

MINUTES
SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
LAWTON REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
JANUARY 30, 2012
NEW CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM

George Moses, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:30 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.

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.

-
1. Approve Minutes of January 30, 2012.

MOVED by Godlove, **SECOND** by Smith, to approve the minutes of January 20, 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 before we get into the discussion of the drafts I want to discuss the pending change in my status on this committee. I will be giving my resignation on the 14th of February. On that date I will attempt to submit a name of an individual to replace me as the Ward 5 representative. This committee will then elect a new Chair shortly thereafter. It is my hope that we will be able to zero in on an alternative that the group is comfortable with either this week or early next week. We will then give notice of the Public Hearing and hold another meeting ten days later to sign the Resolution. That will complete the work for this redistricting. Does anyone have any questions or concerns?

Henry asked do we vote on the map we are going to support prior to the Public Hearing or after the Public Hearing?

Moses stated we have to have an agreed alternative at the Public Hearing.

Jensen stated we will not pass a resolution until after the Public Hearing.

Moses stated at the last Public Hearing we called it a Preferred Alternative. Our only objections was to Precincts 31 and 32. We had serious comments about those precincts and were powerless to fix them. Since it was a State matter we wrote letters asking they fix the problem.

Henry asked is the Public Hearing is to educate the public on only one selected alternative.

Moses stated we will have a preferred alternative that we are expecting to approve unless there is a serious objection that arises in the Public Hearing. It would have to be a serious one in order to go back to the drawing board. I don't expect that. The last time we had very limited participation by the public. Council has been here looking over our shoulders and staying involved and we are trying to accommodate as much as we can the concerns they have. I'm not anticipating some real serious concerns at the Public Hearing. If there are on questions let's move on to the discussion of these alternatives. Let me say I know you may feel a little overwhelmed by the number of alternatives. I sat down Sunday and I listed them all and I show we have nine alternatives in total. That includes the current wards that we have as a baseline. Then Rogalski has produced a tenth alternative and they are going to discuss that. I think the task at hand now is to be able to understand how these different alternatives vary from the current Wards we have and each of us come to some conclusion in our own mind about the one we prefer and then we will discuss them and if we have one that we have a common agreement on we may vote on that today to agree to that as being the preferred alternative and begin to finalize that. If not we will put together whatever the committee thinks we need to do to further evaluate these alternative and come back and try to get that done. I would like to see us get finished with our work today if we can but if we can't then by the end of the week for certain. With that we have Jones here this morning with the automated system and let me say Jones's model of what he presents will have a lot of detail in it. The detail is down to the census track level and the Ward boundaries that you look at on the maps that we have received are not going to match exactly at the edges of where the census tracks are. This model will display the census tracks and the Wards will be shown around the census tracks so it will look a little ragged on the edges but don't become dismayed by that that is the principle difference. This model is designed to help us understand the difference alternatives and in our own mind evaluate what we like and dislike about it. With that I'll turn it over to Rogalski.

Rogalski stated I'll take a minute and walk through the alternative that we have looked at and bring us up to date. Obviously we started off with A and today we have ended with H so there is a number of alternatives. Alternative A was based on splitting no precincts at all. It was to keep all the precincts together and trying to work the population out. We looked at it and there was a 27% variation from the low precinct to the high precinct. That is the number we are trying to get as low as possible. Then we went through alternatives B, C, and D. We didn't spend a lot of time on C and D because they just weren't good ideas. As we moved forward you find you like something a little better and you change it a little bit. Alternative E at the last meeting we felt was getting stronger getting the population down to a decent amount. There are two things that have occurred since them. One is I started looking at the map and looking at where I was splitting precincts and decided that it would be better to try and split the precincts in favor of the current Ward boundaries. If I'm going to split a precinct lets go back to the current Ward boundaries and try to split that. The next family of alternatives is F, G and H. They all have the same basic premise in that if there was an area that was taken out of precinct and that caused a lower population I tried to put it back as the first step towards balancing. That is really where these came from. Jester took Alternate E and asked that we try not to split as many precincts. This is a good idea and I did look at it but it came to a population spread of 19%.

Jester decided that wasn't what we were trying to accomplish. It seems once I find a new alternative I don't like the others. The difference between F, G and H is how small you are cutting. F splits five precincts with great population numbers. G splits three precincts but the population numbers are not so great. I'll talk about H in a little bit. One of the things I took from Jester's suggestion was to really take a look at our growth and try to factor in growth to our process. Looking at the spreadsheet at the bottom line that says "On Going Subdivisions". What I did was I went through our data base and I found all the subdivisions that had been platted following 2009. One of the reasons I did that was as I started looking around some of these areas there are a number of subdivisions that have gone in since that time and there are currently people living in them but the census tract is still zero because there wasn't anyone living there at the time the census was done. I felt like in turns of this was just an option that I threw out for you as a way to at least measure and feel the population changes and where the growth is occurring in a mere concrete way. What we have is a platted subdivision is one where all the improvements such as streets and waterlines and sewer lines have already been built. The lots are recorded and being sold.

