

**Minutes of the
Common Council Organizational Committee
December 14, 2004**

Time and Place: A meeting of the Common Council Organizational Committee was held on Tuesday, December 14, 2004, at 4:30 p.m. at 210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Room 103A, Madison, Wisconsin.

Members Present: Ald. Brenda Konkel (chair), Ald. Paul Van Rooy (vice-chair), Ald. Robbie Webber, Ald. Paul Skidmore (arrived at 4:36 p.m., left at 4:59 p.m., returned at 5:35 p.m.), Ald. Jean MacCubbin, Ald. Brian Benford, Ald. Judy Compton (4:35 p.m.) Ald. Mike Verveer (4:35 p.m.- alternate).

Members Absent: No members absent.

Staff Present: Lisa Veldran, Common Council Office.

Others Present: Mayor Dave Cieslewicz, Janet Piraino, Chief of Staff, George Twigg, Mayoral Assistant, Guy Van Rensselaer, City Training & Organizational Development, Michael May, City Attorney, Lara Mainella, Assistant City Attorney, Kelli Lamberty, staff person to the Street Use Staff Team, Ald. Ken Golden, Ald. Zach Brandon, Paul Malishke and Vicki Kraatz (Isthmus)

Call to Order: Ald. Brenda Konkel called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of minutes from November 9, 2004 meeting

Ald. Paul Van Rooy moved, seconded by Ald. Brian Benford, to approve the minutes from the November 9, 2004 meeting. Motion to approve the minutes carried (Ald. Jean MacCubbin was not in the room when vote was taken).

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Creating CCOC Work Group to Review Budget Process – Ald. Brenda Konkel

Ald. Brenda Konkel indicated that she and Ald. Zach Brandon were going to discuss the budget process and come up with recommendations. She asked if CCOC members approved of this process or if they wanted it to be more formal: subcommittee of CCOC, subcommittee of BOE or a council president work group. CCOC members indicated that a council president work group (possibly including some BOE members) would be preferable.

Results from Common Council Survey on Civility and Communication Issues – Guy Van Rensselaer

Guy Van Rensselaer reviewed the results from the Common Council Survey on Civility and Communication issues. He provided the following documents:

- ❑ “Using the Common Council Survey Data Appropriately”
- ❑ “Common Council Survey Report”
- ❑ “Common Council Survey Results” spreadsheet

He noted the following correction in the report on page 5:

Quality or Relevance of Communication – The mean rating of 2.9375 is very near the midpoint of the scale and therefore can be interpreted as being basically neutral. This is confirmed by the mode being “3”. The range is 2 – 5 which is skewed somewhat to the positive. The median is 3.5, **3.0** but it is rendered meaningless by the eight “3s”.

The following are excerpts from the report:

- ❑ 16 of 20 Council members responded.
- ❑ Specifically, the instrument was designed to look at three general areas:
 1. Communication between the Common Council and the Mayor’s Office
 2. General Climate of the Common Council
 3. Council Behavior/Conduct to the Public

Communication Between the Common Council and the Mayor’s Office

These sections yielded the lowest and highest mean satisfaction ratings of the entire survey.

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Comment</u>
Timeliness of Communication	Mean rating 2.3125	The comments noted that Council Members received materials prior to a meeting, but not enough time was allotted to read and consider them thoroughly. This would be a fairly easy area to address and an immediate impact on satisfaction could be noted
Accuracy of Communication	Mean Rating 3.4	The mean of is the highest for any attribute in the survey
Completeness of Communication	The mode, the median and the mean are all 3.0 This attribute demonstrates a classic bell curve	This wide range makes it difficult to pinpoint one improvement that would have a significant impact on the mean satisfaction rating.
Proactive Communication	Mean Rating 2.1667	Major area for improvement for the respondents. Must start with identifying the needs of these respondents and then delivering them. This is the only way to significantly improve this attribute rating.

Response/Follow-Up to Inquiries	Mean Rating 3.1875	One area of concern noted in the comments was the desire to receive direct response to inquiries rather than being forwarded a press release.
Quality or Relevance of Communication	Mean Rating 2.9375	As mentioned in the previous attribute, a respondent felt that the forwarding of press releases wasn't the response necessary for high quality communication. The key to improvement lies in understanding the needs of the many "2s" and "3s."
Ability to Contact the Mayor After Hours	Mean Rating 2	Before any action is taken to improve in this area, what is realistic must be defined. Then improvement strategies can be identified
Ability to Schedule Timely Meetings	Mean Rating 2.6875 Median Rating 3	This implies that an established expectation is not being met. One respondent commented that it was quite difficult to get on the mayor's schedule. This may be a "carryover" attribute from previous administrations. Previous mayor's have either had an open-door policy or went to considerable lengths to make themselves available to alderpersons.
Overall Satisfaction with Communication	Mean Rating 2.5625	It implies that not all the attributes of communication valued by the respondents have been identified in this survey. There is a lot of room for improvement in this general area. But first, needs must be identified, and then appropriate strategy(s) developed.

General Climate of the Common Council

This section of the survey had the lowest overall satisfaction rating of any of the three survey sections (2.5 as compared to 2.5625 and 2.9688).

