

<b>Our Recommendations Regarding the Remaining Referrals</b>
--

## **NUMBER OF DISTRICTS AND COUNCILORS**

**Referral from Council:** We considered two referrals together.

- The appropriate number of city council districts.
- The appropriate number of city councilors per district.

**Action:** refer the current configuration of 4 dual member districts to the 2030 Charter review and adjust the sequence of Charter and Redistricting Commissions.

**Recommendation:**

- That the number of districts and councilors be referred to the 2030 Charter Commission as soon as the 2030 census is completed, and
- The next Charter Commission should be convened prior to convening the next Redistricting Commission.

**Commentary:** The benefits of adding a district and reducing the number of councilors do not outweigh the disruption that these changes would make at this time.

The sequence of Charter and then Redistricting commissions' work is preferred. One recommended possibility would be to spend the census year with a full year of charter review with ample public engagement from beginning to end of that year. The census report and the charter report would then both be available to the redistricting process.

## **AT-LARGE COUNCIL MEMBER**

**Referral from Council:** Whether the City should have an “at large” council member.

**Action:** apply the legal restriction against this item.

**Recommendation:** that the council does not forward this item unless the Legislature acts to allow it.

**Commentary:** Case law in NM would not allow at-large membership. (*Casuse v. City of Gallup*, 1987-NMSC-112, P 8.) Presently, the council approaches the maximum number of members allowed by NM law. An at-large member would only serve to relieve the necessity of all members to act on behalf of the city as a whole as well as to represent their own district.