



Multnomah County Charter Review

Equitable Representation Subcommittee

April 18, 2022, 7:00 – 8:30 pm

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING 6

Purpose: To review temperature check survey of subcommittee members' priorities and determine which research topics to focus on for the future.

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

- Samantha Gladu (she/they)
- Annie Kallen (she/her)
- Meikelo Cabbage (he/him)
- Timur Ender (he/him)

- Maja Harris (she/her)
- Jude Perez (they/them)

Staff:

- Kali Odell (she/her), Charter Review Committee Program Coordinator

In addition, members of the public were welcome to observe the meeting as non-participatory attendees. There were two observers at this meeting.

Welcome

Kali went over Zoom logistics. Annie welcomed everyone.

Public Comment

Annie noted that the subcommittee had received two written comments in advance of the meeting.

Kali overviewed the public comment process.

Carol Chesarek had signed up for verbal comment in advance. Carol said that she served on the 2016 Charter Review Committee. She had submitted written comment ahead of the meeting, as well. She cautioned the subcommittee to be wary groups or individuals with a particular solution they wanted to sell the subcommittee. She said that there is seldom one right and answer and it is important to hear a variety of perspectives, including from people who could speak to less obvious implications of ideas they are hearing and can speak to local history and conditions. She was concerned about some of the things More Equitable Democracy had spoken to the subcommittee about, which she wasn't sure were in line with where the county is today.

Carol also spoke about the costs of adding commissioners, pointing out that each office currently had three staff members and office overhead, so the subcommittee should account for that if they think it is important to continue staffing those offices. She also alluded to her written testimony and her concerns that more commissioners would mean lobbyists and special interests have greater influence than citizens. She thinks it would be more difficult for citizens to get meetings with commissioners who do not represent their districts. Carol also addressed a previous subcommittee discussion about electing all county officials at the same time and a remark she remembered that it was unlikely all of the commissioners would turnover at the same time since incumbents usually win reelection. Carol said the committee should consider how terms limits might come into play. She thought it was important to maintain some experience on the board.

Carol also said that even as an informed voter she can have difficulty educating herself about all of the candidates on a ballot and that people might not be getting complete information about candidates in a race. She said she was concerned about a point brought up at the subcommittee's last meeting that multi-member districts making it more likely that the county will get more conservative white men, right-wing crazy people on the board. Is that a direction the subcommittee wants to go?

Carol also said if they change the voting system she thought it would be better to at least initially limit them to Multnomah County offices. She thought it would be better to offer voters lots of small changes rather than grouping them all together, so that voters can pick and choose what they like.

She also recommended that the subcommittee look at the history of Charter recommendations.

Maja invited Carol to submit any additional points to the subcommittee in writing.

No one else was interested in giving verbal comment.

Annie addressed the written comments submitted to the subcommittee. One was from Carol and addressed many of the points in her verbal comment.

Meikelo said he agreed with the point that proportional representation or alternative forms of voting would increase representation comparative to other factors. He said that the existing system has already increased the diversity of candidates and believed that ultimately voters' preferences will trump everything. He thought the subcommittee needed more detailed data and evidence to show that the changes they had been talking about would actually increase diversity and effect the changes they were hoping to see.

Annie summarized comment submitted by Amanda Fritz: Commissioner District 2 is the only commissioner office elected at the same time as the Chair, which means that commissioner has to choose between running for reelection or running for Chair, which other commissioners don't have to do. Amanda recommended having the District 2 commissioner elected in the same cycle as the other three commissioners and not in the same cycle as Chair.

Samantha and Maja expressed interest in addressing the issue and exploring further.

Meikelo also thought this was important point, but was interested in having another position moved to the Chair's year so that there isn't a loss of experience in a single election.

Timur pointed out that a decision has to be made between policy preferences: is it more important to protect experience or to have elections at higher turnout election? Or is there disagreement that there is lower turnout in off-year elections?

