1 c

Summary Index
CITY OF SANTA FE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 19, 2015

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
1. PROCEDURES		
a) Roll Call	Quorum	1
b) Approval of Agenda	Approved	1
c) Approval of Minutes of March 12, 2015	Postponed	1-2
2. PUBLIC COMMENT	Discussed	2
3. OLD BUSINESS		
a. Standing Item-Legal Issues Surrounding Redistricting	Discussed	2
b. Santa Fe River Corridor Map	Discussed	2
4. NEW BUSINESS		
a) Discussion with Independent Consultant	Discussed	2-11
b) Discussion: Possible Action-Instruction to Consultant	Discussed	11
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	None	11
6. BOARD MATTERS		
a) Setting Next Meeting Date(s) and Locations	Discussed	11-12
ADJOURNMENT	Adjourned at 4:57 p.m.	12

MINUTES OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Thursday, March 19, 2015

A scheduled meeting of the Independent Citizens' Redistricting Commission was called to order by Karen Heldmeyer, chair, on this date at approximately 3:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers, 1st floor, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1. PROCEDURES:

a) Roll call indicated a quorum as follows:

Members Present:
Karen Heldmeyer, chair
Lillian J. Montoya, vice chair (arrived later)
Steven M. Bassett
William E. Beardsley
Erin McSherry
Roderick E. Thompson (arrived later)
Elizabeth West

Members Absent:

Staff Present:
Zachary Shandler, Assistant City Attorney
Irene Romero, City Attorney's Office

Others Present:
Alternates: Neva G. Van Peski and Suzanne Ronneau (arrived later) Jody Larson, Peggy Vasquez
Brian Sanderoff, Research & Polling, Inc.
Michael Sharp, Research & Polling, Inc.
Charmaine Clair, Stenographer

b) Approval of Agenda

Ms. West moved to approve the agenda as published. Ms. McSherry seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

c) Approval of Minutes of March 12, 2015

Page3, second line under New Business: He (Mr. Sanderoff) said *that is not the case* in the plan today and...should have read: ... that is not the case in all the plans today...

Page 6, at the very end: "Chair Heldmeyer said it is lower on the priority list..." should have been: '...it is lower on the priority list *than other considerations'*.

Page 8, "Ms. McSherry asked if "limit the plans" meant that the Commission would not look at Plan B..." She meant to ask if Mr. Thompson's motion would include Plan A, not Plan B.

Mr. Beardsley moved to postpone the approval of the minutes of March 12, 2015 until the next meeting. Ms. McSherry seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Councilor Lindell thanked the Commission for their willingness to serve. She said the maps appear to be the same as the maps on the city website. Chair Heldmeyer explained there will be a new map D today.

Councilor Lindell said she understood there would be a public comment next Tuesday and will wait until she sees all of the maps before making comments.

3. OLD BUSINESS

a) Standing Item-Legal Issues Surrounding Redistricting (Exhibit 1)

Mr. Shandler said he provided a brief memo on questions and answers about annexation issues. He said point one is in response to Commissioner Beardsley's questions on annexation south of the city. He said after meeting with the Planning Commission staff he learned there will be no annexation on the southern end of town in the next 10 years.

He said secondly on Precinct 56: the Las Soleras development is estimated to have 500 lots in the next 3 to 5 years. He pointed out that using Plan A, which is already 4% above standard deviation; the consultant had mentioned that other commissions have factored in future growth, if they do not want to bump up against the 5% standard deviation.

Mr. Shandler said on point three he asked about further annexation plans. He said in Phase III annexation in the northwest part of town (the West Alameda annexation), approximately 600 people will be annexed into the city in about three years. He suggested the Commission consider that calculation in the standard deviation issues.

