

Responses and Comments: TFOGS survey of 79 current and former officials. (8/16/18)

Q1 COMMON COUNCIL: The current Common Council has 20 alderpersons representing 20 different geographic districts. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Increasing the number of alderpersons	3.80	3
Decreasing the number of alderpersons	40.51	32
Keeping the number of alderpersons the same	43.04	34
Neutral	12.66	10

Increasing the number of alderpersons would make the council and its meetings much more involved and give each alderperson less influence. Decreasing the number of alderpersons would make each district much larger and more difficult for alderpersons to manage all the constituent contact.

I'm worried that the re-districting process could be contentious and a huge distraction that isn't worth the results.

I know Madison is growing, but getting too many people on the council can make things drag.

I think it will be necessary in the not too distant future to downsize the Council and go to a full-time, professional model.

The number is less important than their ability to work full time and receive a full time salary. That is more likely to ensure better constituent service and representation, and most importantly to allow any of our citizens to run for office. It's social justice, and just plain good management.

I don't feel strongly about the number of alders, however I do think that at some point the Council will have to become full time. There is simply too much work for anyone who doesn't have a very flexible schedule (students, retired people, people who are self-employed, or those who have very understanding bosses.) If the Council seats are reduced, there should be at least 10, because fewer than that would make it too easy for interest groups to get enough votes to pass an agenda. For instance, with only six alders, someone would only need four votes to pass (or block) something.

No matter what is done, I support increasing staff capacity for alderpersons. I believe a model like the Milwaukee County Board where every 2 board members splits a full-time staff person would be sufficient.

With the additional staff and compensation and technology tools available, I think a smaller Council is warranted.

Smaller numbers tends to invite professional politicians rather than regular folks

While I appreciate the need for extensive coverage across the City, studies show that slightly smaller numbers would allow for more effective / efficient decision making. It is just important to make sure the right people are elected.

Number about right for being able to adequately represent people while not being so large as to be unwieldy.

Decrease the number only if the role is changed to full-time and fully paid position.

Population and development in Madison will continue to increase. Hand in hand with that will be the need for an increasing involved CC. All of this leads to the need for a full time CC with adequate support staff. Structurally, the city should be divided into 10 or 12 districts with a full time alder and staff serving each district. An intangible benefit of this restructuring could be an example to the Dane County Board albatross!

This oversimplifies a complicated question. The problem today is that the workload exceeds what most people can provide while maintaining a full time job, which limits the accessibility of the job to those with the resources and/or support and/or privileges to manage the balance. If nothing else changes, the job of Alder should be full time and in that case the districts could be enlarged by a factor of up to 2.

Alders' districts should be LIMITED IN POPULATION -- so that people can have effective and real representation. I'd suggest no more than 10,000 people per district and then we have the number of Alders to make that a reality! It's about representing people more democracy!

Aldermanic district boundaries and County Board district boundaries should AT LEAST be coterminous.

Much larger cities are able to govern with fewer council members, and they get paid better. It would depend on what factors are considered in drawing fewer districts.

at lease a third or even half

It would be difficult to campaign door-to-door in larger districts. Door-to-door visits are important for learning what constituents think about issues.

Given the number of committees and the complaints about alder workload, if there were more alders to share the work, they would have less to do. Additionally, having more alders representing smaller areas makes it easier for people to run for office - takes less time to knock on doors and less money to print lit. Also, the alders can give neighborhood groups more attention if they have less neighborhoods to represent.

One of the best things alders do is to provide a personal link to residents. I think decreasing that would reduce people's contact with elected officials - right at a time when distrust and disconnect are to high. Maybe we'll need more as we grow, but we'll not need less.

Hard to believe we have so many, overkill

It is challenging to have citizens spend the number of hours needed to help run the City and still have occupations that pay them well enough and give them the time to have a family.

going to 15 or 16 would be acceptable

The current number is unwieldy and not consistent with best practices of other similarly sized (and larger) municipalities.

The current number strikes a good balance between community-wide and neighborhood/spot-specific issues.

There are inherent risks with a large governing body. I would like to see the Common Council at the same number or even reduced.

20 districts divides the city into manageable neighborhood based districts

The Council is one of the largest, if not the largest, in the country. Membership needs to be reduced and the role of an alder clarified.

I just believe a better, more efficient council could be obtained and it would save the taxpayer some money.

Madison has always prided itself on local, neighborhood representation. Reducing the number of alderpersons would violate this value. The city has grown considerably in the last decade and a small increase might be justified. It should be reviewed.

My observation is that the number of Alders results in fewer conversations about city-wide policy benefits vs. individual neighborhoods. As we look to the future and future generational conversations, it would be helpful to have big picture/36000 ft. view conversations. Fewer Alders could facilitate this. Also, at-large positions could be helpful vs. all district related positions.

This should be the last question, after we determine how to best serve the city and create a sustainable model. Other questions precede such as full time or part time? I don't know the answer at this point in the journey.

While a good case can be made for decreasing the size of the council, I believe that having a more districts affords each alderman the opportunity to be more responsive and more available to a smaller constituency. As this unit of government is the most accessible to citizens, we need to foster responsiveness of elected officials to their constituents. I fear that decreasing the number of districts would increase each alderman's workload, reducing their availability to a larger body of constituents.

Decreasing the number of alders will dramatically decrease representation, both of neighborhoods and of women and people of color on the council.

but, fewer wards and 4 to 5 alders "at large"

I see no reason to change. A smaller council would also eventually be full-time with full-time staff for each member, office space, etc. This would invite more money into council elections. I know that council members are asked to a lot for little compensation, but the cure would be worse than the disease in this case.

Given the increase duties, responsibilities, and pay, I believe city districts should increase in size and subsequently reduce the number of alderpersons. I previously advocated for a large council so we'd have more political engagement. For a myriad of reasons, I don't think the current structure of the council allows for hyper local political engagement.

The number of alderpersons should be determined by the population and the geographic area covered. If there is not already a formula to determine the

optimal number of representatives per population and geographic area, develop one.

Decreasing the number of districts means alders will have to spend even more time covering the needs of their districts creating pressure to have full-time alders. On the other hand, increasing the number of districts can make it harder to make quorum and make decisions, and increase the length of council meetings.

I know the current climate is to cut the number of politicians in office but I think the number is good right where it is. The current scheme ensures there is a good chance to get a good cross section of people making decisions.

6 or 7 full time would be my ideal. I believe Portland, OR has about that number, and each becomes a department head. Check that out!

Q2. COMMON COUNCIL: Alders represent and are elected by geographic districts in the city. Should the City consider electing some or all alders at-large, that is, in a city-wide election?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	17.72	14
No	69.62	55
Neutral	12.66	10

All alders should represent both their districts and the whole city.

I consider neighborhood representation essential to the alder position and the council in general.

This may create a sense that the at-large alders have greater authority. The Council should either be all at-large or all geographically elected.

The concept of creating a mechanism for some portion of legislators to focus exclusively on city-wide issues is appealing. I would add to that the idea that those positions have 4 or 6 year terms. This would allow them to think in greater time horizons, invest in more long-term planning, and modulate passing sentiments even further.

Some alders elected citywide would assure that there are votes not held hostage to narrow neighborhood concerns. Sometimes it's hard for alders to think about the "big picture" when they are being bombarded by people from just one area.

If at-large districts are determined to be the right direction for the city, there should only be a limited number of at-large seats. I do not like the idea of every alder being elected at-large.

Although many issues spill over to multiple areas and districts, I think for accountability purposes each Alder should have a definite group of constituents to respond to for decisions.

A 2 tier council would not work well. This diminishes the status of the Mayor

It would be very hard to run a city-wide campaign for an alder position. And who the alder would represent would be too vague. The mayor is our city-wide alder.

I have a hard time seeing additional at large seats being anything other than additional representatives from our wealthiest, oldest, whitest and often highest turnout wards.

Not all...maybe two. Need more info.

Districts promote diversity and enable strong personal connections with constituents

Alders At-Large would allow for a citywide perspective from the Council, moderating the sometimes parochial positions of some alders.

All areas of the city need to have representation on a part or full time CC.

The white majority is overwhelming and some neighborhoods are far more politically active than others, city-wide elections would favor the Isthmus, near east, and near west sides at the expense of everyone else. City-wide elections will not improve public participation, but they will further favor those with power and/or name recognition.

Not sure the point of an At-Large Alder -- I think Alders should represent a specific group of people, and those residents should know who their Alder is, so they can hold that person accountable and replace that person if needed.

While it is certainly important to keep direct representation of neighborhoods (and ethnic communities) as a focus of local government, it is also important to represent the broader, city-wide view on many issues. NIMBY views are too powerful in the current structure.

Terrible idea. Don't even consider this. Disastrous for diversity in representation. And what about constituent service? No, no, no.

At-Large representatives could provide a counter-weight to those alders who tend to only support their districts' parochial interests over city-wide interests.

I don't understand what this would accomplish.

Differences in perspective from a range of geographic districts is valuable, let's keep this format.

That's what the mayor and committees are for.

I would not like to see all of the alders over represented from one area of the City.

it's hard enough to be known in your own district. At large would give advantage to those with access to money or notoriety

At-large representation will tend to increase the power of affluent neighborhoods and interests.

Alders should serve as the voice of their constituents, representing the people in their district, but always keeping in mind that their district is part of a larger entity, the City of Madison. All should have equal responsibility in responding to the mundane questions of barking dogs and idling buses while also considering bigger questions such as how to improve mass transit.

Only if they decrease the total number of alders.

City-wide representation is not a good model for our city. It can provide representatives with an easy excuse for ignoring neighborhood issues by proclaiming "I must represent the entire city".

See earlier comments

It might create more opportunities to find excellent candidates. But I'm not sure who the person feels accountable to...the "city"? That entity doesn't vote or have specific needs and interests. Electeds are always encouraged to balance the needs of the district with the needs of the city. What would this position balance?

I believe that the job of each alder is to embrace concerns beyond their district and to represent the city at large, moving beyond parochial concerns.

HAVING SPECIFIC DISTRICT WHICH GENERALLY ALIGN WITH NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARIES HELPS BOTH ALDER AND COUNCILMEMBERS COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY.

Generally, I think not - it will make council races more expensive and less accessible to people. In some places, at large districts can increase diversity, in others they can decrease diversity in representation.

The mayor is elected by the whole city. Having some alders elected at-large would create unproductive rivalries about who represents the entire city.

I can see an effective system where several at-large alders are elected with a higher salary, expected to serve on committees that meet during the day, and regularly interact with city staff.

Add one alder at-large.

People have enough difficulty remembering one alder person in their district. Adding city alder people might detract from the work of this body. I think those elected on a city wide basis would view themselves as better than those elected by district.

We still need strong neighborhood perspective.

Q3. COMMON COUNCIL: Alders are part-time government officials. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining alderpersons on a part-time status	59.96	45
Making alderpersons a full-time position	22.78	18
Making some alderpersons, such as the President of the Common Council full-time positions	11.39	9
Neutral	8.86	7

There is value to having alders as part-time positions. The office should be taken on out of a desire to serve the district and the city, not for financial gain.

I would need to hear discussion points before changing my mind on moving some alders to a full-time position. I could see where some positions would benefit from a full-time position, but the cost, responsibilities, etc would need to be considered.

I am concerned that making alders full-time would have unintended negative consequences. Turn-over within the Council would be likely be reduced. The influence of money in elections, which to date, has not been a significant factor, could become more prevalent.

Like I said above, full-time salaries are more likely to ensure better constituent service and representation, and most importantly to allow any of our citizens to run for office. It's social justice and good management.

There is too much work for part-time alders. Or at least the pay needs to reflect the amount of work.

I support staff assignments/a true dedicated staffing structure as the first option. However, if that is not feasible, then I would support a full-time council.

If they are full time then the number should be reduced significantly, i.e. 12. Also maybe term limits would be in order for a full-time Alder.

A key progressive value is to take care of people--including ourselves. Not all districts are demanding. But as alder in District 13, which has so much development, I had to work full-time to do my job properly. It was not reasonable that I was not paid for that work.

While the addition of the Chief of Staff has made the job of being alder somewhat more manageable, more could be done to ease the job of/time required to do a good job. This would potentially enable more people to run. Making the positions full time would result in the job of alder becoming more "politicized" and create more pressure on the "need" to be reelected.

In connection with a reduction in members, making Alders full time positions would increase the potential pool of candidates

Support if the number of Alders is reduced

Again, I support a full time CC subject to the parameters outlined in my responses to Questions 1 & 2.

Glad you asked! I strongly support making alders full time and reducing the number. If you have a family and/or full time job, it is extremely difficult to make being an alder work. The time constraint result in a constant triage approach to job, particularly if you represent a busy district. You handle development issues, parking and traffic concerns, constituent concerns, public safety, everyday trouble shooting etc etc etc making it difficult to address broader issues. The lack of time to devote to the job makes it difficult for the council to be a co-equal branch of government and more dependent on staff. At the very least Council President should be full-time, which I proposed after two years as President. Doing the job well requires full-time attention, this city is too large for anything less. But, I would rather see the entire Council be full-time as we are no longer a small community, we are a medium sized city and the demands on Alders increased even during my seven years from 2009 to 2016. The notion that the job should receive

an honorarium is rooted in a political tradition put forth by the wealthy and powerful. Thomas Jefferson promoted the citizen-farmer as the primary holder of power in a democracy, men not corrupted by kickbacks for their services, but we tend to forget that his farmers owned property and slaves and their wives and daughters did not get to vote. They already had power and (at least some) wealth. Alders are often (but not always) quite privileged and well off and have support networks and understanding employers. If we are truly concerned about inequity, we have to pay our elected officials for their work so they can do their work and not find themselves having to choose between career and Council. As of this writing on July 25, three of the last four resignations, including my own, were due to career, and in the fourth case the Alder was retired. If people with resources and support find themselves having to make that choice, how do we persuade others who have less, but also valuable perspectives and leadership skills, to take the job?

Currently the ability of "regular folks" to become Alders makes our local Madison democracy a vibrant place -- it means many people (like PAUL SOGLIN in 1968) are able to be Alders who would never have a chance in a professional full-time Council situation. Additionally, I believe the turn-over of Alders is good for us -- having Alders step down after a few terms and allowing others an opportunity to be elected is good for representative government.

The more Alders get paid, the more mercenary the candidates become, and the more influenced they will be by outside sources of money. Keep money out of politics. Keep money out of government representation at all levels, whether the offices are partisan or not.

A city of 250,000 can get by with a part-time legislature. By rotating the presidency, the council has not treated it as a full-time position. A stipend remains appropriate.

This is a difficult question. Alders in districts that have active constituents or many issues -- often these are downtown -- must put in much more time to do a good job than their colleagues who represent districts that are pretty quiet. If districts were re-drawn with this dynamic in mind, perhaps all alders could be treated equally; otherwise, it might be worth creating some kind of scale to compensate alders for the time they actually spend representing their districts.

Alders are gradually becoming city employees instead of people working for their constituents.

The part-time nature of elected officials allows more people to run. If it's a full-time job people won't be willing to give up their jobs to run to be an alder and potentially lose and be left without a job. Many people aren't privileged enough to be able to do that. Also, the part-time status ensures that we get people with lots of current experience from different walks of life.

Alders are committed elected officials, but motivating one or more with full-time work could be risky in ending up with folks who just stay on as fixed people for longer periods of time. Like the idea of the alders having other commitments and time for other pursuits, those that might be reflected in their broader work.

I find it hard that any mid-career professional would give up a job for a 2-year commitment to an elected position. I fear we'd attract some marginal people who can't get a real job. I do understand how hard it is to have FT work AND alder, but I think other supports - admin types - would go a long way to allow alders to focus on policy and legislative issues, and large scale community concerns, without getting caught up in routine Q & A and communications. You could share positions by assigning one capable and quick-thinking assistant to three, maybe 4 alders in a geographic area. Think deputy alder....If you did choose to go FT alder, please change the term to 4 years, maybe 6!

See answer to question 1.

provided the number is substantially reduced so that the fiscal impact is minimized.

Full-time status would tend to prioritize re-election and campaigning over the public interest

I believe Madison is better off having true community representatives participating in the governing process. My concern with making them full-time would be creating an environment for the career politician. However, Alders put in a lot of time and are very committed public servants where part-time status is a reasonable solution.

I can see no justification for full-time alders, President of Council or not. The Council needs to streamline the way it does business---reduce the number of committees that alders sit on, fewer referrals of items to numerous committees, etc. The work of the council is not full time work, though some seem to make it so.

The legislative workload does not justify any full time elected positions.

I can see benefits to full time and part time. FT allows an alder to be more effective representative, follow up with constituent contact, district and city issues and policy debates and get paid a living wage for their work. Not having two jobs would be a relief (assuming the candidate is not retired). The downside is if you do have a professional career underway, you have to leave it, and there is no certainty that you would get it back or get re-elected. So there is a risk that some qualified people would not be willing to take. There is a benefit to having people serve for several terms in order to learn the ropes. Incumbents do have an inherent advantage but with a political job that pays well, the position could be regularly contested which is good for democracy but may not serve constituents very well if there is lots of turnover on the body. The staff would have

more power as a result. If the position was PT, assuming it was paid at a sustainable level, you would need to have a second job that could accommodate the hours and demands. For me, a goal would be how to insure that a person of modest means who represents the situation of most residents, can afford to serve.

