

---

**From:** ContactCouncil@cityofcamarillo.org  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 20, 2019 7:58 PM  
**To:** Jill Gordon  
**Subject:** Web Contact All Council Members

Subject = city electoral districts

Name = Michael Newman

Phone = 805-987-2678

Email = mikenewman93012@yahoo.com

Comments = I am against 5 electoral districts. Too few voters per district. Please consider 4 districts and mayor voted by all city voters.

Client IP = 23.241.57.16

## Jeffrie Madland

---

**Subject:** FW: Voting Districts - Public Hearing #2 3/27/2019

**From:** [jeffmcvicker@yahoo.com](mailto:jeffmcvicker@yahoo.com) [<mailto:jeffmcvicker@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 25, 2019 12:51 PM  
**To:** City Council Internet EMAIL Group <[council@cityofcamarillo.org](mailto:council@cityofcamarillo.org)>  
**Subject:** Voting Districts - Public Hearing #2 3/27/2019

Dear Councilmembers:

I've posted this clip from the first public hearing the Council had on 2/27/2019 regarding district elections.

There is no talk from the Council about the voters being able to vote in every election if there was a two-year term at-large mayor.

There is no talk about disenfranchising voters by only allowing everyone to vote every four years if there are 5 districts and no at-large mayor is selected.

Instead it's all talk about your views and needs. Not once, was there anything about the resident's needs, that elected you, to represent us.

With an at-large mayor, every resident would have elected two representatives onto the Council instead of one, doubling EVERYONE's representation.

And with only 4 districts, each district would be 25% larger than if the City has 5 districts. It's interesting that there was discussion about districts allowing people to get elected with less votes. That's true, but with districts, it's more likely that winners will get a majority of votes as opposed to the current council, of which none of you won a majority of votes, only a plurality of the votes.

The immaculate vote (fix) appears to be in even before this Wednesday's meeting when you're supposed to be listening to what the people need and want. It was nice of Brian to caution you against actually voting after 4 Council members had declared their choice of 5 districts and no mayor. Neal Dixon called you on it and he is right.

It's yet another major faux pas for the Council after blowing the safe harbors and getting sued for no good reason. And now it's costing the taxpayers at least \$500,000 just so the Council could hide the Shenkman letter until after the election. No other City in the County fell into this trap other than Camarillo. Tony, what happened to the argument that Camarillo should be like everyone else in the County? □

I've also attached a screenshot I just took of the poll Shawn is currently conducting on Facebook regarding district counts and an at-large mayor. While it's not scientific, it's better than what anyone else has beyond their own opinion.



## Shawn Mulchay Camarillo City Council

Member created a poll.

Saturday at 2:58 PM ·

Public Hearing #2 for Camarillo's Voting Districting process is this Wednesday, March 27th, 7:30PM, at City Hall. The City Council will be soliciting public comment regarding the composition of the City Council voting districts and the # of districts residents want. Please come voice your opinion on Wednesday and/or participate in this informal poll below of two options which residents have most commonly suggested to me. You can expand or suggest alternatives in the comments below.

**14%** 5 Districts

**86%** 4 Dist. + at-large Mayor

This poll ends in 2 days.



114 Votes 10 Comments 6 Shares

Represent the people, not just yourselves.

Jeff McVicker

## Jeffrie Madland

---

**From:** Bev Dransfeldt <bevdransfeldt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 25, 2019 1:09 PM  
**To:** Tony Trembley Internet EMAIL; Charlotte Craven Hotmail; Kevin Kildee GMAIL EMAIL; Susan Santangelo Internet EMAIL; Shawn Mulchay Internet EMAIL; Dave Norman; Jeffrie Madland; Brian Pierik  
**Subject:** Defining the Mayor's Role - Districting

Hi everyone -

As Wednesday's council meeting approaches, I have been critically thinking about districting and what the mayor's role would entail with one elected at-large versus the current role. In order for the public to make an informed decision, they should be presented with what that actually means. With the public hearing, I'm not sure if it is too late to include due to Brown Act regulations.

While I try weighing the options between 4 or 5 districts something that I think may be really helpful to present at the next hearing from city attorney is what an at large mayorship could entail so that others can understand potential ramifications.

Questions that come to mind:

- If 5 districts, will the mayorship still rotate annually?
- How long is the at-large term? 2 or 4 years?
- How can it be ensured that a councilmember's term isn't protected because they run in a year they're "safe." And that the other councilmembers are always at a disadvantage?
- If councilmember vacates that seat is there an election or an appointment?
- Who sets the duties of the mayor?
- Does it become a "full-time" position?
- Is the stipend then adjusted to reflect that?

When I mention the "safe" question above here is an example below with an at-large elected mayor:

2020: District 1 & Mayor

2022: District 1 rep can run for mayor and not worry about losing their seat if 2 years.

District 2,3,4 elections

2024: Mayor

District 2,3,4 all safe. District 1 potentially is always at a disadvantage to risk running for Mayor over their seat.

How is that mitigated?

I understand these are all a lot of hypotheticals, however they are all questions that I think will be important to weigh in on.

Thank you for your time.

Best,  
Bev Dransfeldt

--

Bev Dransfeldt  
[bevdransfeldt@gmail.com](mailto:bevdransfeldt@gmail.com) | 209-200-2313