

MINUTES
SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
LAWTON REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
JANUARY 16, 2012

George Moses, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Notice of meeting and agenda were posted at City Hall as required by the Open Meeting Act.

ROLL CALL

Present: Godlove, Ernest; Henry, Pat; Jester, Kent; Knippenberg, Don; Moses, George; Smith, G. Wayne; Stewart, James (entered late)

Absent: Holland, Dennis.

Also Present: Frank Jensen, City Attorney; Richard Rogalski, Planner Director; Michael Jones, GIS; Monica Baughman, Election Board Secretary; Denise Ezell, Deputy City Clerk.

Moses stated I would like to welcome Councilman Tennis, Councilman Zarle, Councilman Wells, and Kim McConnell from the Lawton Constitution. We would like to welcome all of you.

-
1. Approve Minutes of January 11, 2012.

Moses stated take a moment to make sure the minutes represent your comments accurately.

MOVED by Godlove, **SECOND** by Smith, to approve the minutes of January 11, 2012 as written. **AYE:** Henry; Jester; Knippenberg; Moses; Smith; Stewart; Godlove. **NAY:** None. **MOTION CARRIED.**

-
2. Discuss and Review Draft Ward Boundaries and take action if necessary.

Moses stated staff has put together a draft Ward boundaries. I looked at the changes on the precincts from 2000 to today and there are quite a few minor changes. Do you have an official record of these changes that we could have?

Baughman stated nothing you could have. I just have one map.

Moses stated I have made some notes of theses changes and will get those typed up. This will give us a record of the precincts changes that occurred between 2000 and 2010. Looking at the information Wards 1, 2 and 3 appear to be short in population somewhere between 1,300 to 2,000. Ward 4 has to come down and I don't know how we are going to do that. It has 2,600. The average number excluding Ft. Sill and the prison is 10,501. I used 2,000 for the prison number and it is actually 2,300.

Haywood stated the prison population is in Ward 7.

Moses stated good morning and Welcome. I didn't see you come in. The last time we met we decided to treat the prison and Ft. Sill the same way we did in 2000. We are stripping those out of the Wards and will put them back once our work is complete. Ward boundaries will be strictly on Lawton population.

Haywood stated okay.

Moses stated the prison population is bigger than I used so we will have to account for that variation of about 300. Wards 2 and 3 will need to be increased. Each of them are down about 2,000. That is an imbalance I don't think we can live with. If you take 10% of the average and add and subtract that number you get a range. If you get the population of the Ward within that range you have met the criteria. If not you haven't met the criteria.

Godlove said there was some discussion about if you kept the precincts together you don't have to meet that 10%.

Moses stated that is true.

Henry stated when you add or subtract population from a Ward you can't split a precinct. You have to take a whole precinct.

Godlove stated we split them last time.

Henry stated they suggest we not do that due to the additional expense.

Moses stated Baughman cautions us against splitting precincts because of the problems it creates.

Jester stated the new boundaries have created several of these situations we will have to address. We did split precincts the last time.

Godlove stated according to this map there were five precincts that were split.

Jester stated that is because of the new precinct lines.

Jensen stated that is the current map.

Rogalski stated the way I was doing it was finding the average and going ten plus or ten minus. The guidelines say 10% between the lowest and the highest. That is 10% difference between two distinct numbers. This makes it a little more difficult to meet if you are going to try and meet that number.

Moses stated if we take the average and do what I'm suggesting the range is 9,551 to 10,551. We would have to recalculate the numbers. I'm trying to get a methodology we can work with. We will use that range to work with in establishing the Wards and get as close as we

can to meet the criteria. Mathematically we will meet the criteria from the smallest to the largest being 10%.

Henry stated there isn't anything in our paperwork that states that the way you just said it.

Rogalski stated it is in the draft guidelines under population and equity. It says "The total deviation between the largest and smallest ward must be as small as possible, but in all cases must be less than 10%". Isn't that the way it is listed in the federal guidelines?

Jensen stated I haven't read the federal guidelines. I want to emphasize this is based on the Wards. It says "a municipal governing body to the extent practical shall not sub-divide precincts by the County Election Board in establishing Ward Council boundaries." That is not an absolute. It is to the extent possible. The second criteria says "the Ward shall be substantially equal in population." And the third criteria about sub-dividing precincts says "municipal governing body, to the extent practical, shall not sub-divide precincts established by a County Election Board." I view those as three criteria's and the one that is absolute is the population.

