

DRAFT

CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT TO COUNCIL

MAY 2022

CITY OF SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	
II.	BACKGROUND	
III.	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	
A.	Council Compensation	
B.	Directly Elected Mayor	
C.	Ranked Choice Voting	
D.	Voting Rights for Noncitizens	
E.	District-Based Election of Council Members	
F.	Charter Update and Modernization	
	1. Council Vacancy Procedures	
	2. Frequency of Charter Amendments	
	3. Responsibilities for Emergency Management	
	4. Flexibility for City Operations	
	a. Option for Two Year Budget	
	b. Confirm Scope of Board of Public Utilities	
	c. Options for Contract Procurement	
	5. Clarification of Ambiguities	
	a. City Attorney Required Experience	
	b. Council Recall – Filling Vacancy	
	c. Appointment of Deputy Officials	
IV.	ADDITIONAL ISSUES CONSIDERED BUT NOT PRIORITIZED	
V.	CONCLUSION	

Appendices

A	Proposed Charter Amendments in Redline	
B	Committee Member Comments	
C	Meeting Minutes	
D	Summary of Votes	

I. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2022 Charter Review Committee (Committee) submits the following recommendations to the City Council. A fuller discussion of each recommendation is set forth in Section III of this report. In addition, Committee Members were provided an opportunity to submit additional comments for the Council's consideration and those comments are attached as Attachment B.

The Committee's recommendations are as follows:

- A. Council Compensation: The Committee recommends that the City Council submit to the voters a ballot measure to increase compensation of Mayor and Council members. The Committee found that increased compensation would open the door for a greater diversity of Council member candidates and more fairly reflect the work and responsibilities of membership on the Council. The Committee recommends as follows: (1) Mayor's compensation shall be set at Area Median Income (AMI) for a three-person household; (2) Council members' compensation shall be set at two-thirds of the Mayor's compensation (two-thirds of AMI for a three-person household); (3) Mayor and Council member compensation shall be permanently tied to AMI for a three-person household, with annual adjustments; and (4) Council may consider providing for reduction in compensation for specified circumstances (for example, unexcused absences, city-wide salary reductions, etc.).
- B. Directly Elected Mayor: The Committee considered, but did not reach a consensus on a proposed ballot measure to move from a Council-appointed Mayor to a directly elected Mayor. The Committee was almost evenly split, with a bare majority recommending that the City hold off on any changes to the structure of the Council at this time, given the recency of the City's transition to District-based election of Council members and this year's redistricting of the existing Council districts. Almost an equal number of Committee members recommended moving forward with a ballot measure at this time, finding that the benefits of a Mayor elected by City-wide vote and answerable to the full community outweighed any possible disruption. The Committee refers the matter to the Council for final decision.
- C. Ranked Choice Voting: The Committee considered, but ultimately rejected, a proposal to implement a system of ranked choice voting for the election of Council members. The Committee found that the high expense of instituting and operating the new system was not warranted, given the limited impact shown in recent elections in Bay Area cities with ranked choice voting systems.
- D. Voting Rights for Noncitizens: The Committee recommends that the Council move forward to consider expanding local voting rights to noncitizens. The Committee urges the Council (a) to hold a study session to examine potential eligibility criteria, costs of the new system, options for implementation, the experience of other cities, and other issues, and (b) to launch a robust community outreach and engagement to gauge the community's preferences and support.

