

Meeting Date: 9/15/2015

Report Type: Staff/Discussion

Report ID: 2015-00833

Title: Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee Final Report and Recommendations

Location: Citywide

Recommendation: Approve the framework of recommendations proposed by the Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee and pass a Motion approving the following actions: 1) Direct the Independent Budget Analyst to work with the City Clerk to hold multiple public forums on budget priorities; 2) Approve moving forward with the establishment of an Independent Redistricting Commission and direct the City Clerk and City Attorney to return with language and the appropriate action for the Council to act on placing a measure for this purpose on the November 2018 ballot; 3) Direct the City Clerk to work with the City Attorney to draft an Ethics Code and bring forward the Code to City Council at midyear for review and approval; 4) Direct the City Clerk to establish an Office of Compliance and bring to City Council for review and approval by midyear a report defining the program and a proposed budget amendment to add staff to create an Office of Compliance in the City Clerk's Office; 5) Direct the City Clerk to work with the City Attorney to draft an ordinance to implement an Ethics Commission and bring the ordinance forward to City Council for review and approval by midyear; 6) Direct the City Clerk to work with the City Attorney to draft a Sunshine Ordinance and bring the ordinance forward to City Council for review and approval within 60-90 days; and 7) Direct the City Clerk to implement the transparency and public engagement open government recommendations.

Contact: Angelique Ashby, Mayor Pro Tem, (916) 808-7001, District 1

Presenter: Angelique Ashby, Mayor Pro Tem, (916) 808-7001, District 1

Department: Mayor/Council

Division: Mayor/Council

Dept ID: 01001011

Attachments:

- 1-Description/Analysis
- 2-Attachment A (Good Gov Ad Hoc Results of Community Meetings)
- 3-Attachment B (Framework for Good Gov Recommendations)
- 4-Attachment C (Draft Summary of Redistricting Commission Process)
- 5-Attachment D (Benchmark Cities Ethics Research – TO BE DELIVERED)

City Attorney Review

Approved as to Form
Matthew Ruyak
9/10/2015 3:50:53 PM

Approvals/Acknowledgements

Department Director or Designee: Shirley Concolino - 9/10/2015 1:18:08 PM

James Sanchez, City Attorney

Shirley Concolino, City Clerk
John F. Shirey, City Manager

Russell Fehr, City Treasurer

Description/Analysis

Issue Detail: At the November 6, 2014 City Council meeting Mayor Johnson appointed the Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate good governance reforms that he felt reflected the input and interest of the community. The Committee includes Councilmembers Ashby, Schenirer, Warren and Mayor Johnson. The Mayor asked the Committee to evaluate the good governance issues noted below as well as other possible proposals and make recommendations to the City Council. The Committee was charged with reporting to the City Council with a work plan and timeline for the following:

- Independent Budget Analyst
- Independent Redistricting Commission
- Ethics Committee, with code of ethics and sunshine ordinance
- Neighborhood Advisory Committee

On January 6, 2015 the Committee presented to the City Council recommendations on an approach, mapping process, and timeline for each of the above issues. Those approved recommendations included beginning recruitment for the Independent Budget Analyst and providing partial funding for the remainder of the 2014/15 fiscal year. The Independent Budget Analyst was selected by the full Council and started in mid-June. Full funding for the Office of the Independent Analyst was included in the approved 2015/16 budget.

Also included in the January approval was a recommendation that mapped out a process for creating an Independent Redistricting Commission to be implemented by a future Council in 2019. The next census takes place in 2020 and a commission would undertake a redistricting process in 2021.

During June and July of this year, the Ad Hoc Committee held three community meetings to solicit input on ethics and neighborhood engagement. The agenda and a compilation of those meeting notes are shown in Attachment A. Input on the city's budget was identified as of high importance. In addition, interest was expressed by several organizations that encourage active citizen participation in government to have the Independent Redistricting Commission placed on an earlier ballot.

Following the community meetings, the Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee asked staff to meet with representatives from the League of Women Voters, Common Cause and former FPPC Chief of Enforcement Gary Winuk to get input on the development of final recommendations including ethics and moving forward the action on an Independent Redistricting Commission. Concurrently, Mayor Johnson asked Mayor Pro Tem Ashby to

bring back a final report of recommendations from the Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee to Council no later than the end of September.

