City of Austin

SPECIAL REPORT

A Report to the Austin City Council

Mayor
Lee Leffingwell

Mayor Pro Tem
Sheryl Cole

Council Members
Chris Riley
Mike Martinez
Kathie Tovo
Laura Morrison
Bill Spelman

Report on Peer City Council Committees and Council Meeting Management

December 2014

Office of the City Auditor

Acting City Auditor
Corrie E. Stokes
CIA, CGAP, CFE

Acting Deputy City Auditor
Jason Hadavi
CPA, CFE

REPORT SUMMARY

Austin's peer cities generally structure their council committees to cover more areas of their city operations and provide more oversight of city departments, especially the public safety, water, and aviation departments. Also, the peer cities generally met more often and for less time in council meetings than Austin. Peer city practices to manage council meeting workload include using work sessions or other separate sessions for specific components such as briefings, executive sessions, zoning, and public input. One peer city runs most items through council committees prior to being heard at a council meeting.

REPORT NUMBER: AS15101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND **1**

METHODOLOGY **1**

REPORT RESULTS **2**

Appendices
Appendix A: Austin City Council Resolution 20141002-047 17
Appendix B: Assumptions Made about Data Used in This Analysis 19
Appendix C: Peer City Demographic Matrix 21
Appendix D: Peer City Council Committee and Council Meeting Summary Matrix 22
Appendix E: Peer City Departmental and Budget Coverage Matrix 23
Appendix F: Peer City Council Committee Coverage Map 24

Exhibits
Exhibit 1: Council-Manager Peer City Profiles as Compared with Austin 3
Exhibit 2: Peer City Major Department Operations as Compared with Austin 3
Exhibit 3: 1992 Austin Council Committees – Established and Eliminated 4
Exhibit 4: High-Level Peer City Council Committee Categories and Prevalence 5
Exhibit 5: Peer City Council Committee Documentation as Compared with Austin 6
Exhibit 6: Peer City Major Department and Budget Coverage as Compared with Austin 9
Exhibit 7: Peer City Council Committee Departmental Coverage as Compared with Austin 10
Exhibit 8: Peer City Council Committee Budget Coverage as Compared with Austin 11
Exhibit 9: Summary of FY 14 Peer City Council Meeting Metrics as Compared with Austin 13
Exhibit 10: FY 14 Peer City Council Meeting Metrics as Compared with Austin 13
Exhibit 11: Component Time Comparison of Typical Austin, Dallas, and San Jose Meetings 14

REPORT NOTES

This project was conducted as a non-audit project.

This report was originally published on December 5, 2014 without Appendix F. In response to requests for additional information about peer city council committees, Appendix F was added and the report was published in its current form on December 18, 2014.

TEAM

Patrick A. Johnson, CGAP, CICA, Assistant City Auditor
Henry Katumwa, CGAP, CRMA, CICA, Auditor-in-Charge
Rachel Castignoli, Auditor
Keith Salas, Auditor
Michael Gaudini, Audit Intern

Office of the City Auditor
Austin, Texas
phone: (512)974-2805
email: oca_auditor@austintexas.gov
website: http://www.austintexas.gov/auditor

Copies of our audit reports are available at http://www.austintexas.gov/auditor/reports

Printed on recycled paper
Alternate formats available upon request

December 2014

Report on Peer City Council Committees and Council Meeting Management

Report Highlights

Why We Did This Project

On October 2, 2014, the Austin City Council passed Resolution 20141002-047 that directed the City Auditor to study how Austin's peer cities with Council-Manager governments structure their council committees, including how those committees provide council oversight for city departments, and to study practices in council meeting management.

For more information on this or any of our reports, email oca_auditor@austintexas.gov

Mayor and Council,

I am pleased to present this report on Peer City Council Committees and Council Meeting Management.

WHAT WE FOUND

We identified eight peer cities with Council-Manager governments and comparable council committee information.

Related to the structure of peer city council committees:

- Most committees are organized and operate in a similar manner.
- Austin lacks both public safety and environment/quality of life committees.
- Two cities include members of the public on their audit committee.
- Kansas City requires all items, except resolutions, to first go through a council committee where all public input is taken.

Related to peer city council committee oversight of city departments:

- The majority of cities align their council committees according to council priorities and three cities align according to city departments.
- The top five common departments by budget among the peer cities are police, fire, water, transportation, and aviation.
  - Six of the eight peer cities provide council committee oversight, or coverage, of the majority of their top five departments.
  - Only Austin Energy is covered out of Austin's top five departments.
- Compared with peer city averages related to department and budget coverage, Austin's coverage is lower.

Related to practices in council meeting management:

- We reviewed relevant literature that suggested practices such as the three-touch rule for public input, the use of committees to accomplish council business, an agenda planning committee, and focused meeting administration through specific agenda ordering and efficient debate.
- Peer cities generally met more often and for less time than Austin.
- The longest components of Austin Council meetings are executive session and zoning.
- Common practices in peer cities include using work sessions or other separate sessions for specific components such as briefings, executive sessions, zoning, and public input.
- Kansas City uses council committees to manage their council agenda items.

We appreciate the cooperation of peer city and City of Austin staff that assisted in the completion of this report.

Corrie E. Stokes, Acting City Auditor

BACKGROUND

On October 2, 2014, the Austin City Council passed a resolution that directed the City Auditor to study how Austin's peer cities with Council-Manager governments structure their council committees, including how those committees provide council oversight for city departments, and to study practices in council meeting management. The City Auditor was also directed to provide a report for public consideration by December 5, 2014 and work with the City Manager to post a public hearing for December 11, 2014 to hear from both the public and current City Council members on those results. See Appendix A for the full text of Austin City Council Resolution 20141002-047.

METHODOLOGY

To accomplish the directives provided by Council, we performed the following steps:

- selected relevant and comparable peer cities;
- researched and collected City of Austin and peer city information related to:
  - demographics,
  - council committees,
  - council meetings,
  - departments, and
  - budgets;
- reviewed and verified the accuracy and completeness of the information collected;
- interviewed peer city staff to clarify and verify information gathered;
- evaluated, analyzed, and summarized peer city information;
- compared peer city information with City of Austin information; and
- reviewed meeting management literature and identified relevant practices.

SUMMARY

Related to the structure of peer city council committees, most committees are organized and operate in a similar manner. However, there are a few exceptions. Austin does not have a council committee dedicated to public safety or environment and quality of life issues. Also, two cities include members of the public on their audit committee. Finally, Kansas City is unique in its requirement that all items, except resolutions, first go through a council committee. Kansas City staff indicated that no public testimony or input is allowed before the full council on these items.

Related to peer city council committee oversight of city departments, the majority of cities align their council committees according to council priorities and three cities align according to city departments. The top five common departments by budget among the peer cities are police, fire, water, transportation, and aviation. Council committees in six of the eight peer cities provide oversight, or coverage, of the majority of their top five departments. Only Austin Energy is covered out of Austin's top five departments. Also, compared with peer city department and budget coverage averages, Austin's coverage is lower. Austin would meet and exceed those averages by adding council committee coverage of the remaining top five departments – water, police, fire, and aviation.

Related to practices in council meeting management, we reviewed municipal meeting management literature that suggested practices such as the three-touch rule for public input, the use of committees to accomplish council business, an agenda planning committee, and focused meeting administration through specific agenda ordering and efficient debate. Using a comparison of FY 14 meetings, the peer cities generally met more often, for less time, and considered fewer items in their council meetings as compared with Austin. We noted the longest components of Austin Council meetings are executive session and zoning. Also, common practices in peer cities include using work sessions or other separate sessions for specific components such as briefings, executive sessions, zoning, and public input. However, the biggest difference among the peer cities seems to be Kansas City's use of council committees to manage council agenda items and public input.

DETAILED RESULTS

1 Study How Austin's Peer Cities with Council-Manager Governments Structure Their Council Committees

Council requested a study of Austin's peer cities with Council-Manager governments. We looked at the most populous of those cities and all but one has district representation. In order to better align this study for Austin's incoming district-based Council, we identified eight peer cities with district representation and comparable council committee information. We also looked at the council committee structures in the peer cities and Austin.

