

# City of San Antonio



## AGENDA

### Charter Review Commission

Thursday, April 25, 2024

5:30 PM

Central Library, 600  
Soledad, Auditorium

---

A full list of Charter Review Commission meeting dates, times and locations can be found at <https://SASpeakUp.com/CharterReviewCommission>.

The Charter Review Commission will meet at Central Library, 600 Soledad, Auditorium beginning at 5:30 PM. Once a quorum is established, the Charter Review Commission will take up the following items no sooner than the designated times.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

1. Approval of the minutes from the Charter Review Commission meeting on April 11, 2024.

#### **Public Comments**

Individuals may sign up for live public comment the day of the meeting at the meeting location up to 15 minutes before the start of the meeting or prior using SASpeakUp up to 12:00 pm the day of the meeting. Those unable to attend the meeting may submit written comment by calling 311 or using SASpeakUp at <https://www.saspeakup.com/CharterReviewCommission> until 4:00 PM on the business day before the meeting. Comments may be provided in English or Spanish and interpretation services will be provided with advanced notice. Voicemail comments can be left at 210.207.6889. Voice messages will be limited to 300 words transcribed. Comments that do not pertain to the agenda items will not be presented to the Commission.

#### **Briefing on the following items:**

2. Briefing and discussion of the working recommendations from the following subcommittees:
  - a. City Council compensation and term length
  - b. City Manager tenure and compensation

- c. Council districts and redistricting
3. Discussion of subcommittee assignments and issues under consideration by Charter Review Commission including the process used by the Commission to make their final recommendations.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

At any time during the meeting, the Charter Review Commission may meet in executive session for consultation with the City Attorney's Office concerning attorney client matters under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.

### **ACCESS STATEMENT**

**The City of San Antonio ensures meaningful access to City meetings, programs and services by reasonably providing: translation and interpretation, materials in alternate formats, and other accommodations upon request. To request these services call (210) 207-7068 or [iliana.castillodaily@sanantonio.gov](mailto:iliana.castillodaily@sanantonio.gov). For individuals with hearing loss contact Relay Texas 711. Providing at least 72 hours' notice will help to ensure availability.**

For additional information on the Charter Review Commission, please visit  
<https://www.sa.gov/Directory/Departments/CAO/City-Charter/Charter-Review-Commission>

Posted  
on: 04/18/2024 04:13 PM

**State of Texas**  
**County of Bexar**  
**City of San Antonio**



**Meeting Minutes**  
**Charter Review Commission**  
Central Library Building  
600 Soledad Street  
San Antonio, Texas 78205

**Commission Members**

Bonnie Prosser Elder, Co-Chair | David Zammiello, Co-Chair  
Elva Pai Adams | Josh Baugh | Luisa Casso | Mike Frisbie  
Pat Frost | Frank Garza | Martha Martinez-Flores  
Naomi Miller | Bobby Perez | Shelley Potter  
Dwayne Robinson | Rogelio Saenz | Maria Salazar

**Thursday, April 11, 2024**

**5:30 PM**

**Central Library Building**

The Charter Review Commission convened a regular meeting at Central Library, 600 Soledad, Auditorium at 5:32 PM. Deputy City Clerk Aurora Perkins took the Roll Call noting a quorum with the following Members present:

**PRESENT:** 13 – Prosser Elder, Zammiello, Baugh, Casso, Garza, Frisbie, Frost, Martinez-Flores, Miller, Perez, Potter, Robinson, Saenz

**ABSENT:** Adams, Salazar

**Approval of Minutes**

1. Approval of the minutes from the March 21, 2024 Charter Review Commission meeting.

Commissioner Perez moved to approve. Commissioner Garza seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** Prosser Elder, Zammiello, Baugh, Garza, Frisbie, Frost, Martinez-Flores, Miller, Perez, Potter, Robinson, Saenz

**Absent:** Adams, Casso, Salazar

## Public Comments

Betty Eckert spoke in opposition of 4 term for City Councilmember Terms unless there was language to address removal process not including for petition.

Raymond Zavala spoke in spoke in opposition of removal of statutes in Charter for holding contractors accountable for work and spoke of his concerns of fraud waste and abuse on recycled bins.

Robert A Abraham, a San Antonio Housing Commissioner, spoke in support of salary increases for Mayor, City Council and City Manager. He noted that they managed a \$3.4 billion dollar organization, and their salaries should reflect that.

Ryan Hollins, Dr Chyssa Delgado and Christina Martinez spoke in support of increased funding of 20% of growth revenue funds be used for youth and child education programs at all levels of education. They stressed the importance of education programs and impact to the overall community.

Mary Bureau spoke in support of establishment of Ethics Officer position and a separate ethics review board outside of current staff in order to properly address ethic issues. She supported three-year terms for council members.

Evita Morin, CEO of Rise Recovery, spoke in of support for advocacy for increased funding for quality programs for youth and young adults training and development programs.

Keith Toney, former City Councilmember, spoke in support of funding for increased funding for youth educational programs, increased salary compensation and unlimited term limits for City Manager. He also supported increased compensation for City Councilmembers and Mayor.

Guillermo Vasquez, AFSCME Union representative, spoke of concerns for equal representation and compensation for uniformed personnel and City employees.

Andrea Flores of Move Texas spoke in support of changes to agenda changes to address autonomy and equity for gender neutral language. She stressed the importance of gender inclusivity in City Charter language.

Anthony Cruz spoke in support of expansion of district seats in order to gain fair and equal representation for all residents. He also spoke of removal of charter language for allowance for city workers to speak freely on agenda items.

Evelyn Delgado, CEO of Healthy Futures Texas, spoke in support of use of 20% of growth revenue to be used for youth and young adult education and programs.

Dylan Villalon of Move Texas advocated for updating of City Charter language to gender inclusive language which would set precedent for the City community and other organizations.