City staff, including the City Clerk, City Attorney, and members of the Mayor and Council Offices, have met several times with representatives of the League of Women Voters, Common Cause and former FPPC Chief of Enforcement Gary Winuk to refine a framework of recommendations for government reforms for the City of Sacramento. The Framework of Recommendations (Attachment B) is supported by the League of Women Voters, Common Cause and Mr. Winuk. The framework for a ballot measure creating an Independent Redistricting Commission is included as Attachment C.

Policy Considerations: The recommendations in this report are consistent with the City Council direction to identify opportunities for good governance, improved transparency, compliance and public engagement.

Financial Impacts: Staff will report back on the cost for implementing the reforms, the most costly of which is the Office of Compliance which will also support the Ethics Commission. The estimate of cost for two staff and an outside investigator is approximately \$450,000. Other costs related to improvements to the city's website and support to an Independent Redistricting Commission need to be estimated. Implementation of other recommendations would be accomplished within existing resources.

Economic Impacts: Not applicable.

Environmental Considerations: Not applicable.

Sustainability: Not applicable.

Commission/Committee Action: At the request of Mayor Kevin Johnson, this report is presented by the Ad Hoc Committee on Good Governance.

Rationale for Recommendation: The recommendations of this report reflect a blending of best practices from other cities and incorporation of current city practices to improve transparency, compliance, and public engagement (Attachment D).

Local Business Enterprise (LBE): Not applicable.

Office of the Mayor and City Council

**GOOD GOVERNANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF OUTREACH/COMMUNITY MEETINGS**

The Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee held three community meetings to discuss neighborhood involvement in the City's budget process and the topics of a Redistricting Committee, Ethics Committee and Neighborhood Committee.

Ad Hoc Community Meeting #1

Monday, June 15, 2015

Natomas High School

6:00pm – 8:00pm

Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee Members Present: *Vice Mayor Allen Warren, Mayor Pro Tem Angelique Ashby, Councilmember Jay Schenirer*

City Staff Present: *City Clerk Shirley Concolino, Assistant City Manager Howard Chan, Mayor's Senior Community Advisor Helen Hewitt, Neighborhood Services Division Manager Vincene Jones, City Attorney Matt Ruyak, Independent Budget Analyst John Silva*

General Public in attendance (based on sign-in sheet): 9

Ad Hoc Community Meeting #2

Saturday - June 27, 2015

Sam and Bonnie Pannell Community Center

9:00am – 11:00am

Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee Members Present: *Mayor Pro Tem Angelique Ashby*

City Staff Present: *City Clerk Shirley Concolino, City Neighborhood Services Division Manager Vincene Jones*

General Public in attendance (based on sign-in sheet): 7

Ad Hoc Community Meeting #3

Thursday - July 23, 2015

City Hall – First Floor Lobby

6:00pm – 8:00pm

Good Governance Ad Hoc Committee Members Present: *City Councilmember Jay Schenirer*

City Staff Present: *City Clerk Shirley Concolino, City Neighborhood Services Division Manager Vincene Jones, Mayor's Senior Community Advisor Helen Hewitt*

General Public in attendance (based on sign-in sheet): 17

Questions and comments from attendees were transcribed by Neighborhood Services staff at each meeting and are organized by topic area below:

Independent Budget Analyst:

- How was the individual selected? What was the process of selection?
- What department are they under?
- Hiring power of the position?

Redistricting Committee:

- Are the Ad Hoc members considering a commission for Redistricting and not for Ethics or Behest?
- Redistricting should not be put off until 2020. It is fresh in people's minds how unfair and difficult it was recently and needs to be addresses sooner than later.
- # of members on previous committee
- How/who appointed?
- "Memory still fresh", do now rather than later
- Track record from previous (census 2000) year not much better
- Much more independent process to be developed by the next council meeting (5 years away)
- Some thought to do it now
- Commission- how they are appointed?
- Suggested that committee members not be selected by council
- No decisions- Eye on Sac and League of Women Voters and Common Cause
- 15 members for the last commission
- What is the thought of the current councilmember on doing it now or doing it later?
- Suggesting to do it now so the discussions can begin sooner and not be last minute
- Sac Integrity Project has been focusing on this topic
- The process will take time.

Ethics Committee:

- Is there a way for the public to give input during the Ad Hoc Committee Meetings?
- There are strong feelings in support of an Ethics Commission, as a way to address compromising behavior by City Officials/public officials. For example, using private emails to do City business/work. One audience member emphasized the need for an enforcement (Ethics Commission) branch to ensure that City officials are doing their jobs ethically. An Ethics Commission is needed to keep City officials behaviors in line.
- Another resident vocalized the deterioration of trust by the public in their City & public officials. Stating that residents don't feel they have a voice and that having an Ethics Commission would go a long way with building that trust.