Chair Heldmeyer said she commented in a memo to Mr. Shandler that it will take 3-5 years for both annexations and will then be 2020 and the next census. She said the annexation has also been called the 2-A annexation and is now called the 3 annexation.

b) Santa Fe River Corridor Map (Exhibit 2)

Mr. Shandler said he wants to include Ms. Hanson's Santa Fe River corridor map in the record.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a) Discussion with Independent Consultant

Mr. Sanderoff said he wanted to make one point regarding Mr. Shandler's feedback and questions in regard to the Planning Commission. He said Plan A is the least changed plan and creates four compact

districts and addresses that District Three became 50% too large. He explained the primary difference between Plan A and the current plan is that District Four crosses over Cerrillos to pick up the excess population in the Cerrillos corridor neck and there were adjustments made to Districts One and Two.

Mr. Sanderoff noted the statistics on the back of Plan A population deviations of the four districts:

- District One is two-tenths off of the ideal population of the district.
- District Two is at minus 1percent.
- District Three is at minus 3.3% and District Three is anticipated to be high growth and if you have population deviations, it is nice to have them on the negative side to anticipate future growth. District Three grew by 47% in the prior decade.
- District Four is on the high end of 4% and Las Soleras development may happen; if Precinct 76 (west of Yucca and between Rodeo and Zia Roads) is moved into District Two, the population of District Four would be lowered to minus 1.5 percent. The Commission can choose to keep the two anticipated high growth areas on the low end, rather than the high end of zero.

Precincts-35, 50, 76 and 29 were looked at. Precinct 29 is too big to swap out; Precinct 50 if moved into District Two splits a neighborhood with Precinct 35. Precinct 76 seems the best candidate if the Commission wants to lower the deviation in District Four. If the Commission wants to equalize the population more and make District Four the low end of five percent, one precinct swap will do it; but if the compactness is a concern, that is an example of a decision the Commission will have to make.

Chair Heldmeyer asked Mr. Sanderoff when he said that Precinct 29 is too big, did he mean geographically or population wise.

Ms. Montoya entered the meeting at this time.

Mr. Sanderoff said population wise; moving population wise, the deviations get off kilter.

Mr. Beardsley said on the population growth forecast for that region; they haven't broken ground yet. There will be several years of development and the city will be close to another session like this.

Mr. Shandler said he discussed that with staff. He pointed out that the consultant has mentioned the Commission could not be speculative and as the chair noted, it could be years before people live there. He said the development was brought to the Commission's attention only because there were or have been, applications submitted to the Planning Commission staff.

Mr. Sanderoff said anticipated development cannot be built into the head count, but the Commission could consider regarding population deviations that they are comfortable with plus or minus one , two, three percent; up to the legal case law of plus or minus five. He said they will also have to consider compactness issues in that case and which of those is more important to them.

Chair Heldmeyer confirmed with Mr. Shandler that the initial numbers for Plan A are legally okay. Mr. Shandler replied the table is 4% and is under 5% and would be okay.

Mr. Sanderoff said on the request of the Commission and Commissioner McSherry, the firm was asked to try a new plan, Plan D. He said they were not able to accomplish everything Ms. McSherry requested and so he also has a Plan D-1. (Exhibit 3)

Mr. Sanderoff said Commissioner Sherry asked what it would be like to try three stated objectives: 1) to keep Districts Three and Four the same; 2) to change the configuration of Districts One and Two to make them more north-south rather than east-west and 3) to avoid having three districts touch at one point creating the possibility of three City Councilors all being elected from the same "neck of the woods".

He said they were only able to accomplish two of the three things in Plan D; keeping Districts Three and Four the same and changing Districts One and Two to a north-south configuration. Plan D does not accomplish the third objective to eliminate three districts that touch at one point in space. The population deviations fall within the plus or minus 5%: two districts have zero point percent; and two are in the 3 and 4 percentage point range.

Mr. Sanderoff reviewed Plan D-1 and explained the differences.

Plan D-1: accomplishes the objective to have Districts One and Two in a north-south configuration and the objective of not having three districts touch in one point of space. To accomplish that Precincts 29 and 31 and 34 swap out between Districts One and Four and District Three stays the same.

