparency, and if there's
2 a sentence that said a "yes" vote shall have the effect of tying Mayor
3 and Council's salaries to the Board of Supervisors, period, I feel
4 like it's clear. They don't know what the Board makes either. I mean
5 there's a real - it's not information -

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

7 MS. DENT: - that's out there enough, or people are paying
8 that much attention. But I think they realize that those folks are
9 doing commensurate public service at the regional level.

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

11 MS. DENT: And I would say that that would be more
12 successful than trying to put forth something. So, some details.

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

14 MR. WARNE: Madam Chair?

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

16 MR. WARNE: Also, more just thinking as we're all talking
17 and sharing, the one thing is, is that the - they're - the populous,
18 the voters, they don't know that we're sitting here talking about
19 \$19,000 difference.

20 They - we're talking about - we're, we're negotiating
21 within our sphere, our, you know, just us sitting here. And they're
22 not aware that, hey, well, they have a choice - 57,000 or 76,000, you
23 know.

24 The \$19,000 is not, is just not, you know, that they don't
25 have an end saying, you know, this - that's where I started thinking

1 about it last night after our meeting with Lane yesterday, is, you
2 know, is it - if you just say, hey, should they, should this Council
3 make the same as a Supervisor? Period. You know?

4 That's, and other than her, other than her remarks, which
5 were, I thought very deep and intelligent, obviously she got the two
6 of us thinking.

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Yeah.

8 MR. WARNE: Which was good.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Nico?

10 MR. NIERI-LANG: Yeah. I think I was initially
11 apprehensive to the alternate recommendation.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

13 MR. NIERI-LANG: And like after today, I, I sort of lean in
14 the direction of whatever will produce more simple ballot language,
15 just stuff like that will have more of an impact in the end.

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

17 MR. NIERI-LANG: So, yeah. That's, that's the way I feel
18 like I leaning now.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

20 MR. NIERI-LANG: (Inaudible) talk.

21 MS. DENT: I really want to see a raise in pay.

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

23 MS. DENT: And I really, really, really want to see that.

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MS. DENT: And I always believe in keeping it simple as
2 well.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

4 MS. DENT: I worry about the level of pay that's suggested
5 in that alternative. But again, I think that one has a better chance
6 of passing than the one with, you know, very intricate language.

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Agustin.

8 MR. URQUIDI: I think that's a good point where you have to
9 have something with simpler language. Just - I, I just did some
10 calculations, just if, if we went with the first alternative, the
11 Mayor would see an increase of, of 66%.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

13 MR. URQUIDI: The Council Members would see an increase in
14 pay of 133%. So, that would bring them to the second largest, you
15 know, in terms of pay, to Phoenix where the Phoenix Mayor makes
16 88,000, and Council Members make 62 - 62,000.

17 So, do we want to have a pay increase that, that pays, or I
18 understand the situation with the Board of Supervisors. And I, I
19 personally agree with it.

20 But I'm always taking the perspective of the average voter,
21 the typical voter, you know. I appreciate that Thomas has talked to a
22 lot of people that want to pay - and so have I.

23 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

1 MR. URQUIDI: They want a larger increase than 70,000,
2 56,000. The typical voter, I believe from their perspective, they
3 typically do not, you know, vote for pay increases that's substantial.

4 You look at historical context - 2017, they proposed a very
5 large, substantial increase which is equitable. There was nothing
6 wrong with it. "No" 71%, "yes" 29%.

7 So, a more more modest increase was proposed in 2021. It,
8 it failed by just 980 votes. So, I'm into reality here just as a
9 counter to Congress (sic) Woman Santa Cruz. I believe somebody spoke
10 to Councilman Kozachik.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

12 MR. URQUIDI: He had a different point of view. So, just
13 to say, you know, it's - there are, there are different points of
14 view.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

16 MR. URQUIDI: So, you know, I, I think I'm, I'm, I'm making
17 my best pitch to the - for the first proposal. Like I said, I do
18 agree. I'm one of those that I think they should be paid a lot more,
19 but I think it's perfectly fair to tie it into the Board of
20 Supervisors pay.

21 But I think reality is reality, and then I have, you have
22 to take the perspective of the typical, average voter in Tucson. And
23 I don't believe, I'm not a prognosticator, you know, I don't know
24 what's gonna happen. But I don't believe that there is a realistic
25 chance of passing.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

2 MR. URQUIDI: And I think it's our responsibility to
3 propose something that has a realistic chance of (inaudible)

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. I do - I just - I really do
5 worry about the ballot language just making that something that's
6 automatically like kind of a strike against the, the proposal.

7 And something I was thinking about last night as well.
8 You know, it's interesting, Agustin, that you said that we have a
9 responsibility to, to come up with a recommendation that will pass.

10 I think - thinking about it more last night, I almost feel
11 like we have a responsibility to make a recommendation that is, is
12 what they should be making.

13 MS. DENT: Right.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I think you could make an argument
15 either way, really. I mean it's, it's, it's -

16 MR. URQUIDI: I, I - yeah.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

18 MR. URQUIDI: I, I can see your point of view.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

20 MR. URQUIDI: I think that's the honorable way of doing it.
21 I just think you have to take all factors into -

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

23 MR. URQUIDI: - consideration. And it's not, it's not like
24 they're not getting an increase, a 66% increase, increase for the

1 Mayor and 133% for, for Council. It's not enough, it's not
2 sufficient.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

4 MR. URQUIDI: You know, do, do, do we want to make, you
5 know, Tucson the, the highest paid city for Council-Manager form of
6 government? You know, same as Phoenix, with Phoenix having three or
7 four times the population, you know? And I'm just throwing it out
8 there. I can see your point.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

10 MR. URQUIDI: They, you know, we - maybe we should be
11 proposing something.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

13 MR. URQUIDI: The voters and everything, and doesn't make
14 any difference. Just - let's just do something. I, I personally
15 believe that you have to take that into consideration, but you have to
16 take into consideration what is more likely to pass because it's a,
17 it's a zero endeavor. It's all or nothing. If, if, if, you know, if
18 it doesn't pass, they get nothing. So, that's my concern, too.

