

Veldran, Lisa

From: lgwhites@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 6:50 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: [All Alders] Changes to City Council

Recipient: All Alders

Name: Ginny and Larry White
Address: 71 Oak Creek Trail, Madison, WI 53717-1509
Phone: 608-821-0056
Email: lgwhites@gmail.com

Would you like us to contact you? Yes, by email

Message:

We're weighing in on the proposal for a smaller, but full-time city council. The idea of providing better service to all constituents sounds good, but there could be unintended consequences.

We oppose such changes because of the expense use the money for pressing needs and because of what happened when the Wisconsin legislature created professional positions. Establishing a career path for politicians has not been good for Wisconsin. The incumbents tend to become too entrenched and eager to hold onto power.

We favor the current City Council arrangement which relies on citizen volunteers, who receive nominal payment for their services.

Veldran, Lisa

From: gordian@nym.hush.com
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 11:39 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Item ID 62930

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Madison Common Council,

I am writing to oppose an item on the Madison Common Council's agenda for its meeting on Dec. 1, 2020.

I oppose Item ID 62930, a resolution authorizing the placement of binding referendum questions related to the structure of city government on the Spring 2021 general election ballot. The timing of the vote is wrong, and the wording of the resolution unnecessarily limits the choices that Madison's citizens may make.

Although the measures in the Resolution are intended to increase participation of "the City's residents of color and low income", the vote is scheduled for the low turnout Spring election, when those very groups are less likely to turn out and vote. The binding Resolution should be scheduled for a high turnout election. The final report of Madison's Task Force on Government Structure was released last January. The vote could have been held on the date of the recent Presidential election, but that opportunity was missed.

Question two in the Resolution should be unbundled into two separate questions so that voters can cast separate votes on the size of Madison's Common Council and on the salary of its members. Voters should have the chance to judge each issue on its own merits. Madison's voters should be presented a ballot with separate questions on the number of Common Council members, the term length of Common Council members, and the pay of Common Council members.

Madison's Task Force on Government Structure has produced a very valuable report. It would be a shame to waste their hard work in the implementation stage.

Don Lindsay

Veldran, Lisa

From: David Ahrens <dmahrens@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 2:32 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: The proposed referendum

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Alders:

The proposal for a referendum on the composition and compensation of the Common Council uses the pretext of improved racial and social equity as its objective. In fact, this change would dilute representation and create higher barriers to office, thus setting back those very goals.

Our centuries-old system of citizen-legislators, used in all but one city in the state, would be replaced by a new well-paid political class serving four-year terms. (The proposed salary for the Alder is \$16,000 higher than that of a state legislator.) This class would be the winners of professionally-driven political campaigns that are at least twice as expensive as the current most costly campaigns. Campaigns that now cost \$12-15,000 could easily run \$30,000 as the need for multiple mailings takes the place of multiple visits per door in a district that has doubled in size.

This "reform" alleges that this new structure would enhance the opportunity for entry into city politics for the poor and lower class. What is the likelihood that poor and lower class residents have access to tens of thousands of dollars for a campaign? Or that they have relatives, friends and neighbors who can contribute hundreds of dollars? It is more likely that they will simply be massively outspent by a well-funded candidate.

The notion that the Council is a preserve of the "white and wealthy" class -as described by Atty May (letter of 11/25/20)- is obviously not a true description. Indeed, it is a much more apt description of city managers than our elected representatives.

The current demography of the city's population is approximately 75% white and 25% people of color. The make-up of the Council is 60% white and 40% people of color. Many of the latter members represent districts with the highest percentages populated by people of color. When those districts are merged with overwhelmingly white voters, any advantage would be diluted and districts with a substantial minority of people of color would be eliminated. In the context of gerrymandering, this strategy is a classic example of "cracking."

As a member of the Task Force on Government Reform and as a veteran of decades of membership on numerous civic and organizational committees, I can say without hesitation that I have not participated in a more dysfunctional process than the Task Force. After 90+ meetings over close to two years, its primary recommendation passed by a single vote.