Moses stated we need to talk about that. Is there a legal requirement to use the number strictly used in the 2010 census or if we move forward to where we are in early 2012 then these numbers would represent changes from the census and I guess in my mind I'm saying to myself well wait a minute is our redistricting to be strictly on the change from 2000 to 2010 or are we able to include growth that has happened since the 2010.

Jensen stated my opinion is we can include actual growth but not projected growth. You could look at projected growth.

Smith stated facts not speculation.

Rogalski stated even then it would be an other consideration. Obviously the census numbers are very important. Several members have mentioned how to handle growth.

Moses asked these on going subdivision numbers represent actual people living in those areas.

Rogalski stated no. They represent an actual platted subdivision.

Moses asked so we don't know that those numbers represent a head.

Rogalski stated no they do not. In fact I put an estimate on the person per lot of 3.0.

Moses stated I think we would have to look at that as a question.

Henry stated I feel very uncomfortable adding population number that is not concrete.

Moses stated the population numbers on all these sheets represent the current 2011 population. The current population growth from 2010 to present. IN other words is the

population of Precinct 1 actually if you looked at the 2010 census numbers would that be 4,019 or is it something less than that and this number includes the growth.

Rogalski stated no. The population numbers for the precincts are the actual census numbers.

Moses stated okay that is 2010 numbers.

Rogalski stated yes the 2010 census numbers. The other subdivision is just added across the bottom. That is the only place those numbers show up.

Moses stated I think we are going to have to exclude those bottom numbers.

Rogalski stated that was just something to consider.

Moses stated it was a good thought but we should not include those numbers

Jester asked the stand you are showing at the bottom is based on actual numbers and the subdivision is just there for information? Is that correct?

Rogalski stated no I actually put in to see what the population did and it actually comes out to 12% spread without that. I went ahead and put them to say this is what it would like once these house were built. This is again just for informational purposes. Generally speaking a number of 500 people of the average is a 5% increase. If you look at Wards 6 & 7 you see that they had a very short term projected population growth of about 800 to 900. There is about 10% population growth that is occurring right now. Again this is just to give you a feel.

Moses stated I see what you are doing but these numbers the 10% population deviation and theses deviation target population for Ward numbers we should not use because basically we go back to the Alternative G right?

Rogalski stated there are some changes to the precinct boundaries. It is very close to G but it is not quite G.

Moses stated then this should be redone to exclude those numbers.

Rogalski stated if you take those numbers out it is a 12% spread.

Moses asked so that 10% becomes 12%.

Rogalski stated yes.

Moses asked does everybody have that? We will exclude those numbers so this gives us an alternative with at 12% deviation and we can look at the details of what the boundaries look like.

Rogalski stated what was significant was if you look across the bottom line there are really only two Wards that have no sub-division in them. I thought that was interesting to see that. That would be Wards 5 and 8.

Moses stated that will help to inform your judgment. Lets proceed and go through the explanation of each of these alternatives. Before we proceed Henry asked the question earlier about does anybody have the number of population growth for the entire City from 2000 to 2010? That is a number that we probably ought to have in our mind. We have seen the growth in each of the precincts I think looking at an old precinct map but the total population growth do we have that number anywhere.

Henry stated on the map that is dated 1-11-12 population 85,871 so I'm assuming that you can take any of these maps and get the population map for Lawton in 2010. It appears to be 83,375. My question was is that correct? Does the City of Lawton population show a decline from 2000 to 2010.

Rogalski stated no it didn't decline. It might have gone down from 2005 because that was based on estimates.

Moses asked the 85,871 does that include the prison and Ft. Sill population?

Rogalski stated I don't have that number with me.

Moses stated okay let's table this until the next meeting because we need to have that number consistent with the exclusion of Ft. Sill and the prison.

Henry stated I would like for us to look at that.

Rogalski asked so you want the difference between 2000 or 2005.

Moses stated 2000 and 2010. I don't think that we have declined. We may not have grown as much as we expect but I don't believe we had declined.

Rogalski stated these are current totals. I don't have the difference between 2000 and 2010 in front of me but I can get them.

Henry stated this is a 2000 map but the numbers are 2010 census numbers.

Rogalski stated we were overlaying the 2010 census data with the existing Ward boundaries. That number does not include Ft. Sill or the prison.

Henry stated it has to be better than it was in 2000.

Godlove asked what is this?

Rogalski stated that is the 2010 census number without Ft. Sill and the prison.

Godlove stated this doesn't either.

Rogalski stated that is the same 2010 census number.

Godlove stated one of these number is 83,000 and one is 85, 000. I know it just 2000 people different but it is different.

Rogalski stated the prison population is probably the difference

Henry stated the prison population is on there.

Rogalski stated that separates Ft. Sill population but we didn't take out the prison. The prison population is 2,600. On the newer maps the prison population has been taken out.

