

**2017 HOUSE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS**

**HCR 3016**

# 2017 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Political Subdivision Committee  
Prairie Room, State Capitol

HCR 3016  
2/10/2017  
Job # 28236

- Subcommittee  
 Conference Committee

*Carmen Hickle*

## Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Legislative Management to consider studying the desirability of moving city elections from the primary election in June in even-numbered years to the general election in November in even-numbered years

Minutes:

1

**Chairman Klemin:** Opened the hearing on HCR 3016.

**Blake Crosby, Executive Director of ND League of Cities:**(Testimony #1) (Time 3:48 to 6:42) Discussed HCR 3016.

**Rep. Zubke:** Can you tell me what some of detractors positions are to oppose this?

**Mr. Crosby:** No one likes change. The detractors when I pushed them on the issue it was just change.

**Rep. Johnson:** One reason would be doubling the size of the ballot in a November election. What is a city election? Is it just commission or council?

**Mr. Crosby:** It would be mayor, city council, city commission.

**Rep. Johnson:** So you would still have county commission, park district, water district in June?

**Mr. Crosby:** Park Districts would go along with is my understating.

**Rep. Johnson:** But not county?

**Mr. Crosby:** Counties already do November, do they not?

**Chairman Klemin:** Primary in June and general election in November.

**Rep. Johnson:** So everything would move to the general election?

**Mr. Crosby:** Yes, and this would be not eliminating the situation we had in Fargo where we had 16 or 17 candidates running for one position. They could use June to narrow down that field. Then have the finalist appear on the ballot in November.

**Rep. Beadle:** I know they had a conversation in Fargo and was looking at doing what you just said. Are they preempted from being able to that based on what we have on the statute now? Or would they be able to do that on their own?

**Mr. Crosby:** By Home Rule authority they have the authority to do that already.

**Rep. Hanson:** Do we have any data on when we have a November election what the drop off is? So if someone goes and fills out their ballot today in the general election we typically see people vote for President and US Senator further down the ballot you see fewer votes.

**Mr. Crosby:** I am not aware of any statistics that indicate that. I think that it is important to open up the conversations on the elections and balloting. I know there was legislation introduced for balloting hardware. I think this is an appropriate time to look at how we logistically go with the election as the electronic possibilities continue to increase and continue to have the possibility of making this more efficient. We might find out something in the study that cause us to look more to the future as to how we are going to vote and what those ballots are going to look like. Right now there would be size of paper problems running through the ballot machine. They can only handle a piece of paper so big.

**Chairman Klemin:** There is a bill to move school bond elections to November also.

**Mr. Crosby:** I think that is an excellent point as that has been brought up. Filtering through all the elections could be a problem. At some point in time the technology is going to catch up with us and this will come back, so this may give us a chance to get out ahead of it. It's a study resolution.

**Rep. R. S. Becker:** I have heard that early balloting is becoming more popular. I heard that a quarter to a third all people are voting absentee and early balloting. Shouldn't that reduce waiting in lines?

**Mr. Crosby:** I absolutely agree, as we continue to look at the statistics that are gathered and at the hardware and software that are available and the logistics of the process more and more of us are voting in advance.

**Rep. Guggisberg:** Why do you want the legislature tell the local government what to do? Couldn't your organization just have a study and say this is the cost and here are the benefits of putting a ballot on the general election?

**Mr. Crosby:** Where would it end up anyhow? It would end here so it might as well start here.

**Vice Chairman Hatlestad:** Was there a straw vote taken at your convention?

**Mr. Crosby:** Within the group I asked people to raise their hands and it was a majority of people who raised their hand.

**Vice Chairman Hatlestad:** You have a regular newspaper in there would you utilize that to conduct a straw vote and get a response?

**Mr. Crosby:** Because we are looking at an interim study I would likely do it at our next annual convention which will be in September.

**Rep K. Koppelman:** Home Rule cities are able to do this on their own. How many cities are Home Rule versus the total number of cities in North Dakota?

