

PROJECT PLAN

**SINGLE MEMBER DISTRICTS
Proposition 3
10-1 Plan**

10/17/2012

Jason Hadavi
Prepared by ACA

Date

Reviewed by City Auditor

Date

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to complete the City Auditor's responsibilities regarding the proposition of a 10-1 Redistricting Plan on the November 2012 ballot. Executive Summary of Project Charter

Background

Proposition 3 (Ordinance 20120802-015) calls for the City Council to be composed of:

1. A mayor elected from the city at-large; and
2. Ten (10) council members elected from single-member districts.

An "Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission" will be empowered to divide the city into 10 districts for the election of the council members. The ordinance sets out a process to identify members for the 14 person Commission, including several requirements of the City Auditor.

Project Objective:

The overall objective for this project is to plan for and ensure that the City Auditor's responsibilities detailed in Proposition 3 are carried out effectively and efficiently in order to support the creation of an Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission that is qualified and diverse (by race, ethnicity, gender, and geography)[assuming Proposition 3 passes in the November 6th Election].

Project Scope:

The scope of this project includes the responsibilities of the City Auditor as outlined in the Proposition, which ranges from December 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 as well as necessary preparations prior to December 1, 2012.

Project Teams

Strategy Team

Ken Mory
Jason Hadavi
Corrie Stokes
Patrick Johnson

Implementation Team

Jason Hadavi
Patrick Johnson
Tope Eletu-Obido

Resources

The following expenditures are anticipated:

\$1,500	Travel, lodging, and meals for 2 team members to California to meet with representatives that implemented a similar process
\$300	Advertisement costs associated with publicizing the application process and names of members in the pool
\$200	Raffle barrel for public drawings
\$150	Locked drop box/safe for applications

Meeting rooms in City Hall will be free of charge. Hours required to facilitate the entire process would exceed 3000 if Proposition 3 passes.

Summary of Project Phases

1. **Pre-Application Phase** 11/01/12 – 11/30/12

During this phase team members will conduct research, advertise the process, and finalize preparations, including the applications, questionnaires, etc.

2. **Application Phase** 12/01/12 – 02/01/13

During this phase applications are received and reviewed. Unqualified candidates will be eliminated, but all applicants will be recorded.

3. **Applicant Review Panel Selection Phase** 02/01/13 – 02/15/13

During this phase the members of the Applicant Review Panel are selected via random drawing at a public meeting.

4. **Redistricting Commission Selection Phase** 02/15/13 – 06/30/13

During this phase, the members of the Redistricting Commission are selected. The Applicant Review Panel identifies a pool of 60 qualified applicants. Council members have the opportunity to strike one applicant each. Eight are then selected via random drawing at a public meeting. Those eight select the remaining six.

Project Milestones

Milestone	Complete by
Project plan approved by CA	11/01/12
Project Initiation	11/07/12
Project Strategy Team meets with CA representatives	11/14/12
Initiate and widely publicize application processes	12/01/12
Close application processes	02/01/13
Applicant Review Panel Public Drawing	02/15/13
Commission member pool creation and publication	03/01/13
Provide pool applications to Review Panel	03/01/13
Applicant Review Panel selects 60 applicants for Commission member pool	05/01/13
Council members strike 1 applicant each	05/07/13
Applicant Review Panel submits remaining pool to City Auditor	05/08/13
Commission Member Random Drawing (8 members only)	05/09/13
8 Commission members select 6 applicants for remaining commission members slots	06/30/13

PROJECT TASKS

TASKS	Responsible Auditor	Due Date
Pre-Application Phase		
1.) Project Plan Approved by City Auditor	JH	11/01/12
2.) Determine if Proposition 3 Passed – if not, suspend rest of project	All Team Members	11/07/12
3.) Meet with California State Auditors involved in CA process	KM/JH	11/14/12
4.) Finalization of Review Panel Application		11/19/12
5.) Finalization of Redistricting Commission Application		11/19/12
6.) Publication of Application Process	Implementation Team	11/30/12
Application Phase		
1.) Initiate application process	Implementation Team	12/01/12
2.) Receive applications for Panel and Commission	Implementation Team	02/01/13
Applicant Review Panel Selection Phase		
1.) Review applications for Panel and eliminate unqualified/conflicted applicants	Implementation Team	12/01/12 - 02/14/13
2.) Conduct random drawing in public meeting to select three panel members	Implementation Team	02/15/13
3.) Notify three individuals selected as Review Panel	Implementation Team	02/15/13
4.) If any of the three individuals decline to serve, resume the random drawing at a public meeting as soon as possible.	Implementation Team	TBD, if necessary
Redistricting Commission Selection Phase		
1.) Review applications for Commission and eliminate unqualified/conflicted applicants	Implementation Team	12/01/13 - 02/28/13
2.) Publicize names of applicants in pool and provide applications to Review Panel	Implementation Team	03/01/13
3.) Receive pool of remaining applicants following Council strike process	Implementation Team	05/08/13
4.) Conduct random drawing in public meeting to select eight commission members	Implementation Team	05/09/13
5.) Provide applications of remaining applicants to eight commission members	Implementation Team	05/09/13

