



## Boards and Commissions Peer City Analysis

City	Number of Boards	Average Term Length	Average # of Members Per Board
Santa Barbra, CA	32	3.6	7.56
Ann Arbor, MI	30	3.24	8.8
Cedar Rapids, IA	25	3.6	8
Charlottesville, VA	25	3.21	3.64
Athens, GA	24	4.2	8.04
Tacoma, WA	23	3.2	9.4
Norman, OK	23	3.1	7.5
Loveland, CO	22	3.2	8.9
Gainesville, FL	21	2.75	8
Greeley, CO	21	3.4	8.4
Asheville, NC	20	3.3	9
Boulder, CO	20	5.1	5.4
Longmont, CO	20	3.5	7.5
Burbank, CA	18	3.7	6.94
Irving, TX	17	2	8.4
Denton, TX	17	8.29	2.12
Portland, ME	15	3	7.3
Arvada, CO	15	3.38	6.93
Eugene, OR	14	3.37	9
Olathe, KS	14	3.1	9
Provo, UT	13	3.6	7.4
Garland, TX	13	2	9.7
Santa Rosa, CA	13	4	7.5
Anaheim, CA	13	3.7	8.9
Boise, ID	12	3.6	6.6
Bellevue, WA	12	3.7	9
Westminster, CO	10	2	8.2
Thornton, CO	10	3.7	8.4
Richardson, TX	9	4	6.1
Palo Alto, CA	9	3.3	6.5
Lakewood, CO	8	3.6	6
<b>Peer Average:</b>	17.35	3.84	7.41
<b>Fort Collins</b>	25	3.96	8.6



The above chart outlines the average number of boards, average number of members per board, and average term length for each of the City of Fort Collins' peer cities. This data was collected from information provided on each city's website and municipal code/charter. *As a result, Coral Springs, FL, one of the peer cities, is not listed above as their online board and commission information was significantly incomplete.* This data reflects boards and commissions that are solely city entities, not joint boards, or boards of outside organizations. *As a result, Lincoln NE, one of the peer cities, is not listed above due to their joint board structure.*

The City of Fort Collins tracks closely with its peer cities in the average term length and number of members per board. However, the City of Fort Collins has 7.65 more boards than the peer city average.

The cities of Irving, Garland, and Westminster are unique in that they have 2-year terms for all their boards (except their youth advisory boards which serve 1-year terms). Whereas, the rest of the cities have term lengths more similar to that of the City of Fort Collins.

The chart below outlines the structure and process alternatives used by the same group of peer cities. Many cities use a mix of these processes, with some variation between individual boards.

### Peer City Process Alternatives

Process Alternative	Peer Cities that Use Process
Appointments made by Mayor	Provo, Olathe, Cedar Rapids, Ashville, Athens, Lincoln
Seats on board are assigned to districts/wards and or at large.	Santa Rosa, Ashville, Portland
Specific board seats are reserved for current board members (of same board or different board) to fill and appoint	Provo, Eugene, Bellevue, Athens, Lincoln, Ashville, Tacoma, Burbank
Individual council members appoint one board member each <sup>1</sup>	Santa Rosa, Thornton, Anaheim
Reserved seat(s) for youth	Eugene, Loveland, Tacoma, Santa Barbra
Specific profession assigned seats	Provo, Tacoma, Gainesville, Olathe, Cedar Rapids, Santa Barbra, Athens, Irving, Charlottesville, Ashville, Portland, Greeley, Loveland, Lakewood, Boulder, Thornton
Must have attended prior meetings to be eligible to apply	Lakewood
Use of active alternates 1-3 per board <sup>2</sup>	Irving, Ashville, Longmont, Provo, Westminster
A mix of non-voting and voting members	Irving, Charlottesville, Ashville, Westminster, Tacoma
Large board with subcommittees	Lakewood
Two-year terms	Irving, Garland, Westminster



Explicit diversity requirement statement, or strict diversity demographic seat requirements <sup>3</sup>	Tacoma, Garland, Santa Barbra, Ashville
Staff advisory boards and council advisory boards <sup>4</sup>	Eugene, Tacoma
Percent of board appointments made (or recommended) by specific community groups/outside entities	Tacoma, Athens, Norman, Portland, Loveland, Thornton, Longmont
City Manager appointments	Provo, Gainesville, Bellevue, Irving, Portland
Residency requirements vary per board or certain seats of boards, versus a blanket residency requirement for all boards	Most
Use of ex-official members	Longmont, Tacoma

The following provides examples and further explanation of a few of the alternatives listed and noted in the table above:

<sup>1</sup> In addition to assigning each seat on the board to a ward/district or at-large, the City of Anaheim’s Senior Citizen Commission has terms that run concurrently with the current term of the elected official who appointed the member.

<sup>2</sup> The City of Longmont is one of the cities that uses alternate appointments for several of their boards. These alternates are asked to attend every meeting and step in if an appointed member is unable to attend a meeting and or take the position of a member that must resign from their term.

<sup>3</sup> There were several variations of diversity requirements among the cities that had them. The City of Ashville’s Human Relations Commission requires that a set number of members be from specific community groups. The seat requirements are as follows, “6 African Americans, 2 Latinx individuals, 2 members of the LGBTQ community, 2 youth members, between the ages of 18 and 25, 2 to 3 individuals who live in public housing, 2 individuals with a disability and 3 individuals who are recognized as community leaders”. Whereas, the City of Tacoma uses the following statement, “membership must reflect the diversity of our community as to race and culture, gender, age, socioeconomics, geography, and interest in commission membership”.

<sup>4</sup> The City of Tacoma and the City of Eugene have boards that advise city staff instead of advising the city council. The City of Eugene has six Department Advisory Groups, with board members appointed by department managers. These advisory groups can only exist for two years before being evaluated.