In recent years, the support for aldermen has dramatically increased with the advent of a legislative analyst and chief of staff, doing much to maintain the job of alderman as part-time.

I AM AWARE OF CITIES WITH FULL TIME ALDERS; THESE HAVE BECOME POLITICAL POSITIONS AND ALSO POWERFUL, WHICH, TO ME, DOESN'T MATCH MADISON'S 'GRASSROOTS' WAY OF GETTING THINGS DONE.

I dislike the idea of people running for their jobs every two years. If it becomes full time, terms should be increased to 4 years.

This works well. Because council members are not full time they are more independent. They're not concerned about losing their livelihood.

The role should either have part-time or full-time expectations. Council was a full-time job for me.

Having fulltime alder persons will possibly discourage the average citizen from running for office.

But only with a much smaller Council.

Q4. COMMON COUNCIL: Alders are paid the same amount regardless of how much time they spend working on city business. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Setting specific time expectations for alderpersons	30.43	21
Paying alders according to how much time they spend on city business	15.94	11
Neutral	53.62	37

Alders are responsible primarily to voters of their districts. If they neglect their duties, they can be voted out of office.

I'm not familiar enough with this issue to offer an opinion

I lean towards making it a full-time position.

I am not in favor of either of these approaches.

All alder should be paid the same regardless of how much time they spend during city work.

None of the above. Full-time pay for full-time work. Madison shouldn't be governed by economically advantaged hobbyists.

I think it would be tough to either set time expectations (minimum amount of time, or maximum?) or to pay according to how much time they spend on city work. How do you measure how much time they spend? And what would prevent alders from just making up work to get paid more? And sometimes things take longer than you expect. Also, some areas of the city have more work because of development going on or more active constituents.

I believe that, at the very least, per diem for committee and council meetings should exist.

Work loads are so variable and fluctuate from time-to-time that keeping track would be administratively time consuming.

Would be impossibly complex and would invite witch hunts by opponents or political parties.

If an alder is not doing his / her job, the people should not re-elect that alder. People take different approaches to decision making - some are more detailed and some are bigger picture. So, just because someone spends more time doesn't mean they are actually doing a better job. Also, it is good to have several approaches to ensure valid decision making.

I don't know what I think about this. It would be hard to keep track and report. But maybe it would be an answer to the wide variation in time demands by district.

I do not support changing the pay, or providing time expectations for alders.

This makes no sense to me. Some districts, by their nature, require more time than others. Some have 4+ development proposals in the works virtually all the time. Some have more engaged/demanding residents. Of course the time required to do a decent job will vary by district. So I don't see how it is possible to sensibly set specific time expectations for alders. Paying alders according to how much time they spend on city business also doesn't resonate with me as being a good approach.

I support neither of these options. Alders should be salaried like other elected officials.

There should be equitable division of responsibilities among alders, to the extent possible. This means assigning committees based on time commitment and workload.

Alders should all receive the same pay rate. The only exception would be for an alder serving as the CC President/Vice President. Voters will determine whether or not their alder is spending enough time on their job.

Setting time expectations or making it an hourly position does not seem feasible or desirable.

None of the options fits my position. They should be paid as full-time salaried positions. It would be up to the electors to decide if the level of effort is adequate. One requirement on full-time employees could be in the form of expected work hours, however Alders would need flex-time options because public meetings are ideally scheduled when everyone else is not at work.

It's important to keep the Alders equal period. I have seen people "show up" and do nothing.... so they should be paid more for that? Pay them all equally and let the electorate judge them!

If they were full time elected officials, then this questions would be irrelevant. There were be a set salary and alders would be expected to do their job regardless of hours.

I expect Alders to respond as best they can (or want) to the demands of their constituents. More money for more time spent: bad idea. Keep money out of government service positions.

The choices are incomplete - I support the current system. There are "specific time expectations" -- set by the district. And the administration of a time-based payroll system would be a true pain, and subject to abuse. Keep it as it is.

Please note the "neutral" response is the only one that seemed appropriate for a question that is much too complex for a binary choice. District boundaries and characteristics can't be separated from questions of what constitutes adequate representation and how alders are compensated for their work. As you can see from the comment to Question 3: Alders in districts that have active constituents or many issues - - often these are downtown -- must put in much more time to do a good job than their colleagues who represent districts that are pretty quiet. If districts were re-drawn with this dynamic in mind, perhaps all alders could be treated equally; otherwise, it might be worth creating some kind of scale to compensate alders for the time they actually spend representing their districts.

Not neutral, I don't support either of these ideas. Alders who work harder, typically get re-elected. Those who do less, have less rapport with their districts and are less likely to get re-elected. I have no idea how you would define "city business".

This seems like a fair way to respond to alderperson's time committed to their work.

it is up to alder how much time they spend and that can impact their commitment to the job and re election. They should not be full time or this a job.

Knowing that different districts will have different demands and that different people will have different committee commitments, just set a floor.

I think this is done in some fashion by the number of committees and meetings the alders are assigned to work and attend.

IF PAID ON A TIME BASIS THERE SHOULD BE A REPORTING AND AUDITING PROCESS

Support full-time, paid alders with no more than 7 alders.

Alders are not City Staff.

If an independent reporting/time-tracking system can be efficiently implemented, that would be ideal. Practically speaking, I think it would be very difficult to verify.

we need a way to triage agenda items so that at least a rotating core group of alders is well informed on each item, but each alder is not required to come to every meeting with a full knowledge of all items.

Although specific time expectations may be set, some will spend more time, some less, on City issues. Different districts have different expectations of what to expect from their alders. The role of an alder needs to be clarified, and clear expectations need to be set for what they do - both to them and to their constituents.

Oppose record keeping, audit, complexity issues. Let voters decide.

Establishing a piece-rate system of compensation? \$50 per resolution?

I am definitely opposed to paying alders for the time they spend on city business. I would support the president get paid more.

I don't support "busy" work just to satisfy a minimum time requirement. Also, how do we define work? Does waling the neighborhood and casually talking with constituents about issues constitute work? How about reading articles on what other city's are doing?

I serve a busy district whereas several of my colleagues don't have as many issues on a daily/weekly basis that require their attention. That is one argument for larger districts and smaller number of alders so that the work could be spread more equitably. I'm not

sure how requiring specific time expectations will change the difference between an active "high maintenance" district and one where not much is happening day to day. If an edge district requires 10 hours/week and a central district requires 20 hours/week and there was a pay differential, would we be able to find people to run for districts at the edge that had smaller remuneration than their colleagues? In addition, how would you balance a light committee load with a heavy one (a quick review of 2018 assignments shows one alder with three committees and another with 20 something committees). Some of the disparity is due to politics (mayor appointment) and some to geography. We should review whether a downtown alder should have so many committee requirements. In general, my goal is to create a collegial body that may have differences in workload but respects the time and commitment to learn the business of city governance.

After spending 4-8 hours preparing for a council meeting, I would see colleagues first open their packet as they sat down at their desk. While at first indignant that some would not engage more seriously in the legislative process and better understand each issue, I later learned that having some approach issues more superficially and not being prepared could be a good thing. There was a Darwinian kind of selection for who weighed in and shaped the outcomes. Similarly, some aldermen respond to every call and e-mail; some don't. Some work harder than others. With elections every two years, the voters get to make the final statement. Finally, elected representatives are not doing piecemeal. Our effectiveness can't be measured by the number of hours devoted. The guy who came up with the idea for study circles on racism got the idea while taking a shower, no doubt time when he would not have been "punched in."

IN ANY 'WORKPLCE' YOU'LL HAVE HIHGLY PRODUCTIVE AND THOSE JUST 'COLLECTING A PAYCHECK'.

Alders should absolutely NOT have financial incentive to do work they should be doing as part of their elected position. Also, the time put in is not indicative of the quality of the work!

Same pay for all

I don't support either of these proposals. Leave things as they are. Alders don't do this for the money and we don't want them to.

Neither. Leave pay scale as is. Increase pay if size is cut and the job becomes full time. Pay more to Council leaders.

Q5. COMMON COUNCIL: The Council President earns \$15,800, Council Vice-President earns \$14,000, and all other Alders earn \$12,980 per year. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current pay structure	41.03	32
Reducing pay to alders	6.41	5
Increasing the pay to alders	39.74	31
Neutral	12.82	10

I always thought I was underpaid but the recent pay increases seem excessive.

The primary motivation for alders should be to serve, with financial reward being a secondary consideration.

I'm not familiar enough with the range of times spent by officials in these positions to hold an opinion.

I think there should be regular small increases in pay for alders, within the paradigm of a part-time position.

I could see MARGINAL increases...say, \$15,000 for all alders and then additional comparable increases for the officers.

Full-time.

See my responses to 1,2,4

No preference.

Only if you reduce the number of alders. The example from the State Legislature is instructive. As they became "full time" they added staff to create projects that would justify the increase in time spent in Madison.

Reduce significantly but pay amp diem for each meeting attended

Adjust for inflation.

Maintaining for now.

Increase if the number of alders on council is reduced

Pay structure seems adequate now for a part time CC. Obviously this would need to change for a full time CC. The present pay structure is certainly far better than the pittance that I received during my CC tenure!

If nothing else changed, the pay should still increase. I had to go half-time at my day job for almost a year, an option I had the privilege to take, to be Council President, and at the pay at the time it cost me a healthy five figure sum in take home pay to do that. And I am lucky, I am privileged, I am upper middle class, and I only had two cats to worry about. Someone without my advantages may not be able to take the job of Alder in the first place, let alone step into Council leadership. The best way to achieve equity is to remove the barriers entirely.

This seems a bit high to me.... but the "leadership" of the Council should not be paid at a much higher level -- that seems wrong on principle to me. All Alders should be paid equally -- if you are to make any change here.

Again, if they were full time, this would not be relevant.

I am unfamiliar with the amount of time Alders spend on their duties.

I haven't run the numbers; a slight increase may be in order. But there should be some economic hardship in exchange for the opportunity to exercise governmental power.

Without knowing how many alders might serve on a Common Council that takes into account potential re-drawn boundaries, expectations of time spent by alders, and the other issues identified in comments to Questions 3 and 4, this is an impossible question to answer -- hence the "neutral" response.

I want to make sure the wages stay at the point where someone on SSI or SSDI does not lose their benefits. Instead of paying the alders more, I think more support should be given (technology, training and staffing.)

Seems fair for the work they do.

This is a labor of love, not a money maker.

Reduce number of alders and increase pay.

I don't think many citizens run for election based on the salary.

Using the same dollar amount to pay 7 full-time alders roughly \$37k.

With cost of living adjustments

I'm not sure how these amounts were derived, or how the differentials between alder, President and Vice-President were established. I doubt that reducing pay to alders will attract people to the position but I truly hope that nobody runs for the City Council for the money!

Increase pay for Council President.

Every few years, increase it by \$1,000.

The pay structure can be reviewed periodically and adjusted to reflect inflation and cost of living.

I support making the President a full time position and increasing other positions.

I can see paying the president more, but the VP and alders should be at the VP pay level.

The compensation has become so high that it may be a factor in attracting people to seek the job or continuing to perform the job. Having a voice in city matters is a privilege, not something people do for the compensation. The same people that honored the role of government in Wisconsin when building such a beautiful Capitol Building envisioned citizen-legislators as being part-time. Now, legislators show up just to get their daily per diem before slipping out to do their workout or a sumptuous lunch. Maybe maintaining lower compensation at the local level imposes a natural kind of term limit, freeing the position for another to serve.

I MIGHT CONSIDER LEADERSHIP HAVING ADDED BONUS, \$3-4000/YEAR

Plus Inflation

This is about right. Adjust over time for inflation.

I would not advocate for raising the salaries any higher, unless districts expand drastically.

But index for inflation.

The current structure provides some remuneration without creating a political class of people running for office.

But only with a smaller, full time council.

Q6 . COMMON COUNCIL: The 20 alderpersons now have staff of 4 persons dedicated to operations of the Council, consisting of a Chief of Staff, Legislative Analyst, and two administrative assistants. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current level of staff support for alderpersons	43.04	34
Increasing staff support for alderpersons	31.65	25

Reducing staff support for alderpersons	13.92	11
Neutral	11.39	9

As the city grows and the workload of alders and staff grows, there will have to be a larger staff.

I'm not familiar enough with the responsibilities of, and demands placed on, these positions to hold an opinion.

Again, I'm not saying that there isn't a need to increase staffing by, say, a person...but I would need more information to endorse that decision.

Even if alders are paid full time salaries, some amount of staff will improve the effectiveness of the body and members. The mayors office and departments need a credible counterbalance in the legislature. That requires some amount of staff. It's hard for me to say what that number would be without first knowing how many full time alders there would be.

I don't know how well the current number of staff is working, because I haven't had experience under this number of staff.

Again, a staff structure such as that of the Milwaukee County Board would be sufficient for the City of Madison. There are a number of benefits to developing a true staff system.

Only if you reduce the number of Alders. Otherwise maintain.

The council and amazon used to share staff. Why not do this. Council staff additions seem to be the result of a failure of council members and the Mayor to respect each other.

Providing additional administrative support is a good way to leverage the time the alders spend. This would also support maintaining the part-time position for alders.

I consider all City Departments as 'Council staff'. I have always been able to get the information or assistance I need from them. With the exception on the Council secretaries, I consider paid Council staff as advocates (lobbyists) for political agendas of the Council members.

More staff allows each alderperson to spend less time working on routine constituent work like questions about potholes and parking tickets, thus reducing aldermanic workload. I'd much rather have a higher percentage of staff time dedicated to more active districts than pay some alders more than others.

Possibly increasing. Definitely not reducing.

Maintain the staff support level, only if the Alders are shifted to full-time and fully compensated, salaried positions. If the current structure is maintained, there may be a need for more staff support

When I started on Council, Alders were able to lean on City Staff to a greater degree than when I left. That change was due to a host of factors, but it highlighted why Alders need more staff help, and their own staff separate from the Mayor's Office. The efforts to bring the Council's Legislative Analyst under the Mayor's umbrella were infuriating and highlighted the need for the Chief of Staff. Council needs more people to help with research and outreach. That need is particularly acute if the size and pay do not change.

When I was a member of the Common Council we had 2 administrative assistants and no computers for Alders. These two persons were awesome -- did tons of work and treated us all fairly. AND they did all our typing for us all. Today -- I am not sure what the Chief of Staff does -- or how that person effectively works for 20 "bosses." And the Legislative Analyst (I assume) gives advice on State and Federal Legislation -- isn't that the same for both the Mayor and Council? Aren't they all working for one city? Not sure why all this extra staff is needed. ALL city staff were available to me, as an Alder. And they were excellent to work with! Not sure -- but this staffing thing looks like a "turf struggle" to me. But, I WOULD ADD SOMEONE WHO CAN SPELL "COUNCIL" (SEE ABOVE) CORRECTLY.

Since the time and efforts put in by these people is not known, it is hard to decide which way to go.

I've always thought that the City's entire staff works for the Common Council, the Executive, and the citizenry at large. Increasing the Council's staff only accentuates any divide between the executive and legislative branches. Better than increasing the Council Office staff? Reduce the size of the Mayor's Office staff.

Regardless of how many alders emerge in a potentially reconfigured Common Council, the real question is whether there is enough staff capacity to support elected officials engaged on issues in their districts as well as city-wide issues.

First you'd need to fix the workload inequities in the office. Hiring someone that actually focuses on doing the work would make a difference as well.

I think the staff for Alders is great, supporting the broader Committee infrastructure is probably more worthwhile.

See the admin support note above.

Having some dedicated staff for the alders is good, but most alders use other City staff to help with issues.

If there is a need for additional support, the city should provide the necessary resources for the Alders to perform their duties. However, a demonstrated need should be established as with any new hire.

When I was an alder we added the second administrative assistant. I really don't know what the roles of the Chief of Staff and the Legislative Analyst are. Again, if the role of alders were more clearly defined it would be possible to determine whether these positions are necessary or whether additional staff is needed.

The staff of the various departments and divisions are capable of providing the information, data and analysis the council members want and need.

There should an additional secretary if the number of alders stays the same.

I haven't seen the quality of the council's work improving as the budget for their expenses has increased nearly tenfold. If making the case for maintaining the dramatically expanded level of support, please illustrate with specific examples of how the city has been better served. Meanwhile, I still see problems with the practically unfettered flow of alcohol downtown. I see a tormented JDS project that sunk to an inferior design where the developer is now suing the city. I see the maintenance of streets in serious decline. I see debilitating conflicts between the council and the mayor. I see an imperial police force that bucks the trend by not using body cams to document their work. I see first responders who can't cooperate with other units of government, building their own training facilities after we paid for regional facilities at MATC. Please tell me: what has the dramatically increased support for the council produced?

The Council should hire at least 2 more staff to handle constituent service.

This also seems about right. Maybe adding another analyst or two over time might be a good idea.

Council members have different expectations for their staff. I thought the management hierarchy was mismanaged and employees treated unfairly by specific council members.

The staffing level seems a bit low for 20 alders.

