



CHARTER COMMISSION AGENDA

May 26, 2020 – 6:30 P.M.

CHARTER COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING

To be held via WebEx

1. Call to order
2. Approve minutes of Nov. 12, 2019 meeting and Jan. 28, 2020 meeting
3. Discussion of ranked choice voting study project and work plan for project
4. Schedule next meeting

Attachments:

- a. Draft minutes, Nov. 12, 2019 meeting
- b. Draft minutes, Jan. 28, 2020 meeting
- c. Memo from City Attorney Corrine Heine

Due to the COVID-19 health pandemic, the charter commission's regular meeting place is not available. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 13D.021, commission members will participate in the meeting remotely via WebEx. Members of the public who desire to monitor the meeting remotely or to give input or testimony during the meeting can find instructions at <https://www.minnetonkamn.gov/government/virtual-meeting-information>.



UNAPPROVED
DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA CHARTER COMMISSION**

Nov. 12, 2019

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Northrup called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members present: Karen Anderson, John Cheleen, Sandal Hart, David Larson, John Northrup, Terry Schneider, Linnea Sodergren, LuAnn Tolliver, Brad Wiersum.

Members absent: None.

Staff present: City Attorney Corrine Heine; City Manager Geralyn Barone, Administrative Services Manager Moranda Dammann, City Clerk Becky Koosman, and Elections Specialist Kyle Salage.

Chair Northrup noted a correction to Agenda Item 4, which should have indicated the 2020 meeting schedule rather than the 2019 meeting schedule.

2. MINUTES: NOV. 20, 2018

Schneider moved, Larson seconded, a motion to approve the minutes of the Nov. 20, 2018 charter commission meeting. All voted "aye."

3. REPORT OF CITY ATTORNEY

The city attorney provided her report regarding legislation and court decisions in 2019 that had a bearing on city charter matters.

4. RANKED CHOICE VOTING AND 2020 MEETING SCHEDULE

Chair Northrup opened by indicating that the city council had held a study session in September 2019 and had asked the charter commission to consider studying the possible use of ranked choice voting. He asked what the commission members wished to do.

Anderson commented that it might be appropriate to have a subcommittee of four or five people study the issue and report to the commission. Schneider stated his preference

that the entire commission undertake the study rather than a subcommittee.

Sodergren stated a preference to hear from a panel of experts on the subject. Hart indicated that the commission should hear from St. Louis Park regarding its experience, since that city just completed its first election with ranked choice voting.

Wiersum indicated that the League of Women Voters would be holding an event in December at which David Maeda from the Secretary of State's Office would be speaking. Attorney Heine reminded the commission that they could attend an outside meeting but should not participate in the discussion if a quorum or more of the commission was in attendance, due to Minnesota Open Meeting Law concerns.

Commission members asked about costs associated with studying ranked choice voting. Administrative Services Manager Dammann introduced the elections staff in attendance and explained that the costs that were identified in the city council study session staff report were determined based on the assumption that the study would be fast-tracked, which would have required the city to hire temporary help to assist with elections duties. Dammann explained that 2020 would be a busy year for elections staff, with a presidential primary in March, state primary in August and state general and presidential election in November.

Wiersum stated that the commission should objectively look at the upsides and downsides of ranked choice voting, and ask itself whether there is a problem that needs to be solved. Wiersum mentioned special elections as an area of inquiry, and Schneider agreed. Sodergren questioned whether no-excuse absentee voting has increased participation and stated her desire to get more people involved and voting. Dammann stated that absentee voting has increased and that voter turnout in the recent municipal election was 15 percent. She did not have information as to whether the turnout in St. Louis Park increased over past years.

Tolliver asked whether it was possible to provide in the charter for multiple voting methods but to let the selected method be determined by ordinance. Heine responded that may be possible.

Wiersum suggested that commission members should be thinking of questions that they would like answered and that they could forward those questions to the chair and city attorney. Northrup suggested the commission should: first, learn what ranked choice voting is; second, review what the city charter provides; and third, determine whether ranked choice voting is preferable. The commission could then discuss how to implement ranked choice voting and how to educate voters.

Anderson indicated it is important to hear pros and cons and to hear from both sides of

the issue. The process should be deliberative and inclusive of a variety of viewpoints. Wiersum suggested that the commission should also consider, at least in a cursory fashion, other possible voting methods.

