



Multnomah County Charter Review

Equitable Representation Subcommittee

May 16, 2022, 6:30 – 8:30 pm

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING 7

Purpose: To discuss final priorities and potential recommendations to the MCCRC.

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

- Samantha Gladu (she/they)
- Annie Kallen (she/her)
- Timur Ender (he/him)
- Maja Harris (she/her)

Committee Members Absent:

- Jude Perez (they/them)

Staff:

- Kali Odell (she/her), Charter Review Committee Program Coordinator
- Katherine Thomas (she/her), Assistant County Attorney

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. She informed the subcommittee that Meikelo Cabbage had resigned from the MCCRC and the subcommittee's quorum was now three members. Subcommittee members acknowledged gratitude for Meikelo's service.

Samantha welcomed the subcommittee.

Public Comment

Kali alerted the subcommittee that one person had signed up in advance to give public comment. She gave an overview of the process and invited other members of the public to raise their virtual hands if they wished to make a comment.

Carol Chesarek introduced herself as a former member of the last Charter Review Committee. She gave general advice to the committee that it would be best to do a few things well and be aware of unintended consequences. She said that incremental change was preferable to avoid unintended consequences that the county would be stuck with for six years.

She said that representation mattered, but so did checks and balances, so did constituent access and effective government. The county budget is \$3.3 billion with a broad range of responsibilities, and needed to be used effectively. Carol raised comments from Chair Deborah Kafoury to the MCCRC's Government Accountability Subcommittee, that she had seen other government systems in her time at the county, and the existing one works well. Carol said that not only does it work well, but that it also already elects women of color.

Carol thanked Annie for sharing information at the subcommittee's last meeting that helped Carol better understand her support for STAR voting.

Carol also said that the issue of Commissioner District 2 being the only district elected in the same cycle as the Chair is an example of an unintended consequence from changes recommended by the last Charter Review Committee. The 2016 committee recommended allowing commissioners to run for Chair without resigning from office, not realizing that Commissioner District 2 was on a different cycle. Carol suggested that the commissioner for that district has the option to run later or shift to have two commissioners elected every two years, but she said that any change would burden some commissioners. She recommended asking for input from the Chair and commissioners on this topic, as well as consulting them on the question of whether to elect all commissioners at the same time. She pointed out that the Charter limits commissioners to two terms and there is a high rate of reelection, so electing all commissioner in the same cycle would likely lead to more frequent instances of complete board turnover, losing a lot of valuable experience.

Carol said she looked at the current county budget and each commissioner was slated to get over \$750,000 for their office. That funded a commissioner plus three staff. She ran through some calculations of the budget implications if the number of commissioners increased at current staffing levels, or if the number of commissioners increased with lower levels of staffing. She pointed out that either way it would be an expensive shift. She also said that reducing staff would leave commissioners less informed about county business, as well as limit their responsiveness to constituents. They would be more dependent on county staff and lobbyists for information, which Carol said would undermine independence and effectiveness.

Samantha thanked Carol, particularly for the budget insight. She encouraged Carol to submit her comment in writing, as well.

Timur said that the Portland Charter Commission was planning to align its two districts with the lowest historical voter turnout with presidential election years, while the two districts with higher turnout would be aligned with the governor election years. He said this was interesting in relation to Carol's comments about not having all county commissioners elected in the same cycle.

Samantha asked Carol about her thoughts. Samantha said she shared concerns about total board turnover, but thought it was strange to have only one commissioner office elected in a different cycle.

Carol said she struggled with this because she agrees with Samantha's assessment. She said she thought the experience factor was very important and that she was less concerned about Commissioner District 2 not being able to run for Chair in that cycle without resigning. She said she did think it was unfortunate that this was the district impacted. She was not sure if there was a good solution to this problem, and in light of that she would prioritize preserving experience on the board. She also asked if every commissioner even wanted to run for Chair.

Annie told the subcommittee she and Kali had met with Commissioner Meieran earlier in the day. Commissioner Meieran had expressed concerns about complete board turnover and a lack of continuity if all of the commissioners were elected in the same cycle.

Kali said that she recollected Commissioner Meieran expressing concerns about the county adopting a voting method that conflicted with the City of Portland's method.

Annie added that she did not think Commissioner Meieran responded favorably to the idea of increasing the size of the board. Annie said she hoped Commissioner Meieran would share her opinions with the committee in writing.