PROJECT PLAN

**SINGLE MEMBER DISTRICTS
Proposition 3
10-1 Plan**

11/07/2012

Jason Hadavi
Prepared by ACA

Date

Reviewed by City Auditor

Date

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to complete the City Auditor’s responsibilities regarding the proposition of a 10-1 Redistricting Plan on the November 2012 ballot. Executive Summary of Project Charter

Background

Proposition 3 (Ordinance 20120802-015) calls for the City Council to be composed of:

1. A mayor elected from the city at-large; and
2. Ten (10) council members elected from single-member districts.

An “Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission” will be empowered to divide the city into 10 districts for the election of the council members. The ordinance sets out a process to identify members for the 14 person Commission, including several requirements of the City Auditor.

Project Objective:

The overall objective for this project is to plan for and ensure that the City Auditor’s responsibilities detailed in Proposition 3 are carried out effectively and efficiently in order to support the creation of an Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission that is qualified and diverse (by race, ethnicity, gender, and geography)[assuming Proposition 3 passes in the November 6th Election].

Project Scope:

The scope of this project includes the responsibilities of the City Auditor as outlined in the Proposition, which ranges from December 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 as well as necessary preparations prior to December 1, 2012.

Project Teams

Strategy Team

**Ken Mory
Jason Hadavi
Corrie Stokes
Patrick Johnson**

Implementation Team

**Jason Hadavi
Patrick Johnson
Tope Eletu-Obido
Ben Leffler**

Resources

The following expenditures are anticipated:

>\$100,000	Legal support/independent consultant
\$1,500	Travel, lodging, and meals for 2 team members to California to meet with representatives that implemented a similar process
\$300	Advertisement costs associated with publicizing the application process and names of members in the pool
\$200	Raffle barrel for public drawings
\$150	Locked drop box/safe for applications

Meeting rooms in City Hall will be free of charge. Hours required to facilitate the entire process would exceed 3000 if Proposition 3 passes.

Summary of Project Phases

1. **Pre-Application Phase** 11/07/12 – 11/30/12
 During this phase team members will conduct research, advertise the process, and finalize preparations, including the applications, questionnaires, etc.

2. **Application Phase** 12/01/12 – 02/01/13
 During this phase applications are received and reviewed. Unqualified candidates will be eliminated, but all applicants will be recorded.

3. **Applicant Review Panel Selection Phase** 02/01/13 – 02/15/13
 During this phase the members of the Applicant Review Panel are selected via random drawing at a public meeting.

4. **Redistricting Commission Selection Phase** 02/15/13 – 06/30/13
 During this phase, the members of the Redistricting Commission are selected. The Applicant Review Panel identifies a pool of 60 qualified applicants. Council members have the opportunity to strike one applicant each. Eight are then selected via random drawing at a public meeting. Those eight select the remaining six.

Project Milestones

Milestone	Complete by
Project plan approved by CA	11/07/12
Project Initiation	11/07/12
Project Strategy Team meets with CA representatives	11/14/12
Initiate and widely publicize application processes	12/01/12
Close application processes	02/01/13
Applicant Review Panel Public Drawing	02/15/13
Commission member pool creation and publication	03/01/13
Provide pool applications to Review Panel	03/01/13
Applicant Review Panel selects 60 applicants for Commission member pool	05/01/13
Council members strike 1 applicant each	05/07/13
Applicant Review Panel submits remaining pool to City Auditor	05/08/13
Commission Member Random Drawing (8 members only)	05/09/13
8 Commission members select 6 applicants	

PROJECT TASKS

TASKS	Responsible Auditor	Due Date
Pre-Application Phase		
1.) Project Plan Approved by City Auditor	JH	11/07/12
2.) Determine if Proposition 3 Passed – if not, suspend rest of project	All Team Members	11/07/12
3.) Meet with California State Auditors involved in CA process	KM/JH	11/14/12
4.) Finalization of Review Panel Application		11/16/12
5.) Finalization of Redistricting Commission Application		11/16/12
6.) Publication of Application Process	Implementation Team	11/30/12
Application Phase		
1.) Initiate application process	Implementation Team	12/01/12
2.) Receive applications for Panel and Commission	Implementation Team	02/01/13
Applicant Review Panel Selection Phase		
1.) Review applications for Panel and eliminate unqualified/conflicted applicants	Implementation Team	12/01/12 - 02/14/13
2.) Conduct random drawing in public meeting to select three panel members	Implementation Team	02/15/13
3.) Notify three individuals selected as Review Panel	Implementation Team	02/15/13
4.) If any of the three individuals decline to serve, resume the random drawing at a public meeting as soon as possible.	Implementation Team	TBD, if necessary
Redistricting Commission Selection Phase		
1.) Review applications for Commission and eliminate unqualified/conflicted applicants	Implementation Team	12/01/13 - 02/28/13
2.) Publicize names of applicants in pool and provide applications to Review Panel	Implementation Team	03/01/13
3.) Receive pool of remaining applicants following Council strike process	Implementation Team	05/08/13
4.) Conduct random drawing in public meeting to select eight commission members	Implementation Team	05/09/13
5.) Provide applications of remaining applicants to eight commission members	Implementation Team	05/09/13

