

MEETING SUMMARY
Redistricting Committee of the BOCC
10am-12pm
Tuesday, April 5, 2011

Attendance

Staff: Brian Francis, Assistant to the County Manager
Rebecca Herbert, Facilitator
Tracy Edwards, Administrative Assistant

Members: Aisha Dew, Chair
Antoine Dennard
Bryan Holladay
Lawrence Shaheen
Arthur Griffin
Robin Bradford
Mike Walker
John Autry

Absent: Lee Teague

I. Recap of Previous Meeting

Ms. Herbert gave a recap of the March 22, 2011 meeting. Ms. Herbert reminded the committee it agreed to use consensus as its decision-making model for formulating its recommendation to the Board. Ms. Herbert also reminded the committee that at its previous meeting the committee made the decision to use voting age population as the data set for the racial criteria and that 53-55% was agreed to as the range for defining a district as majority-minority.

II. Partisanship Criteria

- A. First Decision – Which Data Set?
- Election Results of Actual Contests
 - Registered Voters

Ms. Herbert did a quick poll regarding the data set. Before responding to the poll, she asked each member of the committee to consider which data set would best speak to the interest he/she represents and would also help the committee achieve the task given to it by the County Commission.

Mr. Francis responded to the poll on behalf of Lee Teague by reading a letter Mr. Teague sent the previous evening. Mr. Teague was absent due to work commitments. The letter stated that Mr. Teague was in favor of using registered voters as the data set to determine the partisanship of a district. Mr. Teague's letter also stated his opinion that 40% Republican and 22% Unaffiliated should be the threshold to define a district as likely Republican.

After each member responded to the poll question, the results were that four (4) members favored using election results, four (4) members favored using registered voters, and one (1) member was still undecided as to which data set to recommend.

To help committee members understand each others' support for the particular data sets, the discussion continued by having members divide into two teams based on which data set members supported. Ms. Herbert asked the one (1) member still undecided, Mr. Antoine Dennard, to spend time with both groups so as to listen/participate in each team's conversations. Teams were asked to nominate a scribe and then report out about the values of

the data set they support. Once a group reported out, the other team would be able to ask questions for clarification.

During this exercise, committee members supporting the use of registered voters offered a possible concession to those members supporting election results. The concession offered was that consensus support might be possible for using election results if straight ticket voters were the benchmark.

Discussion continued on the pros and cons of using both data sets. Discussion was tabled to allow Mr. Francis time to review key facts related to the discussion.

B. Key Facts

Mr. Francis explained what a partisan district was for redistricting purposes. He reminded the committee that it was asked to create three (3) districts that would likely elect a Republican and three (3) districts that would likely elect a Democrat. He continued by reminding the committee it was part of its charge to define the parameters for these definitions as well, for example establishing the percentages necessary for a district to be considered a Republican district and the percentage necessary to be Democratic.

Mr. Francis went on to explain that once the decision about which data set to use was made, additional decisions would be required by the committee. He then gave a variety of "If, then" scenarios to help illustrate the steps required in fulfilling this task. He also made some suggestions to help the committee stay on task such as, use only contests which were partisan and avoid contests older than 2008 to ensure the data would be relevant.

He said if the Committee decided to go with voter registration they would look at the voter registration rules and how many Republicans were in a precinct, how many Democrats were in a precinct and how many unaffiliated were in a precinct and use those numbers based on the criteria that was set to determine the districts. Set a minimum standard for Democrat district and Republican district.

Mr. Francis said he will provide the web-based mapping tool at the next meeting which will allow members to draft maps based on the criteria upon which they have agreed. He then asked the committee if they agreed that a district that meets some of the criteria is better than a district that meets none. The committee agreed with that statement as members said they looked forward to using the mapping tool.

The committee then resumed its discussion about which data set to use for the partisanship criteria. Ms. Herbert asked each member to work independently and offer his/her suggestion on which data set should be used and then prescribe the subsequent parameters/thresholds to use and post these suggestions on large sheets of paper. Each member reported out on his/her recommendations and answered questions from the other members. Once each member reported out, Ms. Herbert asked each member to indicate which suggestions they would support by placing a sticker at those items. This exercise revealed the greatest support for the following:

- Straight Ticket (12 stickers supporting)
- BOCC Actual Elections (9 stickers supporting)
- Registered Voters (2 stickers supporting)

This exercise revealed that there was substantial support from the committee to use straight ticket data for partisanship criteria.

MEETING SUMMARY
Redistricting Committee of the BOCC
10am-12pm
Tuesday, April 5, 2011

III. Actions Taken

- A. (Reaffirmed) Data set to determine majority-minority district will be voting age population; percentage required to be classified as majority-minority district will be 53-55%.
- B. Asked Brian Francis to use 2008 and 2010 straight ticket information to test the mapping tool and reveal drafts for analysis.
- C. Agreed that by July recommendations would be finalized to present a final recommendation to the Board by August.

IV. Calendar Reminders

A regular meeting schedule was set for the 1st Tuesday of the month except for July which was set for the 2nd Tuesday of the month from 10am-noon, location 267.