Kali told the subcommittee that it could be more proactive in seeking input from the Board of Commissioners. She offered to work with the board members' offices to arrange meetings with one or two committee members who could report back on those conversations at the subcommittee's next meeting.

Samantha said that she was scheduled to meet with Commissioner Vega Pederson's office on Friday.

Recommendation Topic Prioritization

Samantha acknowledged that the subcommittee had lacked a quorum on May 2nd, which meant the subcommittee's goal to narrow the topic's it was focusing on was delayed to tonight's meeting.

She summarized the topics the subcommittee was still currently exploring:

- Extending the county franchise to noncitizens
- Elimination of primaries
- Ballot structure (STAR, RCV, approval voting, etc.)
- Electing Commissioner District 2 in the same election cycle as other districts
- Allowing candidates to indicate a party preference in county elections
- Increase number of county commissioners + whether to have multi-member districts
- Elections using proportional representation

Samantha asked subcommittee members if any of them had a place they thought the group should start and invited Jude and Maja to share their experiences from co-chairing the Government Accountability Subcommittee.

Maja suggested doing a temperature check on each topic and seeing if anything could be eliminated, and which topics have consensus.

Timur said that his top priority remained increasing the number of commissioners and adopting multi-member districts.

Samantha described how fist of five would work: 5 meant the member was excited to champion a topic; 0 meant the member wanted to block the policy from moving forward; 3 meant the member was neutral. She said that anyone with a 3 or below would have a chance to voice their concerns if they desired.

Extending the county franchise to noncitizens:

Annie: 3

Samantha: 5

Timur: 4

Maja: 4

Annie said she liked the idea, but that she would like to know more about how noncitizens in the county would feel about this. She said she was concerned about potential political backlash. She would be interested in knowing Katherine's opinion on the legal question, and would overall like to better understand the implications of this policy.

Samantha asked if they should stay on this topic or move to the next item. The subcommittee agreed to stay on this topic for now since there was general consensus.

Samantha told the group she had met with Katherine and Kali to learn more about the legal processes if an amendment was passed by voters.

Katherine explained that as the county executive, the Chair would be the one to decide whether to implement a law or policy. Board approval would be required for the County Attorney's Office to initiate certain kinds of legal proceedings. She explained that there were a few different approaches the county could take if an amendment giving noncitizens the right to vote in county elections was passed by voters. One option would be to immediately implement, see if the Charter amendment was challenged, and address any challenge in court. Another option would be that if the county did not think the amendment was legal, it could decide not to implement, see if that decision was challenged, and then address that challenge in court. A third option would be for the board to initiate a validation process. This would require the County Attorney's Office to proactively take this question to court if the county is concerned that implementing the amendment may be unconstitutional. The benefits of this approach would be that the county would not be violating anyone's constitutional rights, and that it would not have wasted resources on implementation if the amendment was found unconstitutional. Katherine imagined this latter process could take two to four years.

Katherine said that if the Charter Review Committee explicitly put in the charter that noncitizens can vote in county elections, she thought there was a significant likelihood that it would be struck down, depending on how the subcommittee framed the recommendation. She did add that there were other recommendations the subcommittee could make, like having the board expand the franchise to the extent legally possible.

Samantha shared notes in the chat from a meeting she and Jude had with Jessica Maravilla, Policy Director at ACLU Oregon, who also previously worked on the issue of noncitizen voting with Causa, and Ricardo Luján-Valerio, Policy Director for the Office of Carmen Rubio, who previously worked on this issue with Latino Network and ACLU Oregon. She noted that they think this is a good policy idea. Samantha also shared from their meeting that there were 17 jurisdictions in the U.S. that allowed for noncitizen voting.

On the matter of implementation of noncitizen voting, Samantha said Jessica and Ricardo pointed out that changes to Oregon's voter registration system have happened in the past, such as allowing pre-registration for 16 and 17 year olds.

Samantha suggested that they could recommend including an implementation timeline in a Charter amendment so that if it is passed by voters, there is some time to go to the state legislature and ask for any necessary changes to current state law ahead of county implementation. She said Jessica and Ricardo thought that would take at least a year. There would also need to be time to connect with and educate the community about changes.

