

Submission Date	First Name	Last Name	Address	Comment for the Charter Review Commission
2/19/2019 13:58	Dawn	Powers	8403 Potomac Ave	I am for changing the length of term from 2 to 4 years. It is a waste of energy and resources to constantly be thinking about the next election cycle. Don't stagger the election either. Let all members become one council body over 4 years. I think this will help the council focus on making progress instead of worrying about elections. We should be thanking those that run and rewarding those that win by giving them a fair chance at progress.
2/21/2019 14:50	James	Garvin	4805 DREXEL RD	I greatly oppose changing the length of the term for elected officials from two to four years, and see no benefits and have extreme concerns that staggering those terms will lead to a unchangeable political block in the mayor and council positions that can never be altered or ever hear permanent residents or small or single family concerns and focus only on the university and its students. It is a form of election control very similar to the gerrymandering the Maryland democrat party feels it is right to impose..
3/6/2019 11:49	Dawn	Budd	5010 Paducah Road	I appreciate the challenge you have before you. While there are many positives and negatives for either 2 year terms or 4 year terms, I believe the better choice is to keep it to 2 year terms. Why? Because the closer to the people, the more important it is to keep the terms shorter. Especially in a metropolitan area, people tend to move frequently. It could be that in 4 years, many of the people who elected a council-member have moved out of the area. I do not know if this is why the Federal Government decided members of the House of Representatives only serve 2 years -- since they represent an area of population, not that full body of the state like Senators. If a person is doing a good job, they will be reelected (look at Kabir) without much need to campaign -- BUT we need to be able to replace those who are not working in the best interest of the constituents in as short a time as possible. Thank you for your dedication, hard work and fairness.
3/6/2019 17:45	David	Dorsch	4607 Calvert Road	I see no reason to extend the terms of members of the council from 2 to 4 years. The system we have had for all these years works just fine. Those who are elected and do what their residents expect or want of them will be reelected over and over again just like Jack Perry was.
3/7/2019 12:56	Mary	Hartnett	4915 BLACKFOOT ROAD	Four years is a reasonable time for a term of an elected official. With the increasing costs of elections to the candidates and City of College Park, elections every four years could easily reduce this cost without a great impact on the quality of citizen representation. Also if these elections coincided with national/state elections I believe even more dollars could be saved. Staggered terms would provide for continuity of governance and provide for smoother transitions as new members join the City Council or office of mayor.
3/10/2019 12:14	Mary	King	3413 Duke St	Dear Committee for Charter Review, It is with dismay that I submit my comments concerning changes to our city council wishing to change our structure of government by extending council terms to four years and imposing staggered elections. Just this past year our council brought in the mayor of Rockville to give her views on four year terms. Members of council remarked then about the general lack of interest in citizens of College Park to run for election. Some stated that they had run for election many times unopposed. Also, recently our council passed an ordinance authorizing voting at the Stamp Student Union on campus. During that discussion the council lamented the poor voter turn-out in College Park. Some districts have voter turnout of less than 10%. One of the justifications for a Stamp Student Union polling place was to encourage voting. The cry was "Make it easier, and we will vote." We want people to vote. Was their discussion about the possible reasons that people don't vote? No, no discussion at all was had on this topic. So, in the climate of poor voter turnout and lack of citizens willing to run for public office, our city council now wishes to make their terms longer. Why? In the Spring of 2017 Councilwoman Kujawa first brought up this issue to council. During discussion then-Councilwoman Stephanie Stullich commented that the door knocking during the campaign was when she most heard from constituents. She also stated that when she was opposed for election, she sometimes didn't bother doing even this. Overall she remarked that elections every two years kept the council more attuned to their constituents. City government is government closest to the citizens. Let's keep it that way and continue with elections every two years. And let's dismiss even the suggestion of staggered terms. And let's maintain equal representation from every part of the city, too. No at-large seats. Mary King College Park Woods
3/11/2019 13:33	Richard	Hageman	9207 48th Place	I remain convinced that 2 year terms for Mayor and Council seats is suitable for College Park. I do not believe that the term is too short to allow for a learning curve and subsequent execution of the duties of office. Four year terms will not allow citizens the opportunity to vote out of office those who they believe are not suited for the position, but does allow many who are responsive to their constituents to remain in office. I think history bears me out on this, and the process has worked well for years.
3/11/2019 13:45	Cliff	Bedore	7403 Radcliffe Drive	First comment is that no matter what changes are proposed, the city charter should have a recall method for all elected officials. This becomes even more important if you go to four year terms. If you go to four year terms and stagger the terms you will still need elections every two years to keep the staggered terms in place. Don't see any advantage in voting for one rep in each district every two years. Seems like a waste of time and money. If you really want to do something useful, either make smaller districts or get rid of half the council. I see no reason to have to contact two members of the council every time I want to comment on something I know that years ago they changed the council makeup so we could effectively lock out students from the council but I dislike the duplicative effort of having to contact and wait for answers from two council members. Bottom line. I think if you're not going to substantially modify the council makeup, leave things alone.
3/12/2019 13:46	Jordan	Schakner	5206 Mineola Road	I am 100% against increasing terms to 4 years. Let me explain why the top reasons used to promote this idea - a steep learning curve for new councilmembers and the need for greater social cohesion among them - are wrong. Being a Councilmember is not an office job in which one is supposed to acclimate oneself to established social and work routines over a long period. Instead, we need new councilmembers actively and immediately questioning outdated and ineffective ways of doing things. Read "Anfragility" by the author Nassim Nicholas Taleb, which gives solid reasoning from the field of Systems Analysis on why systems in a world of increasing complexity need regular internal stresses to increase strength and flexibility in the face of problems. Without a dynamic interplay, systems like a City Council become stagnant and can actually fail when a nimble response is needed. Look no further than our U.S. Congress for an example of why an institution with long, stable careers of partisan congressmen means total dysfunction and an inability to solve long-term problems. Also, the concern about the need to constantly campaign every two years is untrue. My two Council candidates haven't campaigned at my door once in the past 2 years, and one of them never did originally. If our Council is seriously concerned with the prior knowledge of new Councilmembers, I suggest setting up a Mentorship program between new Councilmembers and seasoned or veteran ones. We certainly have enough of them in this City.