Schneider suggested that the commission direct staff to prepare a plan and process for studying ranked choice voting and bring it back to the commission. The commission discussed who might participate in providing information, including the FairVote group, representatives from cities that had decided not to pursue ranked choice voting, a political science professor or someone familiar with voting methods.

Tolliver moved, Anderson seconded, a motion to direct the city attorney to identify potential experts who could provide information to the commission on ranked choice voting and other voting methods, and to work with the chair in scheduling a special meeting of the commission within the next several months. All voted "aye."

Chair Northrup indicated that the commission needed to set a date for its annual meeting in November 2020. Wiersum moved, Hart seconded, a motion to schedule the annual meeting for Nov. 10, 2020. All voted "aye."

5. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS 5.08 AND 5.09 OF THE MINNETONKA CITY CHARTER

The city attorney reviewed the draft amendment to Sections 5.08 and 5.09 of the charter. She indicated that the amendment was consistent with the amendments made to Section 2.06, which the city council approved in early 2019. Like Section 2.06, Sections 5.08 and 5.09 include requirements that elections be held within a specified time period – in this case, 60 days. However, because the Legislature adopted legislation in 2017 that sets five uniform dates for holding municipal elections, the 60-day time requirement conflicts with that legislation. In addition, the 60-day time period conflicts with state election laws, which require the city to give 74 days' notice to the county of any ballot issues.

Under the proposed language, a special election must be held at the earliest date allowed under state law. Schneider moved, Anderson seconded, a motion to recommend that the city council approve the amendment by ordinance. In response to a question from Chair Northrup regarding the wording of "earliest date possible under state law," Heine suggested that the word "permissible" could be substituted for "possible." Schneider and Anderson consented to the substitution as a friendly amendment to the motion. All voted "aye."

6. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Hart moved, Anderson seconded the following slate of candidates: John Northrup, Chair; Linnea Sodergren, Vice-Chair; and LuAnn Tolliver, Secretary. All voted "aye."

7. ANNUAL REPORT

The city attorney provided the draft annual report and indicated that relevant information from the Nov. 12 meeting would be added. Wiersum moved, Anderson seconded, a motion to authorize the city attorney to submit the annual report. All voted "aye."

8. OTHER BUSINESS

The chair asked whether there were any issues that the commission wanted to review in the upcoming year. Commissioner Wiersum asked whether the commission would want to consider an amendment to address the filing requirements that candidates for office must meet. Wiersum commented that a neighboring city requires candidates to pay a higher filing fee and also submit a nominating petition signed by at least 50 voters. He suggested that the current filing fee of \$5 may be so low that candidates could file without having a strong desire for the office. Anderson questioned whether the need to verify signatures on the petition would create an administrative burden. The city attorney offered to report to the commission in November 2020 whether a petition requirement could be addressed by ordinance or would require a charter amendment.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Anderson moved, Hart seconded, to adjourn the meeting. All voted "aye." The chair declared the meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

LuAnn Tolliver
Secretary



UNAPPROVED
DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA CHARTER COMMISSION**

Jan. 28, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Northrup called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members present: John Cheleen, David Larson, John Northrup, Terry Schneider, Linnea Sodergren, LuAnn Tolliver, Brad Wiersum. Commissioner Karen Anderson participated remotely from Naples, Florida, pursuant to the interactive television exception to the Minnesota Open Meeting Law.

Members absent: Dick Allendorf.

2. PRESENTATIONS ON VOTING METHODS AND RANKED CHOICE VOTING

Chair Northrup stated that the meeting would be a listening session, designed to provide information to the commission regarding voting methods and ranked choice voting. He introduced the first speakers: David Haeg, a Minnetonka resident who is coordinating the local community education effort for the use of ranked choice voting in municipal elections; Jeanne Massey, the executive director of FairVote Minnesota, a nonprofit organization that advocates for the use of FairVote Minnesota and an election judge in Minneapolis.

David Haeg stated that he has observed ranked choice voting being adopted in other cities and had seen positive results. About a year ago, he began meeting with council members to discuss the possible use of ranked choice voting in Minnetonka. He indicated that there were already several hundred people in Minnetonka who were interested in ranked choice voting.

Haeg said that the benefits of ranked choice voting are that it guarantees more complete voter participation, saves money and time, results in winners that are supported by a majority, and encourages more competitive elections and dialog with residents.