19 MS. GARCIA: And in reading all of the responses in the
20 survey, it is very mixed. But the one thing that I kept seeing over
21 and over and over again was that the, the citizens, the voters are
22 looking at this as a merit increase for the service that has already
23 been provided.

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MS. GARCIA: And that's not where we are coming from.
2 We are looking at the job itself. And that job being compensated
3 properly for all the work that goes into doing that job.

4 So, in consideration of who's going to voting "yes" on
5 this, I think we really need to figure out where that sweet spot is in
6 the appeal. I personally really do love the, the salary we came up
7 with.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes.

9 MS. GARCIA: And if we can make that a simpler sell -

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

11 MS. GARCIA: - in this to the Tucson voters, -

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

13 MS. GARCIA: - and really drive home that this is not for
14 current work or a reward for the work that has been done. This is
15 something that is going to be put in place to properly compensate the
16 people who are going to be doing this job in the future.

17 MR. URQUIDI: Sure.

18 MR. WARNE: Jennifer, that - Council Member Santa Cruz
19 brought that up. And so, she said, "Well, okay," you know? She, she,
20 she said, "How do corporations do it? Don't they," you know, "do it
21 by responsibility and so on?"

22 And I said - and she thought of the term and I did
23 simultaneously. I said, "Yeah. They benchmark it." And she said,
24 "So," she said, "So, a Council person that's, you know, going over all
25 of this, we are a City Manager form of government, but we have the

1 responsibility of over a \$2 billion budget. Is that the same? And
2 she wasn't putting any, believe me, with her personality, she wasn't
3 putting anyone down. She goes, "So, is that the same as an Assistant
4 Manager at Fry's?" And it's like what are we providing?

5 That's why she was willing to back - she was willing to
6 lose, and because, you know, she brought up, you know, that point.
7 And I'm wondering, and I couldn't agree with Agustin. He's good at
8 numbers and I'm decent at numbers, percentage and analyzation, but -

9 MR. URQUIDI: (Inaudible)

10 MR. WARNE: Okay.

11 MR. URQUIDI: (Inaudible)

12 MR. WARNE: Well, you, you came up with - you, you analyzed
13 it I think very well, the percentages and increase and all that. But
14 in all fairness, I don't have - Agustin, he's, he's not the average
15 voter. And now I'm being very judgmental. But he's like way above
16 the average voter.

17 And when they see this ballot, and they start to read, you
18 know, and which you, you know, you learn, you learn in economics in
19 college, and you learn there's a San Francisco District.

20 And you learn all the formulas and how they - how this all
21 is done, you know, that they don't get into - we don't get into that,
22 thank goodness. It would never pass. But then, you know, that type
23 of thing or if you just say simply that equal to a Supervisor's
24 salary, period. End of case.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right.

1 MR. WARNE: That's, you know - because they, I don't think
2 anyone will even know the 57,000, you know? They'll just, they, they
3 just won't know it, you know? It's no different to them than 76 in a
4 way. They won't see the comparison that we see here.

5 MR. URQUIDI: I don't - I, I know that's simpler language,
6 and I, I know we should be able to do that. I just don't feel
7 comfortable with them not knowing. I just -

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: But they don't know in the way the
9 ballot language is written right now for the recommendation we had
10 talked about.

11 MR. URQUIDI: The first (inaudible)

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

13 MR. WARNE: They'll never figure it out.

14 (Multiple speakers.)

15 MR. URQUIDI: I, I probably, you know, I didn't know a
16 whole lot before I came into the - I thought the, the Council Members'
17 position was part-time, you know, that's how much I know, so - yeah.

18 MS. GARCIA: And, and a lot of the public, I think, is
19 (inaudible)

20 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

22 MS. GARCIA: I think in the spirit of moving (inaudible)
23 towards the sweet spot that you described, and I hear you on the
24 Phoenix component, 'cause I do feel like we often get compared to our
25 neighbor north, and we want to be mindful of kind of the optics.

1 Instead of, I mean could we just do straight Council
2 salaries with the Board of Sups. instead of the, like the Mayor,
3 mayoral ratio (inaudible)

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: That all seven of them make the same.

5 MS. GARCIA: I don't love that, but it puts the Mayor in a
6 better place than she would have been under our recommendation.

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: That's true.

8 MS. GARCIA: And future commissions can tackle that once we
9 get over this like first hurdle of like just getting these (inaudible)

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: (Inaudible)

11 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. Yeah. And then, and then that will not
12 put the Mayor over the Phoenix, which I think would be an eyebrow
13 raiser and speak to the viability concerns that you're reaping
14 (inaudible)

15 MR. WARNE: I respect what, what you're saying. I just
16 looked up before our meeting. We have - and I agree. I'll just put,
17 put the facts out.

18 Their population's about three times ours, just a little
19 short of it now actually, which I was a little surprised. And their
20 budget's about \$500 million less. I was shocked. I was shocked.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. But that does speak to one
22 getting to a - us to a sweet spot. But then, too, even making the
23 ballot language more simple.

24 MS. DENT: Yeah.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Because it'll just say, "Raise the
2 Mayor and Council."

3 (Inaudible comments.)

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: No. That's, that's - I think that's
5 actually really interesting kind of compromise.