Diann Andy, League of Women Voters, spoke in support of rank choice voting for the state and City. She submitted a letter to the Commission for review.

Barbara Robles Ramamurthy, founder of Teku Family and Community Mental Health, spoke in support of increased budgeting for youth and child programs to be funded by 20% of growth revenue funding. She also spoke in support for updating current language to gender inclusive language in the Charter.

William Whiting spoke in support of City Charter amendment to allow for ranked choice voting in the City of San Antonio elections. He provided materials supporting his comments to the Commission for their review.

Ana Trevino with Texas Rising spoke in opposition of increasing tenure for City Manager and rather increase the salary of City employees in order to achieve pay equity.

Chris Baecker of Infuse SA spoke in opposition of increased salary for Mayor and City Councilmembers and that the position is not considered full-time position. He supported the movement of City Council meetings to evenings or weekends for more residents to attend. He did not support term limits for council nor increased salary compensation for City Manager. He supported revision of Section 4 of the Charter related to petitions.

Lee Denning spoke in support of gender equity language within the City Charter.

Ananda Tomas, Executive Director of Action SA, expressed concern of limited time to address commission. She spoke to concerns of increasing City Manager pay and not that of lowest paid City employees. She did not support the removal of term limits for City Manager.

Eda Saenz, CEO of Boys and Girls Club of San Antonio, spoke in support increased funding for youth and young adult programs and services be funded from 20% of City growth revenue.

**Briefing on the following items:**

2. Presentation from staff related to public engagement.

Assistant Director of Communications and Engagement Laura Mayes provided an overview of outreach for the Charter Review Commission. She noted that the primary goals of the engagement were to encourage residents to participate in public comment process and understand the role of the Charter in the City. She reviewed the various ways for the general public to participate included attendance at Charter Review meetings, through SASpeakUp and by submitting comments with 3-1-1 system. She introduced Luke Simmons, Public Communications Manager, and Melissa Escamilla, Engagement Manager, to review the Communications and Engagement staff efforts for outreach and engagement for the Charter Review meetings.

Simmons provided an overview of the staff communications efforts which included media materials such as press releases/requests for coverage and coordinated media interviews with Commission co-chairs. He noted that efforts also included social media videos and social media ads on City social media channels. Simmons spoke to grassroots communication efforts including City-wide text messages via the City's text notification system, discussions with local partner organizations, email outreach to City lists and stakeholder groups, distribution of flyers and digital signage at City facilities and kiosks.

Simmons mentioned that engagement was first started by a press release on February 28, 2024, to

inform the community of the Charter Review process and assigned commission. He noted that live interviews were also conducted in English and Spanish on television and radio. Simmons stated that request for coverage were sent out for every Charter Review Commission meeting which not only reminded the community of meetings and allowed for low-cost media coverage from all sources of media channels.

Simmons noted that staff utilized social media posts to expand coverage of the Commission meetings and subjects covered. He provided an overview of over 76 social media posts and metrics from expanded sharing of those posts. Simmons spoke to social media videos created to educate the public on City Charter review process, obtain input and next steps in revising the charter by including as election ballot item. Simmons stated that social media ads were also developed on Meta and YouTube for meeting coverage and topics.

Simmons spoke to City-side text messages for those enrolled to receive text updates on City of San Antonio events and issues. He reviewed other speaking engagements coordinated by staff to include events with the South Texas Business Partnership, San Antonio Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, San Antonio Business Coalition and the “bigcitysmallcity” podcast.

Escamilla spoke to communication efforts via email that were distributed on March 1 and March 28, 2024, established lists collected from Neighborhood Engagement briefs, associations and organizations registry, City Departmental lists and chambers of commerce.

Escamilla provided an overview of digital engagement conducted by staff to include email established lists and contacts. She stated that emails were issued on March 6 and April 3, 2024, reaching over 19,000 individuals. Escamilla spoke to digital signage campaign throughout the City’s downtown area which included kiosks located at City Tower, City Hall and 26 IKE locations. She added that flyer distribution was conducted at 70 locations throughout the city to include libraries, council districts, community centers and senior centers both in English and Spanish with total distribution of 2,500.

## DISCUSSION

Co-Chair Zammiello spoke to the importance of outreach and communications and thanked staff on their efforts of engagement to the public about the Charter Review process.

Commissioner Casso stated that it had been very helpful to the Commission on the sharing of the communications and that she supported increased outreach and communication efforts.

Co-Chair Zammiello asked what other efforts would be conducted in the upcoming two months. Simmons stated that similar efforts already conducted would continue and that staff welcomed input and recommendations from the Commission on future efforts.

Co-Chair Prosser Elder expressed her support of staff efforts. Commissioner Potter echoed her support of communications efforts. Co-Chair Prosser-Elder stressed the importance of non-digital communications and outreach to make sure digital divide concerns were addressed.

This item was for briefing purposes only.

3. Briefing and discussion of the working recommendations from the following subcommittees:
  - a. Language modernization
  - b. Ethics
  - c. City Council compensation and term length

- a. Language Modernization

Commissioner Saenz provided an overview of Language Modernization Subcommittee charge which was to review whether the Charter should be generally amended to update its language to reflect current processes, acknowledgments, and roles more accurately. He added that the subcommittee was also charged with reviewing the Special Meeting Section of the City Charter (Section 11) and evaluated language that provided for special meetings of the City Council, and how those meetings are should differ in purpose, use and timing from the current policy making process of Council Consideration Requests (CCR).

Saenz stated that the subcommittee had met twice since the March 4, 2024, presentation to include meeting with the Human Resources Department and reviewed additional provisions of the Charter submitted by Human Resources, Public Utilities, Finance and Budget to address their charge.

Saenz stated that under Article VI: Civil Services Provisions and Human Resources Department that the subcommittee reviewed 10 provisions and that of those eight had recommended revisions with 17 total suggested amendments.