Moses stated lets proceed to look at each of these alternatives in a summary kind of way and ask our questions about each one so we satisfy ourselves that we understand them. As we go through this try to come to some conclusion in your own mind as to which you prefer and then we will discuss them among ourselves and see if we have any consensus. If not we will continue to work until we get a consensus.

Jones stated it has already been mentioned that you have a lot of alternatives out there and I don't want to further complicate things but just to let you know that the maps that my program produces are going to appear a little different than the ones that Rogalski hands out. You will see some different colors and maybe some lines in different places.

Moses asked do the black lines represent the Ward boundaries.

Jones stated yes.

Moses asked and the different colors represent the area covered by the particular Ward.

Jones stated yes. Lets go to the east side of town and I'll show you how this program operates and what it looks at. If you look at one of the alternatives that Rogalski produced earlier you are going to see probably just a straight line across this portion of Ward 4. In this program it breaks it down by the census block as the lowest form of breaking information down. When you zoom in further still you begin to see how those blocks are broken down. These numbers that you see the small numbers are the population that are assigned to those blocks. This one that I have highlighted follows Cache Creek and for the purposes of the map you would like to see a straight line across there but that is the way these blocks are broken down and each block has a population assigned.

Moses asked does the orange represent one census block.

Jones stated yes.

Moses asked and the population there is thirteen.

Jones stated yes. Now these usually as I said before follow streets and if you turn off the census blocks you can see the street and you can see they are almost always in the same locations. So in some of these cases you kind of have to guess a little bit to come up with a number for where you are breaking it down because like right here you show a twenty-nine but that twenty-nine can be on just one side of the street and you might have houses right along in here or across the street and so when you are looking at some of these areas you kind of have to guess. That is why some of my numbers might appear a little different than Rogalski's. For this section right here you show 327 but you can see that part of that census block is going to be over here in Ward 4 and the other part will be in the pink Ward.

Moses stated what I'm taking from this is when we look at these summary charts they are much more simplified than reality. When you get down to where people have to vote you get into these tracts and these boundaries get pretty ragged compared to what we are looking at on these charts. So when we finish with our preferred alternative the actual boundaries may look kind of ragged.

Jones stated yes sir.

Rogalski stated I will say one thing and Jones and I discussed this and it has been very difficult working on some of these lines but I think that it is important as we are looking at Ward boundaries it is one thing to have census boundaries drawn a certain way but when we are looking at Ward boundaries if we are going to be splitting a precinct I think it is very important to take a neighborhood as much as possible. What the problem is take a look at the one that say 350 there. Depending on how you drew that line all the people that live around that mobile home park on the outside are counted in that 350 all the people that live on the outside of those streets that are precincts boundaries they are all counted in that 350. This is just an example but if we were to move this into this Ward what you have is a situation where people on the opposite sides of the street are in different Wards but they are in the same subdivision. So you really can't do that. That is what he is saying we end up guessing and saying well okay if I come up this road and I head around there and count houses on the photograph then I can sort of interpolate what the population is reasonably but in the end it is still just a guess. It is not a hard census tract number. There is just not way around it. Once you start splitting you will always going to end up doing that. I think again keeping neighborhoods together is another one of the directives that the commission has to deal with.

Moses asked when you put this alternate together you are looking after those kinds of issues.

Rogalski stated yes. I actually estimate. I go up the line that I think is keeping the neighborhood together so that is another reason you will find that Jones' number and my numbers are exactly the same. I have been looking at it in terms that we are going to have to keep the neighborhood together as much as possible. Now if you look at some of the alternatives I didn't do that trying to play with the numbers to get the numbers lower.

Jester asked so what we are really saying is that we won't know the exact numbers unless we go strictly by precincts.

Rogalski stated yes or go door to door. We can get very close to where it would be a margin that would not be significant. If you are within 100 people you are within 1%. I think we can estimate within 100 people on these. I guess what I'm saying is you can't rely to much on the census tract boundaries because if they follow the streets the people on this side would be in one Ward and other on the other side would be in another. That would not be a good situation.

Moses stated that is enlighting. So we are going to be dependent upon you guys to make smart choices when we establish these boundaries in keeping neighborhoods together because that is one of the ways we will meet that criteria.

Baughman stated if I can make a suggestion on splitting your Wards in precincts if you could stay with a main road. If you go zig zagging between precincts that is going to be mass confusion. You need to stick to a straight line so when voters come in we can ask if the live on the east or west side of that line.

Rogalski stated to a certain extent that is why I gave you three alternatives of the same idea. It has to do with the level of split in neighborhoods. It is the same thing as splitting precincts. If you don't split precincts your numbers are this far apart and if you don't split neighborhoods your numbers are this far apart but if you go wherever you want you numbers will be this far apart. That is the difficulty and why you are here.

Moses stated for this reason because of this issue I guess I would ask the questions if anybody had an objection if we had Baughman to work with Jones and Rogalski when we get to our preferred alternative to work on this problem to minimize the confusion and to try and not make any major changes from what we decide here but when you draw these boundaries do it in such a way we can minimize the confusion for the voters and still maintain the character of the alternative that we prefer.