Maja pointed out that changes in turnout aren't as dramatic in Oregon as other states since the state has vote by mail. She said there is still a lower turnout.

Annie noted that it might be helpful to track down some voter turnout data.

Subcommittee Survey Results

Annie invited subcommittee members to share about any research they've done.

Meikelo asked to look at survey results, first, to get a sense of where people are on different topics.

Annie shared the survey results (included in Appendix B) and overviewed the subcommittee members' responses:

The first set of questions asked about the importance of aligning county recommendations with those made by the Portland Charter Commission.

Subcommittee members had mixed responses about the importance of aligning ballot styles. There was generally less support for aligning recommendations for the use of multi-member districts and the power of the top executive.

Annie added that as they move through the survey, it would be helpful for subcommittee members to think about what additional information they felt they would need to move forward on a topic.

Meikelo said it was too early to know how Portland would package their recommendations, which might impact subcommittee members' views. He thought this could be worth revisiting later.

Samantha introduced the next question, which asked subcommittee members about their thoughts on the number of commissioners and the strength of that opinion. She reported that two members were in favor of maintaining the current size, two members weren't sure, and two members were in favor of an increase in size. The strength of members' opinions varied.

Samantha said the next question asked subcommittee members if they favored single member districts, multi-member districts, or were not sure. The subcommittee split evenly between the three options. They were also split on the strength of those opinions.

Samantha reported that the next question asked members' thoughts on having an at-large position like the Chair of the Board of Commissioners. Half of the subcommittee members believed the current system works, 2 did not think anyone should be elected at large, and one member was not sure.

Samantha read the written comments members included in the survey in response to this section of the survey, which included one remark about not having the bandwidth to do due diligence on increasing the size

of the Board; they did not think mirroring the Portland City Commission's recommendation on this would be a good enough process given the differences in size and the fact that the county already uses districts. Another subcommittee member wrote that they would be interested to hear what the Government Accountability Subcommittee might be discussing about the powers of the chair.

Samantha asked members if there was additional information they would want on these topics to move forward or potentially change their minds on these topics?

Jude asked if the subcommittee would do a fist of five on each of these topics, or if these were already set as research areas?

Samantha clarified that this survey was a temperature check to see where members are on the research topics previously identified.

Meikelo wanted to know what is wrong with the current system for electing county commissioners to justify such significant changes? And then what are the benefits of what is being proposed?

Annie introduced the next survey section on ballot structure and voting methods.

Two thirds of subcommittee members said they were interested in changing the ballot structure. One person was not sure and one thought it was dependent on what the Portland Charter Commission recommends.

Half of members favored ranked choice voting, two members favored STAR, and favored of the current system. Most members felt strongly about their opinions.

Annie summarized written comments from the survey: One said it was a good idea to put RCV on the ballot because it was polling well and would be straightforward for voters. One supported STAR but was open to a Condorcet method or Approval voting; they would also support setting up a county-level task force to research voting methods and make a recommendation to county commissioners. One comment expressed preference for STAR voting, but also would not mind ranked choice voting.

Annie said she was interested in what happens in Portland. The commissioners did recommend ranked choice voting, but that was going through legal review and she was concerned about what happens if Portland cannot implement it.

Meikelo said he would like to see polling about RCV, particularly among Multnomah County voters.

Maja said that ranked choice voting is polling around 71% with Portland voters. She shared a poll from GAOB <https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2022/gbao-slide-deck.pdf>.

Samantha introduced the next section of the survey on expanding the franchise to noncitizens:

Four members were in support, one member was against, and one member wanted more information about how noncitizens are defined and the level of public support for this expansion. Most members felt strongly about their opinions.

Annie said that she was the one wanted to know how noncitizens would be defined and the level of public support.

Annie moved the group into a review of results about election timing:

Two members were in favor of leaving election timing alone. Four members were in favor of changing election timing, but differed on when what changes should be made. Most members identified with a middling level of strength behind their opinions.