Saenz mentioned that the subcommittee reviewed the entire City Charter and had 12 provisions recommended for revisions and 18 total suggested amendments for language covering Finance, Budget, and Public Utilities.

Saenz spoke to subcommittee analysis on Article VI, Section 70: Civil Service Provisions under Human Resources recommendations included removal of outdated provisions authorizing investigations at Commission, Council or management initiative, which has not been exercised in over 15 years and already within authority of Human Resources. He added that under various sections of Article VI, it was recommended to change Personnel Director to Human Resource Director throughout the section and remove language associated with personnel lists for promotion, probationary reporting and certifications which had not been practiced in decades.

Saenz reviewed recommendations for removal of outdated language associated with unused provisions requiring written notice of suspensions or other disciplinary actions which did not apply to civilian employees and language pertaining to Civil Service meeting requirements related to disciplinary appeals.

Saenz stated that under Article VI Section 78 – Provisions, that the Human Resources staff nor the subcommittee did not have any recommendations regarding employee participation in general elections, and that this could be addressed in future Charter Review Commissions and that recommendations would be a substantial change to the Charter.

Saenz reviewed recommend revisions of outdated provisions to sections addressing powers and

duties of the Finance Department which were now completed by other departments such as Office of Management and Budget and City Council Offices. He spoke other recommendations addressing outdated language in Article VI and VII related to budget and public utilities to reflect updated State or County requirements or allowances.

Saenz spoke to the subcommittee recommendations to the City Charter, Section 11 associated with Special Meetings by Written Request which currently stated that a special meeting could be called if three councilmembers requested in writing. He noted that the standard to agendaize an item was through a Council Consideration Request (CCR) which required five councilmember signatures. He stated that a Council special meeting request had only been used three times in the last 15 years and were reserved to be used by City Manager and Office of the City Attorney to address emergency situations or meetings not on the regular Wednesday or Thursday schedule.

Saenz provided an overview of feedback received in the conducted meetings and through SASpeakUp supporting no change in Section 11, citing transparency, democracy and public engagement. He stated that feedback impacted the subcommittees recommendations for Sections 11 and 78 and that further changes would be best suited for a full Charter Review Commission study and analysis which could lead to substantive changes and individual propositions on a ballot.

Saenz stated that the subcommittee supported to maintain recommendations made on March 4, 2024, except those related to Special meetings. Under Special Meetings, he spoke to the subcommittee's recommendation of no amendments other than striking calling a meeting by the City Clerk, as the City Manager's Office and City Attorney's Office now manage. He added that changing the purpose of a special meeting would require a review by the full Commission.

## DISCUSSION

Commissioner Garza reiterated the charge of the subcommittee was to make modernization of general language and that the entire commission would be charged to address larger issues. He stated that the subcommittee stressed that it was easier for a special council meeting to be called by three members and it was more difficult to put an item on an agenda. Co-Chair Zammiello spoke to the worthiness of discussion by the full commission on the issue of special meetings.

Commissioner Frost asked for clarification on the changes to the general language. Saenz provided clarification. Co-Chair Zammiello asked if there was a red-line draft of proposed edited changes. Saenz confirmed that a red-line version was being kept so to monitor all recommended changes.

Commissioner Perez asked for clarification to the removal of the language of removal of the "City Clerk" putting the item on the agenda.

Commissioner Casso asked for clarification on the items being considered by the full commission and how the subcommittee subject matter experts provided recommendations. Garza stated that the subcommittee was charged with review of topics as requested by the mayor and that the entire commission would make their recommendations to the Mayor and Staff. Co-Chair Zammiello clarified the process for review and rendering of commission recommendations.

b. Ethics



Ethics Subcommittee Chair Frisbie provided an overview of the Ethics Subcommittee recommendations about Ethics Officer, Ethics Review Board (ERB) and other proposed recommendations. Frisbie stated that the charge of the Ethics Subcommittee was to determine if an Ethics Officer position should be appointed as an independent ethics auditor with a legal background. He noted that currently the position was held within the City Auditor's Office.

Frisbie spoke to the ERB and whether it should be autonomous with independent oversight and power to compel testimony and whether additional recommendations would strengthen the effectiveness, authority and/or jurisdiction of the ERB.

Frisbie reviewed the resource investment and research conducted by the subcommittee and feedback received in reviewing their charge. He noted that information was requested on time spent on ethics training and that staff noted that 29 hours of formal ethics training was provided to City Council, boards and commissions, and staff across the City in 2023.

Frisbie provided an overview on the ERB structure under the City Charter and stated that the ERB, coupled with the Compliance Auditor, was an overall best practice model and that Section 16 of the Charter outlined specific cause is required to remove a member of the ERB.

Frisbie reviewed the research and conclusions of the Ethics subcommittee and noted that the regarding "conflicts of interest", the Ethics Code contains several sections that address conflicts of interest in a variety of ways, but the Charter did not have language that addressed it directly. Due to this, he spoke to subcommittee recommendation to include high level statement that addresses the City's principles regarding conflicts of interest.

Frisbie reviewed the subcommittee recommendation on the possible extension of look-back to Council members full tenure would conflict with existing statutes of limitation under state law for same offenses, and thus the subcommittee would no longer consider.

Frisbie mentioned that the subcommittee did not recommend the appointment of an independent Ethics Auditor with a legal background. He stated that the recommendation was to leave the Ethics Auditor position as it was and noted that the current structure fostered a balance between independence and collaboration.

Frisbie stated that additional recommendations would strengthen the effectiveness, authority and/or jurisdiction of the board which included a higher-level definition of "conflict of interest" and strengthen autonomy of ERB with increased funding in budget, eliminate term limits due to the existing process available for appointment of new members if desired.