The suggestion that the Council should adopt its recommendations as a gesture of appreciation for holding dozens of meetings or alternately, that there is a binding precedent because the Council adopted the recommendations of earlier "task forces" is absurd. Unlike the proposals for the Municipal Building or police reform, this recommendation is without empirical evidence to substantiate either its (mis)statement of the problem or purported solution.

Finally, consider this thought experiment: You conduct individual meetings with 100 constituents and ask each person two questions: What do you think would improve your engagement with city government? And, What should the city do with an additional \$1 million (the estimated additional cost of the proposal)?

Would anyone say, "Let's triple the expenditure for the Common Council instead of building eight units of housing, or hiring 10 police, or funding a summer program for youth, or rebating the funds to taxpayers?"

I urge you to vote "NO" on both the main and the substitute resolution; neither are the solution to anything but both have the potential to be problems of their own making.

Veldran, Lisa

From: Eileen Harrington
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 7:14 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: In Support of the Advisory Referendum Regarding the Common Council

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders,

I am writing in support of the resolution to place an advisory referendum regarding the Common Council on the spring 2021 ballot. I chaired the Task Force on Government Structure and recently had the privilege of speaking with you about the TFOGS' recommendation to reconfigure the Council as a ten-member full-time body. The Task Force did not come to this recommendation quickly or easily. The underlying rationale focuses on fundamental questions of access to and representation on our city's legislative and policy-making body. It will be difficult to engage our residents throughout the city on these important questions, but we should not shy away from the task because it's hard. Ultimately, our residents should decide how they wish our city government to be structured, and whether the status quo meets their needs. The advisory referendum is likely the most effective way to generate this community-wide conversation leading up to a binding referendum in 2022. Please vote in favor of this resolution when it comes before you on Tuesday, December 1, 2020.

Thank you for your attention to my views.

Eileen Harrington
4209 Veith Avenue
Madison, WI 53704
202-256-5337

2115 E. 6th St.
Tucson, AZ 85719

Veldran, Lisa

From: Jackson Muellenbach <jacksonmuellenbach@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 9:26 PM
To: All Alders; Verveer, Michael; district@cityofmadison.com; Skidmore, Paul; Baldeh, Samba; stubbs@countyofdane.com; Rep.Stubbs@legis.wisconsin.gov; Jackson Muellenbach
Subject: Who among this 20 will want to be on full-time?? See this

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Greetings council members,

If I understand this correctly, on a Monday night when I got other things to do upon returning home from a four day holiday trip, that you all will take-up the issue of voting yes or no on a full-time city council, tomorrow Tuesday.

A brief reply to this, prior to that vote---as if you all had not heard comments, pleas, and opinion from those in your own district, I say no...vote against this and keep it a twenty-member community city council not a likely political paid larger-district "alder district-ship".

I am shocked to say this, east-side alder Samba Baldeh said it best with his letter to the editor of the Wisconsin State Journal that ran four weeks ago in that publication.

http://madison.com/wsj/opinion/column/samba-baldeh-why-i-will-vote-no-to-a-smaller-more-expensive-madison-city-council/article_6fd58566-04cc-5fef-ba64-b37cf9d179d.html

For once, on a big issue, I agree with him, and it was a very good and logical letter on why to vote no....even if the city paid thousands and spend years on a committee to sit and debate this foolish-issue of a full-time council.

But now that Samba is our elected state representative, we wonder will that be enough for you..or will you want to also run again for Dist. 17 alder...for yet another term on the city council?

However, the biggest question of all...all 20 of you hopefully reading this email.....just how many of you would vote to say that you will end your term and not run in 2021 if you vote yes.....lets see who among the YES voters will now turn around and run again. And how many and who will be the ones willing to give it up to let this ten-member council get a clean start vs old hacks returning over and over and over?

I speak of Alder Verveer, who has been a sponge on the city government since he can't get a job elsewhere in his district let alone the city other than being a city paid alder? Who needs a ten member boards when we got our very own professional alder right in the person of Michael Verveer?

Nearly thirty-long-years is insane.

And he is the same alder who sponsored that marijuana ordinance earlier this month....Mike must be smoking that same green-leaf drug that he was caught smoking on State Street over 15 years ago with then-city police officer and future UW police chief Kristen Roman. We still never got the conclusion of that questionable incident. It took ten months to clean-out the smell from that Street Street coffee shop.

