



**Charter Review Commission Meeting
Monday, June 15, 2009
Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 & 2
5:30 p.m.**

Members: Rita Brohman, Rex Clark, Paul Frank, Janice Hanson, Rick Hoem, Valerie Hoff, Cathy Macaulay, Aldo Pineschi, and James Viele

Staff: City Attorney Brita Bayless, City Clerk Sonia Orozco, Deputy City Manager Julia Burrows, Assistant City Clerk Audrey Byrnes

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes – May 18, 2009
3. Public Comments – (On Items Not Appearing on the Agenda)
4. Old Business/Follow-up:
 - Article II. – Plan of Government
 - a) Size of City Council – Informational Report/Discussion/Action
 - b) Question and Answer Period on Time Commitments – Former Councilmember Richard Roccucci and Current Councilmember Jim Gray
 - Article III – Provisions Regarding Officers and Employees
 - a) Council Seat Vacancy/Appoint First Runner-up from Previous Election – Informational Report/Discussion/Action
 - b) Mayor Vacancy – Process to Appoint Mayor
 - c) Appointed Person Standing for Re-Election – Elected Term
 - d) Council Salary – Possible Increase with Automatic Provision for Annual Increase – Informational Report/Discussion/Action
 - e) Other Discussion – Article III Sections
5. New Business:
 - Article IV. – Procedure of the City Council
 - Article V. – Legislation
6. Comments/Members/Public

PLEASE NOTE: Public Comments on Items Not Listed on the Agenda or on Any Matters Requiring Committee Discussion or Action Will Be Listed on a Future Agenda
7. Adjournment – Next Meeting Date July 20, 2009



Minutes

Charter Review Commission Meeting

Monday, May 18, 2009
Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 & 2
5:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Members Present

Valerie Hoff
Paul Frank
Janice Hanson
Rex Clark
Aldo Pineschi
Rita Brohman
Cathy Macaulay
James Viele

Staff Present

Brita Bayless, City Attorney
Sonia Orozco, City Clerk
Julia Burrows, Deputy City Manager
Audrey Byrnes, Assistant City Clerk

Members Absent

Rick Hoem - excused

2. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the Minutes of April 20, 2009 as amended (page 2 – Article II item #4 comments added).

Moved by Brohman, seconded by Frank

Vote: Motion carried 8-0 (Hoem absent)

3. Public Comments

No public comment received.

4. Old Business:

Follow-Up on Article II – Plan of Government

a) **District Elections – Issues Report/Discussion/Action**

Deputy City Manager Burrows presented District Elections Issue Report.

Jack Wallace – Provided information regarding the certified District Elections petition that proposed Measure T which was submitted to voters in 2000.

Jim Williams – representing Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Association spoke in favor of elections by districts stating he feels it would bring about better communication from residents and Councilmembers. Mr. Williams feels neighborhoods would be better represented.

Charter Review Commission Minutes – May 18, 2009

Commission discussion.

Commission consensus to have staff report back with statewide “hybrid” election models.

Motion to continue at-large elections and continue discussion of district election hybrid models at a later date.

Moved by Frank

Vote: Motion failed due to lack of second.

Commission discussion.

Motion to continue current at-large elections and furthermore to recommend that the City of Roseville not implement district elections.

Moved by Brohman, seconded by Frank

Vote: Motion carried 8-0 (Hoem absent)

b) **Size of City Council – Issues Report/Discussion/Action**

Jim Williams – Provided information regarding previous correspondence related to Council size and spoke in favor of increasing Council membership from five (5) members to seven (7) members.

Commission discussion.

Commission consensus to have staff report back with statewide comparison of cities with populations of approximately 200,000 residents and their respective number of Council members in order to determine if seven (7) members would be appropriate for Roseville at build-out. Current build-out forecasted for Roseville is approximately 190,000 residents.

Members also requested information be provided on Council workload relative to hours of participation on outside committees such as SACOG, etc. and current Council duties. Members also stated it would be informative to have a brief report from a former Council member (Roccucci) and a current member (Garbolino) on their individual perspectives on workload and representation.

No action taken. Information will be assembled and presented at next meeting.

c) **Maintain Limit of Two Consecutive Terms – Issues Report/Discussion/Action**

Jack Wallace – Spoke in favor of current two (2) term limit.

Commission discussion.

Charter Review Commission Minutes – May 18, 2009

Motion to maintain current Charter language of two (2) consecutive four (4) year term limits.

Moved by Viele, seconded by Brohman

Vote: Motion carried 8-0 (Hoem absent)

5. New Business

Recommendations Submitted Regarding Article III

Provisions Regarding Officers and Employees

a) Jim Williams, Meadow Oaks Neighborhood Association

1. Fill vacancies with Runner-Up Candidate from Previous Election

Commission discussion.