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Respect for Fellow Alderpersons	Mean rating 2.9375	Those alderpersons that rated this attribute 4 or 5 were generally speaking about their own respect for other alderpersons, while those that rated it a 2 were generally making observations based on the behaviors of other alderpersons, rather than of themselves.

Civility	Mean Rating 2.8	Those that rated this higher were generally speaking about themselves, and those that rated it lower were speaking of other alderpersons. Comparisons were also made to previous iterations of the Common Council and the broader decline of civility of at all levels of government.
Level of Trust Amongst Alderpersons	Mean Rating 2.4375	The number of low ratings (2 and below) is more than 4 times the positive ratings (4 or above). The numbers alone, dictate that this attribute should be addressed, but it isn't an easy attribute to remedy. Trust is the effect of trustworthiness, and therefore can't be directly addressed. Trustworthiness is a behavior and a habit that must be continually demonstrated. There is no one time "fix". It has to become part of the "water" or culture of the Common Council
Amount of Forewarning	Mean Rating 2.3125 (Which is the lowest in this section of the survey)	The significant number of negative ratings for this attribute indicates this is a high leverage opportunity for improvement. It is quite probable that this is a contributing factor to the Level of Trust attribute discussed above.
Level of Collegiality	Mean Rating 2.4375	The ratio of negative to positive ratings is 8:1 Although there has been some noted deterioration of this attribute over time, it may not be an attribute that is universally accepted as important.
Level of Communication	Mean Rating 2.5333	The ratio of negative to positive responses is 7:1. Communication in any organization is an issue. In a governing body it is critical. Communication is based on a willingness to listen and share information. Effective decision-making is based similarly. This attribute, because of its low mean rating should be a high priority improvement area. It is a contributing factor to Level of Trust, Level of Collegiality, and other attributes within this section

Overall Satisfaction with the Climate of the Council

Mean Rating 2.5

All of these are low and represent a collective level of dissatisfaction with the operational climate. The ratio of negative to positive responses is 3:1.

Council Behavior/Conduct to the Public

Even though this is the highest rated section of the survey (2.9688), it is below the mid-point of the scale. Also, there are no 5 ratings in any of the attributes in this section. This is encouraging in the fact that even though there tends to be a self-positive bias in questions of this nature, the alderpersons were able to see opportunity for improvement in this area.

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Courteousness When a Member of the Public Is Speaking	Mean Rating 2.7333	Specifically, one comment stressed the legitimacy of the public's concern that the alderpersons aren't giving members of the public attention while they are speaking. Another noted that this might be a product of time availability for alderpersons to speak to one another
Attention Given to Members of the Public When Speaking	Mean Rating 2.75	
Willingness to Ask and Accept Without Criticizing	Mean Rating 2.8667	The comments gave little direction to improving in this area.
Overall Satisfaction with Civility Demonstrated to the Public	Mean Rating 2.9688	One might question why the overall satisfaction rating for this area is higher than for any of the attributes. Perhaps there are more attributes that are being considered by the respondents than appear in this survey. Again, the comments give little direction for improvement.

Guy Van Rensselaer summarized that the communication issues could easily be addressed but that individual behaviors are value-based and are harder to address or to change. He asked if the Council wanted to change or were they comfortable with the way things were currently. He believed that the results of the survey could be used as a platform, which may or may not create inertia for change. The CCOC took no action on this item.

City Report Process – Mayor Dave Cieslewicz

Mayor Cieslewicz distributed a memo entitled “Study Committees and Process” (dated December 14, 2004). The memo was written in response to comments he had received from Council members relative to reports. The memo outlined the differences between “Process for Mayor’s Task Forces” and “Process for City Study Committees”.

The Mayor indicated that the task force process was the way he develops his policy initiatives. They offer him a menu of choices and a set of ideas that he can pick and choose from when developing his initiatives. He indicated that he is resisting the collective model, believing that these policy initiatives then would no longer be his vision.

He indicated that the other report process (City Study Committees) was the process that formal policy is set by the City and adopted by the Common Council.

Concerns/ideas from alders:

- ❑ There is a public perception that the Mayor’s initiatives are the policies of the City of Madison, when they are not.
- ❑ There is no buy-in or input from the Council prior to the reports being made public.
- ❑ When there are media calls for alder reaction on Mayor’s initiatives – alder can’t react in a knowledgeable way to questions from the media.
- ❑ Agendas/minutes for Mayor’s committees/work groups/task force are not being sent to the Council.
- ❑ Concern that staff time is being used for the Mayor’s committees/work groups/task force and that staff is being pulled from alder projects/initiatives.
- ❑ Concerned about passing resolutions on reports they haven’t seen (e.g. Allied Drive RFP and the Mayor’s Vision)
- ❑ Suggestion that the Leadership Meetings be used as a way to communicate his initiatives to alders and ask alders if they have any content or process expectations (feedback) on Mayor’s initiatives – provide an opportunity for exchange.
- ❑ Have City Attorney Mike May review and update the memo from Eunice Gibson on accepting, adopting, and receiving reports.

