

JOHN ARDNER  
SHELLEY DENISON  
CHRISTOPHER DRESEL

JACK HOLLIS  
DANA STROUD  
DIANA MARCELA WASH

**GRESHAM CITY CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE –  
SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**April 20, 2022**

OPEN SESSION – 3 PM

VIA ZOOM MEETING (SEE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW)

**COVID-19 EMERGENCY ORDER MEETING PROCEDURE**

Due to the restrictions in place established by the Governor's Stay-at-Home Order  
The Gresham City Charter Review Committee will be holding the  
April 20, 2022, Meeting at 3 P.M. via Zoom Meeting.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://greshamoregon.zoom.us/j/86912317016?pwd=V3pBWUt5TWZrdXU4R2JGa2VWWEliUT09>

Passcode: DzV5E8

One Touch Telephone: US: +12532158782,,86912317016#,,,,\*544531#

Telephone: US: +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 869 1231 7016

Passcode: 544531

International numbers available: <https://greshamoregon.zoom.us/j/kcaqPgSPCZ>

Persons who desire to access the meeting and are unable to access the meeting via Zoom are encouraged to contact Dara Wright, Paralegal, by calling 503-618-2505 or emailing [Dara.Wright@GreshamOregon.gov](mailto:Dara.Wright@GreshamOregon.gov) by 5:00 pm two business days before the meeting, so that the City can provide alternate arrangements.

Persons who desire translation services for this meeting must notify Dara Wright, Paralegal, by calling 503-618-2505 or emailing [Dara.Wright@GreshamOregon.gov](mailto:Dara.Wright@GreshamOregon.gov) by 5:00 pm three business days before the meeting, so that the City can make arrangements for translation services.

If you wish to receive notices of future meetings, please contact Dara Wright, Paralegal at [Dara.Wright@GreshamOregon.gov](mailto:Dara.Wright@GreshamOregon.gov) or (503) 618-2505.

GRESHAM CITY CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE –  
SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
APRIL 20, 2022

**AGENDA ITEMS**

1.       **PRESENTATION FROM HEALTHY DEMOCRACY.**
2.       **PRESENTATION FROM THE STAR VOTE TEAM.**
3.       **DISCUSSION ON TOPIC VALUES LIST.**
4.       **AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS; FUTURE  
SCHEDULE.**

**From:** [Jack.C.Hollis@outlook.com](mailto:Jack.C.Hollis@outlook.com)  
**To:** [Dara Wright](#)  
**Subject:** Value Topics List  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 13, 2022 6:18:34 PM

---

**CAUTION:** External Email

Hi Dara,

This is the list of values I had written down from the last meeting, in no particular order.

1. Equity
2. Minority Representation
3. Fair
4. Created with everyone in mind
5. Integrity
6. Simple
7. Honest
8. Expressive
9. Accurate
10. Lower barrier of entry to candidates

Thanks,

- Jack Hollis

To: Members of the 2021 Charter Review Committee for the City of Gresham  
From: Professors Todd Lochner and Ellen Seljan  
Date: April 15, 2022  
Re: Update on Research Possibilities

---

Having received the Revised Work Statement, it would be helpful for us to verify which criteria are of greatest interest to Committee members. In this memorandum, we lay out some additional areas of research we could examine in order to help you reach a more fully-informed recommendation. It is unlikely that we can pursue *all* of the research mentioned below given resource constraints, so we want to ensure that we are working on the issues you deem most important. Additionally, some of this research will take longer than others to complete; if expediency is a top concern please bear that in mind.

## **Research Possibilities**

### **1. Electoral Systems and Their Effects on the Number of Candidates**

Electoral rules can affect the number of candidates that run for elected office. Generally, more candidates are also associated with greater diversity of candidates. In order to investigate how electoral variation in the state of Oregon affects the number of candidates, we could look at electoral histories of comparable Oregon cities, examining the relationship between how many candidates run and a city's electoral rules. Such analysis could also be run for comparably-sized cities in Utah, where there is additional variation within ranked choice voting regimes.

### **2. Electoral Rules and Candidate Election Costs**

Electoral rules can affect the costs of running a campaign, which indirectly may affect the number and diversity of the candidate pool. We could collect campaign finance data for elections run in comparable Oregon cities, examining how the cost of campaigns varies by electoral institution. This analysis could speak both to at-large and single member districts, as well as any costs associated with primaries. Our analysis would likely only be able to accurately collect data on funds raised and spent by the candidates themselves, not independent expenditures by third-parties. We would caution against using out-of-state examples for comparative purposes, as Oregon has a very different campaign finance regime, than does, for example, Utah.

### **3. Costs for Voter Education for New Electoral Systems**

We could provide more detail on the likely administrative costs of introducing new voting regimes. This would involve collecting budget data pertaining to voter education, for example in Benton County. We probably could conduct some out-of-state analysis here if you wish.

#### **4. Time Required to Count Votes Under an RCV System**

We could provide more detail on the length of time it takes to count votes in ranked-choice voting regimes. For example, we could collect data the length of time it took to count the votes in Benton County before and after RCV adoption. We could conduct some out-of-state analysis here if you wish. In addition to an analysis that examines the time between when polls closed and election results are posted (both preliminary and final counts), we could also examine the rate of recount requests in RCV and non-RCV elections.

#### **5. How Other Oregon Commissioners View Their Electoral Systems**

We could design and execute a survey of city commissioners in comparative Oregon cities. Such a survey could provide insight into how changes in electoral rules would affect decisions to run for office, perspectives on representation, and governance.

#### **6. How Gresham Voters View Different Electoral Systems**

We could design and execute a survey of voters in Gresham that would allow us to learn more about their perceptions of the status quo electoral system and proposed changes. Do they have strong opinions about these matters? We also could integrate a ballot test that would provide insight into whether voters are likely to accurately fill out their ballots in new voter regimes. If the Committee has an interest in this methodology, we would work with them to specify the type and size of the survey instrument.

#### **7. Possible Effects of Electoral System Change on Minority Representation**

We could examine census data that speaks to the level of racial housing segregation in the city of Gresham. Those metrics could be applied to a published political science method (Trounstine & Valdini 2008) to give a more data-informed estimate that the likelihood that a change to single-member districts would increase candidate diversity.

#### **8. Description of Primary Election Use in Comparable Oregon Cities**

We could compile data on how many comparable cities use primary elections for City Council positions. We could also determine how many candidates run in these primaries.

#### **9. Description of City Councilmember Demographics (race/gender) for Comparable Oregon Cities.**

As discussed in our original memorandum, there is some evidence that changing electoral rules can affect the demographic characteristics of both candidates and elected officials. Although clearly electoral rules are only one factor among many with such potential effects, we could compile data on comparable Oregon city councils.

## **10. Effect on Policymaking Environment**

Electoral reforms, by nature of affecting constituencies, are expected to affect governance outcomes. We could examine whether there are consistent patterns between electoral rules and governance outcomes, as measured by increased division in council votes. For example, we could present data on recent council votes in Oregon comparable cities, highlighting how frequently votes are closely split or unanimous.

We look forward to hearing which of these avenues the Committee wishes us to pursue. Finally, we have a single clarifying question. The Revised Work Statement mentions “Progressive voting”—did the authors intend to mean “Cumulative voting”?