Categories	Activity	Description	Required Predecessor	Deadline	Status	LEAD	Comments
ID	A	Confirm authority 3 vs 4	none	11/9/2012	Done 11/09/2012	Strategy Team	Authority comes from Proposition 4 Ordinance
ID	B	Clarify intent and identify risks/constraints	none				
	B1	Meet with Steve Bickerstaff	none	11/9/2012	Done 11/09/2012		Met on 11/8/12
	B2	Meet with Peck Young and Fred Lewis	none	11/13/2012	Done 11/09/2012		
	B3	Meet with Linda Curtis	none	11/14/2012	Done 11/15/2012	JH	11/15 at 2pm.
	B4	Contact TSBPA Representatives	none	Done	Done 11/09/2012		Sent letter on 11/8/12
	B5	Meet with City Attorney	none	11/9/2012	Done 11/09/2012		1:30PM
ID	C	Identify resources and constraints					
	C1	Contact California State Auditor Representatives	none	11/9/2012	PENDING	JH (& KM)	Left voicemail for State Auditor on 11/8/12
	C2	Assign Internal Resources	B	ONGOING	ONGOING		
	C3	Contact Keel	none	11/30/2012		KM	Discuss State Auditors as backup plan
	C4	Identify legal counsel (COA?)	B1	11/9/2012	Done 11/09/2012		meeting with Karen Kennard 11/09/2012
	C5	Identify PIO resources	none	11/9/2012	PENDING		including room schedule at Convention and Palmer Centers
	C6	Identify available financial/staff resources	none	11/14/2012	PENDING		Staff resources identified. Pending decision on outside assistance.
ID	D	Research process					
	D1	Obtain California Applications	none	11/16/2012	Done 11/09/2012		
	D2	Meet with AGR	none	11/14/2012	PENDING		Need to complete B3
	D3	Interview California State Auditor Representatives	C1	11/14/2012	PENDING		Meeting set for 11/19 4:30PM
	D4	Consult with legal advisor, if used	C4	11/26/2012			
ID	E	Determine publicity strategy (PIO)					
	E1	Meet with PIO staff assigned	C5	11/9/2012	Done 11/13/2012	PJ & RT	Larger Meeting 11/13/2012
	E2	Document PIO Plan	B3, C2, C5, C6	11/9/2012	ONGOING		Steps from detailed PIO plan to be added 11/13/2012
DEV	F	Develop application processes (PANEL & COMMISSION)					
	F1	Develop process requirements from Charter language	B, D2	11/20/2012			Need to make final decision on ambiguous language by OCA
	F2	Develop application forms (PANEL & COMMISSION)	B, D	11/22/2012	ONGOING	App Team; TE draft	Do we include prohibition language/disclosure on serving on a commission? First Drafts Complete 11/15
	F3	Determine logistics - Online vs Hard Copy, receipt of applications, process for vetting forms	B, D, E	11/22/2012			
	F4	Document "process regulations"	B, D	11/22/2012			
	F5	Identify key controls to ensure integrity of process	F1, F3, F4	11/29/2012			
DEV	G	Develop application review processes (& forms)					
	G1	Identify Requirements from Charter language	B, D2	11/20/2012		Strategy Team	Need to make final decision on ambiguous language by OCA by 11/15/2012
	G2	Document "process regulations"	B, D2, F4	11/22/2012			
DEV	H	Secure resources					
	H1	Obtain legal/consultant services if needed	C4, C6	11/19/2012			COA Procurement process, including Council approval as needed
	H2	Purchase supplies	C6	12/13/2012			Raffle barrel/drop box
	H3	Obtain or design/develop online tools	E, C5	11/15/2012	PENDING		Webpage
	H3A	Other online tools	E, C5	11/26/2012			Social Media tools.
	H4	Obtain venues for public forums	C5, E	11/19/2012			Schools, churches, city facilities
	H5	Obtain advertising	E, C5	11/26/2012			Statesman, Chronicle, print, etc
	H6	Develop Council Resolution for additional monetary resources if needed	H1				Only required >\$75K
IMP	I	Publicize plan/distribution process					
	I1	Contact Keel	none	11/30/2012		KM	Request assistance with distribution of info
	I2	Contact TSBPA Representatives	none	11/14/2012	Done 11/12/2012	JH	Pending response
	I4	Prepare message for AFC	B,D,E,F	11/15/2012	DONE 11/13/2012	CS	Note: Only focusing on how it will affect the service plan.
	I5	Present Plan to AFC	I4	11/19/2012	TBD		
IMP	J	Implement PIO Plan					
	J1	Develop and review redistricting info to be placed on current site	None	11/13/2012	Done 11/13/2012	Clayton, RT, PJ	
	J2	Place redistricting info on OCA's current site	J1	11/14/2012	Done 11/13/2012	Clayton, RT, PJ	
	J3	Establish the theme for marketing	None	11/14/2012	PENDING	RT, PJ	
	J4	Draft website content (application covered in separate step, but will need to be incorporated)	B, D, E, F	11/26/2012	ONGOING	RT, PJ	
	J5	Review website content prior to launch	J4	11/29/2012		RT, PJ	
	J6	Develop "branded" website to publicize process, requirements, and other info and ultimately link to the application. Will also include press releases, AFC presentations, link to AFC meeting, etc. as they occur. [same as H3]	J3, J4, C5, H3	12/4/2012			to post on agenda for 12/4 then needs to get to Council by 12/3
	J7	Launch branded website: Update info on OCA site to refer to branded website.	J4, C5	11/30/2012			
	J8	Launch other media tools [e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn (for auditors), Facebook?, Others] [related to H3]	J7, C5	12/7/2012			