**Mr. Crosby:** Roughly a third.

**Rep K. Koppelman:** So the two thirds could not change it on their own? It would have to be statutory?

**Mr. Crosby:** That is my understanding.

**Rep. Guggisberg:** Are they required to have city elections in the spring?

**Mr. Crosby:** Yes, in June.

**Donnell Presky, Association of Counties:** (Inaudible)

**Rep K. Koppelman:** Would the language of the resolution need to be changed to make the study broader?

**Donnell Presky:** I would think you would want to take a look at that.

**John Ertelt:** Why was this brought up at all to move it to the general election?

**Chairman Klemin:** This was an issue that was brought up at a meeting Mr. Crosby was at, some of the people there were questioning why can't they move the city election to November. This is a resolution to study that question. We are not deciding anything on this now.

**Mr. Ertelt:** Why was that brought up at all?

**Chairman Klemin:** You will need to talk with Mr. Crosby.

**Rep. Johnson:** Do you think there would confusion because we have local elections in June along with the primary versus the general election in November? You vote for some local officials during the primary election in June where you may be voting for a Presidential candidate. That was the previous testimony that people are confused and moving all primary matters to November would be less confusing.

**Mr. Ertelt:** I worked polls over the years and I don't think it would be an issue at all.

**Chairman Klemin:** The process would be at the end of session our Legislative Management Committee will look at all the study resolutions and prioritize them and decide which ones we are actually going to study.

**Chairman Klemin:** Closed the hearing in HCR 3016.

**Rep K. Koppelman:** In line 22 if we changed the word from city to local would that work?

**Chairman Klemin:** The counties do have primary elections.

**Rep K. Koppelman:** Rep. Johnson mentioned park board, would that be swept up in city?

**Chairman Klemin:** May I suggest that we leave the word city in and say other local?

**Rep K. Koppelman:** I would move that in line 22 of the bill, after the word city we add and other local

**Rep. Johnson:** Second the motion.

**Rep. Ertelt:** For consistency you would want to do that on line 2 as well.

**Chairman Klemin:** Same amendment on line 2, is that in your motion?

**Rep K. Koppelman:** Yes, it is.

Voice vote carried.

**Rep. Maragos:** Made a do pass as amended motion.

**Vice Chairman Hatlestad:** Second the motion.

**Rep. Guggisberg:** Do these have to be unanimous out of committee to go on the consent agenda?

**Chairman Klemin:** I believe that is what we are requiring. So if we have a unanimous vote on this it would be on the consent agenda otherwise it wouldn't be.

Vote 12 yes, 1 no, 2 absent.

**Chairman Klemin:** This will not be on the consent agenda.

Carrier Rep. Toman

2/10/17 DE

17.3043.01001  
Title.02000

Adopted by the Political Subdivisions  
Committee

February 10, 2017

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3016

Page 1, line 2, after "city" insert "and other local"

Page 1, line 4, after "city" insert "and other local"

Page 1, line 12 , after "city" insert "and other local"

Page 1, line 22, after "city" insert "and other local"

Renumber accordingly

**2017 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE  
 ROLL CALL VOTES  
 BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB HCR 3016**

House Political Subdivisions Committee  
 Subcommittee

Amendment LC# or Description: 17.3043.01001

Recommendation:  Adopt Amendment  
 Do Pass     Do Not Pass     Without Committee Recommendation  
 As Amended     Rerefer to Appropriations  
 Place on Consent Calendar  
 Other Actions:  Reconsider     \_\_\_\_\_

Motion Made By Rep. Koppelman Seconded By Rep. Johnson

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Klemin			Rep. Guggisberg		
Vice Chairman Hatlestad			Rep. Hanson		
Rep. Beadle					
Rep. Becker					
Rep. Ertelt					
Rep. Johnson					
Rep. Koppelman					
Rep. Longmuir					
Rep. Maragos					
Rep. Pyle					
Rep. Simons					
Rep. Toman					
Rep. Zubke					

Total (Yes) \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Absent \_\_\_\_\_  
 Floor Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

Voice Vote Carried

Date: 2-10-17  
 Roll Call Vote: 2

**2017 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE  
 ROLL CALL VOTES  
 BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB HCR 3016**