Moses stated I'm trying to get some parameters we could work with to get the criteria. I'm suggesting we keep in mind this range in population in order to get to some workable solution. We won't hit them all, but we will get as close as we can. With the criteria I looked at the current population, excluding Ft. Sill and the prison, and this is what I ended up with. In Ward 1 we need to add 406 people; Ward 2 we need to add 1,055; Ward 3 we need to add 1,043; Ward 4 we need to remove 1,553; Ward 5 we need to remove 613; Ward 6 we need to remove 94. Ward 7 is the only Ward that meets the criteria. It is in permissible range relative to population. Ward 8 we need to add 208. In Ward 7 we have a huge development going on at the west end with a large gap and then you have the rest of the population. That becomes a non-homogeneous issue relative to the criteria.

Stewart asked do you have a conception as to the Wards that need to be added to or subtracted from.

Moses stated yes.

Jester asked did you use these numbers?

Moses stated yes. I didn't have the prison population so I used 2000 and it is actually 2,300.

Rogalski stated it is almost 2500.

Moses stated so these number are 500 off and they will need to be adjusted. Ward 4 is heavily skewed by population on the east end and in towards I44. We have gaps in Wards 7 and 4 that the State has linked together. With regards to population it is a straight issue. If we deal with the gap we need to think about how we are going to do that. That is the setting within which we are going to view these alternatives that staff has put together.

Godlove asked which map are you using? I'm looking at this map and the figures you just stated are not consistent with the figure on this map.

Moses stated no they are not. I'm using the average of all the Ward populations excluding Ft. Sill and the prison.

Godlove stated and that is 9,551 as the low and 10,501 as the high.

Moses stated yes. That establishes the range and if we get close to the range we will be close to meeting the criteria.

Godlove stated you stated Ward 7 is within the range, but Ward 7 is showing 12,981.

Moses stated I used 2,000 as the prison population and you have to take that out. The actual population is 2,500 so it will have to be adjusted.

Godlove stated ok.

Moses stated I'll adjust these numbers accordingly. Once it is typed I'll get a copy to everyone.

Godlove stated I looked at the figures that were printed in the newspaper as far as the precincts and looked at what I thought were our figures and there seemed to be some significant differences.

Moses stated McConnell where did you get your numbers?

McConnell stated from the map.

Moses stated lets hear an explanation of the drafts from Rogalski. Once he is finished we will answer any questions you might have.

Rogalski stated first let me explain the sub-division tracking map. We use this map for tracking our growth. It indicates all the growth that has occurred since BRAC in 2005. It is a good indication of where the community is growing or has grown. This is just for informational purposes. When looking at redistricting you can take this into consideration. The task I had was what could be done without splitting precincts. Precinct populations are very large. The average Ward population is 10,400 and some of the precincts have over 6,000. Three precincts is too much and two is not enough. This is not an easy process. I have an Excel spreadsheet you will need to marry up with the Alternate map. On the Excel spreadsheet you see the population with each Ward and precinct. Whatever population shows that is which precinct I put in the Ward. Two things to look at across the bottom are the percentages and the deviation from the average. The target Ward population between each Ward is 10,400. The bottom row of percentages is the difference from that target. Ward 1 is -12; Ward 2 -10; Ward 3 +8; Ward 4 +17, Ward 5 - 2; Ward 6 -12; Ward 7 -10; and Ward 8 +21. This does not achieve population equity at all. I kept the precincts in tact and I don't feel it was a disastrous layout. While respecting or maintaining

precinct lines you have few options. There are few precincts with a small population that can be moved around readily. In precinct 43 there are 173 non-incarcerated inhabitants. You could move that to an adjacent Ward without changing our overall average by much. Ward 8 is 21% with only three precincts. All the adjacent precincts to that Ward are all over 4,000 so there is no way to win by moving precincts in that Ward. This is not a perfect alternative, but I was trying to mathematically look at what adjacent precincts could be moved around to get as close as possible and it is not very close. At the top of the page on the right hand side I showed the population deviation between the largest and smallest Ward. For this alternative it was 27%. I did well on compactness, but not on population.

Moses stated I'm getting confused. Will you explain the percentages. What is the 27%.

Rogalski stated you take the largest number and subtract the smallest. Then divide the difference by the largest. It is the difference between those two divided by the largest precinct population. At the bottom they are based on the target average. Bottom line is based on the difference of that number from the average population.