Jude said that discussion would help them cultivate an opinion and that they don't have a full picture of what each of these options would look like. They would like to have a fist of five on each topic to gain more understanding of different perspectives and figure out which areas are worth spending more time on and getting into the weeds on.

Annie said she also felt like she did not have a strong sense of the pros and cons of election timing and would like to develop more understanding of the topic.

Samantha moved the group to the next section, starting with results about whether members supported allowing candidates to self-identify with a political party.

Half said candidates should be able to identify with a political party. Two were in favor of remaining strictly nonpartisan. One member was not sure. Most members ranked the strength of their opinion as middling.

The next question asked whether county elections should move to a proportional representation system. Subcommittee members were equally divided between yes, no, and not sure, with varying levels of strength in their opinions. One subcommittee member wrote they were not sure proportional representation would add much benefit given county demographics and were concerned about the added complexity. Another subcommittee member wrote they were not sure how it would be implemented.

Maja said proportional representation abroad is often dependent upon party elections. She wanted to point out that proportional representation can be achieved without parties, like the Portland Charter Commission was trying to do.

Annie spoke about how proportional representation works in some other countries. She pointed out there are a lot of different ways this could be done.

Samantha noted that the most group alignment existed for ballot structure and noncitizen voters.

Samantha asked how people were interested in moving forward, particularly given there's not currently a lot of alignment on the other topics.

Timur pointed out that there might be more alignment possible, but that people needed more information. He mentioned needing to do some work on research topics to present information about what is not working with the current system and why change is important. Timur also said he hoped there would be opportunity at future meetings to present cases.

Annie said she and Samantha were gathering the questions people have already asked and would send those out to the members researching the relevant topic. At the next meeting, small groups would share the information they have found so far. They can have a PowerPoint, just talk, or put it in writing. She asked if this seemed like a workable process to people or if there were other suggestions?

Maja asked if the subcommittee plans to do a deep-dive on all of these topics or if they were going to narrow the list.

Annie said they could narrow down more. She noted there was interest in a lot of topics, but limited time to look into them. She asked if the committee wanted to narrow further now?

Jude was in favor of narrowing topics.

Samantha pulled up the research priorities document generated at the subcommittee's last meeting. Each of the subcommittee members signed up to research two topic areas. Samantha asked if subcommittee members felt comfortable eliminating anything now or if they wanted a couple of weeks to try to persuade the group.

Annie noted relative consensus on noncitizen voting. She thought there should be additional research to structure their recommendation to the full committee. She also said that she felt the group was all over the place on the concept of partisan elections and no one seemed to feel too strongly about it, so perhaps they could eliminate that.

Meikelo said he had not supported noncitizen voting because he felt like there was a strong possibility of a legal challenge and was concerned about the viability of such an amendment based on the legal analysis presented by Katherine Thomas, Assistant County Attorney, at an earlier subcommittee meeting.

Annie said they could ask for additional legal analysis on the recommendation, although she was not sure if that would help since it sounded like this was a grey area.

Timur said he was reluctant to eliminate topics after the survey since members were all over the place and he felt like people didn't have enough information to make decisions about all of the topics. He thought the survey helped identify where research was needed and felt like there should be an opportunity to present that since members had not had much opportunity to weigh out information on all of the topics.

Annie said she was in favor of taking the next two weeks to do what research they could, present information to the group, and then decide what to continue pursuing.

Maja said that she felt like they were way behind schedule for deep diving into some of the more complex topics they were discussing. She said she thought an issue like noncitizen voting was fairly straightforward and was done in 15 municipalities in the U.S., so while rare, it was not without precedent. She did not think two to four weeks was enough time to work through some of the more complex issues, no matter where she generally stands on them. She did not think that it was adequate to mimic the Portland Charter Commission's plan for multi-member districts, and that if the subcommittee wanted to proceed, it needed to start doing its own math to figure out what would best serve county districts. She felt that if they want to make a big change she would want to commit to that as soon as possible so they can dig into the details.