House Political Subdivisions Committee

Subcommittee

Amendment LC# or Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation:  Adopt Amendment  
 Do Pass  Do Not Pass  Without Committee Recommendation  
 As Amended  Rerefer to Appropriations  
 Place on Consent Calendar  
 Other Actions:  Reconsider  \_\_\_\_\_

Motion Made By Rep. Maragos Seconded By Rep. Hatlestad

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Klemin	/		Rep. Guggisberg	/	
Vice Chairman Hatlestad	/		Rep. Hanson	/	
Rep. Beadle	/				
Rep. Becker	/				
Rep. Ertelt		/			
Rep. Johnson	/				
Rep. Koppelman	/				
Rep. Longmuir	/				
Rep. Maragos	/				
Rep. Pyle	/	/			
Rep. Simons	/	/			
Rep. Toman	/				
Rep. Zubke	/				

Total (Yes) 12 No 1

Absent 2

Floor Assignment Rep. Toman

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HCR 3016: Political Subdivisions Committee (Rep. Klemin, Chairman)** recommends **AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS** and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (12 YEAS, 1 NAYS, 2 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HCR 3016 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 2, after "city" insert "and other local"

Page 1, line 4, after "city" insert "and other local"

Page 1, line 12 , after "city" insert "and other local"

Page 1, line 22, after "city" insert "and other local"

Renumber accordingly

**2017 SENATE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS**

**HCR 3016**

# 2017 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

## Political Subdivisions Committee Red River Room, State Capitol

HCR 3016

March 23, 2017

Job # 29604

Subcommittee

Conference Committee

Committee Clerk Signature



### Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

A concurrent resolution requesting the Legislative Management to consider studying the desirability of moving city and other local elections from the primary election in June in even-numbered years to the general election in November in even-numbered years.

### Minutes:

Written testimony #1 Blake Crosby  
Written testimony #2 Rep. Scott Louser amendment #  
17.3043.02001

**Chairman Burckhard** opened the hearing on HCR 3016. All senators are present.

**(:16-2:13) Blake Crosby President of the North Dakota League of Cities**, In support of HCR 4016. Written testimony #1.

**(2:16-3:08) Rep. Craig Headland**, District 29. Just here to present to you this resolution on looking at studying the changing the date of city elections. Mr. Crosby is here to go through the details of that, but it seems like a reasonable thing to do if we could first of all save money by moving the timing of the election. I think the bigger issue for me is, to get better participation in local city elections. I think the study would be warranted and narrated.

**Sen. J. Lee:** This isn't a tough question, but, one of the reasons as you may recall that we split the ticket a few years ago, so that half the state offices are elected in once a year period and the other half in the other is that on the one ballot it was so long and the next one a few years later was so short, it was just a US House member plus locals. It was a real imbalance and part of the problem was that the folks who were half way down the ticket and farther down they couldn't even get any newspaper space or media time because the big guns at the top of the ballot bought it all up. So I am just wondered if, I don't care really when we have the election I understand about having a greater turnout, but was that any part of the consideration when the idea took root for you?

**Rep. Headland:** To be honest, that didn't really occur to me when I decided to put the resolution forward. But I do understand the point and those changes were made prior to my time in service here at the Legislature, so it escaped me. But it is worthy of some discussion amongst your committee. Certainly.

**Mr. Blake Crosby**, continued with his written testimony #1. (4:54) There was a bill introduced to put some money aside for the Secretary of State can purchase new election balloting equipment. I don't believe that went anywhere. In the discussion on the House side, the question that Sen. Lee brought up was also brought up and that is the length of the ballot. The physical length of the ballot because the machinery can only handle a piece of paper so big. I understand that. There was also a concern raised about how many names would be on that ballot. I certainly understand that. However, I believe it's important that we look 5-7 years down the road and here's how we're going to vote. The other importance for this study is we need to start thinking about citizen participation and how we can deal with them voting electronically, remotely electronically. So, some of the questions about equipment, logistics, they are going to become much less a piece of the discussion. We're just moving to a modal electronic voting. So, I think this is an appropriate time to begin that discussion and to begin that discussion with the cities and counties, townships so that when it finally does happen we're not trying to chase the horse.

**Sen. Anderson:** When other elections does that include school elections or are we lumping those in to the same group or how is going to work?