Q7. COMMON COUNCIL: Under current city procedures, the Mayor appoints nearly all members of City Boards, Commissions and Committees, subject to confirmation by the members of the Common Council. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
---------------	---------	---

Maintaining the current rules on appointments and confirmations	49.37	39
Giving more authority t the Council President to appoint	44.30	35
Neutral	6.33	5

I would favor a system where the Council or Council President appoints members to committees that are advisory to the Council, while the mayor still appoints, with Council approval, members of boards and commissions such as the Plan Commission that have quasi-judicial powers.

On the committee that I served on (Water Utility Board) the system worked well. In fact, I perceived some problems with representation on the Board; the Mayor was open to hearing my position and implementing changes. I don't think this would have been possible (or at least it would have been very challenging) with Council involvement.

Allowing the council leadership to make some of the appointments

I think the mayor needs and deserves his or her appointees to help enact their policies and vision. That said I think another mechanism that allowed for counterbalancing would be helpful too. Having a Council President make some appointments, for example. I would give the Mayor the majority of the political appointees, but not all.

Without it being a full-time position, this seems like too cumbersome a task for an alderperson.

I think the Council President should appoint Council members to citizen committees. Those committees such as Finance should be jointly appointed by the Mayor and President.

Permitting the council to appoint very selected members of special committees and study groups my be worth considering.

Appointments should be shared by Mayor & Council

Yes, the council should make its own appointments, again having it rest with the mayor diminishes the council's authority and makes alder beholden to the mayor to secure or retain appointments to the high profile committees. The council president should make the appointments.

Both Mayors I served under used their power to appoint Council members to reward and punish Alders to varying degrees. For the record, I was given appointments I sought when I was Alder, and hold no grudge for the one time I didn't get what I wanted. At one time, probably in 2014, Mayor Soglin and I discussed moving Council appointments under the President and he was amenable to it, though he also warned it could backfire.

I did work out a mostly objective system for assigning Alders to committees that would at least be a starting point for appointments, since a clear and documented process would be critical to controlling the political issues that can arise from appointments.

The entire city votes on the Mayor -- so that person should be held accountable for the actions they take -- like appointments. The Council President is voted on by other Alders -- so how is THAT person held accountable by the "public"?

I think that there should be a better way of finding people to serve on various commissions.

Mayor must continue to appoint all citizen members to all bodies, and all aldermanic members to all bodies except Finance Committee; council president should appoint those.

It's important for city boards, commissions and committees to be empowered to carry on their work regardless of who is elected mayor or the common council. If elected officials are choosing to appoint qualified individuals who know the issues, the pool of candidates would be deeper if more people who have the city's best interests at heart are proposing appointments.

I think that the mayor should appoint some, and the council president should appoint some - all with the council confirming.

Given the number of committees and members, would support putting the Council in a position to decide on one or more appointments to increase bandwidth.

Alders know best who wants to serve where and who wants to work together. Honor that.

Absolutely Mayor

Subject to the proviso that alders are given an opportunity to nominate members, and that the Mayor gives reasonable consideration to those nominees.

The Council President should appoint Council members.

Only the Mayor represents the entire City and is in the unique position to maintain geographical balance in the committees.

I would support having Alders make recommendations and for the Council President and Vice President discuss confirmations before final decisions are made.

I'm not sure what the correct balance is but the Council should appoint more members to committees while maintaining mayoral appointments. I understand in other municipalities, the CC appoints to all committees so there is more than one way to do this. I like having checks and balances. Previously mentioned that in 2018 one alder has three committees when the average is 7-8. This seems to be a political calculation, not a workload equity calculation. Politics could enter into appointments with either method but if Council leadership makes some appointments, it seems more accountable to fairness.

My response here may be colored by my own experience of being frozen pout of any appointment. And, trying to step outside of that, the council president could gather names from colleagues of effective neighborhood leaders outside of the mayor's political circle who deserve the opportunity to shape and implement city policy.

As long as the Council keeps in mind the needs of the whole city and doesn't get too focused on their individual district issues.

This is one area where significant change would be good. It's odd that the executive makes appointments to the committees of the legislative body. It seems to me that the council president should appoint council members to their committees. I think it's fine that the mayor appoint citizens subject to council approval.

More authority of the Council, not the Council president.

When I think of mayoral powers, making appointments is 1 that makes sense. Splitting this with the council president just seems messy.

Q8. COMMON COUNCIL: The Council almost always meets during the evening at City Hall. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
The Council meeting at other locations and other times in the City of Madison	11.54	9
The Council meeting at other locations in the City	8.97	7
The Council meeting at other times at City Hall	6.41	5
Maintaining the current meeting location and schedule	60.26	47
Neutral	12.82	10

There can be value in having the Council hold listening sessions or receiving presentations in other venues. For regular meetings, the current chambers are fine.

I think there's good merit in keeping the time, place and date consistent so that the public builds a common knowledge of the meetings and don't have to "find the meeting" in any given month.

I'm open to having some meetings in locations other than the CCB. However, in the current model I don't think the time of Council and committee meetings can change due to the fact that many people need to work a "regular" job during the day and would have too many conflicts with morning or afternoon meeting times.

I responded on polco about this as well. City Hall is at the most central and accessible part of the city, which makes it the easiest to get to for the majority of residents. Predictability of location and time also help with planning.

Maintaining set meeting times is important, however, if the Council wanted to add some additional meetings on their calendar at other times and locations specifically to garner public feedback, I would be supportive of that.

With selected, infrequent exceptions when being somewhere makes sense.

I think the consistency of meeting at the same time and in the same location is good. However, it might be helpful to move the start time back to 6:00. In addition, I think that holding more focus groups at different times and different locations on important topics to gather feedback from the public would be additive to the process. This feedback can be summarized and provided to the Council members who are not able to attend. Having additional administrative staff could help facilitate this process.

There is absolutely no excuse for meeting past 10 or 11 p.m. If an issue is that contentious, it should be addressed on another day.

The fact that we do (nearly) everything downtown is a serious obstacle to equity and inclusion. I don't think adding daytime meetings helps us bring more people into the fold and therefore shouldn't be pursued.

Meeting at other locations would be confusing to residents. Other locations do not have as good public transportation as downtown. Other locations would be further away for some residents. It is impossible to predict which particular topics might of interest to what part of the city and given having to schedule things in advance even if something were predictably of interest to a particular part of the city, chances are it would not be in that location when the item was scheduled. The time is such that it is available to a greatest proportion of people given the standard work schedules. If the time were varied to provide access to shift workers (for example) the chance that the meeting would be at a time they could come when any particular item of interest were to be covered is slim.

If the Council shifts meeting times and places, it would need to reflect other changes in structure that make those changes possible. i.e., If council met other places, there would need to be staff support and resources diverted to making those meetings happen, and alders would likely need more time to plan and get to those meetings

Stay away from this one-it's a minefield. There is no way that every resident/neighborhood would ever be satisfied.

There are multiple considerations to balance. A regular schedule at a central location provides predictability that has benefits insofar as planning for members of the public. The problem with moving locations is that in our City few are as accessible as downtown by most modes of transportation. My experience was that relocating regular meetings tended to drive down public attendance. Additionally, the infrastructure for recording meetings is best in room 201 CCB, and that room also allows for recording all votes taken if that option would be enabled in the system. In terms of transparency and accountability, that change has more value than relocating meetings. Shifting the times may or may not help, ultimately there will always be issues with scheduling. In our system the bulk of the work should be happening over the course of multiple committee meetings, which opens up the process to more people than even perfect scheduling of one single meeting.

Committees move around and meet at various places, dates and times. That's good. The Full Common Council should meet in a predictable manner -- in a regular place. Being open and transparent is important in a good democracy -- and it means people can know how to attend the meetings -- and not have to do a search to discover where and when a meeting is held.

The regularity of the current structure is generally beneficial to anyone who has to figure out where to find and attend the next meeting. Start changing the locations and times and you start making it more difficult for people to attend. City staff members and others who must attend as part of their work responsibility may prefer a daytime meeting, but what about everyone else who attends as a non-work, non-paid civic activity?

You should do what makes it most convenient for Alders - the job is hard enough.

Must continue to meet at evening, otherwise disenfranchise most working people. Meeting elsewhere, if logistically feasible, would be a nice idea.

It's difficult enough for residents to attend meetings without moving them around the city and changing the time. If you're serious about widening the potential for participation in government, in this day and age, please consider alternate real-time ways of "attending" meetings like Skype.

What is the goal of moving the location? If its to be more accessible that only works if there is sufficient outreach that accompanies the moving around. I think it does more harm than good in that people are creatures of habit and if it moves around you may get less people attending because they don't know where the meetings are that week. I would support more closely examining the meeting schedule around the holidays -

meeting on a Tuesday after a holiday weekend makes it hard for people to know what is going on if the agendas come out on Friday and they are gone all weekend.

Afford others the chance to attend meetings, utilize other spaces in the city to encourage attendance by a broader range of folks and, where possible, even support local businesses by utilizing their spaces sometimes?

changing the schedule and venue will confuse people as to where to go.

As long-time library board chair, we met at branch libraries on a regular basis and got a different perspective on library matters. Very helpful.

Complicating the meeting time and locations will have an overall affect of reducing public participation

This system has worked for a lot of years!!! Alders, and the Mayor, hold meetings in different locations throughout the City. There does not appear to be a need to move a PA system and related items to varying locations. Though some people cannot make evening meetings, a larger proportion of the population would not be able to participate if meetings were to be held during regular working hours.

End meetings at 11 PM. Not many people will sit through a meeting until 1 AM. The late meetings act as a bar to participation.

The current meeting place is readily accessible and has adequate room for spectators and interested parties. Everyone does not work the same hours so trying to accommodate work schedules is fruitless.

If the Council becomes FT and meets during the day, it limits access. If Council remains PT, there is less flexibility for electeds who have a second job. While the 21st C workforce is more contingent, meetings in the evening may not serve everyone but serve most.

We have enough to do and enough demands on our time without reinventing the basics.

ANY CHANGE IN PLACE OR TIME MUST CONSIDER THE PUBLIC'S ABILITY TO ATTEND.

Meetings should be moved around the city, in locations with good bus service and free parking, held at times ore conducive for public input, and if possible some childcare so that single parents can more easily attend and testify on issues and at hearings.

The important thing is to keep meetings accessible to a broad range of people. Evenings are probably best for that.

Evening meetings allow the public to attend. I suppose having the occasional meeting elsewhere would be okay, but the council room is set up for the purpose.

Any time selected has drawbacks. Weekday evenings are difficult for working families.

I would entertain meeting at other times but the council chambers are centrally located and designed to support the council meetings (TV, support staff). It would cost more money to duplicate appropriate meeting space in other locations of the City.

While you can make the case for rotating times, locations or both, doing so just makes things more confusing for the average person who decides on the spur of the moment to go to a council meeting. Keeping one specific time and place makes figuring out where to go and when easier.

Other locations would be great! An occasional meeting at Warner Park, for example. But daytime meetings are a problem for people with jobs. If the Council becomes smaller and full time, then consider changing the times.

Q9. COMMON COUNCIL: The Council currently meets twice a month, every-other Tuesday, at 6:30 p.m. Do you support polling the community on when and where the Council should meet?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	18.99	15
No	60.76	48
Neutral	20.25	16

I believe Council members should decode-- they work very hard and for not much money...

Meeting at the same place on a regular basis lessens confusion for citizens who wish to participate.

It makes sense that the alders should be able to indicate what time/schedule works best for them. I would just reinforce that the meeting time, place, date should be consistent.

Again, polling is fine but with the current part-time model, daytime meetings would make it near impossible for many members of Council to attend.

How would you establish how much input is enough to determine a meeting time and place? I think consistency is important. There are many ways to communicate an opinion on an issue outside the specific meeting time.

I think it would be helpful to hear what the community thinks. However, it would also be better to offer options / choices, rather than just a free form question.

This is an interesting idea, but the way said poll would be conducted would be very important in determining if this is a good idea or not.

I do not think the location or time are the major impediments to public participation in Council meetings. Nor do I believe that Council meetings are necessarily the best places to gather public input. More robust engagement should happen with community members prior to votes at Council meetings, with Alders feeling confident enough that they have an informed position that will not be swayed by the few residents with the time resource to sit at Council meetings to participate there.

See my response to Question 8.

I'm not sure how you conduct the poll and if the results would give you the information you need. I think you'd have a tough time getting a good cross section of citizens to respond.

Why not? However, I suspect most potential respondents will have no opinion, giving a lot of power to a smaller group who may feel strongly one way or another for some reason. Frankly, the scheduled time and location of the Council meetings is not in the top ten issues when it comes to accessibility of Madison's government.

Unworkable, unnecessary. Early evening is a reasonable time to meet, no reason to change. (7 pm would be ok, too)

Where depends on what you decide about alternative ways of "attending" Council meetings. As for when, twice a month is probably necessary to keep issues moving and avoid overly-long sessions.

I'm not sure what this would accomplish.

Having public input is important, consistency might be good for Council Members but if they're being paid anyway they should oblige their community in allowing for flexible scheduling.

this is a good time. Enough time to get home from work and have dinner and get to a meeting.

Polling would set an expectation of adjusting council meeting times and days after every election. Consistency and predictability increase overall public participation. Council members, staff, and other participants organize their calendars around these meetings.

I believe there is a benefit to consistency

I suspect that most members of the community don't care....

The business of the legislative body should be at a fixed location, time and day.

But if alders have a second job, they may not be as flexible as if they were FT.

We have enough to do and enough demands on our time without reinventing the basics.

THIS HAS WORKED FOR DECADES.

I don't support polling "the community" because participation in such polls is often most likely people able to participate, meaning they have the time, are able to access childcare or don't need it, and are able to attend via their own vehicle and not reliant on public transportation. The only way I could support polling "the community" is if the polls are conducted at local non-profits, within public and subsidized housing units to ensure greater input from people most disenfranchised from the process.

I doubt the public would care much.

It would need to be a statistically valid poll designed by professional pollsters taking into account relevant demographic characteristics.

It would be interesting to know what city residents would have to say about this.

The community has no idea what the best time would be. If a significant number of members of the Council have jobs, you can't have daytime meetings on weekdays.

Q10. COMMON COUNCIL: The Council does not currently set time limits for completing individual agenda items or set a time at which meetings must end. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Setting time limits for agenda items and end times for meetings	17.72	14
Setting time limits for agenda times, but not end times for meetings	7.59	6
Setting end times for meetings, but not setting time limits for agenda items	31.65	25
Maintaining the current practice	34.18	27
Neutral	8.86	7

Although long meetings can be difficult to sit through, they are an important part of our democracy, allowing everyone from the public to be heard and ample time for debate. In

addition, Robert's Rules already allows for debate to be limited by a supermajority vote of the Council (call the question).

Setting time limits may result in tabling items for future meetings, but it could also result in more efficient deliberation and less burn-out of Council members.

Innumerable studies have found judgement to decline dramatically with tiredness. The CC is in no way an exception. We owe it to our citizens to give them our best judgment, or at least not or worst. Set a reasonable end time like 10 or 10:30. A meeting timeline will also help focus discussion.

All of this could pose very real problems, especially for business items that are time-sensitive.

Decision making at 2 am. is not what should expect or support.

Meetings which extend for inordinate amounts of time end up no longer being efficient or effective. Although I understand that important issues need to be decided, if there is an end time set, it should given how much time is spent on each item. Some items are inherently more important than other, so should not all be given the same amount of time.

See above. It's hard to think if the meeting runs too late.

Important conversations deserve as much time as they need. I do think we should have a mandatory end time. Experts strongly caution against driving while overly tired because impairs much like alcohol. If you shouldn't be driving in a given state, you shouldn't be making community defining decisions either. If an item is worth talking about until the AM, it is worth coming back for a second meeting.

Some agenda items are vastly more complex than others. Does not make sense to me to have a common time limit for all items.

Time limits WILL result in decisions based on a calendar or clock, not on reasoned consideration and inquiry

If we want individuals to participate in Council meetings, they need to know when we will be discussing their items. It's not realistic to think that individuals can attend meetings from 6:30pm to as late at 2am, waiting for their time to speak.

All night CC meeting are silly.

Not sure how to balance these issues. Wonder how other cities handle it.

So long as public testimony can be received in a reasonable amount of time at an early enough hour, the Council should be allowed to decide the time to spend on items and

the time to adjourn. Rewriting the zoning code and TIF policy did a lot to reduce the late nights, they have been far less frequent in the last 5-6 years. We also made changes a few years ago to further prioritize public testimony when setting the order of the agenda. Setting time limits and end times has often been suggested, and it was tried a few times, but every time it was set aside, even after the infamous 13 hour Edgewater Hotel meeting in May 2010.

People come to a meeting to be heard -- and to witness the actions of decisions. When I come to the meeting, I know I am sharing that agenda with dozens (or over 100) other items ... and I know there will be a decision that evening. The Consent Agenda works well -- although it seems overly legalistic in the way the President lists the items. Thanks to the Mayor for the way he re-clarifies what is about to happen in a short, clear way. I am impressed that the other, NON-Consent Items can then be focused on.... and it works well most of the time.