Peer Cities

EXHIBIT 1
Council-Manager Peer City Profiles as Compared with Austin

National Population Rank	Peer City	Council Members	Number of Districts	Council Committees	Boards and Commissions	Population (2013 est.)	Metro Population (2013 est.)
11	***Austin, TX***	***7***	***0***	***7***	***68***	***885,415***	***1,883,051***
6	Phoenix, AZ	9	8	7	63	1,513,350	4,398,762
10	San Jose, CA	11	10	7	26	998,537	1,919,641
37	Kansas City, MO	13	6	7	102	467,007	2,054,473
16	Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	12	7	8	36	792,862	2,335,358
27	Oklahoma City, OK	9	8	8	9	610,613	1,319,677
9	**Dallas, TX**	**15**	**14**	**9**	**51**	**1,257,676**	**6,810,913**
17	**Fort Worth, TX**	**9**	**8**	**5**	**38**	**792,727**	**6,810,913**
7	**San Antonio, TX**	**11**	**10**	**9**	**89**	**1,409,019**	**2,277,550**
	Peer City Average:	**11**	**9**	**8**	**52**	**980,224**	**3,490,911**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of U.S. Census and Peer City Information, October 2014

Of the identified peer cities, three are Texas cities and two others, Phoenix and Oklahoma City, are state capitals. Again, each city has a Council-Manager form of government and council members are elected through a district-based system with the mayor elected at-large. Two cities are considered hybrid cities in that Charlotte elects seven council members by district and four at-large while Kansas City elects six members by district and six at-large. On average, the peer cities have eleven council members (including the mayor), nine districts, seven council committees, and fifty-two citizen boards and commissions. Austin currently has seven council members, seven council committees, and sixty-eight boards and commissions, but will soon have eleven council members from ten districts.

Operational Comparison

We contacted representatives from each peer city in order to better understand their operations. We were specifically interested in whether their operation of airports, convention centers, and water and energy utilities were similar to Austin.

EXHIBIT 2
Peer City Major Department Operations as Compared with Austin

Peer City	Aviation	Convention Center	Water Utility	Energy Utility
Austin, TX	***Y***	***Y***	***Y***	***Y***
Phoenix, AZ	Y	Y	Y	No
San Jose, CA	Y	Y	Y	No
Kansas City, MO	Y	Y	Y	No
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	Y	No	Y	No
Oklahoma City, OK	Y	Y	Y	No
Dallas, TX	**Y**	**Y**	**Y**	**No**
Fort Worth, TX	**Y**	**Y**	**Y**	**No**
San Antonio, TX	**Y**	**Y**	**Y***	**Y***

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, November 2014
***** San Antonio's water and energy utilities are operated as municipal corporations

While not all the peer cities have a municipally-owned airport like Austin, each city has a department that deals with aviation issues. All cities, except Charlotte, reported operating a convention center. All cities reported operating a water utility and only San Antonio reported operating an energy utility. However, San Antonio's water and energy utilities are not operated as a city department like they are in Austin. See Appendix C for additional peer city demographic information.

Council Committee History in Austin

We researched historic Austin council committees to provide context for the comparison with peer city council committees. Through a public records search, we identified a 1992 resolution that listed the consolidation of a number of council committees "to support the Council priorities" as well as a number of committees that were eliminated.

EXHIBIT 3
1992 Austin Council Committees – Established and Eliminated

1992 Consolidated Austin Committees	1992 Austin Committees Eliminated
Community and Youth Services	Development Process
Health and Hospital	LCRA Water Rate Review
Economic Development	Rules of Order for Open Government
Transportation and Infrastructure	Southern Union Gas Rate Request
Public Safety	SPAC Subcommittee on Youth Services
Finance	Austin Travis County Joint Airport Zoning Board
Environment	
Aviation	
Affirmative Action	
Housing	
Cable	

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Resolution 19921124-5, November 2014

Over the next several years, a number of committees were added including Legislative (1993), Telecommunications Infrastructure (1994), Minority-Owned Business Enterprise and Women-Owned Business Enterprise (1998), and Judicial (2005). Since 1993, a number of committees were eliminated including Cable, Housing, Affirmative Action, Aviation, Community and Youth Services, Economic Development, Environment, Health and Hospital, Public Safety, and Legislative.

The Audit and Finance Committee appears to be the most consistent committee, existing in some form since 1985. The newest council committee is the Committee on Austin Energy, created in 2013. There are currently seven Austin council committees excluding the Special Committee on Economic Incentives which last met in late 2012:

- Audit and Finance;
- Comprehensive Planning and Transportation;
- Austin Energy;
- Emerging Technology and Telecommunications Infrastructure;
- Judicial;
- Minority-Owned and Women-Owned Business Enterprises and Small Business; and
- Public Health and Human Services.

Intergovernmental Entities

While not the focus of this report, we also noted that Austin council members serve on numerous intergovernmental entities including the Balcones Canyonlands Conservation Planning Organization Coordinating Committee, the Capital Area Council of Governments, the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the City of Austin/AISD Board of Trustees/Travis County Commissioners Court Joint Committee. We also noted that it appears that council members in peer cities also serve on a similar array of regional entities.

Peer City Council Committee Comparison with Austin

In studying peer city council committees, we first conducted a basic analysis to identify council committee categories at a high-level. We identified and sorted the peer city committees by name and function and noted twelve common categories along with the prevalence of those committees. Austin does not have a dedicated committee for the categories listed in bold. For example, while each peer city has an Economic Development committee, Austin does not, but aspects of that topic are discussed in other Austin committees. We noted that discussing a topic in multiple committees seemed to occur in the peer cities, as well.

EXHIBIT 4
High-Level Peer City Council Committee Categories and Prevalence

Common Peer Council Committee Categories	Cities with Category Committee (Out of 8)
Audit	8
Housing/Neighborhoods	8
Economic Development	**8**
Transportation/Infrastructure	7
Budget/Finance	7
Public Safety	**6**
Environment/Quality of Life	**5**
Legislative	**4**
Judicial	3
Intergovernmental Relations	**3**
Social Services	2
Aviation	**2**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, October 2014

All peer cities, including Austin, have council committees dedicated to Audit and Housing/Neighborhood topics. All the peers, excluding Austin, also have a dedicated Economic Development committee. The majority of peer cities have committees dedicated to Transportation/Infrastructure, Budget/Finance, Public Safety, and Environment/Quality of Life topics. Austin does not have dedicated committees related to Public Safety and Environment/Quality of Life, but is unique in having council committees related to their energy utility (Austin Energy) as well as Emerging Technology and Telecommunications Infrastructure and Minority-Owned and Women-Owned Business Enterprises and Small Business topics.

Council Committee Mechanics

In studying the peer city council committees, we looked at their mechanics, specifically how they are created, their composition, how members are assigned, and how many members are on the committees. We also looked at how the meetings are conducted, including committee power and public input. See Appendix D for additional council committee information.

Creation

Related to the creation of council committees, we noted that the all committees seem to exist at the discretion of the mayor and council. Looking closer to how the council committees are documented, we did not find formal codification in five of the eight peer cities. In the remaining three cities, as well as in Austin, committees are formally established through code or council rules.

EXHIBIT 5
Peer City Council Committee Documentation as Compared with Austin

Peer City	Documentation of Council Committees Creation
Austin, TX	***Code/Rules***
San Jose, CA	Not Codified
Phoenix, AZ	Code/Rules
Kansas City, MO	Not Codified
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	Not Codified
Oklahoma City, OK	Not Codified
Dallas, TX	**Code/Rules**
Fort Worth, TX	**Code/Rules**
San Antonio, TX	**Not Codified**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, October 2014

Composition

Not surprisingly, peer city and Austin council committees are populated exclusively by council members except for the audit committees in San Antonio and Phoenix.

In San Antonio, as in Austin, the city auditor reports to the city council. Three San Antonio council members and two members of the public serve on their audit committee. San Antonio staff indicated that current public committee members have expertise in accounting.

In Phoenix, the city auditor reports to the city manager. This reporting structure is reflected in the composition of their audit committee as three council members, three members of the public, and three members of city management serve on the committee. The management members of the committee are the city manager, the finance department director, and the budget and research department director.

Committee Member Assignment

In all the peer cities, council committee membership is at the mayor's discretion. In Austin, committee membership is made by council appointment based on seniority. While we noted that

council member expertise and interest does play a role in committee assignments, none of the peer city representatives indicated that expertise is a determining factor in committee assignments.

Number of Members per Committee

In the peer cities, where the average number of council members is eleven, the number of members on council committees ranges from three to nine and averages five. In Austin, the number of members on council committees ranges from three to seven and averages four (out of seven council members). Also, we noted that the entire council served as members on only three of the sixty-seven total peer city and Austin council committees. Those three committees are the City Council Finance and Capital Improvement Committee in Oklahoma City, the Housing and Economic Development Committee in Fort Worth, and the Council Committee on Austin Energy in Austin.

➢ *Council Committee Members*

PEER CITIES:	**AUSTIN:**
Range: 3-9	Range: 3-7
Average: 5	Average: 4

Number of Meetings Authorized and Held

We also researched how often council committee meetings are authorized in the peer cities. In the seven cities where information was available, meetings were generally authorized on an "as needed" basis, but most committees were authorized to meet once per month. Council committee meetings in Kansas City were authorized to be held once per week.

The actual number of council committee meetings held in Fiscal Year 2014 (FY 14) for the peer cities ranged from zero, for an existing ad hoc committee in Dallas, to forty-four, for the Planning, Zoning & Economic Development Committee in Kansas City. The average number of meetings held for all the peer city council committees was approximately twelve times per year. In Austin, the seven active council committees met between four and fifteen times and averaged approximately ten meetings per committee in FY 14.

