

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

I city council should not be able to replace the voters choices
100% by voters. If the City Council wants a say, they should vote like everyone else.
A non-starter for effective leadership. If appointed by the Council there is no accountability.
A whole representation is best.
Absolutely not. Give the people a choice.
Absolutely should be elected by the voters Winston-Salem.
Absolutely should be elected by voters
Absolutely the mayor should be elected by the voters.
all voters in the city should elect the mayor.
An issue voters should be directly involved in!
Anything less than elected by the citizens is just dumb.
Appointment of a Mayor by the sitting City Council would likely give way to cronyism, rather than representing the citizen of the City itself.
Appointment of the Mayor by the Council would be outrageous, and give the Council too much control over the Mayor. This makes the Mayor answerable to the Council rather than the voters. The voters need to elect the Mayor.
Are you kidding me with this question?! Let the people choose the mayor, not a select few.
Are you kidding? The Mayor should be elected BY THE PEOPLE, not by the City Council!. Good Grief! That was not ever brought out in your video, as I recall.
As the face of the city and council, the mayor needs to be representative of all the voters not a majority of the council members.
At-large voting for the mayor give the greatest voice to the most taxpayers in the city.
bad idea for the Council to select the Mayor
By no means should we leave the selection of a mayor to just 8 people. The mayor should be selected by all the citizens he serves.
Citizens rule and should have the voice of their leadership.
citizens should decide not politicians
Citizens should get to choose who leads them (I would do away with electoral college for president if I could).
Citizens should have the right to choose.
Citywide support for the figurehead position is proper for me.
Come on! Really?
Definitely a voter-elected position!
Definitely elected at large!!
Democracy. The city council does not always represent my needs.
Do not have strong opinion.
Elected at-large allows for a choice "by the people."
Elected by the people NOT the council.
Elections are for the people, don't take that away! Better that voters elect than appointing one.
Everyone should have a chance to vote for who they want, not just council.
Feel strongly about this. The Mayor of the City should be voted on by the citizens not just eight elected individuals
For the same reason I don't think the Mayor should have a vote except in a tie, the council members should not "elect" the Mayor. The people at large should elect the Mayor, less change of the council forming a power block, more accountability to the people.
God forbid the city council have any more power.

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

Having the mayor elected directly by the citizens is essential, in my opinion.
He represents all residents, regardless of party, and should be elected by all residents.
He works for the entire city not an elected panel of people who may or may not be working for the benefit of the people.
Hell no to a politically appointed mayor. She/he should be elected by the citizens of WS.
I definitely feel that the voters should have the power to decide who should be mayor, rather than making that decision be based on dynamics potentially unknown to voters.
I do not think it would be wise to rely solely on the judgment of city council members to appoint a mayor.
I feel strongly about this, 8 council members have to right to vote on mayor, other than as a voter like all of us
I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.
I feel very strongly about this one..... he should be an "outsider", not a person from "within" the ranks of city council.
I have never heard of a council selecting a mayor. It is (and should be) and elected position -- an elected position BY THE PEOPLE (not just the council). AGAIN -- hot button issue. Too many "things" have been shoved down our collective throats over the past 8-10 years and I fear that the council electing a mayor would turn into one of those.
I have never heard of city residents not being able to select the mayor
I hope this question is a joke. Obviously the mayor should be elected by the voters.
I like to see some separation from mayor and council. The citizens are the ones to make the decision on who is mayor.
I prefer leaving more control with the voters.
I see no reason to change to a different system. Appointment of mayor by council members opens up a door to political manipulation and other types of worse corruption.
I think it is important that the mayor should be elected directly by the citizens rather than risk that he be beholden to a majority of council representatives.
I think the current system of an elected Mayor with the Council selecting the Mayor Pro Tem from their ranks works well essentially giving us a Vice Mayor without the overhead of another elected office.
I think voters should have a direct input to selection of the mayor
I want to vote for the mayor rather than city council vote on my behalf.
I want voters to decide who the mayor is.
I would absolutely move out of this city if the mayor's appointment was left up to the members of the City Council. This would be doing a grave disservice to the citizens of this city!!!
If City Council selected our mayor, this would take power away from the citizens of City of Winston-Salem. Let us be involved in how we take care of our City!
If he/she represents the entire city, the entire city should be able to vote for him/her (not just a handful of elected officials). Plus, Council members would appoint their friends or the highest bidder.
If the City Council chooses that makes the mayor one step more removed from the people.
If the council appointed it could be partisan whereas a true election reveals the will of the people as much as possible.
If the mayor is elected by the council then his obligations would lean towards the ruling majority of the council. The mayor needs to be held accountable by the people.
If the mayor is required to break ties (assuming the mayor is non-voting) then the mayor must be elected. If they mayor is appointed from the membership of there would have to be an odd number of city council members to avoid ties.

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

If the mayor is selected within the council it might be more representative, as long as the council members were selected by wards.

In no way should the Mayor be selected from within the Council. This gives way to too many potential conflicts - the Mayor needs to win an election of all the people of the city.

It is good for the people to directly pick the mayor. Especially necessary if elections were to go non-partisan.

It is more democratic for the community to have a direct say in who their mayor is.

It should be the cities choice as a whole

It will make his job easier to have the community's support.

It would be anti democratic to not allow citizens to vote for the mayor

It would be nice if it could also be non-partisan.

It's a people's decision. Not a particular person's decision.

It's called democracy

It's the right and responsibility of the citizens to elect the mayor. See #5.

Just as the power of the mayor should not be over extended, neither should the city council hold that much power. If they choose the mayor, you end up with a biased, lop-sided council with a specific agenda. That would be like having the state legislature choose the governor.

Lessen confusion

Let the people decide

Let the voters decide.

Let the votes matter

Let us vote for mayor

Let voters choose our mayor

Majority rules.NOT LIKE THE FAIR VOTE

Make term limits

Makes the mayor more responsible to the voters

Mayors answer to the voters, not the council, so they should be elected by the voters

More likely mayor can be impartial leader.

Never, ever should the Mayor be appointed.

Nice try, council members.

No governing body should choose it's own leadership

No need to comment on this!

NO NO NO to the City Council electing our Mayor!!!! Everyone needs to have a say in who our Mayor is, not just a small number of people - that is a VERY BAD idea!

No preference

None

Not all Mayors are elected, I, however, believe that they all should be.

Not broken; don't fix.

Of course the Mayor should be elected at-large. It is a SERIOUS conflict of interest when the Council can vote on the job of anyone, because then that person is in their pockets if not voted for by citizens. I promise you if Mr Garrity was elected, for example, he would still be City Manager and the only difference is he would RIGHTLY be able to tell the City Council what to do and not the other way around. It is totally backward

Of course the MAYOR should be elected by ALL voters. I find the idea that the Mayor should be selected by City Council members very disturbing.

Of course the voters should elect their mayor. I'm surprised to see this question. It's disturbing that anyone thinks otherwise.

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

oh no, please keep mayor voted by at-large city residents!!!!

uhm, didn't realize this was a choice!

Our votes are supposed to count

People elect city council which reflects the whole city more proportionally than a popular vote

People should be allowed to cast their vote and opinion

Please

Please let the voters directly decide!! Having an appointed mayor is less transparent and could lead to cronyism.

Provide voting privileges to the general population as much as possible.

See #4

selected by the City Council from the entire citizenship of the city, but NOT from the membership of just the council

Should never be up for 8 people to decide an elected office.

Since the mayor is the chief administrative officer of the city, supervising a large bureaucracy, I think the voters should determine who does that.

Some of the members of our City Council are too corrupt. To empower them with more power would only lead to further corruption. City Council would be given the self serving power of their interest over the citizens of Winson-Salem.

That makes it less political and gives the community more control.

That question is hilarious. I give you credit for putting that thought in writing and in public. Let's totally let the wolves decide on what's for dinner. Great idea. Gonna be huge.

That's insane to ask. We should absolutely vote in a Mayor!

The all citizens of the city should have a say as to who they want as mayor.

The citizens elect their representatives and mayor for a reason, to avoid corruption! Does congress pick the president?

The citizens should elect all members.

The city council could have their own agenda, for whatever reason!

The city should have the say so on who we want as mayor. People have gotten to comfortable and voters need to be held more accountable.

The community should vote for who will represent us.

The Congress doesn't elect the president, the General Assembly doesn't elect the governor and the City Council shouldn't elect the mayor. That person would then be burdened by satisfying Council members, not the larger electorate. I frankly can't even believe this is being considered. It's an incredibly bad idea.

The Council does not need another issue to cause in-fighting

The council is bad enough, we do not need them to further destroy voter confidence

The current system has worked well. I'm not strongly opposed to the idea of selecting the mayor from council but changes often have unintended or unforeseen consequences -- so why risk it?

The entire City Community should vote for their Mayor

The entire community/city need to be able to vote for our Mayor.

The entire voting populace should have a say.

The first option is a step away from democracy. Citizens should have the ability to vote for the mayor directly. Putting this choice into the hands of 8-12 people would be a serious mistake. Selection by the council is a horrible idea.

The mayor definitely needs to remain someone elected by the people of Winston Salem. If that changes people will NOT be happy.

The Mayor is a very visible office in WS - all voters should decide who that will be.

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

The mayor is an important figurehead as well as the head of the city's administration.
The Mayor is an important political position as they are the person, more than any other, than represents the city to outside interests. This position is too important to leave to closed door politics and the people will never be happy with that idea.
The mayor is the face of the city, not the face of the city council. Of course voters should vote the mayor into office.
The mayor is the figurehead of the city and should be selected by the people he/she represents.
The mayor of our city should be elected by US!
The mayor represents all citizens, not the council
The mayor represents all of us.
The Mayor represents all the people and should be elected by all the people.
The mayor represents the city and therefore should be accountable to the citizens not the council.
The Mayor represents the people and therefore the people should vote for the major and not just a few people who have agendas.
The mayor should absolutely NOT be elected by the council and should be elected at large by the voters.
The Mayor should be an elected official by all the voters in Winston-Salem, NC.
The mayor should be chosen by the people.
the mayor should be chosen by the voters to represent the entire city and not just a majority of the council.
The Mayor should be elected at-large by the voters. This election process provide the residents of the City to become actively involved in the process and create a greater sense of community.
The Mayor should be elected by the citizens, as he is a representative of the City as a whole. It would not be fair for Council to appoint a Mayor, as they are only 8 of the 240,000 citizens that live in the City.
The mayor should be elected by the people not the council as the council could be heavily seated by one party thus creating agendas to support one group of voters and having a negative impact on the other.
The Mayor should be held accountable to voters and citizens who elect them.
The Mayor should be responsible to all voters and not to elected representatives. If elected by the Council it will be one more political game with backroom deals and horse trading.
The mayor should be selected by the people as a representative of the people.
The Mayor should be voted by the people.
The mayor should be voted on by the body he serves(citizens of the city)
The mayor should have term limits. No one has the cash to oppose Joines. What a shame for our city
The mayor should have to appeal directly to the citizens.
The Mayor should still be elected by the voters so their is no bias by the city Council Members.
The people have the right to decide who runs their city
The people need to vote.
The people should always decide who's in office. For this system only exist because of us.
The people should always retain the right to select the Mayor. I would prefer that the mayor be elected every 2 years for the same accountability reasons as the city council, but the mayoral election should certainly be no more than every 4 years.
The people should have say.
The people should have the right to choose the Mayor.
The power to elect the mayor should reside with the constituents, not the City Council.
The public should decide.
The voice of the people matters.

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

The voters have the voice. Appointment option smacks of socialism. The very suggestion of this option is offensive Representation should be elected by the people for the people
The voters should always elect any official
The voters should decide who leads and represents their city.
The voters should definitely select the mayor. It could prove devisive within the council if the mayor is selected by council members, perhaps even resulting in the mayor showing favoritism to those council members who support him/her..
The voters should have a direct say in who their mayor is.
The voters should have the right and responsibility to elect the Mayor.
There are many important roles for a stand-alone major above and beyond being simply the chair at council meetings.
There should be term limits for the position of Mayor.
These options were not covered in materials pertaining to this survey so I prefer mayoral elections to remain the same
This allows the mayor to stay out of the mostly partisan fray.
This is a difficult question because the people of Winston-Salem don't really vote and there has not been a viable opponent. The rich white men in Winston-Salem and Joines are in bed together.
This is a equal representation issue, especially if at-large members were to be added to the city council.
This is a horrible suggestion that the mayor be appointed! The mayor should reach out to every city citizen and be available to all the difference voices a mayor serves!
This is a key position, and voters should have voice in his/her election. Especially if the mayor has a vote.
This is a more democratic means of choosing a representative.
This is a no-brainer. Please, don't hand this decision off to a bunch of politicians!
This is absurd, the Mayor should be elected by voters. The Mayor should not be appointed by Council, that would essentially make the Mayor an employer of Council. Is this even legal under NC General Statutes?
This is more typical and democratic.
This provides more control to the voters.
This pseudo-presidential at-large vote really matters to local civic engagement. Putting out a council vote would make citizens suspicious in our current political atmosphere
This survey is getting more ridiculous.....
This way the mayor is accountable to all citizens in the city.
To avoid any internal favoritism, the Mayor should be elected at large according to his services in our entire city.
Voters are always the answer
Voters must elect the mayor. Appointment is not appropriate for this position.
voters should have more of a voice, not less, the other way is too political and leads to corruption
Voters should have the right to select who the Mayor is
Voters should have the. This also inhibits cronyism.
Voters should pick their leader. They are then held more accountable and are required to listen well to their constituents.
Voters should select the Mayor, not council members.
Voters should take part in electing their Mayor, not Council Members.
We need to choose
We the people of W-S should be choosing our mayor, not the Council.
Why would any citizen NOT want to vote for their mayor?!
Why would I want to give up my right to vote? The Mayor should be elected at-large.

Mayoral Selection Process Comments

Works well; back off, Reps. Conrad and Lambeth! The public should determine the mayor.

At-Large Representation Comments

1 at large is enough

Elections, says, for redress of grievances and for amending and strengthening the laws, elections shall be often held Since the city county represents the people, they should be held accountable by being elected every two years.

2. Any seat that is NOT elected at large should be term limited to 8 years.

3. At-Large seats could also be term limited to 8 years, but since all of the people in the city would be able to limit someone's term at election, term limits are not nearly as important.

4. At-Large seats should be specific seats. If there are 3 at-large seats, then a candidate for office would file to run for a specific seat. This allows the people to run a candidate against a specific elected official that they may not be happy with. At Large seats should never be filled the persons with the most votes until all seats are filled.

10 Council Members could be too many. 5 may be too few elected members for the population size.

4 at large and 4 wards

4 member elected from wards, 3 members elected at-large, 1 mayor elected at-large. I think a total of 7 members in the City Council. 4 elected from wards- like, North, South, East & West, 3 members elected at large. I get to vote for four members of the City Council.

4 wards, 4 at large

6-2 is my second choice. We do not need more politicians on city council. Do not do 8-2.

8 members is sufficient

individually, electronically, and by mail. At Large Members will have difficulty communicating with such large numbers and will not be effective since they would have 2 people sending messages. WE DO NOT NEED AT

8/2/1 would make the Council too large

A combination system would be most beneficial to the city since it accounts for everyone in the city rather than having individuals serve the needs of their district alone.

A more measured change to current system which introduces some at-large flavor

Actually I do not recommend a change to the current make-up of the council. Equal representation from each ward is better than additional at-large representation which would provide an opportunity for double representation from an at-large candidate based on where they live. At-large candidates also need a larger purse from which to pull from to campaign to a broader audience limiting the candidates based on economic background.

Adding at-large members to the city council would only increase the clout of outside influences, such as developers, and would not be to the benefit of residents.

Adding at-large seats should allow for a broader vision for the citizens of each area of the city.

Additional Council Members are not needed.

Agree that At Large seats - it provides diversity, they represent all of city and focus on "city" as whole (which we need more of). Each voter still has a specific council member, but to me they can now reach out/comment need to at-large as well. Greater opportunity for others to run (which would nice for "newbies"). Voters vote for every at-large seat as well (which good for ALL voters). It is time WS updates/modernizes/refreshes its process which may encourage/increase voter participation. As far number of members; WS does not have the population to warrant more than what we have now. Maybe if actually annex or grow ALOT then 'maybe' add then. But since Durham passed us by in growth and we do not grow at rate of the other larger cities, I think keeping no more than 8 is good.

Aldermanic privilege is a bigger problem than the actual structure of the city council. Communities of interest extend beyond ward lines. The most-needed change is one of elected officials' perspective, not of the actual structure. We can do this by voting for better candidates.

At-Large Representation Comments

All council members should be elected at large to remove the cancer from the wards where there is always low voter turn out and the same ward members keep being voted in by cronyism and never working to improve the ward. it makes the city look bad

All members elected at large

All members of the City Council are already representing the entire city "at large." With few exceptions, everything is too interconnected for council members to work in or govern from a silo. Additionally, changing from the current ward system to an at-large system would effectively octuple the cost of running a campaign, which would shut many people of color and fewer resources out of the mix.

Allows for different representation. And honestly, I don't want to run against my member he does good work, so moving is not an option.

Allows for more more distinct areas of the city to be represented, as is the case currently, as well as providing more representation from the city as a whole.

Allows specific constituencies to have their own representation.

Any reduction in the number of wards dilutes the vote of those in the wards as each ward would contain more voters. You need to ask why two republican legislators pushed this legislation. It was not a voter lead initiative.

As long as we have competent City Council Representative 8 wards should suffice.

As our city continues to grow, fewer wards will mean larger wards, which will reduce equity of voice for diverse citizens.

Assuming wards would be redefined into 5, then 3 with broad, oversight view. This would not create additional cost to taxpayers.

At large dilutes the wards say in government, the wards need someone fighting for them.

At large enables people who dont live in the ward to vote for someone. This should not be.

At large members are not accountable to a local area of the city, making them less likely to reflect the needs and demands of local wards.

At large members influence should be as dilute as possible.

At large members represent the entire city, not just their wards.

At large members would be able to represent the city better than members elected from wards.

At large members would be for the City as a whole not just one district.

At large members would have the whole city's best interest at heart, rather than just their ward.

At large members would look at the city's needs as a whole rather than just one certain area only.

At large members, in my opinion, would have no clue what other wards needs are

At large representation assures votes presumably from members who have the whole city's needs at heart instead of only one ward's

At large representation is good to help avoid the tit-for-tat on spending that seems to be happening among wards. And starting with 2 eases into the new format.

At large representation limits accountability for those representatives. Also the way you have structured question 1 implies that my answer doesn't matter and you intend to restructure regardless of the results.

At large representation may tend to reduce the advocacy voice of any particular ward.

At large representation, with some districts, is much more democratic and gives citizens a greater voice, with more options. As it is now, ward representatives need only satisfy a small group in their ward, and if you are not part of that group you are out of luck.

At large will diminish minority representation.

At large will hopefully look at the big picture not just the ward

At large would not allow for as much representation

at most, one at-large rep

At-Large Representation Comments

At most, one or two at-large, but no more than 20% of the district members

At-large council members will likely be from the western side of the city and may overlook or have bias towards the east.

At-large districts would be very hard for low-income individuals to run for. I fear at-large seats would end up going to wealthier folks from wealthy parts of town, giving unequal representation to those in town who already have more power than the working class and poor.

At-large elections at local level gives additional power to local elites at the expense of people. It is beneficial to have vibrant democracy at the local level with a ward based election system.

At-large has been banned in all federal elections and discarded by many states. It is just another way to discriminate against the disenfranchised and under-served members of the population.

At-large members can diminish minority influence and promote party-serving candidates rather than public-serving members.

At-large representatives dilute representation, something the Republican legislature in Raleigh yearns after because there are more members elected at large.

Because Winston-Salem's history of the racial segregation and inequity, it is important that we do not disenfranchise residents living in wards which are predominantly black or brown. So we should keep elected officials with a geographic focus, and minimize watering down their vote with other at-large members.

Better option would be two additional wards

Change terminology from Wards to Districts

City Council members are elected for life if they so choose. I think every city council member should be at large and there should be term limits on the city council as well as the mayor.

City Council need to be in a ward so they have less constituents.

City has grown and requires additional representation to more fairly represent the residents

Council Member is a better designation than Alderman but if the area of governance is in actuality a District then they should be District Chiefs. If it remains Wards then that would make them Wardens [bad conotation] The at-large positions should be full-time positions with pay higher than the "Wardens" [in other words "pros" with, at least, the \$ status of the Mayor

Council members naturally want to look after their wards, but that leads to too much "I want my share" whether it is good for the city as a whole or not. Very much needed are at large members of the council.

Council members serve on a variety of boards that impact everyone, not just one particular area. I reside in the south ward but that doesn't mean I never go to a different ward.

Current government structure seems to fairly represent our diverse population

Current wards should not be reduced.

Decreasing the wards from 8 to 6 allows strong ward representation and overlap of current wards than 5 wards. At large members would have a more city wide view of issues than those representing a single ward.

Decreasing wards would dilute voter impact

Different parts of the city should be represented equally, if there were too many at-large members that were voted in from one area of the city, then parts of the city could be ignored.

Districts should have a strong chance of being represented on the city council and ward-elected members will be more responsive to their constituency. Adding some At Large Council members can bring a broader perspective than that facing one district and help to coalesce members toward resolve issues that affect the whole community with the problems of the whole community;

Divide into six wards and allow two at large members. Current council has spent millions of tax dollars that have provided no benefit to the city overall. Also missed out on federal low housing income dollars because Council was asleep as a prudent administrator.

Do not change what is currently working fine.

