

COMPILED BY STAFF
NOT APPROVED BY BEAG DUE TO NO ADDITIONAL MEETINGS

Orange County BOCC Elections Advisory Group Meeting Summary

Thursday, August 5, 2021 at 7:00 PM

RECONVENED Virtual Meeting from Recessed July 22, 2021 Virtual Meeting

Members Present: Kathy Arab, Dr. Jennifer Bremer, Jaazaniah Catterall, Dr. Lisa Hazirjian, Martha Jenkins, Dr. Krishna Mondal, Patrick Mulkey, Alicia Reid, Dr. Jonathan Weiler, Rex Williams

Members Absent: Dr. Nathan Boucher, Brian Crawford, Susana Dancy, Jenn Sykes

Facilitator: Jay Bryan, Retired District Court Judge

Staff Present: Greg Wilder from the County Manager's Office, Brian Carson from the Planning & Inspections Department, and Todd McGee, Orange County Community Relations Director

Others Present: None

1. Vote to Reconvene the July 22, 2021 Recessed Meeting/Roll Call for Quorum – Co-Chair Lisa Hazirjian

Group Co-Chair Lisa Hazirjian welcomed everyone to the Virtual meeting and expressed appreciation for members' willingness to serve on the BOCC Elections Advisory Group (BEAG) and for the work everyone had completed together.

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian requested a motion to reconvene the Group from the recessed July 22, 2021 meeting, and noted that the motion would also serve as a roll call of the members present. Group Member Jonathan Weiler made a motion to reconvene the Group from the recessed July 22, 2021 meeting, and that the motion also serve as a roll call of the members present. Group Member Jennifer Bremer seconded the motion. Group Co-Chair Hazirjian asked Mr. Wilder to call the names of Group members for voting and roll call purposes. Group members voted by roll call on the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

2. Approval of July 22, 2021 Meeting Summary

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian requested a motion to approve the July 22, 2021 Meeting Summary as written and distributed with the agenda package. Group Co-Chair Patrick Mulkey motioned to approve the meeting summary, and Group Member Bremer

seconded the motion. Group Co-Chair Hazirjian asked Mr. Wilder to call the names of Group members for voting purposes. Group members voted by roll call on the motion, and the meeting summary was approved unanimously.

3. Review of Any Written Comments Received

Mr. Wilder commented that he was not aware of any written communication submitted to the Group or to him regarding the BOCC Elections Advisory Group or its work since the last Group meeting. There was no additional discussion.

4. Review of Revised Draft Report

Judge Jay Bryan thanked Group members, the Co-Chairs and staff for their work. He shared that the agenda package for the meeting included an updated “clean” version of the primary 12-page report, as well as all of the Appendices, based on discussion and Group action at the July 22, 2021 meeting. Judge Bryan also noted that a “markup” version of the 12-page report was also included in the agenda package so that Group members could review the specific updates that had occurred since the July 22nd meeting. He then opened discussion on the updated draft Report document and Appendices.

Group Member Weiler stated that the updated document looked good and consistent with the discussions at the July 22nd meeting. Group Member Jaaz Catterall agreed, and added that he had also reviewed the seven potential clarification items that Mr. Wilder had previously emailed to Group, as well as the follow-up comments that Group Member Martha Jenkins had provided. He noted that all the clarifications and comments seemed appropriate.

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian noted that she had attempted to review the Report from a member of the general public’s perspective, and she had some suggestions for consideration.

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian suggested, on page 3 of the Report, under Current Voting Method, that the second sentence, beginning with “Two commissioners...” be revised to read, “Two commissioners are elected at-large, meaning candidates must reside somewhere in Orange County, and voters from the entire county vote on these candidates in both primaries and general elections.”

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian also suggested, in the same paragraph, that the long final sentence beginning “In the primary...”, be revised with shorter sentences to read, “Candidates for these seats must reside in the district in which they are running. In primaries, voters living in District One vote only on District One candidates, and voters from District Two vote only on District Two candidates. In general elections, voters from the whole county can vote in both District One and District Two races.”

Group Member Jenkins, Group Member Kathy Arab and Group Member Krishna Mondal all commented that they thought both suggestions were good changes.

After some discussion it was decided that rather than voting on each individual proposed revision one-by-one, the Group would only vote on specific individual changes that had some uncertainty/objection, and that all of the other agreed-upon changes that had no uncertainties/objections would be addressed together through one motion and vote.

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian continued that on Page 7, in the paragraph beginning “After the presentation,” the Group consider the addition of the word “perceived” to read “perceived strengths and weaknesses”. She noted that the current wording made it sound like the stated points were all established facts, when some if not all of them could be open to debate. Group members generally indicated agreement with the update.

Lastly, Group Co-Chair Hazirjian shared that on Page 8, under the paragraph on at-large districts, she was uncertain of the meaning of the second sentence, beginning with “Those supporting them....” She suggested the Group consider a clarification. It was noted that the word “members” at the end of the sentence should instead be “land”, that the word “and” was not needed in the sentence, and that the verb should be “have”, not “has.” Group Member Catterall suggested a revised sentence read, “Those supporting them touted how they would cover future growth by accounting for areas that have gained in population and would be based on representation of people, not land.” Group members accepted this revised sentence.

Group Member Bremer noted two minor updates, suggesting that the word “district” be made “districts” on page 7 in the first paragraph under the Current Method. She also suggested the addition of the word “the” on Page 8, under the paragraph on at-large districts to read, “....capture the bulk...” The Group accepted these suggestions.