6 MS. DENT: I don't love it. (Inaudible)

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

8 MS. GARCIA: I like what you have put here. I like, I
9 (inaudible)

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

11 MS. DENT: I just want an - I just feel like there's a way
12 to argue a better way, and this might be like -

13 MR. WARNE: You don't think that the populous, you think
14 that would confuse it? I mean the populous wouldn't think, hey, I
15 make, -

16 MS. DENT: It's possible.

17 MR. WARNE: - you know, that I guess, you know, 'cause the
18 Mayor, you know, we all know deserves more than - I mean her hours
19 are, are awful. I mean -

20 MR. URQUIDI: (Inaudible) Laura, I, I don't know. I, I'm
21 not quite sure I understand. So, you're proposing to raise just a
22 Council Member's salary?

23 MS. DENT: I'm, I'm proposing because we, we talked here
24 about the concerns of viability that I'm hearing you say. I'm hearing
25 you say you want to look for a sweet spot.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

2 MS. GARCIA: And that we want to be mindful of our
3 neighbors, neighboring communities and not like looking too skewed as
4 a smaller community than Phoenix.

5 So, instead of looking at tying the Council's salary to the
6 Board of Sups. and then 1.5 for the Mayor, just a straight-across-the-
7 board Council and Mayor are just like the Board of Supervisors.

8 I mean, obviously, -

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: It's the same.

10 MS. DENT: Yeah. The Chair at the Board makes the same as
11 the Board. And I, I just want to underscore like I don't love this
12 idea at all. I think it's super flawed.

13 I just feel like every option on the table right now is
14 flawed in some way. So, I'm trying to think of like is this a way to
15 put her in a better place and the Mayor's role in a better place than
16 it would have been before, but still give everybody a boost?

17 MR. URQUIDI: So, you're saying just have both the Mayor,
18 Mayor and Council make 76 across the board?

19 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

20 MS. DENT: The Board of Supervisors. So, in a couple of
21 years, they'll make 95.

22 MR. WARNE: That's exactly how they do it. Yeah, when
23 Sharon Bronson was and Adelita Grijalva (Inaudible) and Supervisors,
24 their salary's exactly the same (inaudible)

1 MS. DENT: But to be fair, the Mayor does more work.

2 (Inaudible)

3 MR. WARNE: Oh. No, no question.

4 MS. DENT: I mean I just want to -

5 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

6 MS. DENT: 'Cause I don't like, I don't love this idea. I
7 just feel like we could go (inaudible) for a while. And I think this
8 kind of gets to our language concern that I don't -

9 MR. WARNE: The, the Mayors, Mayors drawn on by all, all
10 wards, all six wards. And as Council Member Santa Cruz brought up
11 yesterday. So, somebody is doing something on a road in the southeast
12 side of town, somebody's doing it in Ward 1. Someone's doing Ward 6
13 by the University. The University's having its thing.

14 And, you know, she's like, like this, running around, or
15 he's like whoever's the Mayor is out running around all these
16 different wards servicing all six instead of just one. And that's
17 the difference - yeah.

18 MR. URQUIDI: I, I kind of think the Mayor should - it's
19 higher visibility position with a little bit more responsibility.
20 And, and if you look at in terms of the other cities, it's going to
21 be a huge discrepancy.

22 So, could we - we're talking about a sweet spot. Could we
23 propose something where instead of the one and a quarter above the
24 salary, we go to one five? Would that be, would that be a compromise?

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: No. I think he's saying on the, on
2 the first recommendation.

3 MR. URQUIDI: On the first recommendation.

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I think that, that still just doesn't
5 quite address our ballot language issue.

6 MR. URQUIDI: Well, the - aren't we talking about two
7 different issues, though? The ballot language versus the actual
8 salary proposal?

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I think from what I'm hearing, a lot
10 of us like the first recommendation, but we're having a hard time
11 overcoming the burden that the sal- -- that the, the ballot language
12 will place on voters just not understanding.

13 Even if we were go to 1.5 times, that doesn't simplify what
14 the ballot language would look like at all. And so, I think like for
15 me, I personally like the numbers from the first recommendation
16 better, but I am really concerned about that translating -

17 MS. DENT: Right.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - into the ballot language in a way
19 that's easy for folks to understand.

20 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah, I see your point. I, I feel very
21 uncomfortable with the second view. I, I realistically, it's just,
22 like I said, we're also getting 66% increase for the Mayor, -

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

24 MR. URQUIDI: - 113% for Council.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MR. URQUIDI: You know, granted, there were - it was
2 atrocious what they're, what they're getting now and we're just
3 increasing that. People do look at the percentage increase.

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

5 MR. URQUIDI: And the voters are sophisticated enough to
6 figure out, you know, if you go with the second proposal, what that
7 increase would be.

8 MR. WARNE: Just think, if it's worded the same as the
9 Board of Supervisors, it'll be an easier sell. I just can't believe
10 that, that our voters are all - you say a half cent sales taxes,
11 blunt, it's plain.

12 Okay. Now you gotta justify it, and we have to justify it
13 whatever we do, you know? We don't, but it has to be justified for
14 the voter to vote "yes".

15 But I think that, you know, we get into the, into the labor
16 statistics, and everything else. It's just - if it just says, do you
17 - if you, the person on the street - do you think the Council Person
18 should make the same as the Board of Supervisors? I, I just think 80%
19 of them are gonna say "yes".

20 MR. URQUIDI: I, I think the voters are sophisticated
21 enough to realize, you know, what the, what the, what the pay is
22 actually going to be. I do believe it's equitable, I agree with that.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

1 MR. URQUIDI: I, I, I - it's not my personal belief. I
2 think it's just what's going to translate into a realistic, you know,
3 recommendation.

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I guess I have - I would have a
5 question for you then, Agustin. Is - I, I think - I'm hearing you,
6 I'm on board with you. The part that I can't get over is how
7 complicated the ballot language is because there's so many pieces to
8 way we've structured out recommendation.