Moses stated I just want to make sure that everybody understands that. Are there any questions?

Godlove asked is the 27% the percentage figure you are using in the draft guidelines?

Rogalski stated yes. That is the way the draft guideline is laid out.

Godlove stated to meet the draft guidelines the 27% must come down to 10%.

Rogalski stated correct.

Godlove stated so the bottom one really is irrelative as far as the draft guidelines are concerned.

Rogalski stated more or less. It is a way to look at them. As I was working on this I was actually looking at the bottom number. It is very easy to try and fix the smallest and the largest. You will get your overall down and then you will take the smallest and largest and fix those. They are just different ways to look at the same item. That was Alternative A.

Moses asked is there a way to explain the changes that were made?

Rogalski stated I tried to do very little to this alternative. When the new precincts were laid out they split precincts in several locations. I had to adjust those to get back to precinct lines. Precincts 1 and 2 stayed basically the same. Precinct 3 was adjusted to the new precinct lines. It went south a little. Ward 5 was adjusted to the precinct line and I added some. It lost population and I added precinct 32. Ward 4 is basically the same except I took out precinct 30 to try and reduce the population.

Moses asked what happened to the slice in precinct 30? It was north of Rogers Lane.

Rogalski stated a portion of precinct 30 was inside the city limits and outside the Ft. Sill boundary.

Moses asked is it still there?

Rogalski stated yes.

Moses stated I believe in 2000 we treated that as 30b. We are talking about drawing a line from the intersection of NE Flower Mound Road and east Rogers Lane. Does everyone have that?

Rogalski stated when you see this again it will have the city limits on there. Somehow we lost that or the military boundary.

Moses asked are those populations included in precinct 31?

Rogalski stated there are 884 residents outside of Ft. Sill and 2,460 inside Ft. Sill.

Godlove stated now those are not included in precinct 31 they are in precinct 30 and in Ward 4.

Rogalski stated currently those residents are in Ward 4. This alternative moves them to Ward 2.

Godlove stated Alternative A moves them to Ward 2 and Alternative B leaves them in Ward 4. Is that correct?

Rogalski stated yes

Moses stated so that little pie slice is actually in Ward 2.

Rogalski stated yes. Ward 4 other than losing that triangle basically stayed the same. In Ward 5 I added precinct 32. There was little change in Ward 6 and 8. Precinct 9 took in the square mile between SW Lee and 67th Street. Ward 8 lost that whole square mile so I had to add something back in. You couldn't add just that square mile because it was one of the large sections. Precinct 9 has 5,000 residents so I could have added it or precinct 1. Precinct 1 had the lowest population so I added it to Ward 8. Ward 6 took the rest and heads east. I brought precinct 45, which is down to the southwest, in Ward 6. Ward 7 is the most expansive. It is still expansive in this alternative.

Stewart asked do you mean expansive geographically?

Rogalski stated yes. It spread across the whole south part of town. It has seen a lot of growth in the southwest part. I split that on 67th Street due to growth occurring east of there. It splits that new population that is growing in part of Ward 6 and 7. Basically that is it. I took

precinct 32 and added it to Ward 5 from Ward 7. I tried to do as little as possible by maintaining precinct boundaries and creating some population equity. I didn't get far with population equity. It is still at a 27% difference from the low to the high.

Stewart asked when you make a change from one precinct to another does the geography aspects have to be contiguous?

Rogalski stated yes. When looking at where a precinct might go it has to go to a Ward that touches. Even then you want it to be as compact as possible.

Moses asked are there any other questions for this alternative? If none lets move to Alternative B.

Rogalski stated I don't necessarily like Alternative B. I was just trying to get something different. I was trying to change those numbers to see how low I could reduce the population equity without thinking about neighborhoods or anything. I was playing with numbers trying to make something change. If you look at the bottom row of numbers the percent differences from the average I did succeed a little bit. The highest went from 21% to 16%. The lowest actually went a little further down. Ward 2 is minus 15% as opposed to minus 12% in Alternate A. It get a little lower from the average and a little closer on the high end. With all that work the population difference is still 27%. I'm comfortable saying you will not beat that population equity while maintaining precincts. I can come up with a well configured Ward with the neighborhoods in the right place and the demographics are good, but the population equity will fall short of the target.

Moses asked what did you do different between Alternative A and Alternative B?

