



**CITY OF GREENBELT**  
25 Crescent Road  
Greenbelt, MD 20770

# **CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA**

**JUNE 3, 2026  
7:30 PM**

## [Zoom Link](#)

Dial-in: 301-715-8592

Webinar ID: 812 8105 2221

Passcode: 444128

## **I. WORK SESSION**

### 1. Board of Elections Update

Suggested Action:

1. Introductions — 10 minutes (7:30–7:40 pm)
2. Board of Election Discussion — 30 minutes (7:40–8:10 pm)
3. Council Discussion — 30 minutes (8:10–8:40 pm)
4. Question and Answers — 35 minutes (8:40–9:15 pm)
5. Other Items — 15 minutes (9:15–9:30 pm)

- Informational Items

## MEMORANDUM

January 27, 2026

TO: City Council, City of Greenbelt  
FROM: Bonita Anderson, City Clerk  
RE: Post-Election Report to City Council

Please accept this memorandum, with the attached table, as the report of the Board of Elections to the City Council after last November's election.

The Board has met and discussed the election held November 4, 2025. We are prepared to review with Council members the findings we have made. We apologize for the delay of several weeks in the submission of this report, occasioned by Board member illnesses and several unique issues that came to our attention.

In general, the Board has determined that the election proceeded reasonably well, with some counting delays after the polls closed. Several unusual issues arose during the election campaign, but nothing came up that greatly affected the outcome.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The chief results of the election were in three parts.

First, a new member was added to the Council. Six incumbents were reelected, and Council's composition remains largely as it was prior to the election. Our incumbent Mayor and Mayor pro tem remained first and second in the balloting.

This year also saw a notable increase in voter participation. In 2023, a total of 2,685 voters cast ballots, but this November's election had 3,255 votes, a 21% increase.

Third, among the 3,255 total votes, a substantial number, 2,151, voted in favor of the ranked-choice voting referendum question. This approving response represented about 12% of registered voters in the City. That is, although only about one in eight residents who are registered to vote approved the ranked-choice measure, a large majority of those who did vote were in favor of the concept.

## CAMPAIGN ISSUES

The Board was not asked a large number of questions from voters, candidates, residents, or the press (the News Review). We had inquiries regarding voter registration procedures, as happens every election year, and candidates as usual – with some exceptions – took advantage of the City program allowing common signage, at designated sites in Greenbelt. The processes for registration (with the County for citizens and the City for noncitizens) and candidate signage went forward without serious problems.

We did not receive many resident complaints about how candidates posted signs, distributed campaign literature, or ran their campaigns generally.

Several residents took issue with candidate access to their homes, and a public multifamily building manager had a problem with campaign workers who did not follow management’s nonpublic access policy. Some Greenbelt residents, especially in the older neighborhoods in the City, wish not to be disturbed by door-knockers, and have posted “No Soliciting” or similar messages. Some campaign workers in 2025, however, took the position that they had the right to ignore these signs, and continued to knock on those doors.

The Board had to advise complaining residents that it was up to candidates how their workers behaved in these situations. We tried to pass on these complaints to the candidates, but we decided we did not have authority to make official orders in such cases.

City staff, at the designated candidate sign locations, had to install signs for a candidate who had not paid for placement. He did make the payment at a later date. The Board recommends that in future elections, no candidate may be included on signage until payment has been made. Moreover, candidates should not be allowed to store signs with the City.

A dispute also arose as to access to a multifamily building. Management there allows access only to residents and their guests, not members of the public generally. One campaign argued that it had the right to access, regardless of this management policy, and we had to advise the candidate that access to any building, public or private, single- or multifamily, is up to the authorized managers (or owners). That is, a candidate for public office – or his or her workers – cannot use

that status to demand, as a legal right, access to a residential building whose management has a nonpublic access policy.

A minor issue arose after one candidate requested use of his nickname on the ballot. The Board tries to follow what we understand as Maryland state policy: On an election ballot, a candidate may not use titles like "Doctor," "Attorney," "Representative," and the like, or a personalized nickname. In the case before the Board, however, the candidate demonstrated to our satisfaction that he is generally known in the City by his nickname, and many residents do not know his legal name (on his identification). The candidate's nickname appeared in quotation marks, with his legal name, and this disposition was satisfactory to the candidate.

An issue arose on election day, after polls closed, in the Board's public reporting of results. The report was delayed for several hours. Board members were unfortunately short-handed that evening, because of a member's illness. Also, we were notified that provisional ballots were mistakenly scanned at some precincts. This required the Board to manually review all ballots, to ensure no provisionals were counted on election night.

