



Citizens' Commission on Public Service and Compensation Minutes

**Wednesday, March 5, 2025, 5:30 p.m.
Mayor and Council Chambers, City Hall, 1st Floor
255 W. Alameda St., Tucson, Arizona**

1. Roll Call

Chair Dent called the Citizens' Commission on Public Service and Compensation (CCPSC) meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

Present:

Gerard Acuna-Schultz
Laura Dent
Greg Facey
Jennifer Garcia
Tyson Gillespie
Mark Kimble

Appointor:

City Manager
City Manager, Chair
City Manager (electronic attendance)
City Manager
City Manager (arrived at 5:47 p.m.)
City Manager

Absent:

William Morales

City Manager

Staff Present:

Yolanda Lozano
Danny Garcia
Jaime Corrales

Chief Deputy City Clerk
Management Assistant, City Clerk's Office
Office Manager, City Clerk's Office

From this point forward, minutes are a verbatim transcription from Microsoft TEAMS.

2. Approval of Minutes from the February 25, 2025, Meeting

It was moved by Commissioner Kimble, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Commissioners Gillespie and Morales absent), to approve the minutes

Chair Dent: Thank you so much. Moving into approval of the Minutes from our last meeting on February 25th, I did have one note from the legal action report. Which I actually let me double check and make sure if it's been reflected here on the legal action report. It didn't show that we took action, not to increase or adjust Council salaries, because we kind of talked about this two prong approach of like the first step being to just basically say we're not going to take any action in relation to compensation recommendations or question for voters this cycle. And then the second step being this bigger conversation around the role of the CCPSC. And so, I didn't see that first action reflected, which I believe Jennifer, seconded. But I don't remember who make the motion, so I wanna just make sure that that was in the minutes. Which I am simultaneously reading right now, but I did not notice it in the legal action report.

Yolanda Lozano: So, I can revise the LAR to reflect that, but the Minutes are a transcription.

Chair Dent: OK.

Ms. Lozano: So, it should be in there. OK all I did with the minutes was just put names to where people spoke and adjusted that way.

Chair Dent: Perfect. OK. So then maybe if I could entertain a motion with the updated Legal Action Report to approve the minutes of the 25th, that'd be great.

Commissioner Kimble: I move we approve the Minutes for the February 25th meeting.

Commissioner Garcia: I will second.

Chair Dent: Thank you so much. All those in favor?

All: Aye

3. Discussion and Development of Recommendation to the Mayor and Council

Discussion ensued:

It was moved by Commissioner Garcia, duly seconded, with a friendly amendment made by Commissioner Gillespie, to recommend sending a memo to Mayor and Council laying out options for their for kind of like what the future of the CCPSC looks like given the index that the voters approved in 2023 to include the recommendation made by Attorney Rankin for the Tucson Charter, Section 9.1 (a) and 9.1 (b)(1) and (2) and adding a subsection (3).

Discussion continued.

The motion, with the friendly amendment, was carried by a voice vote of 6 to 0 (Commissioner Morales absent).

Chair Dent: OK. Motion carries. Great. So, moving into the conversation that. Was really initiated by the recommendation made by Attorney Rankin. He sent around really, the language in the

Charter itself around what might change if we were to make recommendations to the Council in relation to this issue and whether the CCPSC continues to meet every two years, if we recommend that the Council refer a question to voters, that would essentially change the Charter to change the role of the CCPSC.

I appreciate the kind of additional language here that would get us to where we would need to be to make a recommendation. I was thinking about this like in between our last meeting in this meeting and I'm feeling a little bit uncomfortable with this committee making recommendations around changes to the Charter beyond like the original scope of the committee is. Our role is to make recommendations around Mayor and Council salaries and that this body has, you know, been reiterated like dozens of times in the history of Tucson. And there's nothing particularly special about our configuration or anything one of those configurations to then sort of take up this mantle of saying we need to change the Charter too, adjust this.

And so, part of me was thinking and I wanted to just get a gut check from you all, if you would feel comfortable with the idea of presenting Council with like options instead of necessarily saying, we recommend you send a question to the voters around changing the Charter. Because so often there's conversations around charter changes and I think it comes with a lot of heft, a lot of like political weight and often times these will be packaged up into, you know, bigger thing.

And so, I just sort of feel like maybe we can recommend to them, hey, this is a question mark that we've come across as a Commission. These are some of the options that you might consider. We think these make sense, but we really kind of want to look to you all for like action and next steps. So it's kind of more explaining the situation, part of what is led me to think about that is I remember in the conversations that we had in the last iteration of our convening or the CCPSC in 2023, when voters did approve by 300 some votes, the recommendation of this committee was that there was a lot of critique around taking this out of the hands of the voters.