At-Large Representation Comments

Do not need at large council members
Do not try to water down the neighborhood representation that we have. Leave things as they are
Do we need more reps?
Don't change what isn't broken
Don't delete my direct representation
Each Ward deserves representation.
Each ward needs its own representation. Reducing the number of wards would make that harder.
Each ward should have a representative from that ward. I do not believe that should change.
Eight is enough
Electing council members at large would greatly benefit the citizens and employees of Winston Salem. It would ensure that each ward elected at large would have a more diverse voter base
Electing your Ward representative where you live keeps it more personal.
Even number makes it easier to access a finish if there was a tie in a vote without one party getting more people than the other.
Expanding the Council with 2 additional seats preserves the ward representation that ensures diverse perspectives while allowing for representation that is city wide.
feel that would offer much better "city as a whole" mindset. some council members already treat their wards as personal "serfdoms" and why is it split 5 wards/3 at large? why not 4 & 4 plus the mayor (ne, se, sw, nw)?
For a city the size of Winston-Salem, 10 members is not too many. More points of view would be beneficial.
Four members elected from wards, Mayor and four elected at large. Seems like this should be an option.
Gerrymandering
Gives additional opportunity to individuals to run for election who might otherwise be stymied by current members with localized power.
Gives each citizen a greater voice in elections of City Council. Makes more Council members accountable to all the citizens.
Having 2 at large members could provide more equity and diversity. And would bring more residents to get more involved in my opinion.
Having a City Council member representing each ward helps ensure that residents in each ward have fair and equal representation.
Having additional members at-large should provide a more balanced and less divisive approach to decisions that impact citizens in wards and citywide.
Having at large representation helps keep an eye on the overall needs of the city and having a near-balance (i.e., 5-3) of members elected from wards and members elected at large makes sense. We should also ensure that the council does not become so large that decisions cannot be made or are more difficult to make. Question: which wards/districts will send members, though?
Having at-large members to look at the the city as a whole and not just their backyard would be helpful and hopefully give a few non-biased members to speak up certain items that get overlooked
Having too many at-large members would make it more likely special interest groups would be infiltrating and affecting decisions for the entire city.
Having wards where only residents of the ward can vote for their city council member allows for greater representation for all areas of the city and all citizens
helps think of the city as a whole
Hopefully more big picture opinions represented
I am against adding elected at-large members. It is a Republican ploy.

At-Large Representation Comments

I am always a fan of more districts and more elected officials. You could choose to increase the number of wards or the number of at-large members and I would be more than happy.

I am concerned about current proposals that would combine minority wards, effectively reducing minority representation. I would much prefer to keep ward representation for the current 8 wards, adding additional members for the at-large seats.

I am concerned about how wards would be condensed and the impact on communities of color.

I am concerned that "at large" councilmembers will drown out the voices representing the wards. It is difficult enough to get funding and attention in the south and east wards without adding increased competition.

I am not for larger government

I am not in favor of the wards system, and would prefer to eliminate it entirely. It promotes division in a time where we should all be working to advance our city as a whole and not have a system that fosters fighting tit-for-tat over territories.

I am strongly against at-large representation. The wards now fairly represent city residents, and council members are responsive to them. Adding at-large representation would only benefit the monied interests who seek to obtain even more lopsided control over city decision-making. Well-funded candidates with the backing of business interests would have an unfair advantage in running against local community leaders. At-large council members would be beholden to their donors as opposed to the citizens that they supposedly would represent.

I am strongly opposed to at large especially if it reduces representation in wards that have African American majorities. I am also against at large because I do understand the advantage of "At Large". City Council members should represent a specific ward. I do not understand how changing our present system is to our advantage.

I answer this only because of the "if". At-large members are a bad idea. It's bad enough already that many ward reps see themselves as representing the city at large. I want my city council member to represent ME and MY WARD. If each member does that, the result will be a city council that represents the entire city collectively.

I appreciate the at large members having to consider the city as a whole.

I believe acquisition of additional members at-large would support the city of Winston-Salem to meet the needs of the communities who need the support the most

I believe all current wards need to be represented. To get a more global perspective, the 'at large' member seems the best option, but not too many, as Durham learned.

I believe that having some city council members elected at-large could increase the number of candidates running for office. If members are only elected from wards, the only way for someone living in a given ward to be elected to the city council is to defeat a specific candidate. This may not be the best thing, as a potential candidate may like and agree with that candidate's position. It may also be unadvisable to run against a given candidate who is popular, both because that could lead to backlash from that candidate and also because some candidates are so popular that it would be very difficult and expensive to defeat them in an election.

I believe that it's better to have more from the wards versus the at-large because each ward has different needs than others would have. By having less at-large I feel that individual needs of the wards is better addressed.

I believe that the Council member should not be voted at large because the Councilman or Councilwoman services is usually relevant to the ward he or she works in, while the Mayor services is citywide which he should be elected by at large votes.

I believe the current districts (wards) should be protected if additional seats to city council are created. I believe that members across the board have two constituencies there district and the city as a whole.

At-Large Representation Comments

I believe the Ward System provides EVERY citizen of Winston Salem with appropriate representation and we do not need at-large members. Further, I believe that the size of the City Council should remain the same; no wards should be combined to create a larger base of voters for any area of the city. It is up to the member representing each ward to vote appropriately on issues affecting not only her/his ward, but also the entire city. I tried to "undo" the mark above on the 8/2/1 question and was unable to do so. Changing our current system gives one party or another the opportunity to "take over" the council and gives no consideration to the individuals being represented in a given area of the city. .

I believe we should keep our 8 wards as is and add 2 members at-large.

I believe Winston-Salem has become very one sided. Certain areas receive the attention most of the time and issues in other parts of the city are ignored. I believe in a time of political correctness, there is a hesitancy to prioritize based on true need/funds vs wishing to not offend. I believe "At Large" representation would provide a broad overview to some representatives. Today its more about "what I can secure for my ward"and not what is fair for the city.

I believe you old be getting more diverse opinions.

I chose the 8+2+1 option. I was not clear if the other options with less members from the wards meant the wards would be redrawn or some wards would not have representation. I believe each ward should have representation.

I chose your third option, as the lesser of 3 evils. You should offer none of the above as an option. Wards are designed so that it is impossible for a conservative to win. How about all member's at large?

I do not believe we should have at large positions on city council.

I do not favor diluting representation of any 'community' of voters.

I do not feel that someone who does NOT reside in my area, can honestly say they know what we deal with on a daily basis

I do not support any of the three options above. The form will not allow me to skip it which is actually my preference. I chose an option simply so I could complete the form.

I do not think that at large members are necessary and especially not at the expense of the members elected from the wards. At large members could potentially be beholden to whichever interest group that is responsible for electing them at the expense of citizens of a particular area/ward. (i.e. say the property management and real estate lobby got together and to help elect an at-large candidate who would then be there to advance that lobby's interest and not the interest of the city residents)

I do not think the possibility of representatives elected that represent special interests is a good idea. I think it's a lousy idea. I indicated that I did not think at large representation was a good idea, but still was required to indicate what scenario I would choose to elect at-large members. I would not choose at large members. Seems the decision has been made and the survey is just fluff.

I do not want the voices of marginalized parts of Winston to be diluted by at-large members.

often, individuals elected "at-large" are not minority members of our community. Thus, IF at-large members HAD to be added to the Council, I prefer the first option, which would presumably keep our current ward lines

I don't know that we need more elected officials but maybe a couple of under secretaries to assist the council instead.

I don't appreciate being forced to answer the 2nd part of this question. I DO NOT WANT additional at-large representation beyond the mayor.

I don't see a need to change anything about the Governance Structure of Winston-Salem. Keep it the same.

At-Large Representation Comments

I don't think more ppl should be added yet you force me to pick how they should be added. This is exactly what's wrong with the city government. You've already decided your action and you want a fake survey to back it up. Not that I voted or care about DCF but sounds awfully familiar. Do you know what a strawman is??? I'm answering question only because you forced me too in order for this to process.

I dont think there should be extra at-large members. That will just allow people from one area to have more of a voice than they should.

I don't want more at large members.

I fear council members are focused only on what is best for their wards, not What is best for the entire city.

I fear that at-large members would have partisan agenda . . .

I feel like the wards protect the minority groups better in our community.

I feel that the city council members in Winston-Salem generally does a good job of balancing the needs of the city as a whole as well as their specific district. If this balance were to change, I think at-large member would be justified.

I feel the at-large elected will have a wider viewpoint rather than dedicating their voting decisions to their area.

I feel there is little difference in issues from one ward or another.furthermore i believe there should be forsyth county police by combiming the current 2 departments

I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as

I have found that the fewer chefs in the kitchen the better. Additionally, I feel that ward representation is more accurately representative of WS, while the at large representatives will essentially be a double representation of whatever populace does turn out to vote, which you previously indicated is quite small and not representative of the town.

I have no idea why the question is even asked - we're ok just the way we are

I like at-large representation b/c it helps us all have a more holistic view of the city.

I like having members attached to voters more strongly.

I like how Greensboro votes for elected city officials.

I LIKE that the member elected is intended to represent his/her ward alone. Having at large seats just makes the COST of running for a ward seat higher. It was also proposed by what appears to me (newcomer) to be a

I like the accountability of council members representing their district. I do not think it would be a good idea to make the city council larger than it is today.

I like the current composition of Winston Salem city council -- if it isn't broke, don't "fix" it!!

I like the current system. I do not see a good reason to change it.

I like the current word representation, but agree that more at large members are needed.

I like the idea of at-large members but think the commissioners then need to have more elected from wards so at-large members don't have too great a majority.

I like the idea of being able to vote on more seats as I think there are several diva council members who might get taken down a notch or two if there were at large members because more voters would have a say-so

I like the idea of more of the council having an interest in what is good for the city as a whole.

I like the idea of some ward-specific representatives but a more holistic approach.

I like the idea of the mayor breaking the tie if needed

i like the rationale behind this -

I lived a long time in a city (Mobile, AL) that had only at-large representation on the council when I moved there and as a result no African American members. A switch to districts made the system much fairer and gave better representation.

At-Large Representation Comments

I lived many years in a major US city that for most of those years had at-large representation. I did not observe any actions consistent with "view points that considered the greater good" and did observe minority interests ignored. If we must go this route, keep the at-large numbers as low as possible.

I object to any change that reduces black representation, and the video doesn't make it clear that this would be the result of some of these options.

I prefer a ward-based group. Mayor at large is fine.

I prefer leaving things as they are now.

I prefer more ward representation than at-large representation.

I prefer the five ward system with three at large members. This system would help balance the needs of the ward with the needs of the City.

I prefer to keep a smaller council even if that means fewer wards in the case where at-large members are added.

I really prefer NO at-large, at all.

I see no need to change.

I selected 5 and 3, but prefer 4 and 4, which wasn't provided as an option.

I strongly believe that local representation is of great importance, as is ease of communication with those local representatives.

I strongly believe that the governance of the City would benefit from having some of its members at-large. Ward representation is important to assure some geographic balance, but an all-ward City Council tends to be fixated too much on having "one of each" in every ward, regardless of whether "one of each" is really needed in 8 wards. Having some at-large members will help keep a balance between looking at matters from a city-wide perspective, as well as addressing the needs of different areas of the City. I prefer the 5 and 3 split, as each voter will be able to vote for their ward representative, plus 3 at-large members, plus the Mayor---in other words, a majority of the Council. The 6-2 split would be preferable to an all-ward Council, but would not give each voter as much say in elections as the 8-3 split.

I strongly oppose moving more positions or a balance of positions to at-large. Research has shown that at-large seats reduce minorities and working class peoples from taking office and thus having a strong decision in governing. This is because local representation or ward representation encourages people who might be well known in a smaller community to participate. As elections move to at-large seats, candidates with more money, more connections, more backing, often wealthier and from white collar backgrounds are favored in these roles. Thus it serves our community best if we keep our geographical representation without extending at-large representation.

I think because of the partisan nature of voting for council members, candidates for at-large positions would receive a disproportion of funds leaning toward wealthier Republicans. This is the reason for this local governance study, to appease the Republican members of the general assemble who wanted more at-large members. They should have no business in our city governance.

The representation of the less wealthy districts would become more difficult to obtain.

I think eight council members is enough. Ten would be too many.

I think having 8 members representing districts ensures a greater representation of the citizens

I think it would be better to not have at large representation other than the mayor. It would be better to rework the wards or add more. Right now, people in the less-populated outskirts of the city don't have a voice because we're all lumped in with more populated areas.

I think it would be good to have several voices that have the interest of the city as a whole as their concern.

I think that more at large elections does nothing to enhance unity in small community elections.

I think the 8 members from the wards more represents the city.

At-Large Representation Comments

I think the Council needs some members who represent the entire city, with a perspective that encompasses the citizens of every ward. Ward-only representation fosters a narrow view of what the City should do and tends to promote members-for-life who have a "power base" in their neighborhood, which is not healthy for the body

I think the current system serve to the well.

I think the current ward structure of 8 wards gives adequate representation to all areas of the city . They should remain . However , having at large members should balance out any territorial issues that may conflict with the whole city's progress.

I think the options presented are highly restrictive. Changing Ward lines would be a disaster, so keeping all 8 Council Members by district would allow that to maintain, but adding at-large members would bring a much needed city-level representation. I would prefer more at-large than maintained ward reps. 5 ward, 3 at large takes the burden off of a single definition of representation. Cut it up across the 4 cardinal directions, plus a downtown ward to remove as much bias as can be.

I think the people who live in the districts should have more say as to who best represents their interests. I believe that at large members would have a greater chance of invalidating the votes of persons in specific wards.

I think this will be a way to eliminate favoritism in the wards. By having someone voted in by at large will possibly give a better balance of the wards. Right now, I am not seeing a even balance of things being done in the individual wards.

I think this would give us a better view of what is good for everyone in Winston Salem

I think we shouldnt do any at large, this would give more voice to areas with more population. Every district and area should be represented.

I think with City Council members representing their wards and less at-large members, each ward would have a better voice at the table and less chance of being overpowered by members who get together behind the scenes to manipulate outcomes.

I was re-districted a couple of years ago. For decades, we were in the Northwest Ward, Suddenly, we're in the West Ward. There were no Democratic candidates in my new ward. I want that to change.

I would ask for more than 2 at large Council Members.

I would choose 6 members elected from wards and 2 elected at large if there were only 6 wards. I think each ward needs to have their own elected council member.

I would like community and socio-economic balance on the council

i would like to encourage diversity but maintain council members representing "the city" at large

I would like to see 1 or more wards and 1 or more at-large spots on the council.

I would like to see more overall representation of the city instead of separate districts.

I would love to have a council that allows folks from all over the city to have a voice in developments. Sometimes, there is too much self-interest for residents of a specific ward and that hinders progress for everyone.

I would not want to reduce the representation of individual wards in any way.

I would prefer an equal number of members elected from wards and at-large members. This would insure that the wards and the city as a whole are equally represented.

I would prefer to see additional wards, which would increase the number of Council members, perhaps to 10.

I'm worried about the NIMBYism that's occurring in separate neighborhoods and I think more at large members will help that

I'd still prefer to see a person elected for each ward, but eleven committee members is just too many people. Perhaps reshuffling the wards so there are only 5 or 6 and the rest of the members are elected at-large.

If 6 or 5 from wards, then some wards are being left out - that's not fair; even with the at-large because you don't know where the at-large member will come from.

At-Large Representation Comments

If at-large members are added to the board composition, some thought should be given as to which issues individual members are addressing. A citizen has the potential to call the council member of their area and each at-large member to address the same concern. Duplicative staff time could evolve with several individuals working on the same issue. Staff would need to determine a method that this would not occur.

If it ain't broke don't fix it!

If more at-large representation is selected, it should be limited to seats out of a total of 10. Ward representation at the current level is most desirable.

If the cost of adding at large representation is diluting the representation of marginalized populations within the city, then the cost is too high and I would rather us stay with what we have. The only way I would support it is if the wards stayed the same and the seats were added.

If the role of elected council members is to represent their district's constituents, I am not sure who the at-large council members represent. What is their purpose? Can this become a conflict to the role of district council members? It's my understanding that the 8 council members already have a full time job. Reducing the number of districts will create larger districts and more work load on council members.

If there are less than 8 members elected then who decides which wards are "not Represented"? The at-large member could be elected from the same ward as a ward that has representation and that would not be fair to the ward without representation. Even though the at-large member is suppose to represent the whole city they are going to "look after" their ward first.

If there could be a way for at-large members to be from different districts would be preferable. So there not over power from 1 district.

If there were more at large members I feel it would better represent the City as a whole. There is too many turf wars with the current system

If we could get away from the ward system entirely, it should help end the provincial governance we see now in many cases.

I'm concerned that reducing the number of members elected from wards will diminish the representation of all parts of the city.

ward. Adding at-large members would make the election process more onerous for the average voter as well as potentially elongating the pre-election time frame because at-large members would have to campaign/meet-and-greet in all wards. I also believe smaller groups focus and work together better than larger

It gives some people thinking about the city as a whole

It is important that the people who live in the northeastern, eastern, and southeastern districts maintain adequate and equal representation. It very clear that in a system with more at-large representation, these districts could easily become under represented.

It is important to have districts that are small enough for a representative to serve them effectively. Thus, the eight districts should be maintained. It is also important that the voice for each district have equal impact, especially to allow minority communities to have equal access to governmental power. If at-large-representatives are added, it can weight the decisions of the council in a direction that may not serve all wards fairly. While representatives are expected to voice the concerns of their districts, I would hope and expect that all would look to the overall welfare of the city as a whole. I would not count on just the at-large-reps to provide the only overall welfare. I am strongly opposed to adding at-large members.

It is time to increase our Council members who look at issues from the global what is best for the City vs. a view from one's ward only.

It isn't necessary to have a lot of at large elections

At-Large Representation Comments

It seems like having each ward represented by a knowledgeable resident of said ward is important to local residents' welfare. But it is also wise to have representation for how any changes for a ward affect the city as a whole.

It won't matter how many people you have on board because I don't feel you will listen and you'll do as you please as you had always done

Keep it way out is

districts, especially given this city's very high levels of segregation

Keep ward representation with 8 wards, while providing some at-large perspective

Larger number hopefully means more representation and more voices heard.

Leave it structured the way it is! Each city council member knows his/her district and is responsive to it. It works. Please leave it alone.

leave it the way it is

Leave the city council alone. I voted for the first choice, but I don't like any of the above scenarios because there is no reason to make such a change. Omit the at-large idea now. Thus far there has been no logical, reasonable explanation for making such a drastic change.

Leave the council members as is.

Leave the ward lines as they are.

Leave the ward system as is if At-Large are added

Leave things alone

Less gerrymandered also

Local people should be able to elect local representation, without outside interference

Lower income areas have less influence with at large elections--they are not representative of specific neighborhood needs

Make term limits

Members should be elected by the people they will represent

More "at-large" seats is a yet another way to take away representation from marginalized communities in the city. Stop trying to move backwards and pouring money into the hands of those who already have plenty.

More at large members will result in less representation of minorities.

More at-large representation could lead to a heavy representation in one section and light or non-existent representation in another.

More at-large representation would limit minority representation from specific wards

More diversity and representation city-wide vs. geography. Odd numbers help with voting outcomes.

More people means more salaries and more taxes! Smaller govt!

More productive, more informed members

More representation focused on the city at large is valuable but definitely important to also keep a good number of unique districts represented

More representation is always good

More representatives is better than fewer- but what matters more is HOW voting is done, not just how many districts there are. We need some form of single-transferable vote, ranked choice voting, or multi-member proportional districting.

My response would change depending on how the wards are re-drawn. If 6 new wards would result in less representation for minority groups or areas with lower median household income, then I would choose to stay with current 8 ward system and add 2 at-large

My teachers making me take this

need more elected officials thinking about the larger community without being tied to their specific wards

At-Large Representation Comments

Need more representation looking at what is best for the city as a whole
No at large elections
No at large members
No at large members
No at large members.
No at large members. The options I wanted were not provided and my submission was rejected unless I completed the questions I did not like the answers for
No at large seat should be allowed. This is a practice that promotes inequality and oppression in cities.
No at-large members
No at-large members at all. Government (including representation) should be as close to the electorate as possible.
No change in current representation structure.
No change needed
no changes are needed
No changes are needed
No comment
No I want district/ward representation from all W-S districts/wards I like having a few at-large positions and a mayor elected at large.
No more at large officials. I want NONE of the options offered in above item
No preference, It would only dilute fair representation.
None
None do not change
Only those that live in your area understand the concerns of your area.
Our City Council works well as it is. We do not need to change the structure.
Our ward system was set up many years ago and provided that our city was not subject to the Voting Rights Act, because everyone was equally represented by our elected council members!
People need a specific representative for their ward. They need to know who to count on to represent them. Each ward has unique challenges. Introducing at-large members will not only make it harder to reach a consensus, but how can two at-large reps possibly responsibly represent Winston-Salem as a whole. Throws in a curve ball, confusion, and a serious question of accountability.
Population/commonality based districts rather than wards. Odd number of district councilmembers, 2 at-large councilmembers; non-voting Mayor.
Prefer the close balance of 5-3-1. Also support term limits.
Prefer to keep it as it is. If I HAD to pick, we would add only two additional as at large.
Present system works well and provides a system that appears to allow fair representation for racial minorities. Fair representation for minorities is very important.
Provide a balance to keep the bigger perspective in mind....rather than just what is best for my ward
Question#1- I do NOT prefer any at-large members. I feel more comfortable with the current district system; if at-large came into play some districts or areas might be left out and have less representation
Reducing the # of wards must be done fairly and within the historical contexts that have shaped the inequality of the city. Is it possible to have at-large members divided by Hwy 52?
Reducing the number of wards could decrease the representation of less affluent neighborhoods. Keeping 8 wards would eliminate the argument over some people losing representation.
Reduction of representation is not the answer
Representatives should reside in the ward they are elected to represent

At-Large Representation Comments

See my response at #7.

see no issue with representation as it is

Seems like 8+2 would be too many representatives who may not come to an agreement. I do think the parts of town do need represented accordingly, though. Don't feel strongly about 5 vs. 6.

Seems like a good balance of ward and at-large.

Self explanatory

Should be a combination. No strong feeling about total number on the council.