Godlove asked isn't that what is happening except with regards to G. With G you have this unusual shape over here on the east side in Ward 4.

Rogalski stated the G you have is Jones's view.

Godlove stated so your G is straight lines.

Rogalski stated yes. A little cleaner but still a little messy and that is why I came up with H. If you look at H I did the straight big lines. I did exactly what you just said. I tried to take a half mile or a quarter mile or a hard line to keep a whole neighborhood either in or out. That is why the numbers are as good.

Jester asked H has four split precincts.

Rogalski stated yes.

Moses stated I would ask that Baughman once we select the alternative have to work on these boundaries to make sure we keep these neighborhoods together and minimize the voters confusion. Would you agree to work with Jones and Rogalski to establish these boundaries to minimize the confusion and maintain the character of the preferred alternative.

Baughman stated sure.

Moses asked are there any other questions of Jones on this issue. This is a good explanation. Lets go ahead and look at each of the alternatives and try to let everyone get into their minds the character of each of these alternatives and where we like it or not. Lets ask questions of clarification as we go through and then when we start trying to down select we will then get into questions of preference and reason for preferring one alternative versus another. Lets go through each alternative and ask any questions of Jones to clarify what he has explained.

Jones asked do we want to start with F?

Rogalski stated yes.

Jones stated I did hand out some clear overlays earlier but I'm not sure how well they are going to work. If you look at this map you can see that I have added a heavy black dashed line which shows you what the current Ward boundaries are. Again these breakdowns are going to show the lines in my locations.

Rogalski stated it got to be kind of hard to see where the old Wards and the new Wards are and that is a good thing. That is what I like about this version is they really kind of follow the Wards boundaries. You can see right here this square mile is currently in Ward 8 today but Precinct 9 cuts across this way and now it is in Ward 6. That is why I chose Precinct 9 as being one to split. I put this whole square mile back into Ward 8 but then it creates population equality I added in a neighborhood. So I took this neighborhood over here currently in Ward 6 now goes to Ward 8.

Moses asked what is that the difference between.

Rogalski stated that is the difference between existing Wards and this new alternative. All three of them have the same thing in the same spot. Looking at Ward 5 this whole quarter mile here which is currently in Ward 5 was taken out and put into Precinct 17. That is one of the precincts that I decided to split to put a portion of it back into Ward 5. All that is left in purple is in Ward 5 today but it does represent a split precinct. This area remains in Ward 5 and that area above it in yellow is moving into Ward 3. Again the amount of cut that I make is trying to create population equity.

Moses asked what does that look like today?

Rogalski stated today the whole square mile is in Ward 5.

Moses stated okay so the top part is moved to Ward 3.

Rogalski stated yes but again the precinct cut had already moved it to Ward 3 so to speak. So I split the precinct to leave some of it in Ward 5. You see this area here currently in Ward 5 is taken out based on the precinct boundaries and put into Ward 7 but because the population was working out I didn't split that precinct to put it back into Ward 5. So that area currently in Ward 5 is now going to be in Ward 7.

Moses asked is it in Ward 5 now.

Rogalski stated yes but the way the precincts were drawn it moved it to Ward 7 and I just left it alone. Lets look at Wards 1 and 8. Again we are looking at these two precincts side by side. Ward 1 is low it is really low without expanding somewhere. I had a lot of room in Ward 8. They had a little more extra population and I expanded into there from Ward 1 into that neighborhood.

Smith asked what is the population count in that?

Wells stated 985.

Rogalski stated again if you look at Alternates F, G and H that amount changes a little bit the amount of population changes. Again H takes the whole neighborhood where F takes a small amount. F was my attempt to try and get the numbers really small. With H I took the whole neighborhood. Between Crosby Park and Sherwood there is a creek and so up where the number eight is you could put a line there to separate the two neighborhoods cleanly. Doesn't make the numbers as good but it separates cleanly. Now moving to Precinct 2 and 4 I looked at a straighter line and this is an area where Jones followed the census blocks and it makes it look a little crazy.

Jester asked you alternative would follow a straighter line and Jones doesn't have the ability to so.

Rogalski stated correct. Again what I tried to do is follow section lines as much as possible because when we go to do the legal I'm thinking ahead so I tried to follow those hard lines. In this case in Alternate F I was getting down to a more micro level by taking a little corner here and bringing it around. If you look at H I went down the half mile mark and left one quarter in Ward 4 and put three quarters of the section into Ward 2. There is not a lot of population in the three quarter area.

Moses stated I'm confused about the differences between the way it is today and what you are showing here. What has changed?

Rogalski stated in this case today everything east of I44 is in Ward 4. That is a major split precinct.

Moses stated okay. Up to that section line that has all changed?

Rogalski stated right now the Ward 4 boundary runs up I44 and all that you see in pink east of I44 is a change from current to a possibility.

