



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF LOS ANGELES

**MAR VISTA COMMUNITY COUNCIL
ELECTION DAY
Tuesday, March 15, 2006**

IEA FINAL REPORT

STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

355 stakeholders participated in the Mar Vista Community Council election on March 15, 2005. The election was held from 5:00pm to 9:00pm, at the Mar Vista Elementary School Cafeteria, 3330 Granville Blvd., Los Angeles, CA, 90066.

Jerry Kvasnicka, IEA, met with the Elections Committee prior to the election to clarify procedures, verify candidate applications, and Election Day logistics. MVCC volunteers delivered signs, booths, and ballot boxes. MVCC volunteers assisted with registration and ballot counting. The IEA arrived at the polling site at 4:00pm and designed the layout of the room, inquired of the eligibility of each volunteer and then secured a space for counting of the ballots. Volunteers were trained.

CANDIDATES' FORUM

A candidates' forum was held on March 15th (Election Day) at 6:00pm in the school auditorium. Each candidate was given equal time to speak to the audience of approximately 35 stakeholders. All candidates were present and participated in the forum. Due to the location of the polls, a specified area in the auditorium was set up for the candidates and stakeholders were able to approach and speak with them if they so desired.

VOTING RESULTS (Elected are in bold)

	votes	elected
<i>At Large (7)</i>		
William L. Scheduling	255	elected
Kenneth S. Alpern	280	elected
Renee Marcus	242	elected
Matthew M. Vodnoy	213	elected
Claudia Border	255	elected
Tom Ponton	274	elected
Rob Kadota	280	elected

Note #1: Ballots were counted by an optical scan machine. William Scheduling, a candidate, programmed the machine to count properly. The IEA observed and ran a test batch to affirm that the programming was accurate. Mr. Scheduling signed an affirmation attesting to his fairness in programming the machine. He did not handle any of the ballots. The IEA inserted the ballots with the assistance of a volunteer.

Note #2: The MVCC handed out a survey to voters after they had voted as they left the polling place. In addition to getting advice from stakeholders on several issues, the MVCC felt that the survey would assist in “getting out the vote”.

Election 2003	380 ballots	election for full board
Election 2004	145 ballots	election for partial board
Election 2005	355 ballots	election for partial board

RECOMMENDATION

Although the addition of the survey certainly encouraged more stakeholders to participate in this election, voters had little choice in selecting the candidates. There were seven candidates for seven board positions. Many voters commented on their lack of choice; some noted that they would turn in a blank ballot; some noted that they participated only for the survey. It is highly recommended that for future elections the Election Committee set a goal of two candidates for each open board position and increase efforts in securing candidates for these positions.

CHALLENGES

Challenges to the election are to be submitted to the Arbitrator, Human Relations Commission.

CONCLUSION

It is the Independent Election Administrator’s opinion and recommendation that the election results be accepted as presented, and that the election be certified.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry Kvasnicka
Independent Election Administrator
March 22, 2005