Some wards may not have a representative on the board

Stay local. I think it could be dangerous to elect officials who don't know or maybe represent what those people need. I worry minorities would be marginalized.

Still 8 council and 3 more opportunities for a fair seat and someone who deserved to be in that seat, not just because they've been there 20 or 40 years

The 2 members elected at large sould NOT. they all should be elected by wards except the mayer.

the 8 members would allow them to just focus on those ward while those 2 members allows them to focus on the city at large. then the mayor brings all the ideas together.

The at-large seats dilutes representation of residents. Those representatives are not accountable to any specific constituents. The issue that at large seats raise is the continuation of single race representation. It has been historically difficult for African Americans to secure at large seats in this city. That is why there are specific districts for county commissionners and school board.

The City absolutely needs more at-large representation, with those at-large members looking out for the good of the overall city, not just a particular ward. It's crazy that someone might be supporting a project that runs up to one street, but since his/her jurisdiction ends at the next street over, he/she may have a different view of a project or development.

The city council members should have term limits.

The city should retain its current representation, which encourages council members to address concerns from their constituents and properly balances all interests throughout the city.

The city's current ward structure is well established to serve distinct neighborhoods and cultures. Reducing the number of wards would disturb these alignments and be detrimental to citizens in these neighborhoods. Adding two at-large members would give talent that is otherwise locked out of council leadership opportunities (because of other long serving current members) the chance to emerge and serve as well.

The combination of wards and at-large gives all areas of the city to be represented.

The complete imbalance of the present districts does not come close to representing the entire community in my opinion.

The council members are currently more concerned about their ward than they are for the betterment of the city as a whole

The Council needs more at-large members to view policy decisions with a more holistic view of Winston-Salem. While I agree that wards provide more representative governance, especially to underrepresented populations, the current ward system allows too much political turfism that stifles the growth of all areas.

The council needs more people that look at what is good overall for the city, not just with special interests.

The current structure does not have a voting council member that is focused on/accountable to the whole city. Each council member is highly focused on their maintaining their fiefdom and not the entire city.

The current structure gives City Council Members a more thorough knowledge of their district and needs of their residents. Even suggesting these changes reeks of a political ploy! Plus, there is no sensible reason to have "at-large" members on the City Council. Keep things as they are! Shame on Donny Lambeth & his cronies for meddling in City business without even contacting City Officials!

At-Large Representation Comments

The current system encourages decision-making that may not be best for the city as a whole; e.g., in a bond issue for example the needs are not evenly distributed by ward and some needed projects are not done only because the total for the bond issue is divided 8 ways.
The current system provides a voice for everyone. At large council members might start to create an imbalance for representation
The current system works well and is fair. I do not want council members who are not from my ward representing me.
The election from wards ensures that people in low income areas or racially separated areas still have representation.
The less change, the better
The mayor should be required to vote on all matters of city government
The more at-large members, the better Winston-Salem can work to become one cohesive City, versus eight mini cities.
The more at-large representation, the fewer opportunities for a single representative to hijack a vote. Winston-Salem is a city of many people.
The more elected by 'THE PEOPLE' the better !
The option of 8 members elected by wards and 1 mayor elected at large should be an option in the choices above or a person should be able to skip this question if they would like to keep the election process the same as it is now
The option we have works well I see no reason to change just for the sake of change.
the people elected to the council should live in the ward they represent. its the only way to get a pure representation of the citizens who live in that ward.
The people should vote for their ward in their community. Especially if someone from that community is running for that ward. Not having someone from the North rural area vote for a ward to represent the east MLK area. Not cool nor fair.
The present system places individual responsibility for each ward. Not a group .
The ward method is more representative of the population if the wards are drawn fairly. Otherwise, those who can afford to run city-wide could skew the voting to the more affluent areas of the city.
The ward system does not work for all citizens or the greater good of Winston Salem as a whole. There is too much "gimmie for my kingdom". A perfect example is paving roads that do not need it because bond money has to be distributed evenly for council members. Not all bad roads are distributed evenly through the city. Bond monies need to go where there is the greatest need. Same for recreation, sidewalks, etc. Adding at-large representation would allow a couple council members to look at the big picture and spend where the need is the greatest.
The Wards are well represented as they are now. I resent having to choose the last option when I don't agree with it.
The wards must all have representatives. I do not trust current city government with regards to East and Northeast Winston. White representatives will not fairly allocate resources to these wards.
The wards need adequate representation. Additional at large members could dilute the influence of each ward. If additional at large members are added, do not decrease the current number of wards.
the way it is is working well
There is already applied regulation.
There is no Latino representation.
There is so much to do in each ward. We need 8!

At-Large Representation Comments

<p>There should be an at-large member of the city council elected from the side of town with the highest income level and one from the side with the lowest income levels. We do not have enough everyday folks making decisions in this city</p>
<p>There should be an equal number of members elected from wards and at-large members in order to ensure objectivity</p>
<p>There should be no at-large members. Eventhough we elect by disrict/ward very few current members ever voice opinions of members their district/ward</p>
<p>There should not be more than eight Council Members, and I would prefer to keep all districts. I like to feel like I have my Council Member who I can call, even if I never have. But the districts need to be drawn carefully so that they're not gerrymandered.</p>
<p>They should all be elected at large.</p>
<p>Things seems to be working find as they are. Let;s keep it that way.</p>
<p>Things should stay the same as the are now</p>
<p>This allows some stability as the wards will remain the same while adding additional members at large to represent the city as a whole.</p>
<p>This change would insure that a number of council members are elected to represent what is best for the city as a whole. The most prosperous and progressive cities in our state already have at-large representatives.</p>
<p>This is confusing, came at the last minute and we have no time to consider..,</p>
<p>This proposed change looks like a round about way to dilute minority representation. Republican lawmakers proposed it with several other racially motivated changes to school board composition.</p>
<p>This restructuring attempt is a disingenuous attempt by Republicans to gain more power in local elections.</p>
<p>the second part of this question, but was forced to choose one.</p>
<p>This survey question is flawed. I specified "no at-large" representation on the Council but am forced to choose at-large answers in the second section. Anyway... The whole point of district representation is to give a voice to citizens on a level playing field. Additional at-large representatives would provide an opportunity for big-money/special interests to wield undemocratic influence on city politics.</p>
<p>This will give representatives with a citywide perspective.</p>
<p>This would give voters representatives and with the at large members voting and working for the whole city</p>
<p>this would maintain existing wards</p>
<p>This would take away from the African American Community, leaving further gentrification and pushing us out.</p>
<p>This would work, especially due to our smaller population. We do not need more representatives.</p>
<p>Too many make decision making more difficult</p>
<p>Too many money allocations by ward now, some for no good reason.</p>
<p>Voting should allow more input from other people. More thoughts and ideas should help arrive at a overall positive process for our citizens</p>
<p>Ward representation assures voters that they have equal representation at the council level. In theory at-large representation does imply that the at-large councilperson is looking out for the whole city and not just their ward, but they will also assess where their voter base is located and have the temptation to weigh matters with that base in mind -- thus curtailing their city-wide perspective. If at-large council members is the preferred path, limiting the number of at-large council persons minimizes that temptation factor.</p>
<p>Ward representation is the core principle of our city government. It works effectively.</p>
<p>ward representatives are to highly focused on their ward. Leads to waste when they have to have something in their ward even when it doesn't make sense.</p>

At-Large Representation Comments

Wards allow for specific Representatives to be more tuned in to the needs of their communities. Let's also dispense with the charade that this inquiry is anything but racist in nature. The racist state GOP officials need to keep their white Supremacist values out of Winston.

Wards create mini cities, more at large seats provide more broad representation

Wards should be larger, with at-large districts so council members focus more on the whole community rather than just their small territory

We are 1 city, not sure why we need so many wards. This isn't NYC!

We deserve "taxation with representation." In fact, the US Constitution gives this as a basic right. We deserve to elect someone from our respective areas of the city to help us with micro-issues.

We don't need more Council Members just more at large representation.

We need a more diverse City Council.

We need fewer folks in government, not more.

We need more people looking at the overall picture

We need people thinking big picture...and not ward only...

We need to be a unified city with equal representation for the good of everyone.

We need to support grass roots government. At large candidates positions are going to discriminate against qualified candidates that do not have deep financial pockets. Political power should not just be in the hands of the wealthier citizens.

We should have council members who represent the entire city.

We should leave the wards as they are. And make sure all sections of the city have a representative who lives in and concentrates on that particular section of the city.

We should maintain our current governance structure, 8 wards and 1 mayor

We should not dilute minority representation.

Why is a change needed? To dilute the less represented's voice?

Why is Raleigh trying to dictate our elections?

Why not 8 members elected from wards, 2 elected at large, and one elected mayor at large?

Why not just add one additional council member for each ward? Why would any council members need to be

Winston-Salem is small in the way our community interacts. We travel to different wards daily, so I think it would be best to have more at large representation as a whole.

With 8 elected members, I don't think we need at large members.

With the way that the wards are split up it is unproductive to try and get a usable number representative of the Downtown demographic. Therefore, the elected Council members almost always side with their rural constituents.

Would focus results on the whole city instead of wards only.

Would it be more beneficial to have more wards?

Would like to make sure that each district/ward is well represented.

Would like to see less party representation, more people representation. Seems to be a "Good old boy network"

Would prefer ward/neighborhood specific representation over at-large members.

Yeah

You have forced an invalid answer. I chose NONE of the above! Council members should ALL be elected at-large. The City Council's core mission is to craft policy that is in the best interests of Winston Salem and NOT to craft policy that is in the best interests of e.g. Ward 5 vs Ward 4.

You must disregard my selection in the second part of this question I did not choose one I would have chosen none If not for the desire to turn this ballot in On a local level we should have direct representation Don't f*cking do this

Term Length Comments

on a 4 yr term (staggered) on a 2 year term (same time). Staggered terms allow for current representation, fresh perspectives would be more possible.
2 term limit
2 term limit
2 term limits
2 term limits
2 year elections are very disruptive - there should be elections only every 4 years
2 year terms result in too much wasted time campaigning and getting up to speed on issues.
2 years is inadequate to get up to speed on local govt.
2 years is too short, we need more continuity
2 years may not be enough time for a Member to "get things done" and would require them to spend a great deal of time in their re-election efforts. I am in support of 2 term limits.
2 years would barely give a new person time to settle in to their position . And it is expensive to hold campaigns so quickly
3 might be better. It takes at least 1 year to figure out what to do.... On the other hand, perhaps TWO 4-year terms with strict term limits IS an idea.
4 year terms provide members to thoroughly learn the ropes.
4 years allows them to get things done
4 years but they should be staggered so that half the wards are electing every 2 years. Keeps continuity but also allows new ideas to come in every 2 years.
4 years gives council members time to focus on their job rather than having to campaign every two years
4 years gives them more time to get work done.
4 years goes fast, and 2 years even faster. I agree that we should not have members needing to campaign so frequently but instead focus on getting the work of the city accomplished. I side with longer terms, though, because I am also recommending staggered terms. I might choose 2-year terms, instead, if the decision is for simultaneous terms.
4 years is deemed enough for a US President to become efficient. 4 years should serve City Council. They will be re-elected, or step down, or reach end of term. There will almost always be multiple levels of experience on a City Council. This will serve newcomers and long-term members.
4 years is too long
4 years isn't too long to be in office
4 years or 6 years with only one reelection. After two terms they are done.
4 years save money on elections, & gives new members more time to understand their responsibilities
4 years should be long enough for the elected Council person to fulfill any promises he or she has for their ward.
4 years staggered terms prevents complete board turnover from possibly happening
4 years To be an effective representative.
4-year terms allow for more time between elections for actually doing the business of the City.
A four year term allows for council members to learn how to serve the city best
A four year term would allow Council Members to adjust and grow into their positions, thus making them more effective as well as spending less time in the re-election process.
A four-year term allows members sufficient time to come up to speed on issues that impact the City thereby yielding a more informed Council
A lot can happen in a two year time span and we may want to change who we elect more often than every 4 years.
A too-rapid turnover seems like a waste of resources.

Term Length Comments

A two year term is too short. It takes a while for a newly elected Council member to get up to speed, and Council members will be focused too frequently on their re-election campaigns rather than on good governance.

A two-year interval would likely decrease voter participation as political campaigns are tiring and stressful to everyone involved. People would likely be inclined to just tune out the noise by opting out of participation if they had to deal with council elections every two years.

Accountability!

Again leave things alone

Again, don't see a need to change anything.

Again, keep your racism and purposeful chaos out or Winston.

Again, this goes back to voter turnout and encouraging representation from minorities and working class people. Short election cycles favor candidates with more financial backing because they don't have to worry about running every two years while more cash strapped and grass roots candidates do. Additionally, campaigning takes a lot of energy from the candidate, volunteers etc that could be spent on governing and doing their day job. Because of this it is vital that we stick with 4 year terms.

business. Also gives time for a new member to get up to speed, function effectively, and have historical perspective.

allows for learning curve

Allows our council members to learn as they go and I want some longevity on the board without frequent turnovers.

Allows time to learn about the position and the issues.

An election every 2 years is cumbersome and unnecessary for effective government.

As long as there is a way to remove them from office if needed, I think four years is better. Two years is only enough time to get ramped up.

At-large council members should be 6 years

Because if they are not doing their job, they can be replaced.

Because it takes time to get up to speed it would be best to have council members elected every 4 years. If one does not like a council member then vote them out. The problem is though is that there is usually no one running against the council member during elections. and if the council member is not doing a good job how do you vote him/her out?

Believe incumbents need the extra time to familiarize themselves with local issues and what has been done/outcomes from past interventions

best to have on presidential election years

Better transition in my mind, not all at once

Big job--lot to learn, about the range of city services and how the city is organized to provide them; takes time to learn these and adjust to personalities and factions among the group. Foolish to have them go through this process then have to defend your record after only 2 years against someone who is likely going to be a negative force within the group.

But I prefer 'staggering'

But the election year should not be the same as presidential elections when local elections get less attention.

CANCER members like D.D. Adams need to be voted out for the sake of the ward

Change of choice.

City council members should be elected every two years and have term limits of four terms.

Consistence of board and more informed members w/o having all to have a new starting point if majority are elected at once

Term Length Comments

Costs of elections would increase and two year terms would limit the effectiveness of the members (especially newly-elected) in that they might spend a lot of time learning the ins and outs of local government.

Council member should be elected every two years, with a 2 term limit.

Council members have finite time, energy, and talent to apply to this part time service job. Running for office consumes these valuable resources so they are not available to be applied to governing. Another factor is the time and energy new council members must expend to learn how to do their jobs. Elections every two years would require council members to expend these limited resources on campaigning and/or learning the job for much of their terms.

Council members need a chance to become acclimated and the time to not only set goals, but to also see them through. Two years is not enough time to accomplish this.

Council members should spend their time governing, not campaigning. Plus, they need time to get fully up to speed, then have time left in their terms to be effective.

Council should be elected on presidential election years to get the largest number of voters to the polls. Off year elections allow a council member to get elected with less than one thousand votes. A disgraceful percentage of citizens electing these important positions that have a direct result in how high property taxes are and spending taxpayer dollars on pet projects that pick and choose winners.

Current rules seem adequate.

Do I have to

Don't make them campaign all the time

Don't fix what ain't broke

During Presidential election years to increase participation and decrease cost. Off-year elections cost additional public dollars.

Elected Officials need to have a time to lead and not constantly be worrying about re-election.

Electing city council every four years allows members to learn the ropes without running for office every two years.

Electing Council Members every two years would not give the elected officials enough time to complete meaningful projects in their ward and the City as a whole. It would also cost the City more to have receptions and replace Council Members every two years, versus every four years.

Elections are expensive. People often do NOT vote in "off" years -- something which could further skew the representation of various areas of our city (if we did not elect by wards.) It's disheartening to see how few people actually vote in primaries and in "off" year elections. Very sad.

Elections every 2 years for all council members would create perpetual campaigning.

Elections every two years allows us as voters to change our council member if they are not doing what they stated they would or if they are not helping their wards at all.

Elections every two years increases the cost to the taxpayer, thus reducing the number of dollars available for other, needed projects.

Elections should be staggered every two years. This would provide for more accountable.

Empowerment and self serving political gains are becoming the norm, service to the citizens should be top priority.

Every 2 years keeps elected officials on task otherwise they would not be re-elected.

every 2 years is too unstable with people always running for office

Every 2 years would mean they rush through projects and doing their jobs because of their concern for reelection. It unrealistic to think they could make a difference/change if they are at a rush to get it done in two years when it will not show if it is a change or not.

Term Length Comments

Every 4 years allows the Council Members to focus on doing their jobs and not having to spend so much of their time campaigning. Also, it is said that it can take 4 to 6 months to "learn the ropes." So, elect them, give them time for a learning curve, and then time to do the business of the people who elected them.

Every 4 years seems appropriate.

Every four years is fine.

Every two years and no more then 2 terms!!!

Every two years because I think 4 years is too long.

Every two years is a recipe for chaos.

Every two years is a waste of resources.

Every two years is just too often to force people to seek reelection.

Every two years is too often. I don't want our elected officials to be distracted by running for office every two years.

Every two years leads to continual campaigning.

Everyone should start equal with no member have advantage due to time on council.

Fairness in representation

For more consistency, 4 year terms are more appropriate. I also think 3 terms is long enough to serve.

Four is common, no need for more

Four year terms allow office holders to focus on policy issues more than just getting re elected.

Four year terms but staggered. Two year terms give nearly continuous campaigning and flip flopping.

Four years allows the members to get up to speed and become more effective without having to start running for re-election so soon.

Four years give the Council Member time to be more effective.

Four years is enough time for representatives to accomplish things without only being worried about the next election.

Four years is enough time to deliver solid improvements to constituents

Four years is too long for any seat

Four years is too long if we elect an incompetent or a scoundrel.

four years is too long to hold council members accountable

Four years is way too long for an elected official for a city as small as Winston to operate. If someone can't do their job in two years, then this option opens up the possibility of getting someone else in that seat twice as fast

Four years provides more continuity.

Four years provides more stability in the council.

Four years provides sufficient time to enact policies and govern. If elected every two years at least half the year is spent campaigning for re-election

Four years should give them time to create policy and work to see them applied.

Four years terms allow for longer term plans to have a chance of being implemented and so staff is not spinning their wheels.

Four Yr terms because it just seems best that Council Members have opportunity to serve. HOWEVER, Term Limits are needed. Council member can be elected/re-elected up to 5 terms (that is 20 yrs of service.). Then must be off the council for at least 1 term (I don't care if the 'off term' is 2 or 4 yr and let the Commission decide). Then they can run again. As far as Mayor am ok if he/she has no term limit.

Four-year terms offer continuity and reduce the percentage of time council members need to campaign.

Given how long it takes to get anything accomplished four year terms are needed.

Given the expense of running a campaign, a four year term seems reasonable.

Gives members time to learn their job.

Gives others a chance to run for office and there should be term limits.

Term Length Comments

Gives them longer to focus on work and not campaigning.
Gives them time to know the process
Government work takes time. A four year term allows the focus to be on the work, not continuous election
Hard enough to get the populace to come and vote as is. 4 years gives time to council members to get used to the job.
Hard to make change within 2 yrs
Having elections every two years causing systemic disruption. Incumbents and candidates are in constant campaign mode while matters of the community take a second or third position.
Having off election voting would be costly to the city.
Hold 4 year terms, elect on same cycle as state and federal elections. Quit wasting tax dollars on two year cycles. Also, put term limits in. Council and Mayor are not career positions.
Hold elections at the same time as presidential elections to increase turnout.
Honestly, let's go with the option that cost the least amount of money. And keeps the tacky signs that are destroying the environment from being created. Have you seen the Southside Library front area?
I (sic) you staggered the terms, what wards would have the staggered terms?
I agree there is probably a long learning curve which affects their decision making and effectiveness for their constituents.
I agree with the perspective that every 2 years would be too much time campaigning and acclimating rather than getting actual work done.
I believe 4 year terms are better because Council Members can get more things accomplished without having to worry about campaigning all the time. Also, if someone new is elected frequently it takes time away from the job because of having to learn their new position all the time.
I believe council members will be more effective given a four-year term. With two year terms it seems to me the council members would spend half that time learning their jobs and campaigning for re-election.
I believe it takes a year just to get up-to-speed before you are even useful. Four years is more logical.
I believe that council members should be given a fair opportunity to make a difference. I do believe that the terms should be limited to two terms.
I do not have strong feelings about this issue
I do not like the idea of members spending so much of their time running for office.
i do not want constant elections/campaigning
I do not want my representative busy trying to be reelected every two years. It takes time to learn the job and to become familiar with city issues. Two year terms will not provide the continuity that an effective council needs. It will also take time away from city council business.
I don't know the checks and balances of city government, but usually it takes a couple years to establish a direction and two more to see the results.
I don't feel terribly strongly about this. For 4 year terms, staggering makes sense.
I don't want Council Members constantly running for office. Four years gives them a chance to learn and show us they've done something before they have to run again.
I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.
I imagine it takes a while to learn about city issues. Better to have 4 years to develop that knowledge than 2.
I like giving new council members time to learn the job before they have to begin worrying about running for re-election. Also, if council members are running every two years, they have less time to focus on the business of running the city because they are constantly running for re-election.
I like our current system
I like that a longer term allows them to accomplish more and campaign less.