Annie agreed with Maja.

Samantha said she thought there was enough general agreement on addressing ballot structure and noncitizen voting that they could probably make recommendations on those topics. Samantha asked about how they wanted to proceed with research in other areas. She and Annie recommended the trios researching each topic work in concert.

Annie said that after subcommittee members brought back research, they could determine whether they had enough information to proceed on each topic.

Maja pointed out that all research would come at the expense of actions that the subcommittee could take. She said she thought it was time to start eliminating topics, even ones of great interest to them, because there was not enough time to research all of them well.

Meikelo asked what the bylaws say about level of voting to approve recommendations.

Kali said that the MCCRC bylaws required that two-thirds of subcommittee members present for a vote needed to vote affirmatively for any proposals to move forward.

Annie noted that Samantha wrote in the Zoom chat that More Equitable Democracy had offered to draft some district maps related to proportional representation. Annie suggested they could reach out to MED and find out what a timeline for that would look like.

Annie also raised another comment from Samantha in the chat, that the Portland Charter Commission benefitted from having years of community groups' research on a number of these topics to rely on in their decision-making, which the county did not have.

Jude asked if they could come to some agreement about on noncitizen voting and ballot structure at the next meeting.

Maja's preference for the next meeting was to have subcommittee members bring forward proposals about what they would like to recommend and take a temperature check or a vote to decide what to move forward. After that, they could discuss what additional questions or details needed to be addressed before submitting a recommendation to the full committee. She spoke about the Government Accountability Subcommittee's tough decisions to cut research topics so it could focus on the topics that had the most support.

Annie said she thought part of the challenge was that some of the subcommittee's topics were very intertwined, which made it challenging to narrow. She said her inclination was to start voting at the next meeting to narrow topics.

Jude liked Annie's idea. They said they would want to hear from commissioners and county members about their thoughts on the changes that would impact commissioners' elections since they are people who would be directly impacted. They felt these people would have insight and they wanted to know where they stand.

Annie said they could have commissioners or county employees speak at future meetings or that could be part of individual research that is brought back to the group.

Timur pointed out that since the impact of increasing the number of commissioners will dilute current commissioners' power, which might influence their view. He was not opposed to hearing from them, but also noted they cannot control whether they could get a response from those offices in the next two weeks.

Timur also said he thought it would be a good idea to have formal votes on the ballot structure and expanding the franchise at their next meeting, followed by pitches on the other topics, and then they could decide how to move forward. He felt that the universe needed to be clearly defined.

Samantha said she could not be at the next meeting and asked if it would be okay for her to email her votes.

Kali said Samantha was welcome to email her opinions to Kali, who would share them in the meeting, but that only members in attendance at a meeting could officially vote.

Annie expressed appreciation for the subcommittee members and ended the meeting.

APPENDIX A: ZOOM CHAT

19:08:56 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

That's 3 minutes

19:10:31 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Kali, would you mind putting the agenda in the chat?

19:11:01 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Tonight's agenda: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Equitable%20Representation%20Subcommittee%20Agenda%2004.18.22.pdf>

19:11:40 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Thanks, Kali!

19:22:23 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Turnout was 74+% in the 2018 midterm and 79+% in the 2020 presidential election.

19:24:34 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

What questions would you need to have answered to support decision making?

19:24:58 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Thanks Maja! Good fact!!!

19:24:58 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

I can't really read the comments - the font is so small...

19:25:08 From Jude Perez (they/them) to Everyone:

Can the survey results be shared?

19:25:18 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

I can share a pdf of them!

19:25:29 From Jude Perez (they/them) to Everyone:

That would be great!

19:25:45 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

Katherine will talk a bit about packaging proposals and how that works at your Wednesday meeting.

