

Jomsky, Mark

From: martin117a@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2017 12:01 PM
To: Terry Tornek; Tyrone Hampton; Gene Masuda; Margaret McAustin; Victor Gordo; John J. Kennedy; awilson
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: election plan

- 1) The city should file a plan that complies with the consolidation law beginning June/November 2022.
- 2) As part of this plan, councilmembers elected in 2017 would receive a 5 year term, not being up for reelection until 2022.
- 3) The city should run its own election for March 2019 where winners will be elected to a 5 year term ending in 2024.

This plan keeps the city in compliance with the law and removes any argument that the March 2019 election is in defiance of the law.

This plan also gives the city the time and opportunity to litigate the consolidation issue if it chooses.

Costs:

Claims that the city can not cost effectively run a March 2019 election are false. **The cost of running both a primary election and a general election are combined somewhere between \$993,813 to \$676,271.** The county estimate of over \$2,178,000 to run a primary and general stand-alone election is absurd.

The costs associated with internally running a 2019 primary and general election is grossly overstated by both the county and in city clerk's report. I will ignore the PUSD in this analysis because any costs attributable to the PUSD will be reimbursed by the PUSD.

The city does not need to purchase a \$500,000 tabulating system unless the law requires electronic tabulation.

In 2015, there were 15,368 cast ballots. Counted manually; assuming 5 seconds each, these ballots would take one person 22 hours to count.

A crew of 22 workers could thus count all of these ballots in an hour. If these workers were paid \$20 an hour it would thus cost \$440 (22 x \$20) to manually count these ballots one time. They could be manually counted 20 TIMES for less than \$9,000. It should be noted that more than 60% of these ballots will be mailed in and that the city is allowed to start counting ballots 10 DAYS before the election.

On election night there were only 5,762 ballots cast at the precincts. It would take a crew of 22 people 36 minutes to count these ballots once. In 4 hours they could count these ballots more than 7 TIMES.

In summary, assuming Pasadena is allowed to hand count, the total cost of counting ballots in a city election by hand would be less than \$10,000 and the same exact preliminary results would be available election night.

Unless required by law, the city would not need to purchase a \$500,000 "Hart Intercivic Ballot Tabulating System". In addition, even if an electronic optical scanning counting machine was desired, these machines can be purchased for less than \$1,000.

The city would also not need to spend \$50,000 for 256 voting booths or \$7,500 for reusable ballot boxes. Since the city will be complying with the law, these items can be borrowed from the county (as they always have been in the past) at little to no cost.

Therefore, the costs outlined for running both a primary and general election are as follows:

Capital Investment \$40,000

Services and Supplies \$450,000 (which based on my conversation with the city clerk is probably more like \$375,000 because of some double counting)

Staffing \$503,813 (which is probably overstated by the clerk by \$242,542 because it requires 1 Program coordinator not three)

So the costs of running both a primary election and a general election are somewhere between \$993,813 to \$676,271.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Jeff C <tongva4802@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2017 1:27 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: 10/16/17 Council Agenda item 15

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

I'm not sure if you're still collecting correspondence for the City Council agenda tonight, but if you are, please add my e-mail to the list of correspondence for item 15. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Jeff Cyrulewski

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I'm a Pasadena resident, and I'm writing you about item 15 on the agenda tonight, about the future of Pasadena's city elections. Some people believe we should fight the CVPRA and keep our local election process in place. Others think it's inevitable that we'll need to comply with the CVPRA and we should start doing that as soon as possible. It seems like the best answer is in the middle - to look to comply with the CVPRA in 2022, while keeping our 2019 elections intact.

There's a few different reasons this approach makes sense. First off, it would certainly give more time to those who are fighting against the CVPRA to see if it truly applies to Pasadena. Secondly, it would give residents time to get used to the idea of voting on statewide or national election dates and the impact of that (something that could be brought up throughout the 2019 election cycle). And, third, there were a number of issues brought up in Pasadena's 2017 city races that a lot of people are talking about and are engaged in. Some of the city got to vote on those issues this year, and, based on how much more civic engagement there's been on those issues (on top of the normal amount of civic engagement in Pasadena), the rest of the city is more than eager to vote on those issues as well. Being able to vote on those in early 2019 would be more beneficial to all of us in the city than waiting until late in 2020.

I'm not sure if you're looking to make a decision tonight on the election cycle, or if you'll be looking to obtain more information and input before making a decision, but I hope you'll keep this idea in mind as you move forward and decide which direction to go in.

Thank you,
Jeff Cyrulewski

10/16/2017
Item 15