DRAFT REPORT

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE CONSOLIDATION OF TIMES OF GENERAL ELECTIONS

January, 1979

To: Honorable John N. Dalton, Governor of Virginia

and

The General Assembly of Virginia

SUMMARY

The Commission to Study the Consolidation of Times of General Elections was established pursuant to H.J.R. 8 of the 1978 General Assembly. The Commission believes that a direct cause/effect relationship exists between the frequency of elections and the rise in voter apathy in the Commonwealth. In hopes of reversing the trend of voter apathy, the Commission carefully studied a specific proposal to alter the present election schedule in Virginia. Every odd-numbered year would be election-free as a result of such a proposal. The members of the Commission were intent on raising all possible questions and examining the positive and negative effects this kind of consolidation would have on the electoral process.

The Commission does conclude that some degree of consolidation of Virginia's present election schedule is in the best interest of the Commonwealth and her citizens. The Commission recognizes the possibility of partial acceptance of the consolidation proposal (such as approving the concept to consolidate general election times, but not according to the specific proposal). In anticipation of a partial acceptance, the Commission drafted several alternative options for consideration. The Commission believes that the specific proposal to consolidate election times, as well as the alternative options, aims at making the electoral process in the Commonwealth more efficient, discourage voter apathy and increase citizen participation in the electoral process.

CONCLUSIONS

Politics, campaigns and elections are practically continuous in Virginia, one of the few states in the nation where an election is held every year. While few people would argue against periodic popular elections, giving the electorate its voice in government, the yearly routine of elections in the Commonwealth seems excessive; perhaps we really have "too much of a good thing." When decisions are the result of an apathetic and uninformed electorate, the inevitable result is a deterioration of government, which is designed to represent the majority public opinion.

In order to discourage apathy in the electorate, a "breather" from elections is a reasonable solution. A break from voting could be achieved by consolidating the times of general elections in Virginia, such that every odd-numbered year would be election-free.

Apathy is not the only ill plaguing today's electorate. Complaints about the soaring costs of political campaigns are growing, and never before have campaigns lasted so long. Gearing up volunteer participation in the political process is getting more difficult in states with yearly elections. The Commission feels that the yearly event of elections has adversely affected the electorate in Virginia, generating apathy, fueling the cost of campaigns and creating the need to organize active, volunteer participation in the electoral process all too frequently.

THE COMMISSION STUDY

Introduction:

The Commission to Study the Consolidation of Times of General Elections, created under H.J.R. 8, set out to study the feasibility and desirability of consolidating general elections in Virginia. The twelve-member Commission, composed of three gubernatorial appointees from the state at large, five members of the House of Delegates, selected by the Speaker of the House, and four members of the Senate, appointed by the Senate Committee of Privileges and Elections, concerned itself

primarily with examining the possible effects of a specific proposal to alter the present election schedule. Any changes in the election schedule would require changes in the law and the Constitution.

The detailed proposal considered by the Commission would shift all state elections to even-numbered, non-presidential years and would also have local elections held at the same time as state elections. The odd-numbered years would be election-free as a result of these changes. Historical and theoretical research, along with public opinion, provided the Commission with the information needed to weigh both the positive and negative effects upon the electoral process in Virginia.

Under the present design, the people of Virginia are faced with an election every year. While the number of eligible voters increases, the number of people exercising their vote is declining proportionately. Voter apathy is a principle reason for such decreases in voter turnout (as Virginia follows a national trend). Virginia, however, must confront voter apathy and indifference more often than most states in the country. Virginia's voters must choose a candidate for at least one race every year. And since the electorate never gets a "break" and must endure an election annually, it is reasonable that such frequent elections encourage voter apathy.

The Commission to Study the Consolidation of Times of General Elections held three meetings, including a public hearing in Richmond on October 26, 1978. These meetings, and particularly the public hearing, provided forums for any and all questions concerning the kind of impact the specific consolidation proposal would have on Virginia's electoral process. Historical background information and political research, along with public opinion, were presented at the Commission meetings. These materials provided the members of the Commission with the information they needed to determine whether the consolidation proposal is in the best interest of Virginia's people and their politics.