19:26:06 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

This is for our committee, but are the same rules Portland follows

19:26:27 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

These don't have the option to scroll down in the survey responses... will share a sheet version as well

19:38:43 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

I'll share an excel version

19:39:07 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

<https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2022/gbao-slide-deck.pdf>

19:42:13 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Is the level of zoom-ed in ok?

19:45:07 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Agreed, Jude

19:55:56 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Recapping what Annie shared - curious whether there are changes to this process that anyone would like to propose

19:55:57 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Samantha emails relevant notes from conversation to each research trio

Each trio connects between this meeting and the next to plan how they'll find answers and share back info

Each trio shares back at our next meeting - max 15 min each for a high level overview and including q&a

19:57:58 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

categories:

file:///C:/Users/Owner/Documents/Pics%20&%20Docs/Documents/Charter%20Review%20(New)/MC CRC%20Equitable%20Representation%20Subcommittee%203%20Research%20Priorities%20(1).pdf

19:59:08 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

Thanks Samantha!

20:02:15 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Miekelo then Timur!

20:13:06 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Also - at our last meeting, MED offered to make maps for the county like they did for the city, which would show some options for how it could move forward. If we do not move forward with them this review process, they will at least be there for next process. A big distinction I'm minding between city and county process is that for the city process, there have been groups of community members extensively researching for years. The same is not true at the county.

20:14:46 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

I really enjoy dedicating time during meetings to talk with each other and less presentations so thanks to the chairs for that.

20:14:58 From Jude Perez (they/them) to Everyone:

^agreed

20:15:12 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

2/3

20:15:26 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

2/3 of the subcommittee must approve, then 2/3 of the full committee - right?

20:16:10 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

True, Samantha!

20:16:21 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Thank you!

20:21:44 From Meikelo Cabbage to Everyone:

Fully agree!

20:27:35 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Sure!

20:29:12 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

Samantha- can you follow up with MED about the potential district maps?

20:29:23 From Jude Perez (they/them) to Everyone:

Thank you Annie and Samantha!

20:29:40 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Yes, thank you, co-chairs!

20:29:55 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

I think we left it with you following up with them, Timur! I'll email you!

20:30:07 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

Oh ok thanks

APPENDIX B: SUBCOMMITTEE TEMPERATURE CHECK SURVEY RESULTS

On a scale between 1-5 with 1 being not that important and 5 being very important, how important do you think it is that our recommendations align with the City's recommendations on ballot structure?	
Maja Harris	3
Annie Kallen	3
Timur Ender	2
Meikelo Cabbage	2
Samantha Gladu	4
Jude Perez	4

On a scale between 1-5 with 1 being not that important and 5 being very important, how important do you think it is that our recommendations align with the City's recommendations on multi-member districts?	
Maja Harris	1
Annie Kallen	1
Timur Ender	4
Meikelo Cabbage	1
Samantha Gladu	2
Jude Perez	3

On a scale between 1-5 with 1 being not that important and 5 being very important, how important do you think it is that our recommendations align with the City's recommendations on power of the top executive?	
Maja Harris	1
Annie Kallen	1
Timur Ender	2
Meikelo Cabbage	2
Samantha Gladu	1
Jude Perez	3