Categories	Activity	Description	Required Predecessor	Deadline	Status	LEAD	Comments
	J9	Incorporate application on website and distribute hard copies (libraries?)	G	1/6/2013			
	J10	Determine logistics for citizen workshop (phase 1) [secure resources is covered in H4]	H4	11/29/2012			
	J11	Draft press release(s), flyers, and email text to:	J4				
	J12	Announce process initiation and generate interest (Panel and Commission)	J1-8, J10	12/1/2012			Use CPA firm information collected by Charles
	J13	Announce workshop	J1-8, J10	12/1/12 & ongoing			
	J14	Announce application availability (Panel and Commission)	J9, F, G	1/6/2013			
	J15	Announce citizen forums (application launch and Q & A; Q & A in various parts of the city)	J1-10	12/15/12 & ongoing			
	J16	Reminders throughout Jan/Feb to apply	J1-10	Repeatedly Jan/Feb			
	J17	Determine logistics for application Q & A sessions (phase 2: central application launch & phase 3: application Q & A in commission districts)	J1-10	1/6/2013			
	J18	Update website as needed with press releases and other pertinent news	J1-17	ongoing			
IMP	K	Distribute applications					
	K1	Ensure application is available in all chosen formats	F	12/15/2012			
	K2	Monitor and respond to queries as needed	F	ongoing			
DJS	L	Communication to Council/public as needed		ongoing			

11/9/2012*

Meeting with Peck Young and Fred Lewis -
10am, strategy team

Meet with Karen Kennard - 1.30am,
strategy team

Contact PIO - Patrick Johnson and Rebecca
Takahashi

Auditor Critical Path- Tope
Auditor Organization Research - Ben
Leffler

11/13/2012

Meet with Linda Curtis 11/14 2PM

OCA Website Content 11/14

"Branded" website development 11/15
(ongoing)

Final Decision re: ambiguous language 11/15

CA application/website research - TE 11/14

Panel Talking Points RT

Contact and interview CA Auditor JH/KM
11/14

Binder Assembly - TE 11/19

Begin Draft Applications - TE 11/13

Commissioner Talking Points - PJ

Pull CPA firms without COA Contract - CH
11/13

KM Daily Update - JH/CS

Legal Interpretation on ambiguous Language
- John Steiner (11/14, 1PM)

Application Review Methodology BL/PJ
(11/16)

Discuss with Elaine Nicholson (re: open
records requests, definition of
correspondence, handwritten notes, legal
advice, etc.