With some of the meetings going into the morning this is not a good way to run government. By late into the night or morning people get tired and cranky and don't make good decisions.

How do you set a time limit for the most important issue of the month?

Lots of legal issues from setting time limits. Bad idea, too. Better to set limits on how often and long alders can talk. Used to be done, during era of Committee of the Whole.

This is critical to open government if you're serious about hearing from the public and having the time to discuss and digest serious (complicated) issues. Consider, however, the option of adjourning any meeting that -- for whatever reason -- has lasted too long for decision-makers to be capable of casting meaningful votes on a weighty issue. This doesn't happen often, so it might be helpful to approve a process for handling these situations when they arise and letting the public know in advance.

Discussion should not be arbitrarily limited. If it is limited that should be decided on a case by case basis. If meetings go too late, meet every week. Limiting debate could have unintended consequences of reconsideration for issues that could have been disposed of if sufficient time were given to them. It could also result in a filibuster situation where people talk so much on insignificant items to run out the time for the meeting.

Getting caught up in one or more topics compromises time for others, and I think committing to a more strict structure will support a more efficient allocation of time in meetings overall.

The variety of issues and the time they need is too vast. Rather, think about really training alders on how to use Robert's rules and normal communication with staff members or other experts to speed the meetings along without sacrificing the backstory

for the public. I would consider ending meetings at midnight, with the remaining or current under discussion issue rolled over to the next meeting.

Meetings past Midnight are unreasonable. Solutions would include starting a little earlier (say 5 or 5:30pm) or adding an additional meeting during the week.

Arbitrary time limits would not produce better results. Sometimes people need to be heard, need to speak their piece. Possibly setting a recess time at midnight, with the understanding that the item would be continued the next evening, would prevent decisions being made at unreasonable hours of the morning....On very controversial items, the Council could schedule a separate special meeting for public input and action...

Time limits for meetings would result in not giving due consideration for some items. If a specific item requires more time, it can be referred to the next meeting.

The public registers to speak and that adds an unknown to timing considerations, plus debate after a long public hearing takes the time it takes to play out so it's hard for me to say there should be time limits for CC agenda items. In my private life, I have experience determining time limits for meetings I participate in and usually consider that a good practice. There is at least one city committee that I've noticed establishes expected time limits, you can always vote to extend. I do think if the CC remains PT and people are assumed to need a second job if not retired, there should be ending times. The CC president can manipulate agendas when approving agendas to spread out the big topics over two meetings. I think the best meetings take no longer than two hours and understand that is not realistic for all CC meetings, but there should be a hard rule that a vote must be taken to extend a meeting past 11p.

When delving into the concern for time limits and a more predictable and manageable format for meetings, the first thing that would get cut is the speaking time for citizens. And, that should not be limited. Prior to the council meeting, lobbyists and agents have had unlimited access to the process. Citizen participation at the meeting must be encouraged, not limited.

This is difficult, I'd be inclined to say set end times but not limit time for agenda items but that could result in people attending multiple council meetings before an agenda item they were concerned about came up. I have attended enough meetings to see that sometimes Alder seem to talk to hear themselves talk, reiterating points already made rather than simply agreeing with what someone else has said, so if agenda items were limited I would only support time limits on discussion but in no way on public comment.

Don't artificially limit public input or discussion. And end time for each meeting is not a bad idea, as after a certain hour meetings are no longer reasonably accessible to the public.

Why is the occasional long meeting such a sin? Some times people need to talk.

The agenda setting process for items is odd. One example, the council spent nearly 3 hrs debating a \$200k allocation for the Mayor but later in the night passed a \$30M budgetary items with less than 20 minutes of discussion. "Alder fatigue" should not be a factor in our democracy.

None of the above. Set time limits on how long an individual alder can speak on an agenda item. They can speak as many times as they want but the cumulative time couldn't go above an overall time limit of say 10 minutes. A former 20th district alder used to speak for 15-20 minutes or more without saying anything relevant. This would force alders to be direct and to the point.

I definitely oppose setting item time limits. If 100 people are moved to testify on an item, they should have the right to speak.

Unless you can control the number and consequence of agenda items for a meeting, it would be unfair to all to set a fixed time for meetings to end. On the other hand, I have no problem with fixing a time limit per agenda item. It should be long enough to handle a complex item though. You might want to consider allowing an extension by majority vote of the members present. How can you be fair to all who want to testify if you set a time limit per item? The only fair way would be to divide the time allotted by the number of registrants. I'd definitely set a time limit for signing up as no later than the start time of the meeting. Currently at the Plan Commission registrants can sign up until I close the public hearing, which I find unreasonable.

Q11. COMMON COUNCIL: The Council does not currently have term limits for alderpersons. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current practice	62.03	49
Setting term limits for alderpersons	27.85	22
Neutral	10.13	8

Voters are the ones who decide whether Alders serve another term. There is value in having Alders who serve for a long time, because they possess institutional knowledge.

I think experienced alders bring a lot to the table. The voters get to express their satisfaction or dis-satisfaction at the voting booth.

I would support limiting Alders to 10-12 years of service.

This is a tough one...we all know it can be difficult to find representatives. Naturally, the goal would be to generate fresh ideas and remove ineffective alders, but since the public votes that

last point is somewhat built into the system. There's also something positive to be said for experience.

Without the Council being full-time, I do not think there should be term limits.

If you go to full-time Alders, yes, but otherwise no.

Institutional knowledge is critically important. If alders don't have it because they're all new, somebody else will run the show.

Alders are accountable to their constituents. An alder who does not meet the needs of their constituents are subject to 'term limits' by not being reelected.

Should be 3 or 4 year terms.

Serving the public is a privilege. At some point senior Alders should move on to allow others to serve.

If the Council moved to full time, salaried members, I would be open to considering term limits. They should be staggered and long enough to allow for the gathering of expertise and institutional knowledge. Otherwise, there could be an inadvertent benefit to staff and mayors, who would have much knowledge, that policymakers may not have time to gather.

Let the voters decide.

The structure and duties of the Council already substantially works against building and maintaining institutional memory. Term limits are a potential problem trying to be a solution to a problem we don't have.

Keep it a part time Council then when people get "tired" they can rotate off. While it appears some Alders are coasting and are no longer active participants on the Council I still don't favor limits. That's the work of the electorate -- to vote a new, better person onto the Council.

Term limits is another terrible idea. Don't even think about it.

It's as important to have turnover as it is to have institutional memory on the Common Council. There's a steep learning curve for alders who are not familiar with city government procedures, so the term should be long, e.g. 10-15 years.

Very few alders actually serve past 6 years. I don't know what this would accomplish. If people want to re-elect incumbents, that is democracy.

Fresh blood in alderperson positions is totally appropriate. Please make this a consideration.

Let the people choose, so long as these are part-time low-paying positions.

I think "new blood" is important in any governing process, but I think we currently experience that naturally through attrition and the voting process. I think it would be a much bigger issue if we paid Alders a full-time salary.

Although I might think some people stayed around too long, there is an election every two years. Let the people decide if someone has been there too long.

I have mixed feeling on this. Term limits mean denying me the right to vote for the person I want. On the other hand, being an alderperson should not be viewed as a career position.

I'd rather be voted out by my constituents than termed out by an ordinance.

The constituents should impose term limits. And as stated above, the compensation should minimally compensate the elected representative for their time while hopefully being a factor in having each open their seat for one of their neighbors.

THE PEOPLE WILL SET TERM LIMITS AT THE BALLOT BOX.

I generally oppose term limits, that's what voting is supposed to address.

I'm opposed to term limits in all cases. Warren Onken was one of the finest members of the council and he served something like two decades. Do you really want to deny the public the opportunity to keep someone like that serving them?

10 yr max.

Voters should have the right to vote for who they choose. If someone wants to run for 10 terms, voters should have the right to vote for them.

Q12. MAYOR: Under current city procedures, the Mayor has the authority to appoint, subject to confirmation by the Council, the high level employees (heads of Departments and Divisions) that operate departments and supervise city employees in the civil service. The appointments are for terms of five years. The Mayor has the obligation to supervise and discipline those Department and Division Heads. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current appointment and supervisory powers of the Mayor	83.12	64
Transferring some of the Mayor's current powers over the selection and supervision of high level employees to the Common Council	6.49	5
Increasing the Mayor's authority to hire, fire and discipline high level employees	6.49	5
Neutral	3.90	3

The current system works well. The Council President should appoint high level appointments that serve the council (chief of staff).

Of all the changes being considered, this is the one that I am most concerned about. Selection of City managers requires careful understanding of best practices in developing position descriptions, advertising positions, screening, and selection. This work should be the responsibility of the Mayor and his/her staff. Also, the DDH's need to answer to one supervisor, not several. Including the Council in supervision and priority-setting will make it difficult for staff to adopt and follow an efficient work plan.

The council won't need this now that Paul is retiring.

Council should have a more active role in oversight.

I would be open to a City Manager, who has bureaucratic authority to manage high level employees

This is another complicated question. At times there have been concerns that Mayors overly-politicized their power over these positions, and at times it seemed like managers would promote what they thought a Mayor wanted rather than their own opinions, even in policy discussions with the Mayor and/or Alders. The only real way to address that would be to move to a city manager model that takes those oversight powers from the Mayor, which opens the door to changing or eliminating the Mayor's position as we know it. If we did add a city manager, the job of Mayor could be redefined to account for that change while still maintaining some powers and balance against the legislative branch.

Hold the Mayor accountable the Common Council confirms these folks, so that is a critical vote and power. Not sure how 20 people would select or supervise

I believe that a 5 year term for department managers strikes a fairly good balance between executive authority to hire and fire without cause and a reasonable

expectation of employment security for professional public employees. And the Council's confirmation role is appropriate.

In my view, these high level employees serve in the executive branch of city government and should be supervised by the city's chief executive. The council should focus on legislative actions.

This is the essence of being the executive.

The Common Council reviews these contracts every 5 years, and thereby has the power to influence this process.

None of the above. I think council members should play a role in evaluating high level employees. I would prefer 3 year contracts. I would be unwieldy for the council to supervise staff - they can't even supervise their own staff adequately given the transient nature of the council members.

These sorts of appointments make sense to still be in control of the Mayor, but with weigh-in from Common Council on overall activities and functions.

Absolutely--keep the same, Mayor is Chief administrator

The appoint with confirmation approach maintains a check and balance system.

As the chair of the Human Resources Committee when this system was developed, I support its continuation. Council members have the ability, indeed the responsibility, of expressing concerns about department and division heads to the Mayor. However, appointments and supervision do not belong in the province of the legislative branch of government. Similarly, the Mayor should not be able to terminate department and division heads without cause, except at the end of a contract period. This system was designed to give greater flexibility to the City than when these positions were subject only to the civil service process providing that they were there until retirement unless there was just cause for dismissal, but also to provide stability as the person in the Mayor's office changed.

The Mayor is the CEO of the City and should have the authority to hire and supervise all key and high level employees. The Common Council is legislative and should restrict its activity to that purpose. Alderpersons should not be involved in managing the operations of the City.

I recommend hiring a City Manager, who would report to the Mayor, but have supervising authority over Dept Heads.

I would need to learn more about alternatives. If CC members served for four years like the Mayor, it may be easier to make the case for CC hiring and supervision.

I don't know. The salaries of the department heads, combined with very generous benefit packages, seem too high. But, I don't know what would be better than the current system that gives the mayor these powers.

I think it's a close call but I would move to a cabinet form of government where the agency heads submit their resignations at the start of the mayoral term and the mayor gets to choose his own team. However, I think the current system works well enough.

Largely maintain the current structure. You don't want 20 alders giving contradictory direction to city staff. However, I could see giving the Council the ability to remove high level appointed employees with a 2/3 or 3/4 majority vote.

I think the current structure works. The mayor and council seem to have a good balance of power with this current structure.

I believe that Portland, OR has a small, full time City Council. I had a friend on their Council years ago. She told me that each City Council member was appointed as a department head by the Mayor, who is elected by members of the Council. I like the idea in theory, but I wouldn't support dumping our current department heads at the end of their contracts simply to implement a change like this. So phase it in? Not my best thought out suggestion!

Q13. MAYOR: Under state law, the Mayor has the power to veto acts of the Council, which may only be overturned by a 2/3 vote of the Council. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Changing State law to limit the Mayor's veto power	3.80	3
Maintaining state law on veto power	82.28	65
Changing state law to give the Mayor increased veto powers, such as, some form of line-item veto (type of veto power allows the Mayor to veto certain portions of a legislative action without vetoing the entire legislative action.)	8.86	7
Neutral	5.06	4

I do not think the purpose of this Task Force should be to change state law.

I would support a Mayoral line item veto of certain legislative actions. I don't think it is likely that the State legislature would support that.

Madison has a strong CC. The existing system/state law works quite well.

Not sure how realistic changing state law is at this point

This is a key aspect of balance between the branches, as frustrating as vetoes can be. Line-item power is too great a power to have, particularly when considering the scope of many actions and the budget.

NO LINE ITEM VETO!! If a Mayor is to veto an item, then veto it -- no games with "line item" vetoes like at the State level.

Another essence of the executive. And line-item veto another bad idea.

Assuming the Common Council remains a non-partisan body, less vulnerable to "tribal pressure" than we're seeing at the state and federal levels, the current process seems to work; that said, having a City Manager would avoid this problem.

I don't see a problem that needs to be fixed.

This seems like a good balance of control over acts undertaken by both Mayor and Council.

There have not been many times that the Mayor has vetoed items over the past several decades. Clearly it is not a power that has been abused. Increasing veto power, such as permitting line item vetoes, would erode the voice of the people as expressed by the Council.

The power of veto is important in maintaining balance. Currently, for example, if there is one item in the budget that the Mayor feels is harmful to the City, the entire budget must be vetoed. Line item veto authority would make the process easier and more efficient.

The mayor already has so much power that the line-item veto would only add to that imbalance. The present system encourages more collaboration between the two branches of government.

The line item veto is worth consideration, but I don't think it's crucial.

But only a line-item veto, not a partial veto and only for the budget .

With the art of political compromise failing these days, I think mayors need to have the ability to line item veto impractical legislation that passes.

A certain line item veto authority would be an improvement, but not the current statute that controls the Governor's line item veto authority, which essentially allows him to create ransom note vetoes by picking a letter here, a letter there, etc.

Q14. MAYOR: Under current city procedures, the Mayor chairs the City's Finance Committee. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the Mayor as Chair of the Finance Committee	59.94	47
Having the Common Council President or some other alderperson chair the Finance Committee.	25.32	20
Neutral	15.19	12

Only if the council President can chair the finance committee. Otherwise let the mayor chair the committee

I am completely indifferent, however, recognize that the budget can cause a lot of consternation between the Mayor and the Council.

Veto power gives the Mayor authority, the Council should deliberate and recommend fiscal policy, subject to approval and potential veto of the Mayor
The change I would make to the Finance Committee is that the Council President, or Council President and Mayor, appoint the committee.

The Mayor needs to be held accountable for the actions she or he takes as Mayor. Having a committee (Finance) where the Mayor is not only present, but chairing the meeting, makes that a great forum to really hold the Mayor accountable for the financial and executive actions taken.

Mayor chairs, but some/all of members should be appointed by council president.

Consider sharing this responsibility between the Mayor (or Manager?) and a qualified Alder.

I think the council should elect the chair of the finance committee, which may or may not be the council president. Or the finance committee should annually elect their own chair.

I would need to study the issue.

IT IS VITAL THAT THE MAYOR BE A FORMAL PART OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

The Mayor is elected city-wide, and is the Executive.

I could see benefits with either structure

Currently, the Mayor appoints all of the members and then chairs the Committee.

The City has an Executive Budget process and the involvement of the Mayor in the budget review is essential. The Mayor votes only in case of a tie. If there is not sufficient votes to change a budget item, the executive budget should prevail.

This issue has been raised in the past and we learned across the state of Wisconsin, city councils have council only finance committees so we know it is a functional model. I would want to make sure we didn't create a dual system of reporting and accountability. I'm ok with keeping Mayor as Chair but interested in looking at options to split appointment power, stagger terms etc. I'm ok with changing it if all the impacts understood.

This is philosophically odd (the executive chairing a legislative committee) but it works well in practice. It gives the executive and legislative branches the chance to hash out budget issues before they get to the whole council.

Grant the power to the Council President to provide a better check on the city's financial operation.

None of the above. Allow the Finance Committee to select the person they deem best suited to be Chair from among their members. It could be the Mayor, the Council President, or some other alder.

I think the mayor has plenty to do. This is like any other committee which should be chaired by someone on the council.

Q15. MAYOR: Under state law, the Mayor is to Chair meetings of the Common Council. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Changing state law to allow an alderperson to Chair the meetings of the Council	29.11	23
Maintaining the current law that makes the Mayor the Chair of the meetings of the Council	49.37	39
Neutral	21.52	17

Only if the council president or vice would be the meeting. Otherwise let the msyor chair the meetings.

I've never been in a council meeting where I thought the chair--whether mayor or council president--led the meeting astray.

Chairing the CC is part of the Mayor's job and responsibility.