And Mike has not been the only alder who lives on the city council term after term...we got Alders Shiva Bidar and Paul Skidmore and also a west-side Madison alder who promised to just be an appointed replacement for Mark Clear, but was not clear was how many terms was enough fo Keith Furman could not live without being elected over and over....as with many US House members in Congress, once they get in, its like hell trying to pry them away from that "for life" job which was meant for a couple of terms of community involvement and let someone else represent the district.....it will be the same on the lower level of 10-member city council incumbency.

No....absolutely no....vote no....as we already got alders who live on the city council without districts getting smaller and less good representation so that they can be full-time alders....and never see any turn-over. Sorry Mike and Paul you both have been on the council too long, way too smug and feel like you own the district seat. And sadly, many don't even bother to challenge you both and Shiva as why deal with hassles of what incumbents get away with. What we need instead are term limits.

So....wonderful editorial letter, Samba, but come January you will have a new two-year term as a state rep., and that should be enough for you in elected politics...let another run for D-17. We should not have elected city council and Dane County board members serving concurrently....are you reading this Supervisor/Assemblywoman? Pick an elected position and hold it...not multiple ones. You are not the Queen of West-Side Madison. You are there for constituent representation, not pad you wallet with all elected jobs you can get voted to be on. Thats not the intention of elected politics in America...its activism for your city or state, not use as your only job, which is what we will get with a ten-member city council.

But voting for a ten-member city council it will be full of KINGS and QUEENS of the Madison city council...but if it does passes then all on the city council should end their term in April and not run for re-election.

Jackson and Myra Muellenbach

Common Council
Meeting of December 1, 2020
Legistar 62930

Like Mr. May, I am writing as a resident, not as your legal advisor. Mr. May asks you to consider his op-ed piece in the Wisconsin State Journal. I ask you to consider the attachment to this comment letter, a series of four posts I made on the neighborhood list-serve, posts that provide facts related to the claims made by Mr. May in his op-ed piece.

WHEREAS Clauses

1. The resolution states:

WHEREAS, on September 8, 2017 the City of Madison created the Task Force on Government Structure ("Task Force") (RES-17-00714) to examine and make recommendations related to the structure of the Mayor's Office, Common Council, and the City's Boards, Commissions and Committees;

Not so. The resolution did start out using "recommendations" but by version #3 (version #5 was adopted), the language about making recommendations on elected officials was removed. The purpose of the resolution, as adopted, read:

Creating a special task force on city governance to examine the structure and powers of the Common Council and its committees and the structure and powers of the Mayor's office.

2. The resolution states:

WHEREAS, the Task Force Resolution asked the Task Force to consider whether the City's existing government structure provides residents with adequate representation and meaningful avenues for participation, without privileging individuals with the time, resources, and ability to navigate the City's current government structure;

Not so. In 2017 the Council was concerned about privileging those with the time and ability to attend meetings.

Other systems/methods for creating multiple avenues for resident participation in government without privileging decision-making based on the time and ability to attend meetings.

The Council was concerned about making sure everyone had the opportunity to have a voice. And, in fact, that is what was intended in 2013 when the City declared its intention to adopt an Equity Impact Model: "WHEREAS, equity exists *when everyone has access to opportunities* necessary to satisfy essential needs, advance their well-being, *participate in and contribute to civic life* and achieve their full potential; ..." (emphasis added)

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=1461266&GUID=E77D2014-5101-4A65-B6EC-38752D337C53&Options=ID%7CText%7C&Search=31054&FullText=1>

There is not a need to create classes of residents and divisiveness – those with the alleged "time, resources, and ability" and those without. This gets translated, as it did in Mr. May's comment letter, to the "white and wealthy" versus "communities of color and with less treasure and time."

Timing of a binding resolution

If educating the public needs to be done before a binding referendum, is there enough time to educate the public?

By fall 2021, the redistricting process should be completed. (After the 2010 census, the Council adopted the plan in September 2011.) Should residents know the direct comparisons between the 20-member districts and the 10-member districts before voting on a binding referendum?

