

Redistricting Commission Public Meeting
 City of College Park
 Hybrid Meeting – City Hall and Zoom
 Monday, September 12, 2022
 7:00 p.m.
 Final Minutes

Members	Present	Absent
Betty Colonomos		X
Val Graham	X	
Alan Hew	X	
John Krouse		X
Delmar Nelson	X	
Nathan Rickard	X	
Marilyn Yang	X	
Fritz Leopold	X	
D.W. Rowlands	X	
Jordan Dewar	X	
Robert Day	X	
Staff and Others		
Bill Gardiner, Assistant City Manager	X	
Suellen Ferguson, City Attorney	X	
Jacob Vassalotti, City GIS Analyst		X
Sam Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting		X
Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting		X
Carleveva Thompson, Contract Secretary	X	

I. Call to Order

Mr. Day called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. Review and Approval of the Agenda

The Commission reviewed the agenda and Mr. Day asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Ms. Rowlands motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Second by Ms. Dewar. All members in favor, no opposed. Motion carries, 9-0-0.

III. Introduction of Commission Members

Mr. Day introduced the Commission members.

IV. Presentation of the Commission's Charge from City Council

Ms. Ferguson presented the charge of the Commission, which is to review the combination of population and voters to determine whether reapportionment is necessary. The Commission is to hold at least two public hearing to receive views on the reapportionment and develop three redistricting plans to submit to the City Council.

The reapportionment criteria is the sum of the population and actual voters shall be substantially equal in each district.

V. Presentation of Draft New District Maps

Ms. Rowlands presented the current district populations and the estimated population in 2024. Districts will be outside of range based on projected 2024 data and the Commission concluded that the districts need to be reapportioned.

Proposal 1 – Based on the 2020 census population with no consideration of new construction.

Proposal 2 – Based on 2022 population, including new buildings that have opened.

Proposal 3A – Based on proposed summer 2023 population, including new student housing.

Proposal 3B – Based on 2023 population, keeps the Northern part of the City similar, but moves student housing around in districts 3 and 4.

Proposal 3C – Based on 2023 population, moving Mazza grand mark into district 2 and moves courtyards into district 4.

VI. Public Questions and Comments

1. City resident Mr. Swanson stated to the Commission his preference to map proposal 3A and feels map proposals 3B and 3C could destroy and isolate Old Town residents and recommends 3A.

2. Did the Commission take into account an increase in the number of voters when taking into account new construction?
No, we were allowed to consider new population, but not change the number of voters.
3. Was the concept of keeping student apartments in the same districts also used to keep resident communities in the same districts?
We did attempt to keep both student communities and resident communities together as part of the Commission's charge. The specific concern in map 3B is having three buildings next to each other in different districts.
4. Mr. Oates, President of Calvert Hills Civic Association commented that the Civic Association discussed the proposed redistricting and stated that Calvert Hills and Old Town would like to remain together since both communities share common interests and would like a single Council member to go to for these interests.
5. Ms. Stulich stated the 5 proposed maps presented do not preserve the core of district 3 and would move 2 of the 4 core neighborhoods, Calvert Hills, Old Town, College Park Estates, and Yarrow out of district 3. What comprises might be needed to the criteria to have an option to preserve all 4 neighborhoods in district 3?
The Commission did calculations to see what fraction of voters in old district 3 versus the new district 3 would look like and concluded that majority of the voters in district 3 would remain in district 3.
6. Can all drafted maps be made available to the public?
Yes, the maps will be posted on the website.

Ms. Rowlands motioned to make all the proposed maps available to the public and posted on the City's website. Second by Ms. Dewar. All members in favor, no opposed. Motion carries, 9-0-0.

7. What does population error means?
The difference between the population of a district and the ideal population of all the districts.
8. What is criterion?
The population plus active voters from the last City or State election.
9. Resident Mr. Doris commented that with the University of Maryland, there are a lot of students that are not residents of the City and do not vote in the City. The districts with low voters have more students. The voters are more important than the population in any district.
10. The criteria of voters plus residents, was this a choice of the Commission?

The Charge of the Commission was to use the voters plus residents for total population.

11. Resident Ms. Bryant commented that as a resident of Old Town and President of Old Town Civic Association, she is upset with the proposed maps as Old Town and Calvert Hills share the same issues and should not be split into different districts. The Commission is bending over backwards to accommodate students and low voter turnout. The resident's wishes should be considered over non-residents that do not vote.
12. Student Carolyn, UMD SGA, commented in support of maps 3A and 3C.
13. What was used to determine that new construction would be used for student housing?
Student apartments were determined by being rented by the bed and/or signing a lease.
14. Was the criteria a choice of the Commission?
The language of the Charter requested the Commission to use the criterion of voters plus population.
15. Resident Mr. Meadow commented on being opposed to all proposed maps that remove Old Town from Calvert Hills and from district 3.
16. Based on the voter numbers, how did these numbers relate to a non-pandemic election?
The last City election and last State and Federal elections were higher due to a presidential election year.
17. UMD student Mr. Barret commented in favor of maps 3B and 3C to keep student housing together and not move the Courtyards to district 1.
18. UMD student Mr. Hamburger commented in favor of map 3C that keeps University View and Tempo together.
19. Mr. Gavin expressed concerns to splitting Old Town and also requested the Commission to label the maps on the website.
20. How was race taken into account and how does this breakdown look in each map?
Mr. Day commented that race was not used in any part of redistricting in the City. The Commission did review the current maps and race was not a factor.
21. If race was not considered, how did you ensure compliance with Federal requirements?
The Commission's understanding was that there was only concern if racial block voting was present and the City does not have a strong history of racial block

voting. The racial data was also not available to the Commission during drafting of the proposed maps.

22. Ms. Hercules commented that race issues are still happening within the City and stated the Commission did double check the racial breakdown per Ms. Rowland's presented data.

23. Mr. Oates asked what decisions were made in creating the proposed maps?
Ms. Rowlands explained that the Commission had to meet the criteria of the Charter, voters plus population and requirements of the Federal and state regulations.

24. What is the deadline for submitting comments?
The Commission will present their findings to the Council on September 27th and will include the comments from the two public meetings that were held.

VII. Adjournment

Mr. Rickard motioned to adjourn the meeting. Second by Mr. Hew. All members in favor, no opposed. Motion carries, 9-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Carleveva Thompson, contract secretary