The problems that ranked choice voting is trying to address are low turnout and primaries, uncompetitive elections and single day elections without a majority winner. The city has approximately four percent turnout for primaries. Ranked choice voting

would eliminate primaries. The city has uncompetitive elections. In the past November, two races were competitive and three were not. Ranked choice voting would address some of the things that keep people from running for city offices. Single day special elections are also problematic.

Haeg explained what a ranked choice voting ballot looks like. He has shown the ballot to over 1,000 people in Minnetonka, and everyone understands how voting works. Ranked choice voting requires a majority winner. The candidate with the least number of votes is eliminated, and the votes of people who voted for the eliminated candidate are re-allocated to the remaining candidates. The same process continues until there is a majority winner. Haeg provided a demonstration using choices for different types of food.

Haeg pointed out that under the current system, the city could have a special election with multiple candidates, where one candidate could win with a small percentage of the overall vote. The city council opted instead to appoint a temporary replacement rather than hold a special election.

Minnetonka also has a history of low turnout for primaries. Historically, it has a four percent turnout, and that is not representative of Minnetonka. Primaries are also expensive – a city-wide primary costs \$50,000 or more that could be used for other primaries. St. Louis Park went to ranked choice voting because of the cost of primaries. Primaries also make it more challenging for candidates and could discourage them from running.

He indicated that St. Louis Park candidates reported that it changed how they ran. The conversations were more positive than negative and more issues-based.

Who likes ranked choice voting? People who don't want to go to polls twice – seniors, disabled persons, people who are busy. People who prioritize low taxes and efficiency. People who want Minnetonka to think ahead and who value engagement and inclusivity.

Northrup opened the floor to questions. Schneider asked what percentage of voters actually vote for only one versus ranking their votes. Haeg indicated that it would depend upon the city.

Northrup stated that Hennepin County takes the position that ranked choice voting cannot be used in conjunction with a state election. He asked what problems would be raised by the ability to use ranked choice voting for some elections but not others, and what are possible solutions. Jeanne Massey stated that administrators have a huge preference not to use a second ballot, but it is an option available under state law. It is

rare occurrence, but it did happen in a St. Paul election, and the ranked choice ballot was put on the reverse side of the ballot. In addition, there is legislation pending that would address the issue, and she was hopeful it would be enacted within the next year or two.

In response to Schneider's question, Massey said that competitive races, like a mayoral race, there is a slightly higher number of exhausted ballots. In smaller elections, maybe only 10 percent choose to vote for only one voter. Massey reported that voter confidence regarding ranked choice voting is high. Over 90 percent of voters say it is simple to use.

Wiersum asked about the time lag that occurs before the results of a ranked choice election are known. David Schultz answered that he would address that issue in his presentation.

Cheleen asked if, where ranked choice voting is in use, have unique new ways been used for candidates to meet the public. Massey responded that the increase in number of candidates created more interest, and people sponsored more candidate forums. It also caused candidates to work harder and knock on more doors.

Schneider stated that Minnetonka prides itself on nonpartisan elections. What happens when there are seven or eight running and someone decides they want to get party endorsements to help. Massey responded that candidates who tend to go negative tend to get fewer votes. Ranked choice voting provides an incentive to stay nonpartisan and focus on the issues. It is not to any candidate's advantage to play to their base, because they need to appeal to the majority of voters.

Northrup introduced David Schultz, a professor of political science and legal studies at Hamline University and a visiting professor at the University of Minnesota. Schultz indicated that he was asked to perform the initial evaluation of how ranked choice voting rolled out when it was first used in Minneapolis. He is also working on a book about ranked choice voting as an election system.

Schultz explained that election systems are about values and goals. For example, nonpartisanship is a value and goal. Election systems create incentives for voters and candidates. Ultimately, each community has to think about its values and goals in order to determine what its voting system should be.

There are lots of things to think about for voting. For example, the mechanics of voting – paper, optical scan, etc. Another question is the districting system – do candidates run

at large or in districts. Most common voting system in the United States is called “first past the post.”

In terms of goals, goals can include: maximize voter choice; maximize turnout; be simple to use for voters; be simple to administrate; easy to figure out voter preferences; makes sure that everybody’s vote counts; ensure majority rule and minority rights; and minimize voter confusion.

