

7-18-2017

14.E2



City of Santa Clara
The Center of What's Possible

**CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

City Council Chambers
1500 Warburton Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Monday, June 12, 2017, 7:00 p.m.

Committee Members

Present:

Tino Silva, <i>Chair</i>	Christ Horton
Keith Stattenfield, <i>Vice Chair</i>	Rex McIntosh
Hazel Alabado	Jodi Muirhead
Saskia Feain	Beverly Silva
Steve Lodge	Teresa Sulcer
Hosam Haggag	
Mary Hanna-Weir	

Absent:

Markus Bracamonte

Staff:

Brian Doyle, Interim City Attorney
Rod Diridon Jr., City Clerk
Raania Mohsen, Management Analyst (Staff Liaison)

Matters for Council Action: None

1. **Call to Order.** Chair Tino Silva called the meeting to order with a quorum present at 7:02 pm.

2. **Public Presentations on any matter not on the agenda.**

David Kadlecsek noted there are well-qualified candidates who represent different interests of the City and should be given the opportunity to run for Council.

3. **Approval of Minutes from May 22, 2017 Meeting**

Amendment in Minutes to Item 4 on page 2: strike "In addition, proportional representation can only be implemented in at-large election systems. It could be implemented in two districts of three representatives."

MOTION MADE BY VICE CHAIR STATENFIELD AND SECONDED BY FEAIN TO APPROVE MAY 22, 2017 MINUTES WITH AMENDMENT. MOTION CARRIED 9:0 WITH THREE ABSTENTIONS FROM HANNA-WEIR, BEVERLY SILVA, AND HORTON.

4. Registrar of Voters: Feasibility of Voting Methods in Santa Clara County. Matt Moreles, Assistant Registrar of Voters, and Philip Chantri, Election Division Coordinator, reviewed the following Voting Methods: At-Large, By-District, Ranked Choice Voting (RCV), Cumulative Voting (CV), Single Transferrable Vote (STV), and Limited Voting (LV). See attached memo for review of presented information.

Questions and comments from Committee Members and staff led to the following information from the Registrar of Voters representatives:

- If other cities decide to change their voting methods to cumulative voting, then the Registrar of Voters would have to reassess and do mock ballots to ensure the ballot does not exceed four double-sided cards.
- Based on past years, it is anticipated not to exceed four cards in the 2018 general election.
- If the County upgrades its voting system before the next planned upgrade, the cost will be shared by all cities implementing a new election/voting method; however, at this time, no other city has expressed interest in changing its election/voting method.
- Any change will be less costly if implemented with the future generation voting equipment in 2020.
- Considering the City's timeline and that a charter amendment must go to the voters in June 2018 with implementation of the new election/voting method effective November 2018, RCV would be a risky option and STV is not an option. The election/voting methods that are options for consideration include at-large, by-district, CV, and LV.
- In 2020, when the new voting system is ready, RCV could be implemented with more than three candidates; currently, in Oakland and San Francisco, voters cannot rank more than three candidates.
- The cost of voter education usually depends on resources shared between the county and the city.
- Santa Clara County could potentially incur higher costs than estimated due to translation requirements of the ballot into 8-9 languages (as required by state and federal law), printing costs and voter education.
- If voter education is started far ahead of an election, it is likely to get less response.
- Implementation of CV will not prevent the Registrar from meeting the 30-day requirement to certify election results.
- Hand tallying is not possible; it tends to lead to human errors and it will not be completed within the 30-day requirement of election certification.
- The voting system/equipment and the state's standards of approval determine which election systems and voting methods are feasible and implemented.

Committee suggested considering a two-part recommendation, or two ballots, for 2018 that would include one going into effect in 2018 and the second going into effect in 2020.

Elections Division Coordinator Philip Chantri noted that the primary concern is voter outreach and education. City of Oakland began voter education in February of the year RCV was implemented in the City. There are ongoing education costs, such as the need for translators to speak in other languages and educate citizens at the polls. In order for the State to begin review of the requested election/voting method change, the following is required:

1. Administrative approval document
2. Use procedures document
3. Implementation plan
4. Voter outreach education plan

City Clerk noted that the City of Santa Clara currently has award-winning voter engagement programs funded in the mid five-figure level. Should the City move to one of the alternative voting methods that requires a different voter interface than traditional at-large or district elections, the level of funding to educate voters would likely increase to the low to mid six-figure level.

Assistant Registrar of Voters noted that any change in the election/voting method will create confusion and high need for voter education.

Interim City Attorney advised the Committee against a recommendation that cannot be implemented by the Registrar today.

MOTION TO EXTEND MEETING TO 9:30 PM WAS MADE BY HAGGAG AND SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR STATTFIELD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 12:0.

Chair noted that considering the unknown variables of education and equipment costs, and the State's 6-18 month approval timeline, it is important that the Committee provides a practical recommendation that leads to a long-term solution.

Committee noted that the Council wants a recommendation in time for the 2018 election and not to wait until the 2020 election.

Committee discussed considering the recommendation for election and voting method as a combined deliberation versus in a two-step process: 1. By-District Options; 2. Voting Methods.

Committee recommended to table discussion on by-district options (item 5 of the Agenda) until the next meeting.

Interim City Attorney noted that a ballot measure that is not easily understandable by the voters is risky and will likely not lead to a solution.

Committee requested demographic information of city to be provided at next meeting.

MOTION TO EXTEND MEETING TO INCLUDE PUBLIC PRESENTATION WAS MADE BY VICE CHAIR STATTFIELD AND SECONDED BY HAGGAG. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 12:0.

5. Public Comment on Agenda Items. Steve Chessin addressed voting method options; Jeremy Macaluso addressed the likelihood of a minority candidate to get elected when proportional voting is implemented; David Kadlecek addressed whether or not a district is single-member or multi-member affects the options of voting methods.

6. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING MADE BY VICE CHAIR STATENFIELD AND SECONDED BY LODGE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 12:0.

Prepared by:



RAANIA MOHSEN
Management Analyst, City Manager's Office

I:\LIAISON COMMITTEES\Charter Review Committee\2017\Minutes\06-12-17 Charter Review Committee Meeting Draft Minutes.Doc