On Plan D: there is a district that stretches from the northern boundaries of the city down to Rodeo Road. District One goes from the top of the northern boundaries of the city and includes the north side and a good part of the west side and goes down to 1 25. To accomplish those objectives there is a long district that covers the geography of the city. He said St. Francis is a nice boundary between Districts Two and One and minimizes neighborhood splits, because many of the neighborhoods are all on one side or the other of St. Francis.

Mr. Beardsley said District Four still has a 4.0 or 4.6 % and has not solved the concern for that region.
Mr. Sanderoff said Plans D were created before hearing about the issue just discussed.

Ms. Montoya thought it would be helpful for Mr. Sanderoff to recap the other plans.

Mr. Sanderoff recapped the plans under consideration:

- Plan A: is a least change plan with no precinct splits. District Three encompasses the airport area, Tierra Contenta and the bulk of the annexed areas. District Three is 47% too large and with Tierra Contenta as the heart of the district and not crossing Cerrillos Road; the neck from Jemez/Lopez up to Siler is excess population that has to be shed from District Three.

  This plan crosses District Four over Cerrillos and picks up the excess population from District Three and puts most of the population crossing over Cerrillos into District Four. District One is a northern district including the west side of the city; District Two is south of Cerrillos and Alameda and east of Yucca for the most. The deviations are low: within plus or minus 1%; one at minus 3 and one at positive 5% above the ideal population of a district. District Three, an anticipated growth area, is better to have a deviation on the minus side to enable growth. Two Hispanic majority districts (currently there is one) are created using old boundaries and census data: District Three-

at 74% adult Hispanic and District Four at 57 % Hispanic. The total deviation among the districts is 7.3% from the smallest to the largest districts, with the average deviation at 2 percent.

Mr. Sanderoff said his impression on Plan A-1 is that the Commission was leaning against the plan. He provided overview on Plan A-1 and Plan B:

The Commission requested in the initial meeting to also develop a plan that has as close as possible to the ideal population for each of the districts.

- Plan A-1: is the same as Plan A except that it splits four precincts in order to have a population deviation among districts be 0.0% in two districts and 0.1% in two districts with a total deviation from the ideal between 0.0 and 0.1 percent.
- Plan B: District One picks up the excess population from District Three. The neck between Jemez and Siler goes into District One stretching the northern part of the city down to Jemez. District Two is everything west of St. Francis. District Four runs south of Cerrillos and between District Four and I 25 is District Three: the airport, Tierra Contenta neighborhoods. Plan B is an attempt to do something different with the Cerrillos Road corridor /Santa Fe River area. The plan creates three Hispanic majority districts. Population deviations stay within the plus or minus 5%, but take the maximum up to plus or minus 5 in District Four. There is tension between sticking with major thoroughfares and sticking to Cerrillos and St. Francis to I 25; if so, the plans could have almost no neighborhood splits and stay to major thoroughfares. The plan takes advantage of the population deviation with more flexibility.
  Plan B-1: the plan is the same as Plan B except that Precinct 83 in the northern part of the city and north of the bypass goes into District Two. There are no precinct splits. The reason that Precinct 83 was put into District Two is because the area north of the bypass, by St. Francis etc., looks more the terrain and demographics of District Two and is a way to avoid having District One stretch as far as under Plan B. The only difference between Plans B and B-1 is Precinct 83 goes into District Two and St. Francis and Cerrillos remains the primary boundary and District Three does not cross Cerrillos and District Four is bounded by St. Francis and Cerrillos and I 25. This plan is an attempt so District One does not stretch as far and to put Precinct 83 into District Two, which it has more in common with.
- Plan C: This plan uses Airport Road as a rough boundary and creates Districts Three and Four in an east-west configuration. District One becomes a north side/west side district. District Two is an east side district going as far as Yucca. This plan is an attempt to give something different that handles the excess population in District Three.
- Plan D and Plan D-1: a Commissioner request was to change Districts One and Two to north-south configuration. Plan A-2 was talked about to swap out one precinct to make Plan A the population deviation in District Four anticipated growth area on the low end of 5 percent, if the Commission chooses to do that.

