



AGENDA

May 20, 2019

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE WELCOMES YOUR PARTICIPATION

If an agenda item is open to public comment, such public comment shall be addressed to the chair of the meeting.

Public Comment - Speakers have three minutes under Public Comment to speak on issues that are not listed on the agenda and are within the City's jurisdiction. The Brown Act does not permit any action or discussion on items not listed on the agenda.

Consent Calendar - If applicable, the Consent Calendar consists of routine items that may be approved by one motion. Any person can remove an item from the Consent Calendar to be discussed separately.

Agenda Items - Speakers have five minutes to address items that are listed on the agenda.

Americans with Disabilities Act - Notify the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance if special assistance is required to participate in a meeting including the need of auxiliary aids or services.

Audio/Visual Presentations - If making a presentation regarding an agenda item, audio/visual materials must be submitted to the City Clerk or Secretary at least 72 hours in advance.

Roseville City Clerk 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 916-774-5200 TDD 916-774-5220

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
5. **MINUTES**
 - 5.1. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Audrey Byrnes and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members approve the minutes of the April 15, 2019 Charter Review meeting.

CONTACT: Audrey Byrnes 916-774-5268 abyrnes@roseville.ca.us

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Compensation of Councilmembers and Mayor - Article 3 - Section 3.05

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members receive a presentation on Section 3.05 of Article 3 on the topic of Councilmember and Mayor compensation. The report and presentation are for information only.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

6.2. Councilmember Vacancies - Article 3 - Section 3.09

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members receive the presentation on Section 3.09 of Article 3 regarding Councilmember vacancies. The report and presentation are for information only.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

6.3. Duties of the Mayor and Structures of Local Government

Staff presentation on the duties of a Mayor in a government structure.

CONTACT: M. Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

6.4. Charter Review Commission Members and Resident Proposals

Review and discussion on any sections of Articles 1, 2, 3, or 4.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

6.5. Staff Proposed Amendments to Charter Article 4 - Sections 4.01 and 4.02

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members approve proposed amendments to Section 4.01 and Section 4.02 of Article 4 regarding regular meetings and special meetings of the City Council.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

6.6. Staff Proposed Amendments to Charter Article 4 - Section 4.06

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members approve staff proposed amendments to Section 4.06 of Article 4 of the Charter regarding Council rules.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

7. ADJOURNMENT



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Minutes of Prior Meeting
Contact: Audrey Byrnes 916-774-5268 abyernes@roseville.ca.us
Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019
Item #: 5.1.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review members approve the minutes of the April 15, 2019 Charter Review meeting.

BACKGROUND

There is no background associated with this item. The request is to approve the minutes of the previous meeting. According to the Administrative Standards, the minutes may be approved by majority vote even if one or more of the voting members were not present at the meeting to which the minutes relate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Audrey Byrnes, Assistant City Clerk

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

April 15, 2019 Charter Review Commission Minutes



MINUTES

April 15, 2019

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

5:30 p.m.

**Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California
www.roseville.ca.us**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Susan Rohan called the April 15, 2019 Roseville Charter Review Commission meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Brohman, Cannon, Dohner, Sanchez, Viele, Constant, Rohan

Absent: Frank, Garrett

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commission member James Viele.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment received.

5. MINUTES

5.1. Minutes of Prior Meeting

Memo from Assistant City Clerk Audrey Byrnes and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members approve the minutes of the March 18, 2019 Charter Review meeting.

CONTACT: Audrey Byrnes 916-774-5269 abyrnes@roseville.ca.us

No public comment received.

Motion by Rita Brohman, seconded by Robert Sanchez, to approve the March 18, 2019 Charter Commission meeting minutes. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Rohan, Sanchez, Viele
Absent: Frank, Garrett

6. REQUESTS/PRESENTATIONS

6.1. Charter Measure Process

Oral presentation on process recommendations by Chair Susan Rohan to include correspondence, presentations by staff, amendments, formulation of priorities, decisions and final actions of the Commission.
CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Chair Susan Rohan made the presentation to the Commission.

Gina Garbolino - spoke in support of Charter review process and opportunity for public participation.

Jim Gray - requested flexibility when receiving public input.

For information only; no action required.

6.2. Proposed Amendment to Charter Article 1 - Section 1.05

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Commission approve proposed amendment to Section 1.05 of Article 1 regarding Charter Review and Amendments.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

City Clerk Sonia Orozco made the presentation to the Commission.