The Office of the City Attorney issued Formal Opinion 2017-003 which addressed the question of whether "Alders have begun to so resemble city employees that the APM should be applied to them." The opinion concluded Alders were not employees, but did say: "The increase in those benefits and salaries may have other effects on the nature and operation of the Common Council and might suggest other policy outcomes, but that is beyond this inquiry." Should a legal opinion be obtained regarding how a full-time, full-salaried Council would affect the status of alders before conducting a binding referendum?

The argument why a 10-person Council is better

The Task Force noted the "possible positive effects": (1) having alders who are able to dedicate all of their professional time to the work of the City instead of balancing multiple jobs and responsibilities; (2) making the position of alder more attractive to candidates who may otherwise be unable to participate on a part-time council with part-time pay; (3) having alders who would likely have larger districts, making Madison's residents per council member closer to other cities, thus possibly changing the level of influence a small group of residents can have on a single alder; and, (4) having alders who may be better positioned to consider the best interest of the entire City and not necessarily just their individual districts or small groups therein.

Reasons #3 and #4 are, in my opinion, questionable. This whole process has been about increasing participation in the City process, yet #3 implies that shutting down influence is a good thing. So if 20 residents get together and talk to their Alder, should that group have an effect on their Alder? And if they do not, even just to the extent of feeling their voice is heard, why should they bother participating in the future? As to #4, if the desire is to consider only the best interest of the entire City, then move to at-large representation (which was specifically rejected by the Task Force).

As to #1, it is worth noting that there would not be any prohibition on an Alder having another job.

As to #2, would a full-time Council increase representation by non-white persons of lower income? Mr. May's comment letter calls the current Council composition "an historical anomaly." From a statistical perspective, it is not an anomaly. The number of non-white Alders has increased each term since 2014, thus, from a statistical perspective, the current composition does not qualify as an anomaly.

Every resident should have access to opportunities necessary to participate in and contribute to civic life. The Task Force report lists a number of possible initiatives on pages 36-37. These, and others, are items that could be implemented in the near future to increase those opportunities.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

ATTACHMENT

I have a more than one issue with a full-time, 10-member Council. So today's installment addresses Mr. May's claim that other cities, such as Milwaukee, "are not overrun by "professional politicians" ..."

Milwaukee has 15 Alders. Of those 15, 5 have been Alders for more than 10 years (one dates back to 1989). Of the 10 Alders elected since 2010, only 2 unseated an incumbent -- the other 8 were first elected to fill an unexpired term, or when a current Alder resigned.

Of the 10 Alders elected since 2010, there is a lot of political background – only 2 had no previous political experience (Lewis and Perez).

- Johnson (staff assistant to the mayor)
- Dodd (WI state senator 2012-2017, Milwaukee County Board 2010-2012)
- Rainey (County Board 2013-2016; staffer for the local District Office of Congresswoman Gwen Moore)
- Zamarripa (currently also in the WI Assembly. Intends to do both until January 2021 when her Assembly term ends)
- Borkowski (22 years on the County Board, announced in March 2014 that would leave Board when term ends in 2016; ran against State Sen. Tim Carpenter; elected in 2015 to fill-in for an unexpired term)
- Spiker (legislative aide for the retiring alderman in that district)
- Dimitrijevic (County Board from 2004 until elected as Alder; ran for Assembly in 2014)
- Stamper (County Board in 2012, resigned to fill Alder seat in 2014)

Three of them (Rainey, Borkowski, and Stamper) are former County Board members whose departure from the County Board occurred after state law cut salaries to \$24K and removed health insurance effective in 2016 (2013 WI Act 14).

Alder races seem to cost a lot of money. Two Alders were elected in 2020 (no incumbent was running)

- District 8: Zamarripa as of 7/2020, raised \$17K in 2020 and spent \$47K. One opponent raised \$5K in 2020 and spent \$13K.
- District 14: Dimitrijevic as of 7/2020, raised \$21K in 2020 and spent \$32K. Opponent terminated campaign, and had spent less than \$2500. The other opponent did not file the July update, but as of March 2020, had raised \$35K in 2020 and spent \$32K and had \$65K in outstanding loans.

The second installment, since it is Election Day, is representation.