Dr. Robert Montjoy of the Institute of Government at the University of Virginia presented material dealing with the possible effects the proposal might have. Voter turn-out and ballot falloff were among the effects examined by Dr. Montjoy. Mrs. Joan Mahan, Secretary of the Board of Elections, also appeared before the Commission and outlined a number of problems she considered might arise as a result of the consolidation proposal. These and other likely political consequences will be detailed further on in this report.

The Commission raised the question about how Virginia's present election schedule came into existence. The Institute of Government at the University of Virginia provided the Commission with historical background, and this, along with a look at state statutes concerning elections, explains the current system and schedule in Virginia.

Virginia's Present Election Schedule: Historical Explanation and Current Statutes:

Before examining Virginia's present election schedule, as it was designed according to whatever statutes created in this year or that, an understanding of why state elections are held in non-presidential election years, and specifically why Virginians choose a governor in odd-numbered years. There are few states in the nation that hold an election every year (only New Jersey, Kentucky, Mississippi and Louisiana, along with W. Va.). Most states elect their governors and other state officials in even-numbered years, whether they fall in Presidential or non-Presidential election years.

Then why does Virginia have odd-numbered elections?

After the Civil War, during the Reconstruction Period, Virginia was preparing to re-enter the Union. A new Constitution was drafted and Virginians waited for a date to be set for the election of Virginia's state officers. After some delay, President Grant chose a date, seemingly by random selection. The election was held on July 6, 1869, and state elections have occurred every four years (every two years for the House of Delegates) since that time.

PRESENT ELECTION LAW SCHEDULES

Let's begin our analysis with an examination of present laws governing election schedules, for any alteration in the

present system as depicted in Table I must involve consideration of constitutional and statutory provisions scattered across the pages of Virginia law.

Governor, Lt. Governor, and Attorney General:

The Governor serves a four-year term and is elected at the time and place set by the General Assembly. Va. Const. Art. V, §§ 1,2. The Governor is elected in November of every fourth year beginning in 1973. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-80 (1973 Repl. Vol.). Thus, under present law, there will be gubernatorial elections in 1977, 1981, 1985, 1989, 1993 and so on into the future.

The Lt. Governor and Attorney General are elected at the same time and for the same terms as the Governor. Va. Const. Art. V, §§ 13, 15. Thus, the election dates listed above for the Governor would be applicable to the Lt. Governor and Attorney General.

Local Constitutional Offices:

Virginia Constitution Art. VII, § 4, requires the voters of each county and city to elect a treasurer, sheriff, commonwealth's attorney, and commissioner of the revenue. The Constitution also directs that these officers will serve for the terms of four years. The fifth constitutional officer, the clerk of the court of record, serves a term of eight years. The General Assembly may provide for the method of selection of these officers.

The Code states that counties will hold elections for sheriff, treasurer, commissioner of the revenue, and commonwealth's attorney in November of 1971 and every fourth year thereafter. For purposes of this memo, these officers will be elected in 1979, 1983, 1987, and 1991. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-86 (1973 Repl. Vol.).

The qualified voters of the cities will elect their constitutional officers (except clerk of court), and any other officers whose election is not otherwise provided for by law or charter, in November, 1973, and every four years thereafter. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-86 (1973 Repl. Vol.). In the years of our study, these officers will be elected in 1977, 1981, 1985, 1989, and 1993.

The clerks of court in counties were elected at the general election in November, 1975. Future elections will be every eight years: 1983 and 1991 for our study. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-87 (1973 Repl. Vol.).

The clerks of court in cities will be elected at the general election in November, 1979. Thereafter this officer will be elected every eight years. Clerks elected prior to 1979 whose terms may have expired will continue to serve until January 1, 1980. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-87 (1973 Repl. Vol.).