Chair Heldmeyer asked if Mr. Sanderoff planned to talk about the neighborhood in relation to the maps.

Mr. Sanderoff said he is not prepared to do that, but in most cases the neighborhoods have been kept intact. He said they stuck to major thoroughfares and tri- to avoid neighborhood splits.

The Commission took a break from 3:43- 3:56 p.m. to look at the larger map format.

Chair Heldmeyer asked for comments from the Commissioners, which she will follow with comments from the alternates and the public. She said the Commission will consider which maps to take on the road after the comments. She said by March 24 the maps with the neighborhoods superimposed will be available.

Mr. Beardsley said he is in favor of Plan A. He said Plan D has interesting aspects, but he does not like D-1, which puts them in "area four at 4.6-within, but high". He said before that he did not like Plan C, but he thought the map should be presented. He said against the plan is that Cerrillos Road is a divider. The area west of Cerrillos is a growth area and the airport corridor is encouraging growth, where west of Cerrillos is fairly well established. He said it would be confusing, thinking as the Commissioner, to try to balance two different things. He said, but he cannot overlook that the plan does balance the population.

Chair Heldmeyer confirmed that Mr. Beardsley was balancing communities of interest as well as population. Mr. Beardsley replied with all of them they have the problem with area four being of high population, if Plan C is accepted.

Ms. McSherry said she likes Plan A better than B and C; it has a lot of qualities that are desirable in keeping communities together and compactness in what is connected. She found the [Plan] D options interesting, but was not sure they totally captured what she wanted. She said the D-1 split at Osage is problematic and she prefers the split at Siler Road. She said she would not mind seeing a more "play" on D, but the consultants have said they tried a few options and this was the best.

Ms. McSherry said if the consultant could play with St. Michaels and West Alameda more and see if there is a version of D that she likes better than A... She said the consultant had followed what she had asked of them, but some of the things she did not communicate is that it was not as important that three and four [Districts 3&4] stay the way they were in [Plan] A. She said [Districts] three and four could still be modified if needed, to accomplish Plan D and the goal would be to create stripes. The orientation of the stripes would not matter, but it would give the Commission the compactness issues.

Chair Heldmeyer said Ms. McSherry could give direction to staff or play with the numbers herself.

Mr. Bassett said he likes Plans A and D as well. He is interested in what an eventual striped Plan E would look like to come up with a way to organize Districts One and Two. He said at this point he thought it difficult to rule maps out. He asked the target number of plans. He was told between three and five is reasonable.

Ms. Montoya said she has a preference for A, but the two most interesting were Plans A and C. She is concerned about the [Plan] D proposals around the homogenous nature of what is presented in District Two. She likes to see a diversity of interest within a district, in the sense that it would put the elected officials and community responsible for ensuring a diversity of interests is represented; rather than what *like* people might want in their *like* neighborhoods. She said D made her uncomfortable.

Ms. Montoya said she would like to go forward with at least four maps for community feedback. She thought because D is an extreme version of the other ideas, the map would be worth putting out for community feedback, especially Districts Two and Four that would get pulled into District Two.

Ms. West said she wanted quite a few of the maps to be presented to the public, because that would stimulate a way of thinking that is close to consensus. She said a pro of Plan C is that it is so different. She

congratulated the consultants on that. Ms. West said when presenting to the public that will make it more stimulating and help people to see there are many ways to look at this, none of which are perfect.

Ms. West said she felt safest with Plan A and likes connecting different parts of town. She said she did not like with Plan C with the stretch across the bottom, but thought it should be presented to the public.