How many residents should an Alder represent?

The number of Madison residents per Alder:

1987 (when the Council went to 20 Alders): about 9,500 residents/Alder

2010: 11,660/Alder

2019 (based on census estimate): 12,984/Alder (if 10 Alders, then about 26,000)

2040 (based on Comprehensive Plan projections): 16,484

Using data provided to the original task force, the top 10 cities, by population, in Wisconsin have the following resident/alder numbers (based on 2010 census data)

Milwaukee	39,656 (each Alder also has a legislative aide)
Waukesha	14,144
Madison	11,660
Oshkosh	9,440
Green Bay	8,671
Janesville	7,654
Eau Claire	5,989
Kenosha	5,836
Racine	5,257
Appleton	5,108

Would a small Council result in better representation?

Mr. May said in his op-ed piece: "Thus, some districts get significantly more democracy and representation through effectively having full-time City Council members. Other districts do not. Let's even the playing field."

In looking at the materials, I could not find anything that provided the average number of hours each individual Alder worked per week. Is it possible that some Alders put in more hours because there is more going on in their districts?

Marsha said in her blog that she puts in 20-30 hours/week. In 2019, in addition to city-wide issues and serving on boards/commissions/committees, Marsha had the following neighborhood specific issues.

Landmarks: 27 Legistar items
(including 2 non-residential, plus the Essen House project, plus a storefront façade, plus a mural)
Conditional use: 12
Demolition: 2
Planned Development: 1
Alcohol licenses: 12 new licenses
Street reconstruction: 2 (Atwood, Blair/John Nolen)

In 2019, an Alder at the City's edge had the following neighborhood specific issues:

Landmarks: 0
Conditional Use: 3
Demolition: 0
Planned Development: 0
Alcohol licenses: 0 new licenses
Street reconstruction: 0

In contrast to Mr. May's opinion, former Mayor Dave Cieslewicz, said in the January 27, 2020 Isthmus:

"Not only should we not reduce the council, we should probably expand it a little. I would add a seat during the 2020 redistricting and adopt a policy that no alder should have more than, say, 12,000 constituents. That would limit the strain on part-time alders as the city grows."

The Ad Hoc Task Force on the Structure of City Government grew out of the Task Force on the Structure of City Government. That task force had a Common Council Subcommittee.

"The subcommittee had an extended discussion on whether the size of the Council should be changed. After much discussion, the consensus of the subcommittee was that reducing the size of the Council would not necessarily solve any issues such as better representation, and could result in several negative effects: Larger districts would cost more to campaign and it might lead to professional and full-time politicians. The subcommittee members expressed support for the citizen-alder as a volunteer position." (Minutes of the 1/25/2019 meeting of the Task Force on Structure of City Government Common Council Subcommittee.)

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7033039&GUID=A294BCB5-61BC-4D40-A7FA-3FC55A110D09>

And the Subcommittee's final report said: "In addition, the Subcommittee noted it was unsure whether moving to a full-time Council would have a tangible impact on representation or participation by communities of color and low income."

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7089664&GUID=357FC064-0D7E-4970-9A42-551D2F6F1147>

And installment #3. Mr. May states in his op-ed piece: "Some alders have the time or job situation to essentially do what is a full-time job on a full-time basis. Most do not. Many of them (most recently Ald. Donna Moreland) resign after trying for a few years."

So how many Alders have resigned after "trying for a few years?" 8 current Alders have served for 5 or more years. Of the 12 elected since 2015, the following is a list of district number, alder name, date elected, and how long the predecessor served and why the predecessor left office (if reported). 3 of those former Alders cited a time-related reason for leaving the Council, after having served 7, 11, and 8 years.