No public comment received.

Motion by Peter Constant, seconded by Rita Brohman, to approve the proposed Amendment to Charter Article 1 - Section 1.05 regarding Charter Review and Amendments, and move to consensus list of items for future action. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Rohan, Sanchez, Viele

Absent: Frank, Garrett

6.3. Proposed Amendments to Charter Article 2 - Section 2.14

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Commission approve proposed amendment to Section 2.14 of Article 2 regarding boards and commissions. CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us City Clerk Sonia Orozco made the presentation to the Commission.

No public comment received.

Motion by Rita Brohman, seconded by Peter Constant, to approve the proposed amendments to Charter Article 2, Section 2.14 regarding boards and commissions and move to consensus list of items for future action. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Rohan, Sanchez, Viele

Absent: Frank, Garrett

6.4. City Council Term Limits - Article 2 - Section 2.02

Memo from Assistant City Attorney Michelle Sheidenberger and City Clerk Sonia Orozco recommending the Charter Review members receive a presentation on Section 2.02 of Article 2 on the topic of councilmember term limits. The memo will consist of seven discussion points to include: Issue Summary, Current Practice, Pros of Term Limits, Cons of Term Limits, California City comparison, nationwide information and future options. The memo is for information only.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

City Clerk Sonia Orozco made the presentation to the Commission.

Jim Gray - provided historical reasoning and in support of extending term limits to 3 years.

Gina Garbolino - Spoke in support of extending term limits.

For information only; no action required.

6.5. Items for Future Consideration as Requested by Charter Review Commission Members

Information submitted from Charter Review Commission members Paul Frank and Robert Sanchez for Commission consideration of future items and information requested.

CONTACT: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Chair Susan Rohan spoke to written correspondence received from Commission member Paul Frank and Commission member LaMills Garrett.

Commission member Robert Sanchez spoke of written correspondence he submitted.

Jim Gray - requested future items regarding Council vacancies, Mayor replacement if seat vacated, and Council/Mayor compensation.

7. COMMISSIONER / STAFF REPORT

City Clerk Sonia Orozco made a presentation regarding best practices and public outreach.

No public comment received.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Samuel Cannon, seconded by James Viele, to adjourn the meeting at 7:04 p.m. The Motion Passed.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Brohman, Cannon, Constant, Dohner, Rohan, Sanchez, Viele

Absent: Frank, Garrett



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Compensation of Councilmembers and Mayor - Article 3 - Section 3.05
Contact: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us
Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019
Item #: 6.1.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review members receive a presentation on Section 3.05 of Article 3 on the topic of councilmember and mayor compensation. The report and presentation are for information only.

BACKGROUND

Issue Summary

Question: Should the Mayor and Councilmembers pay be increased?

The topic of compensation for elected officials has been brought before the Charter Review Commission in both the 2000 and 2010 reviews. The idea to increase compensation was suggested by former elected officials and members of the community. Circa 1990's, the councilmembers were paid \$150 per month and the mayor received \$250. At the November 2000 election, the voters approved a ballot measure to increase council and mayor salaries to \$600 per month for council with an additional \$50 for the mayor based on the cities population of 75,000 residents.

Current Charter provision Article Section 3.05 regarding compensation of council members and mayor reads as follows:

a. The council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the council shall receive a salary, the amount of which shall be determined by the following schedule:

1. If the City's population is between 50,000 and 75,000 persons, inclusive, the salary shall be five hundred dollars (\$500) per month for each councilmember, and the mayor shall receive an additional amount of fifty dollars (\$50) per month.

2. If the City's population exceeds 75,000 persons, the salary shall be six hundred dollars (\$600) per month for each councilmember and the mayor shall receive an additional fifty dollars (\$50) per month.

b. Councilmembers may, upon order of the council, be reimbursed for reasonable and necessary expenses actually incurred in the service of the City. (Amended by General Municipal Election on November 2, 2010: amended by General Municipal Election on November 7, 2000: amended by General Municipal Election on November 5, 1985: Res. No. 240.)

The salaries indicated above were established based on salaries enumerated in the California Government Code.