Ms. West said an overlay map that shows residential, commercial as well as population was mentioned and she would like that. She is from District Two and the D Plans are interesting because of the line going down St. Francis, because it sequesters and makes District Two almost too homogenous. She said the big thing she is looking at is how Districts One and Two are split and how the corridor down the odd shaped city, that is wonderful, reflects their odd city.

Alternate Ms. Van Peski said she is in favor of Plan A-2 with Precinct 76 switched.

Alternate Ms. Larson liked the idea of presenting one of the Plan Ds as well as Plan C to the public, because they are interesting and different. She said she is torn between presenting a number of alternatives and keeping to 3-5 [maps], which will make it easier to get feedback from the public. She thought the comments would be fragmented with more.

Anna Hansen in District Three and Mr. Rick Martinez in District One showed a large version of the River Corridor map (entered into the record earlier). Mr. Martinez said most of their neighbors noticed how much open space and land there is for the river corridor and have asked that a study be done. Mr. Martinez said they want to protect the density of the area and keep it within the neighborhood. The land is currently mostly R-5 and some R-7 [zones].

Mr. Martinez said redistricting Two [District] will add a lot of population and set the zoning in the area. He said as a citizen's group they are asking the Commission to look at the corridor as they make their decision. He said he noticed that Plan A takes this up to Siler Road and has one councilor that supports them through the process of development and the population growth of the area. He said District Four is also growing and he hopes that an endorsement by the Commission could move a plan forward for those neighborhoods.

Ms. Hansen said what the group is suggesting in the redistricting plan is to keep the river corridor together. She said they are referring to the area from Camino Alire or St. Francis down. They want protection in that section and to be sure they have a councilor to represent the area. She said she is not opposed to the area being in one city council district, because there is a Santa Fe River Commission that oversees the river. She said it is important not to break up the corridor as much as possible.

She said Plan A best represents the neighborhood and what they want and when the corridor goes down the middle of a district and on the edge; they lose protection. She said it is not in anyone's district and is just the dividing line.

Mr. Martinez added that he also likes Plan A and B, but would emphasize the future growth potential for the river corridor is a reason they want to bring up the issue.

Ms. Schruben said she wanted the comment on record that she made during the break. She said the maps that will be presented to the public have no clear evidence of where the commercial districts or the large

government areas are; or where there are strictly residential areas. The neighborhood overlay map will help. Ms. Shruben suggested putting a star for commercial or an X for government land/education, etc. would help people understand why there are big spaces and that the population is low in those precincts.

Chair Heldmeyer thought there would not be time to do that; however there are maps for the general plan that could be made available.

Ms. Schruben said the city has a commercial district and a business and an industrial overlay, but not an education map. Chair Heldmeyer replied that there is a map of the school districts.

Councilor Lindell said she would just echo what Ms. Van Peski said with Plan A. She said the plan keeps communities together and there is an importance with that familiarity. She said also with Mr. Sanderoff's suggestion to get the deviation more closely in line with Precinct 76 by switching to District Two, looks like what the city has now; it gets deviations in line and keeps the communities together.

Ms. Hansen said Plan A appeals to her the most, but she wanted to comment on the growth area in Districts Three and Four, because of Las Soleras. Her concern about Las Soleras is that is where growth will happen and possibly another rail station. She said Plan D makes her uncomfortable.

Chair Heldmeyer explained that Mr. Shandler received information from the Land Use Department and sent a memo out regarding Las Soleras.

Councilor Lindell asked why on Plan D, the district furthest to the east is District *Two* rather than District One.

Mr. Sanderoff said the answer is you can number them however you want. He said currently there are two incumbents in Plan D that live in District Two. Mr. Sharp further explained that Plan D has three current City Councilors within District Two and two of the councilors represent District Two; one of the Councilors represents District One.

Chair Heldmeyer said the Commission now has to decide: a) how many maps to take on the road; b) which maps; and c) if there is anything not in the current maps that the consultants should prepare. She said there have been suggestions for city generated maps for commercial, an industrial overlay map and the school district map. She said those maps can be given to the public, but will not be combined with the redistricting maps.