Rogalski stated in Alternate A Ward 8 was the precinct with the highest population. I new I had to put a different configuration on Ward 8. Instead of taking 7 as it was before I moved it to precinct 3. Now Ward 8 is made up of 1, 2, and 3 which numerically is very concise. It is still over 12,000, but not as high as it was. In Ward 1 I borrowed a precinct so I had to adjust Ward 1 and take it down. Now that would be 15 and 17. I adjusted Ward 3 to take up the vacancy and that ends up with precinct 7 and 8. I put precinct 32 with Ward 2 to bring that number up and put precinct 38 back into Ward 4. I just moved things around to try and see what we could do. There are not a lot of changes. The precincts are just to large. I would like to reiterate I don't like Alternate B. It is just an example.

Moses asked the Mayor has just joined us and I would like to welcome him. Are there any questions for Rogalski about either of theses alternatives?

Stewart asked do these changes do any violence to the Wards or precincts?

Rogalski stated Alternate A isn't overly dramatic. I don't think it is truly upsetting other than the population numbers don't get as close as you might want them to be.

Moses stated we have two alternatives that have been worked out. Jones can your model produce an alternative that meets the population criteria? I'm sure it will look ugly and horrible.

Henry stated the hard thing is he has to move a whole precinct.

Moses stated that is what I'm asking. I don't see an alternative that meets the population criteria.

Jester stated not without splitting precincts.

Moses stated that is why I'm suggesting we look at it if Jones can produce it.

Jones stated I believe we can.

Godlove asked isn't that what we just did?

Moses stated we tried. I think what we will see out of this is a rather dramatic change in Ward boundaries. I guess the question is do we want to go that route or do we want to try and work with what we have and get as close as we can to the population numbers?

Henry asked do we have any responsibility to put the split precincts back together?

Jensen stated we have a responsibility to try and maintain boundaries that match the precincts. That is your third criteria. The overall most important criteria is population. I'm reading a case right now that talks about Rogalski's 10% guideline. It is not just a guideline. It is a rule that you should try to meet. If you are under 10% there is case to be made that we will be okay. If you are over 10% we have to have good reasons decided on the record to be over 10% if we get challenged.

Moses stated we have two alternatives that we can pick at. I'm going to call on the Councilmen to give us some guidance. I would like to have Jones produce such an alternate to look at during our next meeting. Can you do that?

Jones stated yes.

Jester stated I don't know if it is appropriate to mention this, but there is another alternative that we have been hesitant to talk about. It is the only one that is going to match all of our criteria for now and in the future. That would be additional Wards. It may require a charter change, but is ultimately the solution to the problems we are trying to deal with.

Moses asked if we went that route would we add one or two?

Jester stated probably two.

Mayor Fitch stated I believe you have to stay with the Mayor casting a vote in the case of a tie.

Moses asked can you create two additional Wards?

Jones stated I think so.

Moses stated I want to remind you this is for background information to look at. We will not proceed down that road unless the body decides to do so.

Godlove asked where are you going to put the Wards? It sounds like the problem is our precincts are to large.

Henry stated we can't change that.

Godlove stated we can. We can't change the precincts, but we can split them.

Moses stated Baughman has laid out the penalties of doing that. What does it cost to split a precinct?

Baughman stated with the old voting system we could have two or three Wards per system. With the new system if you split a precinct between three Wards you would have three machines, three sets of workers, and confused voters. Voters don't know what Ward they are in. You will have mass confusion as to which machine a voter is going to vote on.

Godlove asked if we split a precinct between two Wards we would have two machines?

Baughman stated yes and two sets of workers.

Godlove asked why do we need to have two sets of workers?

Baughman stated you have to have a person manning each machine with a separate poll book. You can't combine it all.

Godlove stated I understand the machine doesn't work that way and I understand the problem with regard to educating the voters. You have to educate me as to which Ward I'm suppose to go to initially. You can easily educate me as to whether I'm suppose to go to the machine on the north side of the building or on the south side of the building in the event that I'm in a precinct that is split in that particular way.

Baughman stated it seems easy to us, but on the election side of it 99% of the people don't realize where they go vote or what district they are in.