For comparison, General Law Cities follow Title 4 of the California Government Code Division 3. Part 1. General [36501-36525] as follows:

36516(a) (1) A city council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the city council shall receive a salary based on the population of the city as set forth in paragraph (2). The salaries approved by ordinance under paragraph (1) shall be as follows:

(A) In cities up to and including 35,000 in population, up to and including three hundred dollars (\$300) per month

(B) In cities over 35,000 up to and including 50,000 in population, up to and including four hundred dollars (\$400) per month.

(C) In cities over 50,000 up to and including 75,000 in population, up to and including five hundred dollars (\$500) per month.

(D) In cities over 75,000 up to and including 150,000 in population, up to and including six hundred dollars (\$600) per month.

(E) In cities over 150,000 up to and including 250,000 in population, up to and including eight hundred dollars (\$800) per month.

(F) In cities over 250,000 population, up to and including one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per month.

(3) For the purposes of this subdivision, the population of a city shall be determined by the last preceding federal census, or a subsequent census, or estimate validated by the Department of Finance. As of January 1, 2019, the Department of Finance reported Roseville's population at 139,643.

Additionally, Section 4 of Government Code states the salary of a councilmember may be increased beyond the amount provided in the statute by an ordinance or by an amendment to an ordinance, however, amendment to Roseville's current councilmember/mayor salaries would require a Charter amendment and a vote of the electorate.

If approved by the electorate, Government Code Section 36516.5 stipulates a change in compensation does not apply to a councilmember during his/her term of office; however, the prohibition expressed in the statute shall not prevent adjustment of all members of the council serving staggered terms whenever one or more members of such council becomes eligible for a salary increase by virtue of his/her beginning a new term of office. Stated differently, when one or more member begins a new term of office, the City may implement a change in compensation and benefits once a Charter amendment is approved.

In a number of Charter cities, voters set salary terms for elected officials over and above what is enumerated in the Government Code. Government Code 36516 also allows voters in a general law cities to establish a different rate of compensation, which may only be increased or decreased by a vote of the people.

Members of the City Council are currently not eligible for health benefits, vision and dental coverage, or life insurance.

Below is a comparison of salary and benefits of local jurisdictions in the greater Placer County region.

Local Jurisdictions Elected Officials Compensation and Benefits Comparison

City	General Law - G Charter - C	Size of City	Annual Base Pay Mayor - M Council - C	CALPERS (Retirement) Percent & Annual Other	Monthly Medical Insurance (Family or Single)	Dental - D Vision - V Life Ins - L (Family or Single)	Car Allowance Cell Phone Allowance or Internet Credit Other
Roseville	C	139,643	M \$7,800 C \$7,200	CALPERS Opt in 8% Contribution of \$39 out of Mayor/Council Pay	None	None	\$52 Internet \$35 Phone Stipend
Citrus Heights	G	86,291	M&C \$6,300	CALPERS 2.7%@55	Single - \$600 if opt out \$600 goes into a deferred comp account	D - Single Included in medical premium V - Single included in medical premium L - up to \$100,000	\$2,000 limit credit card to be used while on official travel or official business
Elk Grove	G	167,965	M&C \$9,600	CALPERS Classic 2%@55 Hired after 1/1/13 2%@62	Family - \$1,989.59 if opt out of medical \$650 deposited into deferred comp account	D - Family included in medical premium V - Family included in medical premium L - up to \$300,000	Deferred Comp- City will match 100% of officials contribution up to 3%
Folsom	C	77,246	M \$8,760 C \$7,560	PEPRA Classic 2.7%@55 New 2.0%@62	Family - up to \$1,506	D - Family \$160.20 V - Single \$22.04	None
Lincoln	G	47,339	M&C \$7,680	CALPERS Minimum Employer Contribution at \$115 per month	Family - up to \$1,850	D - Family included in medical	None

						premium V- Family included in medical premium L - up to \$10,000	
Rocklin	G	60,351	M&C \$8,220	None	None	None	None

Comparable Jurisdictions in Population Elected Officials Compensation and Benefits Comparison