Commission consensus to have staff report back with information:

- 1) Number of appointed Councilmembers within last 20 years.
- 2) Appointed Councilmembers and subsequent election results.

b) Richard Roccucci Correspondence

1) Council Seat Vacancy – Appoint First Runner-up in preceding election.

Commission consensus to have staff report back with information:

- 1) Number of appointed Councilmembers within last 20 years.
- 2) Appointed Councilmembers and subsequent election results.

2) Mayor Vacancy – Process to Appoint Mayor

Commission discussion.

Committee consensus to have staff report back with election results of previous races.

3) Appointed Person Standing for Re-Election – Elected Term

Commission discussion.

Commission consensus to have staff report back with information:

- 1) Number of appointed Councilmembers within last 20 years.
- 2) Appointed Councilmembers and subsequent election results.

4) Council Salary – Possible Increase with Automatic Provision for Annual Increase.

Commission discussion.

Commission consensus to have staff report back with State Law Requirements and practices of other municipalities.

Charter Review Commission Minutes – May 18, 2009

6. Comment/Members/Public

Carol Margetich – Introduced herself on behalf of Leadership Roseville.

Mark Doane – Introduced himself (former Roseville City Attorney).

7. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:27 p.m. The next Charter Review Commission meeting will be held on Monday, June 15, 2009.

Moved by Hoff, seconded by Macaulay

Vote: Motion carried 8-0 (Hoem absent)

APPROVED DATE: June 15, 2009

Rex Clark, Chairman

ATTEST:

Audrey Byrnes, Assistant City Clerk

HYBRID ELECTIONS

**Charter Review Commission
 Hybrid Elections
 June 15, 2009
 Report for Information Only – No Action Required**

Purpose This informational paper has been prepared at the request of the 2009-2010 City of Roseville Charter Review Commission to provide background information specific to the topic of **HYBRID/MIXED ELECTIONS**

Paper Contents This paper is divided into five sections:

- Characteristics/Sample of Mixed or Hybrid System
- Proportional Representation in Local Elections
- Single Transferable Vote (STV)
- Other Forms: Limited Voting and Cumulative Voting
- Where is Proportional Representation Used Today in the U.S. in Local Elections?

Characteristics of Mixed or Hybrid System

Roseville's Current Practice All five (5) members of the Roseville City Council are elected in an at-large capacity.

Characteristics of Hybrid Elections In California (Example: Oakland) Oakland's Council is comprised of some members who are elected "by district" while others are elected "at large"

January 29, 2008, the # of Registered Voters in Oakland Districts

District No. 1	39,462	District No. 6	23,279
District No. 2	23,886	District No. 7	21,474
District No. 3	30,201	Total Population	399,484
District No. 4	33,135	Total Registration	189,084
District No. 5	17,647	47% Registered Voters	

In November 2008, the following seats were up for election:

- Councilmember, District No. 1 4-year Full Term
- Councilmember, District No. 3 4-year Full Term
- Councilmember, District No. 5 4-year Full Term
- Councilmember, District No. 7 4-year Full Term
- Councilmember-At-Large 4-year Full Term

Excerpts from Oakland's Charter.
 Composition of the Council. The Council shall consist of eight Councilmembers, nominated and elected. The Mayor shall not be a

member of the Council, but he/she shall have a vote on the Council if the Councilmembers are evenly divided. (Amended by: Stats. November 1998.)

The Mayor shall be nominated and elected from the City at large and shall receive an annual salary payable in equal monthly installments. The salary shall be set by the Council, which shall be not less than 70% or more than 90% of the average salaries of City Managers'/Chief Executive Officers of California cities within the three immediate higher and the three immediate lower cities in population to Oakland. No person shall be elected to the office of Mayor for more than two consecutive terms.

Seven Councilmembers shall be nominated from districts and one shall be nominated at large. The Councilmember-at-large shall be nominated and elected by the qualified electors of the City at large. The District Councilmembers shall be nominated and elected by the qualified electors of their respective districts. The districts shall be as they exist upon the taking effect of this section, until revised by ordinance. In the year 1993, and every ten years thereafter, and whenever any substantial territory is annexed to or consolidated with the City, the Council shall form new districts not exceeding seven. Districts shall be composed of contiguous territory, as equal as possible in population, and as geographically compact as practicable. No change in the boundary of a district shall operate to exclude an incumbent from office before the expiration of the term for which he was elected or appointed. (Amended by: Stats. October 1980, June 1990 and March 2004.) The Councilmembers shall be elected to a term of four years.