Frisbie reviewed the subcommittee next steps which included continuation of seeking feedback from the public and the entire Commission and ultimately finalize recommendations for Charter languages changes.

## DISCUSSION

Commissioner Potter requested to discuss the subcommittee's review for balance of the ERB.

Frisbie discussed the importance of accessibility and structure in the maintaining of balance.

Co-Chair Prosser-Elder asked for clarification on the current structure of the Ethics Auditor and if they should have a legal background. Frisbie stated that it was not a recommendation that the position have a legal background and that the current position was in the Auditor's Office and showed to be effective. Garza noted that the current position could at any time work with the City Attorney's Office to gain legal stances and guidance.

Commissioner Casso commended the subcommittee on their recommendations and asked how the recommendations were arrived. Frisbie stated that the process started with large amount of research and evolved due to feedback from subject matter experts and current structure.

c. City Council Compensation and Term Limits

Subcommittee Chair Casso spoke to the charge of the City Council Compensation and Term Length subcommittee which was to determine whether Mayor and City Council terms should be extended to four years with limit of two years and in staggered structure. She reviewed resources provided by City staff to include benchmarking of comparable cities and that the subcommittee had met seven times to review research and data.

Casso spoke to the subcommittee's action plan which included the review of term limits in comparable cities, interview of former council members, determination of areas of discussion as related to term limits, and discussion of implications if there were changes to term lengths and term limits. She noted that the cities benchmarked were Dallas, Fort Worth, El Paso, Austin, Phoenix, San Jose, Philadelphia, San Deigo and Corpus Christi and reviewed the term limits for each city.

Casso reviewed the benefits and shortcomings of research findings of expanding term limits to four years which included comparing frequency of election cycles, focus on governance, completion of capital projects, commitment of candidates and impact of turnover.

Casso spoke to the subcommittee's evaluation of three different term cycle options (Simultaneous Concurrent, Staggered and Hybrid) and the benefits and shortcomings of each option. For each option, Casso discussed costs, continuity of business, drawing of terms and turnover.

Casso stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to change Council terms from two years to four years, run concurrently and be limited to eight years total.

Casso reviewed the subcommittee's charge of reviewing the compensation of Mayor and City Council and input from subject matter experts (SME) on compensation, and that it was determined that additional research was needed, and that subcommittee would provide their recommendation at the April 25, 2024, meeting.

She reviewed the subcommittee's action plan for reviewing Council compensation which would include the review of charters and Council compensation models of other cities, interview of former council members, analyzation of compensation data and discussion of options with staff and SME.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Garza asked when considering four-year terms did the subcommittee take into consideration House Bill 3613 and its impact to census and requirements of elections. Assistant City Attorney Iliana Daily clarified that the house bill only applied to staggered terms.

Garza asked if the subcommittee considered the recall component of 10% being required and if appropriate. Commissioner Baugh stated that the subcommittee did review the issue after data was provided by City staff.

Frisbie stated that he initially supported staggered terms but the more the issue was studied he supports concurrent 4-year terms. Co-Chair Zammiello supported the inclusion of data gathered by staff and as reviewed by the subcommittee.

Miller asked how the expanding to 4-year terms would impact the current Council tenure. Daily stated that staff would draft the language on how to proceed with the implementation. Commissioner Baugh stated that the subcommittee did discuss implementation and added that the review would consider 1st versus 2nd term candidates. Co-Chair Prosser-Elder stated that the process would be refined and that even a drawing of straws process could take place.

Casso thanked the subcommittee and staff for their input and work conducted in the review of Council term limits.

4. Discussion of subcommittee assignments and issues to be considered by Charter Review Commission including future meetings calendar.

Co-Chair Zammiello reviewed the proposed roadmap of remaining meetings and subjects to be reviewed on May 6, 2024, and May 9, 2024, and then final discussion and actions by the Commission set for May 20, 2024, and May 23, 2024.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

## **Approved**

---

*Bonnie Prosser Elder, Co-Chair*

---

*David Zammiello, Co-Chair*

## **Respectfully Submitted**

---

*Debbie Racca-Sittre, City Clerk*

# **Charter Review Commission**



**April 25, 2024**  
**Central Library**

# Agenda

---



- Approval of Minutes
- Public Comment
- Proposed Recommendations:
  - City Council compensation
  - City Manager compensation and tenure
  - Council districts and redistricting
- Process Check-In
- Adjournment

---

# Public Comment

## Subcommittee Proposed Recommendations

---

- **City Manager Compensation & Tenure**
- **Council Districts & Redistricting**
- **City Council Compensation**

# Meeting Protocols



Commission members are encouraged to share their insight, knowledge and experience and in doing so should understand and appreciate that others may have an equally relevant, important but different point of view that deserves respect.

Commission members should:

- recognize that their colleagues are individuals with a wide variety of backgrounds, personalities, values, opinions, and goals who have chosen to volunteer their time to this important effort.
- be mindful of the content, tone and delivery of their words while asking a question or making a comment to others involved in this process.
- respect the public and other members' speaking time.
- practice civility, professionalism and decorum in discussions and debate.