Samantha said she thought Oregon led the nation in being first and best with voting, with the ease of vote by mail and trust in elections, so if this policy could be implemented anywhere, she thought it could be in Multnomah County. She would love for the committee to take a stand consistent with voters recently upholding sanctuary law, with the legislature expanding the right to drive to undocumented Oregonians, and with legislators expanding access to healthcare regardless of immigration status. She thought that this policy aligned with the committee's value and would like to continue with figuring out how to make it work.

Timur said that he is not in favor of taxation without representation, and noncitizens pay taxes. He said he is a fan of municipality disobedience, and just putting this on the ballot would be a protest, as well. He said he did

not need to be convinced to move forward on this topic.

Maja suggested clarifying a bit more what the recommendation is; whether they were looking at a specific residence requirement or moving forward something that is more open to what legal counsel and commissioners might be willing to move forward.

Katherine said that the subcommittee needs to be clear on its policy objectives and language to amend the Charter would be drafted based on that. Once those policy objectives were defined, Katherine said she could come back with legal analysis, but that they have likely already heard what she has to share on the topic. Unless they use broad language about expanding the franchise as allowed by law, she thought there would likely be a legal challenge. She pointed out that the committee could also include policy recommendations to the board in the MCCRC's final report. These would be recommendations only, but she wanted to point out other options when there were these potentially significant legal considerations.

Samantha asked if there was a way for the MCCRC to mandate that the Board of Commissioners advocate for noncitizen voting.

Katherine said that is not something that typically belongs in a Charter.

Samantha suggested that it may be for the full committee to decide if it wants to support a more specific policy that may face legal challenges. She thought that the subcommittee should put forward the most inclusive, powerful policy that advocates suggested, that the county extend the right to vote to all residents living in or having a domicile in Multnomah County. She invited other subcommittee members to suggest language for the proposal.

Maja advocated for including a length of time for residency, perhaps a year. She thought that might give more political viability. She said that as an immigrant herself she was not attached to that.

Samantha referred to the Oregon Secretary of State website, which said that to register to vote in state elections, a person must be a U.S. citizen, have established a residential address in Oregon and are at least 16 years old. She said she was reluctant to create another barrier to voting by adding a residency requirement for voting in county elections.

Annie said she was also concerned about political viability. She did not think a residency requirement was the best way to address this since it was likely to add confusion to voting. She brought up the idea of focusing on extending the right to vote to documented noncitizens. She said she was on the fence about that limitation, but could see it having broader political support.

Samantha said that could be framed as extending the vote to those lawfully present in the U.S.

Timur said he would support whichever Samantha put forward and pointed out that there were still other topics to address.

Maja reiterated her point that she has no concerns herself about extending the vote, but that she did think extending it more broadly would lessen the chances of the recommendation passing. She remarked that in the Government Accountability Subcommittee a proposal to allow people who were not county residents to serve on the Charter Review Committee did not have the support to move forward. She noted that it was different, but was still concerned about it passing. Maja clarified that she would be willing to vote for a subcommittee recommendation that did not include a length of residency requirement.

Samantha asked if the full committee would have time to discuss subcommittee recommendations and make changes, if needed, to make them more palatable to the full group.

Kali said the full committee could make any changes to subcommittee recommendations that it wanted. She cautioned that if the committee had to review a large number of recommendations from the subcommittee there was a risk that if the committee could not come to relatively quick consensus on a recommendation, it

might decide to leave that recommendation behind to focus on others with more support. She also told the subcommittee that there would be community outreach efforts in the coming weeks that might not align perfectly with the committee's decision-making timeline, but might produce more community input on this topic.

Samantha said she thought the subcommittee should start from the strongest position since there seemed to be support among members for that, and that they could raise the possibility of adding restrictions based on legal status with the full committee depending on how conversation went in that space.

Katherine clarified that if the committee did make a recommendation based on legal status, implementation would require developing a process to verify which people were legally allowed to vote. The more specific the subcommittee gets, the more complex implementation is likely to be and she suggested speaking with Tim Scott, Elections Director, about potential implications.

Subcommittee members discussed language options to help define the recommendation; whether to use "domiciled", "resident", "living in" Multnomah County. Katherine pointed out that domicile has a specific legal meaning, while resident is more open to interpretation, and living in was very broad.

Samantha also noted that Oregon does not have same day voter registration and that she thought voters had to register at least 21 days ahead of an election to vote.

Maja said she would prefer to have "lawful resident" in the recommendation. She asked if there was a definition for "permanent resident" in county code.

Katherine said she could not speak for the whole county code off the top of her head.