Term Length Comments

I like the idea of 2 years, but worry that council members will be constantly running for office instead of doing their job.
I like the idea of being able to look at progress more frequently.
I like the idea of council members having increased accountability to the public. However, I feel that it is more important for council members to focus their time and energy on managing city affairs rather than on the election process. I like the concept of staggered terms. I also like the idea of having one or more at-large positions up for re-election every two years. That would make one or two positions on the city council very responsive to voter concerns.
I like the option to vote someone out in two years or affirm them for two additional years than having someone automatically serve 4 years with no measure to remove them if they are ineffective.
I like the productive time that results with a longer period between elections. However, I do think that shorter terms might encourage younger candidates including those with families at home to run for city council, which would be a good thing.
i like the staggered terms though
I prefer a 4 year term so members can have the opportunity to work together closely.
I prefer that the council members not spend too much of their time running for office.
I still believe 4 year terms are better than every 2. Not enough time for rep. to work before being up for election again.
I think (4) year elections allow the work to be done by current leaders, and also allows the results of voter needs to be addressed and acted upon.
I think 4 years would be appropriate. It takes time to complete some projects set forth by council members and having extra time in office would allow for more projects and potentially a larger impact to the city
I think electing members every 2 years would mean spending too much of their time adjusting to the new position and campaigning. I'd rather they have time to govern.
I think fewer people would vote every 2 years.
I think it is important to have longer terms, so that the members can focus on running the city instead of re-election.
I think it takes almost two years to get a good grasp of the job. The next two weeks they can be more effective
I think it takes time to become acclimated to the role and it would decrease efficiency if we were constantly reelecting.
I think that the experience and governing relationships necessary for effective leadership can be facilitated by a longer term than 2 years.
I would rather have commissioners have a longer term so they can learn the job before having to run for election again.
I'd question the turnout on half of the years if it were every two years
If a council member is unproductive for the Ward, easier to remove them in the shorter time.
If elected every two years they would be campaigning constantly and not serving the community.
If elected every two years, council members would constantly be running for re-election
If elections are every 2 years, we will always be in campaign mode. Four years allows for a council member to get to know how city gov. Works and improve city.
If it's every 2 years, all they would do is campaign. Let them get in there and do something. Campaigns are also expensive
If public disagrees with member they can be replaced quicker
If someone is constantly campaigning, then it's hard form them to get any work done.

Term Length Comments

If they are elected every two years they will be in a constant cycle of elections making it more difficult to actually govern
If they don't make change, get them out quicker. If they can't handle the pressure, get them out quicker. If the people like the first two trial, they'll vote two more years.
If they only serve two year terms, they will only have time to run for office, not govern.
If they only serve two-year terms, they will constantly be running for office and not concentrating on doing business.
If we have (for example) 2 at-large, these 2 must also be included in the stagger.
Including the primary, it takes a full year of campaigning to run for election or re-election. Campaigning takes representatives away from their actual job of representing their constituents. Two year terms mean you work for a year and campaign for a year -- lather, rinse, repeat. It costs as much to campaign every other year as it does every four years, so this double the amount of money a candidate must pay out of pocket or raise to run for a local office. Again, this means that only the wealthy will end up holding office. A reasonable suggestion would have been 3-year terms, but this wasn't offered as an option.
It gives them more time to get used to their position and worry less about running for re-election
It is difficult to get people to the polls every four years, two years is not enough time for politicking.
It need to be that they serve. Two four-year terms and then re elect someone else. I don't believe it should be a lifetime. Job
It provides more time to focus on wards they represent,city matters and short/long-term planning
It seems that every two years would decrease productivity as members would have to prepare for elections and get up to speed on city matters quickly.
It should be 4 years, half of the council members elected every two years. This would provide some stability and also some ability to change without all of the council members constantly having to campaign.
It takes a year to get used to a job. Then the person has to campaign for a year to keep the job. Let them keep the position for 4 years.
It takes at least 1 year to learn how the city works, so 2 years would not be a sufficient amount of time to make an impact
It takes at least one year to learn the ropes. Second year to get fully engaged with constituents. Four years needed to make an impact and totally focus on getting something done without focusing on re-election. Two years is not enough!
It takes time for council members to establish relationships with those living in their ward. Every two year elections lead to more constant campaigning with less attention to the business of the city.
It takes time to know the job and get things done. Two years is not enough.
It takes too long to learn the ropes. I'm in favor of keeping it to 4 year terms.
It's costly. What's the advantage of spending more money? Weed out the less fortunate from running?
It's too costly to hold more elections, and council members would have to start campaigning almost immediately after taking office.
Keep cost of elections inline. Elect with State Reps to save on costs.
Keep it fresh
Keeping it the same as it is and vote when we vote in the Presidential election.
Keeps the rotation fresh. If they do a good job, reelection will bring them back.
Kind of torn, like it the way it is but like this concept also
Leave the structure alone
Leave us alone.
Less time and money spent campaigning is preferred.
Less time campaigning waste less money.

<u>Term Length Comments</u>
Less time running for office.
less time spent campaigning for office
Less turnover and the learning curve would not be as drastic.
Limit the number of terms if not already limited.
Longer terms are better for continuity
Make term limits
Make them work for their seat or let us vote them out quickly.
may help prevent a sense of getting too comfortable in that position. is this a good place to add that if there is a two year term, max of four terms to that individual and two term max if we stay at four year terms (so a MAXIMUM of eight years for service, period!)
Mayor 4 years. Council members 2 years
members year serving four year terms should be able to spend less time campaigning for reelection.'
Members need longer than 2 years to effect change
More accountability to the electorate
More continuity of plans, experience can be passed on to new members
More frequent elections incur more expense and lead to constant campaigning and fundraising.
More frequent elections should make the system reflect the people choices.
More often than every 4 yrs would be inefficient as Council members would spend much of their time running for reelection. Also more expense for twice as many elections
More quickly eliminate perceived poor choices
More time on policy and less on campaigning
More turnover, less gets accomplished. Members need time.
My wife and I have worked actively for our City Council members for the past 15 years. A campaign is costly in time and money. In addition, the learning curve for newly elected council members takes months. A four year term is the best choice by far,
Need time to work
Needs to stay as 4 years to maintain project continuity and utilize learning curve.
New members would have fresh ideas
Off cycle elections are not good for the people
On rotating 2 year schedules
Our city is not yet socially ready for a two-year term, given the time of campaigning and the office demands of the council member, we should be aware that having people in office who can follow through on 4 year plans, and pick up where the last council left off, is imperative to winstons growth
People get complacent , this will allow the members to be more attentive to the business at had and do a better job, so they have a better record to be re-elected.
People need time to learn the job.
People should prove themselves
Please NO MORE ELECTIONS than necessary! Let's save the taxpayer money and not have council members spending all their time campaigning!
Please provide comments to your response to question #2
Politicians will campaign too much.
Probably takes them a good year to get up to speed, then they spend the next year campaigning.
Provides stability
Ramping up time can actually take a year. Time/energy focused on city needs is more important than time/energy focused on campaigning.
See previous comment!

Term Length Comments

Seems to be working fine the way it is. A council member likely needs more than two years to learn the ropes.
Self explanatory
Shorter terms allow for more accountability.
Simply prefer option to reelect every two years.
So there can be a reflection seen of their actions; Too frequent of changes won't help the community improve.
Staggered four-year terms give the dual advantage of continuity of experienced members plus influx of fresh perspectives.
Staggered provides greater continuity and accountability
Staggered terms offer many benefits, the greatest being how voters have more opportunities to speak via their vote. Additionally, staggered terms prevent a loss of the entire class of elected officials in the case of a wave election.
Staggered terms on theory are a good idea; however, it seems unfair to have some elected in presidential years & some in off years. Thus, I'd prefer keeping 4 year terms but schedule in non presidential years.
Staggered terms would give the process an overlapping opportunity to share prospective
takes time to become proficient at a job, promote ideas and implement. Too much money spent on re-electing people.
Term Limits should be intact for City Council for 8 years maximum
Terms could be staggered.
That way if they were not working out, you could vote them out.
The city is rapidly changing and terms need to reflect that
The current structure works
The cycle of elections could get in the way of getting work done when the council is worried about elections that take 6+mo of work
the four year terms allow them to strive to get more accomplished in between election years
The needs of the city is changing. We need an opportunity to have a more diverse council member board that can be rotated.
The two year term would require representatives to campaign constantly. The budget cycle for the city would mean that a representative would have to work on projects put in place by the previous representative (if the current representative is not re elected). Thus, the 2 year cycle places more responsibility on the staff. Also, it takes a year for a council member to understand and impact the systems and processes within the city operations and the state operations.
The wards that would have elections in off presedential years would not have the voter turnout as others. Too expensive for city.
There are Councils that we later deem not doing the people's wishes.
There is a learning curve for any new board member no matter how involved in the community an individual might be. Two years does not give enough time for new members to maximize effectiveness. Perhaps a second term could be limited to a two year term. Term limits should be discussed before simply considering 2 year terms.
There is a learning curve once elected and just when a city council member is understanding the inner workings of the city they could be replaced.
There is a substantial learning curve. The term needs to be four years, not two. Elections are costly and time consuming, and too much time is wasted on elections. Please leave well enough alone.
There is entirely too much "churn" if there are two year terms. One of my criticisms of the state legislature is that members are constantly running for reelection.

Term Length Comments

There is no mention of party here? No mention of race?
There is no time to do anything in 2 years. running every 2 years is crazy.
There needs to be a limit on service term
There needs to turnover in elected positions, change is good for the community
There should be a limit to the number of terms any elected Council Member can serve.
They need time to learn the ropes!
They should also have a two term limit
They should be elected every two years and have term limits. Maybe a year off between their terms of service.
They should not be able to serve more than two terms or eight years.
They. need to be elected to four year terms to give them time to actually do something in between campaigns.
This is a more stable system
This is about efficiency. More elections cost more money. Also, Council Members will spend a higher percentage of their overall time in office doing campaign operations rather than the job at hand.
This provides time for council members to learn the job and stops the cycle of endless, endless, endless campaigning!
This will give them 2 years not having to worry about elections
This will keep people from serving to long,they need to face the voters frequent
this would enable experience on the Board.
This would give voters the ability to modify representation more frequently, if needed.
This wouldn't improve good governance and might very well disrupt ability to plan and implement plans.
Time to get engaged with the community and address pressing needs of the community .
Time to provide the opportunity for Members to be nimble and not from an entrenched platform.
Too many lifer/career politicians.
Too much campaigning with 2-year terms.
Too much change in our city to stay that long without contest
Too much time campaigning in two year reelections. We also need term limits. Council members should only be allowed to serve two consecutive terms.
Two year terms are incredibly inefficient, as council members spend half of the term campaigning for the next election
Two year terms are not necessary & more disruptive.
Two year terms exponentially limit the capacity of council members. Similarly to congressional representatives who never stop fundraising, when you have to be elected every two years, you will have to dedicate more of your time to that effort and less to that of serving your constituents. In addition, given the amount of time it takes for new city council members to become accustomed to city government, as referenced in the video from the marketing department I am uncomfortable with the notion that a new council member could spend 1/4th of their term just getting used to the process.
Two year terms is a totally cynical idea from Donny Lambeth, who sucks, and simply does not want to be challenged by a sitting councilman for his lame gerrymandered state house seat
Two year terms means more time spent on campaigning (not always in the best interest of the city at large) and a greater percentage of a term spent learning what to do for newly elected officials.
Two year terms would mean Council members are always campaigning
Two year terms would not allow Council Members to adequately serve their individual wards and would force them to spend too much time and money campaigning.
Two year terms would waste too much time on campaigning and fund-raising.
Two years does not provide enough time to fulfill responsibilities.

Term Length Comments

Two years is a waste of everyone's time
Two years is far too short. On-the-job experience is important. Give members enough time to get into the groove of things and actually get work done before they're forced back into election mode. Two-year terms incentivize stupidity and shallowness.
Two years is insufficient time to allow new members to settle in and season themselves.
two years is long enough to know whether they are affecting positive change or not
Two years is not enough time for new members to learn city processes and achieve effective change for their constituents
Two years is not enough time to accomplish anything.
two years is not enough time to accomplish tasks in a bureaucracy. 4 years is a good amount of time to get things planned and implemented.
Two years is not long enough to learn the law and complexities of local government in NC.
Two years is too short. By the time they figure out their role and responsibilities, they have to start campaigning again.
Two years makes for ineffective council
Two years would be better. Then if they are not doing their jobs, we can vote them out and give someone else a try.
Two-year terms do not give elected officials time to get acclimated to new tasks. I am highly unsupportive of two-year terms, particularly when people who haven't held political office are interested in running.
Two-year terms encourages silly pet projects to get votes and makes council members timid in the face of outspoken neighborhood groups who may not have the community's best interests in mind.
U.S. Reps are elected every 2 years so local officials should too. Also, if you have a bad council person, you don't want to have to deal with them for 4 years! 2 years is fine and forces people to get down to business sooner. Doesn't give them time to take anything for granted.
Voter turnout is greater during the presidential election
We don't need more elections to pay for.
We have always had multiple term Council members, which provides the continuity cited as an argument for staggered terms. Elections are expensive and the argument for doubling that cost is not persuasive
We have enough campaigns and elections to focus on.
We need council members focused on serving the city, not constant campaigning
We need term limits.
What should change is that elections be held in a year other than the presidential election. Then, district members would spend more time studying the candidates themselves and not their party.
When it comes to elections of council members, everything should remain the same so all citizens are represented equal
Where would they find the time to do the job if they perpetually have to run for office?
While council members are generally a rubber stamp type position and have been in the history of the city for incumbents, an election every two years would ensure members are held accountable.
With 2 year terms, council members would constantly be running for election or re-election. A huge waste of time and money and is disruptive to the continuity of the city government.
With changes constantly taking place within the city/wards, council members would not have enough time to research, recommend and get the needed support to move forward with those changes suggestions that they feel will be of benefit to the community. I am satisfied that 4 year terms are adequate.
With four year terms
With shorter terms, council members would virtually be running all of the time. We need them to have enough time to focus on the job of running the city, not just campaigning.

Term Length Comments

With term limits. No one should serve more than 8 years. Including the mayor.

With two year terms council members would always be running for re-election...

Would be greater incentive to bring fresh ideas and represent best interests of the city

Would limit campaigning time as well as campaigning costs.

Yeah

Term Staggering Comments

I like the idea of staggered terms because you eliminate the risk of losing more than two experienced Members at once.

on a 4 yr term (staggered) on a 2 year term (same time). Staggered terms allow for current representation, fresh perspectives would be more possible.

Saves money and ensures more voters since it is at the time of a national election

4-year staggered terms would be ideal.

4-year staggered terms would be ideal.

A longer election cycle is a less expensive option for the taxpayers. Elect all members during the Presidential election year.

Again, enables council to focus on serving city

Again, more unnecessary disruption of city government. Just have all the elections at one time. Staggered terms make it harder on voters.

Also supports the 4 year term - but staggered.

An additional election would be more expensive. It is hard enough to get voters to the polls so staggering the terms would probably mean fewer voters.

And during presidential election for the most visibility.

As long as there is a term limit say they are not allowed to serve more than eight years, it really doesn't matter

assures some experience on the job at each election

assures some experience on the job at each election

At the same time because it makes it simpler and more efficient.

Balance new with experience

Based on the political calendar in the US, staggering would limit voter turnout to some off years, if utilizing bi annual elections.

Because of voter turnout considerations it is probably better to stick to all at once voting on the major election cycles. It would be penalizing to some candidates to be in the midterm years.

Because of voter turnout considerations it is probably better to stick to all at once voting on the major election cycles. It would be penalizing to some candidates to be in the midterm years.

Better for the flow of the city

Better to learn from each other

Better transition in my mind, not all at once

Both options have value. Staggered terms would help with continuity if there are changes in representation. On the other hand, there are benefits and drawbacks to having all elections at the same time, especially if done in a presidential election year. Funding and advertising will definitely be affected, whether to the benefit or detriment of local campaigns. These effects should be considered. A council that is elected at the same time may have more cohesiveness than one with half its members coming in two years later.

Both options have value. Staggered terms would help with continuity if there are changes in representation. On the other hand, there are benefits and drawbacks to having all elections at the same time, especially if done in a presidential election year. Funding and advertising will definitely be affected, whether to the benefit or detriment of local campaigns. These effects should be considered. A council that is elected at the same time may have more cohesiveness than one with half its members coming in two years later.

But on 2 year intervals.

By electing them on staggered terms the other members would have the opportunity to "help" any new members to get up to speed quicker. Therefore, making everything run more smoothly.

Can help with spreading new ideas and thoughts for methods to improve overall.

Citizens should have the opportunity for recall if an elected Mayor or council member proves ineffective.

City issues are not staggered; neither should be council

Term Staggering Comments

Consistence of board and more informed members w/o having all to have a new starting point if majority are elected at once

Continuity

Continuity is important so a staggered term would be my preference.

Continuity of norms could be better upheld.

Could be helpful to ensure continuance by some in case others are completely replaced. That way those staying on can help continue efforts already in progress.

Council members elected in years that do not coincide with national elections will have lower turnout rates for voting, which creates inequity. All members should be elected at the same time.

Creates better stability over time rather than having reactionary elections from current trends.

Definitely think the terms should be staggered. It makes no sense to have a potential total turnover ... ever.

Doesn't matter

Don't fix what ain't broke

Easier

Easier for voters and fir council

Ensures someone with experience is on the council

Every 2 years

Everyone should start equal with no member have advantage due to time on council.

For two year terms, I do not see this as an issue.

frequent changes in council make-up would probably make it harder to establish and maintain good working relationships with other members

Get it over with all at once so the elected officials can get to work for four years without interruption and turnover.

Good value for the money spent on elections

Having all members elected at once allows for popular sentiment to cause larger changes in the council's makeup, which is more democratic.

Having Council Members elected on staggered terms should provide for continuity for important projects, and also hopefully help new members get up-to-speed more quickly.

Having off election voting would be costly to the city.

Having staggered terms ensures that change can be made to the selected people and people already members are there to help

Having staggered terms means you're having Council elections every two years, which is too often. Also, I don't see how staggered terms are cheaper when some of the Council Members are at large.

Having staggered terms would also cost the City more, as receptions and changing the Council would happen more frequently, versus all at once every four years.

I (sic) you staggered the terms, what wards would have the staggered terms?

I am an advocate for staggered terms. That way, you lower the risk of having a complete turn over at the same time.

I am not firm on this, if staggered terms are more expensive to run I would be okay with them being elected at the same time.

I am not sure about this issue - perhaps statistical data should inform this decision

I appreciate the idea of a council that has more continuity in terms of learning and best practices; as new folks cycle in they can learn from those who have been there.

I believe in the staggered times so that ongoing issues that are being resolved will not slip thru the cracks.

I believe it's better to retain the knowledge from some previous members instead of everyone starting new at the same time.

Term Staggering Comments

I believe that staggered terms would increase responsiveness to voter concerns.

I believe that this would facilitate the relationship building within the city council for more cohesiveness.

I believe the staggered option would provide more continuity and a lesser chance of a disruptive major change at any one time.

I believe this assures continuity and a higher performing city council.

I can see benefits of either of these ways.

I could actually go either way on this one.

I could live with staggered terms, but it seems that the potential of having new representatives coming on board every two years means someone is always struggling with a learning curve, which could ultimately decrease the efficiency and effectiveness of the board.

I do not know of any clear arguments for changing to a staggered term model

I do not trust the system to have staggered terms. The staggered terms may not allow enough time for a representative to successfully complete all of the initiatives in their ward.

I do support staggered terms so that some city councilmembers are not distracted by running for reelection every 2 or 4 years, and can go on with keeping things moving while half the council is campaigning.

I don't feel strongly about this issue but voted in favor of staggered terms to help a new council hit the ground running hopefully more smoothly.

I don't feel terribly strongly about this. For 4 year terms, staggering makes sense.

I don't see any advantage to staggering the terms- if they are all elected at the same time it helps to build momentum for the election

I don't see any reason to change the current system.

I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.

I like the current system because it gives us a stable council for a longer period of time.

i like the fact it allows for experience on the council; i also think video mentioned cost savings

I like the idea of staggered if everyone is elected out there would be continuity. However I know the cost of elections is expensive but we have midterm elections anyway so they can be added to that time.

I like the idea of staggered terms. That way, there are always experienced council members in place.

I like the idea of staggering terms only if it does not require someone's term to be up in less than four years at the start.

I like the staggered concept however I doubt voter turnout would be as high under such a change.

I like voting every four years.

I must be missing something here because it seems that if there are elections every four years the only way to stagger is to elect members to an 8-year term.

I must be missing something here because it seems that if there are elections every four years the only way to stagger is to elect members to an 8-year term.

I prefer members have the entire 4 years to work together.

I prefer that council members be elected at the the same to reduce confusion among the electorate and to improve stability of the council.

I see some benefit in staggered terms. Council member should not become complacent in their group dynamic. I could also see how new members coming into an established group could easily be bullied into voting for legislative items without having a full understanding of their impact. I'm torn on this one.

I strongly believe that allowing fresh people to the Council on a staggered basis would be of some advantage. Fresh faces and ideas would be welcomed.

I think for the continued continuity of the council same time elections are best to unsure that the work set before the council is done in a timely and bipartisan manner.

Term Staggering Comments

I think it would be too confusing to voters to stagger the voting

I think stability and consistency would be better for productivity.

I think staggered terms would lead to decreased productivity and cooperation.

I think staggered terms would make for more effective governing, BUT my concern would be a disproportionate amount of turnout on presidential election years vs. not, so the stakes aren't the same for each council member election.

I think that the playing field is more level if all are elected at the same time.

I think that the playing field is more level if all are elected at the same time.

I think the reality is that voter turnout will be dramatically different in presidential election years versus non which would lead to some wards being under-represented. I also think having everyone running for re-election at the same time reduces the amount of time the "council" is campaigning which would hopefully lead to less partisanship and more cooperation on the council.

I think they would work better if they all started at one time.

I think unison would be better because cohesion of government is the better option.

I understand the point about having some members who "know the ropes" but there will always be some members who have been re-elected and have the experience.

I would support staggered terms, but am concerned that it would lead to lower voter turnout. It would be nice if there was a bit more information provided about how this would be handled to get election information to voters and ensure time off was given for voting if an election might only affect a single ward.

I'm mostly indifferent to this. Staggering new members might help with spreading out the learning curve.