- E. District Elections: The Committee unanimously recommends that Council place a measure on the ballot to ratify the City's district-based elections in compliance with the California Voting Rights Act.
- F. Charter Update and Modernization: The Committee considered a number of proposed revisions to update and modernize the City Charter, including the following:
1. Council Vacancy Procedures: Although the Committee recognized the need to update procedures for the filling of Council vacancies, the Committee determined that those updates are best pursued through Council policy or ordinance. The Committee recommends no revisions to the Charter.
 2. Frequency of Charter Amendments: The Committee strongly recommends that the Charter update include an amendment of Section 12 of the Charter to clarify that the Charter shall be reviewed every ten years, but that nothing in that section precludes additional amendments placed on the ballot by voter initiative or by Council ordinance at such other times as deemed necessary.
 3. Responsibilities for Emergency Management: The Committee recommends that the Charter update include amendments to confirm City Manager and Public Safety responsibility for leadership during emergencies and to remove possible ambiguities. The amendments will include revisions to Sections 18 (City Manager), 15 (Mayor), 21 (Police Chief) and 22 (Fire Chief).
 4. Option for Two Year Budget: The Committee recommends that the Charter update include a revision to Section 28 (Budget) to clarify that the City Manager may propose a multi-year budget. All other provisions of Section 28 would remain unchanged.
 5. Confirm Scope of Board of Public Utilities: The Committee recommends that the Charter update include a revision to Section 25 (Board of Public Utilities) to clarify that the Board's responsibilities may, at the Council's discretion, include "dry" utilities, including electricity, broadband and others.
 6. Clarification of Ambiguities: The Committee recommends minor revisions to Sections 19 (City Attorney), 32 (Council Member Recall) and 37 (Deputy Officials) to clarify City procedures.

7. Gender Neutrality: The Committee recommends that the Charter be revised as necessary to ensure all language in the Charter is gender-neutral.

II. BACKGROUND

The City of Santa Rosa is a Charter City formed pursuant to the provisions of the California Constitution. The City's Charter is adopted by the voters and provides the fundamental framework for the City's governance. It is, in essence, the City's "constitution."

Section 12 of the City Charter requires a review of the Charter not less than every ten years, with the review to be conducted by a committee to be appointed by the City Council. The last Charter review began in 2011 and resulted in proposed revisions placed on the November 2012 ballot. Ten years have now passed and on August 17, 2021, by Resolution No. RES-2021-147, the City Council directed the establishment of a new Charter Review Committee and the initiation of a new review.

In accordance with Resolution No. RES-2021-147, the City Council appointed a Charter Review Committee composed of twenty-one individuals. Each Council member appointed three Committee members and the result was a diverse group of Santa Rosa residents, including diversity in age, race, gender, geography, interests and backgrounds. The Committee was charged with reviewing the Charter and recommending to the Council whether any amendments should be made. A full roster of the Committee is attached as Attachment A to this report.

Committee Task and Meetings:

The Council proposed twelve issues for the Committee's consideration, including directly elected Mayor, ranked choice voting, police oversight, Council compensation, climate change, diversity, equity and inclusion, excise tax, regulation of rental properties, procurement policy reforms, board and commission quorums, removal of mayor or Council members for misconduct, and a two year budget.

The Council further encouraged the Committee to consider such other issues as the Committee determined appropriate.

The Committee met every other week from November 17, 2021 through May 11, 2022, with adjustments for holidays. The written information provided to the Committee is available at <https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. Recordings of the meetings are available at [\[https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx\]](https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx).

The Committee voted on issues by straw vote as the issues were presented. Members of the Committee were provided an opportunity to provide additional written comments of up to one page as an attachment to this report if they wished to state a minority position or provide other information for the Council's consideration. The Committee Members' comments are attached as Attachment B .

Chair and Staffing:

Mayor Chris Rogers appointed Patti Cisco as the Chair of the Committee, responsible for setting agendas and presiding over the meetings. The Committee elected Ernesto Olivares as Vice Chair to serve in the absence of the Chair.

The City Attorney, Sue Gallagher, and her office provided legal advice, agenda preparation, information gathering, presentations and arrangement for guest speakers. The City Clerk, Stephanie Williams and her office provided staff support for agenda preparation, meeting notification, meeting minutes, and clerical support.

Opportunities for Public Participation:

All meetings of the Committee were open to the public. Meetings were held from 5:00 – 7:00 p.m. every other Wednesday, via Zoom, with adjustments in the schedule made for holidays. Public notice of each meeting, including directions for participation by phone or internet, was provided in accordance with the Brown Act. At each meeting, the public was provided an opportunity to comment on each agenda item, as well as an opportunity at the beginning of each meeting to speak to issues within the Committee’s jurisdiction but not on the agenda.

A webpage was created for the [Charter Review Committee](#). Information that was provided to the Committee, agendas and minutes were posted at <https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. An email account was established for the Committee to receive additional community input. All written communications received were provided to the full Committee.

III. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. COUNCIL COMPENSATION

Section 4 of the City Charter currently provides that Council compensation will be established in accordance with state law. Section 4 also provides that the Mayor shall receive 150% of Council member salary. Pursuant to that provision, Council members currently receive \$800 per month for their service to the community, with the Mayor receiving \$1200 per month. The Mayor and Council members also receive City benefits, including health, vision, dental, life insurance, long-term disability, retirement and other benefits.

The Charter Review Committee heard evidence of the workload of the Mayor and Council members, of the difficulties of balancing private employment, child care, family and the responsibilities of Council membership. There was no doubt that the Mayor has full time responsibilities, with the responsibilities of the Council members easily requiring 20 - 30 hours per week. The Committee unanimously agreed that Council compensation should be increased to enable a greater diversity of membership (including those with young families, those with lower paying occupations and those without independent means of wealth), to ensure continued strong commitment and professionalism, and as a matter of fairness and respect for the extensive work performed by Council members.

The Committee considered options for compensation over the course of three meetings (December 15, 2021, January 5, 2022 and April 27, 2022). A range of options were discussed, including maintaining the current Charter provision, tying the Council's compensation to the salary of County Supervisors or Superior Court Judges, tying Council compensation to either the lowest wage or average salary of a City worker, or tying Council compensation to the City's median income.

After extensive discussion, the Committee determined, by a vote of 14 to 5, to recommend that (1) the Mayor's salary be set at the Area Median Income (AMI) for a three person household as determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); (2) the Council members' salary be set at 2/3 of the Mayor's salary (2/3 of the AMI for a three person household); (3) the salaries be permanently tied to the AMI for a three person household, rising or falling with changes in the AMI; and (4) the Council consider whether to provide for penalties or reductions in salary for unexcused absences, or in connection with a city-wide reduction in City salaries, or other circumstances the Council deems appropriate.

A strong majority of the Committee believes that such compensation appropriately reflects the nature and extent of the Councils' responsibilities and time commitments, that it will ease the burdens of service that currently prevent a greater diversity on the Council, and that it is easy to understand and will be readily accepted by the community. To the extent that there was opposition to that recommendation by members of the Committee, a number of Committee members voiced a strong preference for a higher level of compensation and a few Committee members felt that the existing Charter provisions (state law) provide an appropriate path at this time.

For the Council's information, the following is a brief summary of other options considered by the Committee and the reasons for their rejection:

- 1) Continue with Current Charter Language and Encourage Council to Adopt Increases Currently Allowable under State Law

As noted above, Section 4 of the Charter currently ties Council compensation to state law. State law sets forth a schedule of Council compensation based on city population. (See Government Code section 36516.) For cities of comparable size – cities with populations between 150,000 and 250,000 – state law provides for a Council members salary of \$800 per month. State law allows the \$800 per month salary to be increased up to 5% per year, provided that any such increase must be adopted by ordinance and made effective only when at least one Council member begins a new term. The allowable 5% increase is a flat rate, not compounded, and thus, for purposes here equals a \$40 increase in monthly salary for each calendar year. The increase may accumulate if not immediately applied.

The Santa Rosa Council's compensation of \$800 per month was set in accordance with state law in 2005 and has not been adjusted since that time -- a total of seventeen years without an increase. Thus under the current Charter provision, the Council has the authority to increase its monthly compensation by \$40 x 17, for a total monthly increase of \$680. With that increase,

Council annual salary would move from \$9,600 to \$17,760. The Mayor would receive 150% of that salary, for a total annual salary of \$26,640. The adjustment could be made by ordinance and no Charter amendment would be required.

Although this option provides the easiest path to increased compensation, a strong majority of the Committee did not believe that this minor increase was sufficient to address the Committee's concerns.

2) Tie Council Compensation to the Salary of the Board of Supervisors or the Sonoma County Superior Court Judges

Members of the County Board of Supervisors each earn approximately \$161,000 in annual salary. A Sonoma County Superior Court Judge currently earns approximately \$182,000 annually.

The Committee discussed the differences in scope of responsibilities between the City Council and the Board of Supervisors, including population levels, number of departments and employees supervised, size of organizational budget, and the nature and scope of services provided. The proposal did not gain traction with a majority of the Committee.