Is there anything else you'd like to share about your thoughts on city and county matching?	
Maja Harris	I don't think it's particularly important to have alignment on form of government or the nature of the districts/number of commissioners because historically that has not been the case. I think voters are used to City and County being different and have come to expect it. I do think that the city vote on RCV increases the odds for Multnomah County to be able to pass RCV though. The City of Portland Charter Review process as well as high profile examples like the NYC mayoral race have increased awareness about RCV and it polled extremely well in a recent poll on the proposed city charter amendments, around 70% in favor.
Annie Kallen	<p>If we are changing the voting method in both the city and the county, it's important for the voter experience to match (such as using a ranked ballot for both), but we could still decide on a different tabulation method (for example, ranked ballots could be tabulated using a Condorcet method at the county level and using IRV/ STV at the city level). Alternatively, we might decide to hold off on changing the voting method at the county level for now. Then a future charter review commission or initiative could make a change at the county level based on seeing how things play out for Portland. We should also keep in mind that Portland's process is not final yet; They still need to complete their legal/ financial analysis, so their recommendations may change based on that analysis.</p> <p>For the other two questions, I don't think they need to match Portland's recommendations, because it doesn't affect how the voter completes the ballot, so it shouldn't cause confusion if they don't match. The county and the city have different dynamics and different needs.</p>
Timur Ender	While I agree with City's recommendations, I also don't think it is super important that they match up closely
Meikelo Cabbage	
Samantha Gladu	<p>I'd like to match ballot structure, or at least not propose an alternative ballot structure</p> <p>I do not think our districts or top executive need to match</p>
Jude Perez	Need to do more research on the last two topics. I don't feel knowledgeable enough to have a hard stance right now.

Number of commissioners: This subcommittee is exploring whether to increase the number of commissioners on County Council. What are your thoughts on the number of commissioners?		What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	It should stay the same (5 commissioners)	1
Annie Kallen	It should increase; I'm not sure the ideal number	2
Timur Ender	It should increase and there should be more than 21 commissioners on the County Council	5
Meikelo Cabbage	It should stay the same (5 commissioners)	4
Samantha Gladu	I'm not sure	
Jude Perez	I'm not sure	1

Single District or Multi-Member Districts: If we increase the number of commissioners, should there be one member per district, or multiple members per district?		What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	Single Member Districts	1
Annie Kallen	I'm not sure	3
Timur Ender	Multi Member Districts	5
Meikelo Cabbage	Single Member Districts	5
Samantha Gladu	I'm not sure	
Jude Perez	Multi Member Districts	3

At Large: What are your thoughts on having an at-large position? An at-large position means someone would need to be elected county-wide. In its current form, the county has a chair that is elected at-large and the four other commissioners are elected by district.	
Maja Harris	I think the current system of having the chair elected at large should remain
Annie Kallen	I think the current system of having the chair elected at large should remain
Timur Ender	I don't think there should be anyone elected at-large. In this case, a "chair" or "president of the Council" would likely be elected by other members of the council to serve for a certain period of time.
Meikelo Cabbage	I think the current system of having the chair elected at large should remain
Samantha Gladu	I don't think there should be anyone elected at-large. In this case, a "chair" or "president of the Council" would likely be elected by other members of the council to serve for a certain period of time.
Jude Perez	I'm not sure

Anything else you'd like to add about number of commissioners or districts?	
Maja Harris	Given how little time we have left in our process I don't feel that we have the bandwidth to do the due diligence and the public input process needed to determine the right number for an increase or for multi-member districts. I don't think going by the numbers in the city reform package is a good enough process because of the difference in size between city and county and the fact that districts already exist.
Annie Kallen	
Timur Ender	
Meikelo Cabbage	
Samantha Gladu	I'm curious to hear about what has come up in the government accountability sub related to chair and powers of the chair
Jude Perez	

What are your thoughts on changing the ballot structure of county elections?		Of the two ballot styles we've discussed, what is your position on the voting method?	What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	I think we should change the ballot structure	I prefer Ranked Choice Voting	5
Annie Kallen	A lot depends on what happens with Portland.	I prefer STAR voting	5
Timur Ender	I think we should change the ballot structure	I prefer Ranked Choice Voting	2
Meikelo Cabbage	I'm not sure	We should retain our current voting system	4
Samantha Gladu	I think we should change the ballot structure	I prefer Ranked Choice Voting	5
Jude Perez	I think we should change the ballot structure	I prefer STAR voting	5

Anything else you'd like to add about ballot structure?	
Maja Harris	I think this is a great time to put RCV on the ballot because it is polling well and would be pretty straightforward for voters.
Annie Kallen	STAR voting is my preference, but I would also support a Condorcet method or Approval voting. I would also support finding some way to set up a county-level task force to do a deep dive on voting methods specifically and make a recommendation to the county commissioners, especially after giving Portland time to see whether RCV is viable for them or not (given their tri-county structure).
Timur Ender	
Meikelo Cabbage	
Samantha Gladu	
Jude Perez	While I prefer STAR voting, I wouldn't mind Ranked Choice Voting either.