D11, Martin, 2017

Chris Schmidt, 2009-2016, left mid-term 1/2016 to focus on his day job. Interim filled by Tim Gruber

D16, Tierney, 2018

Denise DeMarb 2013-2018, left mid-term due a cross-town move, Tierney appointed until 4/19, when he ran and was elected

D19, Furman, 2018

Mark Clear 2007-2018, left mid-term, Furman appointed until 4/19, when he ran and was elected. Clear took a job as COO of 360 Networks and is reported as saying he would not be leaving if being an alder were a financially sustainable position

D2, Heck, 2019

Ledell Zellers, 2013-2019, chose not to run again

D3, Lemmer, 2019

Amanda Hall, 2015-2019, moved out of district

D7, vacant

Steve King, 2009-2019. Moreland elected 4/19, resigned 9/30, then appointed as deputy secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services (Moreland's predecessor is reported to have a salary in 2019 of \$107,910, per the MacIver Institute.) <https://s17596.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Evers-Secretary-Salaries.png>

D10, Henak, 2019

Mo Cheeks, 2013-2019, ran for mayor

D12, Abbas, 2019

Larry Palm, 2005-2019 (including 15th district before lines redrawn)

D13, Evers, 2019

Sara Eskrich, 2015-2018, left mid-term following her acceptance of a new job outside of Madison, Allen Arntsen appointed to fill term until 4/19.

D15, Foster, 2019

David Ahrens, 2013-2019. "He said he is leaving largely in frustration over issues "such as the Judge Doyle Square redevelopment fiasco, mega-parking ramps and mismanagement at the Madison Water Utility." per WSJ

D20, Albouras, 2019

Matt Phair, 2011-2019, "to focus more time on other aspects of his life, particularly his family" per WSJ

D8, Presigiacomo, 2020

Zach Wood, 2015-2019. Alva Reddy, elected 2019, resigned 9/19 citing family illness. Interim replacement was Sally Rohrer

My fourth installment addresses another of Mr. May's assertions. (I had sort of given up on this, but now that the Council will be considering on 12/1 whether to have a binding referendum at the spring 2021 election ...)

Mr. May stated that the current part-time 20-person Council favors the wealthy, implying that a 10-person full-time Council would result in greater democracy: "After a long study, the task force found that the current structure is in fact anti-democratic, favoring residents of the city who are wealthy in time or money, and disadvantaging the poor and communities of color."

In a democracy everyone should have a voice and every voice should count. So how will a 10-person full-time Council will increase the voice of communities of color and low income? The Task Force report says:

1. "Throughout the meeting, Task Force members engaged in a lively debate about whether residents would be better represented with more or fewer alders.[f.n.31]" (page 22)
 - Unfortunately, footnote 31, when clicked, is a link to a Legistar item that states: "This record no longer exists. It might have been deleted."
2. "Task Force members who favored ten (10) alders noted the positive effects of having larger districts, including that larger districts would mean that those populations who tend to be more transient, moving from district to district, would be less likely to cross district lines when they move. These residents may then become more familiar with and invested in their districts and their alder." (page 23)
3. "Proponents also noted that moving to a full-time Council would better position the Council to consistently and effectively pursue policy initiatives, including initiatives related to improving resident engagement and participation in the City." One specific example was provided: "...a full-time Council would be equipped with the time and resources necessary to provide ongoing accountability of the BCC [boards, commissions, committees] system." (page 21)
4. "Finally, proponents for moving to a full-time Council noted the simple fact that Madison has had a large part-time Council for most of its existence. Yet, Madison has acknowledged its struggle to adequately represent and serve people of color and low income." (page 22)
 - My comment: Correlation is not causation.
 - Or, as Alder Kemble is reported as saying: "Kemble, however, says it's a straw dog argument to say that the size of the Council is the reason for the disparate representation. Having fewer alders will not result in better representation."
<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7907355&GUID=89EE6771-1C47-4863-8FDA-715DA3A85639>

The Task Force had created 5 subcommittees to look at various issues in more detail. The Common Council Subcommittee was created to examine the issues contained in the resolution pertaining to the Council. One of those issues was: "Number of Council members and the impact on effective representation of residents in general and people of color and those living with lower incomes in particular, functionality of the body, and city governmental services."

The Common Council Subcommittee Report to the Task Force on Government Structure, dated March 12, 2019 said:

- "In addition, the Subcommittee noted it was unsure whether moving to a full-time Council would have a tangible impact on representation or participation by communities of color and low income."