Godlove stated I understand that, but if we are running up against a population number and we are unable to achieve that number then doesn't one of our alternatives have to become splitting precincts. One precinct could be split and possibly get closer to our 10% deviation. I'm trying to figure out as to what sort of money we are talking about. I read in the newspaper we were talking about an astronomical expense. Are we jumping to an extreme? Can we split one

precinct and maybe add a \$1,000 or \$5,000 as distinguished from running the risk of being hauled into court and not being able to sustain our 10%.

Moses stated Godlove makes a good point. We need to understand servicing a precinct cost X and if we split it then servicing cost XX. Is there some incremental number? Do you have to purchase another machine? Do you have to have more people? Does splitting the precinct double the cost of administrating a Ward?

Godlove stated we can come up with the same solution that we leave the precincts in tact. I think for Jensen's benefit we have to consider the expense we are weighing against keeping the precincts either separate or together. If we don't then we get thrown out of court real quickly.

Henry asked would you refresh our memories as to the deadline the Election Boards needs in order to meet all the changes in the City Charter?

Baughman stated if the Charter passes the filing period is April 11th and we have to have maps in tack before that filing date. The State office has required I encourage this committee to get this done in December. They need it as soon as possible. If we don't get it until March we will have to live with it.

Smith asked when would you like to have it?

Baughman stated as soon as you can.

Moses asked if we can make it by the middle of February can you live with that?

Baughman stated yes.

Jester asked just for discussion what happens if we decide to amend the Charter. How does that happen and could it happen quickly enough?

Godlove stated we don't have time.

Jester stated so for now we have to have something other than an amendment. Can we still recommend the Charter be amended?

Moses stated yes. After this work is over that alternative can be looked at and developed. This committee could come back and re-establish Ward boundaries. That is our business if we decide to establish two more Wards. Lets hear from Council at this time.

Tenis stated the Charter election is coming up. Is there a time limit as what can be placed on the ballot? Is that why we can't do this?

Jensen stated we can't change the propositions. It took about a year and a half to prepare them.

Moses stated I want to emphasis our deadline is redistricting what we have. We can recommend looking at adding two more Ward and then hopefully the next redistricting won't have these problems. These problems are going to be more acute in 2020.

Stewart stated yes it will be more acute and there will be a position of the present precincts in connection with those two Wards if they are created.

Rogalski stated due to the size of the precincts I think you would get better equity with less Wards.

Mayor Fitch stated I think adding Wards is going to be rather extensive and create problems. I don't believe the answer is reducing to six. Eight is a good number for this community. I know the way the town has grown is making it a difficult task for you, but I hate to see us pursue adding two more Wards.

Stewart stated about eight months ago I suggested to Council that we create two Wards. My rational is it is going to give a greater participation of the citizens in government.

Mayor Fitch stated participation of citizens in government comes from within the citizens. It wouldn't make any difference as to what Ward they are in.

Godlove stated we need to address the issues with eight Wards. We can't change that between now and the middle of February. I would like to see as to what the extent will be in the event we split a Ward and if we do split a Ward what is the most feasible splits of Wards or multiple Wards to be able to accomplish this 10%. We need to have something in the minutes to justify deviating from the 10%.

Moses asked can you give us a number?

Baughman stated splitting one precinct for a set of three workers it is a little over \$300 plus the cost of the ballots.

Godlove asked you would have the cost of the ballots in any event wouldn't you?

Baughman stated you would have the cost of the ballot twice for whichever Ward you split. The ballot is the most expensive part.

Smith stated if you split one precinct between two Wards you have to have a set for both Wards.

Baughman stated correct.

Godlove stated okay you have to have a full set for Ward 6 and will use that set in all the different precincts that Ward 6 services right. So do we really have an additional cost?

Baughman stated it depends on which ones you spilt.

Henry asked do we have split precincts in different Wards?

Baughman stated precinct 9 and 11.

Henry stated this is where the additional expense comes in by splitting the precincts into different Wards.

Moses asked do you have to purchase another machine?

Baughman stated no.

Moses asked is it just a question of paying the volunteers?

Baughman stated yes and the ballots.

Moses stated we will take that into consideration. Let's listen to our Councilmen. Councilman Haywood would you like to say anything?

Haywood asked does precinct 8 vote at the Bible Baptist Church?

Baughman stated precinct 8 votes at the Saint Paul's United Methodist Church and precinct 11 votes at Bible Baptist.

Haywood asked is there split voting at that church?

Baughman stated yes under the old precincts. That has changed with the new redistricting.

Haywood asked is Country Club Heights still in Ward 7. It appears it is in Ward 3.