Same comment as 13

I could also support having an Alder, presumably the Council President, Chair Council meetings. (I certainly did it enough...) This is a case where the problem is not the structure used but how well Alders and the Mayor understand their respective powers and how well they are willing to work together. To some extent no structure can fix ignorance or stubbornness.

The Mayor should chair the meeting -- actions taken by him or her can be challenged and overturned by the Council... so this holds all accountable. ALL the City Residents voted for the Mayor -- so having that person chair the Council meetings makes sense to me.

I didn't realize this was state law, but the council president should chair council meetings (as the county board chair, not the executive, chairs the county board).

As it is, the Mayor frequently relinquishes the chair to the Council President and things seem to proceed just fine.

Having the mayor chair puts all alders on equal footing during debate and limits the mayor's discussion unless the mayor steps down from the chair. I'd fear that if the mayor didn't chair the meeting they'd never attend and it would drive a larger divide like on the county board. Since the mayor is a member of the council, would they be able to debate like all the alders on every issue? Would council members want that? Really, would anyone?

I think having the Mayor participate in all meetings is appropriate, but I think the Council members are capable and able to chair their own meetings as well.

Assumes we reduce number of districts.

THE MAYOR NEEDS TO HEAR NOT ONLY THE PUBLIC BUT THE COUNCIL DISCUSSION AS WELL TO UNDERSTAND THE POLITICAL PROCESS

I would support having the Common Council President Chair

The Mayor is the face of the City, and has responsibility to carry out the mandates of the Council. I see no advantage to changing the current system. The City Council is not the County Board...the Mayor and the Council President are not co-equals.

The dual role of the Mayor (CEO and Chair of the Common Council) has served the City well. When there is a tie vote on a piece of legislation, the person representing the entire City should break the tie.

It's interesting that the County Board Chair, chairs county board meetings. It seems to work. On the other hand, the lines of communication between the executive and legislative branches at the county seem less formal and less robust. There is a benefit to having a public discussion with both branches of government so while there may be disagreements between the Mayor and Common Council, we do know what each other thinks and so does the public.

The County Board meetings are Chaired by the Board President, I am not sure why the statutes have a different standard for Common Council meetings.

The mayor always has the option of putting the council president in the chair.

The council should have a say in who chairs their meetings.

Q16. MAYOR: The Mayor does not currently have term limits. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current practice	64.10	50
Setting term limits for the Mayor	26.92	21
Neutral	8.97	7

Voters decide whether the Mayor serves another term or not.

Same as alders.

Term limits may be appropriate if the Council also has term limits, but I think the term limits should be long enough to give the Mayor time to gather institutional knowledge and make change - potentially 2-4 terms

Again, let the voters decide.

See above comments regarding term limits.

Again -- let the electorate decide. I'd limit the \$\$ available to any candidate in an election.... but not term limits.

Term limits for executive marginally less bad than term limits for legislators, but mayor doesn't have the impact or empire-building capability that would make this even close to appropriate. Bad idea.

Depends on whether changes are made in the balance of power between the Mayor and Common Council.

Historically this hasn't been an issue.

Fresh blood makes sense, if prior Mayors can serve or support in advisory capacity in some way as requested that's fine but new faces in government that reflect the growth and change in a community are appropriate.

The Mayor is elected city-wide. Let the people choose.

The people speak...

Same answer as to the question of term limits for alderpersons.

I'd prefer to let the voters decide.

THE PEOPLE SET TERM LIMITS AT THE BALLOT BOX.

Term limits are a mistake in all cases.

Three terms with some emergency powers

A mayor shouldn't have term limits. If they do, their last term makes for lame duck leadership.

Q17. MAYOR: The Mayor currently has a staff consisting of five (5) Deputy Mayors, a Food Policy Coordinator, a Neighborhood Resource Coordinator, and four (4) administrative assistants. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the size of the mayor's staff	43.04	34
Decreasing the size of the mayor's staff	20.25	16
Increasing the size of the mayor's staff	5.06	4
Neutral	31.65	25

The staff may need to be increased over time as the city grows in population.

I know they are all always busy. The special positions (Food Policy and NRT Coordinators) enable the Mayor to address his priorities. The new mayor may have different priorities. These positions should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

I'm not as educated on the roles and responsibilities of the mayor's office staff as I would like to be, but my general sense is that it's a workable amount of staff.

The more Madison grows, the more I believe the duties and functions of our government will grow. With that comes added responsibility and more and more committees. I would support growing all staffing capacity both in the Council and in the Mayor's office.

It may be worthwhile to slightly expand the Mayor's staff to help provide even better support.

It seems like a lot of people, but I don't know what all they do.

The current structure seems to work.

If the mayor remains the Chief Executive, he supervises all high-level employees and should not need so many staff directly reporting to his office. However, if the structure changed to allow for a city manager or other structure, the mayor's staff may be appropriate.

The right size of this staff body needs to be examined as our needs change, but aside from recently moving some oversight of alcohol licenses out of the Mayor's Office and onto the Clerk's Office (a move that I wish had not been made), the current balance seems reasonable.

Seems a little too big to me..... I understand the Deputy Mayors (Assistants) and the Administrative Assistants ... not sure why the others are housed in the Mayor's office.

See comment above. The responsibilities of these people may certainly be important, but move them out of the Mayor's office to another department to serve everybody if the mayor and council are having staffing level wars.

Tough question as I don't know enough about the duties of the above positions

Food Policy Coordinator maybe should be housed someplace more appropriate

Specialized positions like the Food Policy and Neighborhood Resource Coordinators should not be subject to changes in who occupies the Mayor's office -- these are positions that have proven themselves to be important to the community at large and should be supported in a less politically volatile offices.

There is too much bureaucracy.

I think the name of the positions should be changed back from Deputy Mayor. That title seems to indicate more power than they actually have. They don't take over if the Mayor dies or is no longer able to serve. I don't understand why the Food Policy and Neighborhood Resource Coordinator are in the mayor's office. Also, with that many administrative assistants I don't understand why committee appointments can't be made in a more timely fashion.

See previous comments about existing staff being okay, but Committee support resources needing some work.

Keep the deputy mayors and make the other positions regular positions in an appropriate department. The deputy mayors can work as closely as they need to with the positions.

THIS IS WAY TOO HIGH GIVEN HISTORIC STAFFING AND "ACCOMPLISHMENTS" OF THE MAYOR'S OFFICE

I support giving the Mayor the resources needed to perform his/her job, and to perform it well. If that means increasing or decreasing staff, then that is what the Mayor should be allowed to do, within reason

As Mayor, I had 4 Assistants (now called Deputy Mayors?????) and a legislative analyst, There was a receptionist in the office and two additional support staff. They got everything done that needed to be done. I don't know why the current Mayor needs all this staff, nor do I understand why the Food Policy Coordinator and the Neighborhood Resource Coordinator are not located within the Community Services division....

The 5 Deputy Mayors and the administrative assistants are sufficient to coordinate activities and facilitate communication between the Mayor's office and City Departments.

I think the Mayor's office is top heavy with staff. I don't see a benefit to the city by having the food policy coordinator or neighborhood resource coordinator in the Mayor's office and I don't see or how these positions are accountable to anyone but the Mayor. I would reduce the number of deputy mayors and review the work of the admin assts to see if consolidation in duties could be accomplished.

I don't know enough about the workflow in the mayor's office. While this at first appears to be over-staffed, I have not seen the record of neighborhood and constituent contacts. I do hear a lot about the number of days the mayor spends traveling. While I support participation in the US Conference of Mayors, unlike a past mayor, I wonder if the mayor working in town would obviate having such a large staff. More study needed on this.

CHANGING NEEDS WILL SET THE STAFFING LEVELS

Five Deputy Mayors seems excessive but I'd want to hear more about the roles of each before definitively stating support for a decrease in staff.

It's about right and maybe a little large for a city our size.

This seems adequate. Mayor staff is more than alders have.

Q18. MAYOR: Under Madison's current Mayor-Council structure of government, the Mayor is the chief executive of the city and thus is in charge of the day-to-day administration of the City. State law provides that cities may choose a Manager-Council form of government, which has an unelected City Manager with day-to-day administrative responsibilities. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current Mayor-Council form of government	82.89	63
Changing to a Manager-Council form of government	6.58	5
Neutral	10.53	8

I view the job of mayor as primarily a policy creation position, as well public relations and some administration of the day-to-day running of the city. City staff does an excellent job of taking care of the day-to-day running of city services.

Off the top of my head, I cannot think of any major cities that rely on the Manager/Council form of government. Having one individual stand for election, set the city priorities, manage the staff, and be accountable to the community works well. And, when it doesn't, the electoral process is available to take care of problems.

I believe Madison is too big of a city for a City Manager-style of government.

I think a Manager system should be reviewed and considered.

Although I appreciate the possible advantage of having a "professional manager" run the City, I believe the people of the City of Madison prefer to choose the leader of their City.

I strongly support maintaining a balance of power between the Council and Mayor.

I think there are benefits to strengthening the bureaucracy, to maintain across political mayors and council members. The city manager would allow for day-to-day functions to be prioritized, while also supporting political initiatives and priorities of the elected officials.

Madison isn't Janesville. The existing structure works well.

There may be advantages to moving to the Manager-Council form of government.

Hold the elected representatives accountable....

Under the current structure, the City's CEO is elected directly by the citizens.

I checked "Maintaining" but I can see the value of appointment of a special committee to study the value/benefits of a manager-Council form vs. current structure.

We tried manager-council after WWII, and went back to mayor-council after only seven years. Given the ingrained professionalism of city staff and managers, and history of qualified, competent mayors, no reason to go to city manager.

Having a Manager is much more conducive to preserving processes and values the community has developed over time. New ideas and change should come from a more democratic body like the Common Council than the executive branch.

To some extent we have a city manager for some portions of the city - DPCED and Engineering (Rob Phillips) - I think with a city manager it would just add another layer of politics to an already divided system.

This type of role to commit full-time to the administrative needs of the city seems like it could be valuable in, again, increasing bandwidth of Mayor and existing Council to determine future path for the City while still keeping day-in-day-out functions on course.

REMEMBER THE ANDRE BLUM YEARS

In my experience, Manager-Council form of government tends to be a buffer between the elected officials and city staff. Generally, I think this is a favorable outcome. However, M-C governments also tend to be less responsive to the public.

The Mayor is responsible to the community. A City Manager reports to the Council. Nothing more needs to be said.

Madison experimented with the City Manager form of government and it was not successful. A City Manager would be only accountable to the Common Council and that, I believe, results in a loss of representation.

I prefer having a full time Mayor with a full time City Manager that reports to the Mayor, but can handle day to day oversight of Dept heads.

I like having both the legislative and exexutive branches being accountable to the voters.

This has worked well and it provides direct accountability to the voters. Madison is on the cusp. Most cities smaller than ours have a city manager while larger cities have our system. Madison is getting bigger.

The only way I'd support the change is if the role of the mayor, along with the mayor's staff and salary, was reduced.

The head of the executive branch should be elected by the people!!
I don't know enough right now to make a good opinion on this question

Q19. Boards, Commissions and Committees (BCCs): The City currently has over 100 BCCs. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Reducing the number of BCCs	69.23	54
Maintaining the number of BCCs	14.10	11
Increasing the number of BCCs	0.00	0
Neutral	16.67	13

I don't think this will ever happen.

Most of the committees are important. If there are places where committees are redundant or unnecessary, they can be eliminated.

Over 100 seems like too many!

I think all should be reviewed and a more detailed recommendation be made before making a blanket decision as those presented here. I'm betting some could be shut down, changed or combined. And, perhaps there are new ones needed

Good luck with this.

Possibly in favor of reducing, but it's less about the total number of BCCs and more about whether or not the ROI (with cost in terms of BCC time, staff time, etc) for each committee is positive.

I think the committees and commissions serve an important role in allowing work to be done outside the Council meetings and allowing citizens to have input. But many of the BCCs do not have much to do or do not meet on a regular basis. I think some of them can be subcommittees of larger BCCs, be ad hoc, or be consolidated.

If public interest and will is there, they should be maintained and allowed to flourish. However, this stretches staff and alderperson support far too thin, thus the need for more staff and/or a full-time Council is required.

When I was on the Council we looked at reducing the number of committees. After many months of study we reduced the number of committees by one. However the Council should

keep track of if BCCs are meeting on a regular basis, if not, move area of oversight somewhere else. Involvement by many citizens in City affairs is something we should be proud of accomplishing.

I think we have made some strides at being more efficient with Boards, Commissions and Committees - example being the new Transportation Policy Board and Transportation Commission - which combined a number of others into the two new bodies. It is important that we have adequate Boards, Commissions and Committees to fairly address issues in the City; however, I think we can be a little more efficient in how we accomplish that goal.

I support drastically reducing the number of BCC, and ad hoc committees, task forces, etc. We suffer from intellectual constipation. No amount of information or public input is enough. It is a barrier to orderly growth and process.

We have WAY too many. They often duplicate efforts and cause confusion.

That said, I would not reduce the number a lot. I would combine ones like Sustainability Committee and COE. I would also recommend a much better system of educating new committee members on their responsibility and scope of "power"/potential influence.

Reduce significantly!

Nothing works better for citizen involvement than BCCs.

I would support an analysis of whether each BCC is of significant value.

Despite recent efforts to reduce the number of BCCs, there are still several that should have been short term bodies that have continued well after they were needed. Council exacerbates the problem at times by loading up items with unnecessary referrals, and at times indulges in creating committees for efforts that don't require them.

Seems a bit high maybe some can be consolidated? With 5 Deputy Mayors, they each have only 20 BCC's to cover. What I would change: I'd make sure that each committee has at least 2 Alders that way there is balance in representation, of a sort. The resident (non-Alder) members of these city committee deserve to have a good Alder to carry their work to the full council and Mayor. With 2 Alders, it's more certain that at least one Alder will be up to that task.

There may be some that could go, but I don't have any to suggest

If the current number is a product of interest and need in the community, there's nothing wrong with having many BCCs. The problem comes when there is significant

overlap in their areas of responsibility and some become superfluous; this undermines their integrity and authority, and makes it difficult to recruit candidates.

I sat on committees where we tried to eliminate committees and experience tells us that it never works. Maybe one or two committees gets eliminated every few years, but mostly its hard to eliminate committees. I do support more support for the staff that are staffing the committees, more timely appointments and giving the committees more power to make recommendations in their policy areas. It seems we have neutered the committees over the past 10 years and they should be empowered instead.

That's a TON of committees. If we keep them all, at minimum do an assessment of achievements and purpose to consolidate where needed.

A rolling 5-year review of the responsibilities, need for and effectiveness of each non-essential BCC would be useful.

I have seen past experience on attempts to reduce the number of BCC's without specific goals established. This is a very difficult task and almost never successful.

this is often raised, and is often studied. I'd consider looking to cut some BCCs

A FOCUS ON WHAT NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND A COMMITMENT TO GETTING THE WORK DONE WILL SHOW THE WAY TO FEWER OF BOTH

Some could clearly be consolidated.

I would support evaluating the necessity of the current committees and make changes based on recommendations, but not to out of hand conclude that we have too many BCCs.

I think I already said this!

Good luck on this one.

There must be some overlapping and duplication of duties. It should certainly be reviewed and committees eliminated or combined where justified.

Each BCC arose from some concern, whether mandated by state law, created to resolve a certain matter or called for by concerned citizens. The beauty of our city government is that it's open to embracing such concerns as they arise, not rigid and compartmentalized to dismiss such concerns as happens with the state.

I serve on several and quorum is difficult sometimes. Perhaps merging some commissions, board and committees would increase ability of meetings to actually

happen. I also think that Boards, Commissions and Committees should meet at times available to volunteers and people with transportation or childcare concerns and that might increase participation.

The City should focus on more effectively using the time and talents of people who volunteer. This means better training and support for fewer committees.

As the chair of one commission and a member of another, this is really important. Quorum issues keep these commissions ineffective.

And good luck with that.

I sometimes saw the same item four or five times. Along, most alders show only the minimal preference to committees and their members. This should be restructured.

With the understanding that more work would be placed on the remaining committees.

Having these boards and commissions gives residents a way to impact city policy. If these entities aren't doing this, then it's time to either make this happen or rethink what their role is.

I've heard that it is difficult to find qualified applicants for many open positions. If so, then reduce the number of commissions or the number of members per commission. If the size of the Council is reduced then it is even more important to have all neighborhood concerns represented as well as possible on the committees and commissions. On the other hand, I believe citizen members should be representing what's in the best interest of the city as a whole.

Q20. Boards, Commissions and Committees (BCCs): Nearly all City BCCs are made up of a majority of unelected city residents, with only a few alderpersons on the BCCs. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current system with many residents serving on City BCCs	79.49	62
Reducing the number of city residents on BCCs	6.41	5
Increasing the use of residents on BCCs	6.41	5
Neutral	7.69	6

Having residents serve on committees increases awareness and involvement in city issues and provides useful insights and ideas to the city.

I saw a huge amount of benefit at the Water Utility Board from two alders and several residents. It provided a good mix of expertise and perspective!

We gain valuable expertise and resident engagement through this system.

I think this is an important citizen role -- to have the input of unelected officials, many of whom may be experts in a particular field or have important experience relevant to the BCC.