City	General Law - G Charter - C	Size of City	Annual Base Pay Mayor - M Council - C	CALPERS (Retirement) Percent & Annual Other	Monthly Medical Insurance (Family or Single)	Dental - D Vision - V Life Ins - L (Family or Single)	Car Allowance Cell Phone Allowance or Internet Credit Other
Antioch	G	112,968	M&C \$11,652	City pays \$122 for PERS minimum employer contributions	Family - \$1,303 opt out any used funds split 50/50 between city and employee	Family D - \$183 per month V - \$34 per month L - \$12,000	Car \$450 per month for Mayor \$350 per month for members Cell Phone \$50 per month
Berkeley	C	119,915	M \$51,912 C \$35,038	CALPERS - 2.7% @ 55 Classic New member must opt into CALPERS and pay employee contribution	Family - Full Kaiser Premium	D - Full Delta Dental V - none L - \$25,000	Mileage at Standard IRS rate - \$0.54.5 per mile
Carlsbad	C	112,930	M \$25,826 C \$24,626	CALPERS - 2.0% @ 62 formula with 3 years average earnings for final calculation	Family - choice of several medical plans up to Kaiser minimum opt out unused funds received as income	D - No V - No L - two times annual base salary	Car Allowance Mayor \$5,400 per year Council \$4,200 per year Cell Phone \$549 per year
Concord	G	129,707	M&C \$15,600	CALPERS - Tier I 2.5% @ 55 Official pays 8% Tier II 2.0% @ 55	Official Only - \$662.01	D - \$40.30 per month V - \$11.20 per month L - twice	Mileage at Standard IRS rate - \$0.54.5 per mile

Official pays 7% Reform 2% @ 62				annual salary			
Corona	G	164,595	M&C \$9,600	CALPERS - contribution is 8% of base salary paid by official	Family - \$1,517.36	L - coverage up to \$50,000	Mileage at Standard IRS rate - \$0.54.5 per mile
Hayward	C	158,985	M \$39,959 C \$24,975	CALPERS - 2.5@ 55 Classic 2.0@ 62 New Employer 26.388% Official 8%	Family - Up to \$1,906.81 If opt out \$500 income in lieu of medical	D - \$128.84 V - \$58.06 L - 1x annual salary	Car Allowance Mayor only \$1,728 per year
Modesto	C	211,903	M \$43,200 C \$24,000	PARS - Official contributes 3.75% and City contributes 3.75%	No Medical	D - No V - No L- No	None
Oceanside	C	175,948	M \$21,528 C \$19,728	PEPRA - Officials elected/appointed after 1/1/13 subject to PEPRA. Each members retirement varies based on time on Council	Family - Full Cost of Kaiser of United Healthcare	Family - D - Delta Dental V - Vision Service Plan L - 1 times annual base salary	Expense Allowance Mayor \$400 per month Council \$350 per month
Richmond	C	110,378	M \$46,500 C \$16,830	CALPERS Official pays 8% and city pays 11.20% 2% @ 62	Family - Up to \$1,906.81	Family - D - Delta Dental \$122.46 V - Vision Service Plan \$18.34 L - \$25,000	Additional stipends for agency meetings
Vallejo	C	117,322	M \$22,800 C \$14,700	CALPERS - 2% @ 62 split between employer and official	Family - PEMCHA \$300 - City difference of 75% of Kaiser	Family - D - \$116.66 V - \$24.10 L - None	None

The Eighth Edition Model City Charter, a publication of the National Civic League states “councilmembers are part-time officials and do not direct city departments. Council salary level depends on a variety of factors specific to each community, including the part-time nature of the position and the emphasis on policy-making rather than administration.” The publication goes on to reject the setting of the actual amount of compensation in the charter except for the salary of the first council after the charter goes into effect. The delay in the effective date of any salary increases provides some protection from criticism from the community. Additionally the document explains that “the city should provide extra compensation for the mayor because, in addition to regular responsibilities, the mayor has significant intergovernmental and ceremonial responsibilities.”

Determining if Roseville's elected officials are defined as "part-time" in the discharge of their duties is difficult. In addition to their regular responsibilities of representing the Roseville citizens, the members also participate in 31 auxiliary board, commissions, or committees throughout the Placer and Sacramento County region. Examples of the auxiliary bodies include the Northern California Power Agency, the Regional Water Authority and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and many other high priority organizations. Even though the positions are split up

between the elected officials, each organization requires ample preparation and participation in representing Roseville's interests.

Health Benefits for City Bargaining Units

Bargaining Unit	Health Benefit Per Month*
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	\$1,575
Local 39 Stationary Engineers	\$1,347
Management Confidential	\$1,575
Roseville Police Officers Association and Roseville Police Association	\$1,575
Roseville Fire Fighters	\$1,575

*\$30 increase in 2020 and 2021

Local 39 Stationary Engineers are still negotiating contract which expired December 2018.