Call Ken Martin, discuss PIR

PIO Content 11/18

Background (RT, PJ, CS, JH, KHM)

Qualification - KM Review

Process - PJ Edits, CS, JH, KM

Apps (Coming soon, Link to Qualification)

News - N/A)

Workshop Follow-up: Schooler (RT)

Application Drafting TE-JH (11/18)

Press Release Drafting - PIO Assist - RT

**ACTION ITEMS
WEEK STARTING**

11/19/2012

Contact Keel and CPA firms -
KM 11/20

Email: KM to City Council re:
process + date 11/26

Meeting with Law and Sid

Faulk ASAP (RE: PRE-
CLEARANCE)

11/26/2012

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Source: AIC, ACA, and AUDITEE

Purpose: To document the meetings minutes and/or other communications between the audit team and the auditee. [Link to Procedure Step]

Procedure:

Conclusion:

Results:

Date	Time	Persons Present	Issues Discussed	Action Items
11/08/2012		City Auditor, Ken Mory; DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo, Auditor II Rebecca Takahashi; Auditor Investigator, Ben Leffler	<p>AU13100 – TM Code</p> <p>Auditor needs to conduct community meetings and outreach all over Austin (north, south, east, west, and downtown)</p> <p>Note: confirmation of steps to ensure the pool is secured. Certify the pool before drawing from it.</p> <p>Issue: do we put meeting minutes or a summary on the website?</p> <p>Consulting California state auditor in terms of research.</p> <p>PIO team: website branding, distribution list (valid, secure, controlled database), breaking the content down to basic message from Ken, panel and commission info.</p> <p>Dec. 15th deadline for application.</p> <p>Focus on procedure and methodology not policy.</p> <p>Strategy team already spoke to</p>	<p>A simple visual representation of the process from start to finish by Ben Leffler (BL)</p> <p>Meet with AGR reps: Fred Lewis, Linda Curtis, & Peck Young.</p> <p>Find a public venue: school, library, rec centers and so on.</p> <p>Meeting with AGR. Call state board of auditors, California state auditor, and Keel.</p> <p>Complete Critical Path Plan.</p> <p>Draft letter to TSBPA on definition of “qualified independent auditor”</p> <p>Meet with Linda 11/15/2012</p>

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>Beckerstaff 11/08.</p> <p>2 possible Q&A meetings for December. 2-4 meetings to explain the application. Pre-release and post-release of application forum meeting. Provide an opportunity for people to ask questions and learn how to apply.</p> <p>Meeting with Karen Kennard 11/9 at 1:30pm.</p> <p>Keel: discuss with him identifying resources, publicizing, discuss state auditors as back-up plan, and request assistance with distribution of information.</p> <p>Distribution step: distribution to AFC and council. Present plan 19th Nov. CPM presented at high level with a schedule.</p> <p>Consulting TSBPA about definition of "qualified independent auditor"</p> <p>Development step: How do we review the application, accept, and rejection.</p> <p>We need to make a decision on social media. Meet with Ken to discussion this. OCA is formally responsible for content.</p> <p>Do we need both legal and consultants? Beckerstaff recommended Stephanie Ramirez as possible attorney.</p> <p>Two key questions: (1) Forum</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>re: "how do we meet 'charge'?"</p> <p>(2) Application debut and Q&A?</p> <p>(3) Application Q&A in neighborhood (4 commission districts)</p>	
11/08/2012	8:45 a.m.	<p>Steve Bickerstaff , Drafted proposal language; City Auditor, Ken Mory; DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson</p>	<p>Aim to clarify language of the charter.</p> <p>Mr. Bickerstaff (SB) noted that he was not part of Austinites for Geographic Representation (AGR), but that was approached by that group to offer his advice. SB took the California (CA) redistricting provision and drafted a version for Austin. SB noted that AGR members also included provisions in the final draft and he suggested speaking to them.</p> <p>Re: §3(A)(4) "Qualified independent auditor" language was copied from the CA statute. SB agrees that City Auditor staff is excluded from this definition.</p> <p>Re: the timeframe, SB noted to look at directory vs. mandatory language. Thinks the dates can be moved because the proposition was drafted with May elections in mind.</p> <p>Re: §3(D)(1), the student member language was added by AGR (SB noted to contact Fred Lewis or Linda Curtis).</p> <p>Re: §3(A)(6), SB noted that "recognized" in "recognized domestic partner" was not</p>	<p>Write up of feedback.</p> <p>Contact people noted with experience in the California process.</p>