3) Tie Council Compensation to the Lowest Wage or Average Salary of City Employees

The average annual salary of City employees is approximately \$95,000. The lowest City employee wage is \$15.85 per hour. This proposal also did not gain traction with a majority of the Committee.

B. DIRECTLY ELECTED MAYOR (AT-LARGE MAYOR)

Pursuant to Section 15 of the City Charter, the Mayor and Vice Mayor are currently selected by the Council members themselves. The Council elects one of its members to serve as Mayor for a two year term, and another member to serve as Vice Mayor for a one year term.

The Charter Review Committee met twice (January 19, 2022 and February 2, 2022) to discuss a possible Charter amendment to provide instead for election of the Mayor by a city-wide vote. The Committee heard from two directly elected Mayors, the Mayor of San Rafael, Kate Colin, and the Mayor of Petaluma, Teresa Barrett, both of whom spoke to what they saw as the virtues of a Mayor at large. The Committee also had the benefit of comments from two former Santa Rosa Mayors, Scott Bartley and Ernesto Olivares, both of whom were familiar with and spoke to the pros and cons of our existing practice of selection of the Mayor by Council members.

The Committee conducted an informal straw poll at the February 2, 2022 meeting. Four members were absent, but of the 17 members who were present, 7 voted in favor of amending the Charter to provide for a Mayor elected at large, and 10 voted against it. Several members expressed mixed feelings; several expressed caveats on their vote.

Those in favor were persuaded by the following:

- A Mayor at large would speak for the community at large with “one voice”;
- A Mayor at large may be better regarded by legislators, state and federal authorities, at conferences of mayors, by virtue of being elected by the City as a whole;
- An election in which a voter could vote for their district council representative as well as the Mayor would give them the chance to vote for two representatives;
- In times of emergencies (i.e. fires, natural disasters) it may be more advantageous to have a Mayor elected by the entire community.

Many who expressed support conditioned their support on what they would hope would be some form of term limits or perhaps a two year term. Some expressed that they were in favor of the change only provided it came with a dramatic increase in compensation for the Mayor and all Council members. Some thought that equity concerns posed by an at-large election might be offset by perhaps amending the City Charter to provide for noncitizens to vote in City elections.

Those opposed were persuaded by the following:

- Because of the heightened cost of a Mayor at large election, some residents, particularly those of less advantage, would be prevented or discouraged from running; an at large election may thus work against diversity, favoring those who can fund a campaign with backing of those in wealthier parts of town;
- Our current system may afford a better opportunity for selection of a Mayor from the historically disadvantage neighborhoods and backgrounds; (Council may be more likely to select a Mayor from their own ranks who comes from a disadvantaged background, than voters at large);
- This is a “solution in search of a problem,” Current Council members selected by their peers to be Mayor have properly balanced their dual role, speaking effectively both for their district and the City as a whole;
- Timing is problematic; perhaps better to address this after the district-based election system has had time to settle and mature and the voters have had a few years to assess if any problems have emerged;
- Timing is problematic as converting to Mayor at large will require another re-districting which might be a “bridge too far” for voters;
- Risk of “inexperienced” candidate being elected to office greater than current system;
- Risk of Council and Mayor being less cordial and possibly antagonistic toward one another, than between peers.

The consensus of the Chair and the Committee was that, with the straw poll yielding a close outcome, several members absent, and judgments on the issue being somewhat fluid, it was best to present this to the Council with a report, rather than a recommendation.

C. RANKED CHOICE VOTING

The Charter Review Committee met on February 16, 2022, to consider a possible amendment to the City Charter to provide for ranked choice voting in Council member elections. Ranked-

choice voting allows voters to rank candidates in order of their preferences on the ballot rather than voting simply for a single candidate. Ballots are gathered and to begin, only first choice votes are counted. If no candidate wins a majority among those first choice votes, the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated from the race and their voters' second choices are applied to the tallies of the remaining candidates. The process continues until one candidate achieves a majority of votes and thus wins the election.