Moses asked for Ward 2?

Rogalski stated yes and the reason being is because Ward 4 had the largest current population and we had to cut population.

Moses stated so everything in pink east of I44 was in Ward 4 and now in this alternative is in Ward 2.

Rogalski stated that is correct.

Moses stated that is a big change.

Rogalski stated this alternative also splits a portion of Precinct 33. This area right here was split and put into Ward 7 with this alternative with a population of 346. To get numbers really good 346 is really significant but I hated to split a precinct for 346. There is some ability for some growth but a lot of it is flood plain and tribal land so I don't see that being a growing area. If you look at Alternate H I didn't make that split. That would be another split precinct in this alternative.

Moses stated currently what I'm seeing is five split precincts.

Rogalski stated yes Alternate F splits five precincts. I get it down to a 7% difference from low to high but not only does it split five precincts it also splits neighborhoods.

Moses stated so this have a 7% population deviation among the Wards.

Stewart asked which precincts split in Ward 7.

Henry stated Precinct 2 which is virtually no population. It is a very low population.

Rogalski stated it is about 4% and if you are looking to try and get your number down it was significant. I don't recommend it but I'm trying to give you an alternative with the smallest population deviation. That is what this one represents.

Jester stated to me the significance about Alternate F negative is the splitting of neighborhoods.

Rogalski stated absolutely. You have five precinct splits and it also splits neighborhoods. I will tell you I have some of the numbers memorized because I have labored of this to try and find a good way to do this.

Stewart asked which is your preference?

Rogalski stated Alternate H. I feel like it is a balance. If you look at Alternate F it splits five precincts but has a 7% deviation. Alternate G splits three precincts which is good but has a 13% deviation and Alternate H splits four precincts and it splits them really squarely.

Jester asked so the main difference between Alternate G and Alternate H is that H has cleaner boundaries and also four precinct splits as opposed to three.

Rogalski stated yes. It splits four precincts but it has very clean neighborhood boundaries. I will say that I understand the whole issue behind splitting precincts there is going to be some voter confusion that we are going to entail.

Jester stated this would minimize that.

Rogalski stated it will minimize it but it is not as good of numbers. Without counting the growth you are at 12%.

Moses asked so Alternative H has 12% population deviation.

Rogalski stated yes.

Godlove asked Jensen what do you think?

Jensen stated I think we are headed to a compromise.

Godlove asked what sort of a compromise do you see?

Jensen stated the three factors that he just told us about. Under option H is the 12% based on actual numbers?

Rogalski stated yes.

Jensen asked not estimates?

Rogalski stated not estimates actual numbers.

Jensen asked with four precinct splits.

Rogalski stated yes but it doesn't split neighborhoods.

Moses stated getting from 27% population deviation down to 12% is a pretty good step.

Godlove state you had this extensive discussion with regard to this ongoing sub-division and the additions that you have down there are these actual people that have moved in or are these just your estimates?

Rogalski stated it is an estimate on population on actual lots. This is actual platted lots that have been developed. They are not speculated lots.

Godlove asked but they are not houses built?

Rogalski stated some of them are and that is the reason I got into it.

Moses stated what I understood you to say earlier is and we decided that we were going to exclude those numbers if we exclude those numbers this alternative goes from a 10% population deviation to a 12% deviation.

Godlove stated I was trying to figure out as to whether or not we can legitimately include some of those numbers down there because this above that ongoing subdivision is actual 2010 right?

Rogalski stated actual numbers.

Godlove stated so between 2010 and today some portion of your line down there has actually been realized is that correct?

Rogalski stated yes. There are real houses with people living in some of those.

Godlove stated so we are really somewhere between the 10 and 12% deviation. We are not at 12 but we are not quite yet at 10.

Moses stated you are saying the reality is we are somewhere between 10 and 12.

Godlove stated that is what I understand is being said. Is that correct?

Rogalski stated in terms of actual people yes. Again I use West Hills as an example because right now the census shows that it is zero and yet there are houses there.

Godlove stated what I hear Jensen saying is we have to end up with some sort of a compromise. I'm trying to understand what sort of compromises we are going to have make if you recommend Alternate H because of the clean lines because of the ease of being able to explain to the people that live there where they are suppose to go vote those seem to me to be real significant reason to go for a high deviation

Jensen stated that is what I'm calling a potential compromise.

Godlove stated okay.

Jensen stated so if we were ever challenged and I'm not saying we are going to but if we did as far as actual numbers 12% we know it is actually lower than 12% and if we get challenged we will have Rogalski's crew go out and do a census.

Godlove asked and that is all doable right?

Jensen stated I'm not sure about that.

Henry stated we could go do a census right now.

Jensen stated we don't have the manpower to do that.

Rogalski stated the reason I used the platted lots is because the investment has already taken place. The roads, sewer and water are built. There is really not speculation that a house will be there in the near future it is just a matter of timing. It may not be there yet but the developer has put half a million or a million dollars into building the infrastructure.