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>considered and suggested taking a broad reading of that term.</p> <p>Re: §3(A)(7), related to “controlling person,” affiliates were not considered. SB noted that this was adopted from the CA language.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(1), SB noted that the diversity attributes mentioned are not limited and the intent is to make every effort to included everyone in the process.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(1) timing provision, noted that the intent is to get the word out and not be tied to strict deadlines (referred to the idea of directory vs. mandatory language). Suggested that a “task force” might be a way to get the word out.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(3)(A), SB acknowledged the generic use of “city,” “county,” and “state” terms. Noted that § iv was added by AGR. SB noted to interpret this broadly and noted that there was a lawsuit in CA related to the interpretations.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(3) “conflicts of interest including,” SB noted that the cross-reference in §3(I)(5) allows for the conflicts to be limited to those enumerated in §3(I)(3).</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(3)(B), “such consultant” language was</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>added by AGR. SB noted a reasonable reference is to the previous sentence related to performing paid services.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(3)(B), the SB was not comfortable with expanding the “professional contact” language to such things as lawn or pest services. Suggested that we could rely entirely on the applicant to disclose contracts or ask Council for a list of people they have contracted with for the last three years. SB agreed that using a sworn statement would work, but thought a requirement to get the statement notarized would run the risk of limiting involvement – thinks it should be easy to apply.</p> <p>Re: how CA verified the information received in the application, SB noted to contact them, but did not think there could be much verification done.</p> <p>Re: a situation where we could not identify three qualified independent auditors, SB noted that the process would come back to OCA. OCA staff would be disqualified, so we need to define a “backup” process.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(3)(A)(i), “appointed to” does not include employees of a state or city.</p> <p>Re: §3(I)(6) prohibition on the audit panel communicating</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>with City Council “representatives,” SB noted that the City Auditor would not be a representative of Council – the intent was for people in Council offices.</p> <p>Re: §3(K)(3) prohibition on Commission communication about “redistricting matters,” SB noted this would be no communication – all Commission matters would be about redistricting. However, he noted that there would have to be communication to provide information to the Commission to make the process work.</p> <p>SB provided names of CA redistricting contacts: - Stephanie Ramirez (atty) - Donna Nevill (atty)</p> <p>SB will send other names and noted that only people with experience with this process are in CA - Jason Levitt (Loyola, CA) was someone involved in the CA process.</p>	
11/09/2012		<p>City Auditor, Ken Mory; DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo; Auditor II Rebecca Takahashi;</p>	<p>Review of Critical Path Plan (CPP). Feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep city council in apprised should be a step in CPP. Major developments should be sent to city council. Perception issue. 2. Put AFC and monthly briefing in the plan. 3. Change section B: “Clarify intent and identify issues and constraints” 	<p>Outreach to CPAs via firms, organizations, etc.</p> <p>Charles Holder needs to identify key CAU and managing partners, public accountancy firms of sufficient size.</p> <p>Ben Leffler: research organizations such as SIAF, NABA, AI and so on.</p>

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>4. Change section C: “Identify resources and constraints.”</p> <p>5. Add “legal counsel” as a sub-step in section D. CPAs are in the middle of the audit season. It will prove difficult finding the people we need to apply for the panel position. Keel as a plan B for finding qualified CPA.</p> <p>Charles Holder needs to identify CPA firms and audit groups.</p> <p>Other options: State Comptroller Office, Business School Professors, Private Industry Audit group – Dell, IBM, AMD, Freescale and so on.</p> <p>Organizations: OSACA, AGA, AI, SIAF, NABA, TSCPA, NGA chapter and so on.</p>	<p>Find out about all State Internal Auditors. Robert Elizondo may know about this. Also ask Rachel Snell about IIA people.</p> <p>Add lead person column to CPP.</p>
11/09/2012	9:30PM	<p>Peck Young and Fred Lewis (AGR) City Auditor, Ken Mory; DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo;</p>	<p>Aim to clarify language of the charter.</p> <p>Definition of “qualified independent auditor.” “Practicing” interpreted broadly. This person can be retired. This person is practices auditing in a more general sense. 5 years of auditing experience and is a CPA. It doesn’t mean they have to spend every single moment auditing. They must pass the conflict of interest test.</p> <p>The main message is to get</p>	<p>Write up of their feedback.</p>