Advantages of Hybrid Model

- Provides an option where it may not exist otherwise for various parties to be elected
- The "at large" Council member could be the "voice of reason" and counterbalance to district-focused opinions
- Could be solution to perceived problems (underrepresented groups could organize and support an "at large" candidate)

Disadvantages of Hybrid

- May create confusion for voters and lead to decreased turnout
- Establishing and re-establishing districts can be expensive
- Elections costs are higher with ballots designed to elect members by "district" and members "at large"

California Elections
Code

An election held to elect members “by district” and “at large” would still require compliance with the California Government Code Section 34871 which provides for district elections as follows:

Cities may divide into four, five, six, seven, eight or nine districts. Districts boundaries are determined by population, using the census tract information, with the option of redistricting every ten years. The City is responsible for dividing the area into districts.

Odd-numbered districts. If a City is divided into five, seven, or nine districts, candidates file by district and are elected by district; or file by district and are elected at large. Each district is equally represented by one Council member and the Mayor is then selected by the full Council, according to established criteria approved by the electorate.

If a City is divided into four, six, or eight districts, candidates file by district and are elected by district; or, file by district and are elected at large. Each district is equally represented by one Council member and the Mayor files and is elected at large. This constitutes a mayor-form of government.

A change to district elections would require a majority vote of the electorate to amend the City Charter. The current City Charter outlines Roseville’s plan of government and states “the electors of the City shall elect a Council of five (5) members, at large, for a four (4) year term of office.” Once established, districts could only be changed each ten (10) years when the official census is conducted.

Transition to Mixed or
Hybrid Elections

The election of Councilmembers utilizing a hybrid or mixed method would require alternating each election so that voters from specific districts would vote for Councilmembers in one election, and voters from other districts would vote in the next election in order to keep consistency in electing members alternately each even-numbered year. At-large members would need to be scheduled for consistency purposes as well.

A districting plan would be established by committee and could not be changed for a ten year period pending the completion of the U.S. Census.

Any final districting plan for the “by district” members would be subject to referendum.

Proportional Representation

What is Proportional Representation?

Proportional representation awards seats in legislative bodies to parties in proportion of their strength in the electorate. If party A gets 35 percent of the votes, it gets 35 percent of the legislative seats; if party B gets 15 percent of the vote, it gets 15 percent of the seats, and so forth.

How do the various options for proportional representation operate?

Options can vary to the extent that they promote proportionality. In U.S. local government, three variants of proportional representation are used:

- **Single Transferable Vote (STV)**
- **Limited Voting**
- **Cumulative Voting**

Each plan has been used with at-large Council structures.

STV plans allow voters to rank candidates in order of preference: first choice, second choice, and so forth.

Limited Voting grants voters fewer votes than seats at stake in a contest.

Cumulative Voting allows the voter as many votes as seats being contested, while granting the voter the right to concentrate several or all votes on a single candidate.

Each of these plans are used in a few local jurisdictions in the U.S. at present.¹

¹*Proportional Representation in Local Elections: A Review; Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Todd Donovan, December 1994*

Why is proportional representation of interest to local elections in the U.S.?

Proponents contend these plans will increase voter turnout, particularly among minorities.

The federal courts are now accepting **Cumulative Voting** as a remedy in Voting Rights Act cases that challenge at-large Council elections in local government (Washington). The effectiveness of the traditional court remedy, single member districts, can be reduced if the under-represented minority is geographically dispersed. This is not the case in Roseville. Previous demographic information does not support that any section of the City or ethnic group is under-represented.

The Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Single Transferable Vote (STV)

Information contained in this report contain excerpts from Political Science Professor Todd Donavon's Review entitled "Proportional Representation in Local Elections/Washington State Institute for Public Policy

STV is a form of voting where voters are given the ability to express ranked preferences for candidates. If seats on a Council were elected under STV, the voter would indicate which candidate was his or her first preference, which candidate is second choice and which candidate is third. The goal of the system is to insure that few voters' preferences are "wasted." Wasted votes occur when one group's candidates has gained far more votes than the minimum threshold needed to capture one of the seats being considered.

Under regular voting, a group might get only one seat if all the group's voters select the same candidate. Those voters who cast votes in excess of the threshold needed to win the seat have had no real impact on electing the candidate. Under STV, their preferences can be *transferred* to voters' second choices, potentially allowing another of the group's candidates a chance to win a seat.

Studies show STV is relatively easy on the voter in the booth. Voters simply rank their choices among the list of candidates.

From 1917 to 1950, some two dozen American cities adopted STV plans as part of the Council-manager form of government. By 1990, STV plans had been abandoned in every U.S. City except Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Complexities of STV Voting Methods

Some complexity arises in counting the ballots. Winners are determined on the basis of a formula that calculates the minimum "threshold" of votes a candidate must achieve to win a seat, and on the basis of another formula that determines the rates at which votes will be transferred to candidates above or below the threshold.² In counting the ballots, the single vote is allocated to the voter's first preference candidate if it will help elect the candidate. If it cannot help (the candidate has too few first preferences to surpass the threshold) the vote is transferred to the voter's second preference candidate: or to the third preference, and so forth. At the national level, STV plans are currently used in Ireland and Malta, both small nations.