Local Governing Bodies:

Article VII, § 5 is the only constitutional reference to the governing bodies of counties and cities. It should not, however, be an obstacle in implementing the proposed

election reform. Section 5 does not detail when these governing bodies will be elected, and the provision is prefaced by "unless otherwise provided by law," so it need not be amended.

With regard to county supervisors, the Code states that they will be chosen at "the general election in November, in the year nineteen hundred and seventy-one and every four years thereafter...except as may be provided by law for those counties having optional forms of government." Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-88 (1973 Repl. Vol.). For our purposes, county supervisors will be elected in 1979, 1983, 1987, and 1991.

The exception for counties having the optional forms of government does not complicate the situation, except for one instance to be discussed shortly. In most cases, when a county adopts the optional form (either the county manager form, the county board form, the county executive form, the urban county executive form, or the urban county manager form), the first elected governing body serves until the next general election. Thereafter, elections will be held as provided in § 24.1-88 of the Code. The applicable Code sections for each of the optional forms of government are listed below:

County Manager Form:	§ 15.1-622,
County Board Form:	§ 15.1-700,
County Executive Form:	§ 15.1-589,
Urban County Manager Form:	§ 15.1-742, and
Urban County Executive Form:	§ 15.1-729.

In one instance, the election for county supervisors may cause some difficulty. This exception occurs under the County Manager Plan (as distinguished from the County Manager Form). The County Manager Plan is an optional form of government available to counties with population densities exceeding 500 persons per square mile and containing less than 60 square miles of high land. Va. Code Ann. § 15.1-699 (1973 Repl. Vol.).

Counties that adopted the Plan had the option of electing their supervisors biennially for four-year terms. But this option must have been exercised prior to April 1, 1958. Va. Code Ann. § 15.1-676(e) (1976 Cum. Supp.). When the option under § 15.1-676 has been approved by the voters, supervisors are elected to staggered terms in even-numbered years. Va. Code Ann. §§ 15.1-676(f)(1) to 15.1-676(f)(3) (1976 Cum. Supp.).

The Code is also very specific with regard to the election of mayor and council for cities and towns. The terms of office is set by charter, but if it is for two or four years, the Code provides that elections shall be in May of even-numbered years. If the charter provides for elections at one- or three-year intervals, the Code allows elections to be held in years designated by charter. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-90(a) (1973 Repl. Vol.).

The Code also provides that mayors or council members elected in 1969 or 1970 for four-year terms, or in 1971 and 1972 for two-year terms, will hold office until a successor

The Code, in § 24.1-11, provides that these elections will be every two years after 1971. Members of the House of Delegates would then be elected in each odd-numbered year of this study.

Separate municipal elections were first specified in the 1870 Constitution of Virginia.

The Specific Proposal: Making A Change:

A. Now that we have reviewed the constitutional and statutory provisions which determine when officials are elected, it is apparent that constitutional and statutory changes would be needed, if election schedules are to be altered. One of these required changes would involve a one-time only change in the length of the terms of some offices. Thereafter, elections would be held in even-numbered years and successful candidates would serve terms as under the present law.

If a proposal is deemed to have merit, we should not delay consideration of this proposal. There will necessarily be a delay between introduction of this proposal and its adoption; and this delay is more than justified as the merits and implications of this far-ranging plan are debated.

There will be, however, another delay after adoption before we begin to enjoy the benefits of election reform. The reasons for this delay are two-fold: first, while statutory changes can be made with comparative ease, the necessary Constitutional amendments may be effected in only two ways:

qualifies. Successors to these offices would be elected in May, 1974. Thus, officers serving two-year terms will be elected in even-numbered years. This is Group A in Tables I and II. Mayors and council members elected to four-year terms beginning in 1974 would be elected again in 1978, 1982, 1986, 1990 and 1994. This is the Group B in the Tables. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-90(b)(1) (1973 Repl. Vol.).

The Code also states that mayors and council members elected to four-year terms in 1971 or 1972 would serve until their successors were elected in May, 1976. These officers, constituting Group C in the Tables, would be elected in 1980, 1984, 1988, and 1992. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-90(b)(2) (1973 Repl. Vol.).