Ms. Montoya said the tables are helpful and if there could be a table to show the deviations by map in all of the maps; as well as a separate table that looks at the demographic data of 18 years and older; that will make it easier to compare.

Chair Heldmeyer said they could work out whether the consultants or city staff will prepare the handouts.

Ms. McSherry thought it would be interesting on any of the maps to have the length of the District or boundary lines. She said that is one of the top four criteria for the Commission to consider. She asked that the criteria also be defined, because it might not mean the same to everyone that reads the requirement.

Ms. McSherry explained that to her a boundary line is the length of the line that separates each district. She said they should have that for the new maps that will be presented, because that will have to be considered in the final determination. She said the Commission has been looking at criteria for 1) the deviation in population; 2) dilution of minority groups; 3) communities of interest, but have yet to look at 4) the boundary line.

Chair Heldmeyer asked which maps the Commission should take on the road.

Ms. Montoya moved that the Commission consider Plan A and Plan A-2 as one option, with the recommendation of moving Precinct 76 into District Two as one map for community consideration.

Ms. West said with three maps it will be harder for her to make the decision; five maps would be easier. She said also assumes that the current districting map will be available for purposes of comparison, but the current map is not included as a map being offered.

Chair Heldmeyer confirmed that the current district map will also be available. She restated the motion on the floor to take Plan A and Plan A-2.

Mr. Beardsley seconded the motion and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Beardsley moved that the Commission take Plan B as a presentation for the public. Ms. McSherry seconded the motion and the motion passed by a majority voice vote. Ms. Montoya voted against the motion.

Mr. Beardsley moved that the Commission take Plan C for presentation. Ms. Montoya seconded the motion.

Ms. West commented that she was not drawn to Plan C, but the map is clearly different.

Mr. Bassett said on Plan C, it appears that Precinct 35 and Precinct 50 split neighborhoods. He asked if appropriate to ask for a Plan C-1 that seeks to resolve that.

Mr. Beardsley said the friendly amendment was unnecessary. He said the purpose of Plan C is the balance of the districts, and if that is altered that kills any reason he has to look at Plan C.

The motion to take Plan C to show something different to the public was passed unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. McSherry moved that the Commission move forward with Plan D, but not with Plan D-1. Mr. Bassett seconded the motion and the motion passed with a majority voice vote. Mr. Beardsley and Ms. Montoya voted against the motion.

Ms. McSherry moved to create a new map: Plan D-2, where District One and District Two is more similar to status quo of the city council districts, but still has a separation if possible, of not having three city councilors that live close to one another who represent three different districts.

Ms. West asked if Ms. McSherry had an idea of where that would go.

Ms. McSherry said she is trying to incorporate the Santa Fe River as part of the separation (Districts One and Two), but is not sure where that has to go to get the appropriate population into District One. She said it cannot follow the river the whole way and will have to deviate.

Mr. Shandler asked Ms. McSherry if she is talking about the dividing line being east-west or north-south. Ms. McSherry replied that she does not have a preference on that and wants more similarity to the existing district map that follows the river, but it would have to deviate.

Commissioners discussed whether the idea would be a new plan or be a deviation of an existing plan.

Ms. McSherry amended her motion to be Plan A-3 with District One bordering only District Two, except on the relief route, potentially.

The motion for a new plan died for lack of a second.

Chair Heldmeyer said directions have been given to the consultants for neighborhood overlays by the time the Commission goes to the Listening Sessions. She said also a request from Commissioners McSherry and Bassett is to get the length of the borders for the four different districts.

Ms. McSherry clarified she was asking for the length of the *boundaries* between districts, which is different than the borders of each district. She explained that she is looking for the length of the district boundary lines which separate each district from each other; rather than the borders of the district, which is more one of compactness.

Mr. Sharp said he would work on that. He said he was not sure all of the data requested could be done by Tuesday, but would give it a shot.