- When City officials don't report who they hire, i.e. Mayor's recent hires. This is the kind of matter the Ethics Commission could address
- Per the resident, it's the perception that not sharing those kinds of details that causes mistrust in the communities
- Does the City/Council publicize open job positions? Hiring a diverse cross-section of people, not only people that agree with the Councilmembers or City department directors is critical.
- What about large corporations that give money to the Councilmembers/Mayor and are why a behest issue needs to be addressed by an Ethics Commission
- I think we need an Ethics Commission and a Redistricting Commission not a Committee. The Commission should have authority to make decisions and take action.
- Data portal is not user friendly maybe have classes on how to use it
 - Have an online tutorial possibly
 - Using open Gov. (just purchased to become more user friendly)
- There isn't a city-chartered ethics code, City Clerk's Office enforces the state/federal ethics regulations and guidelines
- Real cost of email storage?
- Policy passed in 2007?
- Amendment to policy in 2015? 2015 Retention Schedule
- Who enforces the ethics code?
- Define "transitory emails"
- Who enforces the ethic codes?
- Who has oversight of the City Clerk's Office?
- How the council behaves publicly?
- Transparency
- Public Records availability
- Donations/committees on our website
- Looking for the gaps and what the community is looking for
- Work in process
- Ethic Codes- conduct of council
- Urge the Ad Hoc Committee to recommend ethics commission instead of self
- An Ethics Commission would help with the distrust factors taking place at this time with the public and council.
- Ad Hoc Committee does not favor a commission
 - Ad HOC only makes recommendations
 - 2007- Email Policy
 - Related to projects (retention)
 - Transitory email- only 2 years- no city in CA keeps them longer, most cities 90 Days

→ Check resolution - Feb 2015 Retention Policy- 60 days? Amendment

- Council agenda and minutes are now summaries because of video streaming which is all on-line
- Ad Hoc Committee - discussion between staff and council - no power only make recommend
- Brown ACT- Public discussion
- Measure L- Neighborhood commission/committee
 - “SCAN”
 - Leaders/ reps of neighbor groups bring together and provide 3 top items to make recommendation on
 - Maybe council out in community
- If we took a vote tonight - most would agree a need for an ethics committee- but there is a cost and the members can't speak for others (comment made from the floor, unsure if from city or public)

Neighborhood Committee:

- One resident asked how many languages is the City website translated in? She emphasized that there are many communities that need the information translated in their languages (on the website).
- Setting policies that help to promote healthy neighborhoods and communities
- Maybe have the community/neighborhood associations present at a City Council meeting designated specifically for neighborhood/community associations only, so there doesn't have to be a separate meeting
- Have each Councilmember have an advisory group in their districts, meet with the leaders of their district neighborhood associations
- Ethics & Transparency is a big issue in all of the districts. Maybe invite other Councilmembers to hear the conversation
- City's budget is so huge, can there be a Saturday class on how to understand it
 - Mayor Pro Tem asked if we have budget workshops through Neighborhood Services Division (NSD)?
 - Neighborhood Services Division will look into Saturday workshops and do offer CMA classes that thoroughly go over the city depts., budget, etc.
 - City Management Academy = 13 weeks long, city managements
- Youth opportunities: PLAY
 - D8 reaches out to the schools in the districts and staff CM engages the youth people in his districts
- Are youth being paid a stipend to participate?
 - Summer at City Hall Program – yes
 - MPT (Mayor Pro Tem) Ashby's office, no but do give incentives (ie, gift cards, ipads. Etc.)
 - City of Sacramento Youth Commission does get a stipend
- Best youth program in South Oak Park, could that program access funding by the city to engage the youth?