With no other items from Group members, Judge Bryan asked Mr. Wilder to share information on the seven potential clarification items he had previously emailed to Group members.

Mr. Wilder noted on page 5 of the Report, middle of the page, in the last bullet point, the word “mention” appeared extraneous and possibly should be deleted. Group Member Jenkins had previously agreed in her follow-up email, and Group members concurred.

Mr. Wilder shared, on page 7, under the bullet “Current Method”, the last sentence of the first paragraph read, “A more detailed summary of what members identified as the positive aspects of the current method appears below.” He wondered if the information actually was below or the sentence needed to be deleted. He noted that Group Member Jenkins had followed up that potentially the language should read “in the meeting summary for June 24th.” After some discussion, Group members concurred with revising the wording as suggested by Group Member Jenkins.

Mr. Wilder asked, on page 9 after the July 22nd paragraph, if there was any need for Judge Bryan to add a quick summary of the August 5th meeting (tonight’s meeting) in the Report document. Group Member Jenkins had followed up that Judge Bryan could add something brief under a new August 5, 2021 heading that stated something like,

"The BEAG made minor edits to the report and then approved the report as edited." Group members concurred with this addition.

Mr. Wilder commented that on Page 9, in the middle of the page, there was a reference to Appendices L and M. He wondered if the reference to Appendices L and M was applicable at this particular location in the Report since Appendices L and M were Todd McGee's Powerpoint presentation on the SurveyMonkey results, and the printout of the actual survey results from the SurveyMonkey. The paragraph immediately proceeding the Appendices reference did not address Mr. McGee's presentation or the SurveyMonkey results.

Mr. Wilder added that he did not see a specific reference to "Appendix K" (the grid) in the Report and wondered if incorporating a reference at the appropriate location was needed.

Mr. Wilder also added that he did not see a reference to "Appendix N" (which was part of the SurveyMonkey results) in the Report and wondered if incorporating a reference at the appropriate location was needed.

As a potential solution to the items above regarding Appendices K, L, M, and N, Mr. Wilder suggested that the Appendices L and M reference be deleted on page 9. Concurrently, he suggested that on page 6 under June 24th, the potential addition of "(See Appendices K, L, M & N)" at the end of the first paragraph after the word "recommendations." That paragraph referenced both the grid and the survey results, which constituted the content of Appendices K, L, M and N.

Group Member Jenkins had previously followed up that Mr. Wilder was correct and that his proposed update was probably the best way to handle these items. Group members concurred with Mr. Wilder and Group Member Jenkins.

Moving to two final clarifications, Mr. Wilder noted that the July 22, 2021 Meeting summary currently provided in Appendix C was marked as "DRAFT". Based on the Group approving the Meeting Summary earlier in this meeting, staff would update the document appropriately and replace the current "Draft" in the Report with an "Approved" version in the final Report.

Lastly, Mr. Wilder shared that the August 5, 2021 Meeting summary in Appendix C was currently noted as "DRAFT" since it was just a placeholder. Staff planned to compile a document after tonight's meeting to replace this placeholder and it would be marked as "Not Approved Due to No Additional Group Meetings" at the top of the first page. Group Member Jenkins commented that it might be helpful to also add wording to the effect "Compiled by Staff."

5. Approval of Specific Revisions to the Draft Report

With no other suggestions or discussion on proposed changes or revisions, Judge Bryan moved the Group forward to considering approval of the updates and revisions

that had been discussed. He deferred to Group Co-Chair Hazirjian for the potential consideration of any motions.

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian opened the floor for any motions on the updates and revisions that had been previously discussed. Group Member Jenkins motioned to approve all of the changes as had been discussed and concurred with earlier in the meeting. Group Member Bremer seconded the motion. Group Co-Chair Hazirjian asked Mr. Wilder to call the names of Group members for voting purposes. Group members voted by roll call on the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

6. Approval of Revised Final Report

With no other aspects of the Report to discuss, Group Co-Chair Hazirjian opened the floor for any motions on approving the Report as revised. Group Member Weiler motioned to approve the revised BEAG Report. Group Member Catterall seconded the motion. Group Co-Chair Hazirjian asked Mr. Wilder to call the names of Group members for voting purposes. Group members voted by roll call on the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

7. Potential Need for Any Additional Follow-up or Meeting Based on Report Status/Revisions

Group Co-Chair Hazirjian commented that the Group had completed its work and there was not a need for any additional “business” meetings. It was noted that the Group members might pursue gathering on a social basis if circumstances allowed. Group Co-Chair Hazirjian asked Mr. Wilder if he would send an email to all Group members, and specifically members who could not be at this meeting, to let them know there was a potential interest in gathering on a social basis to celebrate the Group’s work. There was some discussion on the timing of the presentation of the Report to the Board of Commissioners, and it was noted that Group members would be invited to join with Judge Bryan and the Co-Chairs to attend that Board of Commissioners meeting if they wished.

Group Co-Chair Mulkey expressed his appreciation to Judge Bryan for facilitating the Group’s work and discussions. Group Co-Chair Hazirjian concurred, and noted that she appreciative that conversations among all Group members had been productive.

Judge Bryan thanked the Group members for their service and hard work, and expressed appreciation to Mr. Wilder, Mr. Carson, Mr. McGee, and the County Attorney’s Office for their efforts on behalf of the Group. Group Member Bremer also expressed her appreciation to staff.

8. Adjourn

Group Member Mondal motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 pm. Group Member Arab seconded the motion. Group members voted on the motion to adjourn, and it was approved unanimously.