**Mr. Blake Crosby:** School elections are on their own schedule. I don't see them changing that. I think school elections have worked well because of their school year and any issues that may have to do with the bonding, so schools are on their own time frame. However, when we move to this, that might change that.

**Donnell Presky**, North Dakota Association of Counties, in support of HCR 3016. No written testimony. As you know our auditors are tasked with running our elections and I had just texted the Cass county auditor curious as to how many elections they are assisting with. He said so far, in 2017 they've had two elections already, and they have 2 more scheduled and this is on top of the primary and general elections. So as you can tell there are many elections held during the year and attendance yes is a concern along with the expense of running the elections. I was just pulling it up on my phone, you have a copy there but, we had asked for this bill to be amended in the House to include to expand more than just cities and to include other political subdivisions. So, I believe it says for the past this was also study bringing school elections into the general as well. So this would be your school boards.

**Sen. J. Lee:** Did anybody representing the schools comment at the House? I would be surprised to them as I would certainly like to hear what they had to say about this because if we take away something its going on the same time these school elections, it means that fewer people will likely work in the school election if they are on their own schedule. I mean I just wondered if there has been any chats any conversations with them at all.

**Ms. Donnell Presky:** I don't recall if they were present at that hearing or not. I am looking at my notes from that hearing and I don't have it done that anyone from the schools was present at that hearing.

**Chairman Burckhard:** So county auditors are kind of in favor of this thought? This kind of consolidation of elections?

**Ms. Donnell Presky:** Absolutely! In your county as well as the auditor in Ward county has been very busy assisting the schools and others who have special elections throughout the year.

**Sen. Kannianen:** For each election are there temporary employees that need to be hired or overtime that needs to be paid? I suppose it varies I imagine but are there estimates on extra costs like per election or depending on the size?

**Ms. Donnell Presky:** Depending on the county and the relationship then with the school or the political sub that might be holding an election, everyone is different as far as the county support or assistance during that special election. You might have like Cass county for example, they assist in all of the elections all the school elections. They bring their equipment and help manage the election. But you're not going to find that in every county, so this is where this study can also help. As far as the cost, I think that depends on the size of that entity holding that election. For the county elections that are held, the county has to have the expense of hiring the poll workers.

**(14: 57) Rep. Scott Louser, District 5, S. W. Minot.** I am here in favor of this as well. Maybe just to dovetail on the testimony, it was my understanding as we were voting on that bill that this would include those other local elections in the study anyway. With that I would like to offer for the committee's consideration an amendment # 17.3043.02001. It is a very brief amendment but it might have some large impact. This would also include studying party affiliation for local elections where local candidates would declare a party affiliation. This concept has been discussed since last summer. It was not introduced as a stand- alone bill to implement this session, we considered doing that as a stand- alone bill, but it seems appropriate to study it, as opposed to just drop it as a bill and have a hearing in both chambers without probably further public input. So the question may arise as why are we doing this not, why is it something that is being attached as an amendment now and not when it was in the House. This week three times in the House, in floor debate on Tuesday and once yesterday, we heard the comment something to the effect that the local elected officials are closest to the voters. I've heard theoretical arguments against this from people saying that local officials don't want to make a party affiliation, because local elections are not political. Well you can't have it both ways. You can't say it that is closest to the voters and closest to the people, but it's not political so, these are elected officials and so the concept would be to study whether or not we should require party affiliation. (Ex. cited 16:56-18:11) So I guess with this I this I would only question why a candidate wouldn't want to let the voters at least know what their political affiliation is. I think that is a fair question to ask. The voters are asking us for transparency, this is absolute transparency, to the people that are elected that are closest to the people. I am only asking for this to be included in the study.

**Sen. Larson:** Would that then require a party endorsement or would they just declare what their party is?

**Rep. Louser:** That would not require, it may allow for, for would not require an endorsement from the political party because of the political parties are set up by legislative districts and so these are candidates that aren't in defined legislative districts. A way to look at this potentially would be is we have party endorsements for the office of Department of Public Instruction. So, whether or not you declared you are a member of a party, and that can be

Republican, Democrat or Independent, you could request under this bill the endorsement of the local legislator district but you're not running in that district.

