RECORDER'S FORM (Due date: December 16, 2016)

LWVMD Primary Study 2016 - Part I: Single-member or Multi-Member Legislative Districts

DATE		
Name and e	-mail for person filling our repor	t
Name of Loc	al League	
Number of m	nembers participating	Number of Units
Method of co	onsensus (meetings, mail in, etc	c.)
MAIL to:	LWVMD, 111 Cathedral Stree	t, Suite 201, Annapolis MD 21401
Or EMAIL to:	Lu.pierson@verizon.net (410	-821-3004 for questions) AND to lwvmd@verizon.net
	CONSE	NSUS QUESTIONS
Question 1. Should the Maryland League retain its current position relating to single-member and multi-member districts, namely support for:		
used to dete a. full b. ged c. pre	-	or the House of Delegates]. The following criteria should be single and which should be multi-member: unity boundaries;
believes that position, to c	if the current position is retained	n the phrase "for the House of Delegates." The Committee ed, the addition of that phrase should be included in the position on single versus multi-member districts on the local unty commission, etc.
Preser	discussion of above position: vation of political and community bour cross county lines or city lines actness = geographic compactness	ndaries means not establishing district lines that
YES	NO	NO CONSENSUS
Comments:		

IF THE RESPONSE TO QUESTION 1 IS NO OR NO CONSENSUS ON QUESTION 1, YOU MAY ONLY ANSWER YES TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

Question 2. Should the Maryland League support the establishment of all/only single-member districts for the Maryland House of Delegates?			
member			
omposed of ances the			