Timur said he thought it was intentional that "lawful resident" was not included in the language they were discussing.

Maja agreed and said that she preferred it to be included, although she would not vote against it if it was not in there.

Annie said she was unsure how to move forward since she and Maja would prefer to include "lawful resident" and Samantha and Timur would not. She also said that like Maja she would not block the recommendation without "lawful resident."

Samantha asked if they had clear enough language to vote on.

Kali clarified for the subcommittee that members did not need to draft specific language that would change the Charter, they just needed to agree on clear guidelines for the policy that they could clearly write in the subcommittee recommendation form, and then it would be up to the County Attorney's Office to draft language reflecting those guidelines. She also told the subcommittee that if they still had questions to work through before voting on this recommendation, they could wait to vote until their next meeting on June 3rd.

Timur said he thought they should move on this and then look at ballot structure and the number of commissioners. Then they could continue working through the list of topics and anything not resolved that night could be addressed on June 3rd.

The subcommittee voted on the concept: Multnomah County will expand the right to vote to all residents of the County, meaning the broadest number of people possible, including undocumented immigrants

Timur voted yes.

Maja voted yes, but added that she would prefer using "legal resident" and including a requirement for living in the county for a certain length of time before being able to vote.

Annie also voted yes, but agreed with Maja that she would prefer to include "lawful resident" and that she

hoped that her and Maja's reservations would be communicated to the full committee.

Samantha voted yes.

The subcommittee took a 5 minute break.

Katherine asked if the subcommittee intended to include an implementation timeline in its recommendation for extending the vote.

Samantha suggested they could revisit this after speaking with Tim Scott. She asked other subcommittee members if they thought this was important to include.

Annie said she thought it would be helpful to have an implementation date, but was not sure what it should be.

Timur proposed January 1, 2024.

Kali suggested in the chat that this be as a flagged question for next meeting. Samantha volunteered to look into this ahead of the next meeting.

Kali suggested doing a temperature check on each of the remaining topics before getting into further discussion so members could see which topics had the most support and focus on those in their remaining time.

Subcommittee members all supported that idea.

Samantha reiterated the fist of five process: a five meant whole-hearted support; a zero meant no way; and a three meant not sure, more questions. Members with a three or less would have time to explain their reservations.

Elimination of primaries:

Samantha, Timur, and Maja were all at three. Annie was at a one.

Maja specified that she was very interested in favor of eliminating primaries, but this would be dependent on adopting a specific voting method. Samantha concurred, and other subcommittee members indicated agreement.

Ballot structure, whether members supported STAR, ranked choice voting, or another method:

Samantha, Maja and Samantha were at five.

Annie was at one.

Electing Commissioner District 2 in same election cycle as other districts:

Timur and Samantha were at four, Annie was at three, and Maja was at two.

Maja said that she was supportive of allowing the commissioner to run and serve, but she held up a low number because she thought other solutions were too complicated.

Samantha said that commissioners could run for another office while serving, including chair, but the issue was that a candidate could only file to run for one office in an election. Samantha said she did not know if a home rule jurisdiction could allow candidates to file to run for multiple offices simultaneously, but asked if that was a question Maja wanted to explore.

Maja said maybe. She just wanted to clarify that she was interested, but would want to hear from the District 2

Commissioner, and other commissioners, before forming a strong opinion.

Kali suggested it might be helpful to frame the fist of five as an indicator of how strongly subcommittee members supported continued focus on a topic rather than as an indicator of how convinced they were to make a change. Once the subcommittee identified which topics were highest priority they could determine what support there was for specific proposed changes.

Timur said that would change him to a one or two on this topic. He did not have an issue making a change on this topic, but it was not a priority for him.

Allow candidates to indicate party preference in county elections:

Samantha was at three, Annie and Timur were at two, and Maja was at one.

Elections using proportional representation:

Timur was at four, Maja was at three, Samantha and Annie were at two.

Increase number of commissioners and use multi-member districts:

Timur was at five, Annie and Samantha were at four, and Maja was at two.

Samantha calculated the level of support for each topic by adding up the number of fingers subcommittee members held up on each topic.

Based on levels of support, the subcommittee agreed to drop the issue of allowing candidates to express party preference, and to come back to the question of primaries depending on what the subcommittee decided about ballot structure.

Samantha asked how the group felt about eliminating the topic of proportional representation.