In a first past the post system, it has the virtues of being simple and familiar. There are criticisms, too. It generally produces limited set of choices and creates incentive for only two parties. It is an all or nothing perspective, especially if there is a block of people that only support one candidate. That is especially true on a national level and in partisan areas. Minorities feel left out, and there is the potential for someone winning with less than a majority.

With respect to ranked choice voting, there are many variations used across the world. It was used commonly in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For example, the city of Hopkins used it. It gradually went away because the two parties kind of pushed it out, and there were some concerns at the time that it was a corrupt practice.

Schultz explained how ranked choice voting works, using an example of ordering food at a restaurant. Voters intuitively know how to rank choices. There is some evidence that it creates incentives for people to run and addresses the spoiler effect. Ranked choice voting tends to incentivize candidates to appeal to other voters and not trash their opponents. Generally it produces a majority winner, although there can be quirks

The criticisms of ranked choice voting are that it is too complex, but it actually is not. There is a time lag in election results, but even now elections are not over until the votes are canvassed. In a close election, it can take time to work out the results. There is no evidence that it hurts people of color in the core. There is some evidence it increases turnout and some that it stays the same. There is mixed evidence of whether it encourages third party development. There is little evidence of voter confusion. The study he did after the Minneapolis election indicated that there is a need for better voter education and there is a learning curve for administrators.

Home rule charter cities can implement ranked choice voting. The Minnesota Supreme Court determined that ranked choice voting does not violate the “one person, one vote” principle.

Sodergren asked how the costs for voter education costs compare to the cost savings from eliminating a primary. Schultz responded that he had not found that the costs of

voter education costs exceeded the cost of a primary. He didn't see that the transitional costs of moving to ranked choice voting would outweigh the costs of eliminating a primary. He said that there was a concern about possible voter confusion because voters have to flip back and forth between a ranked choice vote election and the first past the post system for other elections. However, he had not found voter confusion.

Schneider stated that he couldn't recall any candidate for city office attacking another candidate. Right now, the city has four wards and eight candidates. People don't have a lot of candidates to research. But if you get a lot of candidates running in a ranked choice voting system, are voters intimidated by having to research more candidates? Isn't that intimidating? Schultz responded that the city could address ballot access and qualification for the ballot; for example, Minneapolis had 38 people on the ballot the first time and then increased its filing fee. Schultz felt that voters were able to filter out the candidates to determine which candidates were viable and which were not. Schultz is not completely convinced that ranked choice voting increases the number of candidates significantly.

Anderson asked if Schultz had examples of elections where someone who would have been a third party candidate actually won. Schultz said it was hard to speculate. He deferred to Massey. Massey said it is not uncommon to see elections where the initial second place finisher ends up winning the majority vote. Where ranked choice voting has really mattered is that candidates find that a primary is a deterrent to running. Voter turnout is trending upward across the country and locally. In addition, ranked choice voting doesn't change the nature of nonpartisan elections; with the exception of Maine, it has only been implemented for nonpartisan elections.

Wiersum said that a reason that the city is having this conversation is that the state hasn't taken action on ranked choice voting. He asked what the likelihood of that happening might be. Schultz said that the DFL seemed to be embracing ranked choice voting but has cooled on it. The legislature has other priorities, and ranked choice voting has no champions at legislature. He believed there was a low likelihood of state action.

Wiersum queried whether this was a solution looking for a problem. He said that a former council member had pointed out that even-year elections would improve voter turnout. Wiersum asked for Schultz's perspective on those two alternatives. Schultz indicated that there is better evidence that ranked choice voting encourages new faces to run. There there is only some evidence that ranked choice voting increases voter turnout, but not as much as we think. Election is even years will result in more voter turnout, but cities have to balance voter turnout with keeping a focus on local issues. City has to decide how that balance comes out. If the city's sole goal is to get larger voter turnout, the answer would be to go to even year elections. Wiersum indicated that

voter turnout in Minnetonka is not a problem, but it is important to keep a focus on what the problem is that needs to be solved.

Sodergren asked whether there was information about a specific type of education that really worked with younger voters. Schultz said that Minneapolis used a combination of approaches -- newspaper, door to door, neighborhood outreach, and social media. Different audiences get information from different sources.