## TECHNICAL ISSUES AND VENDOR PERFORMANCE

Our main election vendor, Clear Ballot, again provided very good service. The Board in November 2025 did not find any significant issues working with Clear Ballot, and we may in future elections be able to make improvements by programming specific ballot types, rather than using just one. This would address the scanning issues. Technical questions regarding equipment setup like outlet accessibility and power cord connections at polling locations must also be addressed, with assistance from our vendor.

Clear Ballot indicated that we could print ballots on demand. In future elections, we will not be required to order a large supply up front, as we have always done. This would include provisional ballots, required whenever a voter's name does not appear in an e-poll book, which will be processed at the Municipal Center rather than the individual polling place.

Clear Ballot also reviewed with the Board options for securing vote counts from polling places. The collapsible-casing boxes we used in this election are easier to move but present security issues. The company's hard-casing containers require van delivery because of their size, but provide better security in the vote-transport process.

Another technical issue concerned candidate financial reporting. The Election Code requires each Council candidate to make an initial, an interim, and a final report of contributions and expenditures. Compliance with the Code this time was improved considerably over prior years, thanks to the efforts of Board member Beth Terry, who spent many hours revising the reporting form and reviewing reports after they were filed. Candidates with one exception made timely filings, though in most cases the campaigns or their treasurers were required to make corrective amendments. At this time, all candidates but one have filed their final report.

Prior to the next election, the Board plans to have special training for the chief judges assigned to each polling place. That will include addenda to the training guides for poll workers, and step-by-step instructions to be followed. We hope these measures will speed up the collection and counting processes, and make them more secure.

## VOTER PARTICIPATION

We saw in November a substantial increase in ballots counted. There were 3,344 votes cast, 21% more than in 2023. In 2025, total turnout was almost 21% of registered voters.

As noted above, voters showed considerable interest in the advisory referendum questions. They did not vote favorably on the inquiries regarding Council terms (to change them from two years to four), but they agreed that members should be subject to recall if they have four-year terms. But a roughly two-to-one majority of those who voted on the question, 3,183, favored changing the balloting system from our present one, with up to seven choices not preferentially marked, to the ranked-choice system, so-called, where voters give a ranking number, from one to seven (or however many, less than seven, they choose to vote for), for each favored candidate.

The ranked-choice voting system is not yet widely used, in Maryland or elsewhere, but it is currently in use in Takoma Park, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and other municipalities. If Council decides to implement a ranked-choice system, it will be necessary to educate residents on how it is supposed to work and why the costs – not substantial, but more than trivial as to public debate and education – are worthwhile, for Greenbelt.

City of Greenbelt, MD  
Election 2025

Precinct Information	PGC Registered Voters	Registered Non Citizens	GB Registered Voters
03 - Community Center	3318	4	3322
06 - Police Station	2549	7	2556
08 - Springhill Lake	4191	10	4201
13 - Greenbriar	3193	0	3193
18 - Schrom Hills	2706	1	2707
Total Registered Voters	15957	22	15979