➢ *FY 14 Council Committee Meetings Held*

PEER CITIES:	**AUSTIN:**
Range: 0-44	Range: 4-15
Average: 12	Average: 10

Committee Power

Generally, peer city council committees hear complex or controversial items before they are heard by the full council. While most peer city staff indicated that this practice was encouraged, such items are not legally required to go through a council committee. The single exception among the peer cities is Kansas City, which requires all items, except resolutions, to first go through a council committee.

In all the peer cities and in Austin, council committees make recommendations to the full council. In Kansas City, a city representative indicated that these items go through three readings. The first reading is when the item is assigned to a specific committee for consideration. The second reading is in council committee where all public testimony and debate occur. The committee then makes a recommendation to the full council. The third reading is when a vote is taken by the full council in the council meeting. Kansas City staff indicated that no public testimony or input is allowed before the full council on these items.

Public Input

According to peer city representatives, public input in council committees is expressly allowed in Phoenix, San Jose, and Kansas City. In the three Texas cities, public input depends on the committee. San Antonio reported allowing public input in all of their committee meetings except for the governance and audit committees. Fort Worth also indicated that public input is not allowed

in their audit committee. In Charlotte, public input is not heard in council committees, but rather in designated citizen forums. Oklahoma City staff noted that public input generally is not allowed in council committee meetings, but members of the council not on the committee can provide input.

2 Study How Peer City Council Committees Provide Council Oversight for City Departments

According to peer city representatives, the majority of peer cities align their council committees according to council priorities. San Jose and Phoenix indicated that their committees are aligned with city departments. Kansas City appears to utilize a hybrid approach where committees are aligned with departments, but are primarily driven by council priorities. We also looked at council committee alignment with large departments and relative departmental and budget coverage.

Peer City Council Committee Coverage Comparison with Austin

We conducted an analysis of peer city and Austin departments and budgets as well as council committee oversight, or "coverage," of these departments. We determined committee coverage using the best information available, beginning with express statements in city code or other publicly available information. Where such information was not available, we reviewed the agendas and minutes for the prior six meetings to determine what departments consistently reported to the committees. Where information was still not available, we attempted to contact a city representative for the information.

Also, due to differences in peer city budgets, we conducted an analysis to distinguish operational, or departmental, budget amounts from non-departmental amounts (including capital and debt service amounts). For coverage figures, we divided the sum of covered department budget amounts by the total departmental budget. See Appendix E for additional peer city department, budget, and calculated coverage information.

Council Committee Alignment with Operations

For the following exhibit, we identified the top five departments in each city with the largest budget. The "% of Dept. Budgets" column reflects the sum of the five departments as a percentage of each city's total departmental budget. The range was 64% to 74% with an average of 70%. In Austin, the figure is 73%. In looking at the top five common departments among the peer cities, all of the cities, including Austin, have a Police and Fire department. Likewise, all these cities except San Antonio have a Water Utility. Six of the peers, excluding Austin, have a Transportation department. Five of the peers, including Austin, have an Aviation department.

➢ *Top Five Common Departments*

PEER CITIES:	AUSTIN:
Police	Police
Fire	Fire
Water	Water
Transportation	
Aviation	Aviation

EXHIBIT 6
Peer City Major Department and Budget Coverage as Compared with Austin*

City Department Budget	Department 1	Department 2	Department 3	Department 4	Department 5	% of Dept. Budgets
Phoenix	Police	Fire	Water Services	Public Transit	Aviation	
Department Budget	$585,912,700	$297,951,260	$262,814,330	$260,424,196	229,332,953	**65%**
San Jose	Airport	Environmental Services	Police Department	Fire Department	Transportation	
Department Budget	$502,095,448	$494,092,893	$314,071,508	$163,499,035	$99,131,865	**73%**
Kansas City	Water Services	Police	KC Airports	Fire	Public Works	
Department Budget	$308,023,592	$209,308,119	$144,152,400	$135,527,915	$131,559,476	**69%**
Charlotte	Police	Aviation	Utility Department	Public Transit System	Fire	
Department Budget	$212,573,755	$113,585,716	$112,735,315	$110,245,360	$107,023,694	**74%**
Oklahoma City	Police	MAPS for Kids and MAPS 3	Fire	Utilities	Public Works	
Department Budget	$209,917,849	$171,095,011	$138,725,127	$97,517,587	$78,962,972	**74%**
Dallas	Dallas Water Utilities	Dallas Police Department	Dallas Fire-Rescue	Comm. & Info. Services	Street Services	
Department Budget	$595,314,797	$426,401,375	$219,029,468	$81,217,523	$80,943,669	**69%**
Fort Worth	Water and Sewer	Police	Human Resources	Fire	Financial Mgt. Services	
Department Budget	$386,649,275	$266,545,802	$121,244,599	$119,744,262	$95,112,337	**71%**
San Antonio	Police	Fire	Cap. Imp. Mgt. Services	Aviation	Public Works	
Department Budget	$395,188,539	$271,332,281	$263,784,989	$185,324,029	$158,230,217	**64%**
Austin	*Austin Energy*	*Austin Water Utility*	*Police Department*	*Fire Department*	*Aviation Department*	
Department Budget	*$1,392,785,342*	*$539,229,693*	*$308,117,602*	*$148,751,134*	*$98,057,724*	***73%***

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, October - November 2014
***** Reflects city departments as sorted by budget amount from FY 14 city budgets

The departments marked in blue indicate council committee coverage in that city. Six of the eight peer cities have council committees that cover the majority of their top five departments. Phoenix, San Jose, and Kansas City have council committees that cover all of the top five departments. Dallas and San Antonio council committees cover four of the top five departments, Charlotte covers three, and Fort Worth covers one. Oklahoma City council committees do not cover any of the top five departments. In Austin, only Austin Energy is covered out of the top five departments.

Council Committee Departmental Coverage

Using our analysis of peer city departments and council committee coverage, we divided the covered departments by the total number of operational departments for each peer city and Austin. This analysis identified a percentage comparison of departments covered as shown in the exhibit below. Peer city departmental coverage ranges from 33% to 64% and the average is 50%. For Austin, we determined that council committees provide coverage for sixteen of Austin's forty-three departments to yield 37% departmental coverage.

EXHIBIT 7
Peer City Council Committee Departmental Coverage as Compared with Austin

Peer City	Percent of Departments Covered
Austin, TX	***37%***
Phoenix, AZ	64%
San Jose, CA	50%
Kansas City, MO	55%*
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	44%
Oklahoma City, OK	38%
Dallas, TX	**53%**
Fort Worth, TX	**33%**
San Antonio, TX	**60%**
Peer City Average	**50%**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, November 2014
***** Kansas City staff reported additional coverage, but we could not verify that coverage through meeting minutes

Austin's departmental coverage would be 47%, approaching the peer city average, if Austin council committees covered the top five departments. This would require adding committee coverage for the Austin Water Utility, Austin Police Department, Austin Fire Department, and the Aviation Department.

Council Committee Budget Coverage

Likewise, we divided the sum of covered department budgets by the total departmental budget for each peer city and Austin. This analysis identified a percentage comparison of departmental budgets covered as shown in the exhibit below. Peer city departmental budget coverage ranges from 13% to 92% and the average is 68%. Oklahoma City appears to have more citizen oversight of departments than the other peer cities and their 13% budget coverage reflects this practice. For Austin, we determined that the current council committees provide coverage for 55% of the departmental budget. As noted earlier, Austin's largest department by budget, Austin Energy, was covered by a council committee beginning in 2013. Excluding Austin Energy from this analysis yields 15% departmental budget coverage.

EXHIBIT 8
Peer City Council Committee Budget Coverage as Compared with Austin

Peer City	Percent of Departmental Budget Covered
Austin, TX	***55%***
Phoenix, AZ	92%
San Jose, CA	89%
Kansas City, MO	91%*
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	56%
Oklahoma City, OK	13%
Dallas, TX	**79%**
Fort Worth, TX	**39%**
San Antonio, TX	**83%**
Peer City Average	**68%**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, November 2014
***** Kansas City staff reported additional coverage, but we could not verify that coverage through meeting minutes

By adding council committee coverage for all of Austin's top five departments – adding the Austin Water Utility, Austin Police Department, Austin Fire Department, and the Aviation Department – Austin's departmental budget coverage would be 87%.

3 Study Practices in Council Meeting Management

We researched municipal meeting management literature to identify relevant practices for meeting management administration and summarized recognized strategies to optimize time spent during council meetings. We conducted a comparison of FY 14 peer city and Austin council meetings as well as components of specific meetings. Finally, we analyzed meeting practices in the peer cities to identify common themes.

Council Meeting Best Practice Information

In looking at the literature related to council meeting management, a common caveat is that the council must decide what makes their meetings successful. Factors to consider include the level of public involvement, the methods available to conduct the city's business such as committees or other meetings, and the manner in which meetings are conducted which encompasses agenda management and meeting administration.