- City does not get funding for youth, children or human services. The County handles those areas. CM Schenirer would like a youth dept. but as of now we don't have that. We have to work w\ the school districts and the County.
- Youth & seniors: we have to grow peoples' interest in understanding City policies and initiatives that affect them. Messaging within the home is important
- How do we get middle school & high school students more engaged in local governance?
- How do we outreach to the military/veteran community to engage in local government?
- Disenfranchised communities - How do they become engage with the City?
- Surplus money from the State & lottery money, where did the money go?
- In relation to Code Enforcement, language barriers in communication efforts needs to be addressed, and most residents don't get involved until affected personally
 - Advocates need to have a direct link to city staff/city elected
 - Police & city elected working together
 - JFN issues and increase City Funding
- Historical remarks 70's and 80's
- Consider neighborhood planning councils as done in the county
- How do these neighborhood associations groups and HOAs interact with the council?
- How would the comments (action items) by a Neighborhood Committee be brought before council?
- In the council districts this type of communication is already happening
 - District 2 – Ten Neighborhood Association representatives met with Vice Mayor Warren to discuss what they perceived as the top three priorities in their respective neighborhoods. The group will meet again in September to continue the discussions and talk about progress being made on their priority items (One voice- one vision of the community).
 - District 5 does the same thing- brings everyone together and asks for their 3 top issues they would like to work in
- HOA's concerns – who can they talk with?
- Neighborhood Services Division seems like a good place to rebuild the connections and communications - including renters and owners
- Neighborhood Summit could happen multiple times a year including the opportunity to speak to council.
- An Association for renters?
- Great ideas but we're not connecting here this evening. Sub-committee to bring ideas to the council.
- Planning councils?
- # of N.A.'s meetings on their own and will continue to meet every other month
- Neighborhood wide issues as a focus

Miscellaneous:

- How is it ok for the Mayor to hire new staff without having the money in his budget, taking the positions from the City Manager's office?
- How was outreach for tonight's meeting implemented? How was this meeting advertised? Because one resident expressed her frustration with only being noticed via FaceBook (FB) the day of the meeting.
- Residents expressed that greater outreach was needed, more than just the City/Council websites
- Would these be formal committees/commissions/councils?
- What summertime activities are available for the youth? Does the City have incentives, like free transportation for youth in the summer? What about subsidized camps? 12-18yrs old. How can we provide something positive to the youth? Transportation is a huge issue. How do we be proactive, not reactive?
- When Ad Hoc Committees makes decisions, or makes recommendations, the dialogue that takes place needs to be made public. Ad Hoc Committee discussions need to be made public.
- Whatever we do decide to do there has to be better advertisement/marketing on meetings like tonight
- Would like to see the Ad Hoc Committee provide recommendations, that the general public could provide feedback on, then take that info. back to the full council
- The reason we have the AD Hoc Committees are due to the Brown ACT. An Ad Hoc Committee can only be made up with a maximum of four members of Council
 - The Committee works through the details w/o having all the council members present, but do bring the info and those details to the full council after they come up w/ recommendations
 - Theses community meetings are the Ad Hocs (good gov.) way of getting feedback from the community that will be put into a report that will go to the full council
- Major outreach was done by the city staff to advertise those mtgs. Still not much response, people seem not as interested
- Somehow communication is still not getting out to people
- Need to have the Ad Hoc Committee meetings open for public observation not as much need for participation
- Ad Hoc Committee meeting should follow the same process including the Brown Act and provide public access, not a closed discussion
- Organize as a "stack" (speaker slips, acknowledge speaker by raising of hand)
- At a point in time the City Council passed a resolution stating that the Arena project was to go to a public vote not a vote only by Council to move the project forward. What happened to this and how did the Council at a later point in time vote as a Council to move the project forward?
- Budget: When do reforms go to council? Fall/late summer

- Has the Ad Hoc Committee produced any documents to date? Who are the members of the Ad Hoc Committee? Why aren't they all here? What other Committees are there?
 - Conduct actual City Council meetings in the neighborhood
 - How do we get a larger voice at council from the community?
 - There is cost to having council meetings in the community 2x day
-

Next Steps

- Gather notes from all three meetings
 - Follow up with individual meetings with key community groups including Eye on Sacramento, League of Women Voters, Common Cause, etc.
 - Report back to Ad HOC Committee with the findings. With these findings a report back to the entire council will take place which will provide recommendations to consider.
 - Report back to entire Council with recommendations for consideration.
 - Depending on the discussion at council the recommendations can move forward to the Law and Legislative Committee for further discussion and development and ultimately returning to council for a vote.
-

GOOD GOVERNANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE
FRAMEWORK OF RECOMMENDATIONS
ON GOOD GOVERNANCE REFORM

Neighborhood Advisory

- Conduct multiple public forums in late Fall to solicit input on budget priorities for development of the Mayor/Council budget priorities for the next fiscal year budget.

Council Action: Direct the Independent Budget Analyst to work with the City Clerk to hold multiple public forums on budget priorities.

