

**Cuyahoga Falls City Council
Ad Hoc Committee Meeting for Redistricting
November 14, 2011**

Members: Don Walters, Chair
Jerry James
Jeff Iula

Mr. Walters called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. All members were present.

The minutes from the November 7, 2011 Ad Hoc Committee meeting were approved as submitted.

Discussion

Mr. Walters stated this was the seventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee, which has been meeting since early September. There are currently four proposals—A, B, C and D—which have also been published in the newspaper. Council phone numbers were listed so if there was any public input, it should have been received by now. Mrs. Pyke stated that one of the maps in the newspaper was not correct. Mr. Walters agreed that Proposal A that was published showed an area in Ward 3 that should actually have been in Ward 8. It was difficult to make out; however, the information has been available if anyone had wanted to contact Council. Temp. Ord. B-119, which is being introduced during the Council meeting tonight, was drawn up by the Law Department without the attachment. The proposal that will be brought out of the Committee tonight will be attached to B-119, as well as the metes and bounds being inserted, prior to discussion during the Public Affairs Committee next week.

Mr. Mader stated that after reviewing the four proposals, it was his opinion that Proposal D was the best since it addressed all of the issues raised by some Council members wanting to keep certain sections in their ward. Mrs. Klinger reiterated Mr. Mader's comments. She asked where the City stood with regard to the appeal for the 50,000 population. The map proposals have all been based on the population being 49,652. Mrs. Truby stated they have not yet applied for the appeal yet. That will happen closer to the end of the year. Everything is a guess, but she believes it will be over 50,000.

Mrs. Colavecchio stated that she had held her quarterly ward meeting this past weekend and they went over this issue. Everyone at that meeting preferred Proposal A. She stated she could have lived with either Proposal A or D but prefers A because it displaces fewer people. Mr. Iula asked what the ultimate goal was of the committee and asked whether it was to just make the wards within the 1% to 2%. Mr. James stated that after review the four proposals, he personally preferred Map A. There was a small portion on Map D on the other side of the river that moved to another ward and he began thinking about the residents he came to know on that side that he'd be losing. Map A allows him to keep those residents.

Mr. Walters stated that the *Falls News Press* had all four maps published, and Ward 3 on Map A was not correct. Other than Ward 5, it is difficult to see a difference between the changes proposed on Map A and the way the wards are currently drawn. The changes look almost nonexistent. It was necessary to change Ward 5 farther to the north because Ward 8 needed to lose quite a bit. The goal is to displace the smallest number possible. The City has lived with the current ward setup for ten years. To make drastic changes now would make it difficult not only for Council members but also for residents. This is being done for them. There is no perfect proposal, however, the guidelines used is to stay within +/- 5% of the population mean, with the least number displaced as possible while staying away from drastic changes. Making the wards square would turn the City upside down, and it would not be fair to the residents to throw things into

upheaval. Mrs. Pyke stated if you take Maps A and C and put dashes, you will see there is a considerable amount of land space. Map C meets the goals, and there is actually more population moved in Map A than in Map C. Mr. Walters stated the biggest reason for the amount of people moved in both maps was because of shifting Ward 5 to the north. In Map C, there are also considerable changes in Ward 7 and in Ward 4 across the river. Mrs. Pyke indicated there is very little actual space reconfigured in Map C.

Don Nelsch of North Haven Blvd. stated in terms of losing old voters and getting new ones, that is not all a bad thing. This has to last ten years, and many of the current Council members may not be on Council five years from now. Wards were created so that neighborhoods would have representation on Council. He did not feel having residents of the same ward scattered across the City was in the best interest of Council or the residents involved. Having a ward that goes from the east side of the river to the west side of the City does not serve anyone. A ward should be a neighborhood and deserves representation. He doesn't feel that things should be gerrymandered so one can win votes. Mr. James stated that ten years ago, the current wards were redrawn to what they are today. Prior to that, Ward 7 still had the area across the river. In fact, that area has always been a part of Ward 7 for at least 20 years. It's not something that was done recently. Keeping it this way has nothing to do with trying to win votes. He resented that comment. Keeping that area has to do with continuity and what the people are accustomed to having. Mr. Walters agreed with the comment about neighborhoods, but pointed out that neighborhoods will always be split at one point or another when dividing into wards. The way the current wards are is a result of what was done ten years ago and they cannot be made square without creating upheaval. He looked at what was done ten years ago and it appears the wards were drawn strangely at that time but this is what the committee had to start with. To make drastic changes to it now would not serve anyone.

Mrs. Klinger stated that in looking at the maps that were passed around, there is a dramatic difference in the hash marks in A and C. If the objectives are to move the minimum amount of people and land, then map C meets that. Mr. Walters stated this could be discussed for another month but doing so would not be in anyone's best interest either. There are many ways to do this. In fact, there were two additional proposals mentioned at last week's meeting that the Committee did not see. Map A does what we want for residents with minimal changes.

Mrs. Colavecchio wanted to make a statement because Ward 5 is so much affected. She stated that Map B was withdrawn. Map C was a compromise to put Portage Crossings back into Ward 5 but it displaces some of the residents who live near Portage Crossings. There will be many issues that will arise between the development and the residents and she wants to be there for those residents, so she cannot support Map C. The goal to this redistricting was to decrease the number of residents in Wards 8 and 5 without displacing a sitting Council person. The goal was not to make the wards look pretty. The current ward map was approved ten years ago. We are looking at, in the way of ward design, what was approved ten years ago. She wondered why those members who voted ten years ago didn't bring out Proposal C at that time. Mrs. Pyke stated she was not a member of the Ad Hoc Committee and did not have much discussion on the matter. She is just looking at moving the least amount. Mrs. Colavecchio stated there are several goals and that is one. The main goal was to lower the numbers in Wards 8 and 5. Mrs. Pyke continued to try to make a case for Map C. Mrs. Hummel recalled ten years ago that there was a map presented by the majority on Council at the time. Because that map was drawing two sitting members of Council out of their wards, she presented an alternate map. However, the majority on Council voted to stay with the original map and draw those members out. She felt the current Proposal A accomplished what the Committee set out to do. She supports Proposal A.

Mr. James made a motion to adopt Proposal A as the new boundaries; second by Mr. Walters. Motion passed (2-1).

Mrs. Pyke asked if it would be described by map or census blocks. Mr. Walters stated it would be by map and metes and bounds on the exhibit that the Law Department has. Mrs. Pyke also stated the map had a small section of her ward sitting as an island.

Mr. James moved to bring out the new redistricting map, second by Mr. Walters. Motion passed (2-1).

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.