And I remember, you know, making a little bit of a case and saying this doesn't change the Charter. This doesn't change our process. It's really just about indexing to a changing economy and like keeping up with the times. And so I just worry a little bit about feeding into some of that negativity or some of that tension that created a very hairline boat last time around, so I wanted to get a gut check from you all on how would you feel about laying out these options and recommending Council consider them versus recommending Council actually send a question to the voters changing the Charter?

Commissioner Garcia: I was actually having the same feelings about this, that the scope of what we are expected to present this really didn't feel like something that we should be putting our hands in with changing the Charter. I like the idea of having that change so I would like to maybe go the same route that you're suggesting that we give them a couple of options but not get too involved in that process of changing the Charter.

Chair Dent: Thank you.

Commissioner Acuna-Schultz: I agree with what you guys are mentioned as well I did mention thought about it when after listening to your guys' last meeting that I still think that we should still meet in two years to kind of go over and kind of bring up what was mentioned after meeting with Mayor and Council, in discussing what you know, what they would recommend and what we think, because I think us coming in and coming in and switching all this up, you know, I don't think that that's our place to do that. So, I kind of agree with you guys as well with that.

Commissioner Kimble: I guess I'm ambivalent on it. I don't see a problem with making a recommendation. I don't think it's outside of the purview of this of this Commission, on the other hand, if the majority is, feels that that's going too far, I'm not opposed to that. I think in his language, City Attorney reflected what I thought was the main point of our discussion, that we would not meet again, this organization, this Commission would not meet again, unless state laws changed. And he put the language in to equal to or greater than 20%. I think that's a reasonable amount. So, I thought he captured at least my feelings about the changes very well.

Ms. Lozano: Madam Chair, just so you know, Commissioner Facey is on the line, he's in the meeting now.

Chair Dent: OK. Hi, Greg. Did you catch some of that conversation that we just had?

Commissioner Facey: Only like the last two sentences.

Chair Dent: OK. So we, just to summarize briefly, we talked a little bit about the idea of recommending to mayor and Council some options for consideration around Charter changes versus like making an explicit recommendation from the CCPSC to essentially change what the CCPSC looks like and the Charter itself, which kind of mandates our existence. So, it's sort of taking a little bit more of a moderated tone around suggesting, hey, this is something that you guys wanna think about. They're gonna have to be the ones, that's my understanding to make the referral to the voters. I don't believe we have the power to refer anything to the voters that's beyond salary changes, so it's really kind of a ball in their court anyway.

So, we talked a little bit about that being a bit of a middle path that hopefully can address. I think these are good recommendations and we should work them into the memo, but that it's not necessarily a thing we think you should send this to the voters. It's just more of like you should probably think about this given the action of the CCPSC in 2023, and the decision made by Tucson voters.

Commissioner Facey: Correct, correct. I do like the fact that there's things baked into the language here of, you know, 10 years out as a trigger effect to reconvene and I do like the fact that you know the 20% is baked into there as well. And then, of course, all the regular normal things are also built in there as well.

Chair Dent: Great. Thank you, Greg. So, if I could, then I just wanted to kind of like offer up like a few options, essentially that we might integrate into this recommendation to Council to consider like how they wanna tackle this issue moving forward. The option A would just be like baseline of what does the Charter say right now we meet every two years we recommend to voters it goes straight to voters and it bypasses the Council. Option B being that we convene every six to ten years or whatever this group decides, instead of every two years. Option C might be that we convene whenever the enabling state statute is changed so that we're tracking, like, how does this reflect Tucson and Option D might be a combination of B&C, which I believe is what Rankin has outlined here.

I mean, we could even say if this group to kind of more meet in the middle, like we suggest Option D as like being a comprehensive way for you all to like think about tracking this should you want to refer something to the voters. But that sort of, for me feels like a comprehensive look at like. what does the CCPSC do? And What are some options that you can consider if you want to send something to the electorate about the work of this body

Does that, how does that sound for folks?

Commissioner Garcia: Yeah, I think it's appropriate and I like it.

Commissioner Facey: Yeah, I agree, I like it as well. You know that's a good approach. I do like the language here in section 9.1 (b)(2) really resonates as a triggering effect, no greater than 20%, and if that's the case or something major changes that a committee will be established within 90 days from the date of amendment.

Commissioner Kimble: So, we have what the city attorney has written. What would we do to this to meet the concerns that have been expressed? What specifically, which changes would you recommend?

Chair Dent: I think the language is good. It's just more about recommending to council that they send this to the voters versus recommend that they consider their options in relation to how the Charter looks for the CCPSC. So, we can, I think we can reflect this exactly. I heard Greg say he likes the 20%. I heard you say that Mike too. If the 10 year feels good, we can include that too. And just say this is an option for you all to think about, but that way we're not necessarily saying you should do this should send this question to the voters this year next cycle. It's just more about like now that this the electorate has made this decision, these are some things you should be thinking about.