- "After much discussion, the consensus of the Subcommittee was that reducing the size of the council would not necessarily result in better representation. In fact, they noted that larger districts could reduce the likelihood of electing a person of color by eliminating districts (like District 14) that were drawn to give people of color a greater chance of being elected."

The Common Council Subcommittee minutes of 1/25/19 state:

- The subcommittee had an extended discussion on whether the size of the Council should be changed. After much discussion, the consensus of the subcommittee was that reducing the size of the Council would not necessarily solve any issues such as better representation, and could result in several negative effects: Larger districts would cost more to campaign and it might lead to professional and full-time politicians. The subcommittee members expressed support for the citizen-alder as a volunteer position.

The Common Council Subcommittee minutes of 11/16/18 state:

a. Full time Alders

Positive effects: More in tune with citywide issues. More professional. Less influenced by a vocal minority in the district (assumes a smaller council). More candidates due to salary. Less stress on family, job, childcare.

Negative Effects: Not as close to constituents (assumes smaller council). Not supported by residents. Makes alder more likely to suffer from job (election) loss and career gap. Fewer candidates because no longer part-time. Bigger campaigns, more money and more influence of moneyed interests. Not as close to local issues (assumes smaller council). More "political." Loss of varied background and job status.

Other effects: Balances power of Mayor and city staff. Alders would have longer elected careers. Effect on communities of color is unknown.

d. Reduce number of districts/alders.

Positive Effects: May reduce the length of debate at Council meetings. Likely necessary if want more full time staff. Fewer alders with staff may reduce inquires to current city staff. Reference some of positive effects of full-time council, above, that assumed reduction in size.

Negative Effects: Bigger districts may increase campaign costs and change nature of campaign. Little support from residents, survey. May increase the power to wealthy and high turn-out districts; these two factors are correlated. Reference some of negative effects of full-time council, above, that assumed reduction in size.

Other Effects: May insulate alders from pressure. Will make Madison's residents per council member closer to other cities.

Veldran, Lisa

From: Eileen Harrington
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2020 1:44 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Revised view regarding referendum on size and status of Common Council

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders,

I need to revise and correct the views I shared in my earlier email. I wrote in my capacity as the Chair of TFOGS. When I wrote, I did not understand there is an alternative resolution coming before the Council to refer the TFOGS recommendation regarding a 10 member full-time Council to the spring ballot as a binding referendum. I apologize for not being better informed about this alternative. I mistakenly thought the only options coming to the Council are an advisory referendum or nothing. Now that I am better informed, I want to strongly support the alternate resolution calling for a binding referendum. I support this because I think it is far preferable to put this to the voters before redistricting. In addition, while next spring may not be the optimum time to put this question before our community, for different reasons it would also be suboptimal to put this before the voters in 2022.

I apologize for expressing a view not fully informed, and ask you to please consider this as my opinion on the matter.

Eileen Harrington
4209 Veith Avenue
Madison, WI 53704
202-256-5337

2115 E. 6th St.
Tucson, AZ 85719

From: Justice Castaneda
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2020 4:28 PM
To: All Alders; Mayor
Cc: Strange, John; Kapusta-Pofahl, Karen
Subject: Letter ICO Size and Status of Common Council

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Members of the City of Madison's Common Council,

This is the first and only time that I have ever directly addressed this body, and do so with extreme prejudice and with the utmost respect for the work you all do and for the accompanying responsibilities. I address you as a native-born Madisonian, a citizen and in my professional capacity as the Executive Director of Common Wealth Development.

I write to you today to strongly voice my support the alternate resolution calling for a binding referendum to determine whether Madison's Common Council should move to a full-time structure, with 10 alders.

I know that Spring of 2021 is not the most optimal time to put this question before the people. However, after two years of work as a member of the Task Force on the Structure of Government, and over a decade researching the structural underpinnings of Madison's racial disparities, I absolutely believe that the people of Madison should be guaranteed the opportunity to make a decision about this prior to the upcoming redistricting process.

I spell out many of the issues raised by TFOGS and my own research in the message below, however I understand that you are all very busy and may not have time to read what is most likely one of many communications from a resident about the issues before you at tonight's meeting. Suffice it to say that while I do think that Madison should fundamentally restructure our Common Council, my actual concern has more to do with ensuring this decision goes to the people, as a binding referendum, prior to the upcoming redistricting process—regardless of what that final decision may be.