9 I, and I, and I think to meet the intent of our
10 recommendation, which is for this not to be a static number that never
11 adjusts, we have to have this like it's tied to some economic table,
12 and it's adjusted, and that has to be conveyed into the ballot
13 language.

14 And a "yes" vote shall - and we have to explain that. And
15 I think that's the piece I'm just having a hard time, like it's not
16 easily readable. Like I don't even know if someone could like, to
17 your point, like they could go and figure out how much the Board of
18 Supervisors is making.

19 But I don't know if someone, if they - if the numbers
20 aren't somewhere else in the, the voter guide, how they're even gonna
21 figure out what this means, what the first recommendation means based
22 on the way it's written in the ballot language.

23 They have to go and find that table, find Pima County, you
24 know, or the Tucson MSA, and then do some math. And I, I just think

1 that's gonna feel overwhelming for like someone who just doesn't read
2 this type of stuff in their everyday.

3 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. I, I, I understand that. I, I don't
4 know if we could work on the ballot language to make it simpler.

5 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

6 MR. URQUIDI: You know how much wiggle room we have there,
7 you know.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

9 MR. URQUIDI: I can see what you're saying. I, I, I just
10 don't feel that that's, just for the very reason of the ballot
11 language being more complicated. I don't, I just don't think that
12 that fits. For just that reason, we should go with the second
13 alternate.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. I guess I, I just feel like
15 that's already doing it to not be successful. And, you know, I think
16 that the intention is to want to pass something that's reasonable and
17 realistic and I think the, the numbers from the first proposal are
18 probably more realistic.

19 I think that just doesn't, isn't reflected in the ballot
20 language. And I, I don't know how much wordsmithing we could do on it
21 to make it anymore readable just based on the way we have it
22 structured.

23 MR. WARNE: When I co-chaired these different bond issues
24 and stuff, it was, it was - always came through from our advisers, you
25 know, outside advisers that were hired for the campaign that the more

1 complicated the ballot and where the ballot's placed has a lot to do
2 with if it passes.

3 And I said, "Wait a minute. How about the subject?" You
4 know, it's Agustin's, you know respectfully, I totally respect these.
5 It's what he's dealing with. It's acts and so on. And they said,
6 "No. It's how simple it is, and where it's placed."

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Like where on the ballot?

8 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. It has a, it has a lot to do with it.

9 MR. WARNE: And if it's last and it's complicated, you
10 don't - you get, you don't get a vote is what happens, you know.
11 That, that's really what happens, you know.

12 Or, you'll get a negative because no one wants to analyze
13 something complicated. And not just this subject, it's like any
14 subject. They always said that.

15 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. I think it's imperative that we put
16 forward something that will definitely get a "yes" vote, because I, I
17 find it appalling what they're getting paid right now. So, -

18 MR. URQUIDI: Oh, well, yeah.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes. So, -

20 MS. GARCIA: And just looking at keeping it as simple as
21 possible, I don't think that putting the salaries up to with Pima
22 County, Board of Pima County, is going to pass because I do feel that
23 it's, it's, it's just too much for the average voter to see that kind
24 of jump in pay.

1 I really do like the example of our original
2 recommendation, the 56 per year for City Council Member and 70 for,
3 for Mayor. I see that passing. I see that passing.

4 MR. URQUIDI: I do, too.

5 MS. GARCIA: And in two years? No. In two years then -
6 well, not the way this is written.

7 MR. URQUIDI: No. It has to be written (inaudible)

8 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. I, I don't want, I don't want to cut
9 you off. But we could use those numbers and use like the CPI,
10 although there's a lot of inflation concerns right now. So, I feel
11 like that is another factor.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Right.

13 MS. GARCIA: So, I just, I just think there's a way. It
14 just, it's not this way, the way that we've decided.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

16 MR. WARNE: And I really don't want to see it (inaudible)

17 MS. GARCIA: (Inaudible)

18 MR. WARNE: Well, Jennifer, I think that, that - I know
19 that it'll be written correctly, and it's gotta have all this language
20 in it because there's no chance that we in Tucson want certain people
21 in the Legislature who are trying to change even how we do elections
22 in our city, to challenge it.

23 Because if it - and it's an easy challenge if it's written
24 wrong. I mean, I've lived it with - I was, you know, representing the
25 City that wanted the high-rise dorm zoning to clean up the

1 neighborhoods and so on. And everybody thought it was the opposite,
2 but it's worked.

3 But the point was that because of that language, every
4 level of court immediately ruled on it. You know, it didn't take
5 long.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I mean that's an interesting point,
7 right? Because like if we do - if it's tied to the Board of
8 Supervisors, they could change it. But then they're gonna change it
9 for every other county in the state.

10 MS. GARCIA: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: And that would just not happen.

12 MS. GARCIA: And I think, I mean just thinking about like
13 the AG that is much more opposed to preemption than previous political
14 leaders -

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

16 MS. GARCIA: - in the past. We're gonna have support in
17 that space, and I think the County has (inaudible) association has
18 strong presence.

19 And there's a lot of stakeholders that, that do work in
20 that space at the Capitol. So, I almost see it as a - with a
21 durability point that it's tied to the Supervisors.

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Interesting.

23 MS. GARCIA: But it's hard to say exactly (inaudible)

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, maybe one thing that we can like
25 discuss to what if all of us like digest a little bit. Last time,

1 last couple of meetings, we had discussed when this proposed salary
2 would be implemented. And so, the way we had, had it originally
3 written was it would happen after the November election in 2025.

4 There were some, some of us who thought like maybe we
5 wanted it to be a little sooner, like after, after like basically as
6 soon as it's approved, it goes into place. One maybe compromise that
7 was brought up yesterday was the beginning - so, we're in fiscal year
8 '23, right now. And then when the election happens, it'll have
9 changed to fiscal year '24. So, we could have it go into place at the
10 beginning of fiscal year '25, which would be July 1st, 2024. So,
11 essentially, the election would be in November, and then seven months
12 later, eight months later, it would go into place.