Godlove stated but if I'm a Judge and I'm sitting there and I'm saying is this plan reasonable it is reasonable to expect those people to move into those lots and therefore we can get closer to the one man one vote theory if we are trying to be reasonable about it. I mean people are dying all the time so these figures are going to change all the time but what you are doing you are inserting into it a reasonable expectation of where people actually live at any given time.

Rogalski stated you are exactly right. I was asked to try to factor in growth areas and I felt like that was a semi-factual way because I have a hard number on lots. Those platted lots are real platted lots. You could go to court and show every one of those plats.

Henry asked what was the population figure you used for each lot.

Rogalski stated 3.0 but I will tell you that it doesn't change anywhere between 2.5 and 3.5 doesn't change the overall number they all move together.

Moses stated to me frankly I kind of like H the way you have given all the factors.

Henry stated I like H and to me the better argument is that we have tried to even out the population and our feeling is that not splitting neighborhoods is much more important than getting to that 2% lower average in this one Ward.

Jensen stated we are not saying much more important we are saying we have to do some balancing and compromising.

Godlove stated we are not doing it based upon any sort of race or economics we are rather doing it based upon these lines that are theoretically easier to describe and easier to keep the communities together as a unit.

Henry stated and it allows a Councilman to represent an entire neighborhood not just a portion of it that he or she splits with another Councilman and that to me is a good argument.

Godlove stated but now one of the things you pointed out was how does this plan impact the existing Councilpersons that are representing a particular individual. How much are we moving somebody who lives on my particular street into a different Ward.

Rogalski stated what I tried to do is do as little as possible that is why F, G and H was like a light went on that if I was going to split precincts start splitting the ones that was just split by the precinct boundaries.

Godlove asked so you have already taken into consideration that particular compromise?

Rogalski stated yes. Those three families are based on making it look as close as today's Wards as possible and splitting those precincts at the precinct line split.

Moses asked what is the deviation in population from the average for those peripheral Wards? Wards 6, 7 and 4.

Rogalski stated the most peripheral Wards are 4, 6, 7 and 8. Ward 4 is about 0 and that was based on not wanting to split Precinct 33 and pick up those people. That is probably the Ward that is growing the most that I still has a positive. Ward 6 is a minus 7 or 8 and Ward 7 is a minus 3 and Ward 8 stays as it is.

Godlove asked Ward 7 is going to go to a minus three losing 900 people?

Rogalski stated yes. That is based on the actual census numbers. Unfortunately Ward 8 remains a minus 3 even after all this and it hasn't had a lot of growth. There is a growth area in Ward 8. There has been some discussion of subdivision at the corner of 52nd Street and Lee. In fact I have a development sketch that has been approved but it hasn't come to about yet. There is some developable land in Ward 8 to try and balance that out.

Wells stated we also have a little strip in Sherwood. Based on these maps Ward 8 about 50% of my people are different people than what I represent now.

Rogalski asked in Ward 8?

Wells stated yes there are 1800 in Sherwood Village and I'm picking up 3300 in Precinct 9.

Rogalski stated many of those in Precinct 9 you already represent.

Wells stated I only represent the people on the right side of the road.

Rogalski stated you go all the way down on the right side of the road. You are right those two moves actually balance each other a little bit. The issue with Ward 1 was really low. It was like 9800 without a move. We only have three choices here Ward 8, Ward 3 and Ward 2 we could pull population from to make Ward 1 balance.

Moses stated we have really kicked this one around quite a lot and I would committee if we want to look at these other alternatives. We have looked at F, H and G. Do you want to look at other alternatives that have been presented.

Godlove stated I think all of those are historic aren't they. All of those are going backwards where H is really the refinement

Moses stated yes that is the last iterations. We had a total of ten alternatives and we have looked at three this morning. Is there any value in looking at others at this point? The three we have looked at this morning are kind of the final iterations of the subsequent meetings we have had to date so do we want to look at any others? We may do some refinements on these to create some additional alternatives.

Smith stated I think H is where we need to be working from.

Moses stated okay if there is no objections I'm going to dispense with the other alternatives at this point and we will focus on F, G and H.

Godlove stated I would like to focus just on H personally.

Smith agreed.

Moses asked is everyone in agreement with that and make our refinements there?

Smith stated when you split neighborhoods that to me is not even a consideration.

Moses stated I would like to make sure that everyone voices their opinion. Do you feel comfortable proceeding for our refinements with Alternate H?

Henry stated I like that very much and the population figures of H I would like to delete the ongoing subdivisions even though if we don't meet the 10% requirement and we have to go to 12% those figures can be part of the discussion and the rational as to why but I don't think it makes any sense to me to put estimates of how much population is going to be there when all of these lots are sold and houses built.

Rogalski stated for this to be presented it would be presented with the census numbers only.

Henry stated okay and we don't have those do we? Just the census numbers?

Godlove stated couldn't it be presented so that we have both of those figures?