Senate:

Article IV, § 2 of the Constitution of Virginia calls for quadrennial elections of Senators. The Code states that these elections will be held in November of every fourth year beginning in 1971. Va. Code Ann. § 24.1-13 (1973 Repl. Vol.). Thus, future State Senatorial elections will occur, under present law, in 1979, 1983, 1987, and 1991.

House of Delegates:

Article IV, § 3 of the Constitution of Virginia requires that Members of the House of Delegates be elected biennially.

1) An amendment must be approved by a majority of the members of the General Assembly. It must also be approved again following a general election of the House of Delegates. After this second legislative approval, the proposed amendment must be affirmed in an election by the majority of those voting. Va. Const. Art. XII, § 1.

2) Or, two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly may vote to call a constitutional convention. After approval by the convention delegates, the proposed amendment must be approved by a vote of the people. Va. Const. Art. XII, § 2.

This means that the necessary constitutional amendments could be studied by the 1978 General Assembly and approved during the 1979 Session. The second legislative approval could then occur during the 1980 Session, which follows the House election of 1979. The constitutional amendments then could be put before the people in 1980. The necessary statutory changes would be made during the 1981 Session. Under this plan, then, the 1981 elections are the first that could be subject to reform.

And, although the reform could begin with the 1981 election, the first election-free year would not be until 1985. (See Table II) This is because the changes are spread over time so as not to affect those elected before the plan was adopted and to minimize disruption.

Our present election schedule is causing problems now which may be increased in the future, but orderly reform will not yield its benefits until 1985. So it is apparent that we need to begin discussion and debate and adopt our solution, whatever it is, if any, as soon as possible.

B. What follows is a more detailed account of the necessary constitutional and statutory changes. They are considered according to the year in which each change must be effective.

1981:

Terms of the statewide offices: Governor, Lt. Governor, and Attorney General, would be lengthened to a one-time term of five years. Thereafter, these terms would revert to four years. This would sandwich these elections between presidential races and in even-numbered years. This would require amending Article V, §§ 1, 2, 13, and 15 as well as § 24.1-80 of the Code.

Article IV, § 3 of the Virginia Constitution and § 24.1-11 of the Code would have to be amended so that Members of the House of Delegates elected in 1981 would serve a one-time three-year term. In the future, Delegates would then be elected in even-numbered years for two-year terms.

City sheriffs, commonwealth attorneys, treasurers, and commissioners of the revenue would also be elected in 1981. And, like the statewide officers, their terms would be lengthened to a one-time term of five years. This would

require amending Article VII, § 4 of the Constitution and § 24.1-86 of the Code. The result would be elections for these city constitutional officers in even-numbered but non-presidential years.

1982:

This year would see elections for U. S. Senator, U.S. House of Representatives, some of the supervisors under the County Manager Plan option of § 15.1-676, mayors and councilmen serving two-year terms, and mayors and councilmen serving four-year terms under § 24.1-90(b)(2).

No changes need be made in the elections for supervisor. These offices would be up for election again in 1986, the year of the statewide races and would continue to be held in conjunction with the statewide races.

Mayoral and councilmanic elections would be rescheduled so as to take place with other elections, rather than in May. As with the supervisors their terms need not be changed.

1983:

In 1983 County constitutional officers, state senators, and county supervisors (except under the County Manager Plan), will be elected.

The 1983 elections for state senator present two choices for reform. Shortening the present term to three years, for one-time only, senatorial terms of those elected in 1983 would place future senatorial elections in even-numbered non-presidential

years. An alternative would be to keep the four-year Senate term following the 1983 election and shorten to three years the term beginning in 1987. One disadvantage to this alternative is that in 1987, the Senate would be the only office having an election, an unnecessary expense and an "invitation" to a host of otherwise "unoccupied" candidates. Table II shows both of these proposals. Whichever proposal were adopted, Article IV, § 2 of the Constitution and § 24.1-13 of the Code would have to be amended.

