

1 **WASHINGTON COUNTY REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE**

2  
3 West Bend, WI  
4 Courthouse-Government Center

April 12, 2011  
1:00 p.m.

5  
6 Present: Herbert Tennes, James Core, Rick Gundrum, Michael Miller, Dennis Myers, John  
7 Stern, and Daniel Stoffel.

8  
9 Also present: County Attorney Kim Nass, County Clerk Brenda Jaszewski, GIS Manager Eric  
10 Damkot, Shirley Schuster (Village of Richfield), Dawn Wiebelhaus (City of West Bend),  
11 Margaret Wilber (Village of Slinger), Supervisors Richard Bertram, Leslie Borman, Melvin  
12 Ewert, Daniel Goetz, Joseph Gonnering, Mark McCune, Joan Russell, Gerald Schulz, Peter  
13 Sorce, and Paul Ustruck.

14  
15 Chairperson Tennes called the meeting to order and read the Affidavit of Posting.

16  
17 **REVIEW AND REVISE TENTATIVE SUPERVISORY DISTRICT PLANS**

18 Mr. Damkot presented eight different maps, four were created without regard to incumbents and  
19 four took into account where the current 30 supervisors reside. All eight have a plan deviation  
20 not less than 5.5% and one just above 7%. In the four plans that maintain incumbents in separate  
21 districts, supervisors generally represent more municipalities. Many would represent three and  
22 in some cases, four different municipalities.

23  
24 The first four plans presented were created without regard to incumbents. It was noted that  
25 within each of these plans, protection of some incumbents could be achieved with minimal  
26 changes.

27  
28 Draft Plan #1 was started at the north end of the county and worked to the south. The error in  
29 this plan is shifted to the south. Total deviation for this plan is 5.78%, with an average of 1.19%.  
30 The range between the smallest and largest district is 254 individuals.

31  
32 Draft Plan #4 was started in the center of the county and worked outward. Total deviation is  
33 6.28%, with an average of 1.40%. The range between the smallest and largest district is 276  
34 individuals.

35  
36 Draft Plan #5 was started at the south end of the county and worked to the north. Total deviation  
37 is 6.60%, with an average of 1.34%. The range between the smallest and largest district is 290  
38 individuals.

39  
40 Draft Plan #7 is a contrast to the first three. In the first three plans, the error tends to shift north  
41 and south. The primary goal of this plan was to try to maintain the north and south town lines,  
42 which shifts the error east and west. Total deviation is 6.62%, with an average of 1.68%. The  
43 range between the smallest and largest district is 291 individuals.

44  
45 The four plans listed above will have some incumbents running against each other as they were  
46 created to follow municipal boundaries as best as possible. The following four plans retain  
47 current incumbents in separate districts. It was noted that if an incumbent knows they will not be  
48 running for office again, it would provide more flexibility and we could create plan options  
49 taking this into consideration.

1  
2 Draft Plan #2 is a companion to Draft Plan #1, starting at the north end of the county and  
3 working south, but maintains incumbents in separate districts. Total deviation is 6.62%, with an  
4 average of 1.52%. The range between the smallest and largest district is 291 individuals.

5  
6 Draft Plan #3 started in the City of West Bend and worked toward the outside of the county.  
7 Much of the error in this plan is shifted to the southern portion of the county. Total deviation is  
8 6.32%, with an average of 1.46%. The range between the smallest and largest district is 278  
9 individuals.

10  
11 Draft Plan #6 started in the Village of Germantown and worked west and north, leaving West  
12 Bend until the end. Total deviation is 5.6%, with an average of 1.27%. The range between the  
13 smallest and largest district is 246 individuals.

14  
15 Draft Plan #8. In the first three plans protecting incumbents, Polk and Slinger had a tendency of  
16 being divided; therefore, this plan began with Polk and Slinger and worked through West Bend,  
17 then through the remaining portions of the county. Total deviation is 7.42%, with an average of  
18 1.61%. The range between the smallest and largest district is 326 individuals.

19  
20 Mr. Damkot stated the focus when creating the draft plans was trying to reduce the number of  
21 municipalities each supervisor would represent while attempting to follow municipal boundaries.  
22 This does not take into consideration the census data that suggests the appropriate number of  
23 supervisors representing each municipality. Inherently, the goal of obtaining the proper number  
24 of supervisors per municipality is somewhat achieved. In these first eight plans, school district  
25 boundaries were not considered. After the Committee provides guidance as to which plans will  
26 be further considered, the school district boundaries will be overlaid.

27  
28 The Committee and Supervisors present discussed the City of Hartford population and the  
29 number of supervisory districts that should be created within the City. Any plan that protects  
30 incumbents will only have two supervisory districts dedicated to the City of Hartford and the  
31 census data shows there should be three. A suggestion was made to create districts somewhat  
32 under the target population for areas that expect to see significant growth over the next several  
33 years.

34  
35 Ms. Nass reviewed the three basic redistricting principles, those being equal population,  
36 contiguity, and compactness. This Committee must decide if protection of incumbents is a goal  
37 of redistricting and if so, should take into consideration the number of municipalities each  
38 supervisor should be required to represent.

39  
40 In an effort to provide Mr. Damkot with more flexibility in creating districts if the Committee  
41 decides to try to protect incumbents, Mr. Stern indicated he will not be seeking re-election next  
42 year. It was requested that if any other supervisors have decided not to seek re-election, they  
43 provide this information.

44  
45 The Committee and Supervisors present discussed protection of incumbents versus keeping  
46 townships intact. It was noted that protection of incumbents does not have to mean the specific  
47 current supervisors, but more of maintaining the integrity of current district boundaries to the  
48 extent possible. Keeping municipalities intact was viewed as more acceptable than protection of  
49 current incumbent supervisors. Also, if a supervisor must represent multiple municipalities, they

1 should represent neighboring townships rather than a mix of town and village or town and city to  
2 maintain commonality of individuals being represented.

3  
4 It was stated the City of Hartford will probably grow the fastest since the other cities and villages  
5 within the county have boundary agreements with their neighboring townships and the City of  
6 Hartford does not. The county should create three separate districts within the City of Hartford,  
7 which the census data supports.

8  
9 School district boundaries and ballot styles were discussed and Mr. Damkot stated that as the  
10 plans develop, he will be able to accommodate some of the school district boundaries.

11  
12 For the next meeting, the Committee directed Mr. Damkot to provide updated drafts of plans #1,  
13 #4, #5, #7, and #8, with the goal of keeping municipalities as intact as possible. In addition,  
14 school district boundaries should be shown on future maps.

15  
16 **ADJOURNMENT**

17 Moved by Mr. Stoffel, seconded by Mr. Stern to adjourn the meeting at 3:27 p.m. Motion  
18 carried.

19  
20  
21  
22  
Brenda J. Jaszewski, County Clerk