AD HOC REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

12 May 2011

Redistricting committee	Others Present
Scott Newport	Caitlin Mullen
Larry Anderson, Chair	John Acardo
Julia Fullerton	Joan Berkes Hanson
Ruth Anne Tobias	Mary Simons
Jerry Augsberger	Steve Kuhn
Riley Oncken	Pat Vary
Anita Turner	Shelia Santos
	Bruce Hamilton
	John Hulseberg

CBD= County Board District

At 6p.m. the Chair called the meeting to order and roll call reflected all members were present. It was moved by R. Tobias and seconded by J. Augsberger to approve the meeting's agenda.

Precinct maps were initially discussed with S. Newport moving and R. Oncken seconding approval of the precinct map drawn by the DeKalb County Clerk. Discussion indicated that the precinct maps would be moved to the full Board for discussion and review. The Board would have the opportunity during the course of the month of May to review the proposed map and would vote on the map at the June full Board meeting. The Board voted unanimously to move the precinct maps to the full County Board.

J. Augsberger indicated that he has a proposal to offer to the committee for discussion. The map is based on the current precinct configuration, has twelve (12) districts with approximately 8,700 individuals in each district. He indicated that he would work with J. Berkes-Hanson to develop a graphic for his map to be distributed to all Board members after the meeting.

P. Vary suggested that having staff develop the maps would be a better, more non-partisan method of drawing the map. L. Anderson stressed that it was the County Board's responsibility to develop maps and to then direct staff to fine tune the maps.

The Committee then began to consider proposed maps. S. Newport's proposed district is comprised of contiguous blocks with similar population and within 5-6% of the target population for districts. He indicated that CBD 3 was the district with the most significant change due to the population boom that occurred between the 2000 and 2010 census. CBD 10 also changed due to population and the remaining twelve (12) districts remained largely the same with some changes. The districts were not redrawn, but

were adjusted to shift population where it was needed to even out the overall distribution of people across the CBDs.

Newport Map

CBDs 1 and 2 are largely the same. However, CBD 12 needed population, so it shifts slightly to the West to take in the Eastern half of Somonauk Township. As drawn, it would have a population of approximately 8,800.

CBD 11 would lose the Eastern half of Somonauk Township and move North to take in Maple Park and part of Cortland (S.E. and S.W. corners). The population would be approximately 9,200.

CBD 6 would lose precincts DK 2, 9 and 7, but would add DK 5 to take on a block shape. DK 2, 7 and 11 will move to CBD 7. CBD 7 needed additional population and would now be comprised of DK 18, 2, 7, 12, 9 and part of DK 11. Population is estimated to be around 9,200.

CBD 5 was too large, so it would lose a precinct and add DK 3 for an estimated population of 8,400.

CBD 9 is the same except the S.W. part of DK 28 was added.

CBD 8 would move slightly East and would drop DK 18 and CO4. It would add CO3 and the N.E. corner of CO8. CO4 would move to CBD 3.

CBD 10 would lose DK 28 to CBD 9and part of DK 11 would move into CBD10. It would also pick up part of CO1 and the N.W. corner of Cortland.

CBD 3 would lose area to CBDs 4 and 8 to have a population of approximately 8,325. It would retain parts of Cortland (N. E. corner and area North of Pleasant Street).

P. Vary commented with respect to CBD 10 that cutting out Taylor and 7th Street where a sliver of land comes down would look more block like if the sliver was shifted elsewhere. Discussion ensued about where to move various portions of CBD 10 and it was suggested that CBD3 needed more population. R. Oncken indicated that the population was left toward the lower end of the spectrum in anticipation of additional growth from planned subdivisions.

At this point A. Turner expressed her preference that maps be drafted by county staff and then go to the County Board. She felt that the current process was confusing and partisan and that the County Board was not using all the resources available to it. L. Anderson reiterated that it was the duty of the County Board to put forth maps and direct staff to fine tune them.

Ausgberger Map

J. Augsberger then presented his map as follows with estimated populations in parenthesis:

CBDs 1,2 and 6 remain unchanged.

DK 4 (1896) would move from CBD 5 to CBD 7.

DK 3 (1044) would move from CBD 8 to CBD 7.

With these changes, CBD 5 would have an approximate population of 8,757 and CBD 7 would have an approximate population of 8,995.

DK 17 (760) and DK 22 (917) would move from CBD 9 to CBD 8 with CBD 8 population totaling approximately 9,060.

DK 27 (1394) would move from CBD 9 to CBD 10 and CBD 10 would have approximately 8,955.

SY 03 (735) and SY 02 (1429) would move from CBD 3 to CBD 4. SY 8 (635) would move from CBD 4 to CBD 3. CBD 4 would have an estimated population of 8,554.

CO 5 (1406) and CO 6 (2104) would move from CBD 3 to CBD 9 with CBD 9 having an estimated population of 8,402.

Move SO 1 (1110) from CBD 11 to CBD 12 so that CBD 12 has an estimated population of 8,819.

CO 1 (1285) would move from CBD 3 to CBD 11 to give CBD 11 an estimated population of 8,560. CBD 3 would have an estimated population of 8857.

R. Tobias presented her map with suggested changes (see attachment). J.Fullerton commented that CBD 8 was totally reconfigured despite the fact that it was only 300 individuals over its suggested targeted population.

Additional discussion followed and J. Hulseberg expressed his preference not to split precincts if possible and to make CBD as symmetrical as possible. He indicated that precinct splitting creates problems on Election Day because voters require two (2) ballots.

The Committee then discussed moving S. Newport's map forward for the County Board's consideration. This map would be the one that the Board would work from at the full Board meeting. A. Turner raised concern that this map was moved forward for consideration. She indicated that this was not the final map and questioned why it should be moved forward. L. Anderson explained that the map would be forwarded to the full Board so that it could discuss the map at the next full Board meeting and the map would be laid on the table for actual consideration at the June meeting. The map could be amended and discussed at the full Board meeting in May and Board members could have a month to consider the map before making a final decision on boundaries in June. L. Anderson encouraged all members to bring their own maps and ideas to the full Board meeting in May.

S. Newport moved and R. Oncken seconded a motion to move S. Newport's map forward to the full Board. All voted aye with the exception of J. Augsberger.

Illinois Statute requires the County Board to determine when redistricting whether or not to have the County Board Chair elected at large or from the ranks of the elected County Board; whether compensation should remain static; and whether voters should exercise cumulative voting rights in multi-member districts. The Committee members unanimously determined that the current structure

for electing the County Board Chair was satisfactory and that the County Board members should not have any increase in compensation. S. Newport moved and R. Tobias seconded the motion to maintain the status quo with respect to these issues.

In closing, J. Berkes-Hanson offered the services of her office in drafting maps for County Board Members. A. Turner reiterated her objections to the redistricting process stating that the process was incomplete and confusing. She expressed frustration that County Board members were not communicating with each other to move the redistricting process forward in a productive and cooperative fashion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30p.m. upon a motion from S. Newport and second from L. Anderson. The Committee voted unanimously to adjourn.