# **Charter Review Commission**



**City Manager Tenure & Compensation Subcommittee  
Proposed Recommendation  
April 25, 2024**

# Agenda

---



- Charge
- Resource Investment
- Feedback
- Research and Conclusions
- Proposed Recommendation
- Next Steps

# City Manager Tenure and Compensation



## Charge

**City Manager Tenure** - Whether the City Council should have the authority and discretion to hire, manage, and determine the length of service of the City Manager

**City Manager Compensation** - Whether the City Council should determine the compensation of the City Manager so that market and competitive indicators are taken into account

## Chair:

- Pat Frost

## Members:

- Elva Pai Adams
- Martha Martinez-Flores
- Naomi Miller
- Dwayne Robinson

# Resource Investment



- Subcommittee met since preliminary recommendation
- Additional comparator information circulated that include
  - Updates to the City of Dallas and City of Austin
  - Updates to the comparator Chief Executive Survey of government entities in Bexar County
    - Response to question about whether other governmental entities afford discretion to their respective boards to determine CEO compensation and tenure

# Feedback

---



- Received public comment
- Subcommittee discussed continued consensus decision to make City of San Antonio competitive among comparators
- Subcommittee did not change recommendation

# Research and Conclusions



- CPS HR, national Human Resources consulting firm:
  - Surveyed other Bexar County governmental entities for additional information and any updates
    - Conclusion: For those that responded, Boards maintain discretion to determine compensation and tenure for their CEO or equivalent
  - Surveyed comparator Texas cities and other metro area City Manager form of government for any updates
    - Conclusion: Austin hired a permanent City Manager and El Paso named an interim City Manager. Information updated in the comparator chart. City of San Antonio cannot compete with the cap in place.

# City of San Antonio 2024 Chief Executive Survey



Local Organizations										
	City of San Antonio	Brooks City Base*	CPS Energy*	Port San Antonio*	SAWS*	University Health System*	VIA *	Alamo College District*	University of Texas - SA*	Bexar County* (Population 2 M)
	City Manager	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	President & CEO	CEO	District Chancellor	President - Univ of TX	County Manager
FY24 Budget	\$3.7 Billion	\$15M	\$1.9B (does not include \$1.1B fuel budget)	\$76.1M	\$1.02 B	\$3B	\$390.8M	\$503.9M	\$671M	\$2.96B
Number of Employees	13,703	35	3,370	107	1,937	10,373	2,128	6,000	7,000	5,304
Tenure in Job	5 yrs	10 yrs 8 mos	1 yr	5 yrs 10 mos	15 yrs	19 yrs	10 yrs	5yrs	6 yrs	12 yrs
Tenure in Organization	29 yrs 8 mos	10 yrs 8 mos	11 yrs	9yrs 4mos	15 yrs	35 yrs 11 mos	11 yrs	25 yrs	6 yrs	27 yrs
Executive level experience	18 yrs 5 mos	10 yrs 8 mos	No Response	27 yrs	No Response	35 yrs 11 mos	25 yrs	12 yrs	18 yrs	20 yrs
Board approves salary & tenure	Yes, Consistent with City Charter caps	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Base Salary	\$374,400	\$367,500	\$655,000	\$413,438	\$593,838	\$950,000	\$380,625	\$400,000	\$700,301	\$284,124
Projected Salary Increase and Frequency	Increase consistent with City Charter, frequency subject to City Council annual budget process	Reviewed annually, typically COLA based on market	Reviewed annually	Reviewed annually, eligible for 5% increase based on performance	At Board's discretion	Difficult to speculate Increase; Awarded annually	No anticipated increase information; If increase occurs - Oct. 1	None- contract renews in 2024	Reviewed annually during Board of Regents Meeting	Reviewed at Contract Extension Contract expires in 2024
<b>Incentives/Allowances</b>										
Communications	\$900	\$1,800	\$0	Cell phone provided	\$1,800	N/A	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0
Vehicle	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$7,200	\$6,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$0	\$0
Insurance Benefits	Eligible for same benefits as staff (civilians)	Eligible for same benefits as staff Employer pays for all costs (\$23,233)	Eligible for same benefits as staff	Medical, dental & vision for CEO & dependent Employer paid all (\$20,397)	Eligible for same benefits as staff	Eligible for same benefits as staff	Eligible for same benefits as staff	No Response	Eligible for same benefits as staff	Eligible for same benefits as staff (civilians)
Employer Provided Health Savings Account Deposit	\$9,300	\$4,300	\$750	\$0	No Response	Not Provided	No Response	No Response	\$0	\$0
Bonus	None	Up to 15% of base salary Max Value = \$55,125	None	Incentive: Eligible for up to 30% of base, for 2024 = \$124,031 Max Retention: \$30,000 Max	Deferred Incentive (Pending Clarification)	Determined by Board (Last Award: \$200,000)	\$0	No Response	Determined by Board of Regents as applicable	\$0
Bonus Frequency	None	Annually	None	Incentive annually reviewed, eligible for up to 30% of Base Salary based on performance	No bonus; eligible for deferred incentive	Annually	None	No Response	Annually	None
<b>Projected Annual Compensation**</b>	<b>\$390,600</b>	<b>\$463,958</b>	<b>\$655,750</b>	<b>\$599,866</b>	<b>\$602,838</b>	<b>\$1,156,000</b>	<b>\$380,625</b>	<b>\$414,000</b>	<b>\$700,301</b>	<b>\$284,124</b>
<b>** assumes maximum incentives available</b>										
<b>Other Information</b>										
Retirement	6% Mandatory Employee Contribution 12% Employer Contribution (TMRS) Value = \$44,928	2-to-1 match up to 6% of salary Max Value= \$25,358	5% employer contribution Value= \$21,373	Defined Benefit 401(a) FY23 Employer paid \$9,250	3% Mandatory Employee Contribution 3% Employer Contribution (TMRS) Value= \$17,815	Pension Plan (2% Employee Contribution) Eligible for Defined Benefit at age 65	6% Mandatory Employee Contribution, 6% Employer Match Value= \$22,837.50	No Response	May participate in TRS or ORP plan	7% Employee Contribution 14% Employer Contribution TCORS Value= \$39,777
Employer Contributions to Deferred Compensation	Employer contributes max allowed IRS Limit Under 50 = \$23,000 Over 50 = \$30,500 Value = \$30,500	Not Provided	\$0	Match of 50% to IRS Limit Under 50 = \$23,000 Over 50 = \$30,500 Max Value= \$15,250	IRS Limit Under 50 = \$23,000 Over 50 = \$30,500 Value= \$30,500	Employer contributes half of IRS limits to 457 Savings Plan Max Value = \$15,250	Employee can participate	No Response	Depends if TRS or ORP plan	\$0