Ideally fresh ideas would be possible every 2 years

If council members join at different intervals, how much time would be spent bringing new members up-to-speed on current projects and issues...What happens if a council member is not re-elected and has to leave in the middle of an assignment, is his/her replacement in charge now...with no background or expertise.

If 2 year terms are selected, then no need to stagger, but if 4 year terms, the stagger.

If elected every two years staggering is not necessary. Every four years - yes

If staggered term, you have some experienced Council members still serving while others are getting up to speed. Also when many Council members are all running at same time, voters have to learn about more candidates at one time - fewer members running at one time gives people better opportunity to study and learn about candidates and make better more informed voting.

If they all come on board at the same time, then they grow together and learn to work together.

If we have (for example) 2 at-large, these 2 must also be included in the stagger.

It gives a chance to rotation and introduction of new ideas. Our city needs to improve in the safety of all of us citizens.

It is likely this would result in a lower turnout.

It just make more sense to get all the Council team members in place rather than staggering the term unless their 4 year turn is not quite complete. Then I believe those who were elected at the same time should be voter for and re-elected around the same time.

It's better to elect on staggered terms so that all council members aren't up for a vote in the same year and therefore more subject to the whims of the voter. It's also good to have some continuity so that a potentially completely new council isn't elected at the same time.

It's the only fair way. Otherwise half might be elected in a presidential election year where interest is higher and the other half in a mid-term where interest is less.

Keep everything the way it is.

Keep it simple.

keep on presidential election years

Term Staggering Comments

Keeping it all together encourages more voter turnout. That is something we should all encourage.
Keeps continuity
Keeps some members with city government knowledge on council to help others get up to speed.
Key to keep the local government on a regular system.
Kind of torn, like it the way it is but like this concept also
Leave the current structure alone
Leave the current structure alone
Less confusion for the voters if all elected at the same time.
Less disruptive.
Let's focus on a unified body of representatives, not a revolving door.
Let's keep the trouble and expenses to a minimum.
lets not add too much change at once. then you have confusion.
Like the idea of a more efficient Council that starts all together.
Make term limits
Makes more sense.
makes sense
Midterm elections tend to have lower voter turnout than presidential election years, so I feel simultaneous terms is more equitable
More consistency by voting at the same time.
More continuity of plans, experience can be passed on to new members
My concern again is with the cost associated with holding elections at different tines.
My question is how do you implement this process since everyone will be elected this year for a 4 year term. Who will be the members to shorten their terms to implement a new system?
Needs to be staggered to maintain project continuity and utilize learning curve.
New members will have mentors and ability to ask advise! The new members could get up to speed faster and continuity !
No change over all at once
no changes necessary
No need to start with a council full of newbies
No opinion
No real preference though
No reason to change
No reason to stagger terms.
No reason to stagger terms.
Not all council members would be focused in re-election at the same time
Not all of them campaigning at once
Not all seats are challenged, which is fine. This year Northwest and Southeast members were not challenged. No changes needed. This gives more stability.
Off cycle elections are not good for the people
Only half the council will be panicked during election years with staggered terms.
Over the years, we aren't seeing turnover all over the city, so no need to stagger terms.
Overlap of knowledge
Prefer staggered terms for partial continuity
Provided continuity of policies, avoiding over-reaction to issues
Provides for continuity.
Provides new plus experience

Term Staggering Comments

Provides stability
Provides stability.
Putting them in the election all at one time allows for less confusion for the voters.
Rapid change but ability to see projects through
Rotating the members will keep ideas and initiatives fresh.
Rotating the members will keep ideas and initiatives fresh.
Same time for City Council member elections will offer citizens the opportunity to focus of the office mission common to city council members. It will focus on local issues and avoid confusion.
Same time for City Council member elections will offer citizens the opportunity to focus of the office mission common to city council members. It will focus on local issues and avoid confusion.
same time so you can have fresh teams initiate all together.
same time so you can have fresh teams initiate all together.
See #2
See #4
See above
See above.
See comments for question 2.
See previous comment!
Seems like a reasonable idea to stagger terms.
Seems to work well as it is now
Self explanatory
Shakes up the council interactive dynamic; yes.
Simultaneous elections allow for a team approach to matters at hand and opportunities to obtain projected aims and objectives.
So as to provide some continuity . . .
So the city government doesn't change too drastically too often
Stagger terms allows changes from the wards/community but gives the council member time to learn the ropes of committee work and to represent/ work for the city betterment.
Staggered allows for some change every two years yet keeps stability in the council.
Staggered elections will be confusing to voters: "Is this my election year or not?" Also, what if a voter moves from one district to the next and misses their voting cycle as a result? Then it makes the voter feel excluded from the process. All this confusion in the process will lower voter turnout and involvement. This is not conducive to having an inclusive democratic process.
Staggered provides greater continuity and accountability
Staggered terms allow for continuation of projects and things to get done.
Staggered terms allow for continuity between election cycles.
Staggered terms allow for continuity.
Staggered terms allows Council to always have a balance of rookie and veteran members.
Staggered terms allows for consistency over time.
Staggered terms allows for continuity while still allowing for change
staggered terms are confusing to voters
Staggered terms are less overwhelming for voters and allow them to be more informed. However, it would lead to more coattail politics.
Staggered terms assure some members have knowledge of what is going on in the city. It could be difficult if an entirely new council was elected.

Term Staggering Comments

Staggered terms can prevent drastic changes to shifts in leadership and maintain more experienced council members in office.

Staggered terms could help maintain continuity year to year.

Staggered terms eliminate loss of institutional memory, ensures continuity

staggered terms ensures that there will always be experienced members on the Council.

Staggered terms give voters the opportunity to make a greater change to the council in case some members are not properly serving the community

staggered terms helps avoid the pitfalls of everyone potentially being new at the same time

Staggered terms leads to voter confusion and low turnout.

Staggered terms may help retain a higher level of experience and effectiveness on the council: better continuity.

Staggered terms means there is overlap.

Staggered terms offer many benefits, the greatest being how voters have more opportunities to speak via their vote. Additionally, staggered terms prevent a loss of the entire class of elected officials in the case of a wave election.

Staggered terms on theory are a good idea; however, it seems unfair to have some elected in presidential years & some in off years. Thus, I'd prefer keeping 4 year terms but schedule in non presidential years.

Staggered terms prevent having a completely new group without experience in place.

Staggered terms provide a better sense of stability when turnover occurs.

Staggered terms provide for more information/experience sharing, both necessary for informed/wise decision-making.

Staggered terms secures the continuation of some experience on the Council.

Staggered terms seems an attractive option, but can limit developing an effective group dynamic and working relationships.

Staggered terms will not assist city functions easily as they are now on a same time frame and all are up to date on items needing decisions made.

Staggered terms would assist with continuity.

Staggered terms would be confusing for voters.

Staggered terms would contribute to greater stability by acting as insurance against sudden total loss of "institutional memory."

Staggered terms would ensure that the council always had someone with past experience on the board.

Staggered terms would give the process an overlapping opportunity to share prospective

Staggered terms would likely increase the cost of Elections, thereby wasting money better spent on services.

Staggered terms would make more sense because turnout varies significantly between midterm and presidential elections. This would give a better balance

Staggered terms would mean an election with its attendant costs would happen every two years.

Staggered terms would prevent (possible, but highly unlikely) an issue of a full-board or over half being voted out at one time. Although pros and cons to that..LOL. Staggering terms seems best option esp. as new ones come on board. Most business boards etc. do this so this is not new.

Staggered terms would provide for better continuity and education of new members.

Staggered would prevent all new people in office at the same time and causing lags in getting things done.

Staggered. Please see my response to question 2.

Staggering allows better historic knowledge of the issues on the council as a whole as new members come on board. Perhaps a bit like domesticated elephaont helping the ediuicate newly captured wild elephants.

Staggering creates power differentials and is not good for the community.

Staggering elections would provide less disruption when elections occur.

Term Staggering Comments

Staggering terms will allow for experienced members to remain on the council to assist with the transition of the new members and to continue its business with as little interruption as possible.

Staggering terms will allow for experienced members to remain on the council to assist with the transition of the new members and to continue its business with as little interruption as possible.

Staggering will keep the council fresh and not overhaul at one time

Staggering will keep the council fresh and not overhaul at one time

Start new, start fresh, get to know each other and get down to business.

Suggested changes are a Republican ploy.

Taxpayers money is wasted in staggered elections.

That gives everyone an equal playing field.

That way at least there would be a fresh set of eyes and ears on the overall Committee

That way everyone is not a newly, and knows how things work.

That way we are ensured that there are experienced members on the board.

That's how it's done.

The experience of members would not take as long since there would always be some members that knew and understand the system.

The issue here is who has to run during presidential elections?

The wards that would have elections in off presidential years would not have the voter turnout as others. Too expensive for city.

There is no mention of party here? No mention of race?

There may be some merit here, establishing some continuity.

There needs to be at least some level of continuity at the Council - wholesale turning over of all the members (potentially) every four years doesn't make any sense and/or provide for any level of stability.

there will always be some who are re-elected and will have experience.

There's enough confusion in local elections. We hardly get any voters to participate anyway. Staggering terms would discourage voting.

They should also have term limits.

They should be elected all at one time because you would run into the same problem of someone always having to learn their new position if it was staggered. I feel they would be more productive if they all learned it at once which in the end would give them more time to take care of the needs of our local government.

They should be elected on the general presidential election term or the voting totals are way too low.

They should be staggered so that those with experience can help those who are new to the Council.

This allows for better institutional memory and coherence

This allows for continuity of the council without the potential for massive changeover in any given campaign cycle

This gives more continuity, so that while the new members become acclimated, the veteran members can continue to explain / effect governing.

This gives us a mix of experience and fresh views

This might improve the bi-partisan quality of the Council.

This plan provides better continuity of vision and less stress on city staff of having possibility of massive council turnover at one time.

This way you will always have senior members on the council when new members are voted in.

This will be helpful for transitions on the council instead of possibly starting over from scratch.

This will make for a better transition for everyone.

this would allow experienced members to mentor less experienced members

This would allow greater continuity. There would always be experienced council members

Term Staggering Comments

This would be simpler and more efficient.
this would enable experience on the Board.
This would provide greater accountability and allow new members to learn from people who have been there.
Too much change at once to do together
Tying the elections to the two year federal House elections does not substantially increase election costs. Allowing half the members to be elected maintains continuity and history for the council.
Unsure
Very unlikely that entire turnover would occur. Therefore, there should always be sufficient experience for continuity. Having all council elections at the same time every four years will be less confusing to electorate (and possibly cost less tax resources).
Voter turnout is greater during the presidential election
Voters need to hold council accountable and guessing when a term ends only confuses that.
Voters need to hold council accountable and guessing when a term ends only confuses that.
We can run staggered terms which allow for change when desired, but allows 4 year terms to persist without unchecked incumbency taking hold.
We do not have the voter turn out or civic awareness for staggered terms to make sense
We do not have the voter turn out or civic awareness for staggered terms to make sense
We don't need added elections, waste of taxpayers money for low turnout
We don't need to be in a constant state of running for office.
When it comes to elections of council members, everything should remain the same so all citizens are represented equal
When people are bombarded with multiple elections, they tend to vote less.
While I would prefer staggered terms, voter turnout is usually less for mid-term elections.
While staggered terms may add some stability, I favor the whole council facing voters at the same time.
While there are advantages of concurrent terms, it is possible that most of the members may be newly elected. That lack of experience creates a unstable board while everyone is learning the "ropes."
Who wants to keep up with staggered terms.
Wholesale change of governing boards does not allow enough continuity and expertise.
why make it confusing?
why make it confusing?
Winston Salem is the only city out side normal municipal elections because of a bill for approved in the state for one city. Makes zero sense, but staggering would keep fresh perspectives and citizens engaged more often who voting in off presidential years.
With 4-yr terms this provides the opportunity for citizens to have more input in their representation.
With four year terms
With staggered terms there would always be experienced members on the council.
Would have experienced representatives to help provide continuity
Yea sounds good
Yeah
Yes, when there is a divisive issue you really don't want a "sweep" where many/most are changed up at the same time. Takes to long to get them all back up to speed.
You will still have experience on the council

Election Timing Comments

Absolutely odd years! Local elections deserve our full attention.
Again - let's make this as easy, efficient and as least expensive on the taxpayer as possible.
Again more confusing
Again, harder on the voters.
Again, odd years lead to low voter turnout. Keep it simple, for goodness sake.
Again, staggering or changing the elections is an added expense the the election process that is unnecessary and will, in my opinion, decrease the number of voters participating in an election.
Again, voter turnout during even years is highest and allows for the city to utilize the get out the vote infrastructure that is already in place. Moving to odd years would result in de-facto voter suppression.
All elections should take place at once to save taxpayers money.
Although I really don't have an opinion on this, I think our local elections get overshadowed by national elections. For that reason, I would like to see odd year elections.
Although it may dilute attention to the local candidates the overall greater turnout during larger elections would mean more people particpiate in the election of local officials.
As I believe real business done locally affects us the most, city council elections tend to get lost in the shuffle when they are elected.rerelected.
As one views the current ballot, City Council races are next to the last item on the ballot. Since straight party selections are no longer available, voters have to make concentrated efforts to make sure they continue to vote until they get to the end of the ballot.
Being held at the same time as the major elections likely increases the number of people voting in our local elections.
Better that they are elected when interest in selecting public officials is at is highest.
Better turnout during presidential elections.
Better turnout.
better voter turnout
better voter turnout
Better voter turnout.
by doing this.... it will really help to keep them from being over shadowed from all the other political rhetoric.
Change
City Council elections get lost when there are major state or national elections on the ballot. I liked it when they were on the same schedule as the other municipalities. If they are in even years, they should be in the year that is not a presidential or gubernatorial election.
Combining the elections gets more turn out
Corresponding to state and national elections probably boost turnout, which is good.
Cost!
Council Member elections should be held in conjunction with State and National elections as the voter turnout typically is greater.
Council Member elections should take place at the same time as as many national and state elections as possible in order to increase voter participation in the election process. That way the members elected will more likely be representative of the constituency rather than the few people that vote in off years.
Council members are already odd, plus it allows for a civic focus vs the state and federal noise of those even year elections.
Council members being on a major ballet with State and National Elections involving things such as the Presidential election takes away from the local election and by the time they get to that part of the ballot they no longer care who they vote for

Election Timing Comments

Council must be elected during State and National elections to ensure large numbers of citizens will vote. Off year elections allow a council member to get elected with less than one thousand votes. A disgraceful percentage of citizens electing these important positions that have a direct result in how high property taxes are and spending taxpayer dollars on pet projects that pick and choose winners.
Definitely. National elections distract attention.
Do not need to confuse city council by putting the with state and national elections
Doesn't matter
Doesn't matter what year, just that we get some people who are not offended at every little thing and not corrupted.
Doesn't really matter
Easier for voters. Hopefully get more turnout for local elections.
Easier to get people to vote if they're already out for elections.
Easier to get people to vote on it
Easier to manage elections.
Efficient not to have separate election cycle (primary, general and run-off). Voter turnout higher if local elections held in concert with State and National elections.
Elect all at the same time to save paying for additional elections. It's hard enough to get people out to vote without adding additional elections.
Elected when the most electorate is represented.
Electing in odd years would allow more attention to be directed to council races. In a year with many state and national races, less attention would be paid to council races and probably less financial help would be made available to city races.
Elections on even years can get council members caught in the party wars for state/national elections
Elections should be held every 2 years on the same calendar as all other 2 year elections (i.e General Assembly and US House of Representatives).
Else too many elections!
Elsewhere in NC municipal elections are in odd years. This is all about partisan politics!
Even year elections are the Presidential elections which bring out more voters. I think increased turnout is a good thing.
Even year elections ensures greater voter participation than odd year year elections.
Even year elections produce greater turnout
Even year elections would provide for better voter turnout.
Even year elections would result in better voter turnout
Even years -- inline with other elections. More cost effective. Less annoying. Gives the world a break in the odd years from the election noise.
Even years could ensure a better voted response
Even years maximizes voter turnout
Even years produce a higher voter turn out, and greater perceived importance to the election.
Even years to save cost
Even years while turnout may be higher, local issues and representatives seem to get lost. New way (enhanced way/) of having local elections could be what's needed to bring voters/new voters out.
Even years will likely have more people turning out to vote.
Even years will probably allow for a bigger turn out for voting. More people will participate.
Even years with the Presidential election. Voter turnout is higher.
Even years, but non-presidential years. We don't need added expense of off-year elections but holding them in non-presidential years helps ensure local races won't be eclipsed by national issues.

Election Timing Comments

Every other municipality I am aware of in the state is on odd years
Fewer elections, please. It's hard to get off work and get to the polls and the lines are a pain.
Fewer people vote in off-year elections, thus again raising the possibility of less effective representation. Also, why pay for extra elections?
Fewer trips to the polls will increase turn-out. City Council members should be elected at the same time as the President.
Financially more responsible.
Focus on local offices, without distractions of state and national advertising/debates/news, would increase voter familiarity with the people running and issues of most importance to the communities in which we live.
Forced to pick an answer but Don't have a strong opinion on this
Go back to the odd year elections so that our council members can draw more attention to the city and its problems.
Go for the higher turn out elections
GOTV all at the same time! Save taxpayer money.
greater turn out during these years.
Greater turnout. Less expensive if we do not have to mount a separate city election.
Greater voter involvement during state and national elections
Greater voter turnout during even years
Greatest voter turn out during presidential elections
Having our elections at the same time as national and state elections gives citizens more reason to go out and vote, and therefor more citizens' voices can be captured.
Having the elections concurrent with Presidential elections supports the goal of greater voter participation. It is a sad fact that having the elections in odd years will lead to the lowest participation.
Helps with causing a perfect balance of representation
High turnouts should be important
Higher response will come by being done on presidential election years.
Hold cost down by syncing with State and National elections.
Hold the elections when more people are going to the polls.
Hold this vote when turnout is already high.
Holding council races at the same time with national and state races generates greater voter attention and participation even though they are "down-ballot" and may receive less attention than the "top-ballot" races. Because of general weak voter interest in odd numbered years, this outweighs any possible "top-ballot" advantage gained by holding races in those years.
Hopefully, holding Council Member elections at the same time as State and National elections would improve voter turn-out. It may be detrimental to voter turn-out if held as a separate election AND cost more money to do so.
I actually don't care
I believe it should be done on odd years so that the main focus is on the Mayor and Council for our city rather than who to vote for state and nationally.
I believe this helps voter turnout on every level.
I can't think of a reason to do it differently.
I could go either way, but electing them in odd years might result in closer attention to these races.
I don't get it really
I don't think it makes any difference
I don't care

Election Timing Comments

I feel there would be a better turn out for voting if it were in conjunction with state and national elections.

I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.

I have no opinion on this

I may be wrong but people have more of a tendency to vote when there are many issues/ candidates on the ballot - more hype/more enthusiasm.

I really don't care, but assume it would be easier to keep this somewhat like it is.

I recall councilfolks complaining that people didn't pay enough attention to local issues during the 2016 campaign but nobody voted in the odd-year elections. I do not think changing to odd year elections will bring more voters' attention to local issues once you account for the drop in turnout.

I suspect having elections in even years helps with greater turnout.

I think coinciding with State and National elections will result in higher voter turnout than otherwise. Obviously this would not always be the case if staggered elections or two year terms were selected, though.

I think it serves the city and the residents better to avoid presidential years. Allows more focus on candidates without being swept up in national politics

I think more people would vote.

I think odd years would be best IF staggered terms are implemented, so that each representative has a similar type of turnout. If it is not staggered, I think it is fine to keep it the same as major election years so that more people will vote. I guess odd years would be more likely to have informed voters rather than those voting by party or name alone, so that is another reason for that preference.

I think odd years would lead to decreased voter turnout.

I think that election in even years is best in order to get the maximum voter participation and turn out.

I think turnout would be terrible in odd year.

i think video mentioned cost savings

I think voter turn out would be lower if the elections did not coincide with large State and National elections. Having lived here for 5 years, I have no confidence in the City of Winston-Salem providing adequate promotion of city council elections on their own.

I think voter turnout for an odd year election would be lower...

I would keep it with the even years with our State and National elections because I think it's easier for people to get out to the elections all at once verses multiple times. I also feel that with it staying with the State and National elections their is a better turn out of voters verses if it's separated because a lot of people don't think it's as important in comparison which is completely wrong of them to think that way.

I would like them to be in the mid-term elections, so more focus can be on the city council candidates (instead of the presidential and statewide races taking up all the media/space/money. However, I don't want them in odd-year elections just because it would be costly to run elections every single year like that.

I'd rather not have to make an extra trip to the polls to vote, and I think turnout would be decreased if those elections happened off-cycle with general elections.

If council members are elected in same year as national elections, then we get better voter participation, plus it may save money since that could prevent necessity of an election in odd years.

If it is staggered, both would be used

would do their research before choosing a member instead of concentrating on the State and National nominees.

Indeed

It makes more sense to have them elected in the same years as other elections. Easier on the voters.

It will be much easier to focus on the City elections if not distracted by the State and National elections.