Rogalski asked on Alternative A?

Haywood stated yes.

Rogalski stated Ward 3.

Haywood asked so Ward 3 is going all the way to Lee?

Rogalski stated yes.

Haywood stated I believe the commission voted to keep precinct 32 in Ward 7.

Rogalski stated I was merely trying to work numbers. There are only 346 voters in precinct 32 you may want to move them back to Ward 7.

Haywood stated I want precinct 32 in Ward 7.

Moses stated I have made a note of that.

Tenis asked why was the population of Ft. Sill and the prison not accounted for? Is it because they don't vote?

Jester stated yes.

Moses stated when the City decided to add Ft. Sill to the population it was done for economic development purposes. We decided to treat it the same as we did in the 2000 census and that was to strip out that population and do the redistricting based on those results.

Stewart stated also the Ft. Sill population vote in their home of record and prisoners don't vote.

Moses stated correct.

Rogalski stated I made contact with a non-profit called "Prisoners of the Census" and they stated typically they recommend that most communities discount that population.

Moses stated so that is what we have done. We are focused solely on what the population is for Lawton.

Godlove asked should we make a determination that we are going to either maintain the integrity of the various precincts or are we going to look at splitting them up. If we split them are we going to ask Rogalski to start working more feverously than he did the last time?

Moses stated that is an issue we have to decide before we leave, but I want to let the Council finish before we get to that issue.

Wells stated it seems that by numbers Wards 1, 2, 3 and 5 are landlocked and should probably be the over takers. Wards 4, 6, 7 and 8 should be the undertakers because they are able to grow and their number will be increasing. I don't know how you will accomplish that without splitting precincts.

Jester stated we should be able to justify that.

Wells stated due to the size of the precincts there is no way to accomplish that without splitting precincts.

Zarle stated Ward 6 within the next two years will have an additional 200 homes.

Moses stated lets come to grip with the precinct issue. The issue is whether or not to split precincts in order to meet the population equity. Does anyone have any comments?

Godlove stated I think we need to leave it up to our legal advisor.

Jensen stated my very strong recommendation is you have to at least look at it. I agree with Baughman, but you are going to have to look at it to create the record that we are going to need if we are involved in litigation. You have to look at the issue to see what impact it is going to have.

Moses asked we can make a case to actually do it? We can consider splitting the precincts if we look at it.

Mayor Fitch asked if you look at splitting precincts thoroughly and it is documented then you decide not to split does that build the case from a legal standpoint?

Jensen stated yes.

Mayor Fitch stated I suggest you visit it thoroughly or you will be no better off than when you started. You need to build a defense if you have to go to court.

Jensen stated we have to look at that issue very hard.

Moses stated it doesn't hurt to take a look at it. We have to be mindful if we decide to split precincts we will have to live with the ramifications. If we do not split precincts we need to make the case for having looked at it. Then we have to make the case as to why we rejected it.

Jensen stated I'm not saying we can just look at it and that because we looked at it we will be okay. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is we have to see what the impact is and then we have to decide.

Moses stated but we can't make a case to not do it.

Jensen stated that is correct.

Moses stated if we go forward and have a huge population disparity seems to be we are just as legally vulnerable than if we don't have anything to present.

Jensen stated what I'm trying to emphasize is just because we looked at it and reject it doesn't make us automatically okay. We are going to have to see what the impact is going to be.

Moses stated there would be some legal judge replied to whatever it resolves, but we stand better if we do that.

Jensen stated right and I would strongly recommend that.

Godlove stated it is going to be a compromise whatever we do. We just have to have the pros and cons of both sides of that particular compromise and with the extent to which we are

taking note and making those our minutes it is going to be real easy for a court to second guess us.

Moses stated we have wrestled with this issue both this time and last time.

Rogalski stated I would offer as a justification money is not the only issue for not splitting precincts. The strong issue by far is the potential of voter confusion and resulting disenfranchisement. There is a real issue with that. Disenfranchising voters is just as bad as population equity.

Jester stated that is correct.

Moses stated everyone is in agreement that you take these two alternatives and split precincts to make the population equity look better.

Smith stated I think with the minority population of precinct 32 it has to stay in Ward 7.

Godlove stated I think it is to early for that decision to be made.

Moses stated we will note that concern.

Rogalski stated I'll make that adjustment to my Alternate A. It actually makes the numbers better to have it in Ward 7.