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>skilled people with experience and no conflict of interest. No amateurs.</p> <p>Note on application that they may face penalty of perjury for misrepresentation.</p> <p>“Austin” reference was intended for people who know about Austin and the community. Austin MSA can be included in this definition.</p> <p>Message: go to the purpose of the ordinance/charter. Section 3’s purpose is open and transparent process.</p> <p>FL argues that auditors can be paid but commissioners cannot be paid. He referred to K5. It was never the intention that professional would be asked to come in and not be paid for it.</p> <p>Section 3,D,1: At least one students but not limited to one student. Student doesn’t have to have voted. Student is exempt from 5 year registered requirement. Any student enrolled in Austin education institution. Texas State not included.</p> <p>Section I on diversity: we do not include religion. The big four are racial, ethnic, gender, and geographic diversity. Socio-economic group is ok and sexual orientation. Peck’s view is to avoid including any additional groups and stick to the big four. As anything else may prove difficult down the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>road; especially at the federal courts level.</p> <p>Including religion is a violation of voting rights act</p> <p>Review of dates: FL states there is a line in the text that allows for adjustment of dates if election date moves. FL states key date is 180 days before the election as this is when people can legally raise money.</p> <p>Concern over use of city attorney's office especially if OCA should be independent. FL suggested avoiding issue of perception by using an external legal service. PY & FL suggested Rick Gray, Dave Richards, Buck Woods as redistricting experts.</p> <p>Section 3,8, &9: we cannot compensate commissioners but auditors can be paid. People who serve on the commission should not lose money from participating. Reimbursements for them.</p> <p>Section I,3,a – definition of "state or city". It is defined generically. No paid campaign political workers from other states. Those have their own issues.</p> <p>No likelihood of getting sued on excluding precinct chairman – campaign specific.</p> <p>Section 3,a, 7: the 10% provision related to ownership of a legal entity. FL said this</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>was direct ownership only.</p> <p>As for professional contract: no paid employees of the city. Professional contract include engineers, architects, and lawyers. Professional contract exempt competitive bidding. If someone worked for a city employee on a personal project they are also excluded from this group.</p> <p>Political consultant and representative of council does not include Ken and his office. This term referred to using surrogates to communicate with commission members or panel members.</p> <p>FL and PY talk about the extent to which OCA investigates the applicants. Easy to check contributions and if they are registered voters. They suggest an external advisor that can help with data – Jeff Smith.</p> <p>Ken mentions there will be a forum to publicize information to the public. PY suggests the coalition talk to the PIO folks as they have contact at every level across the city to help disseminate the information. There are people interested who live way out of the center of the city.</p>	
11/09/2012		<p>City Auditor, Ken Mory; DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo; Auditor II</p>	<p>Consult someone on the process to ensure that it has enough scrutiny.</p> <p>A list of what Steve said and what Peck and Fred also said.</p>	<p>List of what each meeting concluded on the interpretation of the charter side by side</p>

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

		Rebecca Takahashi;	<p>Similarly with legal.</p> <p>Legal review – how would you interpret this – is needed but also need a consult with city attorney as this is city ordinance and they are an expert.</p> <p>Discussion on the best date to release the application based on the November election date.</p> <p>Need to focus on quantity, diversity, and outreach.</p>	
11/09/2012	1:30PM	<p>Karen Kennard, John Steiner, Ann Morgan, and Sabina Romero (Legal Team)</p> <p>City Auditor, Ken Mory; DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo;</p>		
11/13/2012	All Day	<p>DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo, Auditor II Rebecca Takahashi;</p>	<p>Discussed the action items completed from the previous week that ended 11/09/2012.</p> <p>Delineated the action items for week beginning 11/13/2012 and highlighting the urgent task.</p> <p>Reviewing interview notes regarding the language of the Charter from all involved: AGR, Legal, TSBPA, and Beckerstaff.</p>	
11/13/2012	4pm	<p>PIO Team: Doug Matthews, Patricia Fragh, Kyle Carver, Patrick Hughey, Larry Schooler, Chris Florance, David Matustik.</p>	<p>Discussed whether a budget for outreach had been established. OCA mentioned that until there is an understanding of what is</p>	<p>PIO needs the following from OCA:</p> <p>Immediate content on OCA site while PIO</p>

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

		<p>OCA Team: DCA, Corrie Stokes; Chief of Investigations, Jason Hadavi; AC III, Patrick Johnson; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo, Auditor II Rebecca Takahashi</p>	<p>required, we cannot yet submit a request for funding. PIO team asked for the important steps that need to be taken in the next 2-3 weeks. Immediate need includes: messaging for branding sites, the process, and how interested parties can apply.</p> <p>Need to move beyond the “getting ready” message and provide information for those who are ready to get involved.</p> <p>Option: speaking to county about using voters registration to mass mail out to residence.</p> <p>Template of communication efforts. PIO needs guidance on custom navigation, OCA needs to sign off on custom branding, and PIO can set up a list of people ready to receive emails with OCA having control of that information.</p> <p>If OCA can provide details by 11/14, PIO can have something up by 11/26. Deployments occur on Mondays. PIO can create a blank page that OCA can access and populate.</p> <p>Perception of “distance” from City Org as a whole is required.</p> <p>PIO can also include on the site section for news, updates, meeting agenda, and minutes, calendar, and sign-up. Each section needs an OCA narrative.</p>	<p>works on “independent” site. Some kind of graphic outlining different steps in the process and displaying the basic candidate qualifications for the public.</p> <p>Content needed from OCA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background: The What and The Why • The Process • The Document in question • The Qualifications <p>Larry & Trish can identify community groups.</p> <p>A letter from CA to give to the group is required.</p> <p>Need to get an estimate of telephone town-hall and check if Waller is available or a possibility (PIO).</p> <p>Patrick Hughey working on logo and the visual of the website. He will work with OCA staff to come to a conclusion.</p> <p>Patrick to change “Austin Districting Gateway” to “Austin Redistricting Portal”. Add the Office of City</p>
--	--	--	---	---