All of the county constitutional officers will be elected in 1983. For this election only, the term for sheriff, commonwealth attorney, treasurer, and commissioner of the revenue would be reduced to three years. Thereafter, four-year terms would resume. It would be necessary to amend Article VII, § 4, of the Constitution and § 24.1-86 of the Code in order to do this. The county clerk's term should be reduced to seven years for this one election. This would require amending Article VII, § 4, and § 24.1-87 of the Code. These changes would allow subsequent county constitutional officers to be elected in the same years as the statewide officers.

County supervisors and the governing bodies of the optional forms of county government (except the County Manager Plan using § 15.1-676), will be elected in 1983. The terms

for these officers, too, should be shortened to three years, for one time only. This would require amending § 24.1-88 of the Code, as well as the following Code sections specifically applicable to the optional forms of government:

County Manager Form:	§ 15.1-622,
County Board Form:	§ 15.1-589,
Urban County Manager Form:	§ 15.1-742, and
Urban County Executive Form:	§ 15.1-729.

1984:

Consideration should be given to changing the term for supervisors elected in 1984 under the County Manager Plan [§ 15.1-676]. By shortening the terms of those elected in 1984 to two years, for this election only, we could thereafter have all supervisor elections in the same years. Table II assumes that this change in § 15.1-676 is made. There are, however, good reasons for keeping the status quo in this office. The amendment would remove the stagger in the terms, would affect only a few county governments, and would simplify the election schedule only slightly.

In 1984 there also will be elections for mayor and council for those serving two-year terms and those serving four-year terms under § 24.1-90(b)(2). This second group, Group C in the Tables, should have their terms reduced to two years for this one election only. Subsequent elections would have all four-year term mayors and councils in the same year. This would require amending § 24.1-90(b)(2) of the Code.

1988:

The final change involves the city clerks of court. This is the first year that this officer would be elected after the Constitutional amendments. Article VII, § 4, of the Constitution and § 34.1-87 of the Code should be amended so that the 1988 election would be for a six-year term. Subsequent terms would be for eight years. This would mean that later clerk elections would take place in even-numbered, non-presidential years.

Possible Political Consequences of the Specific Consolidation Proposal:

Voter Turnout:

Local elections have the lowest rate of voter turnout while presidential have the highest, with gubernatorial elections falling between the two. Dr. Robert Montjoy concludes that voter turnout will undoubtedly increase for local elections if they are placed on the same date as statewide elections. He points out that there is also some evidence that lower races can add a small, but independent, attraction to higher races. If this is so, Dr. Montjoy notes that the turnout in the combined elections should exceed the highest turnout of the separate elections, all other things being equal.

Ballot Falloff:

The length of a ballot would necessarily increase as a result of consolidating elections. The very likely, and unfortunate, consequence would be a higher percentage of

unfinished ballots. Dr. Montjoy points out, "people who do not complete their ballots tend to be those who do not know or care about lower level races. Many of these people would probably not vote at all in elections where only these 'less interesting' offices were contested. When they are attracted to the polling place by a combined election, some of them will simply not vote in some of the races." Dr. Montjoy concludes, however, that the significant ballot falloff would be more than offset by increased voter turnout caused by combining gubernatorial and local elections.

National, State and Local Issues:

If general election times in Virginia are consolidated, there is a genuine concern that the nature of local campaigns may change. One consequence might be increased "straight-ticket" voting. Some people who have no real preference for a candidate in some races may simply vote for the same party that they supported elsewhere on the ballot.

The possibility of mixing national, state and local issues does exist if elections are consolidated. Insofar as issues form the basis for electoral decisions, a distinction between issues of statewide impact and those of local impact ought to be maintained. Local candidates might feel compelled to take a position on a state issue, that has no particular bearing on the candidate's locality.

Many of the local elections in the Commonwealth are specifically designed to be non-partisan in nature. The concern that the partisan nature of national and state races would spill over to local campaigns is valid. But one can only speculate as to whether the impact would be good or bad. A councilman from the City of Falls Church who is opposed to the proposal expressed concern over a conflict with the Hatch Act, which requires a non-partisan election before federal employees are free to participate.