Annie felt that proportional representation was so complicated she wasn't sure how they could properly discuss it in their remaining time.

Maja said that she thought this would depend on whether they decided to increase the number of county commissioners. If they decided to do that with multi-member districts, that would default to proportional representation.

Annie said there could be multi-member districts without proportional representation, although she thought this committee would support those two things going together.

Samantha summarized the three topics the subcommittee would be focused on going forward: ballot structure, increasing the number of county commissioner and use of multi-member districts, and electing Commissioner District 2 in the same cycle as the other commissioners.

Timur asked to give a pitch on increasing the number of commissioners and implementing multi-member districts.

Samantha asked the subcommittee if there were any other topics members thought they could bring to a vote tonight.

Kali pointed out that the subcommittee's next meeting would be its last and since the remaining topics were complex, she suggested it might be helpful for the subcommittee to briefly discuss each topic in the meeting's remaining 15 minutes so that they knew what questions they needed to research for their last meeting and could make a plan to do that.

Samantha supported that idea and proposed starting with Timur's pitch on increasing the number of county commissioners and implementing multi-member districts.

Timur referenced research materials he had previously shared with the subcommittee. He said he thought it was easier to access state representatives than county officials because the proportion of constituents to elected officials was smaller for state representatives. He proposed increasing the number of commissioners to 12, with three in each existing district, similar to what the Portland Charter Commission was proposing. He said in his research he had difficulty finding similarly sized jurisdictions that were represented by five people, most he looked at had between seven and 19.

Annie said she thought increasing the number of commissioners made sense. She had been thinking maybe eight, but did not think 12 was a crazy number. She was generally supportive.

Maja said she generally supported the idea, but not for this round of Charter review. She did not think they had enough time to do sufficient community engagement, the way the Portland Charter Commission had arrived at its proposal of 12 commissioners. She said that without a widespread community call for change, she did not feel they had sufficient input to make a recommendation. She said she would support putting a recommendation in the MCCRC's final report that the next Charter review committee look into this, but would not vote yes to advance this proposal from their committee.

Timur said that he hoped to piggyback on Portland's process and make similar recommendations based on that. He said the current system was not working for East Portland, people living past East 82nd and on the outer edges of the county. He wanted to push forward whatever systemic change they had the votes to push forward.

Samantha said that she found Timur's case compelling. She was grappling with what she perceived as the high level of effectiveness and functionality of Multnomah County in contrast to Portland. She craved more representation. She highlighted Timur's research about the power of centralization and dismantling systems of white supremacy by adding more voices. What the subcommittee previously heard about this change increasing the representation of people of color was important to her. She noted that while the current Board was majority women of color, this was an exception to its history and was unlikely to always be the case going forward. She said she could be a yes and would like to hear Timur present his case to the full committee.

Annie was interested in having 12 separate districts. She thought this would help people know who their commissioner was.

Samantha said she liked the use of multi-member districts and that it would increase the likelihood that community members would have a commissioner with whom they had affinity.

Maja said she did not think it was reliable to base a recommendation for the county on the Portland Charter Commission's recommendation. She said their process was based on academic research and that NDDG did a full study that evaluated what number of commissioners would optimize the BIPOC vote, and they also found that going over the three commissioners per district actually diluted the vote. She said it was important that a county recommendation be based on data specifically collected for Multnomah County and that could help determine how districts should be drawn.

Timur said that More Equitable Democracy had prepared slides with different maps and different ways to crunch numbers for districts. He said he would have Kali distribute that to the subcommittee. His understanding from that document was that four districts with three representatives was also the best option for the county.

Timur added that there are limited opportunities to seek local elected office, which he considered another reason for increasing the number of commissioners.

APPENDIX A: ZOOM CHAT

18:34:33 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Here is our agenda: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Equitable%20Representation%20Subcommittee%20Agenda%2005.16.22.pdf>

18:41:56 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

3 minutes

18:51:50 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

agenda: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Equitable%20Representation%20Subcommittee%20Agenda%2005.16.22.pdf>

18:59:22 From Annie Kallen she/her to Everyone:

Yeah, let's stay on this topic for now.

