

# Redistricting Group Meeting Minutes

December 1, 2011 - 4:30 p.m.

Room 319 City Hall, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Redistricting Group Members Present: Clegg (Chair), Bad Heart Bull, Brown, Cole, Connell, Dolan, Ferrara, Heinle, Kozak, Lazarus, Lickness, Massey, Peltola, Rubenstein, Sandberg, Schwarzkopf, Unni

Redistricting Group Members Absent: Cohen, Garcia, Gerdes (excused), Johnson (excused), Metge (excused), Richardson, Thaden

Also Present: Carol Bachun, Assistant City Attorney  
Casey Carl, City Clerk

## 1. Roll Call

Chair Clegg called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m. Roll call was taken.

## 2. Adopt Agenda

*Lazarus moved adoption of the agenda. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Cohen, Garcia, Gerdes, Johnson, Metge, Richardson, Thaden.

## 3. Approve meeting notes of Training Session held on October 12, 2011

*Lazarus moved approval of the meeting notes of the October 12, 2011 training session. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Cohen, Garcia, Gerdes, Johnson, Metge, Richardson, Thaden.

## 4. Accept all public comments received and enter them into the official record

*By unanimous consent, public comments were received and filed.*

## 5. Chair's Report

Clegg reported that a GIS consultant had been hired. The redistricting website is now live and the inbox is active ([redistricting2012@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:redistricting2012@minneapolismn.gov)). People with questions, comments, or proposals can send them to the inbox and they will be received and filed as public comment at the next meeting.

## 6. Introduction of GIS Consultant

The GIS consultant was unable to attend the meeting.

## 7. Maptitude Software Update

The Maptitude software license has been received from the county. Training is scheduled for December for the GIS consultant as well as someone from the City's BIS Department. The software will be up and running after training is complete.

## 8. Update on State Redistricting by Carol Bachun, Assistant City Attorney

Carol Bachun, Assistant City Attorney, reviewed the following documents which were provided to Redistricting Group members: a) State and Federal Litigation Summary; b) State and Federal Litigation Summary Brief Update; and c) State of Minnesota Special Redistricting Panel Order Stating Redistricting Principles and Requirements for Plan Submissions.

## 9. Public Hearing Process

Clegg stated that the City Charter requires the Redistricting Group to hold four public hearings, two of which must be held on the final proposed map. The Redistricting Rules provide that a quorum is not required at public hearings, in part because the group cannot take any action at the hearing. The Redistricting Group members present will listen and take public comment back for consideration. The Chair at the public hearing can set reasonable time limits on the testimony based upon the number of

people present, as well as respond to questions, if appropriate. If Redistricting Group members have questions of the speakers, the questions should be directed through the Chair and be for clarification purposes only.

The Redistricting Group discussed adding an educational aspect to the public hearings and reaching out to communities with information on redistricting. The following suggestions were discussed:

- Using the first 20 to 30 minutes of the public hearings to provide the public with educational and background information on redistricting
- Preparing a fact sheet for use at the public hearings and for distribution, ensuring that all members are disseminating the same information
- Investigating the possibility of a video broadcast about redistricting that could be copied and sent to neighborhoods, etc., as well as linked to the website
- Using the City's Communications Department to distribute educational information to neighborhood groups
- Referring people to the redistricting website which has an FAQ vetted by the City Attorney's Office
- Finding ways to communicate with the public other than electronically
- Having all educational materials reviewed by the City Attorney's Office prior to distribution, including any video materials, to insure the group is providing accurate information
- Massey volunteered to contact The UpTake, a citizen journalism forum, to determine if they could provide redistricting and public hearing information to the public, possibly videotaping a public hearing
- The formation of a working group to consider various formats of educational materials and draft information for the Redistricting Group's consideration at their next meeting
- Cole, Dolan, Ferrara, Lickness, Massey, Rubenstein, Sandberg, and Schwarzkopf volunteered to participate in the working group

*Ferrara moved that the working group be charged with the following: 1) Determining the possibility of a video broadcast interview; 2) Preparing brief educational materials for use at the beginning of public hearings; and 3) Preparing brief written materials for distribution at public hearings, outside of public hearings, and electronically, reporting back to the Redistricting Group at their next meeting. Seconded. Adopted upon a voice vote.*

Absent - Cohen, Garcia, Gerdes, Johnson, Metge, Richardson, Thaden.

Declining to vote - Connell.

#### **10. Proposed Redistricting Rules Changes:**

- a) Consideration of maps submitted by the public; and**
- b) Spokesperson for Redistricting Group**

Clegg stated that Common Cause Minnesota will be providing a map-drawing tool on their website, and the public will be able to forward proposed maps to the Redistricting Group. Every map submitted will be considered public comment and distributed to all members. It had been suggested that the Redistricting Group should consider maps submitted by the public only if a member moved the consideration of a map and received a certain level of support.

