

34<sup>th</sup> District Democrats  
Survey of Members 2009  
June Candidates Forum and July Endorsements Meeting  
62 Responses

**Comments by Members**

9. The June Candidate forum could be improved by:

| #  | Response   |
|----|--|
| 1  | An air conditioned venue with "caucus" rooms       |
| 2  | I think it was a well-organized and run meeting.   |
| 3  | Candidates need more than 30 seconds to talk issue |
| 4  | Separate times for separate jurisdictions.         |
| 5  | Only allowiiing democrats                          |
| 6  | The candidate forum is not the problem.            |
| 7  | did not attend                                     |
| 8  | It was almost unbearably hot in the room           |
| 9  | seperate by offices, Mayor candidates at one meeti |
| 10 | Making sure there are only democratic candidates   |
| 11 | Only consider the most controversial races,not all |
| 12 | leave it the way it is                             |
| 13 | Did not attend                                     |
| 14 | endorsement rules closer to 2008                   |
| 15 | Questions were not specific and challenging enough |
| 16 | creating a guide to candidates with candidate info |
| 17 | Better meetilng management. ie seating, crowd cont |

10. The July endorsements meeting could be improved by:

| #  | Response   |
|----|--|
| 1  | Keep the secret ballot                             |
| 2  | Too many races in one night                        |
| 3  | Separate King from Seattle.                        |
| 4  | More time for politicians talking, less procedure  |
| 5  | votes for dual endorsements should be hand count   |
| 6  | Having ballot packets properly prepared ahead      |
| 7  | Changing the rules                                 |
| 8  | Ranked Choice Voting! Let's just do this once!!    |
| 9  | Do away with paper and multiple ballots.           |
| 10 | Have ballot packs ready at start of meeting        |
| 11 | no opinion   |
| 12 | Hard start and stop times                          |
| 13 | counting votes like kcdcc does-live tally          |
| 14 | Be better prepared; stick to the rules             |
| 15 | limit the number of offices at each meeting        |
| 16 | No need for written ballots                        |
| 17 | Mtg collateral done a wk ahead of time             |
| 18 | starting the meeting earlier/just focus on endorse |
| 19 | split endorsements over more meetings              |
| 20 | IRV! IRV!  |
| 21 | By figuring out an easier way to endorse           |
| 22 | Having the ballots ready ahead of time.            |
| 23 | Improve the checkin process and start the meeting  |
| 24 | only candidates speak                              |
| 25 | Making it two meetings on two different nights.    |

12. Given your response to the previous question, what suggestions can you provide to improve upon the current endorsement rules?