Chair Heldmeyer confirmed that Ms. McSherry is talking about the extent to which a given district has part of its border touching another district. Ms. McSherry replied that is her understanding of the requirement.

Mr. Bassett thought that was an imprecise way to say that and was not what was intended. He asked the consultants to speak to the traditional measure of compactness for boundary length.

Mr. Sharp said traditionally the measure of compactness is the entire boundary of the district, including the outer edges all the way around; not just the boundaries between districts.

Ms. McSherry said it does not say compactness. She asked if the Commission is to interpret the criteria intent to mean compactness.

Chair Heldmeyer said the Commission is to look at compactness as one of the criteria. She thought the criteria means compactness and not boundaries. She said also how the Commission is weighing the criteria; they have heard several things that are in conflict with each other. She said the Commission will have to decide what issue is more important than another and possibly in their own minds develop a hierarchy of what is important to them and what is important to the public. She said what they hear from the public at the Listening Sessions may not be what the Commissioners had in mind.

Ms. Montoya said especially helpful at the last meeting was Mr. Sanderoff talking about each map; not just in deviation and demographic table, but also about what made one map different than another. She said the community did not have the benefit of all of the meetings. She asked if possible to have a handout that explains what differentiates one map from another. She said that will hone in what matters most to the public and give the Commission better feedback.

Mr. Thompson entered the meeting.

Chair Heldmeyer said the meetings are intended for the Commission to listen to the public. She said there is also to be a comprehensive and inviting press release that lists all of the Listening Sessions and invites people to come out.

She recapped the events of the meeting for Commissioner Thompson who just arrived. She said asked Mr. Sanderoff to recap the maps that would go the Listening Sessions.

Mr. Sanderoff summarized as follows:
Plan A and a new Plan A-2 swaps one precinct between two districts taking into account that District Four will grow and move the district to a negative deviation from the ideal, rather than a positive. He pointed out that A-2 does not equalize or improve the population deviations from Plan A; it keeps similar population deviations, but takes into account that the two anticipated high-growth areas will both be on the negative side of the plus or minus 5% deviation. The total deviation from the smallest to the biggest is not going to change much if the precincts are not split. The two districts (Districts Three and Four) will be on the low end of the deviation where the anticipated growth will be.

Plans B, C and D - Commissioners did not always like all of those plans, but thought it will be good to show the public a variety of plans for the public's feedback.

Chair Heldmeyer added there was a fair amount of consensus on all of the decisions, not necessarily unanimous. Ms. McSherry was asked to restate her motion that died.

Chair Heldmeyer said five maps will be presented to the public and there will be neighborhood overlays and some maps from the city GIS to also take to the public; industrial and school districts.

Mr. Thompson had no comments and apologized for arriving late.

b) Discussion on Possible Action-Instruction to Independent Consultant- Previously Discussed

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

6. BOARD MATTERS:

a) Setting Next Meeting Date(s) and Locations

Chair Heldmeyer noted the memo from Mr. Shandler that lists the four Listening Sessions with locations and dates. She said it was mentioned at the last meeting that everyone may not make all of the Listening Sessions; however she wanted to be sure each Commissioner could attend the Listening Session for his or her district.

All Commissioners were available to attend the Listening Session for their individual districts.

Mr. Thompson moved to accept the meeting dates and locations as presented. Mr. Beardsley seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Heldmeyer explained that the Commission is not tied to the maps they take to the public and there could be cases where a precinct may be moved to make things better. She reiterated that the Commission will not vote at the Listening Session. She said the minutes will be available for meetings that a Commissioner cannot attend.

Ms. McSherry asked if a vote is required if a Commissioner wants to create a map based on public input. Chair Heldmeyer replied they have been giving direction to the consultant without a vote and that could continue.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

*Having completed the agenda and with no further business, the chair adjourned the meeting at 4:57p.*m.

Approved by:

_____

Karen Heldmeyer, Chair

Submitted by:

Charmaine Clair

Charmaine Clair, Stenographer