13 MS. GARCIA: I like that.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. When the fir- -- when - and
15 then also, that also would be like next budget.

16 (Multiple speakers.)

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. So, that's the way to kind of
18 like -

19 MS. GARCIA: Right.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - compromise where some of us wanted
21 it sooner.

22 MS. GARCIA: Yeah. I would (inaudible)

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Laura?

1 MS. DENT: I personally would prefer it to just go into
2 effect like at the beginning of the next year. But that's just me,
3 and it's okay. Sounds like there's more interest in -

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

5 MR. URQUIDI: On that, on that part, I'm kind of neutral.
6 So, I could sort of bend either way -

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

8 MR. URQUIDI: - on, on that.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I think it does make sense, though,
10 like from a budgeting standpoint to have it start at the fiscal year
11 'cause if it passes in, let's say, like hypothetically it passes in
12 November, then, like they're already kind of starting budget talks
13 like at the beginning of the year.

14 And then that gives time to like make some adjustments
15 where need be, and then it would just kind of happen when the new
16 budget happens. So, I feel like from a timing, from plannings
17 perspective, it could be helpful.

18 MR. WARNE: I was for right away, too. I was the
19 (inaudible) and I was virtual last time, was in the minority. I was
20 the only, only one that was. So, I kind of suggested (inaudible) you
21 know.

22 We don't want another year and a half later, but how about
23 if it's seven months, and it's the budget year. I mean, no, no. But,
24 I - yeah, I was (inaudible)

25 MR. URQUIDI: (Inaudible)

1 MR. WARNE: I wanted it to happen right away.

2 MR. URQUIDI: First proposal and we make it for 2025.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: But that was easier than I thought it
4 was gonna be. Now we gotta go back to the hard thing.

5 MR. WARNE: This might go down as the most respectful
6 quasi-political committee going on in the United States tonight.

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. I'm just gonna, I'm just not
8 like from the numbers perspective, I like the first recommendation.
9 I just really, and I'm just uncomfortable with the ballot language. I
10 just, I think that's something that's gonna be really, really hard to
11 overcome, unless we somehow simplify. Like if we don't want to tie to
12 the average salary, and we'd rather it just be those static numbers
13 which kind of defeats the purpose of this whole like reason -

14 MS. DENT: Right.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - we wanted it to be tied to the
16 average salary. I mean I think getting rid of the CPIP, like is one -
17 like a few words that can be taken out of the ballot language.

18 MR. URQUIDI: So, so, are you saying, I just want to
19 understand. Are you saying just like the arbitrary number, we want
20 to raise this instead of tying it into anything? The 1.25 - is that
21 what you're saying?

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Well, I just saying like I'm just
23 trying to think of how we can simplify what, what we have talked about
24 because it, it seems like the piece of tying the salaries to the, to
25 adjust with the average salary is what has complicated and really made

1 our ballot language be really muddy. So, if it's a static number,
2 which -

3 MR. URQUIDI: So, (inaudible) say like make 75,000, or
4 what, 78,000, and then the Board of Supervisors will make 60,000,
5 something like that?

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I mean we could. I think the, the,
7 the reason we didn't, didn't do that from the beginning was we wanted
8 it, we didn't want to put ourselves in a situation where there's a
9 commission 20 years from now that's working on the same issue of our
10 Council Members being severely underpaid.

11 MS. DENT: Right. Yeah.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: No, but -

13 MS. DENT: Uh-huh.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - that's why we liked the form.

15 MR. URQUIDI: Very considerate young lady.

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I mean, that's a simple way to at
17 least have like some immediate relief, but it doesn't solve this like
18 -

19 MS. DENT: Yeah. The issue.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - on the length of (inaudible) that
21 every two years, it goes to the voters. They turn it down, and then
22 we just kind of go through this cycle over and over.

23 MS. DENT: Uh-huh.

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: And it's a lot of work for Jesus. I
25 mean it's really just -

1 MS. GARCIA: Maybe process-wise because it sounds like,
2 like this, what you've proposed is like a number, potentially indexed
3 or not, but maybe we can just agree that this, like the original thing
4 doesn't feel like a fit right now.

5 MS. DENT: Agreed.

6 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah.

7 MS. GARCIA: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

9 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

10 MS. DENT: Okay. I agree with that. And the more we
11 discuss it, I, I, I feel more and more the compromise is to tie it to
12 the, the, the County.

13 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: For all seven.

15 MS. DENT: Yeah.

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Like at this point, -

17 MS. DENT: Yeah.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - let's just get all seven of them to
19 something, and a commission down the road can adjust (inaudible)

20 MS. GARCIA: Right.

21 MS. DENT: Ideally, I love the pay. I think that's
22 fantastic. It's just I worry about the voters.

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Well, and I think for like
24 argument's sake, like thinking about what people are gonna say about

1 this, like justifying why the Mayor should make 1.5 times what the
2 Board of Supervisors make.

3 I think for some who don't, who aren't into the intricacies
4 of what the Mayor does compared to the Board of Supervisors, that's
5 gonna be like, what the heck? Why, why should the Mayor make that
6 much compared to the Board of Supervisors?

7 So, I do think that's like I like it, but I feel like we're
8 also kind of in the trenches and understand what that looks like
9 compared to - 'cause think also the average person probably doesn't,
10 'cause I didn't, didn't realize that the, the County's budget is
11 actually a little smaller than the City's 'cause you just think of
12 Pima County (inaudible), yeah. You know?