The Committee heard presentations from Deva Marie Proto, the Sonoma County Registrar of Voters, and from the City Attorney. Ms. Proto provided a thorough explanation of the ranked choice voting process. She outlined the equipment and software required for its implementation and provided an estimate of initial and on-going costs. Estimated costs included a one-time investment of approximately \$350,000 for the purchase and installation of needed software and approximately \$70,000 in annual processing costs. Additional costs would likely be incurred for required printing, ballot design, and educational materials. The City Attorney provided data on ranked choice voting results in four Bay Area jurisdictions in the 2018 and/or 2020 election cycles. The data indicated that, out of 32 elections reviewed, ranked choice voting resulted in a different result in one race. In all other races, the candidate leading in the initial vote prevailed in the final round as well.

After a thorough discussion, a straw poll was conducted in which the Committee voted 17 to 3 against a Charter amendment. Those opposed to an amendment expressed that:

- Ranked choice voting seems a “solution in search of a problem”; a possible answer to a possible problem in the future, but not yet warranted for Santa Rosa City Council elections;
- The complexity of a ranked choice voting ballot may discourage voting and add to voter skepticism of election outcomes;
- The financial burden to the City outweighs the marginal benefits;
- Because of the relatively small size of district elections, and the fact that in other jurisdictions ranked choice voting has rarely changed the election outcome, a change to the current system is not needed.

Those in support of an amendment expressed that:

- Ranked choice voting ensures a broadly-accepted winning candidate;
- Ranked choice voting encourages voters to look more closely at the entire slate of candidates and not simply focus on their initial candidate of choice;
- Ranked choice voting, while perhaps not needed now, may prove important in the future.

The proposal for ranked choice voting did not move further.

D. VOTING RIGHTS FOR NONCITIZENS

At the suggestion of Committee members, the Committee, at its April 13, 2022 meeting, explored avenues for expanding voting rights in local elections to noncitizens. Committee

members expressed that people who live, work and pay taxes in the community should have a say in how the City is governed -- granting noncitizens the right to vote is simply fair and just.

Although federal and state laws require U.S. citizenship for all voters in federal and state elections, nothing in federal or California law expressly precludes local jurisdictions from expanding the right to vote in their own local elections. Currently across the nation, fifteen local jurisdictions allow for noncitizen voting in local elections, including New York City, San Francisco (school board only), eleven cities in Maryland and two cities in Vermont.

Those that support extension of voting rights for noncitizens also emphasized that:

- Allowing noncitizens to vote strengthens communities and promotes engagement, investment and belonging.
- Without voting rights, noncitizens are subject to taxation without representation.
- When a segment of the community is excluded from voting, there is a heightened risk of discriminatory public policies.
- Given the high costs and long waiting periods for naturalization, prohibiting noncitizens from voting is unjust and unnecessary.

Although nationally, opponents to noncitizen voting often argue that people should accept the duties of citizenship before being granted the right to vote and that granting the right to vote could discourage individuals from seeking citizenship and the obligations that attach, those concerns were not voiced by Committee members. The few concerns raised by Committee members centered on practical logistics.

The Committee invited Deva Proto, Sonoma County Registrar of Voters, to speak to the logistics of noncitizen voting. Ms. Proto explained that, due to several legal and practical reasons, the County Registrar of Voters would not be available to assist in noncitizen voting in City elections. The City would need to create its own independent voting system, including a voter registration system (including development of eligibility criteria, forms for registration, standards and procedures to confirm eligibility, and on-going maintenance and update of voter database), the development, publication and distribution of a separate ballot or ballots (containing only City elections), establishment of polling places or mail-in voting, and a system for counting and certifying the vote. Ms. Proto confirmed that the County voting system would remain available to provide for citizen voting in City elections, but the City's voting system for noncitizens would be fully independent.

To the extent that Committee members expressed any concerns about expanding the right to vote to noncitizens, virtually all of those concerns centered on the difficulties of establishing that parallel voting system. A few additional concerns were voiced regarding legal risks and the risks of potential immigration implications for individuals.

A motion to recommend that the Council study the issue and place a proposal on the 2026 ballot received substantial support, but was just shy of a majority, with a number of Committee members expressing concerns with setting a deadline for action, noting the need for substantial additional information and work in crafting a proposal.

Ultimately, on a unanimous vote, the Committee recommended that the Council move forward with consideration of expanding voting rights to noncitizens, including (a) setting a study session to examine potential eligibility criteria, costs of the new system, options for implementation, the experience of other cities, and other issues, and (b) launching a robust community outreach and engagement to gauge the community's preferences and support.