² *The minimum "threshold" of votes a candidate must achieve to win a seat is a function of:*

$$\frac{\text{The number of votes}}{\text{Number of seats to fill} + 1} = \text{votes to win a seat}$$

Number of seats to fill +1

Other Forms: Limited Voting and Cumulative Voting

Limited and Cumulative

These other plans are typically viewed as semi-proportional and include **Limited voting and Cumulative voting**. These systems typically facilitate greater minority group representation than other plans but do not approach the proportionality of the STV.

A **Limited voting** plan requires a multi-member district (or at-large Council) where the voter must cast fewer votes than there are seats at stake. Such a system acts to minimize the potential for the majority to “sweep” all of the Council positions at stake in a contest.

A **Limited voting** system works as follows:

Suppose a City has an election and three seats are being contested and several candidates' names are listed on a ballot. Voters would be allowed to vote only for a single candidate. The top three candidates receiving the most votes will be elected without a runoff. Under such a plan, it is unlikely that voters from the majority will distribute their votes in such a manner that they form a plurality over each seat at stake. If minority voters cast most of their votes for the same candidate, they are likely to win a seat. Thus, some measure of proportionality is achieved. (Used in Spanish Legislature and in the Japanese Diet/Parliament). Several local elections have been held in the U.S. under Limited voting plans, but there is little documentation of results from these races.

Limited voting has been used in local races with partisan systems to fill at-large Council seats in New York City, Philadelphia, and West Hartford, Connecticut under previous Charters. It is currently in use in some Connecticut cities and towns, and in some Pennsylvania counties.

Cumulative voting systems grant the voter a number of votes equal to the number of seats at stake in an election. Voters can choose to concentrate all their votes for a single candidate or divide them across a number of candidates.

These election systems require a certain amount of strategic planning and mobilization of voters on the part of groups seeking to maximize their representation. A group might need to estimate the number of voters they will have at the polls and decide how many candidates they might be able to elect based on the group's strength in the electorate. Also, group members must obtain information about how votes should be distributed among candidates (or if votes should be concentrated on a single candidate). Cumulative voting also provides the opportunity to

build coalitions in a manner that winner-take-all districting prevents. Under districting, candidates can win elections by appealing only to narrow, geographically-concentrated groups. This is also possible under Cumulative voting.

Where is Proportional Representation Used Today in the U.S. in Local Elections?

Different Proportional Representation arrangements are not common, but they are not absent from our political landscape.

Jurisdictions in the U.S. using **Cumulative** voting (1994 Data)

Alamogordo, New Mexico City Council
Peoria, Illinois City Council
Centre, Alabama City Council
Lockhart, Texas City Council

Jurisdictions in the U.S. using **Limited** voting include:

Hartford, Connecticut
Various towns and cities in Connecticut
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Washington, D.C.

Jurisdictions in the U.S. using **STV** voting include:

Cambridge, Massachusetts City Council
New York City Community School Boards

No Action Necessary – Report For Information Only

Hybrid model for electing Puyallup council may be best option for voters

PETER CALLAGHAN; THE NEWS TRIBUNE

Last updated: May 10th, 2009 12:17 AM (PDT)

Puyallup isn't the first city to debate the best way to elect its council, it's just the most recent.

The argument is over two options – electing all council members citywide or having them elected from districts within the city. By theory at least, at-large members think of the interests of the city as a whole while district-elected council members are more focused on their neighborhoods.

District election campaigns are cheaper because they cover less ground and fewer voters. And districts assure that all parts of the city are represented on the council.

Puyallup now elects six of seven members from three city districts (two from each district) and one at large. That system became an issue when the need to redraw district lines to add voters from a recent annexation.

How new lines might be drawn caused some residents to conclude the council was trying to disadvantage an incumbent who sometimes disagrees with the council majority. One proposed solution was to get rid of districts and make all seven council members at-large. That too caused objections because it was seen as a way to disadvantage underfunded candidates.

In case you haven't noticed, it doesn't take much to trigger a controversy in Puyallup these days. But there is a real issue here because how council members are elected can influence the type of person who gets elected.

The civic reform movement of the early 20th century pushed for at-large councils along with nonpartisan elections and council-manager forms of government.

“The reformers argued that election at-large would eliminate corrupt ward politics from the city council and replace it with a council concerned with the broader interests of the city as whole,” wrote Vanderbilt University mathematics and law professor Paul H. Edelman in 2003.