13 MS. GARCIA: Oh. Well, they're - yeah. I'm just if, if we
14 wanted to honor the spirit of the original, we could move into the
15 1.5, which is what I kind of thought you were saying as opposed to the
16 1.5, which is the ceiling via the Charter. So, that would be seventy-
17 six six for the Council, and then ninety-five --

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

19 MS. GARCIA: - seven fifty for the Mayor. So, I would keep
20 us under the six digits which I think six figures is like a mental
21 block.

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I think (inaudible) Yeah.

23 MS. GARCIA: So, that's another option. If we wanted to
24 honor the role of the Mayor.

1 MR. URQUIDI: Well, well, you know, the only thing, the
2 optics, you know. We would be the highest paid -

3 MS. GARCIA: Mayor.

4 MR. URQUIDI: - you know, Mayor and Council in the state
5 above Phoenix or anybody else, so -

6 MR. WARNE: Yeah. (Inaudible)

7 MR. URQUIDI: - you know, not that that's wrong, but, you
8 know, it's like you're saying, you know, the optics. I'm just
9 throwing that out.

10 MR. WARNE: Or you could say 1.25. And this thing about
11 the Supervisors I just thought when you were talking, Jennifer, was
12 every property tax, every property owner in the City limits is paying
13 that salary to the Supervisors. That's where their money comes from
14 is the property tax, right?

15 MS. GARCIA: Right.

16 MR. WARNE: And every single one is paying that. And
17 mentally, you know? And so part of that subliminally, I would think,
18 you know, do you think the Council should make the same as the
19 Supervisor makes? I mean they're already, they're paid.

20 MS. GARCIA: Yeah.

21 MR. WARNE: You know, it's - and there also is this thing
22 is, there is this little thing that's been going on. It's gotten
23 better with our City Manager, but, you know, oh, that County, they're
24 doing this, or (inaudible) the City, right? (Inaudible) bickering.

1 And that's being reduced now, but - which is a good thing. But, you
2 know, but they're, they're already paying it.

3 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. And, and, you know, and of course, the
4 - it's inequitable, you know, about the pay. But in reality, I mean
5 because it's, with the Board of Supervisors, it hasn't gone before the
6 voters. That's just reality.

7 MR. WARNE: Right. (Inaudible)

8 MR. URQUIDI: And so that's why it's different. We can't
9 change reality.

10 MR. WARNE: No.

11 MR. URQUIDI: You know? I, I mean, you know, we could, we
12 could make it the same. It is an honorable thing to do, it is
13 equitable, but if, if it, if it had gone before - if, if they had the
14 same, what do you call it? Charter, or, or procedure, -

15 MS. GARCIA: Uh-huh.

16 MR. URQUIDI: - where it went before the voters, they would
17 not be making that -

18 MS. GARCIA: That - yeah.

19 MR. URQUIDI: - amount of money. So, you know.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, okay. What's, what's the group's
21 comfort level with increasing the Council Members' salaries from their
22 current salary to be the same as the Pima County Board of Supervisors?
23 And then the Mayor's salary would also be the same. So, all seven
24 across the board would be making -

1 MR. URQUIDI: I don't, I still don't feel comfortable with
2 that. You know, although I don't feel comfortable with that second
3 proposal, it, it would be a, a major deviation to have, you know,
4 everybody paid the same, you know?

5 It, it, it would just be a major deviation and, and you
6 know, in all reality, the Mayor is a higher visibility position.
7 Maybe with a little bit more responsibility.

8 I've always, you know, when, when I did PDQ's with the
9 State, can't remember what PDQ is. Salary things that we wrote up for
10 each position, the level of responsibility was always, you know, that
11 Mayor did the higher pay.

12 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

13 MR. URQUIDI: So, -

14 MR. WARNE: How about if we said 1.25? That's what I would
15 think.

16 MR. NIERI-LANG: That's what I was thinking, too. I -

17 MR. WARNE: Were you? Yeah. And then that takes, because
18 I do agree with Agustin about, you know, okay. And then one five.
19 Wait a minute, you know. It's kind of out of bounds to relative, the
20 relative parts of the state, you know, 1.25, because - and I, I think
21 that the voter, I think would agree with all of us (inaudible) seem to
22 say, okay, the Mayor works more hours.

23 She's got, she's gotta run the meetings. She has more
24 responsibility on the agenda. You know, those are big things. And
25 so, they might not know all the detail, but they do know that the

1 Mayor works harder, and has more responsibility. And that wouldn't be
2 a hard sell, I wouldn't think.

3 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. The, the only, the only thing with
4 that, though, I just, you know, don't feel real comfortable with the,
5 with that big of an increase in pay, we're gonna, you know, exceed
6 Phoenix. But, but, you know, I, I'm - I, I respect you guys, your -
7 and the ballot language, like you said. It's pretty difficult.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

9 MR. URQUIDI: So, you know, I respect all that. I just do
10 not feel comfortable going with that second recommendation, but I'm
11 only one person.

12 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Well, before we do that, I do
13 want to talk a little bit about the major considerations and rationale
14 because I, I changed them in the alternative, because then our
15 original one - basically, I just took some out, which I'm, I'm happy
16 to put some back in. But we had discussed basically that - well, I
17 took out the bullet, the salaries for the Mayor and Council are
18 designed to reflect the average salaries for our region, 'cause that's
19 no longer (inaudible)

20 MS. DENT: Yeah.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: And then I took out the next two about
22 the Pima County Board of Supervisors, 'cause I felt like they weren't
23 really in the spirit of like -

24 MS. DENT: Uh-huh.

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - supporting this. I would say, I
2 mean I think it's, it's some things to consider maybe putting in there
3 that the City's budget is bigger than the County's budget.

4 MS. DENT: That would be a good idea.

5 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. I think it's 1.8 or 1.9
7 (inaudible) So, then the original one, it said that the, that the
8 Pima County Board of Supervisors will receive a 26% raise to their
9 salary. It happens no matter what. And even before their salaries
10 are raised - oh. I do have a bullet (inaudible) It says, even before
11 - so, the County.