Schwarzkopf stated that it is the responsibility of the Redistricting Group to draw a map. Group members should look at all maps submitted, and if they like a portion of the map, they can propose that the GIS consultant add it to the next draft. If the group wants to consider an entire submitted map, there should be a higher threshold than just a majority vote. He proposed a three-fourths or two-thirds vote threshold.

Massey stated that Common Cause's map drawing tool gives the public another avenue for providing input and should not be discouraged. It was incumbent upon the Redistricting Group to take the maps into consideration as best they can.

Lickness stated that Redistricting Group members are obligated to review any comments received and take them into consideration as they develop their own map. Given the time constraints involved in the process, voting on each comment and/or map would be impossible.

Rubenstein stated that the Redistricting Group should consider submitted maps just like any other comments but only vote on their own maps.

Cole stated that there will be elements and commentary from various faces and places that the Redistricting Group members will take in and digest as they begin to create their own maps. Submitted maps can be used as data points to create group maps.

Heinle suggested that if numerous maps are received, it may be beneficial to create a subcommittee to review them prior to full Redistricting Group meetings.

Clegg stated that if the group took no action on the subject of submitted maps, and a map was received, it would be treated like any other public comment and be distributed to all members. If a member wanted to discuss a specific map, or a specific portion of a map, they could make that motion and if the motion passed, the group would discuss it.

*Schwarzkopf moved that the Redistricting Group not consider voting on any maps received from the public. Seconded by Ferrara.*

Unni inquired if that would include not considering a portion of a map, such as an individual ward. Schwarzkopf stated that it would not.

Peltola spoke against the motion. The Redistricting Group should be discussing how they will create their own maps, working with the GIS consultant, rather than what to do with maps submitted by the public.

Connell felt that the motion was unnecessary.

Clegg also felt that the motion was unnecessary. It would be saying that the Redistricting Group would not pay attention to or consider any public comment.

Schwarzkopf clarified that the intent of the motion was that the Redistricting Group would not take an up-and-down vote on any map submitted by the public. Any Redistricting Group member could propose ideas from a submitted map, but the group would not actually vote on that map.

*Ferrara withdrew his second to the motion because he felt the motion was confusing. He did not think the Redistricting Group could have a useful conversation about this until they understood how the software worked. The process would be different than it appeared today.*

Clegg stated that Mr. Schwarzkopf had made a motion and the second had been withdrawn. He called for a second on the motion.

*Schwarzkopf's motion failed for lack of a second.*

*Unni moved to table discussion until the Redistricting Group was fully educated on what the software would entail in terms of consideration of outside maps. Seconded.*

Ferrara spoke against the motion. It will be useful to understand the software and how it works, but the group should first come to an understanding of how they are going to work together creating their own map.

Connell stated that he was not sure he could support the motion because it seemed very abstracted. The group needed to figure out how to deal with the maps in front them.

*Unni withdrew his motion as his intent was not clear and reworded it to move that the group delay any vote regarding this issue until they are fully educated.*

Clegg stated that since there was no motion before the Redistricting Group, there was no vote to delay.

*Ferrara moved the next item on the agenda. Seconded.*  
Adopted by unanimous consent.

#### 10. Proposed Redistricting Rules Changes:

##### b) Spokesperson for Redistricting Group

Clegg stated that it was a concern to some members that the Charter Commission's Rules state that the Charter Commission Chair is the spokesperson for the Charter Commission, and there is no corresponding Redistricting Rule relating to the Redistricting Group.

*Kozak moved to delegate the Chair and the City Attorney to draft language to amend the Redistricting Rules to designate the Chair of the Redistricting Group as the spokesperson for the Redistricting Group.*  
Seconded.

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Cohen, Cole, Garcia, Gerdes, Johnson, Lazarus, Lickness, Metge, Richardson, Sandberg, Thaden.

## Public Commentary

Michael Dean, Executive Director, Common Cause Minnesota, was present and stated that Common Cause had launched a web tool that allowed citizens to draw maps on the state level. They hoped to launch the same tool for the city of Minneapolis. The mapping tool uses a scoring process, and he asked the Redistricting Group to submit the criteria they will apply in the redistricting process so it can be incorporated into the mapping tool. He will notify the Redistricting Group when the Minneapolis map is available and suggested Redistricting Group members experiment with it.

Bachun cautioned members against drawing a Minneapolis map on their own that could be used in litigation and suggested experimenting with the state map on the Common Cause website if interested.

Rubenstein requested that Common Cause provide a link on their website to the Minneapolis redistricting website.

*Unni moved to adjourn. Seconded.*

Adopted upon a voice vote.

Absent - Cohen, Cole, Garcia, Gerdes, Johnson, Lazarus, Lickness, Metge, Richardson, Sandberg, Thaden.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.