Independent Redistricting Commission

- Support the establishment of an Independent Redistricting Commission
- Commission would have independent authority to redraw council district boundaries
- Model after process used by State of California
 - Open application process
 - Must meet certain criteria to be eligible(e.g. lived in Sacramento for 10 years, voted in 2/3 of most recent primary elections, cannot run for Council office for 10 years after serving)
 - 13 members including one from each Council District plus 2 alternates
 - No direct political appointments
 - Representative of diversity
- Redistricting criteria and requirements established to guide Commission's effort
- Place a measure on the November 2018 ballot for voters to approve or disapprove the establishment of an Independent Redistricting Commission

Council Action: Approve moving forward with the establishment of an Independent Redistricting Commission and direct the City Clerk and City Attorney to return with language and the appropriate action for the Council to act on placing a measure for this purpose on the November 2018 ballot.

Ethics Reform

- 1) Create an Ethics Code centralizing all city policies and ordinances related to ethics. New ethics policies/ordinances will be incorporated into the Ethics Code.
 - Update the current Campaign Finance Ordinance
 - Formalize current policy on city employee participation in campaigns
 - Update current gift restriction policy
 - Require elected officials to complete Sexual Harassment Training every two years
 - Require newly elected official to complete AB1234 Ethics Training within 60 days of taking office (currently 6 months) and every two years thereafter
 - Restrictions on nepotism
 - Statement of Economic Interest (Form 700) reporting and disclosure
 - Revolving door restrictions
 - Candidate disclosure rules
 - Internet advertising disclosure requirement

ATTACHMENT B

- Campaign money laundering provisions
- Prohibition on soliciting campaign contributions from city employees

Council Action: Direct the City Clerk to work with the City Attorney to draft an Ethics Code and bring forward the Code to City Council at midyear for review and approval.

- 2) Establish an Office of Compliance with a Compliance Officer and administrative support position in the City Clerk's Office to support an Ethics Commission and focus on proactive education and training
- Modeled after other ethics and compliance programs including cities of San Jose and Oakland
 - Office of Compliance would be responsible for providing training and education citywide to proactively promote compliance with state and city laws
 - The Compliance Officer would be responsible for administering complaints received of alleged violations, coordinating a review by an independent third-party evaluator/investigator and forwarding any findings and recommendations to the Ethics Commission
 - Focus on complaints would be campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest and other city specific ordinance or policies related to ethics
 - City Attorney will be consulted and provide legal advice
 - Written recommendations of action would be forwarded to the Ethics Commission to determine the appropriate action, administrative penalty or fine based on the recommendations

Council Action: Direct the City Clerk to establish an Office of Compliance and bring to City Council for review and approval by midyear a report defining the program and a proposed budget amendment to add staff to create an Office of Compliance in the City Clerk's Office.

- 3) Establish an Ethics Commission
- Ethics Commission made up of 5 commissioners with any of the following qualifications: administrative law judge, retired judge with a background in election law or ethics, law school ethics professor or a professional arbitrator/mediator and serve 4 year terms. All must be in good standing.
 - The commissioners would be selected by the P&PE Committee with recommendations to the Mayor. Mayor would appoint the Commissioners with confirmation by the City Council.
 - The Ethics Commission would receive findings/recommendations from an independent third-party evaluator/investigator
 - Focus on complaints would be campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest and other city specific ordinance or policies related to ethics
 - Based on the written recommendations of the independent third-party evaluator/investigator the Ethics Commission would determine the appropriate action, administrative penalty or fine based on the recommendations
 - The Ethics Commission would meet once a year to review the activity of the Compliance Office and make recommendations to Council on improvements or enhancements

ATTACHMENT B

Council Action: Direct the City Clerk to work with the City Attorney to draft an ordinance to implement an Ethics Commission and bring the ordinance forward to City Council for review and approval by midyear.

Open Government

Transparency

- Create a Sunshine Ordinance centralizing all city records retention, open meeting, and other transparency laws.
- Ad Hoc Committees
 - Amend the Council Rules of Procedure to include regular updates by Ad Hoc Committees at the end of the City Council agenda
 - Public posting of Ad Hoc reports/recommendations prior to presentation to Council Standing Committees or City Council
- Agendas:
 - Codify current City Council practice publishing agendas 5 days in advance
 - Require agreements over \$1 million to be noticed 10 days prior to Council action Allow notice subscription for these agreements
 - Provide copies of correspondence supporting/opposing agenda items to City Council prior to Council taking any action. Retain all correspondence as part of public record
- Designate a Public Records Manager/Ombudsman within the City Clerk's office who can help formulate records requests; help mediate records disputes; and produce an annual report on requested statistics
- Post online the city's Records Retention Policy
- Require city staff to complete records retention training every two years
- Disclose behested payments online
- Create organized *Topic Portals* within Open Data Portal, e.g. for Budget & Finances Portal, Public Policy Portal, Public Safety Portal, Land Use Portal, State Open Meeting requirements, etc.
- Require a 2/3 vote to remove the City Auditor or the City Independent Budget Analyst from office

