

Appendix C: Committee Recommendations and Comments

Rank Order Voting* for All Trials, Components of Trials, and Alternate Components

	Trial A	Trial A W1 to W2	Trial A Ward 5 to Ward 4	Trial A Ward 6 to Ward 5				
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank				
Ward 1	1	0	2	2				
Ward 2	1	0	0	2				
Ward 3	2	1	2	2				
Ward 4	1	2	1	1				
Ward 5	0	0	1	2				
Ward 6	2	2	2	2				
At Large	0	0	0	1				
Total	7	5	8	12				
	Trial B	Trial B Ward 1 to Ward 2	Trial B Wrd 5 to Ward 4	Trial B Ward 6 to Ward 4				
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank				
Ward 1	1	0	2	2				
Ward 2	2	0	1	0				
Ward 3	1	1	2	2				
Ward 4	2	2	2	2				
Ward 5	1	0	2	2				
Ward 6	2	2	2	2				
At Large	1	0	2	2				
Total	10	5	13	12				
	Trial C	Trial C Ward 1 to Ward 6	Trial C Ward 1 to Ward 2	Trial C Ward 3 to Ward 1	Trial C Ward 3 to Ward 2	Trial C Ward 6 to Ward 3	Trial C Ward 5 to Ward 4	Trial C Ward 6 to Ward 5
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
Ward 1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
Ward 2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
Ward 3	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	1
Ward 4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ward 5	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2
Ward 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
At Large	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	2
Total	4	11	6	3	5	3	5	8
	Alternative Ward 1 to Ward 4	Alternative Ward 5 to Ward 4 - #1	Alternative Ward 5 to Ward 4 - #2	Alternative Ward 5 to Ward 4 - #3	Alternative Ward 6 to Ward 3 - #1	Alternative Ward 6 to Ward 3 - #2		
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank		
Ward 1	1	2	2	2	2	2		
Ward 2	2	1	1	0	2	2		
Ward 3	2				1	1		
Ward 4		1	1	1	0	0		
Ward 5	2	1	2	2	1	1		
Ward 6	0	0	0	0	0	0		
At Large	2	0	2	0	2	2		
Total	9	5	8	5	8	8		

2 = Support Transfer/Exchange
 1 = Ambivalence toward Transfer/Exchange
 0 = Reject Transfer/Exchange

* Please note most members did not complete the 'majority' vote for components of trials and alternatives.

Melissa De Bartolomeo (Ward 2) – Trial-specific feedback.

Overall:

- The city did a wonderful job preparing these Trials, with limited time and census block shape/population constraints.
- No Trial is perfect and reapportionment will, by definition, be disruptive to some.
- Although Trial B is my top pick of the Trials presented, I do have concerns as outlined below.
- Specific accolades and concerns for each Trial are presented below.

Trial A:

- Concerns about moving ‘voting’ population from Ward 1 to Ward 2 and perception about representation. In our limited public feedback, moving voting population from Ward 1 was a primary theme.
- Concerns around the population shift from 5th to 4th. The area to shift is at the heart of the current Ward 5 and doesn’t seem representative of the current demographic dynamics of Ward 4.
- The boundaries in the 5th to 4th shift are not visually easy to understand and geographically awkward (esp on the south eastern borders).

Trial B:

- Although similar to Trial A, this map is less disruptive (in total people affected) and preserves more “identifiable communities of interest”.
- Concerns about moving ‘voting’ population from Ward 1 to Ward 2 and perception about representation. In our limited public feedback, moving voting population from ward 1 was a primary theme.
- Concerns that Ward 5 will be separate from Ward 1. Practically, this may make future reapportionments more difficult. Additionally, this causes a perception of distance from and disinterest in downtown, with Ward 5 potentially having less of an incentive for involvement in the affairs of the heart of the city.
- Concerns about splitting up neighborhood associations in the Ward 5 to 4 shift.

Trial C:

- Love the concept, especially with regards to preserving the voting population in Ward 1.
- This map is disruptive for more people than Trials A and B and does not adhere to a principle of “minimal change”.
- Concern around the splitting of the East Campus Neighborhood Association. Many citizens reported this concern as well. This concern is mitigated with both of the alternates presented to the committee and to the public in the Feb 8, 2022 meeting.
- Additional concerns (not mitigated by alternatives) that this Trial splits up other neighborhood associations, including White Gate and Benton-Stephens.

Kip Kendrick – Ward 3, Trial Specific Feedback

Trial A: Of the three maps, I'm most supportive of Trial A because it has the fewest exchanges while also keeping all wards connected. I believe that has been desired in the past. I also understand that it will make this process less challenging in 10 years. The committee has heard some concerns about the exchange from Ward 1 to Ward 2. I am less concerned than others about its impact. However, I would encourage the Council to continue exploring other possible exchanges from Ward 1 to Ward 2.

Trial B: I'm supportive of Trial B because again it has the fewest proposed exchanges. I wish it were able to keep all wards connected, but I'm not certain that is a reason to oppose it. The committee has heard some concerns about the exchange from Ward 1 to Ward 2. Again, I'm less concerned about this impact of this exchange. However, I would encourage the Council to continue exploring other possible exchanges from Ward 1 to Ward 2.

Trial C: I'm opposed to Trial C in its current form. I understand the intent - however, I'm not convinced that intentionally diluting the student population across all wards is in the scope of the committee's charge or is in the best interest of the City. If the Council believes this to be a good approach, then I encourage them to continue exploring the Trial C alternate that was beginning to take shape in the committee.

Terry Smith – Ward 6 – Trial-specific Feedback

I want to express appreciation for the hard and conscientious work of fellow committee members, the thoughtful and tireless leadership of the chair and the excellent support of city staff.

I evaluated each trial based on the charge given to the committee by Council:

1. Equal population
2. Serves needs of neighborhood associations, etc.
3. Compact and contiguous
4. Balances population changes and minimally changes existing boundaries

Below is my analytical grid (X = satisfies charge):

	<u>Trial A</u>	<u>Trial B</u>	<u>Trial C</u>
1.	X	X	X
2.	X	X	
3.	X	X	
4.	X	X	
# boundary changes:	3	3	8
Population moved:	3673	3058	6560

(Trial C moves 117% more population than Trial B and 78% more than Trial A.)

Trial C splits neighborhood associations. In Ward 6 it splits the East Campus Neighborhood Association, an active group dedicated to historic preservation and continuously beleaguered by outside economic interests. ECNA strongly opposes Trial C. The alternatives proposed in lieu of splitting ECNA do not mitigate the other deficiencies of Trial C.

Trials A and B do what Council asks and are the least disruptive. “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” applies here.