INFORMATIONAL BRIEF

Dual-Step Selection Process Alternatives

Francisco Jasso, PhD, Pat Brown Institute – California State University, Los Angeles

Core Question

The purpose of this brief is to address the following question: Is the dual-step process from the 2023 CLA report the only way to select commissioners? Or are there other processes that could work differently?

Summary of Topline Findings

The 2023 CLA report identifies 3 processes: panel selection, single step, and dual step.[1] Most jurisdictions use either panel or dual-step process. CLA report recommends against single-step in favor of dual-step. Examining the selection processes of other jurisdictions, many use dual-step or a combination of dual-step and panel processes.

Background & Information

In cities with IRC:

1. **Austin, TX – Panel & Dual-Step**
    a. City Auditor selects 3 independent auditors from a pool of certified public accountants to form Applicant Review Panel, who then selects 60 applicants. ARP then draws 8 names to form the 1st round of commissioners, who then spend 3 months selecting 6 additional members to form a 14-member commission (1 of which is a student representative)
2. **Portland, OR – Single-Step**
    a. Appointed by Mayor and subject to Council approval.
3. **St. Louis, MO – Panel & Dual-Step**
    a. Board of Alderman appoints Oversight Committee to review applications and select pool of potential commissioners. 4 are selected at random and that group of 4 appoints another 5 members.
    b. Board of Alderpersons shall select an Oversight Committee of five (5) individuals consisting of one (1) representative from the Planning and Urban Design Agency, one (1) representative from the Comptroller's Office and three (3) retired judges.
4. **Lincoln, CA – Panel**
    a. City Manager, Attorney, & Clerk serve as review body to create pool of applicants sorted by district. They will then randomly select 1 per district (5 total) and then select 6 at-large

In states with IRC:

1. **Colorado State and Congressional – Panel**

[1] https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-1196-S1

a. A panel of three retired state judges screened the applications and randomly selected 300 applicants from both major parties and 450 unaffiliated applicants, then narrowed down to the 50 most qualified in each category; separately, legislative leaders of both parties each submitted a list of ten applicants from the original pool who affiliate with one of the two major parties. The panel of judges ultimately selected the 12 members of each commission from the panel's pools and the legislative leaders' pools.

2. Brennan Center for Justice Recommendation – Panel

[Independent agency] creates 3 pools of 40 representative and qualified candidates for each of 2 largest parties and unaffiliated. Each pool is reduced by 10. Majority and minority party leaders may strike 2 applicants from each pool. Independent Agency will then randomly select 3 from each pool. That initial group will then appoint the final 6 from the persons remaining.