**Sen. J. Lee:** I think that it is very possible to be political and not be partisan because I think that there are fewer and fewer people who are actually engaging with a political party. But that doesn't mean that they are not political. They are just not party animals so to speak. I am thinking of people who run for the school board, and the ones that I know I can't think of one that rises to the top of a list of people who are active in either political party. Occasionally there is one that is. That doesn't mean that they don't care about what's going on with the school board, or that they don't recognize that there will be gives and takes that takes place with this whole thing. All of our city officers in West Fargo and Fargo run at large. It will be fine in Minot too. It is just not that big a deal. But I think it ends up turning off a certain number of people who enlarger numbers than ever, are disenchanted with both political parties. So by having to declare a party if you are not involved in one, I don't see that that necessarily benefits the public who is voting for that person because what are you going to do, yes I have to affiliate with the Republican party, but I am really not active in everything, I know I just had to do it. What is the advantage here for what is considered to be a non-partisan position?

**Rep. Louser:** I think that is the something that would probably show itself in the study. Whether this is a good idea or not; one of the things that I considered putting in the language that I left out intentionally was the size of the community. So if we had a community that had an election for say 5000 people, or greater that this would apply and otherwise would not. It is something that I didn't want to place those limits, I wanted to have the study open so that we could ultimately if this was chosen we could have recommendations and input over the 18- month period to see if this is a good idea. Potentially the study would say it was studied and it's not warranted. But I go back too, I think that the voters very rarely, I think it's an indication of your thought process and where you might lean politically and there can be other advantages to this as well if somebody is the only candidate on the ballot and they are of "a" political party that somebody else may be encouraged to run. Then you have an contested elections so I think there are unintended consequences and benefits and it's worthy of a study. All of that stuff would come out.

**Sen. D. Larson:** Don't you think too that when you have somebody running for an office like that, that a lot of times they are not in a larger community. A lot of times they are not known by everybody and this would just give more information about where their ideas lie, maybe?

**Rep. Louser:** I would hope that would be the case. Again, I wrestled with this all summer and all fall. I wanted to introduce a bill to require this and I think it's more appropriate to study it. I would like to have the input of the League of Cities, and the Association of Counties, and the School Board, everybody should have their input as opposed to having to come and say we've taken a position against this idea publically. I would rather have everybody at the table and determine if this was a good idea. So, studying it is probably more appropriate than just drafting a bill and have us debate us.

**Sen. Dotzenrod:** In other local office, would that include judges?

**Rep. Louser:** That is an excellent question. I think technically it would have to not included judges because they are a non-partisan. The other local offices would be township boards,

school board, park boards but as we know based on our election law and our campaign finance laws, judiciary candidates are specifically non-political. They cannot declare a party.

**Chairman Burckhard:** Let's take Minot for example the upcoming election for narrowing it down to six councilmen and a mayor that votes. Let's say there was 10 people that submitted to run and they all claimed the same political party, would that matter, or probably not matter?

**Rep. Louser:** Would it matter, I think the voters would like to know if everybody that is running is from one party and it would encourage people that are not engaged to probably run and would probably give the people who are not on the ballot yet, an advantage because it is in that large election and so if you have 10 people from one party for 6 positions and nobody from the other, it might encourage additional participation. I think it would be an advantage.

**Chairman Burckhard** closed the hearing for HCR 3016.

### **Committee Discussion**

**Sen. Anderson:** I move do pass on HCR3016.

**Chairman Burckhard:** With the amendment?

**Senator D. Larson:** I will move the amendment.

**Chairman Burckhard:** So we need to undo one. So do we have a 2<sup>nd</sup> on the first motion? How about that. The motion is to do pass on the HCR 3016. **Sen. J. Lee** 2<sup>nd</sup> on the first motion.

**Sen. Diane Larson:** I am going to vote against it just because I would like to see the amendment included on it before we vote on it.