What are your thoughts on expanding the franchise to non citizens?		What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	I think we should do this	5
Annie Kallen	I'd like to know more about how non citizens are defined, and also what the level of public support would be.	3
Timur Ender	I think we should do this	5
Meikelo Cabbage	I do not think we should do this	4
Samantha Gladu	I think we should do this	5
Jude Perez	I think we should do this	4

Anything else you'd like to add about expanding the franchise to non citizens?	
Maja Harris	
Annie Kallen	
Timur Ender	
Meikelo Cabbage	
Samantha Gladu	
Jude Perez	Would need to do more research but I do feel like this is something we should move forward with.

What are your thoughts on election timing?		What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	I think all county elections should be held at the same time, in a November election of a non-presidential election year	3
Annie Kallen	I'm not sure	3
Timur Ender	I think all county elections should be held at the same time, in a November election of a presidential election year	5
Meikelo Cabbage	I'm not sure	3
Samantha Gladu	I think all county elections should be held at the same time, in a May election of a presidential election year	
Jude Perez	I think all county elections should be held at the same time, in a November election of a non-presidential election year	2

Anything else you'd like to add about election timing?	
Maja Harris	I don't have a strong opinion but I think county elections during midterms would drive up turnout for the city districts that will vote during midterms so it would help make the city process more equitable. That probably shouldn't be a consideration for our committee but I can't help thinking of it holistically and those city districts are going to be at a slight disadvantage compared to the city districts that get to vote in presidential years.
Annie Kallen	If we use an alternative voting method, we may want to eliminate the primary, but we might also consider keeping the primary and send the top 4 or 5 candidates to the general election (for the sake of narrowing down the field). If we end up using ranked choice voting, we should also consider how many candidates voters are allowed to rank, because that will impact how accurate the elections will be if there are a large number of candidates in a single election.
Timur Ender	
Meikelo Cabbage	
Samantha Gladu	I see benefit in not having everyone turn over all at once, although I anticipate that it would be rare for the full county commission to leave at the same time. In the state house, all terms are up at the same time and they tend to have some turnover but never 100% turnover. The county has term limits, but it is unlikely that all commissioners would hit their term limit at the same time.
Jude Perez	

Anything else you'd like to add about proportional representation?	
Maja Harris	
Annie Kallen	I don't see that PR would add a lot of benefit to the county given our demographics. It wouldn't be worth the added complexity and reduced transparency of PR unless it can be demonstrated that it would add a lot of value (which I'm not seeing right now).
Timur Ender	
Meikelo Cabbage	
Samantha Gladu	on this one, I'm still not sure how we'd implement it
Jude Perez	

What are your thoughts on allowing candidates to self-identify with a political party?		What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	I think county elections should remain nonpartisan	3
Annie Kallen	I think candidates should be able to self-declare a preference for a political party	2
Timur Ender	I think candidates should be able to self-declare a preference for a political party	4
Meikelo Cabbage	I think county elections should remain nonpartisan	3
Samantha Gladu	I think candidates should be able to self-declare a preference for a political party	3
Jude Perez	I'm not sure	2

The county has a winner take all election formula, meaning whomever gets a majority of the votes wins. In a proportional representation electoral formula, parties gain seats in proportion to the number of votes cast for them. Do you feel the county elections should move to a proportional representation system?		What is the strength of your opinion? Rank between 1-5
Maja Harris	Yes	5
Annie Kallen	No	3
Timur Ender	Yes	3
Meikelo Cabbage	No	5
Samantha Gladu	I'm not sure	
Jude Perez	I'm not sure	2