Reasonable Expenses

Section 3.05 of the Charter also indicates that Councilmembers, upon order of the Council, may be reimbursed for reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in the service of the City, but the Charter does not describe or define reasonable expenses. Reasonable expense could include the following:

- Registration fees and applicable materials for meetings and/or conferences
- Lodging at a conference facility
- Meals (any meals not provided as part of a conference) based on a per diem basis or reimbursement basis
- Non-conference meals (meals are not allowed unless conducting official city business and meals purchased for a group of people is conditionally allowed provided that the purchase of such group meal is a legitimate business expense for the city and a detailed receipt for the meal is attached listing attendees and business discussed
- Air transportation and ground transportation to and from conferences or City Council authorized business trips (air transportation should be coach only)
- Rental vehicles
- Tipping (luggage handlers, food servers or other appropriate attendants)
- Any tolls or mass transit fees or parking charges

The expenses above are outlined for all city personnel in Administrative Regulation 6.11. However, the Charter Review members can determination if the expenses should listed in the Charter.

Proposed Edit to Section 3.05

Charter Review Commission member Paul Frank made a written request to modify Section 3.05 as follows which eliminates the 50,000 to 70,000 population provision as Roseville's population has exceeded this amount:

a. The council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the council shall receive a salary, the amount of which shall be determined by the following schedule:

1. ~~If the City's population is between 50,000 and 75,000 persons, inclusive, the salary shall be five hundred dollars (\$500) per month for each councilmember, and the mayor shall~~

~~receive an additional amount of fifty dollars (\$50) per month.~~

~~2.~~ 1. If the City's population exceeds 75,000 persons, the salary shall be six hundred dollars (\$600) per month for each councilmember and the mayor shall receive an additional fifty dollars (\$50) per month.

b. Councilmembers may, upon order of the council, be reimbursed for reasonable and necessary expenses actually incurred in the service of the City. (Amended by General Municipal Election on November 2, 2010: amended by General Municipal Election on November 7, 2000: amended by General Municipal Election on November 5, 1985: Res. No. 240.)

Options for Future Consideration

(If Council Compensation ranks as a priority of the Charter Review members and the community)

1. Retain current compensation
2. Raise compensation to a specific amount
3. Retain current compensation and recommend health benefits
4. Revoke compensation and recommend health benefits
5. Remove compensation from Charter in order to adopt or modify compensation by ordinance
6. List appropriate expenses in Charter with actions 1-4 listed above

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Councilmember Vacancies - Article 3 - Section 3.09
Contact: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us
Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019
Item #: 6.2.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review members approve the proposed edit to Section 3.09 of Article 3 regarding Councilmember vacancies. The report and presentation are for information only.

BACKGROUND

The proposed amendment is for the benefit of transparency and thoughtful consideration by prospective applicants who choose to apply for a vacancy on the Roseville City Council by extending the timeline in order to fill a vacancy. The amendment also outlines if a individual is appointed to a term of two years or more, the individual would only be eligible to be elected to one four year term following an appointment.

Sec. 3.09. Councilmember vacancies.

The provisions of Section 1770 of the Government Code of the State of California as they now exist or may hereafter be amended shall govern the existence of a vacancy. Any vacancy on the council shall be filled by a majority vote of the remaining councilmembers within ~~thirty~~thirty-four~~five~~ (~~30~~34~~5~~) calendar days after the vacancy occurs. If the council fails, for any reason, to fill such vacancy within said ~~thirty~~thirty-four~~five~~ (~~30~~34~~5~~) day period, it shall forthwith call an election for the earliest possible date to fill such vacancy. A person appointed by the council to fill a vacancy shall hold office until the next feasible General Municipal Election and until a successor qualifies. The candidates receiving the most votes shall serve the longer, if any, of the unexpired terms, and in case of ties, the terms shall be fixed by lot. A councilmember elected to fill a vacancy shall hold office for the remainder of the unexpired term. However, no person who has held an elective office, whether by appointment or election, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was initially elected shall be elected to an elective office more than once.