Ballot Length and Machine Capacity:

One technical consideration had to be examined: do the current voting machines have the capacity to handle the longer ballots? Mrs. Joan Mahan, Secretary of the Board of Elections, found out that it would be possible for all the voting machines to accommodate the number of names required by the proposal. Mrs. Mahan noted, however, that the names of party nominees must appear first and second on the ballot with the names of Independents following.

The idea that the voter may tend to become confused by more names on the ballot is a reasonable one. But such confusion might be diminished as a result of the tradeoff of a longer ballot instead of frequent elections.

Costs of Elections and Campaigns:

No matter how many individual political races may occur at election time, the estimated cost of elections in Virginia is nearly 700,000 tax dollars each year. With a

workers would opt to participate in the more prestigious national and state elections to the detriment of local government elections. The attraction of the individual candidates, however, might negate this preference for more prestigious campaigns.

Constitutional Referendums:

If an election is not held every year, when would constitutional referendums be brought before the public? Would such a delay in referendum proposals impose a significant disadvantage?

Conclusion:

The foundation of representative government is the will of the people. The decisions of the people are reflected in their votes--an idea so elementary that its implications are often overlooked.

When the people are apathetic or uninformed, their votes are likely to be so, too. Since electoral decisions are the basis of representative democracy, the entire system of government, in the long run, may suffer.

While few people would argue against periodic popular election of state and local officials, an increasing number of voters may be asking if we can have "too much of a good thing." A quick glance at Table I suggests this possibility.

consolidation in the present election schedule, such that the odd-numbered years would be election-free, a great savings would be felt by the Commonwealth and her citizens.

But the cost of holding an election is just the beginning. The pricetag on a political campaign is no small item, and is growing rapidly. If state and local elections are consolidated in Virginia, many people, especially party workers (both Democrats and Republicans), feel that it would be easier to encourage financial support in political campaigns. People may feel more comfortable about giving money to politicians who don't ask for it so often.

Citizen Participation:

One of the most important parts of any political campaign is volunteer participation. Yet, never before has it been so difficult to convince people that it's really worthwhile for them to involve themselves in political battles year after year. Mr. Thomas E. Albro, a Charlottesville City Councilman and a former City Republican Committee Chairman, commented in a letter to the Commission about the proposal, "...many people, including the party faithful, simply lost interest due to the proliferation of electoral campaigns. People simply grow tired of listening to politicians."

Only one negative effect on citizen participation as a result of a consolidation of Virginia's present election schedule was brought up. Mr. Richard L. DeCair, Executive Director of the Virginia Municipal League, mentioned the fear that election

We may have "too much of a good thing" in Virginia because there is no end to the campaigning and its resultant public and private expense, which is often exorbitant. Long before the 1976 Presidential election, candidates and supporters were lining up for the 1977 gubernatorial race. Now Virginians are already hearing the beginning of the 1978 United States Senate contest. The pressure continues every year as candidates for the statewide offices, the General Assembly, city and county offices vie for financial and personal support.

We know we have "too much of a good thing" when the frequency of elections adversely affects the electorate. The pressure of the numerous campaigns has caused many voters to lose touch with the issues and develop an indifference toward the electoral process.

When the issues become confused or the desire to stay informed is weakened, the quality of the vote is diminished. And other problems can be discerned. The same causes which affect the quality of the vote also hamper the quantity of participation. Indifference may lead to apathy, as evidenced by the low percentage of voter turnout. Active participation in the electoral process suffers from the same pressures, too. Grassroots volunteers need a break from the ceaseless campaigning. Nobody knows how many former volunteers have been driven from participation by a need to "catch their breath."

And, we know we have "too much of a good thing" when we spend vast sums of money to needlessly duplicate services every year.

Each election in the City of Richmond costs the taxpayers about $45,000. Whether one office or twenty are contested, the cost remains about the same because most expenses are fixed. The large part of this overhead is in moving voting machines to the polls, servicing the machines after the election, and wages for poll workers. A conservative estimate places election costs at $35,000 per 100,000 registered voters. Again, this is true for <u>each</u> election, regardless of the number of officials elected.

