



Date: August 5, 2008
To: Honorable Mayor and City Council
From: Councilmember Bonnie Lowenthal, Chair, Elections Oversight Committee
Subject: **PROJECTED COSTS SAVINGS TO MOVE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS TO ODD-CALENDAR-YEAR ELECTIONS**

The Elections Oversight Committee, at its meeting held July 22, 2008, considered communications relative to the above subject.

It is the recommendation of the Elections Oversight Committee that the City Council concur in the recommendation of the Committee to refer to the Charter Amendment Committee for further discussion and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

ELECTIONS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Councilmember Bonnie Lowenthal, Chair

Prepared by:
Gloria Harper



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY CLERK

333 W. Ocean Blvd.

Long Beach, CA 90802

(562) 570-6101

FAX (562) 570-8789

July 22, 2008

ELECTIONS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
City of Long Beach
California

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive and discuss the City Clerk's report relative to projected costs savings associated with a Charter Amendment to move municipal elections to odd-calendar-year elections.

DISCUSSION

On July 8, 2008, your Committee requested that the City Clerk provide further information on the net costs savings associated with the implementation odd- year elections for the City of Long Beach.

Over six election cycles elections costs (April and June) are projected to total \$11,555,157, as shown in Attachment 1. If Long Beach voters approved a Charter Amendment no later than the 2010 election cycle, it is estimated that the net savings of moving to odd-calendar-year election would save up to \$2,951,616 in General Fund appropriations.

TIMING CONSIDERATIONS

In order for odd-year elections to be implemented in Long Beach, a Charter Amendment approved by voters is required. Assuming support for an odd-year election cycle ballot measure, and the effective date of such a measure (if approved by voters), the measure would need to provide that the terms of current or "first cycle" elected officials would be extended one year. The pros and cons of odd-year elections were previously presented in a 2007 report titled "Election Cycle Alternatives" (see Attachment 2).

SUGGESTED ACTION:

Approve recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,


LARRY HERRERA
CITY CLERK

Attachments

Projected Election Costs and Savings
 Odd-Calendar-Year Elections
 2014 to 2020

Year	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019	2021	Total
April (PNE) \$	1,200,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 683,100	\$ 1,285,470	\$ 707,009	\$ 5,777,579
June (GME) \$	1,200,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 683,100	\$ 1,285,470	\$ 707,009	\$ 5,777,579
Projected Cost \$	2,400,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 2,484,000	\$ 1,366,200	\$ 2,570,940	\$ 1,416,038	\$ 11,555,157
Odd Year Savings							
Voter Education \$	150,000	\$ 155,250	\$ 160,684	\$ 166,308	\$ 172,128	\$ 178,153	\$ 982,523
Polls \$	43,750	\$ 45,281	\$ 46,866	\$ 48,506	\$ 50,204	\$ 51,961	\$ 286,569
Poll Workers \$	97,769	\$ 101,191	\$ 104,733	\$ 108,398	\$ 112,192	\$ 116,119	\$ 640,402
City Employees \$	159,099	\$ 164,667	\$ 170,431	\$ 176,396	\$ 182,570	\$ 188,960	\$ 1,042,123
Projected Savings \$	450,618	\$ 466,390	\$ 482,713	\$ 499,608	\$ 517,094	\$ 535,193	\$ 2,951,616
Net Projected Costs \$							<u>8,603,541</u>



City of Long Beach
Charter Amendment Committee
Election Cycle Alternatives

January 9, 2007



Recent History

- May 2003 – City Clerk met with area city clerks in the City of Commerce to discuss setting up joint powers authority to cosponsor proposal to Secretary of State (SOS)
- June 2003 – Council approves submittal of Municipal Elections Project (MEP) SOS
- July 2003 – Supervisor Knabe writes SOS supporting MEP & long-term goal of one voting system
- July 2003 – SOS declines to fund MEP & ask City to work with Registrar on use of funds
- October 2003 – City of Long Beach Technology Services Department entered into contract with the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for the DIMS Elections Management System.



Recent History

- April 2005 – City Attorney submits E-Minus 50 legislative proposal to County Counsel
- September 2005 – E-Minus 50 deemed not feasible
- January 2005 – 1st Request For Information (RFI) for voting system. System costs range from \$3.1 million to \$8.0 million
- June 6, 2006 – 2 Vote Tuesday
- August 2006 – Notified by RRCC that we may use Ink-A-Vote at no equipment charge
- September 2006 – EOC Demonstrations by voting system vendors
- October 2006 – 2nd RFI for voting system.



Other Jurisdictions

Pop. Rank:	City:	Election Date:
1	<u>Los Angeles</u>	Odd-year: March - May.
2	<u>San Diego</u>	Even-year: June - November
3	<u>San Jose</u>	Even-year: June - November
4	<u>San Francisco</u>	Every year: November - December
5	<u>Long Beach</u>	Even-year: April - June.
6	<u>Fresno</u>	Even-year: June - November
7	<u>Sacramento</u>	Even-year: June - November
8	<u>Oakland</u>	Even-year: June - November.



Alternative 1: April - June

Pros

- 2VoteTuesday Program
- Mail tracking technology
- Candidate name on ballot
- Higher June turnout

Cons

- Voter confusion
- 2-voting systems
- Polls
- Sample Ballot
- Absentee Ballots
- Poll-worker shortage
- Supply distribution



Alternative 2: February - June

Pros

- Meets 88 day deadline
- City conducts primary
- InkaVote equipment possible
- Higher June turnout
- Potential capital investment savings of \$1.9 million

Cons

- No guarantee for June
- Concurrent still possible
- Unknown equipment cost
- Later reporting of results
- Holiday campaigns
- Bottom of ballot
- 28 day canvass
- Write-in candidate voting
- Charter change re: Primary



Alternative 3: June - November

Pros

- Full consolidation
- One voting system
- Higher voter turnout
- Potential capital investment savings of \$1.9 million

Cons

- No guarantee for June
- Unknown County costs
- Lengthy campaigns
- Bottom of ballot
- Later reporting of results
- 28 day canvass
- Write-in candidates listing
- ? Federal - State ticket "affect"
- Charter change re: term start date



Alternative 4: November - March

Pros

- One voting system
- Higher November turnout
- Potential capital investment savings of \$1.9 million

Cons

- Lower March turnout
- Unknown County costs
- Lengthy campaigns
- November bottom of ballot
- November late results
- November 28 day canvass
- Write-in candidates listing
- ? Federal - State ticket "affect"
- Charter change re: term start date
- Impacts in Lakewood, Signal Hill and Avalon



Alternative 5: March - May

Pros

- One voting system
- Focus on City issues
- No 2VoteTuesday
- Fewer voting locations
- Fewer poll-workers needed
- Potential capital investment savings of \$1.9 million

Cons

- Lower turnout
- Must determine voting system and County costs, if InkaVote is used
- Must change terms of office for City, Long Beach Unified School District, and Long Beach Community College District
- Charter change re: term start date
- Impacts in Lakewood, Signal Hill and Avalon



Recommend: Alternative 1 April - June

- Continue 2VoteTuesday
- Increase poll-worker stipend
- Consider new City-owned central count voting system
- Continued use of DIMS election management information system
- Implement mail tracking technology
- Scale up to precinct level ballot counters and direct recording equipment
- Secure elections supply distribution and collection office space



Alternatives Considered But Not Recommended

- **Instant Runoff Voting – requires a Charter change and software not yet certified**
- **All Mail Ballot Elections – highly mobile population**
- **Winner Take All – requires Charter change and produces a plurality result**