Rogalski stated yes. I do think the lots out there already being developed and some of the houses already being occupied is a valid argument.

Jester stated I agree with the idea of working with H however is there any way we can address these concerns that Councilman Wells has presented.

Moses stated point of clarification here we have numbers before us that the staff has put together based on data they have collected and have at hand and the reality is each of these precincts and each of these Wards have an existing population out there that is a little different than those numbers so when we define our preferred alternative we are going to define it by listing each Ward and the precincts or portion of precincts that are in that Ward based on the current population that is out there that number will come out to be some number and the deviation will be a little different than what we actually think it is going to be but we are using these numbers as a vicarious measure of reality out there and I think they will come in very close to what we think they are going to be but they may vary some. We are going to be dependant upon the staff once we settle on the changes we want to make to get the real numbers and get them into the machine and make sure that we got the best numbers available for what we present and the will represent what our preferred alternative will be. Is everybody in agreement and understand all that? I don't want us to get hung up on these numbers particularly but they are the best that we have to work with so we have to work with these. Now the discussion of these on going subdivisions is kind of another matter and I think we need to come to grips with how we want to handle that.

Godlove stated I would suggest that you just have to lines. You have the actual and then you drop down and you have the possible.

Rogalski stated that is very easy to do.

Godlove stated what I would like to hear some of the arguments against the drawing of this particular map like it is show on H and one of those is that we are taking out of one Ward a significant number of people and putting them into another Ward so that we going to change Councilperson. I think that is a valid concern. What are some of the other concerns that H presents to us? The number of precincts that are divided are four and we have addressed that one haven't we?

Moses stated yes four precincts. We haven't heard from Baughman yet about the cost associated with precincts and we will hear that in a little bit.

Godlove asked cost is not an issue is it?

Moses stated it may not be explicitly.

Jensen stated I'm not going to take that off the table. Cost and operational concerns I mean I'm not going to take anything off the table that I might be able to use.

Moses stated we tasked Baughman to come back and give us those numbers and that view and how we use that is our own individual judgment.

Godlove stated may I ask that we address the issue about moving people from one Ward to another first and get pros and cons on that issue and then go to cost.

Baughman stated cost isn't a issue. We will just bill the City and they will pay it.

Moses asked can you handle four precinct breaks?

Baughman stated the problem that they are not concerned with we can't purchase more voting machines. The State had a lump sum and sent so many to each county. What we get into with a split precinct if we need more machines depending on what Wards are up and how many races there are if we need extra machines then what we have to do is drive to Norman, Oklahoma City or Tulsa and borrow extra machines to use for that election. So there would be the cost of sending someone to whatever county can loan us the machines and mileage. It is just an added expense. A three person board at a polling place is \$355 and then you are going to add another \$355 for the additional workers.

Moses stated you have eliminated one of the big numbers in my mind and that is what a machine cost.

Baughman stated a machine cost \$2800 but we can't go out and purchase more machines. We would have to borrow for other counties.

Stewart asked would that be providing they are not having an election at the same time.

Baughman stated most municipalities in the other counties are held in March. That should not be a problem if your Charter passes.

Moses asked so there is a way to get more machines?

Baughman stated yes but like I said it will be an added expense to the City.

Godlove asked why couldn't we drive to Duncan instead of going to Tulsa or Oklahoma City?

Baughman stated they are a smaller county than us and when you get into the smaller counties they only have one or two extra machines. We would have to go to a larger county that has more precincts than we do. Then again I guess money is no issue for the City is that right Jensen?

Godlove asked so other than the issue of the \$355 and the issue of driving do you see other issues that are presented by splitting a precincts?

Baughman stated the cost of the ballots will be extra. On a rough figure 1900 ballots cost about \$500. It is all just an added expense.

Godlove asked but all of these are doable?

Baughman stated yes. We will do what we have to do.

Jensen asked what about from an operational standpoint that you made reference to about voter confusion?

Baughman stated we will not only have confusion with our precinct workers but with the public coming in.

Jensen asked what kind of issues?

Baughman stated you will have to send out letters on those that are changing Wards. You will have to notify them of the change. When you go into a election even when you haven't made changes there is confusion on what Wards people live in.

Godlove asked but you have that in all events?

Baughman stated right.

Godlove stated so that is no new event?

Baughman stated right. That is nothing new.

Rogalski stated this is only an issue for municipal elections or councilperson elections is that correct.

Baughman stated yes.

Rogalski stated as I recall not all Councilperson run at the same time.

Baughman stated correct your Wards stagger. Wards 1, 2 and the Mayor are 2013. Ward 3, 4, and 5 are 2014 and Wards 6, 7 and 8 2015.

Rogalski stated only during the Mayors election would be short machines.

Baughman stated with Wards 6, 7 and 8 you have our splits in all three Wards.

Rogalski asked how many machines do you have?

Baughman stated we have three extra but I can't tie those three to those precincts and not leave any extra and then there be a problem with a precinct on the east side. We have three extra but I can't use them all for that municipal election and not leave us any extra.