The BCCs are far more efficient and influential with alderpersons on them, so I think their presence should be maintained. However, if there end up being more or less BCCs and/or a full-time or truly staff-supported Council, this makeup could shift.

These bodies advise the council and mayor. There should be at least 1 alder on any committee. Here allowing the council to appoint some of the members or to recommend members to the mayor may be worth considering.

Alders are an important part of the Boards, Commissions and Committees. However, since we already ask a lot from the alders, I think we should maintain the involvement from the City residents.

City residents are not democratically accountable. Elected officials are. If we want fewer and more powerful BCCs, to make the time and effort spent on BCCs more worthwhile, we would need to have more elected officials making the decisions in BCCs (subject to resident input and engagement), therefore reducing the "sausagemaking" required at Council meetings

Not sure on this one, how do other peer cities handle this?

This is an aspect of our system that is important, and frankly there is no capacity for Alders to be on more BCCs. Perhaps allowing Alders to Chair committees again should be explored, but it was also nice to not have to worry about running those BCCs as Chair.

Again, I'd make sure that each BCC has at least 2 Alders on it. It's important to have good Alder connections to the BCC's -- and having two Alders helps make sure that connection to the full Council and Mayor is a good one.

Citizen leadership on BCCs is a hallmark and highlight of Madison city government. The council has ultimate power (except under certain statutes), citizen power in the process must be preserved.

There are many residents who care deeply about our city but have no interest in running for office; participating on BCCs allows them to participate in government while providing a balance of elected officials who know the process and can take the city-wide view.

I think this is where the council president or even alders should be able to recommend members of these committees to get a more diverse representation and get more expertise on the committees.

This is appropriate to have citizens on City BCCs in their current form.

AT THE VERY LEAST HAVING LIMITS EVEN BEYOND THE 10 YEAR TIME IS CRITICAL.
REVIEW THE PEOPLE AND TIME INVOLVED AND THERE IS LITTLE REAL TURNOVER

Community support and participation should be the goal.

Unless the number of BCCs are reduced, other than the Finance Committee and Executive Committee, only one alder should serve on each BCC, serving as a liaison to the Council and NOT steering the discussions and actions of the BCC. Let the residents on the BCCs make recommendations to the Council which will then have to decide....

Committees have no authority and only make recommendations. The Common Council can accept, modify or reject those recommendations. Having citizens on committees is an excellent way of getting input and allowing city residents to be involved.

I like the local democracy of resident driven committees but think we have too many committees.

What has evolved in the past couple decades is city residents being LESS available to the neighbors they serve. No longer do we find full contact information for those serving. Formerly, we could infer a perspective based on the aldermanic district in which they lived. Citizens had address, phone numbers and e-mail addresses. Now, these residents cloak their identities, in some cases not even listing an e-mail addresses. IF CITY RESIDENTS WANT TO BE INSULATED FROM CONTACTS OF CONCERNED CITIZENS, THEY ARE NOT QUALIFIED TO SERVE! BCC appointees only had one person's "vote" to secure their position; they should be available to the input of concerned citizens as a function of performing their duties. Meanwhile, I believe that alders who are available and accountable should have a greater role, something that would happen if their voice was not diluted by so many citizen appointees.

BCCs need to have an alder to maintain a connection with the Council, but for most of them, the point is to get a broad diversity of views and expertise, so we should tap as many residents as possible.

I think the county has a better system. Key committees should be all alders. That's currently true of only BOE.

It is my experience that the citizen members are often the ones who do the majority of the work and sweat the details because the alders are too busy. The alders help provide the big picture.

I think it's important that either the assigned alder person or a backup attend these meetings. If they don't, I think the work of these boards and commissions can easily be marginalized.

I think the current balance works. Alders will always represent their districts. Resident members should represent the city as a whole.

Q21. Boards, Commissions and Committees (BCCs): Nearly all BCCs are advisory only, that is, they make recommendations to the Council and the Council has final authority. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current advisory status for most BCCS	77.92	60
Increasing the authority of the BCCS to take actions without Council approval	10.39	8
Making all BCCs advisory, so the Council has the final authority on all matters	7.79	6
Neutral	3.90	3

There are decisions that can be better made while insulated from politics. I'll talk about this a little more below, but I do think there is room for greater technocratic involvement in government decision making.

However, in some cases items acted/voted on do not really seem to need Council approval.

Very selectively. And such power should also include added alder members. If the committee has expertise (or should) like Landmarks, give them some power so that some decisions should not be subject to political intervention.

I think it is important for certain Boards, Commissions and Committees to have the authority to accomplish what needs to be independently accomplished.

This problem with the authority of BCCs has to do with their relationship to staff, not to Council. They should have much more authority vis-a-vis staff, but the Council should always be the final arbiter of decisions. The one exception to this is the Board of Public Works which has too much authority (it can introduce legislative items w/o going through Council, for example) and serves as a rubber stamp for Engineering staff.

I think the authority could be increased without removing the Council final approval - the BCCs would need to be made up of more alders, be smaller and fewer, with more

specific responsibilities for gathering public input and making policy - then the Council could count on their work and approve without questioning as much

Interesting question, I do consider the UD Commission partially responsible for Madison and District 17 losing the new Marcus Theater Palace to Sun Prairie. A million dollar pedestrian bridge to nowhere!!

The people elect the Council. Making the BCCs the final authority takes that power further away from the people. This may seem counter-intuitive, but BCC members are largely only dependent upon the Mayor for their appointments.

Currently an action by a BCC needs to be "Sponsored" by an Alder to make it to the Full Common Council meeting agenda -- and THAT is where the problem lies. I like the current system -- but would add this change to procedures. I'd assure that if the BCC votes to send something on to the full Common Council, then THAT BCC is the SPONSOR of that referral. It would make the work of the residents on a BCC more relevant -- and help to inform the full Common Council. Why is the Bd of Public Works (for example) granted this power now -- but not the others? Clearly it's so that an Alder can't block an important public works action -- right? Why don't we offer this power to the other BCC's -- so that residents have an assurance that their work is valued and makes a difference to the City. Resident members are "city officials" -- they need to not have conflicts of interest and ethical standards, they are approved by the full Common Council -- let's treat them as responsible officials. The final power resides in the elected Common Council -- as it should. But to get an item on the agenda should be within the BCC's power -- and not subject to the whim of an Alder.

I think that committees are very important to have trained professionals on all BCCs. The chair person should have more power to present controversial projects to the next BCC or other people making final decisions.

Specifically as to the Landmarks and Plan Commissions and CDA - I think their balance of advise/autonomy is in almost all instances appropriate. Not informed enough about other BCCs to comment.

Having to "make your case" to the Common Council is a valuable step in the process of implementing policy change and holds BCCs to a certain standard.

I think the plan commission makes decisions that should be sent to the council. I think other formalities and technicalities can be taken care of by committees. You need to look at the committees on a case by case basis.

Some BCCs should be given more control of decision-making, but definitely not more when there are so many spread across the entire system.

The procedures to handle routine matters seems to be set up as efficient as possible, but letting BBC have final authority on routine issues could possibly save time and paperwork.

Do you really want all conditional uses to go to the entire Council for discussion/decision? On the other hand, do you want unelected persons to make all final decisions. What would the purpose of the Council be?

Non-elected bodies should never have authority to take direct action on any City issues.

Some issues, like the landmark process and maintaining historic districts must be maintained, elevated above the political fray.

I'm not sure what it would look like, but any effort to empower these groups would be great.

I think this is the biggest current flaw in the structure. Unelected bodies should never be in a position to force elected bodies to over rule them. It's fundamentally undemocratic.

Either increase their power or reduce the role of commissions.

Making the Council the final authority on all matters would require changes to state law. The parking utility, Metro, and the Police and Fire Commission come to mind. However, for most items, an elected body should be charged with the decision lest people claim unelected bureaucrats are making the decisions.

I don't think voters want to see these entities make final decisions. While it might sometimes be nice to have this kind of power, changing the current system in this way will I fear kill these bodies.

Q22. Boards, Commissions and Committees (BCCs): Nearly all BCC meetings are held downtown in late afternoon or the evening. Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Requiring all meetings to start late enough for residents to attend, but keep them downtown	14.29	11
Requiring all meetings to start late enough for residents to attend, but meet in places other than downtown	25.97	20
Having more meetings during the day, but keep them downtown	5.19	4
Having more meetings during the day, but at places other than downtown	9.09	7
Maintaining the current practices	33.77	26
Neutral	11.69	9

I'm not a fan of trying to get downtown by 5:00 for a committee meeting. We're all volunteers and we have jobs (not necessarily downtown.) I would like the meetings to be elsewhere, but again, I think consistency is the priority. Changing start times to be a bit later might be a good option.

This needs to be a combination of both downtown and other places in the city

1. I think it is important for residents to be able to attend meetings, so having them at night is important. Also, some people might not be able to serve if the meetings aren't after normal work hours. 2. Although some people may find traveling to downtown inconvenient, the transportation options are best downtown, so it is easier for people not driving to get there.

There are fewer 9 to 5 households, so having meetings start at 4-6 pm. should work. You will never be able to accommodate everyone's "work" schedule. But I think BCCs should periodically hold meetings in different parts of the City.

I think the meeting places need to be coordinated so that City staff can properly support the meetings. However, I think it would be helpful to consider rotating locations of certain meetings when trying to gather feedback from certain stakeholders in the community. As I suggested earlier, if the regular meetings cannot be efficiently relocated, then focus groups could be held to supplement the opportunities for public feedback, with those meetings being held at times and locations more convenient for the participants.

There is no perfect time for a meeting. The public seldom attends. If they want to, they can almost always make it happen. The practice of having all the meetings in the afternoon and evening makes the job of alder into a second shift job. I didn't like it.

Again, I do not think the time or location of BCCs is the biggest barrier to public participation. We need to give BCCs power, have fewer, and structure them in a way that gives them responsibility of soliciting public input - then it might be worth resident's time to attend BCC meetings. I do not think there is ever a time or location that makes it possible for all residents to attend

There is room for improvement, and some committees could "roam" and not be too negatively affected. But major BCCs should be where and when they are most accessible, which is downtown and in the evening.

So many people work late so I am not sure that that idea helps. Having meetings which are accessible to our community members is critically important. I'd leave it up to the committees and really hold them accountable to try and make sure their meetings are as open to our community members as possible. I think the geographic location of a meeting may be more of an issue than the time -- so moving meetings around the city may be a great way to start. If the meeting is convenient to get to -- and

I know about it and know the agenda items -- I will be more likely to find the time to attend. Televising more BCC meetings online -- that would be helpful too!

The scheduling must be flexible so that it facilitates and accommodates the individuals serving.

Anytime after 5, in the CCB.

BCCs have different constituencies and areas of focus. They should have the flexibility to respond to perceived community needs for meeting time/place schedule decisions so long as public notice requirements are met.

Since there are regularly 4 - 10 meetings a day Monday through Thursday, its helpful for alders and reporters to have them in one location so they can go from meeting to meeting. If one meeting is at Allied and one at Warner Park you can't be in both places at once. If all meetings were video or audio recorded, it would be different, but many meeting minutes have become so minimal you can't tell what happened without being present.

Similar to Council, move meetings around from time to time to increase potential for citizen engagement.

And, please provide parking for members, and validate the parking for citizens who attend the meetings when paid parking is enforced. It shouldn't cost people more than their time and talent to participate.

Evening meetings are often difficult to attend - dont assume every one works 9-5

MOVE THE MEETINGS TO ALLOW THE COMMUNITY TO ENGAGE. DOWNTOWN PARKING A NIGHTMARE AND IF A MEETING RUNS LATE THERE IS NO METRO SERVICE

I don't think this system is broken. If it is, changes should be made, but I have heard no complaints about this.

Each committee should have the authority to set the time and location of its meetings.

The current practices have evolved over many decades and represent a collective wisdom and experience. I don't think that framework needs tinkering.

hold meetings outside of the City/County building so that more people have access to attending and consider at lease sometimes offering childcare.

BCCs should consider meeting in neighborhoods that are impacted by the things on their agendas.

We should do whatever is most convenient for the public and as far as I can tell the current practice is that.

Downtown is centrally located and is the best compromise. Also, it makes it easier for staff to support the BCCs. I couldn't attend meetings during the day.

I think several of these options work. But I think most of these bodies should be meeting downtown.

It's hard to strike a balance between the needs of members and residents who have day jobs so I don't think it would be a good idea to have morning or early afternoon meetings. I'm fine with moving meetings around as long as CityCable can continue to broadcast at least as many meetings as it does currently. I'm also concerned that spaces be chosen that work well for meetings. The members would be able to see and hear registrants, attendees should be able to see and here the Chair and members. There are a lot of spaces used for meetings in the city that don't work well and should be avoided.

Q23. Boards, Commissions and Committees (BCCs): Nearly all BCCs meet at a set day(s), time , and place each month (e.g., the first Monday of each month at 5:30 p.m.). Do you support:

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Maintaining the current practice	79.75	63
Setting BCC meeting dates after polling the public and interested persons about the best day, time, and place for meeting	11.39	9
Neutral	8.86	7

I have found that having consistent meeting times every month has very helpful in juggling my busy schedule.

The committees should decide what best works for their members

The problem with polling interested persons is the risk of giving the interested persons too much power over how said committee works. Each BCC should be scheduled to best serve everyone and not favor those who happen to be in the know when the polling is conducted. Polling could be used to help identify if things should change for certain committees, but generally the biggest issue is whether something started before 5:30 or 6 pm.

It's easy to confuse people -- we need to make the meetings as consistent as possible, I believe. If we have a variety of times and places -- that would be confusing. The BCC members need to be able to set their schedules for the year, too -- and their attendance is critical.

moving times and places of meetings would be too confusing. Keep it simple. same time each month and same place.

Again, unworkable. You're going to schedule a 7-member commission AFTER polling the public?? Really? No, no, no.

See response to Question 23. Meeting at a regular time/place provides predictability for the public, but may limit participation. BCCs should have the flexibility to alter these routines with appropriate public notice.

This question seems odd. Members of the committees set the times of the meetings - I think its ok for them to change them based on member availability (with few exceptions like Plan and UDC), but they also have to consider the availability of the public. Many of the task force meetings are during the day, which is convenient for the members and staff, but not the public. Meetings like the Street Use committee should be held when neighborhood people can attend, not be scheduled for the convenience of the staff. I think that if you poll the public, you will only get answers from paid lobbyists and special interests. That doesn't seem like a good way to get public input.

Get public opinion about timing of BCCs.

See answer to previous question.

predictable

The current practices have evolved over many decades and represent a collective wisdom and experience. I don't think that framework needs tinkering.

SET DAYS/TIMES WORK FOR ALDERS AND PEOPLE

I'd say maintain the current practice unless you can insure that the polling is done in a way that includes people who are most often disenfranchised, people of color, people living in poverty, people experiencing homelessness, people who rely on public transportation, etc...

Consider setting meeting dates based on polling the appointees.

The public isn't going to care. I suppose there are a handful of activists who might.

The schedule needs to fit the ability of the members to attend meetings since most BCC members are volunteers.

The public can't always make this kind of decision. You can't reach consensus here any way. The standing meeting time ensures these bodies aren't always debating the question of when to meet.

Q24. Boards, Commissions and Committees (BCCs): Some BCCs require members to have specialized qualifications. Do you believe all BCCs should require specialized qualifications?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	25.32	20
No	60.76	48
Neutral	13.92	11

Some committees need to have some members with specialized qualifications. However, even on those committees it is helpful to have "generalists," people who have a wide range of experience and knowledge and can help see issues from a broad public perspective.

It depends on the board, commission or committee...for some, it is more important to have specific qualifications

Probably not all committees require this. When/if the number of committees is downsized it would be appropriate to assess which should and which shouldn't require specialized qualifications.

I would point out that these qualifications should be guidelines. For example, when I worked in architecture I designed some award winning buildings and had an advanced degree (M.Arch in addition to B.S. Arch) in architecture. But it never made sense for me to pursue licensure. Due to that I wasn't eligible for positions held for architects on the UDC, though I believe I was perfectly qualified. Whether I personally was a good fit, the fact remains that there are plenty of capable people who might not meet the letter of a requirement but meet the spirit. We can do better.

I like this idea of some sort of requirement for all BCCs, but understand that sometimes the "specialized" positions on BCCs are the hardest to fill, and that some BCCs really do not need "specialized" members.

An interest in the subject should be enough.

I think that the best representatives from the Alders and the Residents should be chosen to most effectively accomplish the goals of the BCCs. This would usually require some at least have specialized qualifications.

Some technical matters require specialized knowledge, but applying standards and responding to policy changes requires critical thinking but not necessarily special qualifications.

The beauty of city government is its INTIMACY! Every issue affects so many people in direct, close ways -- it's not abstract or distant. When a decision is made, it is typically felt directly by many -- so the "qualification" is what? To be thoughtful? Responsible? A good listener? A very few committees may need technical expertise -- but these BCC's also need to include the important perspective of "regular" residents of the City of Madison to inform the actions and decisions of the BCC.

Some should, depending on the BCC. Some members of the Plan Commission, UDC, etc...should have some specialized qualifications, but not necessarily all.