-
-
-
-
-
-

City Council Appointments (30 Years)

Vacancy Date	Vacancy	Member Appointed	Appointed	Reason
April 1987	Jim Ross	Tom Chambliss	April 1987	Business Conflicts
July 1993	Fred Jackson	Special Election Called	November 1993	Moved to Granite Bay
November 1994	Bill Santucci	Randolph Graham	January 1995	Elected to PCBOS
May 1997	Mel Hamel	Jim Gray	July 1997	Retirement
February 2001	Dan Goodhall	Gina Garbolino	March 2001	Business Conflicts
October 2003	Earl Rush	John Allard	October 2003	Health Issues
January 2007	Rocky Rockholm	Carol Garcia	January 2007	Elected to PCBOS
January 2019	Bonnie Gore	Bruce Houdesheldt	February 2019	Elected to PCBOS

PCBOS - Placer County Board of Supervisors

Subsequent Election Information

Appointee	Elected After	Appointed	Election	Appointment Term
Tom Chambliss	No	April 1987	November 1989	2 years 7 month
No Appointee			November 1991	
			November 1993	
No Appointee			November 1994	
Randolph Graham	Yes	January 1995	November 1996	1 year 10 months
Jim Gray	No	July 1997	November 1998	1 year 4 months
Gina Garbolino	Yes	March 2001	November 2002	1 year 8 months
John Allard	Yes	October 2003	November 2004	1 year 1 months
Carol Garcia	Yes	January 2007	November 2008	1 year 10 months

Proposition A was passed at the November 2, 1993 election which dictated that General Municipal Elections shall be conducted in even-numbered years and at the same time of the State General Election.

As denoted in the information above, Roseville has utilized the appointment process to fill vacancies on the City Council for over 30 years.

Appointed Person Standing for Re-election - Partial Term

The language change denoted above proposes an appointed or elected partial term of over two years serves as one (1) of the two consecutive four (4) year terms. At the November 2010 election, Measure C was approved providing that a partial term served due to appointment to a vacant council seat does not count as a term. The language of Measure C was not formally memorialized in Section 3.09 by the codification company following the election. Staff seeks a recommendation of whether to memorialize the language of Measure C or to change Section 3.09 as proposed.

Appointment of First Runner-up in the Preceding Election

During the 2000 and 2010 Charter Review cycles, there were many proposals and letters submitted from residents requesting the Charter be amended to dictate that when a vacancy occurs, the solution to the vacancy would be to appoint, automatically, the first runner-up in the preceding election. Residents stated the vacated position should not be an appointed position, but rather an elected position, and by appointing a member that may or may not have run in the preceding election was taking away the voice of the people. See attached email submitted by Bruce Hagler dated April 22, 2019 which illustrates some of these points.

Those in opposition to appointing the first runner-up stated a vacancy on the City Council is a great opportunity to open up the process to bring the best possible candidates to the table, and to

choose from the best possible pool of candidates with the most expertise and the most applicable experience. Section 3.09 of the Roseville Charter remained unchanged during the 2000 and 2010 Charter Review process.

Options for Future Consideration

(If Councilmember Vacancies ranks as a priority of the Charter Review members and the community)

1. Retain current process of appointment with current timeline
2. Modify appointment timeline to 45 days
3. Add language that an officer seated over two years is only able to serve one additional four year term of office
4. Memorialize language of Measure C approved in 2010 providing that a partial term served due to appointment does not count as a term
5. Recommend filling vacancies on the Council to the first runner-up in the preceding election
6. Fill all vacancies by special election

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Email Submitted by Bruce Hagler Dated April 22, 2019

Orozco, Sonia

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 9:37 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: City Charter input

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Greetings-

I would like to make the following suggestion as it relates to the election of a candidate for a vacant position on the city council after a general election.

I believe as it is now that a vacancy can be filled by either a special election or by appointment by the current members of the council. All of the vacancies I can remember have always been an appointment versus special election and I believe its because of the cost to the city to pay for a special election. I agree that for the amount of money that would be spent on a special election the money could be better spent for other needs.

My requested change would be that the vacancy be filled off of the most current election results in order of placement. If the next person declines or is now ineligible (moved outside of the city limits, died) then the next person on the list gets the opportunity. Once all of the names in the previous election have been exhausted then the council can decide to fill the vacancy by either a special election or by appointment.

