

**MINUTES  
REDISTRICTING OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 2021**

**Members Present:** C. Spears, J. Nooyen, D. Culbertson, K. Suprise, D. VanderHeiden, D. Gabrielson, C. Fallon

**Members Excused:**

Chair Spears called the teleconference meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

**MINUTES OF AUGUST 19, 2021**

MOTION: SUPERVISOR D. GABRIELSON/D. CULBERTSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE COMMITTEE MINUTES OF AUGUST 19, 2021 AS PRINTED. VOTE: AYES; UNANIMOUS. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERTAINING TO AGENDA ITEMS FOR A PERIOD OF 15 MINUTES (limit 3 minutes per speaker)-NONE**

**REVIEW/DISCUSS PRELIMINARY SUPERVISOR DISTRICT PLAN – OPTIONS A, B & C**

Development and Land Services Director Kara Homan provided an overview of the method used to create each map (Plan A, Plan B and Plan C) along with the differences and highlights between them. Homan discussed the urban areas that need to grow and the districts in the urban fringe that will need to shrink, due to the population changes. The goal is to remain as close as possible to equal populations according to the shrinking or growth of the population over the past ten years. The first two maps, Plan A and Plan B, started with the current supervisory district map and shifted the lines to make the target populations fit based on the Traditional Redistricting Principles. Plan A did not address some of the communities of interest, like Dale Sanitary District and Stephensville Sanitary District, and Lawrence University. Plan A was not able and was not specifically trying to make sure the communities of interest were not split. Dale Sanitary District, Stephensville Sanitary District, and Greenville are split; Darboy Sanitary District, Lawrence University and Freedom remained together. Homan reviewed Plan B as being very similar to Plan A, however, the municipal boundaries were subordinate to communities of interest with intentions to preserve Dale Sanitary District and kept most of Stephensville Sanitary District together. By achieving those two objectives to preserve Dale Sanitary District and keep Stephensville Sanitary District together, it triggered a few other necessary changes within District 30 and District 31 which resulted in chunking off Hortonia to remain in District 31. Plan C was completely created from a clean slate and no maps were used as a starting point. The numbering on Plan C is completely arbitrary and can easily be renumbered. Homan reported that the numbering historically started in the Appleton downtown area being District 1 and worked out from there with the higher numbered districts landing in the northern part of the county. Homan indicated if Plan C would be a viable option, the numbering could be done as it has been historically and would not be an issue. GIS Specialist Traci Meulemans presented an interactive web mapping application and demonstrated how to use it. The application allows for its users to overlay the maps to better view the alterations in each map. Meulemans reviewed the many functions of the “layered lists” along with other functions for better comprehension of the changes on each map and its implications. Homan demonstrated the application with a county-wide view of the current supervisory district then overlaid each plan to have a better visual of the modifications to each map in comparison to the current supervisory districts. Homan continued by demonstrating the application in the largest growth areas that shrunk the district and urban areas where the growth was flat so the district geographic area increased. More views were presented of the rural areas to view the impacts surrounding Shiocton, Black Creek, Seymour, Oneida and Freedom.

Plan C was briefly reviewed and easily presented the most drastic changes compared to the current supervisory districts. Due to the compressed timeline, Chair Nooyen suggested choosing two of the three plans to move forward and recommended Plan A and Plan B be presented for public input. Nooyen pointed out that Plan C would be very problematic on several different levels since the map changes everything, can be confusing and the clerks will run into complications using that plan. Supervisor VanderHeiden expressed concern with the current supervisors that may no longer be a resident in their current district due to the changes. Homan explained that due to the growth in Freedom, there were areas that needed to shrink resulting in her district changes. Chair Spears inquired if current supervisor's resident locations could be taken into consideration when drawing the new maps. Supervisor Culbertson indicated with his past experience in the redistricting process, it is not a good idea to put the supervisor residence on the map so it does not become political, and allows the planning department to develop maps based