But it wasn't all motherhood and apple pie. The undercurrent of these reforms was the feeling that district elections “gave representation in city affairs to lower- and middle-class groups rather than to the business leaders of the city,” Edelman noted.

Federal and state governments have moved away from at-large elections, mostly in response to court rulings that found they worked against minority representation. Most cities, however, retain at-large elections. In Pierce County, only Tacoma, Bonney Lake and Puyallup have at least some council members elected by districts.

Statewide, just 23 of 281 cities and towns have some members elected from districts. Nationally about 20 percent do.

Seattle voters have rejected adding districts three times, the most recently in 2003. The 1998 vote was tainted by a scandal in which wealthy businessman Tom Stewart, upset at the rejection of a heliport at his business, illegally hid his financial support for the measure.

The proposed solution to the latest dust-up in Puyallup is to let city voters decide whether to shift to an all at-large system. But perhaps the better answer is to adopt a hybrid that has a majority of the council elected by district but more than one elected at large. Such a system, Edelman argues, taps into the benefits of both systems and maximizes the influence of each voter.

The mathematician in Edelman even calculated the best mix of district-elected members and at-large members – the square root of the total number of members (rounded down to the closest whole number). For Tacoma, that would be three at-large council seats rather than the four, including the mayor, that exist now. In Puyallup it would be two (although the square root of seven is pretty close to three).

So Puyallup could create four districts and elect three members at large giving every voter a voice in electing four members – a majority. All areas of town would have at least one member.

Of course someone will conclude that such a system is a conspiracy designed to deny some group or some member or some point of view a voice. Such is life on the river these days. But beyond the current politics, it could be a better long-term solution than an all at-large council.

Peter Callaghan: 253-597-8657

peter.callaghan@

thenewstribune.com

blogs.thenewstribune.com/politics

Originally published: May 10th, 2009 12:17 AM (PDT)



[Privacy Policy](#) | [User Agreement](#) | [Advertising Partners](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [About Us](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Jobs](#) | [RSS](#)

1950 South State Street, Tacoma, Washington 98405 253-597-8742

© Copyright 2009 Tacoma News, Inc. A subsidiary of The McClatchy Company

COUNCIL COMPENSATION

**Charter Review Commission
City Council Compensation Comparison
June 15, 2009
Report for Information Only – No Action Required.**

Purpose	This informational paper has been prepared at the request of the 2009-2010 City of Roseville Charter Review Commission to provide background information specific to the topic of COUNCIL COMPENSATION .
----------------	---

Paper Contents Comparison of Pay for Mayor/Council for cities of approximately 200,000 residents

Question	
-----------------	--

Proposed Pay Increase Should the Mayor and Councilmembers pay be increased?

Pay Comparison			
City name	Mayor \$	Council \$	Misc.
Chula Vista	\$118,000 yr (66% of SCJ)	\$47,200 yr (40% of Mayor salary)	Based on % of Superior Court Judge (SCJ)
Fontana	\$1670 mo. \$50 (per Housing) \$30 (per RDA) \$100 (per Fire Protection)	\$1170 mo \$50 (per Housing) \$30 (per RDA) \$100 (per Fire Protection)	\$500 car allowance \$100 phone stipend Plus: health, dental unless waived \$776.70 cash back
Fremont	\$2211 mo	\$1407 mo	
Garden Grove	\$600 mo \$30 (per RDA) \$50 (per Housing)	\$486 mo \$30 (per RDA) \$50 (per Housing)	Plus: health, dental, life, no long term disability
Glendale	\$1100 mo	\$1100 mo	\$525 gas allowance
Huntington Beach	\$175 mo \$1900 mo	\$175 mo \$1350 mo	By charter By ordinance
Irvine	\$880 mo \$880 (per Orange Co. Great Park Board \$30 (per RDA)	\$880 mo \$880 (per Orange Co. Great Park Board \$30 (per RDA)	
Modesto	\$43,200 yr (\$3600 mo)	\$24,000 yr (\$2000 mo)	Offered health benefits
Moreno Valley	\$1101 mo	\$1101 mo	
Oceanside	\$1644 mo	\$1644 mo	
Ontario	\$2885 mo	\$1406 mo	
Oxnard	\$1701 mo \$300 month for expenses	\$1701 mo	
Rancho Cucamonga	\$1459 mo	\$1309 mo	

San Bernardino	\$89,394 yr (\$7449 mo)	\$600 mo	
Santa Clarita	\$1571 mo	\$1571 mo	
Santa Rosa	\$1200 mo	\$800 mo	
Sunnyvale	\$1165 bi-weekly (\$2526 mo)	\$874 bi-weekly (1895 mo)	

No Action Necessary – Report for Information Only

APPOINTMENT PROCESS

**Charter Review Commission
 Appointment Process/Council Vacancy
 And Subsequent Election Results and
 Twenty Year Election Results Tabulation
 June 15, 2009
 Report for Information Only – No Action Required**

Purpose This informational paper has been prepared at the request of the 2009-2010 City of Roseville Charter Review Commission to provide background information specific to the topic of **APPOINTMENT PROCESS/COUNCIL VACANCY AND SUBSEQUENT ELECTION RESULTS AND TWENTY YEAR ELECTION RESULTS TABULATION.**

Paper Contents This paper contains information on member appointments to Council vacancies and subsequent election results.