The qualifications I'm familiar with (on Landmarks and CDA) are appropriate; in general, commitment to the BCC's mission and enough knowledge to fulfill the duties of the office are sufficient.

Again, this is not a binary choice because not all BCCs have a technical focus. Where specialized knowledge is needed, or would constructively contribute to the decision process of a BCC, it should be required for certain "seats" in that group. Where the issue is more general, and the committee needs members who have been involved or have good connections, there should be room for them, too.

I think that whatever crazy unwritten rules are being followed about appointments (not too many people from certain districts or geographic dispersion, etc) should be written down and transparent so everyone understands. I do think that it would be good to have some rules so that you don't end up with a committee of all white men. I'd like to see more people with subject matter expertise be appointed to committees so we draw on the best our community has to offer. It seems that many people appointed to committees don't get appointed to the committees they had the most interest in or the most expertise in.

There are so many, worth doing a broad assessment of mission/vision for each and determine if specialization is needed for them to fulfill that purpose.

Even with specialized qualifications, it takes time for new members to understand their role and educated on their role and responsibilities.

very helpful in some to cases to require special skills

THE SPECIALIZED QUALIFICATIONS PANDER TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

Yes, but not for the entire body. Some members with general skills and knowledge provide a balance.

I think we should leverage the collective experience of the community and for some committees that requires specific experience (e.g. housing, urban planning, etc.)

It all depends on the matters that the BCC considers...

Committees should be balanced between those very knowledgeable about the issue and those who are impacted by any resulting policy or action by the City.

There is a benefit to specialized experts and generalists on committees, a balance of both is ideal.

I support the specialized qualifications but don't believe that all positions should require such specialization. Citizen members also have a role to play.

I think for most BCCs the qualification is that you are a resident of the City of Madison.

Depends what you mean by qualifications - appointees should have relevant experience to the jurisdiction of the committee, but setting really specific requirements for seats makes it harder to get a diverse group of appointees.

If anything we should reduce the number of specialized qualifications that we now require. I often found it hard to find people to fill the narrower slots.

You don't require alders to have special qualifications that serve on the BCCs without specialized qualifications. However, you might require some members of each BCC to have special qualifications.

I think some require special qualifications. You need a majority of people with disabilities serving on the disability rights commission for example. But I don't think all these bodies need such a requirement.

It's useful to have members with specialized qualifications, but it's more important to have broad resident representation. So having a couple of experts per commission would be fine, but no need for more. Appointees serve staggered terms so it's fine for a few to be at the beginning of a learning curve.

Q25. General: Do you believe that changes to the current structure, function, and duties of the Mayor, Common Council, or BCCs could lead to an improvement in the provision of services to Madison residents?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
---------------	---------	---

Yes	67.95	53
No	10.26	8
Neutral	21.79	17

Yes, if done thoughtfully.

This review is a good thing, and it should be done periodically.

I think that we should always strive to improve. However, I do not believe that the system should be totally overhauled in order to accomplish that improvement. So I have suggested modifications that maintain the system with slight changes.

Major structural changes, no. Minor changes and adjustments, yes.

It's possible.

Yes, establishing a 311 service would be great help too. We've just grown too big to rely on our ad hoc system and we will continue to grow.

The accessibility of the job of Alder is the biggest issue that can and should be resolved. Other issues are matters of balance and the need to alter them has been vastly overstated at times to limit the scope of the discussion about altering the job of Alder.

I also believe some changes will be destructive -- for example a smaller, "full time and professionalized" Common Council will deny the direct participation of regular folks in their democracy. I would add child care and a transportation support to Alders -- that may be helpful to allow more people to be Alders. Keeping a large, part-time Common Council adds a strong element of democracy here ... and THAT helps to improve the services to our Residents.

Damn well better, or it would be a failed exercise.

For most residents, what matters most is whether their concerns are being met and this is less about who the elected officials are than how well the city functions. The BCCs, when they are well-focused and their members feel empowered to work on important issues, are a vital connection to members of the public with specific interests.

I don't understand what is broken and why it needs to be fixed. It's not the structure that is the issue, its the actors in the system. If anything, there could be more rules written to be more transparent and to accomplish certain goals. I'm disturbed by the discussion of getting paid more and being full time - we don't need more professional politicians that are just climbing the ladder to someplace else. I want my elected officials to be there because they are passionate about issues in the city of Madison.

Madison is an active community and one that deserves a hard look at current structure to determine how to improve overall engagement and decision-making.

"Could" leaves a lot of room for possibilities. Things work pretty well now.

We should always be striving to pursue improvement in processes which can help provide efficiencies or better participation in government.

The structure of government should be streamlined to provide more efficient services to Madison residents and visitors, possibly at a reduced cost. (Has anyone ever studied the amount of staff time spent on preparing for and attending all the meetings of all the BCCs?)

Difficult to answer without knowing what those changes would be. I am doubtful that structural changes alone can lead to improvements.

This could be the subject of a PhD dissertation for a political science doctoral candidate. Rather than make a superficial comment to what's the purpose of your entire consideration of improving our local government, I'd only say that what we have has evolved over many decades and represents a collective wisdom and experience gained.

I UNDERSTAND THE AMOUNT OF ISSUES FACING ADERS I THEIR DISTRICTS, AND CITY AS A WHOLE, HAS NCREASED THE WORK LOAD. RELYING ON TECHNOLOGY HAS HELPED KEEPING RESDIENTS INFORMED AND ACCESSIBLE TO THEIR REPRESENTATIVES.

This is an incredibly broad question. Of the three entities, I think the BCCs need the most work.

I don't think the system is broken. It could be improved, but there's no crisis here. It works pretty well as is.

Q26. General: Do you believe that changes to the structure, function, and duties of the Mayor, Common Council, or BCCs could lead to an improvement in the ability of residents to participate effectively in City government?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	64.10	50
No	16.67	13
Neutral	19.23	15

I think a full or truly "part-time" Council could be more responsive to residents and also have the capacity to be proactive instead of almost always acting in a reactive mode.

We need to pursue greater inclusivity in decision-making. Under the current form of government, we have been accomplishing that goal incrementally, as the make-up of the

Council and the interest shown in the upcoming Mayoral election demonstrate. We have diversified appointments to committees, our planning efforts have included effective outreach to bring in new voices, and RESJI efforts have begun to increase staff diversity. The community expects/demands these changes, and they will continue under the current or a different form of government.

I think that we should always strive to improve. However, I do not believe that the system should be totally overhauled in order to accomplish that improvement. So I have suggested modifications that maintain the system with slight changes.

Quite the opposite. Changing the balance of power could be very harmful.

Perhaps.

Right now, only a relatively small class of Madisonians can be Alders. Other adjustments will help raise public participation, but the biggest problem has always been a general lack of interest and/or the belief that they have no power. The latter can be mitigated through persistent efforts by the Council and Mayor. The former is something that is much larger than Madison.

More Alders -- make sure Alders represent a reasonable number of residents to represent -- and that those people have access to their Alder!

See above

Depends on the changes.....

We need more tools for residents to understand our local government. Agendas need to be out sooner, easier to access (having some meetings in legistar and some not is confusing), have better titles on agenda items and make sure attachments are in legistar BEFORE the meetings or at least have sufficient hand outs for the people in the room. We need better descriptions for the public about the development process (the neighbors, not the developers) and a "how a bill becomes a law" description. Also, committees all have different procedures and levels of formalities and people need to understand how they have meaningful input. Some committees allow anyone in the room to speak at any time, some are highly formal. Some have city attorneys and parliamentarians - others do not. Overly complicating things and ruling things out of order when people (including committee members) don't understand Robert's Rules are unnecessary power plays that limit meaningful dialogue.

Making some changes can signal to the public that their voices matter and the government is there to serve them.

"Could" leaves a lot of room for possibilities. Things work pretty well now.

see #25

Again, what changes?

The only limitation citizens have on participating in their city government is simply learning the rules and procedures. We have virtually limitless possibilities for citizens having their voices heard, what some would say is too much. Aside from the problem of my own representative stubbornly ignoring my calls and e-mails, I strongly believe that citizens have ample opportunities to participate.

Again, any system can be made better, but I don't think the current process is in crisis.

Q27. General: Do you believe that changes to the structure, function, and duties of the Mayor, Common Council, or BCCs could lead to a more accountable city government?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	64.10	50
No	12.82	10
Neutral	23.08	18

I do think we have an accountable city government. Greater accountability can be accomplished within any of these forms by improving communication and institutional culture.

Maybe or maybe not

I think that we should always strive to improve. However, I do not believe that the system should be totally overhauled in order to accomplish that improvement. So I have suggested modifications that maintain the system with slight changes.

Quite the opposite. Changing the balance of power could lead to a concentration of power, and less accountability.

I'd say it is highly likely; but with changes come new obstacles as well.

This is an important point. Council members are the most directly accountable to their constituents. The mayor is an active part of the community, but slightly removed from day to day contact with constituents. How many meetings with constituents does the mayor have in a typical month relative to an alder. Making the council more effective, makes government more responsive.

The job of Alder is seen as high stress, thankless, and low compensation, which leads to a great deal of sympathy for Alders. That is often deserved, but it also provides

insulation to electoral challenges. Reducing the sacrifices needed for the job will remove some of that insulation.

I'd add RANKED CHOICE VOTING (RCV) to my list of hopes for Madison. Make sure that every Alder is elected by a majority of their residents -- and do this in one election, as we can eliminate the primary election in RCV! We can have a vibrant discussion and debate among various candidates....and assure that the winner is selected by a majority of the residents!! Enliven our democracy with Ranked Choice Voting!! For more info see: http://www.fairvote.org/?gclid=Cj0KCQjwv-DaBRCCARIsAI9sba9qEQx80InIFGEI2Cr-exM22fdyJGFagUn3CtS6h7_jJhilHAMHUQlaAl1IEALw_wcB It's currently done in Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN -- plus cities in Michigan, with legislation pending in Illinois, Indiana and Iowa. Plus many, many more across the US. AND the entire State of Maine just passed RCV!!

I truly hope so. Communication is the most important part of Government. It should be kept free and open.

Depends on the changes, and what expectations are made clear for accountability.

Changes to increase transparency and the availability and understandability of local government would. The changes suggested in this survey won't do any of those things. The solutions proposed don't get to the root of the issues with accountability and transparency.

See previous comment.

"Could" leaves a lot of room for possibilities. Things work pretty well now.

see #25

Accountability results from a good system of checks and balances and a very transparent government.

At this point in the survey, after already devoting over an hour to thinking through this, I don't have time to delve into this. But, I believe that the committee that's beginning could find some improvements, especially if such a change could compel a response from my MIA alderman.

SEE #25 ABOVE

Depends on what changes are made to the structure, function and duties. I do think that the BCC's have too much power and this is undemocratic because accountable people who have to stand for election can in some rare but important cases be over ruled by unaccountable unelected commissioners.

Q28. General: Do you believe that changes to the structure, function, and duties of the Mayor, Common Council, or BCCs could lead to better policy decisions?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	64.94	50
No	14.29	11
Neutral	20.78	16

Hard to know.

More time, resources and energy to proactive policy-making as well as more time to listen to and understand constituents' needs and concerns equals better policy.

I believe that if you don't explore options you will never know

A resounding yes on this item. I truly believe that greater staff capacity would help create better policy for all Madison residents.

I think that we should always strive to improve. However, I do not believe that the system should be totally overhauled in order to accomplish that improvement. So I have suggested modifications that maintain the system with slight changes.

Absolutely!

For Alders, the lack of time to fully study and understand issues and gather feedback can have a tremendous negative effect on the Council's performance. A certain Conditional Use Permit that I supported at Plan Commission comes to mind, if I'd understood it better I would have said no and a particularly unproductive and unfortunately very long term land use would perhaps not have been approved.

The quality of the City Staff is crucial -- and the quality of the people appointed to BCC's is so very important -- that takes a quality of leadership that goes beyond structure. My experience has been very positive -- staff and BCC members are typically exemplary.

It could

Regardless of whether one agrees with the Mayor or not, there should be more balance.

Currently, the mayor is somewhat of a dictator.

In fact, several of the suggestions will lead to worse policy decisions.

"Could" leaves a lot of room for possibilities. Things work pretty well now.

see #25

Policy decisions are the result of the majority of alderpersons supporting an issue. That will not change.

If studying this in-depth, I expect I would write much more about the wisdom of the current processes and how good policy evolves out of the countless conversations fomented in the current framework. Could that be improved? Probably, what will likely come out of the committee that's contemplated for which this survey is the beginning.

In rare cases, maybe. But, again, as a rule I think the current system works well.

Q29. General: The upcoming 2020 census is anticipated to reflect an increasingly diverse city. Are you aware of the City's on-going efforts in the Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative, which aims to eliminate racial and social inequities in municipal government?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	84.81	67
No	15.19	12

The Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative is an important undertaking that should be applauded, empowered, continued, and expanded.

Having served on the Madison Affirmative Action Commission for almost 20 years, I applaud the city's efforts.

And it is evident in this survey's questions about accessing the decision-making process at the Council and BCC level.

The whole RESJI initiative is clear as mud. It's an internal staffing thing, not something the alders and the public are encouraged to participate in or able to really discuss in any meaningful way.

Glad to hear this is an initiative already underway, but don't have much visibility.

This is a great idea although I do not know the specifics.

While I am aware of these efforts, I cannot say that I am aware of any improvements resulting from those efforts.

Not sure I knew about the social justice initiative.

It has been well publicized.

My larger concern is for the disproportionate representation of minorities in our Dane County Jail. People can't serve the city when they are locked up. I feel like the efforts have been laughable at this point in time.

Q30. General: Do you believe the current makeup of City staff, elected government officials, and BCC members accurately reflects the ethnic and racial makeup of the population of the city as well as varying business, social and economic viewpoints?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	16.88	13
No	51.95	40
Neutral	31.79	24

I'm not familiar enough with all BCC boards. In the case of the WUB, I believe the Water Utility staff and the Board together brought balance to our considerations of economic and environmental cost of water supply.

There is no reason to believe that if it doesn't "accurately" reflect the ethnic and racial makeup of the population of the city that something sinister is going on.

I don't really know

Especially not on BCCs and amongst department and division leadership.

However if we focus on whether or not the BCC reflects the city diversity, then we might miss the the real work on eliminating the disparities.

Don't know.

However, I recognize that this is an ongoing issue that will take a long, long time to adequately address.

For the most part, although the BCCs have significantly less diversity.

Generally yes. I think that we should always strive to improve. However, I think the City has made an excellent effort in this regard.

What does "accurately reflects" mean? I'm sure the proportion of black/Latino/gay/business staff, etc, does not exactly match the population. However, I think the staff, electeds, and BCC do a good job of serving the various constituencies.

This is a very simplistic answer to a very complex question.

The BCC structure inherently favors white, wealthy, downtown residents.

I think we are doing vastly better than we were a decade ago.

Too heavily biased towards friends and supporters of the mayor

I believe there are a select few elected officials who are privileged enough to serve. The role requires someone with a flexible schedule, lots of time to devote to the role, and does not provide a full salary. This means someone either has to be independently wealthy, retired, or have an extremely flexible job to serve. This is not representative. I do believe that we are improving the representativeness of city staff. The ongoing work from HR is great - and we need to take these roles and responsibilities seriously, so we can train and recruit great candidates that reflect the diversity of our city.

Elected officials are largely upper middle class. Several ethnic groups have had little to no representation on the Council. Mayors have all been white, upper middle class, and mostly men. City staff somewhat better reflects the City overall, though not so much in terms of management.

In my experience, we can do better..... and we need to keep working towards that goal. But I have been impressed at other times with the good representation in our City government --

Don't have enough information to make this decision. We should work toward ethnic/racial equality through out city government.

I say this from experience on the committee I've been involved with

Can't give blanket answer. Some areas, very accurate reflection; some, not at all. Probably more instances where they don't than where they do, but I haven't actually reviewed the data.

7

There's a flawed assumption at the root of this question. Madison is becoming increasingly diverse, as is its staff, elected officials and membership on BCCs -- which do, to the best of my knowledge, reflect its 74%white population -- but some viewpoints demand more attention than others because their need is greater. Simple membership on these lists isn't enough, hence the need to focus on Racial Equity and Social Justice by all of these levels of government.

Diversity is important, but research must be done to find qualified, hardworking people of all ethnicities and races.

We still have too many white male department heads. The council is slightly better in the gender and racial make up - but very middle class and privileged. Business interests

seem well represented, but that is not very transparent to the public and there have been several glitches in disclosures of conflicts of interests in recent years.

In my own committee, there were lots of older, standing members that had been around a long time and had limited interest or willingness to pursue new avenues of engagement (or at least weren't willing to commit the time to make improvements). Think this needs to change for sure.

Council seems overly obsessed on social engineering

Why should it?

I DO NOT HAVE THE DATA TO MAKE AN INFORMED COMMENT

But moving in a more representative direction.

I really don't know enough of the make up of city staff to comment.

Emphatically not!

Not sure, but probably not.

I have not reviewed it in years but in general the City has always done a good job.

I don't know.