Election Timing Comments

It would allow for voters being better informed as the large races would not drown out local contests.
It would be nice to be able to focus on local governance instead of sweeping it into a larger election cycle
It would no doubt be more expensive for the city to hold additional elections on odd years. And as people are already out voting for the state and national elections they are more likely to vote in the city elections.
It's best to keep the election in even years, because each election will take place in a Presidential election year. This should increase voter turnout, allowing wider representation of citizens.
Just staggered
keep as is, that is when voter turnout is highest
Keep it aligned with larger races for a better, more representative voter turn-out
Keep it every four years.
Keep it the same,
Keep it the same.
Keeps the cost of elections down.
larger turnout on even years
Leave the current structure alone
Less focus on national elections if city council are elected in odd years.
Let's keep it going with the regular elections in even years.
Make term limits
Makes it easier for the voter.
May help promote greater voter participation when coupled with state/national elections.
Minimize election expense.
More exposure to Council elections without background noise of other non-municipal elections.
More people are always tend to vote during election years
More people are going to come to the bigger elections
More people are voting at that time, that is a positive.
More people go to vote during even years
More people turn out to vote when there are many candidates.
More people vote during national and state elections
More people will participate in the election of City Council Members if it happens at the same time as State and National Elections.
More people will vote if elections align with State and national.
More turnout
More turnout at the polls if there are a lot of offices being voted on at the same time, which means better representation for your ward.
More voter turnout
More voter turnout when city council elections happen during national and state elections.
More voters represented in larger elections.
More voters will participate.
More voters would be involved.
Most cost effective way
Most people don't vote in off years
Moving the elections to odd years would decrease voter turnout as many people only vote during general elections.
My favorite numbers are odd numbers.
National elections bring more people to the polls, so theoretically they will be elected by greater representation

Election Timing Comments

National/state elections bring out more voters. Maximized participation in voting improves our democracy.
No need for the expense of alternate year elections.
No opinion
No preference
No preference
no preference
No special election needed
Nobody will vote in odd years
Non presidential even years
None
None
Non-presidential even years.
Not broken so no need to change or fix.
Not everyone can just take off work to go vote, so it is more convenient for voters to have them in the same year, not to mention there would be more turnout due to the national/state election.
Odd year cycles help prevent these important elections from being lost in the glare of national elections. They would also minimize coattail effects.
Odd year elections cost more money from the tax payers.
Odd year elections may allow better focus on these elections, especially for a new candidate trying to be heard amidst a national election year.
odd year elections would decrease voter turnout abysmally, and incur extra unnecessary costs
Odd years affords more attention to the position.
Odd years allow for the candidates not to get lost on the Presidential ballot
Odd years allow voters to focus on more local issues. Even years can have so much other voting and 'noise' that local elections get lost. I realize there may be less turnout historically, however a change in our recommended process may increase voter turnout/excitement and fill like my vote may count/work a little more.
odd years to avoid straight party voting
Odd years will reduce turnout
Odd-year elections allow for more scrutiny of candidates because there is less competition for attention from state and national election politics. Most of the issues that the City Council deals with are non-partisan. It makes sense to elect the council members in a less partisan environment. If council members are elected at the same time (not in staggered terms), then odd-year elections also provide opportunities for forums where city issues are debated in an atmosphere where the attention is only on city issues.
Other elections take place during even years, which in turn could increase voter turnout.
People are less likely to show up to vote in odd years.
people turn out once I don't think you will get the voters out every year
People wont go to the polls in odd years. Keep it in even years.
Preferably in Presidential election years
Present system is best for voter turnout.
Prevents national elections from overshadowing local needs.
Put them in elections with the largest voter turn out like the ones with state and national elections
Quit wasting money holding elections when nothing else is on the ballot.
Really not sure in this one. So much focus is on presidential election that the local election gets over shadowed and voters cast votes for the local election without knowing the candidates. In off years there will probably be fewer voters, but the ones who do come out to vote will know who they are voting for.

Election Timing Comments

Repeated from #3: Council members elected in years that do not coincide with national elections will have lower turnout rates for voting, which creates inequity. All members should be elected at the same time.

Requires no extra effort by voters

Resolves a lot of confusion

Same as my comment for #2. City voters would be more interested in finding out about the candidates themselves and not just look at their party affiliation.

Save money

Saves city money

Saves time and money to have everyone on the ballot at the same time, and more people will come out to vote.

See #2

See above. Plus, I'm no expert but I'd guess there is a better overall turnout if kept on the Presidential Election. Guess some ppl are worried about trends. I really, really hope there's a question about gerrymandering coming up.

See comments for question 2.

See justification above about lower voter turnout in odd years

See response in question 3. If staggered then half would be odd and half would be even.

Should not be same time as presidential elections

Since significant money is already being spent on the elections in even years, I don't see a good reason to hold additional elections. I also feel that holding City Council elections at the same time as State and National elections would help promote voter turnout. Having extra elections in odd years seems pointless and unnecessarily expensive.

Six of one, half a dozen of the other. More people vote in even years, but that doesn't mean they make more informed choices about local elections. The main problem with local elections is the near-total lack of information about the candidates' positions. You can go to their websites and read the local paper but still have really no idea, because it's all vague pablum.

So much focus is done on the state and national elections. I think people get overwhelmed and the local election is like an afterthought.

So residents can focus on local elections and not try to do at the same time as federal elections.

So we will have more people voting . . .

Some patterns best remain the same for the sake of the larger cycle of normal voting patterns in older generations

Term limits!!!

The City is best served by having a large turnout for elections, and that will occur at the same time as State and National elections. Plus, there is no need to incur the extra expense for off-cycle elections that will not draw as many voters.

The current means is more than adequate and the public is accustomed to it.

The largest representation of the electorate is valuable in establishing that subsequent decision are valid.

The other towns in Forsyth County hold their elections in odd years, so then it would be consistent. Also, the city council races are overshadowed by the presidential race.

The turnout in odd years is not representative enough for a fair election

these are the elections with the greatest overall turnout and therefore greatest participation of citizens

They should be elected at the same time as state and US congressional delegates. So as to garner more votes, in general.

they should be elected without the national and state noise.

This allows for more spotlight on the city council vote.

This gives people an opportunity to pay more attention to the elections of their local legislators.

Election Timing Comments

This gives us more time to focus on city council and not let it be obscured by other elections
This insures that council members are elected when there is the best turnout of voters.
This saves taxpayer dollars and there is more voter turnout during State and National elections.
This system seems to work well because citizens are in the voting mindset.
This was a much harder choice, and I'm less sure of my decision. If we move to having any at-large seats (which I do not want to do), I think we should definitely move to odd years so that the local elections can get the attention they need. If things remain as they are I have a slight preference for moving things to odd years, but it's only very, very slight.
This will cause everyone to vote. Most folks tire of voting every year.
This will encourage voter turnout
This will focus on the individual. It makes it less likely someone gets a vote because a name is on the ballot.
This would be more cost effective in my opinion.
this would increase voter participation
To draw more voters
Too many contests on the ballot discourages people from thinking critically about their choices and makes them just vote for party. It should be in odd years where there are less people on the ballot.
Too many elections discourages turnout
Traditionally, it was held in the odd years like other states. Which made it easier than voting at the same time as we vote for the US President.
Turn out will be better and that is good for getting council members that more folks would like to see represent them.
Turning out for elections is hard, let's Kermit simple.
Turn-out for voting is bad enough. Odd-year elections would get even lower turn-out.
Turnout is better in even years
Turnout is far higher in even years. The more citizens who vote in local elections, the better.
Turnout is low enough as it is. Keep elections tied to presidential and midterm elections.
Turnout will be better.
Unfortunately there is larger turnout in even years. Would prefer odd years but the turnout is lower in these years.
Unfortunately voting for City Council isn't going to get many folks out to the polls in non State and National election years.
Voter interest and participation will be greater in even years.
Voter turn out is higher during even-numbered years. If the interest is in increasing the accurate representation of citizens wishes, the election should strive to reach as many voters as possible.
Voter turn out needs to remain high for council member elections.
Voter turnout is always higher during State and National elections than purely local elections. If the goal is to have the largest voice possible in elections then it should coincide with those elections. If you are trying to limit voter input then by all means separate them.
Voter turnout is consistently higher in the presidential election year than off years.
Voter turnout is low as it is in even years. In odd numbers it's abysmal. Municipal races should be given as much visibility and importance as major state and federal elections. Additionally, executing elections in off years substantially increases the cost. There are economies of scales and synergies with even year elections only.
Voter turnout seems low. It would likely be even lower if there was no other vote happening.
Voter turnout will be highest during even years, as people will be drawn to the polls for higher-profile races.
Voter turnout would be greater in even years because of other elections.

Election Timing Comments

Voter turnout would probably be greater in even years.
Voters would pay more attention to candidates and their qualifications
We don't need added expense of odd year elections
We have to maximize voter turnout. Let's keep things easy.
We need more voter turnout, not less!
we should do state and national on even years, local in odd
We should take advantage of the existing election times to increase voter turnout.
While there are efficiencies to be gained from even year elections, odd year elections would minimize state/national partisan influences in our local elections.
Why are we even talking about this?
Why change?!?
Winston-Salem should be treated like all other municipalities in the state and have odd year elections. This means residents can focus on local issues without distraction from national issues.
With all elections happening at the same time, it is very hard to find enough information on candidates. Local issues can be better addressed if they are not taking second place to the state and national spotlight.
With the president when most people vote
W-S's City Council used to be elected in odd years, which worked just fine. The GOP (i.e. largely Dale Folwell) put an end to that, shortening the term by a year when that occurred. It is better to devote more attention to local elections to have them in odd years.
Yeah
Yes on the odd years, more emphasis on local government vs. overshadowed by the national & state elections.
Yes, its to many elections at once, and confuses people.
Yes, regardless of if we choose staggered or simultaneous terms. Detaching city council elections from the partisan circus that is national elections could mean more thoughtful voting and a more stable, consensus-friendly council.
Yes, the odd years would place more attention to the local races, which in my opinion are more important than the national races because local politics directly affects local citizens.
Yes, turnout will always be better and more democratic when national and state officials are on the ballot. 11% of the population or less, which occurs in off=year elections, does not support democracy
You want people to vote, make it easy. If people literally have to vote EVERY year, it won't happen. People barley vote during midterms. This is more of an incentive TO vote especially when it will affect you for two years.
You will have better response from the public if you hold local elections to happen same time National elections occur, better voter turn out.
You've got 136 responses to this, you'll have the same for voter turnout if you go with odd years.

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

A City Council member's political leanings and stances should be clear and transparent.
A person's party affiliation drives their policy making decisions.
A voter has the right to "know"...
ABSOLUTELY NON-PARTISAN!!! Local political affiliation should NOT be part of running a city. Eliminate association with State and National political parties. It creates animosity among the Council Members and the people of the city. It is difficult enough to bring together many people of many back grounds, religions, beliefs, ideals without throwing in political party affiliation.
Affiliation is important and helps identify those who will support my views.
After trump, GOP is cancelled. However, i still believe political affiliation should be listed. I want to know as much as I can about a candidate before casting my vote.
Although political affiliation is divisive most people don't try to know about who they are voting for
As an independent I would like to vote for whomever I think is most effective
As much as I wish it were not so, many voters vote the Party not the Person. I do not think having non-partisan elections for council members would change this. And changing it just for the sake of changing it, is wasteful, imo.
At the city government level, I think the party affiliation is less relevant to people. These are our neighbors and we have more of a shared experience and interest that is greater than a national political party. Non-partisan elections allow us to vote for a person based on their attributes and not those of the party.
Better to move to non-partisan elections
Both political party candidates and Independent candidates should be allowed to stand for election on the same ballot. If someone is affiliated with a political party they should be required to reveal that fact.
By nature, the city council are very much political posts, unlike judges. Of course they should have political affiliations attached.
Citizens have a right to know as much as feasible about political candidates for any elected office.
City council and county commissioners represent all people within their electoral area and we all pay taxes. I don't think it should be partisan.
City Council and school board should be non-partisan.
City council elections will be partisan regardless of whether or not affiliations are listed. Prefer to keep affiliations on the ballot but would appreciate ways for independent candidates to have a better chance
City council should be city partisan not political party
City Council should be working together for their community and not for their party.
city-based issues should be for the benefit of the entire community, not a political party
Complete backstory with voting history, and political affiliations, issues questioniarre should be provided with each candidate at election time.
Council members should be focused on the needs of their districts and the city not politics.
THIS IS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE THAT SHOULD BE MADE.
Council members' votes and decisions are carried out on a partisan basis, so voters should know how their representative is likely to vote on partisan issues.
Don't be stupid - they are partisan even if it's not on the ballot. It's more transparent if they're up front about their affiliation.
Either way is fine.
Elections should remain partisan to reduce the ability of candidates presenting false images of their intent. Partisan labels tell the voters whether the candidate is 99% focused or 1% focused.
Even if party affiliation were not noted, community members would probably know if someone is affiliated with a specific party. Candidates can benefit from funding by a party as they put their views forward prior to an election, making the seats accessible to less wealthy candidates.

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

Even though a lot of people vote straight party tickets, it will be better that the person political affiliation is not shown. It will make the voter do the research and the we will have stronger campaigning. People have gotten to comfortable.

Everyone always has a political affiliation one way or the other, so why hide it? Each party has a platform and those who belong to one party or another should be honest about it. Voters want to know this. As a voter, I want to know. Thus, it should be with the political affiliation on the ballot.

Everyone needs to know how that person will vote.

Everyone running for an office has a political philosophy, therefore, all elections should be partisan elections. The parties should have the right to choose their candidate in a primary election that will then run against candidates of the other party or parties in a General Election.

Excess partisanship has become toxic on all levels.

For local elections here, I don't think identification of candidates with political parties should matter. I would be voting on the person based on their positions and approach to local issues, not which party they are in.

Given the current difficult partisan divide in the country, non-partisan races may allow more focus in issues.

Gives an indication of philosophy of governance.

Gives you some idea of their stand on government and how to run it.

Going non-partisan has a feel good aspect; although, I am skeptical the change would actually accomplish much.

Has long as our nation has a party system, then our elections will be partisan. People will determine the party affiliation if it is not on the ballot. That is why there is a primary to elect the party's representative. I strongly believe that unaffiliated voters should not be allowed to vote for a party's representative in the primary.

Having a non-partisan election would allow for more qualified candidates to campaign for longer and give new citizens a chance to run for a Council seat. Our Council has ben historically very specific with which wards are democratic or republican, and stereotypes can often stopped positive change from happening in the future.

Having local party support is helpful to candidates.

Having R or D could be limiting to those who run independent

Helps clarify positions

How would I be able to investigate a candidate's political views , if I cant start w/ party affiliation? Should I just believe a candidate's verbal prepared responses? You need to have a track record.

I actually wish we didn't have labels but perhaps that is the only way to understand officials guiding principles. However affiliation is not a win all designation to know how a persons views affect their decision making.

I am a little torn on this one, but I appreciate the idea of a city council is detached from partisan politics.

I am excited to see this country begin to move away from partisan-importance. The Democrat and Republican parties have grown even MORE corrupt lately so Indep's might have a better chance on a non-partisan ballot

I am not a strong lean one way or the other on this.

I and most of my community want to know what their affiliation is.

I believe that the issues facing Winston-Salem are different from the issues being dealt with on a state and national level. Listing political affiliation may cause voters to look at their positions on state and national issues when choosing which city council members to vote for. However, I feel that the only relevant issue should be the candidates' position on local matters, which they can explain while campaigning.

I believe the public's best interest is served when info is provided including part affiliation.

I can go either way. Both have their pros/cons

I definitely want to know the political affiliation as it can tell me a lot about the person's priorities. Please keep the political affiliation on the ballot!

I don't think non-partisan elections really exist. Voters will research party affiliation if it's not on the ballot.

I don't want more a\$\$hat Republicans in government so I'd like to know exactly who they are.

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

I don't have a real preference here,
I don't have a strong opinion on this, but I do think ideally it would be non-partisan
I don't see it being a problem keeping it as a partisan ballot. We all should feel proud of what we stand for but by keeping it a partisan ballot it can help people decipher who is who on the ballots.
I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.
I have always felt/wished that local election issues/needs is not/should not be partisan. As our state and national elections get uglier and uglier each election, it's more important we have local be non-partisan. Local issues are not/should be partisan.
I like to know the party affiliation...it helps me determine if the candidate is of like mind.
I need to know a persons basic philosophy in addition to their stand on particular issues. When I elect them, I need to know how they may vote with future issues as well. I think this is very, very important. I would be very disappointed if this was changed.
I picked non partisan because in each ward we have a combination of people : Democrat, Republican, Independent, etc who all have different views. When the Council man or woman does something for his or her particular ward, they general do it for everybody in that community, not just different political groups.
I prefer when local elections are based purely on merit and specific goals rather than party affiliation- it requires voters to learn about the issues and the candidates rather than just voting for their party member
I refuse to vote for anyone unless I know their party affiliation. It is foolish to think otherwise.
I see no benefit to these positions being partisan. Without the labels, the electorate would have to actually listen and understand candidates platforms and qualifications.
i see pluses and minuses on both sides.
I support as many non-partisan elections as possible! I would also support non-partisan judicial and school board elections.
I think all elections should be done on a non-partisan basis.
I think deemphasizing party labels would make reaching consensus and/or compromise easier, which assures better outcomes.
I think party affiliation helps the voter make an informed decision.
I think party is less relevant at the local level and as such shouldn't be used to sway a voters opinion
I think that having some with an affiliation can help people to vote for a member but having independent people added to that will allow for people who don't affiliate to pick a person based off their words/beliefs
I think that we have had enough of partisan politics on the national level. I feel this sentiment also filters down into our local elections as well. Party affiliation is important i think though in some level of transparency in government.
I think that with an increasing number of independent voters, that we need to move towards a platform that allows us to debate local issues and not be burdened with a political affiliation. The current political parties have become so polarized that many people are not voting for a candidate and the skill set they bring to our local community. While having a bipartisan election will not eliminate people knowing what party a candidate is affiliated with, it would steer us back towards discussion of the issues our community face.
I think this information helps less informed voters
I understand good/not so good of each one. Can go either way.
I used to think party didn't matter in local governance. But lately, I'm suspicious and want to know party affiliation and allegiance. It drives some of their opinions and behaviors and informs their source of campaign financing.
I want more independents to run
I want to know party affiliation.

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

I want to know what party a candidate is.
I want to know who my councilman/woman is... Do they represent the political party platform I support or are they out for their own good??
I would hope that all those running would have the needs of the city as their purpose in running.
I would like to know the political affiliation of the person I am voting for.
I would like to see less partisanship in general. Don't really know if it would work in city government.
I would love to believe that not having the party printed on the ballot would make the elections truly non-partisan, but it won't. It will only make it harder for voters to know with which party each Council member is associated.
I'd love to answer differently, but partisan elections brings with it a ton of support candidates might not get otherwise and makes it too difficult for many voters to make an informed decision at the polls.
If it ain't broke, don't fix it.
If the member is no-partisan then there would be better representation as that person would be thinking how to represent everyone and not just those that are the same party as that person. I realize that this may happen now but the fact is that most are looking at the party and how the party members can help them in the future.
I'm not strongly for having the elections partisan and could be persuaded to make them non-partisan.
I'm really neutral on this - most people know the party affiliations of non-partisan candidates.
In the south ward there is no republican candidate. The race will be decided with the democratic primary. The Republican and unaffiliated members of our ward have no voice in who their representative is.
In theory, non-partisan elections should make people pay more attention to the issues a candidate stands for. In practice, I know too many people who will mark the first name on the ballot if there's no party affiliation.
In this political climate, the more transparency the better.
Independent voter but would still want to know the candidates general viewpoints beforehand
It appears that our political parties have a problem! We need more work done and less bickering and accusation on who did what right and who did what wrong!
It does not make sense, not does it reflect the diverse social and cultural nature of the Winston Salem community to divide our city by voter delimitation that is best reserves for larger political stages
It is critical for voters to learn the underlying philosophy of those serving on the city council.
It is difficult for the average voter to know where a candidate stands on issues without doing a great deal of research, and not everyone would be willing to do so. Having a partisan election gives the voter at least a baseline indication of the candidate's views.
It is good to know who is who.
It is helpful to voters to have an understanding of the likely policies based on party affiliation.
It is insane to me that this is partisan. Representing your city is not a partisan issue - your job is to make WSNC a better place not politic around.
It is often difficult to parse a candidates stance on issues from boilerplate campaign language. Party affiliation communicates to voters a partial picture
It only make since
It should be about the person, not the party.
It will be a decision point for most people regardless.
It will help establishing the candidate's basic positions.
It would wind up being de facto partisan anyway, once the candidates' positions are known.
It's easy for someone to look up a candidate's affiliation if that's all they are interested in. I'm more interested in the candidate than his/her party.
It's relevant, for better or worse...

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

It's fair to know what party they lean towards, and allow for a diverse city council.
Keep it open and transparent.
Keep politics out of the cities well being
Knowing a candidates political viewpoint is VERY important to me and all of my personal friends
Knowing a person's political affiliation gives me a sense of how they might vote on issues affecting environment, education, etc.
Less bickering with non-partisan.
Local issues are not party issues they are WS issues
Local issues are or should be less party-driven
Make term limits
Many citizens still believe in being loyal to party versus really trying to understand the platform from those in another party that are running for office. I support non-partisan ballots which will open the door for citizens to really take note of the candidates running for office.
Mayor too
More straightforward this way.
More transparency. It's politics. Political leanings almost always influence policy.
National and State partisan politics needs to be avoided
National politics shouldn't have direct influence on city politics
Need more information
Need to elect based on what they can do for the citizens, not the Party..
Need to get away from labels and segregation based on parties, it should be the integrity of the potential council member.
need to see a balance in the council to prevent extreme policies from being enacted.
No problem with partisan election. Elected officials must remember that post the election, they represent the collective voice of the residents of their ward.
No reason to hide it
No strong feeling about this
Non partisan isnt good. Too many voters will be confused.
NON PARTISAN YES I AM YELLING
None
Non-partisan elections are never really non-partisan; candidates state their party affiliation.
Non-partisan elections help to remove/relieve issue that are Party-related, and provide focus on the issues that are resident-related.
Non-partisan elections make sense in an ideal world, but I don't see a big problem with the way things currently work.
Non-Partisan never seems to be non-partisan no matter how its proponents try to make it seem.
On the local level-there's not a political agenda being pushed (as much). Or at least it shouldn't be.
Only so that we can all see where the voices are being heard from, to help better our society evenly & and a more personal opinion basis.
Our world could use a big dose of non-partisan.
Partisan affiliation is useful information for voters to consider.
Partisan differences are wide and deep. Voters have a right to know the platforms and policies represented
Partisan elections allow for the voters to get some idea of the persons values, ideals, tendencies. Of course this is a very broad statement, it is still up to the individual to provide their background and what they believe in.