Summary

Question: Within the last twenty years, have members appointed to Council vacancies served the community of Roseville in a productive manner and filled the qualifications of the position? (Additional information covers data on appointed members, and outlines if individuals were subsequently elected to fill an additional term or terms after their appointment).

Current Practice

Appointment Process Section 3.09 of the Roseville Charter reads:
 Any vacancy on the Council shall be filled by a majority vote of the remaining Councilmembers within thirty days after the vacancy occurs.

Appointments and Subsequent Election Results

<u>Vacancy Date</u>	<u>Vacancy</u>	<u>Member Appointed</u>	<u>Appointed</u>
Apr-87	Jim Ross	Tom Chambliss	Apr-87
Jul-93	Fred Jackson	Special Election Called	Nov-93
Nov-94	Bill Santucci	Randolph Graham	Jan-95
May-97	Mel Hamel	Jim Gray	Jul-97
Feb-01	Dan Goodhall	Gina Garbolino	Mar-01
Oct-03	Earl Rush	John Allard	Oct-03
Jan-07	Rocky Rockholm	Carol Garcia	Jan-07

Ross - resigned due to business conflicts
 Jackson – moved to Granite Bay
 Santucci - resigned when elected as Placer County Supervisor
 Hamel - resigned when retired as School Administrator
 Goodhall - resigned due to business conflicts
 Rush - resigned due to health issues
 Rockholm - resigned when elected as Placer County Supervisor

During the November 2, 1993 election, ballot Prop A amended the Charter to provide that General Municipal Elections shall be conducted in even-numbered years and at time of the State General Election

Subsequent Election Information:

<u>Appointee</u>	<u>Elected After</u>	<u>Individuals Elected</u>	<u>Appointed</u>	<u>Election</u>
Tom Chambliss	No	P. Roccucci, Hamel, Crabb	Apr-87	Nov-89
None		Jackson, Santucci		Nov-91
None		Hamel, Gamar, P. Roccucci, Crabb (Partial)		Nov-93
Randolph Graham	Yes	Graham, Crabb	Jan-95	Nov-96
Jim Gray	No	Gamar, Rush, Goodhall	Jul-97	Nov-98
None		Rockholm, R. Roccucci		Nov-00
Gina Garbolino	Yes	Garbolino, Gray, Rush	Mar-01	Nov-02
John Allard	Yes	Allard, Rockholm, R. Roccucci	Oct-03	Nov-04
None		Garbolino, Gray		Nov-06
Carol Garcia	Yes	Garcia, Allard, P. Roccucci	Jan-07	Nov-08

Election Results – 20 Year Time Frame

ELECTION DATE:			ELECTION DATE:		
7-Nov-89			5-Nov-91		
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:
Pauline Roccucci	3586	Mayor	Ray Ellis	1941	
Phil Ozenick	2887		Fred Jackson	2511	Mayor Pro Tem
Mel Hamel	3424	Mayor Pro Tem	Bill Santucci	3666	Mayor
Harry Crabb	3357	Councilmember	Steve Covey	675	
Steve Covey	967		Jim Hall	1974	
Tom Chambliss	2818		Chris Hayes	1339	
			David Watts	2079	