Beginning with council meetings and public involvement, a recognized practice is the three-touch rule. As indicated by the name, this rule suggests that the public should have at least three opportunities to provide input on important community issues. The first touch is notice about the issue and provides the public an opportunity to contact council members. The second touch provides an opportunity for the public to collaborate on the issue and reach consensus or compromise. This touch could happen in a special public meeting, a board and commission

meeting, or a council committee meeting. The third touch is at a council meeting when final action is being taken. The use of other public input tools, especially digital tools that allow real-time participation, could increase the ease and efficiency of the public input process.[1]

Again, councils generally have the authority to create standing or ad hoc committees to conduct their business.[2] We saw indications that Mayor-Council cities utilized council committees more extensively than Council-Manager cities. The trend indicates that as cities become more complex, council committees are increasingly utilized. Among large cities, 91% utilized council committees in some form to conduct work outside of full council meetings.[3]

Related to council meeting agendas, one recognized practice is to form an agenda planning committee made up of a member of management, the city clerk, and at least one member of council.[4] The purpose of such a committee is to promulgate rules related to criteria for items going to the full council, including the allowable number of items and how items are added or removed.[5] We noted that San Jose and Kansas City, two of our peer cities, utilize a similar committee to manage their agenda.

We also saw suggestions for improving council meetings through how the agenda items are ordered. The suggested order was public comment on non-agenda items, controversial items, consent items, and executive session. The rationale noted that if controversial items are considered early, they are more likely to be heard at a time certain and before discourse diminishes.[6]

Another common point in the literature is that the presiding officer is key in keeping meeting administration efficient and focused. As noted in Austin, this includes limiting the scope of debate when issues veer off topic or become repetitive. It was suggested that asking for a show of hands to communicate common opinion or encouraging groups to appoint a spokesperson could help avoid repetition in public comments. Also, to avoid unnecessary delays between public speakers, the next speaker should be put on notice when the current speaker is called to speak. We noted guidance that city staff should limit briefings to short summaries when existing, detailed reports are already available to council and the public. Finally, the use of a broad array of options for public engagement was encouraged.[7]

Peer City Council Meeting Analysis Comparison with Austin

We looked both at peer city and Austin meeting rules and metrics from FY 14 council meetings. We also conducted a more in-depth analysis of meeting components from two typical Austin meetings as compared with a typical meeting from each of two peer cities. See Appendix D for additional council meeting information.

---

[1] Municipal Resource and Service Center. Inquiries – Legislative body; chapter *Agenda*, subpart 4 (revised 2014).
[2] MRSC. Inquiries – Legislative Body; chapter *Council Committees*, subpart 3 (revised 2014).
[3] Svara, J., Two Decades of Continuity and Change in American City Councils*. National League of Cities* (2003).
[4] MRSC. Inquiries – Legislative Body; chapter *Agenda*, subpart 4 (revised 2014).
[5] Missouri Municipal League. Conduct of Council Meetings (2009).
[6] Institute for Local Government. Get Your Public Meetings Back on Track (2013).
[7] ILG. Get Your Public Meetings Back on Track (2013).

Council Meeting Rules

Related to council meeting mechanics, we noted that all of the peer cities and Austin follow some form of written rules for their meetings. Robert's Rules of Order is a common basis for meeting rules, but at least four of the peer cities have adopted local rules based on their local code, state law, or "local tradition." All of the cities designate the mayor as their presiding officer.

Council Meeting Minutes Analysis

We analyzed peer city and Austin meeting minutes for FY 14 and noted the number of meetings held, the length of those meetings, and the agenda items considered per meeting.

EXHIBIT 9
Summary of FY 14 Peer City Council Meeting Metrics as Compared with Austin

City	Meetings Per Year	Length of Meetings	Agenda Items Per Meeting	FY 14 Meeting Total	FY 14 Agenda Items Total
Peer Cities	Range is **22 to 44**	Range is **1:15 to 6:40**	Range is **25 to 81**	N/A	N/A
	Average is **35**	Average is **3:24**	Average is **52**	**119** Hours	**1,820** Items
Austin	***24***	*Average is* ***9:31***	*Average is* ***87***	***228.4*** *Hours*	***2,088*** *Items*

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, October – November 2014

As indicated by the summarized averages, the peer cities generally met more often, for less time, and considered fewer items in their council meetings as compared with Austin. Looking at the FY 14 meeting totals, Austin's council nearly doubled the time spent in council meetings as compared with the peer cities, but did consider about fifteen percent more items. The FY 14 council meeting metrics for each of the peer cities and Austin is presented below.

EXHIBIT 10
FY 14 Peer City Council Meeting Metrics as Compared with Austin

Peer City	FY 14 Meetings	FY 14 Meeting Length	FY 14 Agenda Items
Austin, TX	***24***	***9:31***	***87***
Phoenix, AZ	24	2:28	79
San Jose, CA	36	4:23	35
Kansas City, MO	44	1:15	39
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	41	3:53	25
Oklahoma City, OK	38	2:24	81
Dallas, TX	**22**	**6:40**	**68**
Fort Worth, TX	**37**	**2:12**	**46**
San Antonio, TX	**33**	**3:52**	**38**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, October – November 2014

Council Meeting Component Time Analysis

Given the council meeting figures noted above, we conducted a closer analysis of the components of two meetings in Austin and one meeting each in Dallas and San Jose. Each meeting was selected as a "typical" meeting based on the total meeting time.

EXHIBIT 11
Component Time Comparison of Typical Austin, Dallas, and San Jose Meetings

Meeting Component	Austin 03/20/2014	Austin 05/22/2014	Austin Average	Dallas 01/08/2014	San Jose 09/30/2014
Administrative	:02	:07	:05	:01	N/A
Consent	:03	:05	:04	:09	:03
Executive Session	1:07	3:04	**2:06**	**3:13**	**N/A**
Citizen Communication	:35	:23	:29	:57	:19
Public Testimony (non-zoning items)	:15	:50	:33	:03	N/A
Council Discussion (non-zoning items)	:21	:39	**:30**	**1:40**	**:48**
Staff/Council Interaction	1:52	:24	**1:08**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Staff Presentations	:09	:50	**:30**	**N/A**	**:04**
Zoning	3:19	2:55	**3:07**	**:14**	**3:27**
Ceremonial	:37	1:14	**:56**	**:04**	**:21**
Total Time	**8:20**	**10:31**	**9:26**	**6:21**	**5:02**

SOURCE: OCA Analysis of Peer City Information, November 2014

For the two Austin meetings, we noted significant differences in the components especially executive session, public testimony, staff presentations and interaction, and ceremonial issues. We also compared the average of these two meetings with the two peers and noted significant differences in bold. Where Austin's executive session time is comparative to Dallas, San Jose holds executive session in a separate morning session not noted here. Similarly, where Austin's zoning time is comparative to San Jose, Dallas spent significantly less time on this component. Austin's council discussion, staff presentations, and interactions with council components averaged two hours and eight minutes with seven council members. Dallas spent approximately thirty minutes less on these components with fifteen council members and San Jose spent an hour and sixteen minutes less with eleven council members. Ceremonial issues also seem to take more time in Austin. Also, while not highlighted above, citizen communication and testimony combined are similar for Austin and Dallas, but takes about forty minutes less in San Jose.

Peer City Council Meeting Practices

Related to council meeting management practices, we also looked to notable practices in the peer cities. While we did not analyze separate council work session-type meetings in depth, we did note that all peer cities have some sort of work session meeting. San Jose reported a separate morning executive session meeting that functions as a work session. The frequency of these meetings varies from weekly to monthly.

For Austin City Council meetings, we noted that they are characterized by generally longer council agendas and an engaged populace. As noted above, the two components of Austin council meetings that take the most time are executive session and zoning. A common practice among the peer cities includes utilizing council work session meetings for staff briefings and executive session items. Also, peer cities commonly hold separate meeting sessions for specific components such as zoning, briefings, and public input. Several cities reported limiting public input either to these separate sessions or to council committee meetings.

The biggest practice difference among all the cities seems to be Kansas City's use of council committees. As noted above, Kansas City requires all council items, except resolutions, to first go through a council committee on three readings. Also, all public input must take place in council committees except when a change to a Community Improvement District is made. For those items, staff reported that public communication in the council meeting is limited only to residents of the affected district(s). Also, staff briefings are usually held in the work session meetings.

Phoenix staff reported having long agendas and they are currently looking for methods to trim them. They previously held zoning issues as a separate meeting, but have since brought it back to regular council meetings.

In San Jose, meetings are broken into separate sessions (including the executive session noted above). Also, staff reported that controversial items are heard in an evening session held once or twice a month, as needed. During meetings, staff indicated that council members do not engage in conversations with public speakers seeking assistance, but direct the citizen to a city executive who can assist them. Also, San Jose council members can circulate memos to one another regarding their stance on issues and these memos are made public.

Charlotte staff also reported specific sessions for different issues. These sessions include a "workshop" every first Monday where public speakers are allowed, ceremonial issues every second Monday, zoning issues every third Monday, and a citizen's forum every fourth Monday.

Oklahoma City reported that the city manager actively manages the agenda. When an agenda becomes too crowded, items are transferred to a future agenda. Also, staff briefings are generally added to meetings with shorter agendas.