Massey indicated that each city that has adopted ranked choice voting has done more than the last. St. Louis Park did a whole range of things – mobile voting, website, mailing sample ballots, voter outreach at community events. Outreach and education is an essential component. With respect to the counting process, when Minneapolis first used ranked choice voting, they were using old voting equipment that has since been replaced. It took a few days the first time and took a few days. In 2013 Minneapolis reduced the delay by half, and in 2017 had it done by the next day. Software exists to make the process automated. If that software is certified, the process could be fully automated.

Larson asked whether there is some critical mass for implementing ranked choice voting. Schultz said that if the single most important value was increasing voter turnout, there could be a variety of different mechanisms to accomplish that result. For example, go to even year elections. But there is no real indication is that there is a cost curve that creates a cut-off for implementing ranked choice voting. But if the city wants to keep odd-year elections, then there is some indication that ranked choice voting might create an increase in voters and might bring a more diverse mix of voters.

Northrup called a close to the discussion. Schultz offered to provide the commission with a copy of the report that he prepared for the City of Minneapolis.

3. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

City Attorney Corrine Heine reported that March 17 was available for the next meeting of the commission. Representatives from Hennepin County, St. Louis Park and Minnetonka elections staff are available to provide information about election administration. Northrup indicated he was interested in the tabulation process. Larson moved, Tolliver seconded, to set the meeting for 7 p.m. on March 17, 2020. All voted "aye."

4. ADJOURNMENT

Wiersum moved, Schneider seconded, to adjourn the meeting. All voted "aye." The chair declared the meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

LuAnn Tolliver
Secretary

To: Minnetonka Charter Commission
From: Corrine Heine, City Attorney
Date: May 20, 2020
Subject: Meeting of May 26, 2020, Agenda Item 3

Background

At the request of the city council, the charter commission has undertaken a study of ranked choice voting (RCV), to determine whether the charter should be amended to require RCV for municipal elections. A summary of the timeline is as follows:

Sept. 9, 2019	City council study session; council asked the charter commission to undertake study
Nov. 12, 2019	Charter commission annual meeting; commission agreed to undertake study
Jan. 28, 2020	Charter commission special meeting; commission heard from FairVote Minnetonka representatives, the proponents of RCV, and from Prof. David Schultz of Hamline University
Mar. 17, 2020	Charter commission special meeting; meeting cancelled due to COVID-19 pandemic, declarations of state and local emergencies, and closure of city hall; commission had invited representatives from the Minnesota Secretary of State's office, Hennepin County elections division, and St. Louis Park and Minnetonka elections staffs; focus of meeting was to have been on election administration and costs related to RCV voting system; now rescheduled for June 9, 2020
May 4, 2020	City council regular meeting; city council discussed status of RCV study and informally requested that staff prepare an ordinance for council consideration on May 18, to amend the city charter to provide for RCV
May 18, 2020	City council regular meeting; city council introduced an ordinance to amend the city charter to provide for RCV; the ordinance will come back to the city council on June 8, to consider adoption of the ordinance

City council action

Some commission members have asked what the council action means, relative to the charter commission's study. When the council asked the commission to study ranked choice voting, there was no identified deadline for completing the study – although commission members may recall that staff had suggested that it might be possible to complete the study by having three to four meetings over a span of six months. The study would have resulted in a report back to the city

council. That report could have taken different forms, but the staff’s assumption was that the report would have resulted in one of the following:

- A report in favor of ranked choice voting, accompanied by a charter commission proposal to amend the city charter by ordinance. (This is one of four methods to amend the charter, and it is the method most often used by the charter commission. It requires that the council propose an ordinance to amend the city charter. If the council adopts the ordinance unanimously, the amendment is effective 90 days after publication, unless voters petition for referendum of the ordinance.)
- A report in favor of ranked choice voting, accompanied by a charter commission proposal to amend the city charter by putting the issue on the ballot. (This is a second method to amend the city charter. The charter commission has used this method twice: in 1970, to amend sections 2.03, 2.05 and 4.02 of the charter; and in 1991, to change the mayor’s term from two years to four years.) If the commission had pursued this option, the latest date that the commission could have submitted the proposed amendment to the city council would have been July 7, in order for the item to appear on the November 2020 ballot. That is because the state law requires that an amendment be submitted to the city council at least 17 weeks prior to the election, when this particular method is used.
- A report recommending that the city not implement ranked choice voting.