Why the requested change? The people that ran, but placed lower were still voted on by the citizens of this city. Votes should count and this would be one way to do it. Even if ultimately the city changes to vote for council by districts this would still work. This proposed change would eliminate any perception of bias from other members of the council. I have lived in Roseville for almost thirty years. I can remember in at least three instances a vacancy occurred fairly soon after an election and I believe that in at least two instances the next top vote getter was passed over for either someone else on the ballot or someone that hadn't run at all. In our most recent example of the fall 2018 election (source Placer County Elections website):

Total Votes: 89756 (vote for 2 candidates)
KRISTA BERNASCONI 25127=27.99% (voted in)
PAULINE ROCCUCCI 20209=22.52% (voted in)
DAVID C. LARSON 13208=14.72%
STEPHANIE DEMENT 12783=14.24%
BRUCE HOUDSHELDT 12282=13.68% (appointed)
SEHRISH KHAN 5878=6.55%
Write-in Votes 269=0.30%

In this case the fifth place vote getter was appointed over third and forth place. It should not be up to the council on who would be better to work with the other council members. The citizens have voted who they want to see working with the remaining councilmembers.

To be clear on my objectivity, I did not vote for Mr. Larson and have only met him once.

To the charter review commission, thank you for taking time to review my request. Any questions can be directed to me at this e-mail address or call me at [REDACTED]

Respectfully submitted,
Bruce Hagler



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Duties of the Mayor and Structures of Local Government

Contact: Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019

Item #: 6.3.



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Charter Review Commission Members and Resident Proposals
Contact: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019
Item #: 6.4.



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Staff Proposed Amendments to Charter Article 4 - Sections 4.01 and 4.02
Contact: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us
Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019
Item #: 6.5.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission members approve the staff proposed edits to Section 4.01 and 4.02 of Article 4 of the Charter regarding regular meetings and special meetings of the City Council.

BACKGROUND

The proposed amendment to Section 4.01 is to provide clarity and to be in alignment with the Administrative Standards adopted by the City Council.

Section 4.01 Regular Meetings

The council shall hold regular meetings on the first and third Wednesday of each month; provided that, if a regular meeting date falls on a legal holiday, the meeting shall be held ~~the following day at the same hour, same day the following week or may be canceled.~~ It shall An agenda will provide ~~by resolution for~~ the time and place ~~of its meetings~~ of the rescheduled meeting.

The requested change below is to provide clarity and to memorialize current practices.

Section 4.02 Special Meetings

Special meetings may be called by the City clerk, City manager, City attorney or ~~on the~~ by written request of the mayor or any three (3) councilmembers by providing each councilmember with twenty-four (24) hours' written notice served personally, electronically, or left at their usual place of residence. Business transacted at any special meeting shall be limited to the subjects recited in the notice of such meeting.

Staff requests the proposed changes be placed on the consensus list.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

Title: Staff Proposed Amendments to Charter Article 4 - Section 4.06
Contact: Sonia Orozco 916-774-5269 sorozco@roseville.ca.us
Michelle Sheidenberger 916-774-5325 msheidenberger@roseville.ca.us

Meeting Date: 5/20/2019
Item #: 6.6.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the Charter Review Commission members approve the staff proposed edits to Section 4.06 of Article 4 of the Charter regarding Council rules.

BACKGROUND

The proposed amendment is to eliminate the requirement that a synopsis or summary of the minutes be required within seven days after any meeting as the City Clerk Department has converted the creation of minutes to an automated system that aids in preparing the legal minutes in under seven days.

Sec. 4.06 Council rules.

The council shall determine its own rules and order of business subject to the following provisions. There shall be a journal of proceedings or minutes of all council meetings approved by the council and signed by the mayor and City clerk and to which the public shall have access at all reasonable times. ~~Within seven (7) days after any regular or special council meeting, a synopsis of the actions taken by the council at the meeting shall be posted on a bulletin board in the City hall, and w~~ Within thirty (30) days after any regular or special council meeting, minutes of the meeting shall be prepared by the City clerk and presented to the council for its approval.

A vote upon all ordinances and resolutions shall be taken individually by an affirmative or negative vote and entered upon the journal, except that where the vote is unanimous it shall be necessary only to so state. (Amended by General Municipal Election on November 2, 2010: amended by General Municipal Election on November 7, 2000: amended April 13, 1982.)

Staff requests the proposed change be placed on the consensus list.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Sheidenberger, Assistant City Attorney

Sonia Orozco, City Clerk