Dallas reported that the mayor can limit council debate on contentious items. Also, staff briefings are held in the work sessions and Dallas considers its consent agenda in the morning and public hearings and zoning issues are held in the afternoon.

In Fort Worth, like in Kansas City and Dallas, staff presentations are held in work session meetings. Fort Worth reported considering zoning issues at every meeting. They also aspire to hold a

minimum of forty meetings per year. According to our information, Fort Worth held thirty-seven council meetings in FY 14.

In San Antonio, council hears staff briefings and holds executive session in the work session meetings. Staff and council members also hold one-on-one meetings to discuss issues. Like some other cities, zoning issues are specifically heard on specific days each month.

APPENDIX A

AUSTIN CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 20141002-047

RESOLUTION NO. 20141002-047

WHEREAS, the National Civic League, formerly the National Municipal League, developed a "Model City Charter" that, beginning in 1915, called for the Council-Manager form of government; and

WHEREAS, the voters of Austin narrowly adopted a Council-Manager form of government in 1924 through a charter amendment vote and that is the general form of government that remains today; and

WHEREAS, many other cities have adopted the Council-Manager form of government and evolved how the Council functions and meetings are managed as they grow in size or as changes in technology permit; and

WHEREAS, the City of Austin has seven subcommittees of Council, but city operations are not uniformly covered by council committees; and

WHEREAS, Austin Energy constitutes 36% of the City's budget but did not have a dedicated council committee until 2013, public safety represents 70% of the General fund budget and has no dedicated council committee, and other City departments such as Austin Water Utility, Parks and Recreation, and the Library, do not have dedicated council committees; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the 2012 Charter amendment election, a new 11-member Council is to be elected in November general elections starting in 2014; and

WHEREAS, a new Council with additional members would benefit from knowing how the city councils in Austin's peer cities operate effectively using a committee structure; and considering other potential changes to meeting management to work effectively with an 11-member body; and

WHEREAS, national best practices may also suggest small changes to current committees such as including a citizen auditor or accountant on the Audit & Finance Committee; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

The City Auditor is directed to study how Austin's peer cities with Council-Manager governments structure their council committees, including how those committees provide council oversight for city departments, and to study practices in Council meeting management, and to provide a report for public consideration by December 05, 2014, and to work with the City Manager to post a public hearing for December 11, 2014 to hear from both the public and current City Council members on those results. The December 11 posting should not be for council action.

ADOPTED: October 2, 2014 **ATTEST:** Jannette S. Goodall

Jannette S. Goodall
City Clerk

APPENDIX B

ASSUMPTIONS MADE ABOUT DATA USED IN THIS ANALYSIS

Overall

- All information presented in this report is based on the best information available. We considered, in order:
  - express statements in city legislative documents;
  - city information posted for public access such as city budgets, council meeting and committee agendas and minutes, and other information about city operations; and
  - information gathered through direct contact with city representatives.
- We contacted city representatives to verify information collected. We assume the self-reported and verified information is the best information available and used it as a basis for our work.
- We recognize that each city operates and reports information differently and the information gathered may not completely reflect every nuance of each city's operations. Based on our collective understanding of each city's data and operations, we use our best judgment to make representative and useful comparisons for this report.
- All multi-city average calculations were rounded to the next whole number.

Section 1: Study How Austin's Peer Cities with Council-Manager Governments Structure Their Council Committees

- For peer city selection, the Council resolution directed us to limit the study to cities with a Council-Manager form of government. In addition, we selected only peer cities with district-based representation for two reasons. First, seventeen of the eighteen most populous cities have district-based representation. Second, we wanted to better align this study for Austin's incoming district-based Council.
- We noted that Austin's council website lists twenty-one intergovernmental entities. For our peer city research, we noted a similar number of regional entities, but did not document each entity for each city.
- For the high-level council committee category analysis, we sorted the committees by name and function, based on our understanding of the departments reporting to those committees.

Section 2: Study How Peer City Council Committees Provide Council Oversight for City Departments

- We recognize that documentation related to council committee oversight of departments may not fully capture a committee's jurisdiction. Where dispositive documentation was not available, we analyzed the council committee meeting minutes for the last six meetings of FY 14 to determine departmental coverage.
- Due to comparative challenges related to budgetary reporting, we conducted an analysis to distinguish operational, or departmental, budget amounts from non-departmental amounts (including capital and debt service amounts). We assume that the department budget amounts provide the most accurate basis for comparing departmental and budget coverage among peer cities.
- We recognize that council committees may cover operations in a portion of a department. When we determined that a department was covered by a committee and could not determine a basis for partial budget coverage, we assume that the full department budget amount is covered by the council committee.
- We recognize that San Antonio owns, but does not manage or report on their water and energy utilities in the same manner that Austin does. San Antonio's utility budgets are not represented in their department budget, but Austin's utility budgets are represented.

Section 3: Study Practices in Council Meeting Management

- We recognize that each city structures their regular and other council meetings differently. We relied on regular council meeting agendas and minutes to determine the comparative metrics in this report. We also recognize that council member time spent in other meetings – including workshops, special sessions, budget sessions, council retreats, and intergovernmental entities, among others – provides a more accurate reflection of the time and effort that council members contribute to their communities.
- We recognize that cities document their meeting agendas and minutes differently. We attempted to reconcile information from agendas, minutes, and videos whenever possible. Related to the in-depth meeting analysis, we reviewed and timed the components using meeting video and our best judgment.
- We recognize that every city must abide by their state laws related to meeting operation and administration. Consequently, council meeting practices in some cities may be inconsistent with laws in Texas and other states.

APPENDIX C: PEER CITY DEMOGRAPHIC MATRIX

City	Austin	Phoenix	San Jose	Kansas City	Charlotte	Oklahoma City	Dallas	Fort Worth	San Antonio
State	Texas	Arizona	California	Missouri	North Carolina	Oklahoma	Texas	Texas	Texas
Rank (by City Population)	11	6	10	37	16	27	9	17	7
Population (2013 est - City)	885,415	1,513,350	998,537	467,007	792,862	610,613	1,257,676	792,727	1,409,019
2000 Population (City)	656,562	1,321,045	894,943	441,545	540,828	506,132	1,190,110	544,052	1,151,979
2010 Population (City)	790,390	1,445,632	945,942	459,787	731,424	579,999	1,197,816	741,206	1,327,407
Population Change 2000 - 2010 (% - City)	20%	9%	6%	4%	26%	15%	1%	36%	15%
Metro Area	Austin-Round Rock	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara	Kansas City	Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	Oklahoma City	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington	San Antonio - New Braunfels
Population (2013 est - Metro)	1,883,051	4,398,762	1,919,641	2,054,473	2,335,358	1,319,677	6,810,913	6,810,913	2,277,550
2000 Population (Metro)	1,249,763	3,251,876	1,683,530	1,776,062	1,499,293	1,095,421	5,204,126	5,204,126	1,711,703
2010 Population (Metro)	1,716,289	4,192,887	1,836,911	2,035,334	2,217,012	1,252,987	6,426,214	6,426,214	2,142,508
Population Change 2000 - 2010 (% - Metro)	37%	29%	9%	15%	48%	14%	23%	23%	25%
Student Population	97,240	94,023	83,379	35,119	58,721	40,589	56,366	48,314	74,407
Student Population (% of Total Population)	11%	6%	8%	8%	7%	7%	5%	7%	6%
Captial City	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Form of Government	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager	Council-Manager
Representation (at-large, district, hybrid)	District	District	District	Hybrid (6 district, 6 at-large)	Hybrid (7 district, 4 at-large)	District	District	District	District
# of Council Members	7 (11)	9	11	13	12	9	15	9	11
# of Districts	0 (10)	8	10	6	7	8	14	8	10
# at Large	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	6 and Mayor	4 and Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor
# of Council Committees	7	7	7	7	8	8	9	5	9
# of Citizen Boards and Commissions	68	63	26	102	36	9	51	38	89
FY 14 City Budget ($)	$3,270,528,000	$3,502,506,000	$2,912,584,930	$1,385,262,159	$1,960,000,000	$1,027,852,482	$2,811,613,193	$1,461,458,966	$2,250,058,884
FY 14 General Fund ($)	$799,800,000	$1,125,373,000	$1,059,000,000	$429,104,962	$1,180,000,000	$400,831,467	$1,118,399,892	$572,935,411	$988,257,072
Aviation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Energy utility	Y	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Y (Not a city department)
Water utility	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y (Not a city department)
Convention center	Y	Y	Y	Y	No	Y	Y	Y	Y

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX D: PEER CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY MATRIX

