

The Chinatown Working Group currently has a simple voting structure of “one (voting) member, one vote”. This method of voting is very simple to administer and since, as far as I understand, a CWG decision is non-binding on its members¹, in theory, any CWG decision could (and should) be interpreted solely in the context of this simple voting structure and the CWG membership.

However, in practice, something different has developed. It appears that the community boards that have endorsed the CWG want to take CWG developed plans as “from the community”. The CWG itself has, on a number of occasions, made the claim of an unprecedented grassroots effort at representing the communities’ interests.

In light of this, the current voting membership and structure, while simple to administer, is a woefully crude and inadequate approximation of being “representative of the community”. This proposal outlines a potentially better approximation to “representativeness”.

Weighted Votes by Category

We can come up with a better approximation to “representation” than the current “one member, one vote” system. One possible approach is to:

1. Come up with categories for member organizations
2. Assign member organizations to one (and only one) of those categories
3. Assign a “weight” to the category
4. Assign member organizations an equal weight within a category

¹e.g. A CWG vote to instruct Chatham Green to stop criticizing the Park Row closure would have no binding effect on Chatham Green.