12 (Inaudible comments.)

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I'm gonna say 1.9 for Pima and 2.1,
14 since ours is rounded. Okay. I'm trying to make some changes as we
15 do this live. Okay. Well, I figured we wanted to keep our top five
16 the same, and that is that they're not living wages. This
17 disincentivizes. The Mayor and Council have not received a salary
18 raise in more than a hundred - 123 years (sic), more than 23 years,
19 despite the budget increasing 180, right?

20 MR. URQUIDI: (Inaudible) I will say that it was really
21 (inaudible) this is, this is ridiculous.

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Council Members make, you know, less
23 than a minimum wage. We lag behind, and that the salary increase will
24 be absorbed by the budget and will not negatively affect City

1 services. And then we have Mayor and Council serve in a full-time
2 capacity and they should be appropriately compensated for their time.

3 Pima County Board of Supervisors currently - this is a,
4 this is a new bullet. The Pima County Board of Supervisors currently
5 make more than the Mayor and Council despite the City's budget being
6 larger than the County's. The City's current budget is 2.1 billion
7 and the County is 1.9 billion.

8 Mayor and Council hire staff to assist them. That didn't
9 change. And then recently, Mayor and Council have adjusted City
10 employee wages to account for inflation and improve quality of life.
11 Mayor and Council deserve the same.

12 The only other thing that I was thinking we may want to add
13 that was part of the conversation I had with the Mayor and then also
14 Council Member Santa Cruz is like professionalizing the job. Kind of
15 how like if you were to equate what you - the experience and
16 professional background that you would require of someone that you
17 were going to hire as essentially kind of a CEO, or a leader in a, you
18 know, \$2.1 billion company, you would have some pretty, you know,
19 high-qualifying marks that you'd want them to meet.

20 And so, how do we kind of translate like, like that's also,
21 not only do we want everyday Tucsonans, but we want people with good
22 managerial backgrounds that are familiar with, you know, running big
23 organizations to feel like they could also run and not have to give up
24 this, you know, a, a salary that they're living on to make \$24,000.

1 So, is that something we want to add, is it not? I, I
2 really could go either way on it.

3 MS. GARCIA: I'm, I'm not really interested in including
4 that. I think it's feels a little paternalistic -

5 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

6 MS. GARCIA: - towards like the folks that are serving
7 already. And I, I do feel like there's space for like everyday -

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

9 MS. GARCIA: - folks and, and they can lead effectively
10 based on their lived experiences.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

12 MS. GARCIA: Maybe be just as well, maybe not, you know,
13 with the same credentials or experience as someone with, you know, an
14 MPA.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh.

16 MS. GARCIA: But they know what it's like to live in a
17 certain neighborhood, and what that neighborhood needs.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

19 MS. GARCIA: So, so, I'd, I'd like to stay away from that,
20 I think. I feel really good about everything else.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Any other -

22 (Inaudible comments.)

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. I think for me, the,
24 the total budget is more impactful than, than population.

25 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. I mean I think, too, like, but
2 the population argument I think could come into play when talking
3 about like why the Mayor should be making more than a Board of
4 Supervisor.

5 Like although there is a Chair of the Board of Supervisors,
6 that position rotates, and they each, they each represent their
7 district, where we have six Council Members who present each ward, and
8 then the Mayor is representing 500 and whatever hundred thousand -
9 yeah.

10 So, I think that's an argument to use like if someone's
11 like, "Well, why should they make more than the Supervisors? Or why
12 should the Mayor make more than Supervisors?"

13 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. And I think we should keep in mind,
14 didn't somebody interview the Mayor?

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I did.

16 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. And, and she said there shouldn't that
17 big of a gap between Mayor's salary and the Council's salary.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: She would like to see the 1.25 go up
19 to 1.5 on our original recommendation, yeah. Just because -

20 MR. WARNE: On the original.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. I think, you know, the, the
22 Mayor has - I mean, this Mayor in particular has done a good job at
23 like seeking and getting federal funds for the city.

1 And so, I think that's like one reason to make that
2 argument that they should make more is like they're out there really
3 kind of the City's like lead advocate in, in other forums where -

4 MR. URQUIDI: I, I thought you said that she didn't want
5 the, the gap.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Huh-uh.

7 MR. URQUIDI: Oh, okay. I misunderstood that.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Yeah. She would like
9 (inaudible) to see on our original recommendation the 1.25 for the
10 Mayor go to 1.5.

11 MR. WARNE: And it was brought during discussion yesterday
12 how much time she spends - she's been spending away from family and
13 working in Washington, D.C., on an airplane getting the amount money
14 we've gotten.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

16 MR. WARNE: It's probably once we're maybe getting close to
17 our fair share.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

19 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. So, I think the, the draft that
21 you have for the alternative recommendation, the language reads the
22 same. The only thing we changed was the 1.25. Other than that, it
23 looks the same.

24 Okay. And then, I just will need to check my math.
25 (Checking math.) Okay. So, in this recommendation in place today,

1 the salary for Council Members would be 76,600 per year. And the
2 salary for the Mayor would be 95,750.

3 MS. DENT: Ready for a motion?

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Before - almost "yes". Any other like
5 things that we want to our rationale?

6 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

8 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. And we have our lovely, -

10 MR. WARNE: Simple's better.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - our lovely good governance
12 paragraph. We also - oh, Laura, last meeting, we did add - and Nico,
13 since you weren't able, weren't able to make it, we did add a
14 paragraph about just a little bit more background; how this is our
15 recommendation, this is not Council's recommendation. Just a real way
16 kind of try to add that like another layer of separation.

17 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. I think that that's a good idea. But
18 people have the perception that it's the Council and the Mayor that
19 are seeking the salary.