**Sen. Anderson:** The reason I moved the motion was I am not in favor of the amendment. I think at the local level we have many people who get involved in local issues, city commissions, park board, whatever else and they have no concept of whether they are in one party or another. They just want to support the local issue. I really don't think it's helpful now. I do know that we have some cities for example and Bismarck happens to be an example, where you hear complaints about all the city commission is one party or the other. But at the local level you know they are concerned about the local township, the local whatever. Then people who are really haven't thought much about being in one party or the other. I really think that we want to do everything that we can to encourage their participation and their help at those local things, and not say okay now, check the box, do you want to be one party or the other, the alternative is going to be no party. Then we make them uncomfortable too because most of the time maybe they won't vote for one party or the other. So but they really don't feel like another township board that is a concern. That's why I don't think the amendment, I think that if we want to look at that we need a separate deal and debate it separately.

**Sen. D. Larson:** I think that what it does is if I don't know a candidate but I know what the Republican party represents, and I know what the Democrat party represents, an independent you know, I just feel like this will give me more information about the person and you know that not everybody in one party or the other completely aligns with one or the other but it least it will give you more information about the way they're leaning and so the way they're going to perhaps proceed. So, this is only to study if this is something that we do or

not, that we require and to me it seems like a good idea to put that into a study to see if this is something that we should be looking at. Just to give the voters more information on the person they are going to be voting for. So that's why I like the amendment.

**Sen. Anderson:** Additionally, you know you have a limited number of people who check the box and say, contribute, the way you get to be a party member is when you contribute to them. You don't just say, I support you, you have to give them money. Then you get a card that says that I am in the party. Well somebody is just a small percentage of the population who really carries one of those cards or the other. And of course those that are involved in the district and so forth, we think we are active party people and so forth. But there are probably only 50 of us, in the whole district. You know that other people might vote one way or the other. But they don't carry our card around all the time, so then I guess when you say well I am an in a democratic district so I am going to check the Democrat box. Well then how do you vet that? do you check with the state party to see if they really paid their dues.

**Sen. J. Lee:** I think one of the good things about both parties is that we do try to have a little bit larger tent or umbrella under which we all might stand. Sen. Anderson and I don't always see everything eye to eye but I am proud to be Republican along with Sen. Anderson. So the point is just putting an R or a D by anybody's name doesn't really tell me a lot. There are people who are in the same party as I who are often not happy with what I do. But there are more of them that are and that's why I keep getting re-elected or have so far. So, I don't make decisions about people because of them having an R or D by their name, because my Democrat friends are the same way. It is a broad base of support from one place to another. I think that is important. There shouldn't be a litmus test for either party without who we are. We have principles in both parties that we adhere too, but I believe there are more general. I just have a really hard time with the idea that it's going to be the only criteria by which one might be considering whether or not to support a candidate.

**Sen. Dotzenrod:** I don't think we are kind of mixing the apples and oranges here, that I think that if you look at why this was introduced and what it's about and trying to solve the problem of these budget and the taxing than to introduce this question about political affiliation into that study. I just myself think they are really kind, they are quite in some ways, they don't really align. So I would resist if we did have the amendment I would resist it.

**Sen. Anderson:** There is one other thing. I've spoken before about how I don't like studies that have a pre-conceived conclusion. We could modify this before we moved it, but and requiring ballots for counting. It is setting up a pre-conceived conclusion here about were going to study "requiring" not if it should be considered or whatever. So, I really think that the amendment is kind of one sided.

**Chairman Burckhard:** So this makes me think should we consider the amendment and kill it and then pass it, or pass the bill without the amendment or should we just pass the bill with not even considering the amendment?

**Sen. Anderson:** I will move the previous question for the motion before us.

**Chairman Burckhard:** And that means what? What on the motion?

**Sen. Anderson:** It means it means a 2<sup>nd</sup> and 2/3 majority to end debate and move ahead with the vote.

**Chairman Burckhard:** I am not sure of what I just heard.

**Sen. J. Lee:** It means that we need to vote on the motion to stop this without consideration of the amendment and if that fails, then we can get back and we can consider the amendment and vote on that separately and then vote on the bill and it may or may not be amended.

**Chairman Burckhard:** I think what we are going to do is vote on the motion that we had before us which is to remove the HCR 3016 as it sits before us.

Without any further discussion, **roll call vote: 3 yes, 3 no, 0 absent** ( Sen. Dotzenrod=y, Sen. J. Lee=y, Sen. Diane Larson=n, Sen. Kannianen= n, Sen. Anderson= y, Chairman Burckhard=n). It is a tie.