In August, 1977, there were 1,987,372 registered voters in Virginia. Multiplying this number by the estimated cost ($35,000/100,000 registered voters) shows that elections may cost taxpayers $695,450 <u>each</u> year.

It seems clear that disadvantages accompany our present system of conducting elections throughout the State on an annual basis. It is very possible that we are alienating voters and indirectly discouraging participation. And certainly we are spending tax dollars unnecessarily.

We need to consider changing our system, but what is needed is a rational and constructive alternative. We offer the following proposal as a basis for discussion and an incentive to thought.

Our proposal involves a simple goal. Reschedule state and local elections so that odd-numbered years will be free of elections and isolate state and local races from the national elections, as much as possible. This second aim can be achieved by scheduling state and local elections for offices in the non-presidential, even-numbered years.

We mentioned that the goal is easily understood. Unfortunately, the path toward this goal is not so easy. In order to understand how we can reform the election schedule, we must first consider the constitutional and statutory provisions which establish our present system.

Following this analysis, we can determine, year by year, what changes would be necessary. In order to reschedule state and local elections with minimal departure from present law, it would be necessary to alter, on a <u>one-time basis only</u>, the terms for some offices. It must be understood clearly that what is involved here is not a reduction in electoral opportunities, but a reordering of electoral schedules. We believe that it could work.

TABLE I: ELECTION SCHEDULE UNDER PRESENT LAWS

1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
			President				President
	U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House
Governor Lt. Governor Atty. Gen'l				Governor Lt. Governor Atty. Gen'l			
H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates	
		County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct	
City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue		City: Clerk Ct.		City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue			
		County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.				County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec. Urban Mgr.	
	County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&B#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&C#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&B#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&C#

Del. - Gerald L. Baliles

1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
			President				President
	U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House
Governor Lt. Governor Atty. Gen'l				Governor LT. Governor Atty. Gen'l			
H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates	
		County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct	County: Plan under 15.1-676*
City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue			City:Council Groups A&C#
		City: Clerk of Ct					
		County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec Urban Exec Urban Mgr.				County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.	
	County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&B#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City:Council Council Groups A&C#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City:Council Council Groups A&B#		

KEY

* Supervisors under the Co. Mgr. Plan elected pursuant to § 15.1-676 allowing for biennial elections to 4 yr terms.

\# § 24.1-90 provides for Council elections such that Group A is elected every 2 yrs beginning in 1974, Group B is elected every 4 yrs beginning in 1974, and Group C is elected every 4 yr. beginning in 1976.

TABLE II: ELECTION SCHEDULE AFTER PROPOSED CHANGES

1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
			President				President
	U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House
Gov. - 5 yrs Lt. Gov. " Atty Gen."					Governor Lt. Governor Atty Gen'l		
H. Del. 3 yr		Senate-3 yrs or Senate-4 yrs County: 3 yr Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue Clerk-7 yrs	H. Delegates		Senator H. Delegates County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue	¶	H. Delegates
City: 5 yrs Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue					City: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue		City: 6 yrs Clerk of Ct.
		County: 3 yr Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.			County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.		
	County: Plan under 15.1-676*		County: 2 yr Plan under 15.1-676* City: A&C# Group C 2 yr		County: Plan under 15.1-676** City: 2 & 4 yr offices	¶(Senate-3yr. alternative)	City: 2 yr offices

Del. - Gerald L. Baliles

1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
			President				President
	U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S.House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House
	Governor Lt. Governor Atty Gen'l				Governor Lt. Governor Atty Gen'l		
	Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates
	County: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct				County: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue		City: Council 2 yr terms
	City: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue				City: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct		
	County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec Urban Exec Urban Mgr.				County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec Urban Exec Urban Mgr.		
	County: Plan under 15.1-676**				County: Plan under 15.1-676**		
	City:Council 2 & 4 yr		City:Council 2 yr terms		City:Council 2&4 yr term		

KEY

* Supervisors under the Co. Mgr. Plan elected pursuant to § 15.1-676 allowing biennial elections to 4 yr terms.