\*Data Verified by CPS HR Revised 4/18/24

# City of San Antonio 2024 Chief Executive Survey



	City of San Antonio (Population 1.5 M)	City of Austin* (Population .9 M)	City of Dallas* (Population 1.3 M) Interim	City of Fort Worth* (Population .9 M)	City of Phoenix* (Population 1.7 M)	City of El Paso* (Population .7 M) Interim	City of Corpus Christi* (Population .3 M)	City of San Diego* (Population 1.4 M) Chief Operating Officer	City of Charlotte, NC* (Population .9 M)	City of Arlington* (Population .4 M)	City of Plano* (Population .3 M)	City of Larado* (Population .3 M)	City of Oklahoma City (Population .7 M)	City of San Jose* (Population 1 M)	City of Lubbock* (Population .3 M)	City of Midland* (Population .15 M)
FY24 Budget	\$3.7B	\$5.5B	\$4.6B	\$2.5B	\$6.75B	\$1.1B	\$1.5B	\$5.2B	\$3.3 B	\$672M	\$811M	\$905M	\$1.9B	\$4.5B	\$960M	\$400M
Number of Employees	13,703	16,000	13,469	7,219	17,690	7,111	4,091	12,949	8,195	3,000	3,700	3,500	5,108	7,040	2,500	1,200
Tenure in Job	5 yrs	Effective 5/6/24	Pending	9 yrs&6 mos	2.25yrs	8 mos	4 yrs&10 mos	14 mos	7yrs&2mos	12 yrs	5 yrs	1 yr	5 yrs	2 yrs&7 mos	7 yrs	8 mos
Tenure in Organization	29yrs&8mos	0 yrs	Pending	9 yrs&6mos	24 yrs	10yrs 1 mo	4 yrs&0mos	14 mos	7yrs&2mos	31 yrs 10 mos	24yrs	1 yr	31 yrs	32 years	7 yrs	8 mos
Executive level experience	1.8 yrs&5mos	26yrs 2 mos	Pending	29 yrs 6 mos	18 yrs	6 yrs&4mo	19 yrs&4mos	16 yrs	23 yrs	27yrs 1 mos	17yrs	26yrs&6 mos	19 yrs	25 years	18 yrs	18yrs
<b>Base Salary</b>	\$374,400	\$470,018	\$367,683	\$398,127	\$415,542	\$328,000	\$372,000	\$393,744	\$451,933	\$378,668	\$333,583	\$270,000	\$285,896	\$416,417	\$354,605	\$350,000
What does this salary equal in San Antonio dollars? (based on cost of wages)	\$374,400	\$438,189	\$345,670	\$392,272	\$421,412	\$329,311	\$397,723	\$367,080	\$428,484	\$381,706	\$336,259	\$272,166	\$302,130	\$329,527	\$358,529	\$333,412
		Prior CM = \$423,247					Prior CMs= \$441,807.06									
<b>Incentives/ Allowances</b>																
Communications	\$900	\$1,845	No Response	No Response	\$1,440	Cell phone provided	\$840	\$612	\$3,100	\$600	No Response	\$1,200	No Response	\$1,080	N/A	None
Vehicle	\$6,000	No Allowance	\$8,400	\$7,200	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$7,200	\$9,600	\$5,700	\$6,000	\$1,200	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$4,200	\$6,540	\$9,000
Insurance Benefits	Eligible for civilian benefits	Eligible for civilian benefits	Eligible for civilian benefits	Eligible for civilian benefits	Medical (includes vision), Dental, Pharmacy	Eligible for city health and life insurance	Eligible for civilian benefits	\$18,500	Eligible for civilian benefits	No Response	Eligible for civilian benefits	Eligible for civilian benefits	Eligible for civilian benefits	No Response	Eligible for civilian benefits	Insurance benefits provided by City
Health Savings Account Deposit	\$9,300	No allowance unless the CDHP plan selected for health benefits	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	\$1,300	\$0	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	N/A	\$0
Lump Sum	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	Base salary includes an ongoing 5% non-pensionable pay	Not Available	\$0
Raise Occurrence	Increase consistent with City Charter, frequency subject to City Council annual budget process	Annually as approved by City Council	Annually (October 1)	No Response	Council approved percentage and disbursement	No Response	Salary is increased by performance review annually in May. Council approved percentage.	Approval needed by city council. If applicable, Disbursed 7/1& 1/1	Performance based effective July (July '23 received a 4% increase to base pay & a \$15K contribution to 401 (a))	Raise TBD Receives longevity pay like all staff (2023 - \$6,898)	4.5% increase and \$15K contribution to 401	4% Annually	No Response	No Response	Annually	Contract does not include salary increases over the 4 yr contract
<b>Projected Annual Compensation**</b>	<b>\$390,600</b>	<b>\$471,863</b>	<b>\$376,083</b>	<b>\$405,327</b>	<b>\$422,982</b>	<b>\$334,000</b>	<b>\$381,340</b>	<b>\$422,456</b>	<b>\$460,733</b>	<b>\$385,268</b>	<b>\$334,783</b>	<b>\$277,200</b>	<b>\$292,896</b>	<b>\$421,697</b>	<b>\$361,145</b>	<b>\$359,000</b>
** assumes maximum incentives available																
<b>Other Information</b>																
Retirement	6% Mandatory Employee Contribution 12% Employer Contribution (TMRs) Value = \$44,928	9% Employee Contribution 8.68% Employer Contribution Values= \$40,797	13.32% Employee Contribution 22.68% Employer Contribution Values= \$78,398	10.65% Employee Contribution 26.64% Employer Contribution Values= \$106,061	5% Employee Contribution 30.24% Employer Contribution Values= \$119,678	8.95% Employee Contribution, 14.05% Employer Contribution Value= \$46,084	7% Employee Contribution; 14% Employer Contribution (TMRs) Values= \$52,080	Participation in SDCERS Tier II defined benefit pension plan 1% Employee Contribution and 1% Employer Contribution to #01(a) plan Value= \$3,937	6% Employee Contribution 12.85% Employer Contribution Values= \$58,073	7% Employee Contribution 14% Employer Contribution Values= \$53,014	7% Employee Contribution 14% Employer Contribution Values= \$46,702	No Response	4.3% Employee Contribution 6% Employer Contribution Values= \$17,153	Employer Contribution to Pension Plan Values= \$72,237	7% Employee Contribution 14% Employer Contribution (TMRs) Values= \$49,645	None Stated
Employer Contributions to Deferred Compensation	Employer contributes max allowed IRS limit Under 50 = \$23,000 Over 50 = \$30,500 Values= \$30,500	Employer contributes max allowed IRS limit Under 50 = \$23,000 Over 50 = \$30,500	FY23 City paid \$18,000	No Response	9% employer contribution to 401(a) Value = \$35,619	FY23 City paid \$25,000	FY23 City paid \$19,000	No Response	3% to 401(a) Values= \$13,558	8% of employee contribution off base salary	FY23 City Paid \$15,000	No Response	No Response	No Response	Built into salary FY23 = \$26,000	None Stated