E. DISTRICT ELECTIONS

In 2017, the City faced legal challenge under the California Voting Rights Act to its at-large election of Council members. The California Voting Rights Act prohibits at-large election of Council members if a city experiences racially polarized voting. A review of multiple City elections revealed that racially polarized voting had historically combined with the City's at-large election system to impair the ability of Latino voters to elect candidates of their choice or to influence the outcome of an election.

The California Voting Rights Act preempts all local laws and applies equally to General Law and Charter cities. Given the evidence of racially polarized voting, the Council determined to transition the City to district-based election of Council members to bring the City into compliance with the California Voting Rights Act. On April 17, 2018, by Ordinance No. ORD-2018-007, the Council defined the seven Council districts and set a sequencing for the transition. The first district-based elections were held in 2018 for Districts 2, 4 and 6. The transition was completed in 2020, with the election of Council members for Districts 1, 3, 5, and 7.

Although the City has fully transitioned to district-based election of Council members, Section 4 of the Charter still references at-large elections. The Committee unanimously recommends a ballot measure to ratify the City's district-based elections and its compliance with the California Voting Rights Act.

F. CITY CHARTER UPDATE AND MODERNIZATION

The Committee considered a number of proposed revisions to update and modernize the City Charter. The proposed revisions are intended to clarify ambiguities, harmonize current and best practices and modernize language. The Committee anticipates that these revisions can be included in a single ballot measure. Proposed revisions included the following:

1. Procedures for Council Vacancy: Although the Committee recognized the need to update procedures for the filling of Council vacancies, the Committee determined that those updates are best pursued through Council policy or ordinance. On a vote of 17 -1, the Committee recommends no revisions to the Charter. The Committee strongly recommends that the Council review and consider revisions to the vacancy procedures through policy or ordinance.
2. Frequency of Charter Amendments: The Committee strongly recommends that the Charter update include an amendment of Section 12 of the Charter to allow for more frequent amendments to the Charter. The importance of the option to revise

the Charter in the period between decennial reviews was highlighted by the Committee's discussion of the proposals for an at-large Mayor and for extension of voting rights to noncitizens. On a vote of 15-4, the Committee recommends that Section 12 be revised to confirm that the Charter shall be reviewed every ten years, but that nothing in that section precludes additional amendments placed on the ballot by voter initiative or by Council ordinance at such other times as deemed necessary. Those Committee members that voted no, preferred that Section 12 be revised to provide for a comprehensive review of the Charter every five years.

3. Responsibilities for Emergency Management: The Committee recommends that the Charter update include amendments to confirm City Manager and Public Safety responsibilities for leadership during emergencies and remove possible ambiguities. The amendments will include revisions to Sections 18 (City Manager), 15 (Mayor), 21 (Police Chief) and 22 (Fire Chief). The proposed language is included in the redlined Charter attached as Attachment A.
4. Option for Two Year Budget: The Committee recommends that the Charter update include a revision to Section 28 (Budget) to clarify that the City Manager may propose a multi-year budget. All other provisions of Section 28 would remain unchanged. The proposed language is included in the redlined Charter attached as Attachment A.
5. Confirm Scope of Board of Public Utilities: The Committee recommends that the Charter update include a revision to Section 25 (Board of Public Utilities) to clarify that the Board's responsibilities may, at the Council's discretion, include "dry" utilities, including electricity, broadband and others. The proposed language is included in the redlined Charter attached as Attachment A.
6. Clarification of Ambiguities: The Committee recommends minor revisions to Sections 19 (City Attorney), 32 (Council Member Recall) and 37 (Deputy Officials) to clarify City procedures. The proposed language is included in the redlined Charter attached as Attachment A.
7. Gender Neutrality: The Committee recommends that the Charter be revised as necessary to ensure all language in the Charter is gender-neutral. Proposed language is included in the redlined Charter attached as Attachment A.

G. OTHER ISSUES CONSIDERED, BUT NOT PRIORITIZED

[ADD]

H. CONCLUSION

[ADD]

Respectfully submitted,

SANTA ROSA CHARTER REVIEW
COMMITTEE 2022

By: _____
Patti Cisco, Chair

DRAFT