CITY	Austin (7 CC; 7 CMs)	Phoenix (7 CC; 9 CMs)	San Jose (7 CC; 11 CMs)	Kansas City (7 CC; 13 CMs)	Charlotte (8 CC; 11 CMs)	Oklahoma City (8 CC; 9 CMs)	Dallas (9 CC; 15 CMs)	Fort Worth (5 CC; 9 CMs)	San Antonio (9 CC; 11 CMs)	SUMMARY (Excluding Austin)
COUNCIL COMMITTEES:										
Legislative Basis	Code, Resolution	2-60 Rule 13: Subcommittees AND 2-5 Audit Committee	Mayor and approved by council majority	Mayor	Most begin ad hoc and become permanent - exist by consensus of mayor and council	Mayor	City Council Rules of Procedure	7.1 and 7.2 of the Council Rules of Procedure	Mayor	**4 - Mayor/Council 3 - Code/Rule 1 - Unknown**
Year Committees Established	1985 to 2013	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown to 2012	Unknown	Unknown	Unkown to 2011	Unknown to 2012	Unknown to 2014	**Unable to determine specific timeframes**
Meeting Frequency (Legislatively Authorized)	N/A	Unknown	Varies	52	1 to 24	"As needed"	12 to "as needed"	12 to "as needed"	12	**Varies - "as needed" to 52**
# of Meetings (FY 14)	4 to 15 (10 ave)	3 to 10 (7 ave)	3 to 43 (13 ave)	2 to 44 (27 ave)	1 to 17 (10 ave)	2 to 10 (5 ave)	0 to 21 (14 ave)	4 to 10 (7 ave)	[Information not available]	**12**
Power (Outcome of Actions Taken)	Recommend to Council	Policy Guidance (Recommend to Council)	Recommend to Council	Recommend to Council	Recommend to Council	Recommend to Council	Recommend to Council	Recommend to Council	Recommend to Council	**Recommend to Council**
Appointment Process	Council Appointment (Seniority)	Mayoral Appointment; City Code for Audit Committee	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Standing: Minimum of 3 Council members - mayor appoints; Ad Hoc: Authority silent, but mayor appoints and determines number of members	Mayor	Mayor	**Mayor**
# of Committee Members	3 to 7 (4 ave)	4 to 9 (Audit only) (5 ave)	4 (4 ave)	4 to 6 (5 ave)	5 (5 ave)	3 to 9 (4 ave)	5 to 7 (6 ave)	4 to 9 (5 ave)	4 to 5 (5 ave)	**4.875**
# of Council Members	3 to 7 (4 ave)	3 (Audit only) to 4 (4 ave)	4 (4 ave)	4 to 6 (5 ave)	5 (5 ave)	3 to 9 (4 ave)	5 to 7 (6 ave)	4 to 9 (5 ave)	3 (Audit only) to 5 (5 ave)	**4.75**
# of Other Members (with Detail)	0	0 to 6 (Audit only - 3 members of the public and the City Manager, Finance Director, and Budget & Research Director	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 to 2 (Audit only - 2 members of the public - generally with Accounting expertise)	**6 - Only Council 2 - Only Council (except for Audit Committee (public/mgt))**
% of Council on Committee	100%	33% (Audit only) to 100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	60% (Audit only) to 100%	**See Above**
COUNCIL MEETINGS:										
Frequency of Meetings (Legislatively Authorized)	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Four times a month	Weekly	Weekly	Not less than 44 regular and special meetings per year	Weekly	**6 - 52 1 - 48 1 - at least 44 total meetings**
# of Meetings (FY 14)	24	24	36	44	41	38	22	37	33	**35**
Average Length of Meeting (FY 14)	9:31	2:28	4:23	1:15	3:53	2:24	6:40	2:12	3:52	**3:24**
Average # of Agenda Items (FY 14)	87	79	35	39	25	81	68	46	38	**52**
Presiding Officer	Mayor / Mayor Pro Tem	Mayor / Vice Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	**Mayor**
Rules of Order	Robert's Rules of Order	Hybrid - Robert's Rules of Order and Custom Rules	Modified Robert's Rules of Order ("Community Tradition")	Robert's Rules of Order and local rules	Modified Robert's Rules of Order (Local Tradition)	Robert's Rules of Order	City Council Rules of Procedure	Local Rules of Procedure	Robert's Rules of Order	**6 - Robert's Rules 2 - Rules of Procedure**
Role of Council/Citizen Commissions	Advisory (Unless otherwise granted specific authority)	Advisory	Advisory	Some are advisory (Make recommendations)	Can place items on council agenda	Advisory	Varies based Board/Commission	Advisory (Unless otherwise stated)	Report to a city council committee - § 2-542. City council committee oversight	**Generally Advisory**
Work Session (Frequency)	Weekly	Monthly	No "work session" - have closed full council meeting every Tuesday morning	Weekly	Weekly	5 Meetings	21 Meetings	37 Meetings	29 Meetings	**Varies (Most weekly or monthly)**