(Commissioner Gillespie arrived at 5:47 p.m.)

Chair Dent: Hi, welcome, Tyson, I take it. Hi, good to see you. We're just talking a little bit about the recommendations made by Mike Rankin and we've been having a little bit of a discussion about, essentially recommending to council that they consider their options around the future of the CCPSC and what they might want to do, as opposed to recommending a change to the Charter. Which is a little bit above and beyond the traditional work of the CCPSC, which is only limited to like salaries is for Council.

Commissioner Kimble: So just to clarify, would you propose removing section 9.1 (b)(1). Is that address your concerns, and in subsection 9.1 (b)(2) Is that something you would support including?

Chair Dent: So, in thinking about the Charter itself, I would recommend, instead of just sending the Charter changes and suggesting they send this to the voters, we just essentially summarize this and I think we can include this as an addendum and say we like what the city attorney has said, but we want you all to know your options essentially in relation to what the work of the CCPSC looks like.

So, this actually I think can be language that we embrace if 10 years feels like a good amount of time. If we want to say 6 to 10 years, 8 to 10 years, whatever feels good for this body. But we're not necessarily recommending that they send this question to the voters, which is what I believe we are initially talked about when Attorney Rankin joined us at the 25th.

Commissioner Garcia: Written in, there are the recommendations for.

Commissioner Gillespie: Just for clarification, is there? A recommended revision that would include a trigger if. State law changed.

Chair Dent: Yes. So, we had just talked about the idea of sending options to council. So we're not necessarily saying like we think you should do this to change the Charter, which is, you know it's a big step and I think politically that's like been difficult for elections to succeed on in the past. So,

the options could be either like no change, the baseline is just keeping the Charter as it is, this body meets every two years.

Option B could be that this body meets every six to 10 years, or whatever number we wanted to put on it. Option C could be that we convene similar to here whenever the state statute changes, which is kind of to your point, maybe within 20% or some other benchmark that people would feel comfortable with and Option D could be a combination of C&D. So, we could say this group meets every six to ten years or six years and/or if state law changes, which would be I think, like the strongest insurance policy.

Commissioner Gillespie: That's what I think recommending would be that if 10 years, it could be next year that the laws changed then it would be a nine-year cycle until the next Commission would be. So, it sooner triggers if the revision of the state law happens with appeal.

Chair Dent: Yes, I think that would definitely cover like the most variables in the equation, but I think the big question is around like are we comfortable basically laying out these options to council and then letting them take their take the next step on it?

Commissioner Kimble: I guess I would suggest that someone suggests some language that we can discuss. I in theory I don't have any problem with it, although it seems awfully vague, and I mean, I know they probably know their options without us telling them what their options are. But. What, what is a motion that you would propose that we could discuss doing with specific language?

Chair Dent: Sure. I would make a motion that we send a memo to Mayor and Council laying out options for their for kind of like what the future of the CCPSC looks like given the index that the voters approved in 2023 to include the recommendation made by Attorney Rankin.

Commissioner Kimble: Just to clarify your motion. So, what changes would there be in his memo in section 9.1(b).

Chair Dent: It would be the entirety of that section.

Commissioner Kimble: You would recommend all of that.

Chair Dent: Yeah. I mean, I think if folks wanna have a conversation around whether it's 10 years, eight years, six years, whether it's 20% or any change in the law, I feel like all of that makes sense and we should talk about further. But I think for me it's more about the idea of including both in that option for Council and then letting them decide. Is that clear? That motion is that OK? Is there a second to that?

Commissioner Garcia: I will second that motion.

Ms. Lozano: So, Madam Chair, you can recommend the motion but somebody else has to make the motion.

Chair Dent: OK. OK.

Commissioner Garcia: So, then I will motion that we set forth the options to council on the future of CCPSC.

Commissioner Facey: I second that motion.

Chair Dent: Discussion.

Commissioner Kimble: I'm still not clear what., so are we, are we, is the motion to approve language in section 9.1(b) (1) and (2).

Commissioner Garcia: The motion is to present the options to the Council and that would be as written, as Manager, Rankin. I'm sorry, City Attorney Rankin has put forth in the draft.

Commissioner Kimble: So, you would approve all of this?

Commissioner Garcia: I motion that we recommend that to City Council as options for the future.

Chair Dent: Yeah, it's sort of. I just to clarify, it's sort of if you're sitting in the role of a Council, it's like a Commission saying you should send this question to the voters versus you should think about this and take the action that feels right for the Mayor and. Council of this moment, right. It's a little bit of a softer pass than a hardball, if that makes sense.

And I have no objection to including Mr. Rankin's memo in our recommendation so that they're aware what we've been working off of and building off of.

Commissioner Gillespie: I'm in support of the motion if it includes a trigger outside of like a 20% or greater increase. So, like if there is a decrease from standard the current statute or the statutes repealed. I think that also because if we're nine years away, then that that's a challenge for the Council for those nine years.

