

**ELK GROVE CHARTER EXPLORATORY AND ELECTION REFORM COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER, 8400 LAGUNA PALMS WAY  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2007**

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The Regular Committee meeting of November 26, 2007 was called to order by Chair Orrock at 6:04 p.m.

Present: Committee Members – Allen, Chaires, Loveland, Orrock, and Perez

Absent: Committee Members – None

*(Assigned staff/Presenters)*

Also Present: Lucy Eidam, Richard Miadich, and Susan Blackston

2. PUBLIC COMMENT (on non-agenda items)

None.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION/VOTE:

The Committee, on motion of Member Loveland, Allen second, unanimously approved the November 13, 2007 minutes as presented.

4. Review of All Concepts / Principles Discussed in Prior Meetings and Committee's Draft Final Report to the City Council

Lucy Eidam, President of Lucy & Company, facilitated review of the Committee's Final Report – Draft 3 (filed). On pages 31 to 33, characteristics that had been identified as "previously addressed" were discussed and the following advantages and disadvantages were designated:

<b>Characteristics of District-Based Elections "From District" Elections</b>		
<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Candidates reside in the district they seek to represent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates have the opportunity to develop in depth knowledge about a specific district.</li> <li>• Candidates may feel a greater sense of loyalty to their district.</li> <li>• Avoid situations where more than one candidate resides in the same geographical area.</li> <li>• District voters may feel that they know who to contact to voice their concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could cause the candidate to focus on their district at the expense of other areas of the city.</li> <li>• May limit the candidate pool.</li> <li>• Candidates have to raise funds necessary to communicate qualifications and stance on issues with all potential voters within the city.</li> </ul>

<p>All city voters are entitled to vote for all candidates for all council seats.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City wide approval is a higher standard to meet because candidates have to appeal to the interests of their district as well as those of residents across the city.</li> <li>• Voters could feel that they are better represented in that they have an opportunity to vote for all the candidates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates do not need to make the needs of residents of their district a priority in order to be elected.</li> <li>• Residents of a district do not have a way to hold the councilmember from their district accountable for his or her effectiveness in advocating on behalf of their district.</li> <li>• Greater burden on voters to learn about candidates.</li> <li>• Greater burden on candidates to raise money to communicate with voters.</li> <li>• Minority votes could be diluted by votes from other voters who do not reside in their district.</li> <li>• Candidates would have to appeal to a broader range of voters by focusing on city-wide or other district issues.</li> </ul>
<p>Scholars have suggested that since city council members are still elected at-large in “from district” elections, that this type of system can exhibit the same types of problems as at-large districts (e.g., vote dilution of minority groups, lack of responsiveness to community issues).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces influence of special interests.</li> <li>• “From-district” makes it more likely that the council will reach consensus and act on behalf of the city as a whole.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates and office holders are not compelled by the electoral rules to represent their districts.</li> <li>• Citizen-driven groups will also have a higher burden to get their message to the public.</li> </ul>
<p><b>“By-District” Elections</b></p>		
<p><b>Characteristics</b></p>	<p><b>Advantages</b></p>	<p><b>Disadvantages</b></p>
<p>Districts are created within the city and are subject to periodic redistricting to ensure population equality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents may have greater voice on neighborhood concerns.</li> <li>• This ensures that candidates must appeal to a comparable number of people, and that as officeholders they answer to a comparable number of constituents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing and re-establishing districts can be expensive.</li> <li>• May create a situation of a concentration of voters with cultural or other bonds are split.</li> </ul>
<p>Candidates reside in the district they seek to represent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to win, candidates must demonstrate an understanding of issues that are relevant to the residents of their district. Council members can be held accountable for their effectiveness in addressing issues of concern to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may be less likely to address citywide issues and concerns.</li> <li>• Could cause the candidate to focus on their district at the expense of other areas of the city.</li> </ul>

	<p>residents of their district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates may feel a greater sense of loyalty to their district.</li> <li>• Avoid situations where more than one candidate resides in same geographical area.</li> <li>• District voters may feel that they know who to contact to voice concerns.</li> <li>• Allows the voters to focus their efforts on evaluating the qualifications of only candidates from their district.</li> </ul>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Deputy City Manager Cody Tubbs noted that, on page 35, there was a reference to Assembly Bill 1294, which had since been vetoed by the Governor. Richard Miadich, Associate with Olson, Hagel & Fishburn, LLP, indicated that he would update the section to reflect the current status.

Member Loveland submitted a written suggestion to add information to Chapter 4, Section E, related to voters' experience with the Instant Run-Off process (filed). With minor edits, the Committee agreed to include the information in the final report.

Chief Deputy City Clerk Susan Blackston was asked to verify with John Artz, San Francisco's Director of Elections, whether it was his opinion that the outcome of San Francisco's 2004 election was not affected by the ranked choice method that was utilized, and report back her findings to Lucy Eidam who would include it in the final report.

The Committee reviewed and edited the Executive Summary portion of the final report.

5. NEW BUSINESS / CLOSING  
None.

6. ADJOURNMENT  
There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

ATTEST:

/s/ Susan J. Blackston  
Chief Deputy City Clerk