solely on the population and not based on a Supervisor. Supervisor Culbertson continued to explain how there may be Supervisors that will need to run against another Supervisor in their newly developed district in the next election. That is simply part of the process every ten years that the maps will change. Supervisor Fallon concurred with Supervisor Culbertson in order to appear more transparent and not look like there is preference shown for an incumbent. Supervisor Culbertson agreed to move forward with the recommendation of Plan A and Plan B. Supervisor VanderHeiden inquired what the process would look like in the April elections for current Supervisors that are no longer in their current district. Chair Spears confirmed that the current Supervisors would be able to run for the office in the election, however, it would be for their new district and there may be situations where two current supervisors would have to run against each other. Supervisor Gabrielson inquired if there are any advantages to certain maps when considering the municipalities. Homan indicated, that type of insight is a piece of the multi-step process, in that the next step will be for the municipalities to review and comment on the maps along with the public input. Phase 2 will include the Ward plans where the advantages and disadvantages of each map are analyzed by those entities, however, is a concurrent/expedited review and comment, giving them one week to provide feedback on the given options. Municipalities will know right away if there are red flags. Homan expressed that sometimes they will be able to fix the shortcomings for the clerks and sometimes they cannot. Chair Spears expressed the importance to consider the feedback provided by the municipalities to simplify ballots and vote reporting which could require some tweaks. Supervisor Surprise supported moving forward with Plan A and Plan B as options. Supervisor Fallon supported moving forward with Plan A and Plan B but inquired how Plan C was derived. Chair Spears explained that Plan A and Plan B were derived from the current supervisory district map and Plan C was an option that started from a clean slate and decided the best boundaries solely according to population. Meulemans explained they started Plan C with City of Appleton as historically done and moved out from there creating boundaries solely based on the population.

**MOTION: SUPERVISOR D.CULBERTSON/J. NOOYEN MOVED TO APPROVE DRAFTING A RESOLUTION MOVING FORWARD WITH PLAN A AND PLAN B. VOTE: AYES; UNANIMOUS.**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**NEXT STEPS – SOLICIT/REVIEW MUNICIPAL & PUBLIC INPUT ON PRELIMINARY SUPERVISORY DISTRICT PLANS**

Chair Spears requested a matrix outlining the feedback provided from the public regarding Plan A and Plan B. Homan reported she will move forward to the next steps now that the plans have been narrowed down to Plan A and Plan B by:

1. Meeting with County Clerk Jeff King to send requests for input to all municipalities, directed to each clerk. The request will ask for their input on the preferred map from the municipal perspective including pros and cons related to each map.
2. Press release for the public to provide feedback on the two maps ideally to include pros and cons and their preferred map.
3. The communications will indicate that the written comments will be due by 4:00 p.m. on Monday, August 30, 2021.
4. Alternatively, public comment can be provided at the next Outagamie County Redistricting Advisory Committee meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, August 31, 2021, at 11:00 a.m. to be held by teleconference only.

There was a general consensus from all committee members to move forward with the next steps as indicated.

Homan indicated the mapping application will be posted on the Redistricting webpage found at

[Outagamie.org/government/departments-a-e/development-and-land-services/comprehensive planning and special projects/redistricting](http://Outagamie.org/government/departments-a-e/development-and-land-services/comprehensive-planning-and-special-projects/redistricting) and click on Interactive Web Mapping Application. Supervisor VanderHeiden inquired when the ward boundaries will be added to the online mapping application. Homan reported once they know which map is being recommended for approval as the tentative plan, they will begin pre-mapping wards for the municipalities which will all be part of Phase 2. Municipal teams will work through their ward issues. The municipal ward conflicts with the tentative supervisory plan will be cleaned up moving into Phase 3 to complete the final supervisory district plan. It is expected that there will be fine tuning in Phase 3 to account for the ward issues. Chair Spears summarized that after evaluating the pros/cons and input from public, be prepared to narrow it down to one tentative

plan, either Plan A or Plan B. Homan indicated they will be ready to move forward with a decision next week, however, if more time is needed to arrive at a decision, there is one week cushion built-in should there be a need for any changes.

#### **AROUND THE TABLE**

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEXT MEETING**

Next meeting is on August 31, 2021, at 11:00 a.m.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: SUPERVISOR C. FALLONA/D. VANDERHEIDEN MOVED TO ADJOURN AT 2:16 PM UNTIL AUGUST 31, 2021. VOTE: AYES; UNANIMOUS. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Respectfully submitted,

*Shelly Tyson*

Shelly Tyson, Legislative Services  
August 24, 2021

DRAFT