Ald. Zach Brandon stated that gathering early input from alders on the Mayor’s initiatives limits free flowing ideas from citizens. He also felt that if the media calls him about the Mayor’s initiatives and he can’t comment he tells the reporter he would call them back.

Ald. Brenda Konkel thought that there were two issues:

- ❑ There is an expectation to pass a resolution on a report that many Council members have never seen.
- ❑ Spending staff resources on initiatives that are not going to pass the Council.

ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(Draft) 2nd Substitute Ordinance, ID# 33659 - (Two) to adopt and confirm amendments to certain sections of the Madison General Ordinances as set forth in attached Exhibit R pursuant to Sec. 66.0103, Wis. Stats regarding street use permits.

- ❑ Street Use Staff Team met on November 10, 2004 and recommended adoption with recommendations (report was attached).

Ald. Robbie Webber moved, seconded by Ald. Paul Skidmore, to refer the ordinance to the January 4, 2005 CCOC meeting. Ald. Ken Golden, Ald. Robbie Webber, Lara Mainella and Kelli Lamberty are to meet and work out any changes to the ordinance prior to the meeting on January 4, 2005. Motion was approved unanimously.

Ordinance, ID# 37072 - create Section 3.15(2) of the Madison General Ordinances to establish procedures by which the City Attorney may be authorized to commence public nuisance actions on behalf of the City under Wis. Stats. Chapter 823.

Ald. Judy Compton moved, seconded by Ald. Paul Van Rooy, to recommend adoption of the ordinance. Ald. Brenda Konkel made a friendly amendment to the motion to include the following language:

“1. The City Attorney provides written notice to the Mayor and Common Council of the intent to file a nuisance action. This written notice will include a description of the nuisance, why action is necessary, **and a reminder of the fifteen (15) day time limit in this ordinance to request Common Council consideration of a resolution.**”

Michael May explained that the purpose of the ordinance was to allow the City Attorney to move forward immediately on nuisance actions rather than preparing a resolution for Council approval to start the action. He further explained that the Council would continue to have the opportunity to discuss the action.

The motion to recommend adoption of the ordinance as amended was approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Report of LWM 106th Annual Conference (LaCrosse, WI) – Ald. Jean MacCubbin

Ald. Judy Compton moved, seconded by Ald. Paul Skidmore, moved to accept the report. CCOC members thanked Ald. Jean MacCubbin for her dedicated service on the League of Wisconsin Municipalities Board. Motion was approved unanimously.

Appointing Members to the CCOC Sister Cities Grant Review Subcommittee for 2005 – Ald. Brenda Konkel

Ald. Jean MacCubbin provided an overview of the 2005 subcommittee charge:

1. Review grant process, review grant applications and make recommendations to CCOC.
2. Make recommendations on a process for cities to apply as a sister city to Madison.

The following alders indicated that they would serve on the subcommittee: Ald. Jean MacCubbin, Ald. Brian Benford and Ald. Paul Van Rooy.

Creating a Madison Election Advisory Commission – Ald. Brenda Konkel

Ald. Paul Van Rooy moved, seconded by Ald. Brian Benford, to refer this item to the January 4, 2005 CCCO meeting.

Economic Development Commission Report – Ald. Brenda Konkel

Ald. Brenda Konkel had drafted a resolution (for introduction on December 14, 2004) to refer the EDC report and its recommendations to the Plan Commission, the Urban Design Commission and the CCOC for review and comment. This item will appear on a future CCOC agenda (as a resolution).

Legistar (legislative tracking) Update – Lisa Veldran

Lisa Veldran indicated that city staff is in the process of training on the Legistar program. She distributed examples of what a CCOC agenda will look like.

Upcoming Agenda Items – Ald. Brenda Konkel, Council President

- ❑ Discussion on Planning Councils
- ❑ Prohibition of “By Title Only” resolutions or ordinances – request from Terrance Wall
- ❑ Evaluation Process of Comp Group 21 Employees

These items were for informational purposes only and would be on a future CCOC agenda.

UPDATES FROM CCOC SUBCOMMITTEES/WORK GROUPS

CCOC Subcommittee on Public Input and Access – Ald. Jean MacCubbin

Ald. Jean MacCubbin indicated that the subcommittee met with Janet Piraino to discuss the issues related to the Mayor’s Office. Janet Piraino distributed a list of issues and the action the Mayor’s Office will be taking.

CCOC Lobbyist Registration Work Group – Ald. Mike Verveer

Ald. Mike Verveer indicated that the lobbying ordinance changes recommended by the work group would be introduced at the Council meeting on December 14, 2004 and referred to the CCOC. Lisa Veldran distributed copies of the ordinance to the CCOC members.

CCOC Subcommittee on Council IT Issues – Ald. Zach Brandon

Ald. Zach Brandon provided an update on the VPN tokens and accessing the City’s network for Groupwise and Legistar and wiring of the Council chambers.

ADJOURNMENT

Ald. Paul Skidmore moved, seconded by Ald. Paul Van Rooy, to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ald. Brenda Konkel
Common Council President

Recording Secretary: Lisa Veldran, Administrative Assistant to the Council