Godlove asked and that is your margin of error?

Baughman stated yes.

Godlove stated the three extra make you feel comfortable that you will not have more than three machines go down.

Baughman stated right.

Godlove stated so you could squeeze by with just what you have.

Baughman stated I might be able to squeeze one of them but there is no way that I could squeeze all three of them. I don't want to put those three machines in a precinct and then have a problem with one and have no backup.

Stewart stated we don't want to have a machine broke down and we don't have one to replace it.

Baughman stated right.

Godlove stated that could happen right now in any event. If you have four machines out there that are broke you only have three that were covered.

Baughman stated right.

Godlove stated so that is just a risk that we are taking.

Moses stated you would just go get another machine. Operationally looks to me like while it may be inconvenient looks like we can handle four precinct splits.

Jester asked is there a possibility that we can have them get more machines.

Baughman stated no. They only give the counties so many and they are not going to take away from the other counties to give us more. The State is not going to purchase more machines. When they purchased the system it was a packaged deal. They have a fixed number of machines and that is it.

Godlove asked what happens when those machines break?

Baughman stated they won't. It will be like the last system we had. If something breaks you purchase the parts to replace but you don't replace the machine. The State is allotted a certain amount of money and once the money is spent that is it.

Moses stated I think as a committee we can make a recommendation to the State that they need to revisit the number of machine they have because we anticipate that possibly we won't have enough.

Stewart stated the State ought not to allow us to fall into a dilemma.

Moses stated I agree. That is a concern and I think when we sum up our work with our report we will put a concern in there about that and note that. We will give it to all the Representatives and Senators and let them work it the best they can.

Godlove stated we could also eliminate the problem by reducing the number of Wards couldn't we.

Moses asked are there other concerns here with this Alternate H? One that I have is these population deviation on these peripheral Wards. In one case we anticipate zero in Ward 4, Ward 7 is minus three, and Ward 6 is minus seven. Should we rebalance Ward 6 and 7 so they have a equal deficit. I think it is good that we have a deficit on the periphery because that is where we anticipate the growth. And as long as our average is clean as we complete our work we feel comfortable where our population averages I would like to keep that balance going but I see a 3% variation between Wards 7 and 6 while the deficit is about 1500.

Rogalski state 5% is 500 more or less so 3% would be about 300 people. That is kind of why I did Alternate F. To try to sub these numbers you get inside neighborhoods. We could take a different approach. For instance when you are speaking about the concerns that Councilman Wells had the numbers that I start off with we had four Wards that were low in population. You have Ward 1, 2, 3 and 8. Ward 8 was just a little low and the others were significantly low in terms of population. The list I gave is was 1, 2, 3 and 8 and they just happen to all be in one cluster and they all surround Ward 1. In order for Ward 1 to accept additional population it has to come from an area that is losing population. Now that being once you do one shift you have to do a second one. You have to take population away from an adjacent Ward you have to put population back. I could go from 8, 3 or 2. I could have gone either way there and the only reason I did into Ward 8 and Precinct 2 was the nice clean line made by Quannah Parker and then again the clean line by a subdivision. It could go another direction. Also Ward 6 was a very large population I knew if I took away from Ward 8 I could get it from Ward 6. That is the reason for the chose. You could take it out of Ward 3 or 2 but I think you will have the same problem in either case.

Moses asked does anyone else have a concern about the variation between minus 3 and minus 7.

Jester stated I actually don't. I know we are not suppose to consider projection but when you look at projection and think about the future and the deviations we have here are livable.

Godlove stated I would really like to get the actual numbers as far as the actual population is concerned. Break it out so we can really see what that is.

Rogalski stated I can actually get that to you in an hour after we leave here. I can email it to all of you.

Godlove stated then we could come back and have another meeting. Personally I like H. What I would like to do is have the numbers emailed to us and be able to take this home and really look at it and then come back on to say we are comfortable with this taking into

consideration the City Councilperson objections or maybe some other objection that we may hear between now and that time. I like H and I would like to hear any cons to it.

Moses asked do the committee members feel comfortable with this.

Wells stated I didn't say that I objected to that. I was just pointing out that in my case I would be the only Ward with two precincts split and I would end up losing 40% of the people that I currently represent. I didn't say I was against that.

Godlove stated I would like to meet again sometime later this week to be able to make a decision.

Moses stated we will meet again and review the numbers on H and any other concerns or issues you might develop between now and then. Folks we are getting there.

Henry asked the only the we will be looking at will be H is that correct?

Moses stated yes. When we come back we will focus on H and any concerns or issues that we want to settle among ourselves we will take care of and it looks like we are going to zero in on a preferred alternative with some variation of H. Are there any other comments?

3. Discussion.

4. Audience Participation

5. Establish date for next meeting.

Moses stated the next meeting will be February 1st at 2:00 p.m. in the 3rd Floor Conference Room.

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