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX E: PEER CITY DEPARTMENTAL AND BUDGET COVERAGE MATRIX

Austin	Austin Budget	Phoenix	Phoenix Budget	San Jose	San Jose Budget	Kansas City	Kansas City Budget	Charlotte	Charlotte Budget	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma City Budget	Dallas	Dallas Budget	Fort Worth	Fort Worth Budget	San Antonio	San Antonio Budget
Austin Energy	$1,392,785,342	Police	$585,912,700	Airport	$502,095,448	Water Services	$308,023,592	Police	$212,573,755	Police	$209,917,849	Dallas Water Utilities	$595,314,797	Water and Sewer	$386,649,275	Police	$395,188,539
Austin Water Utility	$539,229,693	Fire	$297,951,260	Environmental Services	$494,092,893	Police	$209,308,119	Aviation	$113,585,716	MAPS for Kids and MAPS 3	$171,095,011	Dallas Police Department	$426,401,375	Police	$266,545,802	Fire	$271,332,281
Police Department	$308,117,602	Water Services	$262,814,330	Police Department	$314,071,508	KC Airports	$144,152,400	Utility Department	$112,735,315	Fire	$138,725,127	Dallas Fire-Rescue	$219,029,468	Human Resources	$121,244,599	Capital Improvements Management Services	$263,784,989
Fire Department	$148,751,134	Public Transit	$260,424,196	Fire Department	$163,499,035	Fire	$135,527,915	Public Transit System	$110,245,360	Utilities	$97,517,587	Communication & Information Services	$81,217,523	Fire	$119,744,262	Aviation	$185,324,029
Aviation Department	$98,057,724	Aviation	229,332,953	Transportation	$99,131,865	Public Works	$131,559,476	Fire	$107,023,694	Public Works	$78,962,972	Street Services	$80,943,669	Financial Management Services	$95,112,337	Public Works	$158,230,217
Public Works Department	$90,161,634	Solid Waste Management	$129,638,847	Employee Benefits	$89,995,124	Parks & Rec	$57,899,343	Solid Waste Services	$47,918,786	Information Technology	$31,920,764	Park and Recreation	$78,614,401	Transportation & Public Works	$80,242,638	Convention and Sports Facilities	$155,530,726
Austin Resource Recovery	$80,659,548	Parks and Recreation	$111,344,682	Housing Department	$84,023,079	Health and Medical Care	$54,709,865	Shared Services	$25,094,768	Parks and Recreation	$31,782,716	Sanitation Services	$74,399,205	Solid Waste	$56,060,962	Department of Human Services	$99,659,613
Communications & Technology Management	$76,121,757	Housing	$82,014,323	Public Works	$79,733,059	Economic incentives	$38,108,124	Powell Bill (Street Maintainence)	$23,457,304	Planning	$29,231,407	Convention & Event Services	$65,306,836	Parks and Community Services	$46,973,705	Solid Waste Management	$96,718,716
Watershed Protection Department	$75,393,790	Neighborhood Services	$71,117,238	Parks	$66,950,209	Neighborhoods and Housing	$37,682,628	Transportation	$22,654,587	General Services	$25,773,400	Aviation	$61,184,205	Culture and Tourism	$35,437,069	Parks & Recreation	$86,443,021
Parks and Recreation Department	$71,922,427	Street Transportation	$70,675,818	Convention & Cultural Facilities	$66,626,041	Convention & Entertainment Facilities	$37,217,709	Engineering and Property Management	$18,926,880	Finance	$25,085,844	Trinity Watershed Management-Storm Drainage Management	$55,011,250	Storm Water Utility	$35,278,001	Metro Health	$36,380,006
Austin Convention Center	$70,648,481	Human Services	$62,723,393	Library	$41,624,905	Convention & Tourism	$25,655,909	City Manager	$17,926,073	Development Services	$18,332,255	Equipment & Building Services - Equipment Services	$54,211,753	Equipment Services	$28,219,625	Library	$34,024,717
Health and Human Services Department	$64,627,432	Phoenix Convention Center	$47,193,248	Planning, Building & Code Enforcement	$39,051,574	Fleet & Facilities	$18,213,948	Convention Center	$15,098,476	Public Transit & Parking	$17,627,479	Code Compliance	$33,720,277	Information Systems	$25,327,781	Pre-K 4 SA	$22,877,981
Emergency Medical Services Department	$59,885,237	Municipal Court	$41,968,415	Office of Economic Development	$20,030,666	City Planning and Development	$17,506,501	Storm Water Utility	$12,553,697	Airports	$17,721,726	Sustainable Development and Contruction-Enterprise	$25,262,223	Library	$19,012,018	Finance	$22,467,564
Fleet Services	$48,141,155	Planning and Development	$41,536,572	Information Technology	$18,741,251	Information Technology	$15,899,869	Neighborhood and Business Services	$12,448,919	Zoo	$13,551,678	Equipment & Building Services	$23,261,226	Code Compliance	$17,013,264	Development Services	$20,901,082
Economic Development Department	$43,543,192	Library	$35,798,557	Finance	$15,654,084	Municipal Court	$13,135,399	Finance	$10,027,783	City Manager	$12,335,055	Dallas Public Library	$22,370,198	Municipal Courts	$16,909,218	Convention & Visitors Bureau	$19,434,675
Planning and Development Review Department	$35,310,980	Information Technology Services	$35,059,291	City Attorney	$14,558,085	Finance	$13,083,406	Planning	$5,319,035	Municipal Court	$10,635,823	Courts & Detention Services	$20,113,977	Planning and Development	$11,392,166	Planning & Community Development	$18,029,685
Library Department	$31,634,859	Community & Economic Development	$23,009,363	City Manager	$11,386,765	City Manager	$9,641,766	County-Administered Services	$4,546,093	Municipal Counselor	$6,677,033	Office of Cultural Affairs	$16,916,038	Special Trust Fund	$7,540,257	Downtown Operations	$16,572,609
Financial Services	$26,950,987	Public Works	$22,863,808	Mayor & Council	$11,104,900	Capital Improvements	$6,973,000	Human Resources	$4,163,646	Personnel	$2,847,784	City Attorney's Office	$13,920,124	City Attorney	$6,012,150	Municipal Court Judge	$15,883,078
Transportation Department	$24,542,774	Finance	$21,961,636	Human Resources	$8,392,082	Law	$5,042,009	Financial Partners & Other Community Agencies	$4,025,031	City Auditor	$1,130,307	Housing/Community Services	$10,882,504	City Manager's Office Administration	$5,986,923	Code Enforcement	$11,724,164
Code Compliance Department	$17,306,106	Law	$20,550,337	City Clerk	$2,256,211	Contingent Appropriation	$4,800,000	City Attorney	$2,354,931	City Clerk	$1,091,431	Office of Financial Services	$10,714,350	Housing & Economic Development	$4,956,592	Animal Care Services	$11,260,809
Neighborhood Housing and Community Development	$15,536,177	Human Resources	$11,410,338	Auditor's Office	$2,220,908	Human Resources	$3,671,777	Budget & Evaluation	$1,597,854	Mayor and City Council	$915,908	Public Works & Transportation	$7,120,506	Aviation	$4,833,553	Office of the City Attorney	$7,446,408
Building Services	$15,199,146	City Clerk	$6,769,214	Indepenedent Police Auditor	$1,076,906	Admin & City-wide General Services	$3,532,878	Mayor & Council	$1,520,050			Management Services	$5,967,818	City Auditor	$2,526,279	Office of the City Council	$6,064,886
Municipal Court	$18,665,658	Public Defender	$4,902,494			City Council	$2,940,832	City Clerk	$551,851			City Controller's Office	$5,390,605	Mayor and Council	$1,392,655	Economic Development	$5,932,793
Human Resources	$13,041,912	Regional Wireless Cooperative	$4,380,637			Mayor	$2,071,928					Human Resources	$4,079,802	City Secretary	$1,109,842	Culture and Creative Development	$4,680,189
Law Department	$10,925,529	City Council Office	$3,589,459			Board of Election Commissioners	$1,676,000					Mayor and Council	$3,910,700			Communications & Public Affairs	$4,378,268
Animal Services Office	$8,652,588	Budget and Research	$3,053,828			Kansas City Museum	$1,409,048					Express Business Center	$3,811,690			Human Resources	$4,101,671
Contract Management Department	$4,806,422	Equal Opportunity	$2,796,854			City Auditor	$1,393,714					Judiciary	$3,527,767			Office of Sustainability	$3,983,614
Office of Real Estate Services	$3,745,142	City Manager's Office	$2,663,165			Human Relations (Civil Rights)	$1,289,228					City Secretary's Office	$2,878,721			Building & Equipment Services	$3,549,000
City Manager's Office	$3,399,947	Public Information Office	$2,660,360			City Clerk	$460,760					Business Development & Procurement	$2,654,466			City Manager	$3,248,310
Small & Minority Business Resources Department	$3,220,909	City Auditor	$2,389,388									Office of Risk Management	$2,441,059			City Clerk	$2,919,010
City Auditor	$2,977,133	Mayor's Office	$1,755,285									City Auditor's Office	$2,391,124			City Auditor	$2,823,953
City Clerk	$2,968,709	Phoenix Office of Arts and Culture	$1,630,435									Office of Cultural Affairs- Municipal Radio	$2,379,435			Office of Management & Budget	$2,803,997
Communications & Public Information Office	$2,741,851	Environmental Programs	$1,486,777									Civil Service	$2,125,772			Center City Development Office	$1,635,570
Mayor and City Council	$2,571,423	Government Relations	$1,304,646									Sustainable Development & Construction	$1,787,747			Intergovernmental Relations	$1,106,357
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management	$2,076,364	Office of Emergency Management	$476,598									City Manager's Office	$1,558,962			Office of Historic Preservation	$1,032,361
Telecommunications & Regulatory Affairs	$1,808,061	Phoenix Employment Relations Board	$99,285									Employee Benefits	$1,338,724			Office of Military Affairs Administration	$362,600
Sustainability Office	$1,764,703											Office of Economic Development	$1,122,279			Municipal Elections	$85,500
Office of Medical Director	$1,470,429											Trinity Watershed Management	$661,387				
Government Relations	$1,405,982																
Office of the Police Monitor	$1,079,667																
Labor Relations Office	$991,686																
Capital Planning Office	$961,700																
Management Services (Other)	$873,799																
Municipal Court coverage includes only Municipal Court Judge budget ($2,661,209)		*Does not include Contingencies of $91,208,000*						*City Manager coverage includes only Internal Audit budget ($1,134,980)*								*Does not include CPS Energy and SAWS coverage*	
Department Total	**$3,424,676,791**	**Department Total**	**$2,505,259,730**	**Department Total**	**$2,146,316,598**	**Department Total**	**$1,302,587,143**	**Department Total**	**$886,349,604**	**Department Total**	**$942,879,156**	**Department Total**	**$2,023,943,963**	**Department Total**	**$1,395,520,973**	**Department Total**	**$1,997,922,988**
		Capital Budget	$530,705,000	Other expenditures	$433,848,955	KC Area Transportation Authority	$46,543,456	Other Non-Departmental Accounts	$25,791,818	Non-Departmental	$183,793,835	Non-Departmental	$41,935,424	Non-Departmental	$65,937,993	Non-Departmental/Non-Operating	$42,445,389
		Debt Service	$464,905,000	Less Contributions & Transfers	($572,836,383)	Debt Service	$36,131,560	Capital Budget	$779,339,036	Interfund Transfers	($98,820,509)	Capital Budget	$654,243,307			Contribution to Other Agencies	$24,548,150
				Capital Budget	$905,255,760			Debt Service	$270,950,137							Public Education Gov & Other Funds	$9,264,011
																One Time Projects	$7,432,562
																Debt Service	$168,445,785
Non-Dept. Total	**$0**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$995,610,000**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$766,268,332**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$82,675,016**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$1,076,080,991**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$84,973,326**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$696,178,731**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$65,937,993**	**Non-Dept. Total**	**$252,135,897**
TOTAL	**$3,424,676,791**	**TOTAL**	**$3,500,869,730**	**TOTAL**	**$2,912,584,930**	**TOTAL**	**$1,385,262,159**	**TOTAL**	**$1,962,430,595**	**TOTAL**	**$1,027,852,482**	**TOTAL**	**$2,720,122,694**	**TOTAL**	**$1,461,458,966**	**TOTAL**	**$2,250,058,885**
Approved FY 2014	**$3,270,528,000**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$ 3,502,506,000**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$2,912,584,930**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$1,385,262,159**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$1,960,000,000**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$1,027,852,482**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$2,811,613,193**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$1,461,458,966**	**Approved FY 2014**	**$ 2,250,058,884**
Variance	**($154,148,791)**	**Variance**	**$1,636,270**	**Variance**	**$0**	**Variance**	**$0**	**Variance**	**($2,430,595)**	**Variance**	**$0**	**Variance**	**$91,490,499**	**Variance**	**$0**	**Variance**	**($1)**
Variance (%)	-4.7%	Variance (%)	0.0%	Variance (%)	0.0%	Variance (%)	0.0%	Variance (%)	-0.1%	Variance (%)	0.0%	Variance (%)	3.3%	Variance (%)	0.0%	Variance (%)	0.0%
Budget - Covered Depts.	**$1,890,244,945**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$2,293,437,533**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$1,904,304,241**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$1,188,879,317**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$497,620,351**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$121,055,203**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$1,603,301,191**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$542,787,722**	**Budget - Covered Depts.**	**$1,653,681,992**
Budget - Covered (%)	**55.2%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**91.5%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**88.7%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**91.3%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**56.1%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**12.8%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**79.2%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**38.9%**	**Budget - Covered (%)**	**82.8%**
Depts. - Total #	**43**	**Depts. - Total #**	**36**	**Depts. - Total #**	**22**	**Depts. - Total #**	**29**	**Depts. - Total #**	**23**	**Depts. - Total #**	**21**	**Depts. - Total #**	**38**	**Depts. - Total #**	**24**	**Depts. - Total #**	**37**
Depts. - Covered #	**16**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**23**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**11**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**16**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**10**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**8**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**20**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**8**	**Depts. - Covered #**	**22**
Depts. - Covered (%)	**37.2%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**63.9%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**50.0%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**55.2%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**43.5%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**38.1%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**52.6%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**33.3%**	**Depts. - Covered (%)**	**59.5%**