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

Partisan elections are definitely necessary they help people organize policy positions and sometimes reduce the fact that people do not have the time to research and follow all elections. Partisan issues are integral to city government. Ie. Sanctuary cities

Partisan elections should not be part of municipal elections.

Partisan is preferred, IF they'll all work together as a one team on behalf of one city, and put party stubbornness behind them when it comes to local matters.

Partisan labels and primaries help winnow the field to the strongest candidates before the general election.

Partisan politics is destroying Raleigh and DC we don't need the same problems in local government.

Partisan vs Nonpartisan doesn't change anything as far as governance methods, thus I feel it would be disingenuous to move to non-partisan and deprive the voter of information regarding their choices on the ballot.

Partisanship should have no role in local government.

Party affiliation helps voters know who and what they are voting for.

Party affiliation is a major factor that helps a voter choose one candidate over another.

Party affiliation should be disclosed

Party bias is tearing our country apart, let's keep it out of our city!

Party loyalty is an issue that needs to be addressed by removing identification on ballots.

Party matters to most people. If not, they wouldn't register as Democrat or Republican.

Party shouldn't matter if the council member truly has the best interest of the city in mind

People often don't know much about the candidates and just want to vote for their party

People should know what political affiliation a candidate represents.

Please disregard the field I selected, neither answer is appropriate or valid if It's entirely applicable. The wording is unclear here, are all parties eligible? Are all parties listed? Or our third parties listed as independent? Local councils should be non-partisan, But if a person is partisan then that should be listed next to their name

Please keep the party affiliation on the ballot. WE NEED TO KNOW.

Political affiliation gives an idea of basic beliefs regarding how government should be carried out.

Political affiliation gives more information about those running for office.

Political affiliation gives the voter a idea what that person stands for.

Political affiliation with a largely 2-party system is archaic.

Political campaigning and voting are always partisan whether or not political affiliation is stated on the ballot.

Prefer to know part affiliation if any as can identify overall idea of governance.

Provides a reasonable way to have initial screening of candidates

Really? Let's be honest, most voters have zero clue who most of you are or what you stand for or what you do. You do zero true, legit outreach to ppl. Take away those D's and R's, ppl will have no clue how to vote.

Seems like a good time for ALL elections to be non partisan

Should be in best interest of citizens of the community, not political party

So we can have a more honest representation of the views of the persons for whom we are voting . . .

So we know their political stance, affiliation is important

some folks will vote along party lines, not much you can really do about that. so why even try to subdue that information, just be open about it.

Sometimes the only thing a voter knows about a candidate is his/her party affiliation. While maybe not enough information, it does give an idea of perspective and values..

Speaks to ones character.

That would be nice, but good luck on this one...

The best city decisions are not based on partisan opinions.

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

The city & newspaper does a terrible job of giving voters info about the candidates, so knowing the political affiliation helps, when the voter has no info about the candidate
The council should be making locally oriented decisions and not let partisan issues contaminate our city's needs; the number of UNA is the 2nd highest party in the area. Getting independents on the ballot presently means getting a lot of signatures where as those in a registered party only requires paying a \$5 filing fee. Very unfair
The partisan ballots are an issue and don't allow people who could run to even have a chance
The partisan system is obviously dividing our nation and city. Let's try elections without partisanship at the city level and show the world that we can rise above party politics and elect people that are beholden only to their conscience, wisdom, and the voters.
The party of the candidates should be known to the electorate.
They can be unaffiliated if they choose.
They should be elected based on their qualifications not their political affiliation.
They should be non-partisan, however, in this day and age, we need to know where they stand. Party is an indicator.
They should be nonpartisan. Working for the people.
They should be serving their community and the city as a whole, not a political party
This at least let's us have an idea of how each candidate sees the world.
this give independent voters a voice
This might force people to actually study the candidates positions on issues.
this provides more info for voters
This should prevent down the ticket voting and would force voters to consider policy and not just stick to partisan lines. Non-partisan elections would also allow more independents to run.
This will give us a basic understanding of their way of thinking.
This would keep voters focussed on the issues, which at the city level are for the most part not tied to national party ideologies.
Though I prefer non-partisan elections, those are really more appropriate for judicial seats.
To allow all to have access to the job
To be honest I don't really care either way
Too many people vote straight ticket and our culture is so divided politically. Having just names would mean that (in theory) more people will have to get informed before showing up to vote and would not have as much partisanship built in. Hopefully, city council members are more less likely to be politically entrenched and more likely to work toward compromise for what's best for the city anyway.
Too much weight is given to party identity.
unfortunately with current climate, i don't trust NOT having political affiliation listed
Vote on the issues not the party.
Voters don't always have time to research every candidate ahead of the election. However, party affiliation generally ties very closely with an individual's political position, so 'hiding' that information is likely only being suggested to confuse voters.
Voters have little time (or inclination) to study policy statements from all candidates. And, unfortunately, such statements tend to be intentionally obtuse (i.e. double-speak). Party affiliation is a more obvious indication of a candidate's approach to government.
Voters have the right to assess a candidate's overall political philosophy.
Voters have the right to know party affiliation.
Voters need as much information about candidates as possible. Why hide their affiliations?

Partisan Versus Non-Partisan Elections Comments

Voters seem to focus on which party a particular candidate is associated with instead of what each candidate stands for. Non partisan elections would force voters to learn about each candidate instead of simply checking a box

Voters should know the political affiliation of their elected officials to know that they will truly be fully represented.

voters should know what they're getting on the front end

Voters should know which political party each candidate aligns with. This affiliation gives voters information they need to elect a council that is balanced and diverse.

Voters will be made to do more research about candidates instead of voting blindly for particular parties.

We all know that Council reps have a party affiliation (Dem, Rep, Ind). Cut the crap. Don't confuse people by making it appear to be "non-partisan"

we are a democratic society -- not broken no need to fix.

We have seen what partisan basis can do by the recent impeachment.

We know them anyway

We like to know

We need to highlight each person's character, policy positions, and applicable experience without hindrance from preconceived ideas about political parties.

We need to put an end to this cult mentality

We need to start bridging the gap's between our two primary parties. Ignoring them is one way to do it.

What possible benefit could there be in not knowing the political affiliation? Let's err on the side of more information, not less. It's already hard enough to know what they stand for.

When politicians can be trusted to tell the truth and not say whatever will get them elected, then maybe, I would agree with non-partisan elections. Until then, I want to know party affiliations.

Whether the political affiliation is on the ballot or not, most voters will know and candidates will make their affiliation known.

While I believe candidates should be able to stand on the strength of their platforms - and not the label next to their name on the ballot - unless we had a ranked choice system, I don't think this would be very representative.

While partisan affiliations provide a baseline of ideology, it creates a more polarized voting option, leaving many moderates and independents with no realistic choice. Non-partisan elections would open the field to more middle-of-the-road candidates.

Why

Why in the world would we want to drop party affiliation. More that ever in my life time political parties are so different. Also we would be the same as state and national elections.

why should partisan politics enter in such a small scale where people need to work together?

Will be better for the city with no party affiliations

Winston-Salem is a big enough city that the Council is making big policy decisions, which is when party matters. Party gives you an idea of their governing philosophy.

With such awful and hateful division right now I think anything we can do to allow candidates to be heard on their own merit without having to drag a party affiliation with them could be refreshing.

Yeah

Yes, I believe party lines screw up everything.

Yes, the political affiliations MUST be on the ballot. Given what is happening with the Trumpettes and the koolaid they are drinking, a republican representative is ONLY going to support WHITE citizens and to heck with everyone else (Even though Trump's policies affect all people, even the poorest of the white supporters.

Yes, they should have to identify themselves not only politically but socially.

Mayoral Voting Comments

Accountability

All at-large powers dilute the interests of smaller units of power (neighborhoods, wards, minority populations). I can see no advantage to this and therefore no reason to expand the mayor's power.

Allow the mayor to stay out of the fray of political conflicts. The mayor spends more time with more affluent citizens, the rest of us may not feel that he has our best interests in mind as he makes decisions.

Allows for fairness

As long as the council has an even number, there is no need for the mayor to vote.

As Mayor and being elected, that position should be able to vote just as a Member is/has.

As the head of the City Council, vote only as a tie breaker. That way the Mayor can remain neutral until needed.

Based on my previous answers, the Mayor should be one of the only city-wide elected positions.

Can support either option in conjunction with number of council elected at-large.

Change

City council members are elected to make decisions on items before them. The Mayor should only vote when there is a tie.

Could go either way on this one: would have to hear arguments.

Current system works well

Currently the mayor is the only person who represents the whole city. He should have more power. If we have at-large representation I still think he should but less strongly, since others will be representing the city.

Easier to know where mayor stands on issues.

Feel strongly about this. Having the Mayor vote on all items allows for citizens to know the position of the Mayor on a particular topic, item or subject. Otherwise citizens do not know unless there is a tie

Having the mayor take a stand on issues facing the people he or she represents just makes sense.

Having the mayor vote allows for someone to be on the council that has the whole cities ideas at heart and wouldn't make too much of a difference either way

He or she should have representation on matters being elected from all citizens of Winston Salem.

He should be doing other things

He/She is the elected mayor

He/She is the mayor We the people elect him He should be voting on all items. I also hold him accountable for being that balance looking across the city -- not just specific wards.

Hopefully the council will be able to reach consensus on most items. The mayor needs to remain above the fray, so as to provide leadership for the whole city. The mayor's ability to break a tie would promote discussion and consensus among council members who would probably prefer not to have the need for tie-breaking.

I am confident that Mayor Joines and any successors would be good at voting on all items before the council.

I am intrigued by the notion that an at-large voting mayor gives a district-based city council one vote that is always for the city as a whole. However, Mayor Joines is such a good representative of Winston-Salem, I fear his ability to continue his good work could be damaged if he has to vote on contentious issues.

I am unsure. The fact that our mayor has been in office so long and has such business and political hold on the city makes me hesitant about voting power. If term limits were implemented I would possibly be okay with a voting mayor.

I can see the benefits of both.

I do not have a strong opinion about this item. I do think the City Council should decide.

I do not know the advantages of the two options

I don't feel strongly one way or the other.

I don't like a figure-head mayor

Mayoral Voting Comments

I feel that it is best for the Mayor to focus on promoting harmony and discussion with an eye on what is best for the city. Having the Mayor take a stand on all issues could decrease their ability to promote harmony. With his or her focus on the entire city of Winston-Salem, the Mayor should have influence on what decisions are made. However, I feel that the position of Mayor and the ability to work closely with City Council members and discuss important issues with them, while also contributing to public discussions already provides adequate opportunity to influence policy in a way that benefits the City.

I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.

I just don't think it should change

I like that the Mayor can break ties as needed, and yet remain largely above the political fray. I believe that is the most effective structure.

i like the idea of keeping mayoral office "above the fray"

I like the idea of the Mayor providing at-large representation for the city without growing the Council through at-large members.

I think it could be helpful to have one person representing the city as a whole vote on all action items.

I think it's important to allow the Mayor to only vote in a tie since they are supposed to stay neutral and represent everyone and not just side with a specific ward or political affiliation.

i think the Mayor should be allowed to vote every time on all issues, he is currently the only at large member.

I think the mayor should have more power.

I think the precedent should stand.

I understand that breaking a tie may put the mayor in an "uncomfortable" position, but this responsibility goes with the territory. This process is necessary for an even number of Council member to avoid grid lock and advance city business..

I would prefer that the mayor not be involved at all in Council business. Our current mayor is President of the Winston Salem Alliance, which is the big-organization creme of the Chamber of Commerce, for which he is compensated at such an amount that he donates his mayoral salary like it were small change. As such, I am not comfortable having a person who is essentially the lobbyist for the 500-lb gorillas behind the scenes in town. But people keep voting for him, since 2001, so we're stuck with him.

I would prefer to have the mayor kept apart from controversial issues.

If the council members have reached a majority, the mayor's vote is meaningless to the process.

If the mayor gets to vote on all items then the mayor has more power and higher chance of getting what the mayor wants.

If the mayor routinely voted he/she might unduly affect the way some council members vote. To my having the mayor act as a tiebreaker works bests.

If the mayor votes on all items then he/she is not put in a position where people are angry because the major did not vote the way they wanted him/her too. He/she would have a better opportunity to decided the facts better if he votes as everyone else does and not have to vote because someone is pressuring him/her to break a tie the way they want it. Not saying that may not happen anyway but hopefully less of a chance of that happening. (I hope)

If the mayor votes, it would pressure members of his cabinet to vote along with him. Maybe he could vote as long as he votes last.

If there are no other at-large representatives, I would favor giving the mayor a voter on all items.

If they Mayor is still elected at-large, his vote would be more in line with the vast majority of people who put him there and the special interests of certain council would be not as strong

In no way should power be more centralized on a local level, the brevity and indecision of bureaucracy is the only saving grace against absolute tyranny

Mayoral Voting Comments

In order to preserve the salience of the office of the mayor the mayor should only break ties. To keep them as impartial as possible.
In the current structure, this works fine, but in my ideal layout of four wards and four at large would give us the kind of involvement we should have.
Indicates his/her philosophy of governance.
Isn't it nice to know where the mayor stands esp. on votes that impact city as a whole?
It is not necessary for the Mayor to vote unless there is a tie.
It is pointless to have a mayor without a vote.
It seems to work fine as it is.
It should not be necessary for the Mayor to vote unless there is a tie
It would be another person looking out for the good of the city overall. I don't have a strong preference here, IF at large members are added.
It's important to know where the mayor stands on all issues.
Keep it the same.
Keep it the same. The City Council needs to make sure they are voting on what is best for the city.
Keep the Mayor above the fray, so they are better able to interact with all parties, and maintain fairness is meetings
Keeping the mayor's influence nonpartisan in a vote seems important.
Keeps the voice of the council as elected officials relevant and holds each member accountable to their individual wards.
Let the council members do their job. The Mayor should only break a tie when they can't agree on a majority vote.
Let the Mayor lead the Council well enough that his vote is not needed.
Let's you know where the mayor stands on issues.
Make term limits
make the mayor accountable
Making a deciding vote is important.
Mayor has too much power with not enough accountability
Mayor is the leard and sets the tone for our city. Mayors need to vote.
Mayor should be separate from City Council on this
Mayor should focus on administration of the city
Mayor should steer the council, not influence it.
Mayors have their own political agendas, their own groups they want to please in order to be re-elected. His power does not need to be extended. If he is that wise, why have a city council?
Mayors should be able to vote on all issues, but should take a more magisterial approach, a la the Speaker of the USHR, and generally refrain from routinely voting.
More likely to provide impartial leadership
Need to know how mayor stands on issues
No need. Don't fix what ain't broke.☒
No reason to change it
No strong feeling about this
no super majority.
No, the mayor should not have that much power relative to an individual city council member.
None

Mayoral Voting Comments

Not having to pick sides is important for a mayor who is supposed to represent the entire city and carries out duties that council members do not. Important to have someone with a non-partisan stance presiding over meetings

Otherwise what does he do besides ribbon cutting?

Our system works just fine. Cease and desist trying to make changes, which is nothing more than a power grab.

Permits the Mayor to be seen as more neutral.

Play fair.

Requiring the Mayor to vote on every action item will only serve to slow down the process.

Satisfied w/ this

See #4.

See #5.

see no reason to change

Self explanatory

Since the Mayor is the official head of city government he or she should be weighing in on all matters that are brought to a vote.

Since the Mayor represents all the people, I think he should vote on all items.

So power doesnt get abused.

Some needs to break the tied. Let it be the Mayor.

That is how we are already doing it, and there is no need for him to vote unless there is a tie - if not a tie, it takes a majority of the Council to pass a measure. If there is a majority his vote is not needed.

That's what I believe, the more input from people, the better.

That's why there's one mayor, and several city council members.

The broader perspective that the Mayor currently provides becomes even more important if there are no other 'at large' members. That global perspective is an important factor in any city-wide decision.

The current mayor gets the benefit of the illusion of serving all needs, with very little record of how he would truly lead. Make him a voter, like a chairman of a board. 5 ward, 3 at large, 1 mayor = 9 votes that represent the city with the least dependency.

The current system works well now. Why change it?

The Mayor can n

The mayor does not need to vote on every issue.

The mayor doesn't represent a ward therefore he/she shouldn't have a voice in the wards affairs unless there is a tie

The Mayor duties are to only vote to break a tie

The mayor has the longevity needed to provide continuity.

The mayor is a citizen too

The mayor is a position which should not regularly vote as a board member.

The mayor is a tie-breaker when essential. He serves the entire city, He should encourage the council to work to achieve consensus.

The Mayor is currently the only elected official voted on by all of Council, and he should cast his vote on every decision so that all citizens feel that have multiple voices to speak for them. Currently, the Mayor has very little "power," as he runs the Council meetings, and breaks on the sporadic times where there is a tie on an item. Seeing as he has been voted by the entire City, it makes sense that he would vote for all items.

The mayor is elected by everyone- we should know where he stands on all issues

The mayor is everyone's mayor, needs to maintain neutrality as much as possible.

The mayor is the leader and the leader should vote so we know what his stances are

Mayoral Voting Comments

The Mayor must vote on every issue. Otherwise the elected Mayor cannot be held accountable at election time. If the Mayor does not vote, why elect one? Just use a meeting facilitator.

The Mayor needs to be accountable for all actions before the Council.

The mayor needs to focus upon breaking ties rather than affiliating himself with partisan issues.

The Mayor represents all of the people. Only voting to break a tie helps maintain that.

The mayor represents all of us and is paid to do so. It makes sense for that person to have vote voice.

The Mayor represents all the people; she/he represents the City as a whole. If her/his City Council is tied, this person should vote to break that tie. Otherwise, no vote.

The Mayor should act as an executive, normally acting to enforce the will of the legislative council. Therefore, a limited legislative role is necessary.

The Mayor should Always vote!

The mayor should avoid taking a stance on issues brought to the council unless it is necessary.

The Mayor should be able to vote on all matters rather than being simply a ceremonial chair and tie breaker.

The mayor should be involved in discussion but not vote on all items. Let the council do their work!!

The mayor should be neutral on votes. This eliminates an unfair advantage as the mayor is partisan

The mayor should be permitted to take a stand on all matters as he is the elected leader of our community.

The Mayor should be responsive to all city affairs but doesn't need to be involved in voting on all action items.

The mayor should guide the council, make sure it follows the rules, does the correct procedures. They should be more like a judge, the council members are the jury. I don't want the major forming a voting block and ruling like a king.

The Mayor should have a voice.

The mayor should have a vote on all items. It will show where his heart and mind are other than in Innovation Quarter development and Whitaker Park development; all advantageous to the white population in Winston-Salem.

The Mayor should have the option to vote on all items before the City Council, but should not be required.

The mayor should have the same voting rights as Council members. Otherwise he/she has no say on issues of citywide importance unless there is a tie.

The Mayor should only vote to break a tie so he doesn't get bogged down in every issue. His vote to break a tie would carry more weight as a deciding vote

The mayor should stay above the fray and be allowed to hold the larger picture up. Requiring the mayor to have a position and vote can cause undue influence and a power struggle.

The mayor should vote so we can hold each elected person accountable.

The Mayor should vote. Not just be a figure head.

The mayor shouldn't be tied up by all the decisions of the council, as hopefully civic engagement will increase as the Cory government becomes more technologically adept and implement new strategies of civic engagement on social platforms. The mayor should represent the cultural needs of the city, and spend time in office on understanding the needs of the city and representing that as a figure head and leader in many facets, but micromanaging the council need not be one of them

The mayor shouldn't waste time or resources justifying voting on too many low-priority issues. Leave him to tie-break

The mayor will represent "the city" and provide balance to the council. His or her influence within the council will be increased.

The Mayor's role should be to provide leadership in the voting process and only vote when there is a tie.

The people should know what the mayor stands for on issues in the city

The position is as a tie breaker if needed. Leave it.

Mayoral Voting Comments

The process seems to be working well.
The system is not broken. Leave it alone.
The tie breaking vote allows the mayor to stay in a roll of collaboration as much as possible. Once the mayor votes on all issues, the votes will be increasingly polarized.
The traditional mayoral system that winston salem has in place is perfect, based on the size of the city.
There would be no point in having a city council of the mayor could override every decision made
Therefore, presumably, no ties.
This allows the mayor to lead by serving as the chief collaboration officer.He/she only votes if collaboration cannot be achieved.
This enables the mayor to be seen as less partisan
This gives a record on where the mayor stands on all issues.
This gives more power to the mayor than he currently has.
This helps to keep the mayor's role as one of a non-biased representative of the entire city.
This is a non-issue for me.
then it breaks the tie and decides the outcome. If the vote is not tied then the Mayor's vote is meaningless anyway (3 to 5 means that the Mayor joins the winning side or the losing side, depending on their choice, and this vote has no effect on the outcome). Come on people, this is simple math. The Mayor only needs to vote to break a tie.
This is fine. Also encourages compromise.
This keeps the Mayor neutral except when needed and someone on the council with an interest in the council working smoothly.
This makes the mayor's vote more important because only they are the tie breaker
This system seems to work well, so I see no need to change.
this would give to much weight to the Mayor.
This would prevent ties and allow the people who elected the mayor where they stand on the policies and issues that affect the people and communities that elected them.
Tie vote only keeps the Mayor out of the voting, as it should be.
Tie-breaker voting allows the mayor to build consensus without "taking sides."
Too much power the other way
Voters need to know where the mayor stands on issues.
Voting creates accountability
Voting only during the ties allows for the mayor to stay out of the fray.
We have a weak mayor form of government, keep him weak
We have an awesome Mayor who is a great leader and businessman, why would we not welcome his leadership on key issues.
We need a new mayor.
We need the mayor to serve as a neutral facilitator for the council.
We want to know that our mayor is not biased toward all the votes taken by City Council.
While he often speaks on topics, his open vote would be appreciated.
Why not t he major has an opinion that's why we elected a mayor!
why should he NOT have an active role in how this city is run?
With odd-numbered City Council, no need for the Mayor to vote.
Would show the Mayor's position on items. Vote should not be a rubber stamp of approval.
Yea

Mayoral Voting Comments

Yes, the Mayor should be required to put his two cents in and ppl can then vote on what he stands for. Or doesn't. Fir that matter, if you miss a vote unless you're in the hospital as a patient, you should be permanently removed and never allowed to run again.