| #  | Response   |
|----|--|
| 1  | The paper balloting was a problem. Otherwise I think the method used was this year was okay. Although there may have been frustration with almost achieving 2/3, but not quite, and then achieving a dual endorsement, with someone with far fewer votes, I think that's just the way it works. The alternative is no endorsement at all, which doesn't seem to make much sense. Further, regarding the 2/3 threshold, moving the threshold for endorsement to 60% would likely mean a similar argument if one candidate achieved 58 percent. I prefer individual motions for endorsement rather than consideration of all candidates on one ballot and runoff between top two. I believe that method, in combination with a hand vote and shorter speeches, would lead to the most accurate reflection of the body's will, i.e., dual endorsements would reflect strong support for both candidates endorsed. |
| 2  | Reduce endorsement threshold to 60%. Make sure that all of the ballot materials are ready before the meeting. This would mean that candidates would need to "apply" for endorsement some days before the meeting.  |
| 3  | We have to stay on schedule and trim time where we can (like voting by hand instead of ballot when we can). Democracy can be messy. I think this was a necessary and good process that we had.   |
| 4  | Properly prepared ballot packets - Automatic hand count for third ballot - Lower threshold for endorsement to 60% OR do not allow candidate to be considered for dual endorsement without a minimum level of support   |
| 5  | I think this process is OK, but it's the amount of time involved in counting and re-voting the same race several times. Ranked choice would save us TONS of time but would require some practice to get the practice down.   |
| 6  | I was dissatisfied with the length of time. It needs to move faster. Overlap voting-start the nominations and speakers as soon as ballots are picked up. Shorten # of speeches or length of time per speech.   |
| 7  | Do away with paper ballots. Hand count by show of credentials is far superior. One vote up and down for each candidate. Stop trying to cram all endorsements into one meeting.   |
| 8  | Too many dual endorsements: The 2/3rd threshold is too high to achieve and needs to be lowered.  |
| 9  | I think that repeated use of the current rules will lend to increased efficiency of the process.   |
| 10 | Let all candidates speak briefly. Block endorsed candidates may never get to speak. The endorsement is still valuable, of course, but the people don't get to know the candidate.  |
| 11 | anything that moves the process along! Also once endorsed that's it - none of this b.s. executive board deciding to nullify the memberships decision later FOR ANY REASON.   |
| 12 | scrap them. redo the rules to be correct. do it like kcdcc does. have the questions worked on by a wider team and allow questions from the floor. several important questions did not get asked. involve more people in the process  |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 13 | vote for one candidate on a page. 1st choice, 2nd choice takes too long to count.  |
| 14 | Keep the process for this year but use hand counts, lower the threshold and hold the meeting earlier in the year. It was too close to the August primary. I also think a no endorsement ballot is redundant. If they don't get the endorsement fine but we don't need to bludgeon them with a no endorsement vote. There should be a third option under question 4. This is a blatant attempt to skew this poll for the current rules. There are other options. For instance, having different races at different meetings perhaps in May, June and July (if we have to). This shouldn't be an either or question. So I'm choosing the second option even though I don't support either one. |
| 15 | I definitely WANT to consider ALL candidates for a given position at one time. Only need written voting on the first ballot in each race.  |
| 16 | I am not sure how to answer the question above. I do remember a past meeting and it seemed just as long as the one this year. It sure seemed to me that it took along time to get through the process.   |
| 17 | As already surveyed, lower the percent needed to endorse.  |
| 18 | splitting the endorsements over 2 or more meetings would help a great deal. This could be a combined candidate forum and endorsement session.  |
| 19 | A single ballot with RCV. Do the IRV down to two candidates, then the powers-that-be decide between no, one, dual endorsement  |
| 20 | Follow King County's endorsement rules.<br>Give members ballots with all Democratic candidates listed.   |
| 21 | More experience and more prep would certainly help. Have ballots all ready ahead of time. Couple this with some type of system that minimizes the risk of people fraudulently giving ballots to ineligible members.  |
| 22 | Hand count; lower endorsement % to 60%; handling each candidate separately; start on time; try and conduct all business within a 3 hour max. time limit  |
| 23 | I was puzzled by the fact that several races not on the August ballot were considered in July such as the Port Commissioner unopposed seat and Ginsberg-Conlin. My understanding is that endorsements for November General will be done in September meeting.  |
| 24 | mtg was way too long because of ballot distribution method between each vote.  |
| 25 | The group questions at the June meeting asking the candidates to raise their paws on yes=no questions seemed utterly mindless and useless.   |

13. If you have any additional comments, please provide them here.

| # | Response  |
|---|---|
| 1 | <p>Please consider a venue with better environmental controls, for the comfort of the candidates and the public, and designated "caucus" rooms (possibly with sound or CCTV from the main room) where folks can have their conversations outside of the main room. Please provide seating for all participants.</p> <p>Audience questions should be presented in writing before the candidate forum(s).</p> <p>The nomination process could be expanded to 3 "for" and 3 "against" one minute speeches.</p> <p>Create a political education committee (made up of E-Board and at-large members) that creates a candidate questionnaire, conducts interviews of candidates in May and June, and presents its findings to the E-Board for their information. Once interviews of all interested candidates for any given office have been completed, the E-Board will consider input from other political education committee members and make a recommendation for endorsement. This recommendation requires a 2/3 vote of the E-Board. In order to be recommended for endorsement a candidate must have completed the questionnaire and a political education committee interview. Any recommendation made by E-Board would be forwarded to the membership body. It requires a 2/3 vote of the membership body to confirm an endorsement recommendation made by the E-Board. Any motion for endorsement made from the floor of the meeting without a recommendation from the E-Board will be referred back to the E-Board for consideration at their next meeting, to be brought back to the membership body at the subsequent meeting of the membership. Once an endorsement has been made, no further interviews will be held, except in extenuating circumstances (to be considered on a case-by-case basis.)</p> |
| 2 | Good Luck!!!  |
| 3 | <p>I am extremely disappointed that you did not endorse Greg Nickels in the early process with Dow. Greg has been a supporter in every sense of the word, issues, fundraising, candidates for 30 years. That should count for something. You just insulted him this year and I am appalled. There was no reason for what you did. The party suffered all over King County because of it. It was mean spirited and that is not the party I've known my entire life. He has been gracious, supportive and involved. You did the same this year when you rejected Ann Martin as an Obama delegate. She was there through thick and thin. It has to count for something or why get involved - for so many years.</p>  |
| 4 | My preference is against dual endorsement.  |
| 5 | I am in King County but not Seattle. I do not want to vote on Seattle only issues and candidates. Separate things out so that those of us with narrower interests don't have to sit through the entire mess.  |
| 6 | The biggest problem was people not accepting the results as voted and then starting a bunch of setting aside of rules to get their way. You need to be tougher about that so it feels fair to everyone. Also will go faster.  |
| 7 | <p>My overall impression was that the process is fine, but that a) we weren't ready for the new process, literally unprepared with the ballots, etc.; b) we were unpracticed. There was confusion, and at least initially there was scrambling because people weren't all clear on their roles; and, c) we weren't prepared for the large influx of people attending the meeting. Having it all happen in such cramped quarters certainly wasn't helping anything....</p> <p>cheers, @brian</p>   |