\*Data Verified by CPS HR  
Revised 4/18/24



# Proposed Recommendation



- In order to be competitive now and in the future, City Council should have the authority to determine the compensation of the City Manager considering market and competitive indicators.
- Charter language recommendation in Section 45:
  - Remove language cap on compensation and insert: “in setting the City Manager’s compensation the City Council shall take into consideration market and competitive indicators.”
  - Remove language cap on tenure.

**The proposed recommendation(s) directly address each part of the charge.**



---

# Q & A

City Manager Tenure & Compensation - 2024 Charter Review Commission

# Next Steps



- Subcommittee will consider Commission Feedback
- Subcommittee will consider Public Comment
- Subcommittee will ask CPS HR to continue monitoring comparator entities and cities



**Thank You**  
**End of Presentation**

# **Charter Review Commission**



**Council Districts & Redistricting Subcommittee  
Proposed Recommendations  
April 25, 2024**

# Agenda

---



- Charge
- Resource Investment
- Feedback
- Research and Conclusions
- Proposed Recommendation
- Next Steps

# Council Districts and Redistricting



## Charge

**Council Districts** - Whether an increase in single-member Council districts would appropriately enhance representation for San Antonio residents

**Redistricting** - Whether the decennial Council redistricting process should be conducted by an independent, autonomous citizens committee and how such a committee's membership shall be appointed

## Chair:

- Frank Garza

## Members:

- Naomi Miller
- Bobby Perez
- Dr. Rogelio Saenz
- Maria Salazar

# Resource Investment



- The subcommittee met again since presenting their preliminary recommendation on March 21, 2024 to:
  - Review and consider public feedback from SASpeakUp and CRC meetings
  - Evaluate potential revisions to the subcommittee’s recommendations in light of public and CRC feedback, expertise and findings of those on the subcommittee, and past experiences and feedback received during 2021 redistricting process including extensive public comment during that time period



# Feedback



- Public feedback from SASpeakUp and CRC meetings, general CRC and feedback heard during 2021 redistricting process included:
  - Indexing the number of council districts to population growth
  - Expanding who cannot serve on the redistricting commission to include family members of council member's employees
  - Include requirement that communication with lobbyists and consultants intended to influence the commission be done in an open meeting of the full City Council or redistricting commission

# Research and Conclusion

**The subcommittee's recommendation remains substantially as stated in their March 21 preliminary presentation with the following revisions.**

- An increase in Single Member Districts (SMDs) is not needed at this time given the projected population growth and ability of current council offices to serve their constituents (e.g., budget per district, use of City resources and communication tools to widen awareness across a larger population, etc.).
  - Add Charter language so that Council appoint the redistricting commission to reexamine council boundaries if voters decide to increase the number of council districts even if that time does not coincide with a Federal decennial census.
- A hybrid redistricting commission, versus an independent commission, would best serve San Antonio's redistricting process.
  - Expand who cannot serve on the commission to include immediate family members of council members' employers.

# Proposed Recommendation



Charter, Section 4A creating a hybrid redistricting commission

- **When redistricting occurs:**
  - Charter currently states redistricting occurs after each Federal decennial census
  - Recommend amending the Charter to allow for redistricting if voters through a future Charter election, amend and increase the number of districts

**2020** – Population per district is approximately **143,462**

**2030** – Population per district is estimated between **155,551 – 160,661**

# Proposed Recommendation



Charter, Section 4A creating a hybrid redistricting commission

- **Commission composition:**
  - 11 total commission members – 1 appointed by the mayor and 10 appointed by the councilmember representing the SMD
  - 10 SMD appointees must be registered to vote in their respective SMD
  - Members cannot be:
    - An elected official to any local, state or federal office or their immediate family member
    - Employee or the immediate family member of an employee of the City of San Antonio, a Local Government Corporation governed by the City Council, or employed/supervised by a Councilmember

# Proposed Recommendation

---



- **Communication**

- If intended to lobby or influence the commission member with respect to redistricting, then the councilmember's communication with the commission member must be by testimony in an open meeting of the full City Council or commission or by memo to the full commission or council.

# Proposed Recommendation



- **Adopting a redistricting plan**
  - City Council responsible for adopting a redistricting plan
  - Commission creates and presents a recommended plan that can be adopted by a majority vote of Council
  - Council can propose amending the recommended plan in an open meeting with a written explanation for the amendment
  - The proposed amendment would go back to the commission for consideration.
    - If the amendment is adopted by the commission, then the amended plan can be adopted by Council with a majority vote.

