

First Name	Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip Code	Comment for the Charter Review Commission
Julie & Chuck	Forker Montrie	7008 Wake Forest Drive	College Park	Md	20740	We are strongly support changing the length of terms for elected officials from two to four years. The learning curve and adjustment period seems barely settled and underway before the next election cycle rolls around. Additionally, it takes time and resources (fiscal included) away from initiatives and projects that respective officials may be working on to focus their energies on running a re-election campaign. Julie Forker & Chuck Montrie
Nick	Brennan	8321 Potomac Avenue	College Park	MD	20740	I support extending the Mayor and Councilmember terms to four years to create a more cohesive and effective city government. Our city officials could be more effective on moving big projects forward with more time in office and not focusing on reelection every other year or waiting on moving something forward until it is known who will be following the project through. I think that it would be more beneficial to have concurrent, as opposed to staggered terms, to reduce the resources (both financial and staff time) needed to conduct elections every two years.  I do think if this does move forward, it should be put to a non-binding referendum. The same small group of people have been vocal about opposing this and random resident-led surveys are being conducted to say that a "majority" oppose this. That is not conclusive evidence, particularly when the survey is being done by a very vocal opponent to this change.  Thank you!
Karen	Garvin	9609 49th Ave	College Park	MD	20740-161	I oppose the move to four-year terms for council members. Having shorter terms means more elections and more opportunity for citizens to have input into their government.
Joan	Poor	4707 Howard Lane	College Park	MD	20740-351	My concerns for the Charter change to extend Council member terms from two to four years are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terms should NOT run concurrently; thus elections MUST be staggered (every two years) to permit better community involvement and to maintain Council skill and knowledge levels;</li> <li>- There would be no economic benefit to City;</li> <li>- Fewer incentives for citizen candidates as current commitment of weekly meetings, special events, etc., would be made greater, likely doubled;</li> <li>- Potential for fewer opportunities for citizen involvement if Council members don't maintain citizen communications and contacts (since change would disallow campaigning, stating positions, etc., every two years);</li> <li>- Student candidates would be greatly discouraged due to length of commitment;</li> <li>- Contact with citizens could be more limited than currently, as campaign time brings more interaction, potentially distancing Council from residents;</li> <li>- If a Council person wasn't performing to level expected by citizens, there is no way to recall, per State law;</li> <li>- If a Council person resigned before term, special elections would be required or citizens lose representation for potentially significant period of time.</li> <li>- More citizen involvement could be required to watch for potential power shifts to wean out citizen involvement;</li> <li>- Council members should be ever more responsive to citizens as the turnover of power from citizens is greater.</li> </ul> <p>Possible benefits could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More time for Council member to learn City issues and to know City staff;</li> <li>- Less over-all time &amp; effort for campaigning on part of Council member seeking re-election;</li> <li>- Current system has worked pretty efficiently for decades, so why incur all the work required to change?</li> </ul> <p>Imperative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If Council should decide to proceed to change terms, this Charter change would be of such major importance, it would need citizen referendum for approval.</li> </ul>