**Chairman Burckhard:** Now do I have another motion?

**Sen. Kannianen:** I don't have a motion. But, I just personally I didn't vote no because I am not in favor of the amendment either, I guess that I agree that it is a completely separate issue. But I didn't particularly, I guess I am just not really in favor of what the study is about either. So I guess I am just no all around.

**Sen. D. Larson:** I move the amendment

**2<sup>nd</sup> Sen. Dotzenrod for the purposes of getting out**

**Chairman Burckhard: it has been moved and 2<sup>nd</sup> that we pass the amendment**

**Roll call vote: 2 Yes, 4 No, 0 absent** (Sen. Dotzenrod=n, Sen. J. Lee=n, Sen. D. Larson=y, Sen. Kannianen=n, Sen. Anderson= n, Chairman Burckhard= y)

**Motion fails**

**Chairman Burckhard:** Now do we have another motion  
We've had a do pass that tied...

**Sen. Anderson:** I will move a do pass on HCR3016

**2<sup>nd</sup> Sen. Dotzenrod**

**Sen. Kannianen:** I would vote no, but on a study I guess I am not too wild about it, as it's not that big a deal just basic idea that I think there is certainly something to be said about those local elections getting completely drowned out when it comes to favor on the November ballot. Even as a legislative candidate for the first time, with half my district being Fort Berthold Reservation when they had their various elections for tribal business council, and so forth, they have their primary, however many candidates want to sign up, then they have their primary the 3<sup>rd</sup> week in September and then the remaining 2 when the dust settles on that run, head to head for November. The whole month of September I couldn't get any face time as campaigning there and so I think it would be the same thing for other cities or other officials where to get. Maybe you would get better turnout on your personal election but you would get drowned out trying to campaign is my opinion. I just don't see the purpose of doing it that way.

**Sen. Anderson:** Again, this is a study of the feasibility and the advantages or disadvantages of doing it both ways. So hopefully Sen. Kannianens' questions would come out in the study.

**Chairman Burckhard:** And then Legislative Management may not even want to do it.

**Sen. J. Lee:** I was just going to add, that I checked what the original bill or resolution was and it only changed from the original 3016, was the addition of the phrase "and other local elections" so in the beginning it was only about city elections and now it includes all of them. Sometimes it's kind of nice to know that.

**Chairman Burckhard: Any other discussion on a do pass motion without amendments**  
Sen. Dotzenrod=y, Sen. J. Lee=n, Sen. D. Larson=y, Sen. Kannianen=n, Sen. Anderson=y,  
Chairman Burckhard=y

**Roll call vote: 4 Yes, 2 No, 0 Absent, Motion Passes**

**Carrier: Sen. Burckhard**

17.3043.02001  
Title.

Prepared by the Legislative Council staff for  
Representative Louser  
March 21, 2017

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ENGROSSED HOUSE  
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3016

Page 1, line 3, after the second "years" insert "and requiring ballots for county, city, and other local elections to include political party designations for candidates for county, city, and other local office"

Page 1, line 19, after the semicolon insert "and

**WHEREAS**, information regarding political party affiliation for candidates for public office is useful to voters;"

Page 1, line 24, after "years" insert "and requiring ballots for county, city, and other local elections to include political party designations for candidates for county, city, and other local offices"

Renumber accordingly





Date: 3.23.17  
 Roll Call Vote #: 3

**2015 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE  
 ROLL CALL VOTES  
 BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 3016**

Senate Political Subdivisions Committee

Subcommittee

Amendment LC# or Description: \_\_\_\_\_

- Recommendation:  Adopt Amendment  
 Do Pass  Do Not Pass  Without Committee Recommendation  
 As Amended  Rerefer to Appropriations  
 Place on Consent Calendar  
 Other Actions:  Reconsider  \_\_\_\_\_

Motion Made By Sen. Anderson Seconded By Sen. Dotzenrod

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Chairman Randy Burckhard	✓		Senator Jim Dotzenrod	✓	
Vice-Chairman Howard Anderson	✓				
Senator Jordan Kannianen		✓			
Senator Diane Larson	✓				
Senator Judy Lee		✓			