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>Sign-up can be automated. Individuals who are waiting can enter their email and receive news feeds.</p> <p>Distribution piece beyond online: Looking at the best outreach based on all the distribution channels available to PIO i.e. ANC list, Community registry, Speak-up List, LULAC, ACLA, and Minority Chambers. Neighborhood paper to reach a diverse population. PIO can follow-up with those papers.</p> <p>Keep a running list of contact with who has been contacted.</p> <p>Possible outreach date: 12/15 when the apps go out. Website launches 11/26 to let people know about release. 12/1 would be the public engagement in early December. A forum on 2-3 fundamental question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should we be looking for/asking for? • Strategies to reach out or elicit candidates application • What skills are needed or should we look for in a candidate? <p>Anything that comes out from the forum may affect the applications.</p> <p>Potential venue for initial outreach: One Texas Center, Waller, and Palmer. Possibility of Telephone town-</p>	<p>Auditor seal instead of City of Austin. Use the 10:1 logo instead of the Ten-One logo.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>hall set up to allow people to call into the forum to cover underrepresented area. Budget 1 pence per connection. They would be called a few minutes before the meeting to stay online and participate.</p> <p>Day of the week recommended for outreach: Monday evening, Tuesday evening.</p> <p>Option to post fundamental question at Speak-up Austin website/forum.</p> <p>Workshop in one in each of the four commissioner district for Q&A post release of the application form.</p>	
11/14/2012	1PM	Legal Rep: John Steiner; Auditor III, Patrick Johnson; Chief of Investigation, Jason Hadavi; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo		
11/15/2012	2:00PM	Linda Curtis & Jessica Ellison; Auditor III, Patrick Johnson; Chief of Investigation, Jason Hadavi; Auditor, Tope Eletu-Odibo	<p>Linda built the coalition, brought people together to craft the proposal, and when the campaign started she conducted grassroots outreach. Jessica was charged with social networking for the campaign.</p> <p>Focus groups that impacted the process and group that should be reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Bulldog • Asian Community • Villager Newspaper • Nokoa the Observer • La Prensa Newspaper • La Voce Newspaper • The Austin Cut • Oakhill Gazette 	

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• NAACP• LULAC <p>There is a history with Asian community. Business interest did not get involved until the proposal vetting stage. They decided to then work with the minority groups within the 8-2-1 (hybrid system). That community did not want 10-1 coalition.</p> <p>No response yet from the Asian community.</p> <p>NAACP & LULAC has standing with Department of Justice for the VRA.</p> <p>Using a varied media outlet was most effective: social media, blogs, and newspaper, door-to-door and so on.</p> <p>On AGR's Facebook, open conversation from the public. On qualifications to serve, they put a quiz on their page "can you serve on the commission". AGR's page is called Trust Austin. OCA can go through the page and see what people thought about the qualification.</p> <p>Estimated that 26,000 more or less of Austin residents have voted in the last 3 elections. Estimate via Facebook.</p> <p>Concern that the interpretation of the applicant review panel may strip the pool of auditors; especially when you consider that the auditor's firm may have worked for the city</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>(conflict of interest issue need to be considered also)</p> <p>AGR can publicize the application process through their Facebook channels and other media channels. They will look the auditor's website for information.</p> <p>AGR does not necessarily represent everyone.</p> <p>Linda and OCA team in agreement on having a forum to involve the community. People will be curious to know how the commission will work even though if they don't want to serve.</p> <p>Jessica suggested a quick 15 sec and 30 sec videos on Facebook and Google to reach specifically targeted group of people. Also the suggestion of using door hangars which were effective but laborious. Direct mailing to eligible voters.</p> <p>It was not cumbersome to get 26,000 names of registered voters from the county clerk office for \$30 and Jeff Smith can provide a database of voter history at \$25 per 1000 names. Calling does not work except for making announcements.</p> <p>Student engagement: they had 3,000 to 4,000 signed AGR's petition. AGR has outreach in UT and ACC campus. In the latter, they have people on the ACC trustee board. Student</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

AUDITEE COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

			<p>organizations would love to get the word out. Linda reads the charter as having at least one student but it can be more than one. The intention was to make the interpretation broad.</p> <p>Definition of relevant analytical skills: someone who has the skills to understand that this is a big city and everyone needs representation. Similar to a jury, they should be able to hear testimony, meet experts, understand what is going on, and be able to draw the districts.</p> <p>Steve Lynn headed up the commission in California and would be the best person to speak to.</p> <p>Some people wanted more than 10 seats but they looked at the least number of seats they could pass with the Voting Rights Act. NWACP bought into the plan. If the lines are drawn well, they will accept it. Linda suggested Steve Bickerstaff may be a good source for answering questions on pre-clearance.</p> <p>Question about cost to the city or cost of the process. Not definitive figures yet. This could all depend on whether OCA hires outside consultants or attorneys.</p>	