Other Comments

There are residents who feel disenfranchised in this town. We are good enough to provide money in our property tax dollars but seem to lack support in overall services. When tax dollars are needed for the city, we need for the city to find another way instead of automatically raising property taxes! Also ... someone needs to work on the state level to open up all the medical offices/urgent cares that have popped up and hide behind the "hospital" blanket and thus not having to pay property taxes. This is a racket that needs to change. A lot of revenue is gone as a result and the city puts it back on residents. These offices and urgent cares are businesses -- just because they are owned by a hospital system, they should not be exempt.

(1) Consider creating a 9th ward for the downtown area. Now that it's developing a permanent residential component, they should have a voice on council separate from the business groups & such that interact with the city in a "back door" way.

(2) Councilpersons should have double the salary if we expect them to devote the necessary time to communicating with constituents and making good decisions on the often complicated matters brought to them. They could use additional support staff also; one person serving two councilpersons is not adequate.

All local ordinances need to be looked at evaluated on fairness no matter what side of town or population said ordinances effect

Allow people to their second admenent rights , your city counsel is bias towards those that choose to protect themselves.

As I said in question 1, the people in the more rural outskirts of the city lack representation. We pay the same taxes, but tend to not have easy access to parks, sidewalks, and greenways. It would be nice to have the wards reorganized (or have some added) to give us more of a voice. Chances are, someone who is elected at large would still pay more attention to the people in more populated areas of the city. We need our own representation.

Capital projects to be funded should be based on overall project priority analysis and not based on even distribution of funding to each ward. See how City of Raleigh awards projects and do similarly in W-S.

Citizen advisory committees need more power/influence.

Council Members from 5 Wards, with 3 at-large, and a voting Mayor brings the most diverse representation and the most accountability to our city government. If you have to represent a larger ward, you will not be driven by such singular interests as we see today. If we add at-large Council Members, there will be opportunity for diversity of interests to persist across geographic borders. If the Mayor is a voting member, they will be accountable for their political activity, and have "skin in the game". If we have a 5/3/1 model, we have no tied votes, and great representation.

Do not reduce the ward structure, particularly if predominantly minority wards will be combined and lose representation and their strong voice.

Excited to be offered this (historic? :)) opportunity. Thank you.

For years now our system has resulted in a council that works together and deals with difficult issues with civil discourse and aside from terrible streets has seen that we have excellent services.

Having 8 wards that have to be re-balanced equally by population with each census results in strange looking ward boundaries and wards that don't have a lot of geography in common. Having less wards should allow for ward boundaries that make more geographic sense.

https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=2436219396624000&id=2369566166622657

I am concerned that all sections of this divided city have a voice in the city's governance. I believe that reducing the number of districts and reducing the minority voices should be avoided at all costs. Our city has a need to provide more equal access to city services and resources for all parts of the city. We do not need to take a step backward.

I am highly offended by the state legislators trying to dictate to the City how to run local government!

Other Comments

I am very disappointed in our City Council for even considering at-large and non-partisan elections. It is just an underhanded effort to further silence those that need to be heard the most.

I appreciate the opportunity to fill out this survey. I only saw it in the paper this morning. Publicize it more.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this online, and the option to provide feedback. The video was very well done, thank you.

I appreciate the work that the LGSC is doing on this matter. I do hope that the LGSC will take into account the perception and impact its decision will have on the equal representation of all citizens. I also hope that this will be handled at the local level and that advice from Raleigh and especially the State Legislature will be discounted since partisan politicians have shown the state that they claim to serve the citizens but in fact serve the party and their own power interests.

I became aware of this survey via a letter to the editor of the WS Journal.

I believe four wards with four at large and the mayor only voting on ties is the best way to go. Seems odd that it's not included as an option, but that's what I most support.

I believe it is essential to change council to have some members elected at-large. The singular focus only on each fiefdom MUST end if the city is to compete and grow!

I believe that City Council should have term limits just like the President of The United States does.

I believe that Representatives Lambeth and Conrad had a political motive for pushing this change, obviously. They were trying to solve a problem that only existed in their minds. Much like other solutions that were presented by the general assembly where there was no problem. Example: Bathroom bill, voter fraud.

I came upon this survey on the Nextdoor website. The posting mentioned the survey had not received much response. It seems that little effort was put forth to elicit more activity. Why not? Just lip service to the cause?

I can't wait to live in a world without white supremacy.

I do not want at large members on city council. The people should have access to running for office. At large campaigns are not accessible to the vast majority of people. Do not provide another fast lane for the wealthy and connected.

It does not matter what I think. City Council does what they want regardless of what the voters want (see Dixie Classic Fair as an example).

I don't feel we have issues with city council representation. The school board is what needs attention. We have the worst school in the state in W-S and the schools are segregated. We should all be trying to fix this.

I don't understand why these proposals are under consideration in the first place. Any requests for changes to government structure should come from a groundswell within Winston-Salem. State legislators should have no business imposing changes on us.

This survey was hard to find on the City's website.

I feel like the current system of our city government works well and see no need to change it. I do not want the state legislature to dictate our city governance structure.

I feel that most people do not realize how important the City Council is and what it does often gets obscured by what is going on in other places.

I feel that this process only encourages a hyper partisan hijacking of our city council. Please look at methodology of above questions and make sure they are not biased and leading questions. This is a preposterous notion.

Other Comments

I feel that we should strongly think about all of the research done in political science and economics regarding voting. There are many studies that indicate that shorter election cycles, at-large seats, odd year voting, and discourage minority and blue collar participation in the governing process. Additionally, non-partisan policies has a tendency to suppress voting. To move to any one of these would encourage and foster lower participation by these vital groups in the governing process. I think that Winston-Salem is an amazing place with a great city government structure. We have some pretty huge race and income disparity that need to be addressed and I think that moving to more at-large representation and shorter election cycles will likely harm the kind of progress that we desperately need. I am very happy to participate on this project and provide more citation for this research.

I feel the suggested changes are politically motivated by the state legislature and are not in the interest of local voters.

I feel there should be term limits---- 2 consecutive years, no more.

I feel these choices should be decided by the powers that be and people in office, The regular citizen such as myself is not knowledgeable enough to decide these matters.

I have already filled out form but had a couple more comments. One comment regarding Partisan or Non I commented above with my choice. The other comment is "primary's" are necessary with partisan or non, the numbers of candidates could be too many to choose in election. Hope I made some since.

I have little trust in the whole process given how it originated. The proposals were a surprise to the populace. The state legislators never consulted the mayor or the City Council. They even claimed they did not realize that representation in our African Americans communities would be seriously reduced by these proposals. If they did not know that fact then they are either not telling the truth, or it is evidence of how reckless the proposal is. Truly I think having at large members was an attempt to increase Republican membership on the council and the hope that some day a Republican would be mayor and would vote in Council meetings.

I love our city government. Our elected officials are great folks. My feedback is only to help improve the city.

I see no reason to change any of this election process if it isn't broken don't fix it.

I strongly feel that the this is politically motivated and not in the best interest of the City of Winston-Salem.

I think Republicans need to stop messing with the process. If they want to be elected, they should come up with some ideas and solutions that help people, not try to force their failing policies on them.

I think that there should be term limits for all elected officials.

I truly hope that more citizens would take the time to fill out this form. I hope the Council is open minded enough to listen to the results, take heed of the results and act appropriately. Their job is to do what is best for the citizens, not what is best for themselves.

I want Winston-Salem to be a great city, as someone who moved here from Dallas six years ago, but there are risks and headwinds that could slow the growth and development, and if we're not careful, we could gradually erode as the older/legacy generations fade away from being active. What is good for the city should be good for everyone, and some of the changes this survey is asking/suggesting are things that can make our local governance more of a true team sport - not one of factions/wards that can lead to inefficiency/gridlock.

I was appalled that the current City Council voted to invest another \$500,000 of taxpayer money to support the already high cost hydroponic farm initiative - bringing the investment to \$1.5 million, with no guarantee that more funds will not be needed in the future. This is a gross misuse of taxpayer funds when our City is in much greater need to improve our current infrastructure such as roads, etc. I consider this to be an abuse of power and we must take steps to correct the problem as soon as possible.

Other Comments

I was dismayed that the format for the South Fork meeting was not open for some shared discussion among citizens that showed up. Sometimes, people do not think of a question another person has. The failure of some common discussion time undermined the value of the public input feedback. The feedback is hamstrung by its limitations. Why waste all the money spent on so much research if you don't want people sharing opinions in a public meeting?

I will try to attend a local input meeting to give my thoughts

I wish state and local governments would consider term limits. In my mind the provided benefits outweigh any disadvantages. We would benefit with more competitive elections and more ordinary people with fresh ideas rather than full-time politicians.

I wish that the NC General Assembly would stay OUT of trying to determine how local government should look!

I would like a discussion on the ideas of term limits as well as limiting outside influences for local political races.

I would like to see a similar survey done for school board elections.

I would like to see more effort put in by the council and the city government to update their engagement with social media as well as their presentation of information, and access to participation in civic matters such as this questionnaire: this is a great first step

I would love to see more direct interaction from local government. In particular I am thinking of the Citizen Advisory Councils we had in Raleigh, which were a bit like large neighborhood meetings that provided a regular schedule for interactions between residents and their local reps as well as updates from the local police. This had the benefit of being scheduled in the evening so people could attend after work.

I would vote to eliminate wards all-together!

If it is not broken, no need to fix it.

If there is still concern about ethnic representation on the city council, remember that the Hispanic population has never had representation on the W-S city Council.

If you really want the public to fill out this form, it should not be hidden on the City's website.

In general, I think W-S government works pretty well, except that it has an endless appetite for extracting taxes, often for ridiculous programs that are wasteful or that benefit only a few individuals (RUCA grants, for example). I will probably move elsewhere within the next few years for this very reason. I'm tired of getting dinged every year with an added tax on my vehicles and house, in return for little more than garbage pick-up. It's a significant added cost, when viewed over a 10- or 20-year term. I love W-S but have to admit to myself that it's not worth the added expense.

is this a good place to add that if there is a two year term, max of four terms to that individual and two term max if we stay at four year terms (so a MAXIMUM of eight years for service, period!)

It is important to retain the 8 wards currently represented on the council. Residents appreciate having an advocate for their area of the city.

It is my understanding that this idea of at-large city council was introduced by Conrad and Lambeth. I question their motives.

It isn't right that NC state legislature can change local governments' system of LOCAL representation, without ANY approval at the LOCAL level!! What can citizens do to change this state law??

think it's a good idea? Would it help the government run more efficiently? Or is this whole exercise just to appease the Republican legislators that shoved it down our throats without any input from those who should know best?

It would have been helpful to have learned "best practices" from the video, but perhaps there was no agreement as to best practices.

Other Comments

Local governments are more secure when they use websites that end in .gov. Federal officials control the keys to the top-level domain, making it less likely that somebody could get one fraudulently and use it to fool people. Consider changing that?

Lower property taxes. Turn Silas Creek Parkway into a greenway with walking trail from Novant to Wake Forest University.

MORE training of newly-elected ward persons is important. They should know a lot about HOW development, redevelopment and zoning really works. ALL should take City of Winston Salem University, too.

My question to the committee is why are we even considering changing the voting structure of the Winston-Salem City Council when I have heard no outcry from the public asking for it. We now have a fair system. it should not be made less so.

Need term limits for council and mayor. Maximum of two consecutive terms.

Need to look at the total financial aspect. Odd years and two year terms cost a fortune to hold elections. Have seen runoff elections where the person calling for the runoff did not even carry their ward or district.

None

Noticed there is no mention of term limits...

And their should be some other requirements, just like any other job, like drug tests and a public evaluation aka annual review where promises and goals are compared to achievements. The facts, not the mudslinging during elections.

And great way to get comments but still ignore.

I sincerely hope the results of this are going to be made public, with comments.

Of the people,for the people,BY the people!

Our city council represents the people of our city, and we do not need GOP interference. Our city has a majority of Democrats, and we are managing just fine without interference from the dysfunctional Republican Party. Anything that is introduced to our city government by a sitting Republican is highly suspect, in my opinion. Frankly, I would appreciate it if you would spend time expanding Medicaid for the 500,000 people in desperate need of medical attention. Please do not tamper with our city council. Until I see that you are trying to help "the least of these", I have zero confidence in your legislative ability. Hands off, please. My family and I love our city, and have never been impressed by any legislation brought to our city by the Republican delegation. I find this proposal intrusive and troubling, and the choices for the questions on this survey appear to affect the results or outcome.

Overall I think the city government in Winston Salem works very well with a tone of civility and cooperation on the Council. It's laudable that we're looking at other ways of organizing things, but I think that we have a system that generally works well for us especially with the culture we have in the city today.

See #4

Stop the sale of crystal towers

Strongly believe we need at least 3 at large council members and term limits for council members and the mayor.

Tell our State representatives to LEAVE US ALONE. Their political party claims that the best government is the one that is closest to the people. Then, why don't they let us govern ourselves? We are doing very well, thank you. This comment applies for each and every question.

Tell the state legislature to stay out of our local affairs! Republicans are supposed to be the party of small government.

Term limits for both Council members and mayor should be limited to 6 consecutive years

Term Limits on city council members. 2 year terms for 4 terms or 4 year terms for 2 terms.

Other Comments

Term limits on council members and Mayor. 16-20 years or retirement age. At some point everyone wears out the welcome, and never leaves on a good note.

Term limits on the city council members!

Term limits should be in place for all elected officials. Individuals who do nothing but politic often are out of touch with people in the competitive workplace and the workforce needed.

Term limits!

Term limits!!!!!!!!!! Can't have the same sorry people running the city

Term limits, term limits

Thank you fir your good work on our behalf

Thank you for allowing me to express my thoughts.

Thank you for asking for our opinions

Thank you for creating the survey.

Thank you for offering the video for education.

Thank you for soliciting citizen input.

Thank you for the informative video on these options and for seeking public insight! No further comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate. "Being" a part of the process is tantamount to "feeling" a part of the Council and community at-large.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate. If our current system has been in place since 1913, it seems to me to have withstood the test of time. If there are problems, I was not aware.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion, Also the video explaining the options was very informative and was excellent overall. Well Done !

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my personal opinions as a citizen of this City.

Thank you for the video, it was quite informative.

thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion

Thanks for the opportunity

Thanks so much for soliciting feedback on this important issue. The survey was very easy to complete.

The citizens should have a decision in the process if electing a Mayor.

The City Council is not listening. A majority in Winston-Salem did not want the name of the Dixie Classic Fair changed. However, the City Council voted to change it anyway, catering to a minority. They are not doing their job!!!

The city council needs to be cleaned and replaced by new members, toomany members are a cancerto the city

The council should reflect the entire community in every aspect of their jobs.

The current city council and mayor has taken Winston Salem backwards. But we're diverse.

The current city county government system/structure has worked well for Winston Salem and Forsyth County, no need to alter what gives voice to all of our citizens.

The current system seems to be working well, and I am somewhat suspicious of the state representatives who want to change it. This should be a city-level decision, not another thing that is forced on us by over-zealous state legislators. We have seen too much of this power-grabbing by the state legislature already.

The current system works. Keep it.

The fact that a bill was drafted in the General Assembly without the input of the taxpayers in this city was incredibly egregious. I encourage an open and inclusive process going forward. It is all our city.

The mayor should have term limits. Same mayor since at least 1999 is ridiculous.

The origin of this issue was a partisan attempt combined with other proposed attempts to change school board elections to dilute minority representation. Our city has been making progress with minority representation!!

The at large representation proposal is a Trojan horse meant to undermine this progress.

Other Comments

The public is not receiving the "back story" on why this proposal even came up in the first place. It is an attempt by certain monied interests/politicians to subvert the ability of residents to have any influence over how and where development occurs in Winston-Salem. It is not intended to benefit residents or serve the interests of residents.

The republicans in North Carolina have put so much effort in redrawing district and ward lines to stay in power, that is a shame. The ward system in Winston-Salem should remain as is, put in term limits, and make sure all taxpayers are represented fairly and with consideration. Winston-Salem is a divided city, always has been and always will be. We need all wards represented individually to at least give the appearance of fairness and equity.

The system seems to be working fairly well. I am concerned and confused by these potential changes and the motivation and timing of said proposed changes.

The time for the ward system is past. With property taxes rising at unprecedented rates, we need at-large representation to balance out the "fiefdoms" where elected officials put fiscal responsibility out the window and divide up taxpayer funding as if its an unlimited well to draw from.

The video explaining all the options was helpful and very well done but a little long. I'm glad I chose to participate but I had not heard of this survey until someone on NextDoor mentioned it and provided a link. It needs to be publicized better if you truly want more feedback.

the video should be more forthcoming about the reasons changes are being suggested, and the effect these changes would have on minority citizens of our city.

The video was well-prepared and provides a balanced summary of the issues.

There should be an ethics board to govern City Council and their actions. The city attorney and manager do not provide adequate protection for city employees or the city as a whole from unethical practices of council members.

There is no problem with the way the council is structured. Procedures should remain the same.

There is one question missing on this survey, term limits. All candidates should be limited in the time they serve. I would recommend a limitation of 2 consecutive terms and provided the opportunity for the individual to return to office after sitting out a term.

There need to be term limits for any council Member in Winston-Salem.

there NEEDS to be term limits for council and mayor

There should be a term limit for all council members. Ridiculous for multi-generation terms to be allowed.

There should be more training of the elected members on representing ALL the people and not just some because of their color. I find in my district it seems that those of a particular color are represented more than others.

There should be TERM LIMITS for our elected officials, as our City government has become stagnant with no change or new ideas. When elected officials remain in their positions for extended periods of time, they stop the City from moving forward, as they always have the past stuck in their mind. Having term limits would allow progress and new ideas to make our City a better place for everyone.

Our current City is very divided, by not only the eight wards, but by the east and west sides. Making changes can positively change this and have Winston-Salem act as one united City, versus the division that currently rules.

There should definitely be a stature of limitations on how long anyone can hold an office with the City of Winston-Salem. Times are changing but our local government is not progressing with the changes.

things work the way it is - no need to change

Think citizens should know more about ward system, why it exists, the challenges, and if it should go away or stay?

Other Comments

This appears to be a power grab by the state legislature and I encourage Winston-Salem to resist it as much as possible.

This entire exercise is a waste, driven entirely by a twisted old man's grievance about my councilman running against him and nearly unseating him

Those opposed to having at-large representation seem to include those who have their council member in their pocket, or who think council members have a right to the seat they have always held. This is the kind of thinking that has held us back. Of course there will always be political games, but some at-large seats will provide a better chance of the council focusing on the needs of the entire city. I would bet that most business and community leaders would prefer at-large representation but are unwilling to publicly say so due to potential repercussions from current council members, who enjoy their current positions and rarely face serious electoral challenges. Serious politicians who care about their community and want to lead should embrace at-large representation.

Ward council members should be barred from having a business in the ward they cover this should also be treated as a full time job

We need a voting and redistricting method that is more representative of the voters and encourages a diverse and healthy public debate. The two party system is broken. We need to create the circumstances where change will be possible. Ranked choice voting, multimember districts, or proportional representation are all excellent ways to improve our system.

We need focus on the city & community at large, vs. individual ward accomplishments.

We need to get away from 8 sections of the city and work together.

We need term limits for mayor and council members. Maximum of two consecutive terms.

We need to work to overcome division in our view of the work of our different representatives. Eliminating the number of districts, adding "at large" representatives, and disregarding the need to serve the many varied needs of our citizens is real move backward to develop unity, collaboration and cooperation among us all.

We should never have been put in a situation where the state got involved in local politics.

We want some of the rampant financial fraud cleaned up in our City Council and other departments of our city and county. There is so much fraud and kick-back that the gambling joints, recently declared illegal by our lawmakers in Raleigh, are still operating fully in Forsyth County and Winston Salem. Time for many people to be voted out for not doing their jobs and enforcing the laws, starting with the Chief of Police in Winston Salem.

well-done video; appreciated the info from other cities and research bodies; i hope UNC-CH School of Government has been contacted for info too

What about term limits for all politicians including the mayor? While the mayor has been present for growth of WS he has also watched many corporations leave under his watch. It seems like a fresh perspective might be beneficial as we have transitioned into a new chamber ceo, opening of b40, etc.

What kind of foolishness is being proposed? Stop messing with what works.

Why are you trying to change how it is done? And if we do truly have a say, will our wishes be tended to? Or will a judge swoop in and overturn our wishes?

Why are you trying to fix something that is not broken? Winston's method of government - the way council members and the Mayor run and are elected has been working perfectly for years. Watch some Winston-Salem city council meetings and learn how things work. It's amazing to watch. THE PROCESS WORKS QUITE WELL

Why do you want to change the way it is? It seems to be working fine.

Why is the state legislature interfering with a city issue that did not appear to be an issue to Winston-Salem residents.

Will be interesting to see if any changes are made to the Council structure

Will our opinions make a difference? Didn't seem to on tune name of the fair. Why is any of this a consideration.

Other Comments

You need to ask what was the motivation behind Lambeth/Conrad attack on the electorate of Winston Salem. Knowing the political make-up of the council and that of the two aforementioned, it is obvious to a blind person that their legislation was an attempt to alter the political make-up of the council. A change that should be left to the local electorate not a pair of political hacks in Raleigh.