§ 24.1-90 provides for Council elections such that Group A is elected every 2 yrs beginning in 1974, Group B is elected every 4 yrs beginning in 1974, and Group C is elected every 4 yrs beginning in 1976.

** After amending 15.1-676 to remove the staggers in the terms.

TABLE I: ELECTION SCHEDULE UNDER PRESENT LAWS

1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
			President				President
	U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House
Governor Lt. Governor Atty. Gen'l				Governor Lt. Governor Atty. Gen'l			
H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates	
		County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct	
City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue			
		City: Clerk Ct.					
		County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.				County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec. Urban Mgr.	
	County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&B#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&C#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&B#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&C#

Del. - Gerald L. Baliles

1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
			President				President
	U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House
Governor Lt. Governor Atty. Gen'l				Governor LT. Governor Atty. Gen'l			
H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates	
		County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct	County: Plan under 15.1-676*
City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue				City: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue			City:Council Groups A&C#
		City: Clerk of Ct					
		County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec Urban Exec Urban Mgr.				County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.	
	County: Plan under 15.1-676* City: Council Groups A&B#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City:Council Council Groups A&C#		County: Plan under 15.1-676* City:Council Council Groups A&B#		

KEY

* Supervisors under the Co. Mgr. Plan elected pursuant to § 15.1-676 allowing for biennial elections to 4 yr terms.

\# § 24.1-90 provides for Council elections such that Group A is elected every 2 yrs beginning in 1974, Group B is elected every 4 yrs beginning in 1974, and Group C is elected every 4 yrs. beginning in 1976.

TABLE II: ELECTION SCHEDULE AFTER PROPOSED CHANGES

1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
			President				President
	U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House		U.S. Senator U.S. House
Gov. - 5 yrs Lt. Gov. " Atty Gen."					Governor Lt. Governor Atty Gen'l		
		Senate-3 yrs or Senate-4 yrs			Senator	¶	
H. Del. 3 yr			H. Delegates		H. Delegates		H. Delegates
		County: 3 yr Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue Clerk-7 yrs			County: Sheriff Com. Atty Treas. C. Revenue		
City: 5 yrs Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue					City: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue		City: 6 yrs Clerk of Ct.
		County: 3 yr Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.			County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec. Urban Exec Urban Mgr.		
	County: Plan under 15.1-676*		County: 2 yr Plan under 15.1-676*		County: Plan under 15.1-676**		
			City: A&C# Group C 2 yr		City: 2 & 4 yr offices	¶(Senate-3yr. alternative)	City: 2 yr offices

Del. - Gerald L. Baliles

1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
			President				President
	U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S.House		U.S. Senator U.S. House		U.S. House
	Governor Lt. Governor Atty Gen'l				Governor Lt. Governor Atty Gen'l		
	Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates		Senate H. Delegates		H. Delegates
	County: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct				County: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue		City: Council 2 yr terms
	City: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue				City: Sheriff Com. Atty. Treas. C. Revenue Clerk of Ct		
	County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec Urban Exec Urban Mgr.				County: Mgr. Form Co. Board Co. Exec Urban Exec Urban Mgr.		
	County: Plan under 15.1-676**				County: Plan under 15.1-676**		
	City:Council 2 & 4 yr		City:Council 2 yr terms		City:Council 2&4 yr term		

KEY

* Supervisors under the Co. Mgr. Plan elected pursuant to § 15.1-676 allowing biennial elections to 4 yr terms.

§ 24.1-90 provides for Council elections such that Group A is elected every 2 yrs beginning in 1974, Group B is elected every 4 yrs beginning in 1974, and Group C is elected every 4 yrs beginning in 1976.

** After amending 15.1-676 to remove the stagger in the terms.