<p>ELECTION DATE: 2-Nov-93</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Charles Jones</td> <td>1666</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gerald Unruh</td> <td>1520</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mel Hamel</td> <td>6742</td> <td>Mayor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joe Tadlock</td> <td>4590</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Claudia Gamar</td> <td>6426</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ted Gaines</td> <td>3737</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pauline Roccucci</td> <td>6465</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jack Lish</td> <td>3075</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harry Crabb</td> <td>6186</td> <td>*Partial Term</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Charles Jones	1666		Gerald Unruh	1520		Mel Hamel	6742	Mayor	Joe Tadlock	4590		Claudia Gamar	6426	Councilmember	Ted Gaines	3737		Pauline Roccucci	6465	Mayor Pro Tem	Jack Lish	3075		Harry Crabb	6186	*Partial Term	<p>ELECTION DATE: 5-Nov-96</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Randy Graham</td> <td>14624</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Cantlay</td> <td>7598</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harry Crabb</td> <td>14960</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Randy Graham	14624	Councilmember	John Cantlay	7598		Harry Crabb	14960	Mayor Pro Tem			
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Charles Jones	1666																																													
Gerald Unruh	1520																																													
Mel Hamel	6742	Mayor																																												
Joe Tadlock	4590																																													
Claudia Gamar	6426	Councilmember																																												
Ted Gaines	3737																																													
Pauline Roccucci	6465	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
Jack Lish	3075																																													
Harry Crabb	6186	*Partial Term																																												
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Randy Graham	14624	Councilmember																																												
John Cantlay	7598																																													
Harry Crabb	14960	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
<p>ELECTION DATE: 3-Nov-98</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Claudia Gamar</td> <td>13124</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Earl Rush</td> <td>12453</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dan Goodhall</td> <td>9819</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jim Gray</td> <td>9454</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jeff Atteberry</td> <td>8657</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Al Saraceni</td> <td>5930</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Cantlay</td> <td>3255</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Claudia Gamar	13124	Mayor Pro Tem	Earl Rush	12453	Councilmember	Dan Goodhall	9819	Councilmember	Jim Gray	9454		Jeff Atteberry	8657		Al Saraceni	5930		John Cantlay	3255		<p>ELECTION DATE: 7-Nov-00</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sandra Saraceni</td> <td>6492</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jack Wallace</td> <td>8573</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rocky Rockholm</td> <td>17138</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Richard Roccucci</td> <td>13582</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Cantlay</td> <td>5796</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rene Aguilera</td> <td>5668</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Sandra Saraceni	6492		Jack Wallace	8573		Rocky Rockholm	17138	Mayor Pro Tem	Richard Roccucci	13582	Councilmember	John Cantlay	5796		Rene Aguilera	5668	
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Claudia Gamar	13124	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
Earl Rush	12453	Councilmember																																												
Dan Goodhall	9819	Councilmember																																												
Jim Gray	9454																																													
Jeff Atteberry	8657																																													
Al Saraceni	5930																																													
John Cantlay	3255																																													
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Sandra Saraceni	6492																																													
Jack Wallace	8573																																													
Rocky Rockholm	17138	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
Richard Roccucci	13582	Councilmember																																												
John Cantlay	5796																																													
Rene Aguilera	5668																																													
<p>ELECTION DATE: 2-Nov-02</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gina Garbolino</td> <td>16399</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jim Gray</td> <td>12539</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Earl Rush</td> <td>14527</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sandra Saraceni</td> <td>8090</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ivy Shaw</td> <td>3414</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jack Wallace</td> <td>11728</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Gina Garbolino	16399	Mayor Pro Tem	Jim Gray	12539	Councilmember	Earl Rush	14527	Councilmember	Sandra Saraceni	8090		Ivy Shaw	3414		Jack Wallace	11728		<p>ELECTION DATE: 2-Nov-04</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rocky Rockholm</td> <td>27593</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Richard Roccucci</td> <td>19748</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Allard</td> <td>18555</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jack Wallace</td> <td>13369</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sandra Saraceni</td> <td>11871</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paul Frank</td> <td>10067</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Write-Ins</td> <td>123</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Rocky Rockholm	27593	Mayor Pro Tem	Richard Roccucci	19748	Councilmember	John Allard	18555	Councilmember	Jack Wallace	13369		Sandra Saraceni	11871		Paul Frank	10067		Write-Ins	123	
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Gina Garbolino	16399	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
Jim Gray	12539	Councilmember																																												
Earl Rush	14527	Councilmember																																												
Sandra Saraceni	8090																																													
Ivy Shaw	3414																																													
Jack Wallace	11728																																													
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Rocky Rockholm	27593	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
Richard Roccucci	19748	Councilmember																																												
John Allard	18555	Councilmember																																												
Jack Wallace	13369																																													
Sandra Saraceni	11871																																													
Paul Frank	10067																																													
Write-Ins	123																																													
<p>ELECTION DATE: 7-Nov-06</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gina Garbolino</td> <td>22319</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jim Gray</td> <td>18385</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sandra Saraceni</td> <td>11952</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Write-Ins</td> <td>245</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Gina Garbolino	22319	Mayor Pro Tem	Jim Gray	18385	Councilmember	Sandra Saraceni	11952		Write-Ins	245		<p>ELECTION DATE: 4-Nov-08</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Candidates:</th> <th>Votes:</th> <th>Elected:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rene Aguilera</td> <td>13826</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Allard</td> <td>20406</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Samuel Cannon</td> <td>11930</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carol Garcia</td> <td>22795</td> <td>Councilmember</td> </tr> <tr> <td>George Muntean</td> <td>11729</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pauline Roccucci</td> <td>24817</td> <td>Mayor Pro Tem</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:	Rene Aguilera	13826		John Allard	20406	Councilmember	Samuel Cannon	11930		Carol Garcia	22795	Councilmember	George Muntean	11729		Pauline Roccucci	24817	Mayor Pro Tem									
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Gina Garbolino	22319	Mayor Pro Tem																																												
Jim Gray	18385	Councilmember																																												
Sandra Saraceni	11952																																													
Write-Ins	245																																													
Candidates:	Votes:	Elected:																																												
Rene Aguilera	13826																																													
John Allard	20406	Councilmember																																												
Samuel Cannon	11930																																													
Carol Garcia	22795	Councilmember																																												
George Muntean	11729																																													
Pauline Roccucci	24817	Mayor Pro Tem																																												

