

| Topic | Process/Activity | Who | Notes |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Welcome and Virtual Housekeeping | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Message from Mark Overview of tools/tech we'll use today | Mark Craven | <p>Roll call: Stephanie Crouch, Laura Meyer, Mark Craven, Ron Shultz, Bill Eller, Shirley St. John, Larry Cochran, Mike Nordin, Audrey Ahmann, Brynn Brady, Cindy Reed, Craig Nelson, Kristin Haugen, Mike Mumford, Ryan Baye, Sue Marshall, Tom Salzer</p> |
| Review matrix results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group discussion of the information from the matrix and options | Laura Meyer Group Discussion | <p>Laura Meyer brings up the Round 2 June Matrix, allowing time for discussion – focusing on highlights and particularly calling out areas where there might be a new concern or opportunity for discussion within the group.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Scored highest around affordability, concerned about appointments, as they don't seem to be election policy. If going to general election for all and losing a large percentage of supervisors, then appointment will be very important. Scored highly anything that would allow flexibility. Scored low anything that would be appointments – does not increase transparency. Still hesitant about going on general ballot. Favored option A – finds it gives the most flexibility for all districts. Appointments was a lower score, but would be open to SCC Appointments if no one runs. Ranked low anything that takes away the voters' choice (appointments). Only one that came out high was F (General elections for all, not paid for by CDs). Started to like the idea of the Commission running the election. Definitely doesn't want appointments by Commission. Doesn't feel like there is a risk if they are appointed using the current process. Views appointments as less transparent, equitable, and accessible. Supports Commission appointing 2 members of the board, feels it is a good balance. Wants us to stay true to mission – but doesn't feel like the general election/ballot fits that. Thinks a combo of A, B, E, and F would allow for flexibility and thinking about long-term change (especially if it involves opening up 89-08). |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>10. 4-year term is a plus – the longer someone is there, the better they will be at their job.</p> <p>Averages: Highest scoring reflect discussion – option A (Hybrid), and lowest on anything to do with appointments. Since there is general consensus on appointments, remove options C1-C3 (having to do with appointments).</p> <p>How does the cost of elections get determined per county?</p> <p>Opposed to anything that splits up CDs based on Rates and Charges, certain population size, etc. Partial to hybrid options where CDs have the choice to go on general ballots, giving CDs the option for what works best for them.</p> <p>Financial disclosure: Legislators want to know if there is a financial interest in something being voted on.</p> <p>Option A is the highest rated, and still requires some change to 89-08. In the next meeting – take time to iron out some details about this option. Think about what questions you might want to ask to county auditors during a question and answer session – July 14 meeting.</p> <p>Concepts A, B, F, and G are general consensus to delve into and explore more. Request to hold option E in back pocket for discussion.</p> <p>Removing options: C1 C2 C3</p> <p>More discussion needed: D E F</p> <p>How can we combine some of these options to allow for more wiggle room? Since A is the general consensus, other options can be added to this for consideration.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Concern about opening RCW 89.08 if we want to give CDs the option to go on the general election ballot.</p> <p>Need some degree of certainty that giving CDs the option to go on the general election ballot doesn't become a requirement for all—need more discussion/guidance on strong messaging to support why there's a two-option system.</p> <p>Need to talk more about the logistics of what happens if/when a CD opts to go on the general election ballot. What are the roles/responsibilities of the SCC and district at that point? Who is responsible for funding?</p> <p>Need to talk more about the logistics of moving to a 4-yr term with elections held every other year. Will all 45 CDs be on the same schedule? Will half hold elections in odd years and the other half in even years? Are there challenges in having two opening positions every other election?</p> |
| <p>Wrap-up and next steps</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of next steps | <p>Mark Craven Group Discussion</p> | <p>July 14 – add an extra hour to the meeting. Meeting will be 11 am – 2 pm (or 3 pm). This will also be the meeting where County Auditors will be available for questions and discussions.</p> |
| <p>ADJOURN:</p> | | | |