Election Results

	Election Day (11/04/2025)						Early Voting (11/01 & 11/02/2025)				Mail-in	Provisionals	Total Votes	
	Precinct 3 (CC)	Precinct 6 (P)	Precinct 8 (SHL)	Precinct 13 (G)	Precinct 18 (SH)	Election Day Total	Precinct 3 (CC)	Precinct 8 (SHL)	Precinct 18 (SH)	Early Voting Total	All Precincts	All Precincts	All Precincts	% of Ballots cast
<b>For City Council</b>														
Emmett V. Jordan	575	361	121	165	213	1435	191	26	65	282	632	59	2408	72.0%
Kristen L.K. Weaver	560	323	124	129	169	1305	192	33	60	285	585	54	2229	66.7%
Jenni Pompei	567	319	93	126	160	1265	203	26	49	278	552	51	2146	64.2%
Danielle P. McKinney	524	294	132	134	175	1259	171	35	54	260	559	46	2124	63.5%
Frankie Santos Fritz	553	294	109	124	157	1237	196	27	57	280	474	61	2052	61.4%
Amy Knesel	494	328	90	88	137	1137	185	24	37	246	508	47	1938	58.0%
Silke I. Pope	418	288	75	122	147	1050	149	21	55	225	501	36	1812	54.2%
Rodney M. Roberts	338	235	63	106	121	863	88	18	36	142	408	37	1450	43.4%
Kevin "Coach K" Lockhart	343	183	103	99	123	851	106	14	46	166	378	39	1434	42.9%
Bill Orleans	96	57	23	39	43	258	33	4	15	52	139	10	459	13.7%
Write-In	37	19	1	1	7	65	9	2	6	17	19	0	101	3.0%
Total votes cast	4505	2701	934	1133	1452	10725	1523	230	480	2233	4755	440	18153	
Aver. # of votes cast per voter in Council race	5.4	5.4	4.8	5.6	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.0	5.4	
<b>Voter Statistics</b>														
# of ballots cast	830	499	194	204	267	1994	286	42	88	416	846	88	3344	
# of registered voter Poll Pad check-ins	827	499	195	203	264	1988	286	38	88	412	844	88	3332	
# of registered non-citizen check-ins	2	0	1	0		3	0	4	0	4	1		8	
Total check-ins	829	499	196	203	264	1991	286	42	88	416	845	88	3340	
% of registered voters voting	5.2%	3.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.7%	12.5%	1.8%	0.3%	0.6%	2.6%	5.3%	0.6%	21.0%	
% of votes per precinct/voting method	24.8%	14.9%	5.8%	6.1%	8.0%	59.6%	8.6%	1.3%	2.6%	12.4%	25.3%	2.6%	100.0%	
Difference between votes and check-ins	1	0	-2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	
<b>Referendum Questions</b>														
Referendum RCV (Yes)	558	293	147	127	191	1316	192	28	59	279	487	69	2151	
Referendum RCV (No)	255	184	38	69	67	613	81	7	24	112	294	13	1032	
TOTAL VOTES Referendum RCV	813	477	185	196	258	1929	273	35	83	391	781	82	3183	
Referendum Term (Yes)	275	170	85	83	98	711	94	26	32	152	362	40	1265	
Referendum Term (No)	519	313	100	113	155	1200	173	12	52	237	423	44	1904	
TOTAL VOTES Referendum Term	794	483	185	196	253	1911	267	38	84	389	785	84	3169	
Referendum Recall (Yes)	661	379	147	163	193	1543	204	29	60	293	642	68	2546	
Referendum Recall (No)	83	58	19	26	42	228	37	6	20	63	91	8	390	
TOTAL VOTES Referendum Recall	744	437	166	189	235	1771	241	35	80	356	733	76	2936	
<b>Reconciliation</b>														
Variance between ballots cast and check-ins	1	0	-2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	
Disallowed*											2	30	32	

\* 2 mail-in ballots were sent in without any identifying information or signature.

\* 30 Provisional ballots were found to be cast by unregistered voters (or from those registered outside City limits.)

## MEMORANDUM

May 28, 2026

TO: City Council, City of Greenbelt  
FROM: Board of Elections *B A*  
RE: 2025 Election Report Addendum

Please accept this memorandum as an addendum to the 2025 election report dated 27 January 2026. The addendum covers two notable topics. The Board is prepared to discuss in more detail the topics of the election report and addendum at the work session scheduled for 3 June 2026.

### ELECTION DAY DISRUPTION

During election day polling set-up, a dispute at Precinct 13 (Greenbriar - P13) occurred between a temporary city contractor and an election clerk. Due to the inexperience of the assigned election judge, they were unable to step in when tension between workers arose and prevent escalation. The contractor, without authority, dismissed the election clerk prior to polls opening. Board members met with the City Manager and decided to remove the contractor from the polling place. The contractor was eventually dismissed from election day work. To cover the loss of the two poll workers, a board member was sent to assist temporarily.

For future policy, the Board recommends identifying and assigning election judge positions to applicants with 1) one or more years of Greenbelt election judge (chief) experience, 2) multiple years of Greenbelt election clerk experience, or 3) multiple years of election judge (chief) outside of Greenbelt.

### VENDOR EXPERIENCE: FORT ORANGE PRESS

Fort Orange Press (FOP) was a previously used vendor for printing ballots and mailing ballot applications and mail-in ballots. The City Clerk was tasked with coordinating with FOP for printing and mailing services. On multiple occasions, the City Clerk attempted email and phone communication to establish an expected

timeline and did not receive specific answers. The expected timeline was included in the 2023 election cycle with this vendor. The vendor also made available an online portal to facilitate communication and to receive files; however, unlike previous years, the City Clerk reported the information uploaded via portal was largely ignored. Irregular communication with FOP contributed to the delay in mail-in ballot applications to registered voters. Based on the Board's timeline, the mail-in applications were sent one month later than desired.

Additionally, incorrect versions were printed for mail-in ballots and all election day ballots provided by FOP. As a result, city staff worked with our election equipment vendor Clear Ballot to acquire the appropriate material and printed the early vote and election day ballots in-house between Oct 29 to Nov 4, 2025.

Due to the dissatisfaction working with Fort Orange Press during the 2025 election cycle, the Board intends to find an alternative printing and mailing vendor for the next election. In future, the Board will communicate with the City Manager regarding the performance of a vendor prior to the fulfillment of the contract payment.