Total (Yes) 4 No 2

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Chairman Burckhard

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HCR 3016, as engrossed: Political Subdivisions Committee (Sen. Burckhard, Chairman)** recommends **DO PASS** (4 YEAS, 2 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). Engrossed HCR 3016 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

**2017 TESTIMONY**

**HCR 3016**

HCR 3016

2-10-17

#1

February 10, 2017  
House Political Subdivisions  
Rep. Headland, Chair  
HCR 3016

For the record, I am Blake Crosby, Executive Director of the North Dakota League of Cities, representing the 357 incorporated cities across the state. Approximately 77% of the population of North Dakota lives in those cities.

I am here to testify in support of HCR 3016 and I thank Representative Headland for his sponsorship. The League of Cities initiated this resolution after the question was raised at our 2016 annual conference. I was moderating a panel discussion with Senator Cook, Terry Traynor from the North Dakota Association of Counties and Linda Leadbetter, Director of Tax Assessments from the ND Tax Commissioner's office on the consolidated tax notice/Truth in Taxation statement when the question was asked about election dates. In the discussion on the tax notice it was noted that the municipal calendar would have to be changed by moving up dates on preliminary budget statement preparation, budget hearings, submission for approval, etc. An audience member questioned why city elections had to be in June and suggested moving them to November to coincide with the general election. I noted many heads nodding in agreement and after some additional discussion, here we are.

As with any new idea there will be supporters and detractors, so I wanted to give the idea a chance to get publicly vetted and allow the optimum amount of public input. I will note that at one time city elections were held in April of each even numbered year and was changed to June because it was looked at as a cost savings.

I respectfully encourage a DO-PASS on HCR 3016.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION. I will try to answer any questions.

HCR 3016  
3.23.2017  
Written Testimony #1

March 23, 2017  
Senate Political Subdivisions  
Rep. Burckhard, Chair  
HCR 3016

For the record, I am Blake Crosby, Executive Director of the North Dakota League of Cities, representing the 357 incorporated cities across the state. Approximately 77% of the population of North Dakota lives in those cities.

I am here to testify in support of HCR 3016 and I thank Representative Headland for his sponsorship. The League of Cities initiated this resolution after the question was raised at our 2016 annual conference. I was moderating a panel discussion with Senator Cook, Terry Traynor from the North Dakota Association of Counties and Linda Leadbetter, Director of Tax Assessments from the ND Tax Commissioner's office on the consolidated tax notice/Truth in Taxation statement. In that discussion on the tax notice it was noted that the municipal calendar would have to be changed by moving up dates on preliminary budget statement preparation, budget hearings and submission for approval. Those date changes would impact newly elected officials input to the upcoming fiscal year budget. This led to a discussion on how problematic and time consuming it was to bring those newly elected officials up to speed on budgets in such short notice. As most audience members liked the idea of a consolidated preliminary tax notice, an audience member questioned why city elections had to be in June and suggested moving them to November to coincide with the general election. This would allow those experienced elected officials to have input into and approve the budget whereby enhancing budget stability. I noted many heads nodding in agreement and after some additional discussion, here we are.

As with any new idea there will be supporters and detractors, so I wanted to give the idea a chance to get publicly vetted and allow the optimum amount of public input. I will note that at one time city elections were held in April of each even numbered year and was changed to June because it was looked at as a cost savings.

I respectfully encourage a DO-PASS on HCR 3016.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION. I will try to answer any questions.

HCA 3016  
3.23.17  
#2

17.3043.02001  
Title.

Prepared by the Legislative Council staff for  
Representative Louser  
March 21, 2017

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ENGROSSED HOUSE  
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3016

Page 1, line 3, after the second "years" insert "and requiring ballots for county, city, and other local elections to include political party designations for candidates for county, city, and other local office"

Page 1, line 19, after the semicolon insert "and

**WHEREAS**, information regarding political party affiliation for candidates for public office is useful to voters;"

Page 1, line 24, after "years" insert "and requiring ballots for county, city, and other local elections to include political party designations for candidates for county, city, and other local offices"

Renumber accordingly