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX F: PEER CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE COVERAGE MAP

Austin Council Committee Coverage Map

Austin Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Audit and Finance Committee	- City Auditor - City Clerk - Financial Services	$32,896,829
Comprehensive Planning and Transportation Committee	- Economic Development - Neighborhood Housing and Community Development - Planning and Development Review - Public Works - Transportation - Watershed Protection	$284,488,547
Council Committee on Austin Energy	- Austin Energy	$1,392,785,342
Emerging Technology and Telecommunications Committee	- Communications and Technology Management - Library - Telecommunications and Regulatory Affairs	$109,564,677
Judicial Committee	- Municipal Court (Municipal Court Judge Budget Only)	$2,661,209
Minority-Owned and Women-Owned Business Enterprises and Small Business Council Committee	- Small and Minority Business Resources Department	$3,220,909
Public Health and Human Services Committee	- Economic Development* - Health and Human Services	$64,627,432
TOTALS:	**16 Departments**	**$1,890,244,945**

* Budget included in previous committee

Phoenix Council Committee Coverage Map

Phoenix Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Audit Committee	- City Auditor	$2,389,388
Downtown, Aviation and Redevelopment Subcommittee	- Aviation - Community & Economic Development - Human Services - Library - Neighborhood Services - Phoenix Convention Center - Planning and Development - Public Works - Street Transportation	$604,250,950
Finance, Efficiency, Economy, and Sustainability Subcommittee	- Budget and Research - Community & Economic Development* - Environmental Programs - Information Technology Services - Public Information Office - Public Transit - Public Works*	$302,684,452
Neighborhoods, Housing and Development Subcommittee	- Housing - Human Services* - Neighborhood Services* - Planning and Development*	$82,014,323
Parks, Arts, Transparency and Education Subcommittee	- Parks & Recreation - Phoenix Office of Arts and Culture	$112,975,117
Public Safety and Veterans Subcommittee	- Fire - Municipal Court - Office of Emergency Management - Police	$926,308,973
Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee	- Public Transit* - Street Transportation* - Water Services	$262,814,330
TOTALS:	**23 Departments**	**$2,293,437,533**

* Budget included in previous committee

San Jose Council Committee Coverage Map

San Jose Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Airport Competitiveness	- Airport	$502,095,448
Committee on Economic Competitiveness	- Office of Economic Development - Planning, Building & Code Enforcement - Public Works	$138,815,299
Community and Economic Development Committee	- Housing Department - Office of Economic Development* - Planning, Building & Code Enforcement* - Public Works* - Transportation	$183,154,944
Neighborhood Services & Education	- Housing Department* - Library - Parks	$108,575,114
Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support	- Fire Department - Police Department	$477,570,543
Rules & Open Government Committee	- N/A	
Transportation & Environment Committee	- Environmental Services - Transportation*	$494,092,893
TOTALS:	**11 Departments**	**$1,904,304,241**

* Budget included in previous committee

Kansas City Council Committee Coverage Map

Kansas City Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Finance, Governance & Ethics Committee	- Admin & City-wide General Services - City Auditor - Finance - Law	$23,052,007
Legal Review	- Law*	
Legislative Committee	- N/A	
Neighborhoods, Housing & Healthy Communities	- Health and Medical Care - Neighborhoods and Housing - Parks and Rec	$150,291,836
Planning, Zoning & Economic Development Committee	- City Planning and Development - Economic Incentives - Parks and Rec* - Water Services	$363,638,217
Public Safety & Emergency Services Committee	- Fire - Municipal Court - Police	$357,971,433
Transportation & Infrastructure Committee	- Fleet & Facilities - KC Airports - Public Works - Water Services*	$293,925,824
TOTALS:	**16 Departments**	**$1,188,879,317**

* Budget included in previous committee

Charlotte Council Committee Coverage Map

Charlotte Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Community Safety Committee	- Fire - Police	$319,597,449
Economic Development	- Aviation - Neighborhood and Business Services	$126,034,635
Environment	- Engineering & Property Management - Neighborhood and Business Services*	$18,926,880
Housing and Neighborhood Development	- Neighborhood and Business Services*	
Transportation	- Planning - Transportation	$27,973,622
Budget	- Budget & Evaluation	$1,597,854
Governance & Accountability	- City Attorney - City Manager (Internal Audit Budget Only)	$3,489,911
Intergovernmental Affairs	- N/A	
TOTALS:	**10 Departments**	**$497,620,351**

* Budget included in previous committee

Oklahoma City Council Committee Coverage Map

Oklahoma City Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Audit	- City Auditor	$1,130,307
Economic Development	- City Manager - Development Services - Planning - Public Transit & Parking	$77,526,196
Finance and Capital improvement	- Finance	$25,085,844
Judiciary Committee	- Municipal Counselor - Municipal Court	$17,312,856
Legislative	- N/A	
Neighborhood Conservation	- N/A	[pass through]
Social Services	- N/A	[pass through]
[City Council Annexation/Deannexation Committee]	- [Inactive annexation committee not included in this analysis]	
TOTALS:	**8 Departments**	**$121,055,203**

Dallas Council Committee Coverage Map

Dallas Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Arts, Culture & Libraries	- Dallas Public Library - Management Services - Office of Cultural Affairs - Park and Recreation - Public Works & Transportation	$130,988,961
Budget, Finance & Audit	- Aviation - City Auditor's Office - City Controller's Office - Office of Financial Services	$79,680,284
Economic Development	- Office of Economic Development - Sustainable Development & Construction	$2,910,026
Housing	- Housing/Community Services - Office of Economic Development* - Office of Financial Services* - Sustainable Development & Construction*	$10,882,504
Public Safety	- Business Development & Procurement - Courts & Detention Services - Dallas Fire-Rescue - Dallas Police Department	$668,199,286
Quality of Life & Environment	- Code Compliance - Dallas Water Utilities - Management Services* - Park and Recreation* - Public Works & Transportation*	$629,035,074
Transportation & Trinity River Project	- Code Compliance* - Public Works & Transportation* - Street Services - Trinity Watershed Management	$81,605,056
[Ad Hoc Committees (2)]	- [Inactive committees not included in this analysis]	
TOTALS:	**20 Departments**	**$1,603,301,191**

* Budget included in previous committee

Fort Worth Council Committee Coverage Map

Fort Worth Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Ad Hoc Municipal Courts Advisory Committee	- Municipal Courts	$16,909,218
Audit Committee	- City Auditor	$2,526,279
Housing and Economic Development Committee	- Housing & Economic Development - Planning and Development	$16,348,758
Infrastructure and Transportation Committee	- Aviation - Storm Water Utility - Transportation & Public Works - Water and Sewer	$507,003,467
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs Committee	- N/A	
TOTALS:	**8 Departments**	**$542,787,722**

San Antonio Council Committee Coverage Map

San Antonio Council Committee	Department Coverage	FY 14 Budget Coverage
Audit	- City Auditor - Finance	$25,291,517
Comprehensive Planning	- Capital Improvements Management Services - Planning & Community Development	$281,814,674
Economic and Community Development	- Aviation - Center City Development Office - Department of Human Services - Economic Development	$292,552,005
Governance	- Municipal Court Judge	$15,883,078
High Profile Contract Committee	- Center City Development Office* - Convention & Visitors Bureau - Parks & Recreation	$105,877,696
Infrastructure and Growth	- Aviation* - Center City Development Office* - Code Enforcement - Development Services - Office of Historic Preservation - Planning & Community Development*	$33,657,607
Intergovernmental Relations	- Center City Development Office* - Convention and Sports Facilities - Intergovernmental Relations - Parks & Recreation*	$156,637,083
Public Safety	- Fire - Police	$666,520,820
Quality of Life	- Culture and Creative Development - Department of Human Services* - Library - Metro Health - Office of Military Affairs Administration - Parks & Recreation* - Planning & Community Development*	$75,447,512
TOTALS:	**22 Departments**	**$1,653,681,992**

* Budget included in previous committee