By introducing an ordinance to amend the city charter, the city council has initiated one of four methods provided by law for amending the charter. Of the four methods, two must be initiated by the charter commission; those two methods are described in the bulleted list above. In addition, a charter amendment may be initiated by voter petition. Finally, the only method that can be initiated by the city council is for the council to adopt an ordinance amending the charter and to refer the ordinance to the charter commission.

Each of the four methods has different statutory requirements and timelines, and those timelines influenced the council’s decision on May 18 to introduce an ordinance to amend the charter. An overview of the council-initiated process is given in the chart below. The first column identifies a step required by law. The second column provides the latest possible date for completing that step, in order to submit the issue to the voters on the November 2020 ballot, based on the current schedule of council meetings (i.e., without calling special meetings).

Required step in process to amend charter	Last date
Council introduces ordinance to amend charter	May 18, 2020
Council adopts ordinance and submits to charter commission	June 8, 2020
Charter commission has 60 days to review proposed amendment and to provide council with recommended changes to the charter amendment. Commission has the right to extend the review period for an additional 90 days, for a total of 150 days. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commission completes review in 60 days and reports to council ○ Commission extends time period up to 150 days 	Aug. 7, 2020 Any extension of more than 3 days (after Aug. 10) means that the

	amendment cannot be submitted to the voters on the November 2020 ballot
Council must adopt a resolution to determine the form of the ballot question prior to Aug. 21 statutory deadline for notifying county auditor	Aug. 10 regular meeting
At least 51% of voters must vote yes on the ballot question	Nov. 3, 2020
If approved by voters, amendment is effective 30 days after election	Dec. 3, 2020

The council’s action prompted various questions by commission members, council members, and members of the public. The most frequently-asked questions are listed below, together with staff’s responses.

Why is the November 2020 election important?

Some council members noted that 2020 is not only a state general election year but also a presidential election year. Because voter turnout at presidential elections is typically much higher than at municipal elections, putting the issue on the November 2020 ballot will allow the greatest number of Minnetonka voters to vote on the issue.

What does this mean for the study that the commission was doing?

Members of the council expressed a desire for the commission to continue with the study of RCV. Council members want to know if it is reasonable to expect the study to be completed within the timeframe noted above – i.e., with a report to the council prior to the council’s Aug. 10 meeting.

Can the charter commission recommend against RCV, or is the commission only allowed to comment on the form of the proposed charter amendment?

The state law expressly contemplates that the commission may recommend revisions to the proposed form of the charter amendment. However, the law does not prohibit the commission from recommending that the charter not be amended or from making no recommendation at all.

What happens if the commission needs more time?

If the council adopts an ordinance and submits it to the commission, the commission has 60 days to review and report back. The commission also has the unilateral right to extend that 60-day period for an additional 90 days – a total of 150 days (which would be Nov. 5, 2020). Looking only at regular meetings and assuming the council would not call any special meeting, if the commission extends the review period past Aug. 10, the council could not put the issue on the November 2020 ballot. Nevertheless, at whatever time the commission were to submit its report, the council could decide to put the question on the ballot at a future special or regular election.

If the council adopts the ordinance, does that mean the issue MUST go on the ballot at some election?

Council members have asked whether the council could stop the amendment process, if the ordinance were to be adopted. The state law does not directly address that question. However, the law provides that the council “may” submit to the voters its original form of ordinance or a revised version as recommended by the commission. In addition, the issue cannot go on the ballot

unless the council affirmatively adopts a resolution that determines the language of the ballot question. It is the city attorney's opinion that the council could decide not to put the question on the ballot, even after it has adopted the ordinance and received the commission's recommendation. The council instead could take action to rescind the ordinance. The proposed ordinance that the council will consider at its June 8 meeting includes a provision that expressly reserves the council's right to rescind the ordinance.

Development of a new work plan

Chair Northrup called the May 26 meeting for the purpose of developing a new work plan, as a team, in light of the council's recent action. The following questions are intended to guide the commission's discussion and development of the work plan.

1. What topics and issues does the commission want to explore, in order to develop a report and recommendation to the city council?

Examples: financial information about costs associated with primaries, costs of administering ranked choice voting; information about exhausted ballots; opportunity for input from residents, etc.

2. Based on the topics and issues identified, how many meetings will be required to complete the commission's work?

Set tentative agendas for scheduled meetings and schedule additional meetings if needed. Commission members are asked to bring their calendars to the May 26 meeting.