Charter Amendments Regarding Elections

4/8/1980 – Measure A relating to selection of Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem was approved

4/10/1984 – Prop A changed elections to odd-numbered years

11/2/1993 – Approved elections to be held in even-numbered years and seating of Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem

Campaign Finance Limits

Campaign Finance
Reform Ordinance
Adopted March 15,
2000

Expenditure Limits for Elections:

2000 – \$63,039	(42,026 registered voters @ \$1.50 each)
2002 – \$67,659	(45,106 registered voters @ \$1.50 each)
2004 – \$76,275	(50,850 registered voters @ \$1.50 each)
2006 – \$81,099	(54,066 registered voters @ \$1.50 each)
2008 – \$83,081	(55,388 registered voters @ \$1.50 each)

Elections previous to reform spent amounts in excess of \$100,000

No Action Necessary – Report for Information Only

COUNCIL SIZE

**Charter Review Commission
 Statewide Comparison of Cities Approximately 200,000 Residents
 & Number of Council Members
 June 15, 2009
 Report for Information Only – No Action Required**

Purpose This informational paper has been prepared at the request of the 2009-2010 City of Roseville Charter Review Commission to provide background information specific to the topic of **STATEWIDE COMPARISON: NUMBER OF RESIDENTS AND NUMBER OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Paper Contents This paper is divided into two sections:

- Statewide Comparison – Number of Residents and Number of Council Members
- Statistics/Population

Cities: Number of Residents and Number of Council Members

Name of City	Population	Number Council Members	Mayor Mayor Pro Tem	Total	General Information
Chula Vista	217,478	Four	One Mayor	Five	Elected At-Large Term: Four (4) Years Limit: Two (2) Terms
Corona	148,428	Three	One Mayor One Mayor Pro Tem	Five	Elected At-Large Term: Four (4) Years
Fontana	183,502	Four	One Mayor	Five	Elected At-Large Every Four (4) Years
Fremont	213,000	Three	One Mayor One Vice-Mayor	Five	Elected At-Large
Garden Grove	172,781	Three	One Mayor One Mayor Pro Tem	Five	Elected At-Large
Huntington Beach	198,025	Six	One Mayor	Seven	Elected At-Large Mayor Selected by City Council
Irvine	212,793	Four	One Mayor	Five	Elected At-Large Council: Four (4) Year Term Mayor: Two (2) Year Term Limit: Two (2) Terms
Modesto	210,585	Six	One	Seven	Elected: Council by Districts/Mayor At-Large

					First District election will take place in November 2009 Limit: Two (2) Four (4) Year Terms
Moreno Valley	186,301	Three	One Mayor One Mayor Pro Tem	Five	Elected: By District Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem elected by City Council from its members
Oceanside	178,806	Four	One Mayor	Five	Elected: At Large Term: Four (4) Years
Ontario	173,690	Four	One Mayor	Five	Elected: At-Large Term: Four (4) Years
Oxnard	197,067	Four	One Mayor	Five	Elected: Mayor At-Large every Two (2) Years Council Elected At-Large every Four (4) Years on an overlapping basis
Pomona	163,000	Six	One Mayor	Seven	Elected: Mayor At-Large Term: Four (4) Years Council Elected by District Term: Four (4) Years
Rancho Cucamonga	177,736	Three	One Mayor One Mayor Pro Tem	Five	Elected: At-Large
San Bernardino	205,000	Six	One Mayor	Seven	Elected: By District Term: Four (4) Years
Santa Clarita	177,045	Three	One Mayor One Mayor Pro Tem	Five	Elected: At-Large
Santa Rosa	160,000	Six	One Mayor	Seven	Elected: At-Large Term: No Limitation
Sunnyvale	137,538	Six	One Mayor	Seven	Elected: At-Large Council selects one member as Mayor

Five – Denoted in Yellow Seven – Denoted in Blue

Statistics/Population

There is no statistical relationship between the size of a population and the appropriate size of its representative body. Many cities function well with either a five or seven member governing body.

No Action Necessary – Report For Information Only