20 MS. DENT: And when you read the -

21 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah.

22 MS. DENT: - comments, that's exactly what's coming
23 through.

24 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

1 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Okay. I think at this, at
3 this time, I would accept a motion for our recommendation.

4 MS. DENT: I motion to recommend.

5 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

6 MS. GARCIA: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I have a motion and a second. All in
8 in favor say "aye".

9 (Affirmative.)

10 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Opposed? Passes five-one. So, Jesus,
11 I have a copy here. Do you want me to e-mail that to you?

12 MR. ACEDO: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. And then, and then for Agustin,
14 I did notice that I think it was the last Commission there was also
15 one person who, who didn't agree with the recommendation, and then
16 there was like a little something added where they signed (inaudible)
17 I think it just said like - is that the intention? Do we need to?
18 We're not meeting again.

19 MR. ACEDO: I will get it printed. Once I look back, yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

21 MR. URQUIDI: Like under protest or something?

22 MR. WARNE: So, so, so, it'd say like the vote of the
23 Citizens' Commission was five affirmative, one negative, or five to
24 one. Something like that.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. So, -

1 MR. WARNE: Yeah.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: - last - was it last time before. Oh,
3 yeah, I can do that. It was actually the 2019 version.

4 MR. ACEDO: It is the 2019 version. I have it here.

5 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Basically, it says, "I agree
6 with my colleagues that the Mayor and Council are deserving of a raise
7 after 20 years without one. However, I feel the raise recommended by
8 my colleagues on the Commission are too high. Therefore, I cannot
9 support the proposed raises." And then they signed. I mean you
10 don't, I guess you don't -

11 (Inaudible comments.)

12 MR. ACEDO: It's up on the screen. That's easier, too.

13 (Inaudible comments.)

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Under protest.

15 (Inaudible comments.)

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Greg is not able to make it, yeah.
17 So, if he - well, he missed a really big meeting. He's gonna look at
18 that recommendation and be like, "What the heck?"

19 I guess they can send it to him and then if he's able to
20 come by tomorrow and sign it, he can. Otherwise, he will just won't
21 have signed it 'cause it has to be finalized by tomorrow.

22 MR. URQUIDI: So, if we have like, what's it called? A
23 quorum or something?

24 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah.

25 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. So, that it's gonna go through.

1 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

2 MR. URQUIDI: Yeah. Okay.

3 (Inaudible comments.)

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Tonight?

5 MR. ACEDO: Yeah. We're working on the final changes, and
6 then we'll pull it up once more for you guys to review, and then we'll
7 print it and get it, get it signed.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, don't -

9 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

10 MR. ACEDO: We tried.

11 (Inaudible comments.)

12 MR. ACEDO: And I believe we're just gonna indicate on
13 there, "Not present, unable to sign".

14 (Inaudible comments.)

15 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, after we sign, then adjourn.
16 Maybe we should take a group picture before we leave.

17 (Inaudible comments.)

18 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Or what I like, "Not present to vote".
19 That way it's clear he wasn't, he didn't vote. Can you just scroll up
20 to the top? That way we can just like - one more look.

21 MS. DENT: (Inaudible)

22 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yes. Yeah. Yeah, that looks good.
23 Where is that? Where is - why - oh.

24 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

1 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Cost of loving. That is hilarious.
2 But the cost of loving should be free. That's hilarious. And how
3 many times have we read this? Right. It's 'cause they just read what
4 we want it to say. Yeah. I think that looks good, yeah. Yes.

5 (Inaudible comments.)

6 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: What am I gonna do with my Thursday
7 nights now? (Inaudible) Thank you. Thank you.

8 MR. WARNE: You did a great job.

9 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah, we did. Yeah, we did.

10 (Inaudible comments.)

11 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Uh-huh. Yeah.

12 (Inaudible comments.)

13 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: So, when - is this gonna go on the
14 next agenda? Like when will this go to Council?

15 (Inaudible comments.)

16 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Okay. 'Cause I thought they
17 have to vote on in a ministerial act, 'cause they did in '21.

18 MS. GARCIA: They did -

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

20 MS. GARCIA: - but they don't have to.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Oh, okay.

22 (Inaudible comments.)

23 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Yeah. That'd be great. Yeah.

24 Yeah. If that does go, I'd like to try to attend if possible to kind

1 of see what their feedback is. But, yeah. And I don't know. Like
2 should we - yeah.

3 (Inaudible comments.)

4 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I, I'm interested, yes. Okay. Oh,
5 shoot there was - oh. So, just kind of because of the conversations
6 that we had with Mayor and Council (inaudible) a different
7 recommendation.

8 Do you think - like is it okay if maybe like I work on a
9 narrative to kind of like talk about like we turn - like how the
10 conversation shifted to this, that could be provided like to Council?
11 Yeah. Okay. I'm just thinking like, you know, based on what we had
12 talked about with the Council Members, like this is, this is -

13 MR. WARNE: (Inaudible)

14 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Yeah. Just like a summary of like how
15 we got from this -

16 MR. WARNE: That's great.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay.

18 (Inaudible comments.)

19 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Thank you. Thank you, Laura.

20 MR. WARNE: Are we adjourned?

21 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: I think that's it, right? That's all
22 (inaudible) Okay. All right. This meeting is adjourned at 7:22.

23 MS. LOZANO: So, just real quick before you leave, Alexa.
24 It did go to Mayor and Council the last couple of years. So, in 2019

1 it went in April. So, we'll probably schedule it for second meeting
2 in April.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCHOLL: Okay. Excellent. Yes.

4 (Proceedings were concluded.)

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability the
foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the original tape-
recorded conversation in the case reference on page 1 above.

Transcription Completed: 04/08/2023

/s/ Kathleen R. Krassow
KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner
M&M Typing Service