Chair Dent: Would you suggest Tyson, like any change to the statute, to really cover all our bases?

Commissioner Gillespie: Honestly, we have no idea what those changes might be at any given time, so I would say they would at least then the Commission would be called to review the impact of any statutory change.

Chair Dent: OK. So, do we need a substitute motion for that? OK. Do you wanna throw that out there? I think I think that makes sense and is a little more conservative.

Commissioner Gillespie: And yeah, I moved to.

Chair Dent: Or is it a friendly amendment?

Commissioner Gillespie: Yeah, I mean, like I'm, I'm just wanting to amend whatever recommending.

Ms. Lozano: It could be a friendly amendment and looking at what Mr. Rankin put together. Maybe it's you add a #3. So, it's a separate something separate from what's already there, right.

Commissioner Garcia: Just to put forth the options for them, yeah.

Ms. Lozano: So, can you state what that friendly amendment is?

Commissioner Gillespie: So, I move that we amend that if there's any statutory add a #3 in 9.1, that includes that any statutory change, recommend that the Council would call this Commission do the impact.

Chair Dent: Or Tyson, could we say that we just X out the 20% component and that way we really just get to the crux of like any change?

Commissioner Gillespie: I think if we can simplify the language in two to include all potential changes that I think that that makes the most sense.

Chair Dent: OK, great that way, we're kind of not wordsmithing too much, the attorney's comments, but gets at what you're hoping to do. OK, perfect.

Commissioner Kimble: So to clarify, would you change #2 to be in the event that the salary of members of the Board of Supervisors is approved by state law is changed is changed, then the Commission will be appointed and strike everything between those two points.

Commissioner Gillespie: Yeah, I think so, I think it should read like in the event the ARS statute is revised or changed, and then anything or any successor statute, just cut the part out about the Board of Supervisors salary because it's a revision of the statute, is what we're saying would trigger the board to call the Commission. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Garcia: The supervisors.

Commissioner Gillespie: Yeah, just the whole thing.

Chair Dent: Or could it be from the word by through the word 20% and that way it just reads, "in the event that the salary the members of the Board of Supervisors as provided by state laws changed in a given year through amendment of enabling state statute or any successor statute, then the Commission will be appointed.

Commissioner Gillespie: As long as Mr. Rankin feels like that is legally the way it needs to read.

Chair Dent: Right. Do folks feel comfortable with that change? It's a little more inclusive, so it kind of just covers all the bases of what this legislature might do.

Commissioner Garcia: Yes, I'm. I'm comfortable with that.

Commissioner Kimble: Yes.

Chair Dent: OK. Greg, do you have anything to add?

Commissioner Facey: No, no, that sounds good. If we're gonna make that change, that's good, as long as it still says, you know, the Commission will be appointed within the 90 days. That's important. But other than that, good. If it's more broad.

Chair Dent: Great, excellent. Is there any more discussion?

Commissioner Facey: Sounds great. Yeah, kind of broke it down a little bit better, yeah.

Chair Dent: If there's no more discussion, we can entertain Jennifer's motion.

Ms. Lozano: We can just vote on the whole motion with a friendly amendment all at one time.

Chair Dent: OK, OK. Great. All those in favor of the motion.

All: Aye

Chair Dent: Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you all so much for your flexibility and convening twice. On a simple question. So I have a process point of question, Yolanda in terms of getting this before because I know typically Commissioners have to sign the recommendation once it's been completed. Is there a way for us to do that virtually?

Ms. Lozano: We can prepare the final recommendation, send it out to you all and have you, and if you can sign virtually, digitally, that that works too. Otherwise, you're gonna have to come in and sign. We just have to have it done. And to Mayor and Council. The Commission has to have it done by March 15th, OK and then we submit it to Mayor and Council at one of their next meetings.

Chair Dent: OK, perfect. So maybe by the beginning of next week we can get something out to.

Ms. Lozano: So, we'll work on something. Send it to you all for your review and any changes and stuff that you might want to send it back to us, and then we can route it for digital signature if you want, or if you want to come in and sign. We can do that also. Does that work?

Commissioner Facey: Yes.

Chair dent: Ok, Great. Is there anything else before we adjourn?

Ms. Lozano: So, we don't need any more meetings, right? We're done. OK. 'Cause I got an election coming.

Chair Dent: Yes, good luck on the election, OK? Well, thank you all so much for your time. We'll go ahead and adjourn the meeting at 6:02. Thanks everyone.

Ms. Lozano: Thank you all. Thank you all for your time and service. I mean, it was just kind of a rush quick process, but I think it's a good one and we'll just move forward with it and see how it goes. Thank you.

Commissioner Facey: Alright, take care.

4. Adjournment – 6:02 p.m.