Additionally, based on all of this work, I strongly recommend that Madison establish a formal charter-review process, similar to TFOGS, to occur no less than every 10 years to accompany redistricting. There were many issues brought

to light during the work of TFOGS, and it is healthy for us to periodically revisit the structure of municipal governance to ensure universal access to our democratic processes and institutions.

Again, I go into this in more detail below. Otherwise, thank you, in advance for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully Submitted,

Justice Castañeda
3654 Dawes Street
Madison, WI 53714

--

I write in both a personal and professional capacity; while I personally believe that this is the best course of action for Madison, Common Wealth Development's mission requires me to address issues that affect the lives and well-being of the people we work in solidarity with, especially when there are issues concerning equitable representation and access to democratic processes and institutions.

Two points of emphasis are as follows:

- This is fundamentally about representation. With integrity, while I do believe that the council and representative districts should be restructured, I cannot say for certain that a smaller council will solve all things, or that an alternative structure will absolutely lead to better representation or outcomes for BIPOC residents or other people who are not currently represented. What I can say, with certainty, is that the current structure is fundamentally serving as an impediment to equitable access to governmental processes and policies, for the residents of Madison, WI, and addressing it is a moral and economic imperative. I do not think that the size of the council is so sacred that preserving it should take precedence over ensuring access to democratic processes for **all** Madisonians.
 - What the Task Force found was not that people of color are not on the council—obviously this is not the case. What we found was that if you were a person of color in Madison, you were significantly

more likely to be excluded from public service and especially from being elected to the common council. A lot of this has to do with the size of districts (unusually small, which actually leads to *less* opportunities for collective action), the way they are drawn, the likelihood of people moving, the likelihood of people falling into a category outside of the categories re: What it takes to work diligently as an alder (addressed below), and the history and contemporary housing practices/policies in Madison. We can absolutely have a situation where there are people of color on the council and the people of color in Madison are not equally and/or equitably represented in municipal processes, which is the currently our reality.

- It is critical, for the health and sanctity of our democracy, for us to be unequivocal about the need for representation--especially amongst those who have historically been excluded from these same processes. It is in that spirit, and in the voice of a person of color who was born in this town and continue to advocate for the voices of all people of color and all Madisonians, that I believe we need to move in a different direction as it pertains to the structure of the council.

- Regarding the issue of compensation: What the task force found was that the degree to which any alder was able to spend time on policy, legislation, municipal business etc., was largely moderated by whether they were: a) independently wealthy, b) retired, c) in a job that allowed them flexibility, d) were in a district that had a lot of money and / or influence and / or e) self-employed (or employed by their family--see: 'C'). This was substantially corroborated by talking with former and current alders, and by assessing the terms/tenure of both. This structure absolutely excludes an entire swath of our workforce. And the work being done is essentially full-time work. And they deserve to be paid for it.
 - There are significant concerns with the sprawling structure of boards, commissions and committees in Madison. There have been numerous attempts to try to consolidate them. None very successful (in fact, a couple recent attempts resulted in the creation of additional committees). One of the observations made by the Task Force was that this would be nearly impossible to do without full-time alders. The amount of time and work that needs to go into this

process -- by alders -- is far too demanding for the current part-time structure.

- Re: Amount of compensation: \$67,940 is the amount someone can make and still get access to the housing our city / county subsidize (by way of private *and* non-profit housing development) under the umbrella concept of being "affordable." This is absolutely not affordable to most folks who are severely housing burdened in Madison and / or Dane County. If we are going to compensate alders, we should at least pay them the amount that will allow them to access the housing that we are subsidizing. \$67,940 is the amount a single parent with two children can make and still qualify for income-restricted housing in Madison / Dane County.

===

Respectfully Submitted,



Justice Castañeda

Executive Director

Common Wealth Development, Inc.

1501 Williamson St.

Madison, WI 53703

(608) 256-3527, ext. 12

Email: justice@cwd.org

Web: www.cwd.org

[Like us on Facebook](#)

[Make a gift to Common Wealth. Donate online...](#)