19:16:14 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Some define resident as living, or having a domicile

19:18:33 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

You can register to vote in Oregon if you:

Are a U.S. citizen

Have established a residential address in Oregon

Are at least 16 years old

19:19:27 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

For students, your residential address can be your parents' or other family home, or your home where you are a student. You get to choose, but you can only choose one. Oregon residency requirements for voting are not the same as residency for in-state tuition purposes. Your residential address is the address that you consider home and the place you intend to return to. That address determines which candidates and measures will be on your ballot. If you live on campus and provide a campus address as your residential address, be sure to list your dormitory and room number; a PO Box is not a residential address.

19:19:33 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

<https://sos.oregon.gov/voting/Pages/student-voters.aspx>

19:22:16 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

lawful presence in the US (LPRs, DACA, student visa holders, TPS holders)

19:28:45 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Start strong resident as living, or having a domicile

Then have lawful presence in the US (LPRs, DACA, student visa holders, TPS holders) as a back up

19:30:18 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

Tim Scott will be at the MCCRC meeting on Wednesday

19:31:13 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

June 15

19:33:33 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Multnomah County will expand the right to vote to all residents of the County. Resident means those living, or having a domicile in Multnomah County

19:41:10 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Multnomah County will expand the right to vote to all residents of the County, meaning the broadest number of people possible including undocumented immigrants

19:41:23 From Annie Kallen she/her to Everyone:

Maybe a 5 minute bio break after this vote?

19:41:31 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

^sure Annie

19:51:09 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

We can note that this is a question to answer at the next meeting and someone can take responsibility for information gathering

19:53:15 From Annie Kallen she/her to Everyone:

good call

19:55:10 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

- Elimination of primaries
- Ballot structure (STAR, RCV, approval voting, etc.)
- Electing Commissioner District 2 in the same election cycle as other districts
- Allowing candidates to indicate a party preference in county elections
- Increase number of county commissioners + whether to have multi-member districts
- Elections using proportional representation

20:00:12 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Everyone:

Just to clarify, the commissioners can only run for chair while still serving as commissioners

20:00:26 From Katherine Thomas, she/her, Assistant County Attorney to Everyone:

Without resigning their office

20:01:05 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

Thank you - good clarification - and no candidate can file to run for multiple offices at once, right?

20:02:55 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Hosts and panelists:

We can continue!

20:06:38 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

- Elimination of primaries
 - 3,3,3,1 (Maja is in favor, but it's dependent on voting method) → 10

- Ballot structure (STAR, RCV, approval voting, etc.)
 - 5, 5, 5, 1 → 16

- Electing Commissioner District 2 in the same election cycle as other districts
 - 4, 4, 3, 2 → 13

20:06:47 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

- Allowing candidates to indicate a party preference in county elections
 - 3, 2, 2, 1 → 8

- Elections using proportional representation
 - 4, 2, 2, 3 → 11

- Increase number of county commissioners + whether to have multi-member Districts
 - 5, 4, 4, 2 → 15

20:08:14 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Hosts and panelists:

Sounds good!

20:10:03 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Hosts and panelists:

Agreed, but we'd have to discuss it

20:11:25 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

- Ballot structure (STAR, RCV, approval voting, etc.)
 - 5, 5, 5, 1 → 16

Increase number of county commissioners + whether to have multi-member
Districts

5, 4, 4, 2 → 15

Electing Commissioner District 2 in the same election cycle as other districts

4, 4, 3, 2 → 13

20:13:02 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Hosts and panelists:

Maybe RCV?

20:16:26 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Hosts and panelists:

I'm ready to vote on all of them.

20:16:48 From Katherine Thomas, she/her, Assistant County Attorney to Everyone:

I would also recommend that you consider implementation dates for all of these proposals.

20:16:50 From Kali Odell (she/her) to Maja Harris (she/her)(Direct Message):

Maja, can you switch your chat to "everyone"

20:16:54 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

same with Maja

20:16:55 From Katherine Thomas, she/her, Assistant County Attorney to Everyone:

*timelines

20:18:33 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

How about the position of chair?

20:19:15 From Samantha Gladu to Everyone:

So 13 commissioners - 12 in districts (4x3) and one at large chair?

20:28:02 From Annie Kallen she/her to Everyone:

Good points Maja

20:29:08 From Annie Kallen she/her to Everyone:

I would love to see that.

20:32:00 From Annie Kallen she/her to Everyone:

"Voting Method" is a better term than "Ballot Structure"

20:32:06 From Timur Ender (he/they) to Everyone:

Thanks Annie

20:32:08 From Maja Harris (she/her) to Everyone:

Thanks for moderating, Samantha!