

**City Manager’s Report**  
**April 13, 2021 City Council Meeting**  
**Prepared By: Cleve Morris**



**Item#: 12.1**

**Subject:** Receive Public Input and consider changing the City Logo by removing the depiction of a noose on the Logo.

---

**Purpose:** To consider removing the depiction of a noose on the City’s Logo.

**Background:** On July 14, 2020, the City Council discussed the potential redesign of the City’s logo and consideration to remove the depiction of a noose on the logo. After discussion, the proposed redesigned logo which removed depiction of a noose from the City Logo, was rejected. Following further discussion, the following motion was adopted:

*It was then moved by Vice-Mayor Thomas and seconded by Councilmember Acuna to bring the item back in January to set a date for further discussion on the item. The motion was amended by ViceMayor Thomas and seconded again by Councilmember Acuna to include a meeting between two Council members and City staff to discuss options moving forward.*

On January 26, 2021, the issue returned to the Council for discussion in accordance with the previous resolution. The following motion was made:

*Following Council discussion, it was moved by Vice-Mayor Taylor and seconded by Councilmember Neau that the City Council have two council members volunteer to meet with the City Manager to work out the structure and process of the meeting and bring the item back at the next City Council meeting to propose suggestions for the meeting and finalize a date.*

Vice Mayor Taylor and Councilmember Borelli volunteered to work with staff to prepare a recommendation for Council. The committee first met on February 1, 2021 to discuss options for moving forward. At that meeting we discussed options such as a facilitated meeting to allow both sides to make a presentation followed by public comment and Council discussion and decision. We also discussed a facilitated focus group meeting prior to a special council meeting to work together to come up with recommendations for the Council. The committee spent time talking to potential facilitators determining their interest and obtaining costs. The Committee also considered other options and how the meeting could be effective given Covid-19 restrictions we are currently under. As we started making initial contact with potential presenters/ focus group participants and facilitators we encountered some difficulty finding people that were willing and able to be part of the meeting. It became clear that moving in this direction would require a substantial amount of staff time to contact participants, and then several rounds of back-up participants, which the Committee felt uncomfortable authorizing without knowing if that was the direction the Council wanted to go. There was also some concern that no matter who was chosen for the focus group/presentations, some in the public would take issue with the selection or selection process and that perhaps it would be best to allow everyone who felt strongly on the matter to have an equal amount of time to express their thoughts to the Council. The Committee met a second time on February 8, 2021 to have additional discussion on the issue and determine how to move forward.

At that time the Committee determined the best path forward was to hold a public forum allowing the public to speak on this topic, followed by Council discussion at the same meeting and finally, a decision by the Council. This proposal was not accepted by the Council and the following motion was made:

*Following Council discussion, it was moved by Councilmember Neau and seconded by Councilmember Saragosa that the City Council direct Staff and the Committee (overseeing the structure and process of the meeting regarding the City logo) to prepare a different format to conduct the public forum, bringing a plan of action back to the City Council on March 23, 2021.*

At the March 23, 2021 meeting, the committee returned with a new facilitated process to obtain public input and to consider redesign of the logo. At the meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, this proposal was not accepted and a motion was approved to hold a “History Presentation” using historians and experts in the field. Following the History Presentation, bring back to the next available Council meeting an item to receive public input and make a decision on removing the noose from the logo.

**Discussion:** The Committee met and scheduled the History Presentation. At this time we have scheduled the presentation as a recorded event that anyone can watch on our website at any time. The planned date to release the presentation, at the writing of this report, is April 9, 2021. In accordance with the motion we have scheduled the review of the logo at a meeting following the History Presentation, April 13, 2021.

Staff and some councilmembers have done quite a bit of research on the logo and origination. However, it has been difficult to determine the exact date of the current logo. Some confusion has been created over the difference between the City’s logo, and the City’s Seal. The City Seal is an emblem used by the City Clerk to stamp official documents of the City. Original Resolutions, Ordinances, and Proclamations that are presented are embossed with the City seal.

The City Logo is an emblem or insignia placed on City letterhead, vehicles and other facilities to be recognized as City property or official correspondence from the City. It is also representative of who the City is. During the fall of 2020, staff had color added to the embossing of the City Seal to show what it looked like and represented. This was presented on City documents for a short period to introduce it but was later rejected. Below is a comparison of the two items:

Logo



Seal



In addition to these examples, Staff worked with a local resident to remove the noose only from the logo. Following is the depiction of the current logo without the noose.

**Current Logo without Noose**



Through staff's research and review of this issue, we have also discovered other examples that have been used. Recently the following logo was discovered in our Engineering/PW Department. We believe this logo was used by those departments in the 90's, but have not been able to determine the exact time period.

**Public Works Logo**



We found the following which is similar to the City seal that was used on a Code Enforcement Citation book dating back to the 70's. It is not currently used.



Finally: The Police Department has used different patches over time, changing the shape and sometimes the actual picture.

**Current**



There may be other variations that have been used throughout time.

**Options:**

1. Direct Staff to remove the depiction of a noose from the City Logo and other facilities such as street signs.
2. Make no changes to the Logo.
3. Direct staff to develop costs and a program to redesign the City Logo.
4. Other.

**Cost:** If Option 1 is chosen, the estimated cost to make the change is as follows:

Business Cards:	\$740	
Decals for Facilities:	\$490	Labor: \$300
Decals for Vehicles:	\$463	
<u>Street Signs:</u>	<u>\$1,864</u>	<u>Labor: \$1,500</u>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$3,557</b>	<b>\$1,800</b>

**Budget Impact:** None, Staff believes the cost can be absorbed in the current year budget.

**Recommendation:** Receive Public Input and consider changing the City Logo by removing the depiction of a noose on the Logo.




---

M. Cleve Morris, City Manager