Public Engagement

- Create a public engagement webpage that provides information on how the public can effectively engage in city processes and decision making
- Adopt a social media policy for information flow to community
- Allow written public comment (including email) for any agenda item
- Look at reinstating on-line public comments as part of Granicus update

ATTACHMENT B

- Other council meeting procedural issues will be codified in the annual update of the City Council Rules of Procedure

Council action: Direct the City Clerk to work with the City Attorney to draft a Sunshine Ordinance and bring the ordinance forward to City Council for review and approval within 60-90 days.

Council Action: Direct the City Clerk to implement the transparency and public engagement open government recommendations.

Fair And Independent Redistricting (FAIR) Act

SUMMARY

- Creation: Creates the Sacramento Independent Redistricting Commission, which has exclusive authority to redraw council district boundaries
 - Model: Mostly CA State Redistricting Commission and City of Oakland Redistricting Commission.
 - Membership: Commission has 13 Commissioners and 2 Alternates
 - One Commissioner from each council district
 - Commissioners chosen based on (1) analytical skills, (2) familiarity with Sacramento neighborhoods, (3) ability to be impartial, (4) ability to work cooperatively, (5) reasonably representative of diversity
 - Serves for 10 years (but Commission becomes fully inactive 60 days after maps approved)
 - Voting: 9 Commissioners constitute a quorum.
 - Most decisions made by majority vote
 - 9 votes needed to adopt a Proposed Final Map, a Final Map, or new redistricting criteria, or to remove a Commissioner
 - Commissioner Qualifications:
 - Must have voted in 2/3 most recent primary elections, or have lived in Sacramento for 10 years,
 - File a Form 700 disclosure,
 - Cannot have donated more than \$200 to any City candidate in either of the last 2 elections
 - Cannot have been a City staffer, commissioner, or lobbyist in the last 4 years
 - Cannot have been a City elected official or candidate or campaign staff within 10 years
 - Commissioner Post-Service Restrictions:
 - Cannot run for City office for 10 years
 - Cannot be a City staffer, commissioner, elected official consultant, recipient of a no-bid contract, or lobbyist for 4 years
- Selection Process:
 - City Clerk opens application process and recruits qualified applicants
 - Must create a pool of 40 or more qualified applicants, including 3 from each council district
 - Screening Panel narrows the pool to the 25-30 best applicants
 - 8 applicants are chosen as Commissioners at random, one from each council district
 - Those 8 choose the final 7 Commissioners and Alternates
 - The Screening Panel consists of the Ethics Commission, if one exists, or a randomly selected 3-person selection panel consisting of a retired judge, law or policy professor, and member of a good government organization.

- Redistricting Criteria
 - *Requirements*: All districts must meet the following requirements:
 - Equal population: within 2.5% of statistical mean
 - Comply with US Constitution, CA Constitution, Voting Rights Act
 - Contiguous: allows travel within district
 - *Criteria*: Districts must also comply with the following prioritized criteria, where feasible:
 - Reasonably compact districts
 - Keep neighborhoods intact
 - Keep communities of interest intact
 - Boundaries follow natural and artificial barriers and thoroughfares
 - After 2030, preserve council district cores
 - Other criteria adopted by Commission not in conflict
 - *Prohibition*: Commission cannot consider any individual's residence
- No mid-cycle redistricting unless significant territory is annexed, or by court order
- Deadline: Requires council district boundaries to be adopted within 6 months of census data availability (current law) and delays new boundary implementation by 2 years if maps adopted less than 6 months until next election
- Funding: requires sufficient funding, and no less than 2011 expenditures adjusted for inflation
- Staff: Assigns City Manager, City Attorney, and City Clerk; allows Commission to hire an Executive Director and redistricting consultants
- Public hearings: all meetings open to the public
 - *Subcommittees* open to the public
 - *Ad Hocs*: no more than 3 Commissioners, must record or allow public to observe, must report out at every subsequent public hearing, and can consider no more than 3 council districts
 - *No ex parte communication*: cannot discuss redistricting outside public hearings
 - *Public comment*: orally or in writing, includes submission of maps
- *Public engagement*: encourages engagement, if feasible provide public with online mapping tools

Attachment D – Benchmark Cities Ethics Research

TO BE DELIVERED