# Proposed Recommendation



- **Adopting a redistricting plan (cont)**
  - If the Council's amendment of the original recommended plan is rejected by the commission, then either:
    - The original recommended plan can be adopted by a majority vote of City Council, or
    - The Council's amended plan can be approved by three-fourths (9 votes) of the members of the City Council.
  - If final action is not taken by the City Council within 45 days after the recommended plan was presented to the City Council for adoption, then the City Council must adopt the recommended redistricting plan and, the recommended plan of the redistricting commission will become the final districting plan for the city.

---

# Q & A



# Next Steps



- Commission feedback
- Further discussion on feedback and questions from today to finalize recommendation and draft proposed Charter amendments



**Thank You**  
**End of Presentation**

# **Charter Review Commission**



**City Council Compensation & Term Length Subcommittee  
Preliminary Findings and Recommendations  
April 25, 2024**

# Agenda

---

- Charge on Compensation & Index
- Research
- Analysis
- Conclusions
- Recommendation: Compensation
- Recommendation: Index

# City Council Compensation and Term Length



## Charge: Compensation

---

Whether City Council members should be compensated on indexed terms that more accurately reflect the city's cost of living and lower barriers to participation in City government

### Chair:

- Luisa Casso

### Members:

- Josh Baugh
- Mike Frisbie
- Martha Martinez-Flores
- Dwayne Robinson

# Research

---

- Reviewed charters and salary levels of other cities
- Interviewed former council members
- Analyzed compensation data & evolution of role of council member
- Discussed whether and how to index compensation
- Received input from compensation SME on data sets, analysis, and business case
- Considered public input

# Analysis



Subcommittee setup six step analytical process to answer charge:

- Step 1: Conduct a compensation review of comparable cities
- Step 2: Develop description for council role: Duties, Roles, Responsibilities, Attributes, and Time Commitments
- Step 3: Match council role with similar private/public sector job roles
- Step 4: Research other strategies and consult with Subject Matter Expert
- Step 5: Develop options to re-baseline 2015 compensation to 2025
- Step 6: Identify repeatable, reliable, direct data set for compensation increase

# Conclusions

---



## Subcommittee Background Assumptions:

- 2015 Commission determined Council position was to be compensated
- Applied 2015 San Antonio Area Median Income as the benchmark to establish council pay
- Did not include mechanism to adjust pay on a repeatable basis (cost-of-living)
- 2024 Commission is charged with reviewing and recommending a process change



# Conclusions

- **Council positions are a compensated public service position**
  - It is a full-time position (on average requires 40 to 60 hours per week)
  - Requires evenings and weekends
  - Council members have access to certain benefits
- **Council compensation is not based on “hours worked”**
  - In HR terms the council position is an exempt position (no overtime is paid)
  - Based on authority and decision-making authority
  - Acknowledge council role as a valuable, professional position

# Conclusions

- **Council compensation should be aligned to their responsibilities, duties, attributes**
  - Council role is like an executive or management level job
    - Approval authority
    - Policy setting
    - City Manager oversight
    - Strategic and Financial planning
    - Project prioritization approval
    - Constituent issue management
- **Council districts are unique/different** – different expectations for a council member
- **A similar “executive/management” position in the private sector would pay \$120k - \$140K**

# Recommendation: Compensation

## Bureau of Labor Statistics: Median Income for Management and Professional Occupations in San Antonio-New Braunfels MSA

- Occupations with similar attributes as Mayor and City Council
- 2023 Median salary: \$81,763

## Recommendation for compensation

- City Council: \$80,000
- Mayor: \$95,000 (+\$15,000 from Council compensation)

# Recommendation: Index

---

**INDEX:** City of San Antonio wage increase percentage provided to civilian employees annually

***Option: Index to the annual Bureau of Labor Statistics survey for professional manager/director-level salaries in the San Antonio MSA.***

**Index philosophy:** If the city budget is healthy then the workforce and the city leaders could afford a wage increase. But if the workforce does not receive a raise, neither should the elected officials.

**Note:** This proposal would go into effect after the next municipal election.

# Recommendation: Index Annual Wage Increases for COSA Civilian Employees



Each year during the annual budget process, the City of San Antonio determines a percentage increase for civilian employees based on a number of factors, including the overall economic health of the City.

Under this recommendation, the Mayor and City Council would receive the same percentage increase that civilian employees receive.

Elected officials receive same increase as civilian employees, connecting their compensation to the overall health of the city budget

In years that civilian employees don't receive an increase, neither would the City Council.

# Support for Compensation Recommendation



## A case to change the status quo...

- Recognize the value and complexity of the council/mayor position
- Affirm that council role is a compensated public service role
- Enable council members to focus full-time on their council responsibilities
- This recommendation a move in the right direction, but not the full step as indicated
- Allow council members to sustain themselves during their time of service
- Attract candidate to serve for four-to-eight-year terms
- Proposed changes are modest, appropriate backed by market analysis
- Positions San Antonio for future growth

# Q & A

# Next Steps



- Commission Feedback
- Further discussion on previously identified unanswered questions





**Thank You**  
**End of Presentation**

---

# Process Check-In

# Roadmap



Meeting Date	
May 6	Presentation by all subcommittees of <b>final</b> proposals in response to Mayor's charge
May 9	Discussion and possible action on <b>final</b> proposals in response to Mayor's charge
May 20 and 23*	Final discussion and actions to prepare for June presentation to full City Council

\*All May dates should be held for general CRC meetings

# Next Meeting



**Monday, May 6, 2024** – review and discussion of all subcommittee recommendations

- 5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
- Central Library



**Thank You**  
**End of Presentation**