CITY NEEDS MORE OUTREACH TO TAP RESIDENTS WITH VARIOUS VIEWPOINTS AND RACIAL/ETHNIC MAKEUP

I know the Civil Rights Division tracks this. I'd like to see the make up reflect the demographics of, say, 3rd graders, not just the population overall.

Also consider age diversity

I think we have improved in the last 10 years.

Q31. General: If you answered No to question 30, do you believe the current structure, function, and duties of the Mayor, Common council, or BCCs in any way contributes to this inaccurate representation?

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Yes	33.77	26
No	15.58	12
I answered Yes to Question 30	16.88	13
Neutral	33.77	26

I think it has more to do with society. That said, we should do everything possible to have a more diverse racial makeup at all levels of city staff and government.

I don't know

Would a working-class family or a single parent who might be working two jobs or on second shift realistically be able to serve on Council for \$12,000 per year? We all know the answer to that hypothetical.

I don't think these inequities can be attributed to a specific structure of government. They are built into the fabric of our society, and they must be addressed within the current or any changed government format.

I believe that the question is are you willing devote your time to represent the city and your constituents

As I discussed in Q24, there may be areas where we have hard requirements that should really be guidelines to prevent unnecessary screening out of particular types of people.

That is a hard question to answer. I believe it is more society as a whole that contributes to this issue.

BCC structure favors those with access to downtown and the flexibility to make it to 4:30 meetings.

Absolutely. See above. The Council time requirements make it impossible for many residents to serve. The ability of a Mayor to appoint all BCC members also makes them less representative - citizens are not democratically elected and Mayors can appoint or not reappoint members based on relationships or other non-accountable factors

The quasi-volunteer model for the Council makes it very difficult for people with a full time job, with or without a family, to hold the position. The model we use was developed by landed gentry to support their idea of liberty and representation, and it just doesn't apply to our world. Insofar as the Mayor is concerned, accessibility of that position is a function of a more general issue with running and funding elections - it takes a lot of work, preparation, and support. It is incumbent on everyone to strive to enable a broader range of people to be able to run for Mayor, structural changes can only go so far and would likely be limited to publicly funded elections.

Again -- I think the reality of privilege, the complexity of bias and the support (or lack of support) by individuals is critically important. As Dr. Mika Pollack says: It takes specific people in specific places doing specific actions to create specific improvements in peoples' lives. And that goes beyond the structure it takes some courage!

Not sure.

All mayors in recent memory have been committed to diversity in their appointments; meetings are held at a reasonable time in an appropriate and accessible place; internal power relationships of mayor and council are largely irrelevant to the outside world. If there's inaccurate representation, I don't know why the cause would be structural.

My response to Question 30 was "neutral" because, last time I checked, the City was doing a good job of representing "minorities" in its workforce proportional to the population, but we know that's a shifting number. It seems like white (often retired) people occupy a disproportionate number of elected and appointed positions in government and, while their age/race doesn't necessarily mean they are unaware of or unsympathetic to issues in other segments of Madison's population, it does mean these "minorities" may be less visible at the government level.

The issues around timely agendas (we need at least a weeks notice), outreach (reporters report on what happened, not what is coming up), clear agenda items with adequate information available to the public, and meetings held when people can attend are more important than many of the proposed solutions above.

I think term limits would help, and doing a broad assessment of mission/vision of the BCCs would be useful.

I think there are numerous societal issues that prevent our local gov from reflecting our city in its entirety and we're making progress. Alders themselves can be very effective in growing the diversity of the representation.

More alders improves the chance for accurate representation, Full-time alders would be attractive to more diverse candidates, but then the interests of big money would have greater power. I don't think the trade-off is worth the change. Increasing the diversity of BCCs is the best way to make city government more representative.

The mayor and the council have the job of maintaining this balance, along with concerns for securing the best candidate for getting the job done and serving the city. But it's clear we need better outreach to underrepresented communities so they know opportunities exist and that you don't have to be a rocket scientist to serve

Q32 Identification: I am a current...

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Elected Official of the City of Madison	11.39	9
Member of a BCC	41.77	33
Both	5.06	4
Neither	41.77	33

I recently moved from Madison and resigned from the WUB. I chaired the WUB for about six years and served about 8 years in total.

Public Market Development Committee

Vending oversight committee

Community Development Conference Committee and the Emerging Opportunities Grant Committee

Was Chair of Transit & Parking.

Just appointed to the new Transportation Commission. Past member of the Transit & Parking Commission. Past chair and vice chair of several BCCs

Board of Review

Building and Fire Code Board of Appeals

I was a member of the Common Council in the past, and a member of various BCCs (including as Chair) over the past 25 years. But at this moment -- none.

Landmarks Commission.

Madison Food Policy Council -- so much for anonymity.

I am a former elected official. I have applied to serve on several BCCs after retiring from the Council, but the Mayor has refused to appoint me. That may be because I supported his opponent. Anyway, my experience and knowledge of the city are being wasted.

Newly appointed to the new Transportation Commission.

former chair of Bd of Review

Housing Strategy Committee

Committee on Aging

CSC

Affirmative Action, Co-Chair City/County Homeless Issues Committee

OMSAC

I am the chair of the Disability Rights Commission

Personnel Board

Plan

Q33. Identification: I am a former...

Answer Choice	Percent	#
Elected Official of the City of Madison	21.92	16
Member of a BCC	34.25	25
Both	15.07	11
Neither	28.77	21

Water Utility Board

Lucas Dailey, former Alder (with various committee appointments). Before that for over 4 years I was Vice Chair of Board of Public Works, Vice Chair Sustainable Madison Committee, Member Long Range Transportation Committee.

PBMVC and LRTPC

Many. I can't remember

Past chair and vice chair of several BCCs (Monona Terrace Board, Economic Development Commission, South Capitol District Planning Committee, Judge Doyle Square Committee). Past member of the Transit & Parking Commission. I have participated in several other BCCs over the years.

I am a current elected official. Previously to being elected, I was a member of a BCC.

DCC

Served chair of both the Affirmative Action Commission and the Board of Public Works prior to being elected to the Madison CC.

Chair of the Early Childhood Care and Education Committee

I am Chris Schmidt, former District 11 Alder (2009-2016), former Council President (2013-2015).

I was also a member of the Equal Opportunities Commission for 16 years, and the President of the EOC for several years (until 2011). And an elected Alder for 3 terms in the 1990's.

I was on the Urban Design Commission from 2000 - 2010, and chair for 1 1/2 years.

Water Utility Board

Downtown Coordinating Committee

Formerly chair of CDA and ZBA, vice-chair of Plan.

Plan Commission. I also have served on the Board of Public Works, Inclusionary Zoning Committee, Zoning Code Rewrite Committee, and others BCCs since 1994.

downtown coordinating committee

Alders are not allowed to chair committees - I was chair of the CCOC and some of the subcommittees.

Environment

Board of Public Works

Bd of review

Library Board, Ad Hoc TIF Review Committee

ZCRAC

Commission on the Environment and Water Utility Board

and a member of numerous BCCs as a result of my status as an elected official

My dad always liked to point out that I was "the #2 man on Solid Waste.

7/

AL ALDER, PROHIBITED FROM BEING A CHAIR

Landmarks Commission

The Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Motor Vehicle Commission and the Long Range Transportation Planning Committee.

Disability Rights Commission.

Q34. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions for the Task Force:

I feel that the current system has served us well for the most part. I found that often personal and political differences got in the way of progress more than systemic issues. The best advice that I received was to argue passionately about issues, but at the same time to respect colleagues on the council.

I have limited breadth of experience in City governance, but a lot of depth at the WUB. The WU staff, the mayor, the Common Council and the WUB function well together, demonstrated by the WU weathering several crises over the past 15 years or so, but ultimately providing great value, great fire protection, and excellent water supply, to Madison residents. Madison's water system is very likely one of the best in the world.

I believe there are issues regarding BCC operations that were not touched on in this survey and would be glad to participate in a deeper look at those issues, especially regarding the issue of equity.

In 2008-09, the Council called for a study of the influence of money in local politics. The report of the Blue Ribbon Study Committee found that money was not a significant factor in shaping the outcome of Council elections (I think also Mayoral elections). In part, the committee concluded that the number of alders, their part-time positions, and relatively small pay were factors in Madison's clean elections. You may want to look at that report. Prof. Ken Mayer, who chaired that committee, would be a good resource in helping the Council look at the restructuring questions you have raised.

Reduce the number of BCC. Time limits for those that are specific to a policy/task for example 1 to 2 years

8

This task force appears to be asking good questions but there are other areas of more substantial change that don't appear to be on the agenda. Such as:

- Direct Democracy: Apart from referenda, there is substantial need and opportunity for direct public input/voting via tools like Polco.us that use voter registration data to verify users. We should make voting on your principles and shaping your government a regular occurrence.
- Technocrats: To some degree this was an implication in Question 21, and my answer there touches on this concept. We should look for areas where independent professional opinions can be given greater decision making authority. Our entire legal system is a great example of an independent, technocratic organization. We should use similar models for areas of governance where political interference is likely to stymie progress.
- Public Input: We need to update our channels for receiving public input. Where a meeting occurs is far less important than the ability for people to participate, asynchronously at least. Make it easier for people to register their opinions and be heard by city officials via social media like youtube and instagram.
- Ranked Pairs: There is a way for BCCs/staff/etc to collectively prioritize items, or select a winning option from amongst many options. We've been doing it wrong since the existence of

government. But using computers and math it's now possible. This is a powerful tool that will eventually transform politics. In the meantime it should be used asap for all BCCs/ staff prioritization and option selection. Here's a little brief on the concept, as build by Pivot Libre, an open source group of volunteer programmers I've been a part of. <http://bit.ly/2v78uf5> • Participatory Budgeting: Some amount of city funds should be available for citizens to allocate as they see fit. It's will engender public involvement in government like never seen before, not to mention actually better help communities. Note for it to work well it would need a system like Ranked Pairs/Pivot Libre to select the budget items most supported by the whole neighborhood/polity.

I am happy the City is taking such an interest in their structure and opening up a forum for feedback from individuals familiar with the process. I hope that a sincere look at a larger staffing structure for the Council will be taken. We have lost a number of good members in my relatively short-time volunteering on BCCs because of time commitments, and I believe something should be done.

I sense that many changes considered are motivated by the bad relationship between the current mayor and the council

Thoughtful consideration for progressive change - but not change just for the sake of change.

Please keep in mind what the City's main jobs are: police, fire, library, parks, streets (trash, snow removal), road construction and maintenance. There are things that should be done, but just aren't appropriate for a municipality.

none

I believe the two-year term for Alder is too short. I would support a three-year term with 1/3 of the council being elected every year or a four-year term with half the council being elected every two years .

I think the work of this taskforce is critically important. There are so many structural ways in which we privilege the voices of only some residents over others with our current structure - from the way we give official responsibilities to unelected neighborhood associations for development review processes to how alders are expected to work 20-30 hours per week, but make only a stipend.

I'm willing to help the Task Force in anyway possible.

Urban Design Commission needs to be reworked. City Land Use Approval process needs fixing, as it has become an overwhelming process. I have been involved with it for 40 years and have seen massive changes.

Thanks for taking this on! Really important to the city!

This process began because Alders met in 2011 and identified a need to re-evaluate their job description, from the staff support they have to their compensation. We knew we were a select, privileged group and that that exclusivity was a problem. Other issues with respect to balance of power do fall out from that, but I hope that at the end this shortfall is addressed. A number of politically active individuals will bring their personal missions forward as priorities, but several of those issues have been examined and resolutions attempted, which is important information for the Task Force to have.

Including people -- the residents of Madison -- in a real way with their City government is crucial. The turnout in elections needs to be increased as the basis of all representative government -- and I believe that RANKED CHOICE VOTING will involve more people from more perspectives in our electoral process -- we can follow the lead of Minneapolis and St Paul, MN!! It seems that the low turnout in local elections is a crisis -- and I would focus energy on that front. AND, making sure that the Common Council members represent a reasonable number of residents -- such as 10,000 or less. THEN we can build a strong, local democracy!! Thanks for asking all these great questions!!

I was also an employee of the City for 35 years.

I believe the goal should be to provide the best service and employees possible rather than having diversity regardless of whether people are competent or not.

Very good set of questions. Some of the ideas are bad, but the questions were good.

I'd like to see the problems you are trying to solve better defined. I'd also like to see this survey done after there is public discussion and input and other solutions besides the ones listed are considered. I think the perceived problems are not solved by this list of old ideas and pet peeves.

I'm very pleased to see this Task Force effort is underway! Unfortunately I moved away a few months back and will be unable to participate further, but definitely enjoyed my time service the City and hope this will further improve its engagement with the community at the local government level.

Thank you for doing this! It's a testament to our city's care and keeping of the democratic process!

Working for hundreds of municipalities for 40 years, I offer that the sharing of political power is inherently complex and many participants may be unhappy with their share of power. This will continue regardless of the precise structure of government. I think the current arrangements have usually resulted in wise decisions. I like living in a complex

and evolving community that takes its time about big decisions. I can live with decision-making delays much more readily than rushed decisions.

Most committee meetings are a waste of time for the well-meaning and talented members. Members are not instructed about their powers to recommend modifications of the matters before them. I know of only one committee that established an a policy agenda and then sought to implement it.

Don't change for the sake of change. Identify what is not working and what you hope to achieve.

Thanks for your careful consideration of how to create the best governance model to represent our growing and increasingly diverse city

My comments are colored by my extensive experience in dealing with development, design and transportation issues being passed over after leaving the council. What was ignored is the extraordinary commitment a former elected official has for the city, sacrificed on the alter of politics, personal pique and/or caprice. Who knows?

BIG UNDERTAKING, BUT CONFIDENT IN THE MEMBERSHIP TACKLING THIS TASK

We have to do a better job getting information out to the residents of all of Madison about the role of BCCs and the importance of their voices. At the same time we need to make participation in BCCs and the process more easily accessible for people with families, with limited income, etc...

I think the guiding principles of your work should be representation and accessibility. Accessibility to the government process, but also to appointments and elected service. Representation in terms of everyone being having a representative that answers to them, but also in terms of the diversity of elected and appointed bodies. You should also consider how what you do may impact the role of money in local politics - currently, aldermanic races are won by knocking on doors, while city-wide races are won by raising money. Finally, there is some research available about the impact of various types of government on representation, and you can learn from the experience of other cities.

Please reduce the size of the number of commissions, and empower the existing groups. There are too many and they overlap too much.

The city goes through this kind of thing every five years or so and nothing much changes. And that's fine. The current system is okay. If I had my preferences I'd reduce the number of city committees, populate a handful of the key committees with alders only, make all citizen committees advisory to the council, give the council president authority to appoint council members to their committees and give the mayor a cabinet form of government. But I don't think any of those things is absolutely needed.

Resident of Madison from 1984 to 2011. I am currently a resident of Evansville, and Chair of Evansville's Historic Preservation Commission.

Q35. If you wish to address the Task Force at a future meeting, please provide your contact information below. Thank You!

lkbellman@aol.com

Tim Gruber timothy_gruber@yahoo.com (608)338-3840

They could contact me if they wish

Judy Olson judyolson518@att.net 608-280-1240

No, thank you. Good luck.

Lucas Dailey, lucasdailey@gmail.com, 608 301-5714.

Ben Van Pelt 306 W Main St, Apt 221 Madison, WI 53703 vanpelt@uwalumni.com 815-474-3973

garypoulson@gmail.com

Only if they have questions or are curious about the perspective of a long serving council member. Ken golden

Ann Kovich at annelizabethkovich@gmail.com

7

district9@cityofmadison.com

n/a

Sara Eskrich sara.eskrich@gmail.com

Joe Clausius 18 Clarendon Court Madison, WI 53704 608-244-5066

Jim Glueck Glueck Architects glueckarch@sbcglobal.net

Julia Kerr Julia.kerr@sbcglobal.net 608-260-0046

chris@chrisschmidt.org, 608-239-0940 For some reason my initial letter inviting me to this survey did not make it to my hands, so I appreciate the reminder I received.

Bert G. Zipperer bgzipperer@gmail.com 608.556.5355

stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.net 608-698-1335

Perhaps, and the Mayor's Office has this information.

I would like to be contacted about when and where the Task Force meets. I am not sure if I would want to address the group. anitaweier@netscape.net

Mike Slavney 4824 Sherwood Road, Madison, WI 53711 sherwood@slavneys.net

willing to participate in future meetings on this subject. Jon Standridge 1011 Edgewood Ave. Madison,, WI 53711 608-669-8770 jonstandridge66@gmail.com

Sue Bauman sjmbauman@aol.com

Paul Reilly, 1218 Alexandria Lane, Madison, WI. 53718 608-221-0274
prreilly@charter.net

Here's the information that no BCC appointee's are called upon to provide in full: Steve Holtzman 105 Glen Hwy Madison, WI 53705 608-212-1919
steve_holtzman@hotmail.com

Satya Rhodes-Conway satyarhodesconway@gmail.com 608-320-0254

Dave Cieslewicz I don't really want to address the Task Force but I'm fine with the Task Force knowing how I responded. It'll allow them to disregard it.

Scott Resnick, scott.j.resnick@gmail.com

Mark Shahan 607 Piper Drive Madison 53711-1338 mnshahan@gmail.com

ken.opin@gmail.com