Moses stated take these two alternatives and split the precincts you see necessary and come back to the next meeting prepared to discuss those alternatives. Then we need to deal with the issue of whether we want to proceed with splitting precincts.

Rogalski stated I have to pass the task of splitting precincts to Jones and his software. In terms of the timeline you will have to tell us what you need.

Moses asked can you do by Friday of this week?

Jones stated I think I can have it ready by Friday.

Moses stated I have to be gone the week of the 20th and I would really like to be here for the meeting so can we could meet this Friday. Maybe Friday we can come to grip with the issue of splitting precincts.

Jester asked would it also be feasible or possible for Rogalski to come up with another model like this that doesn't split the precincts, but has higher populations in Wards 1, 2, 3 and 5 and the lower populations in the growth areas.

Rogalski stated I tried to do that and wasn't able to do so.

Moses stated for future planning I would like for you to also mark your calendars for the 30th. I hope we will all look over the information we receive Friday very good during the week of the 20th and when we come back on the 30th we will start narrowing it down.

Godlove asked if we could meet at 9:30 on the 30th instead of 9:00.

Moses stated that is good.

Godlove stated I would like for us to give Jones some directions on how he is suppose to proceed in splitting the precincts.

Moses asked how will you do that?

Jones stated population is going to be moved from one Ward to another at the census block level. Basically you can move those from one Ward to another.

Moses stated it is my understanding the model will take the guidance that Jones gives and what falls out is what it is. This model is recognized widely and used in many cities.

Godlove asked should we ask Jones not to pay attention to precincts or should we have him attempt to come within the 10% deviation with only one split or where do we want to go?

Moses stated I think we leave that up to Jones and then if we want to change that result we can do so. If we start giving him constraints we are eliminating all possibilities to the alternatives and I don't think we want to do that. Come Friday we might, but for now let Jones structure the best he can and let him tell us what he had to do to get there.

Henry asked would it be possible to have this information on Thursday so we can look at what you have prepared prior to Friday. It would mean a lot to see it before we sit down to discuss it.

Jones stated okay.

Moses stated be sure to label it Staff Alternative. I would ask all of you that received a map this morning to label it Staff Alternative. I don't want anyone to look at these thinking these are pre-decisional.

Godlove stated it has been eluded to that we have issues with regards to splitting precincts. One of those issues is cost. We can pretty well pin down the cost of splitting a precinct. What we can't pin down, but what we need to be able to consider are the cons to splitting the precincts.

Moses stated the operations.

Godlove stated yes. What sort of issues you are going to encounter or the issues the voter will encounter by splitting precincts? We need to have that for Jensen's benefit so he can at least suggest that we have considered not only the cost but other aspects.

Moses stated Baughman these are operational issues that we are talking about informing the voters, how you get the maps done, and how do you get everybody to understand where they are suppose to go vote.

Baughman stated that is impossible. You do the best that you can do.

Moses asked how do you get that word out?

Tenis stated you can announce it at a Council meeting and put it in the newspaper. What you have to realize is there are those who don't listen to Council meetings or take the newspaper.

Henry stated they will need to receive a letter to be informed.

Stewart asked so one of your primary concerns in changing precincts is to not disenfranchise any voters?

Moses stated yes. That is not the intent. The intent is to balance the voting power of Council.

Godlove stated you are going to have people who are accustomed to going to Blvd. Christian Church to vote that now have to go to the Catholic Church to vote. People like myself who are old and incompetent are going to have difficulty in figuring out where to go vote. If I carve out 30 minutes to go to the Blvd. Christian I'm not going to take the time to drive to the Catholic Church to vote. So it is going to have to be a real serious effort.

Moses stated any change you make of a district induces that problem and the issue becomes on how massive we make that change.

Stewart asked the matter on Carver with the precinct has that become a mute point?

Rogalski stated that issue has been resoled.

Moses asked does everyone understand how we are going to proceed?

3. Discussion.

4. Audience Participation

5. Establish date for next meeting.

Meeting dates were established for January 20th at 9:00 a.m. and January the 30th at 9:30 a.m.

6. Adjournment.

MOVED by Jester, **SECOND** by Smith, to adjourn. **AYE:** Jester; Knippenberg; Moses; Smith; Stewart; Godlove; Henry. **NAY:** None. **MOTION CARRIED.**

George Moses, Chairman
Redistricting Commission