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 8  | I have found that there are too many personal petty issues brought up during the for/against speeches. The speeches should be based on facts and issues, not because the candidate ran over your cat and did not properly apologize.  |
| 9  | No endorsement is preferable to endorsing candidates whose first ballot vote totals more accurately measured their support than final ballots, which were cast more on procedural grounds than on substantive grounds. The 2009 rules were an absolute disaster, and need to be scrapped altogether. We need to get back to multiple endorsement meetings, vote count by show of credentials, and one vote and one vote only per candidate per meeting. The advantage of multiple meetings where endorsements may be considered is that a candidate who fails endorsement in May must campaign more in the 34th to be endorsed in June. This is far superior to the situation we had in 2009. |
| 10 | Whatever would reduce the time at any one meeting would be acceptable to me.<br>The final endorsement meeting was too long.<br>I didn't stay through it.  |
| 11 | Thanks for this opportunity to provide feedback.  |
| 12 | leave the current endorsements along. allow the body to offer motions at the next meeting to change/replace/modify any endorsement they like. the current rules will very likely result in endorsements that are completely different that what has been issued BY THE BODY.  |
| 13 | Although it appeared there was an effort to be prepared it seemed to fall apart before the meeting began. Also, changing the rules (vote count) in the middle because a "home town" candidate didn't win is not appropriate. Too much time was allowed for discussion since much was redundant. Finally, the meeting lasted too long.   |
| 14 | It would be better to have two meetings a month to cover all the offices and hear all the candidates.   |
| 15 | The informational meeting of our electeds in Olympia needs to be held earlier in the session. Should be a mid-point update not a final wrapup of the session. This I believe caused us to hold the endorsement meeting too late in the year. Also, give us a third option under 5 and 6. With multiple candidates in one race, why not have a simple majority for endorsement. If we still have the top 2, and our candidate doesn't make it, we can still reconsider for the general in September.   |
| 16 | I did not attend the June candidates forum, so I really shouldn't be required to offer an opinion on question 7.<br>I think we went overboard with the dual endorsements. Duals dilute the value and message of a solo. As it happened, we endorsed a number of people who did not even come close to getting a majority sentiment.   |
| 17 | Re: Forum. We don't have to give time to every race. Let's just have a forum with the most controversial races or those with multiple candidates - could have a second forum in October for the two-candidate races. Or do a joint forum with other southside LD's or maybe League of Women Voters.   |
| 18 | I think if you separate it from the regular meeting monthly meeting it will go faster and smoother! Or you could try it on two nights?  |
| 19 | It was a long drawn out process. If it can be shortened it would be good. People would not have to stay so long. I had to leave because one I had a familt issue and two I was just plain worn out!!<br>Maybe if we could do a hand raise vote on some of the issues it would help.   |
| 20 | I wasn't always comfortable with a dual endorsement being given.  |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 21 | I think that those running the show did a fine job but were overwhelmed by the time it takes to count paper ballots. Perhaps hand vote is a better way to go.  |
| 22 | Given the fact that there were many candidates running, people's time is an issue at these meetings. The July meeting was too long. I had to leave the meeting during the spoiled ballot debate. I didn't get a chance to vote for my candidate for Mayor. I'm still unhappy about this. A ballot (with all of the Dem.candidates) could have been passed out to the members. It would have saved us a lot of time. Please, make the endorsement meetings easy and fair. |
| 23 | You needed a better system for getting people credentialed. It wasn't bad, just not good. Folks manning the front table didn't seem to have enough information available quick enough to check whether folks were eligible for credentials.  |
| 24 | GET ORGANIZED -- if you keep the same rules, they call for being a great deal better organized than you currently are. Four + hours having folks crammed into an overflowing room is not good  |
| 25 | Allow candidates to submit 300 word written blurb to a guide (email or web site) which list all filed candidates and their rep opponents if any. Stealth republicans for NP races should be noted by exec board.   |
| 26 | I like this system of voting the endorsements at one designated meeting.   |
| 27 | overall process not bad, just implementation needed some help. Also % required for sole should be flat 60%.  |