

**SUMMARY OF MUNICIPAL AND PUBLIC INPUT RECEIVED BY 4PM, 8/30/2021**

Commenter	Pros	Cons	Preference	Other Comments	Staff Remark
C. Swedberg, Clerk, Vandenbroek	A&B - overall done well	A&B - CTH J - can we move 17 residents back to Dist. 13?	none.		Yes - we can and recommend to the committee to advance this change in their recommended map.
C. Pluger, Clerk, Bovina	A&B - both keep town w/one ward	--	either ok.		
L. Decker, Clerk, Little Chute	--	--	none.	General questions on how districts change, and how that may affect wards	Responded to clerk. Will address ward mapping in Phase 2.
J. Anderson, Clerk, Oneida	A&B - look less complex than last year	Concerned about impact to wards/ballots			Will address ballot/ward concerns in Phase 2.
D. Vanderheiden, Clerk, T. Kaukauna	A&B - new boundaries may help simplify ward/ballots	--	none.		
L. Neuenfeldt, Clerk, Hortonia	A - Similar to existing map	B - Different than existing map	Plan A	Will follow up with board to ID if preference is only because it's closest to old map, or if there is other reasons	Note - A splits Hortonia into two districts; B preserves Hortonia in one district.
K. Schultz, Resident	--	A&B: Too Many Districts	--	Recommends reduction in board size	Decision already made to remain at 36 supervisors.
M. Farina, Resident	--	A&B - more squiggly lines / less compact than current map.		See Citizen email for full set of questions & concerns	Staff provided detailed response to Citizen this morning- staff response is attached.
S. Kenney, Clerk, C. Kaukauna	A&B Incorporate recent annexations	--	either ok.		
J. Booth, Clerk, Hortonville	--	--	Plan A	No reason given	Staff followed up asking for pros/cons and reason for preference; no response received as of Tuesday morning.

## **Paul, Lily W.**

---

**Subject:** FW: Supervisory District Maps

**From:** Homan, Kara J.  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 31, 2021 5:46 AM  
**To:** Marcel Farina  
**Cc:** Bastian, Brad R.  
**Subject:** Re: Supervisory District Maps

Marcel:

Thank you for taking time to review the county's potential redistricting maps & for providing your feedback. Per your request, I am responding with information regarding Outagamie's process & basis for the potential maps under consideration.

Our maps were drawn with the following redistricting principals in mind:

1. Compactness
2. Contiguity
3. Preservation of the unity of political subdivisions (e.g. municipalities)
4. Preservation of communities of interest - identified as Dale, Freedom, Stephensville, Darboy & Greenville Sanitary districts (urban areas within larger municipal areas that are surrounded by rural land use that function like a compact community).

Other requirements include equal population requirements per the US constitution, with a target of keeping all proposed districts within +/- 3% of ideal population.

Maps were created with all factors above considered. This always requires balancing the principals when making maps, as often the geographic reality of municipal boundaries, natural features, population characteristics, block geography, etc. results in maps that may not look 100% perfect but are the best option for balancing what are sometimes competing principals.

Redistricting principals & legal requirements are reviewed in our public informational presentation, which can be viewed here: <https://www.outagamie.org/home/showpublisheddocument/83892/637649663851230000>

Answers to your specific comments are below, in **RED**.

Thank you,

Kara Homan, AICP, Director  
Development & Land Services Dept.  
Outagamie Co.

**From:** Marcel Farina <[ckfarina@sbcglobal.net](mailto:ckfarina@sbcglobal.net)>

**Sent:** Saturday, August 28, 2021 4:01 PM

**To:** Homan, Kara J.

**Subject:** Supervisory District Maps

<p><font size="4" color="#FF0000">\*\* External Email: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply until you know it is safe  
\*\*</font></p>

I have taken a look at the 3 supervisory district maps on the County website.

The two things I noticed were:

1) There is minimal difference between Plan A and Plan B (at least to the untrained eye).

That is correct; the biggest difference in the two is that Plan B is able to preserve "Dale" and "Stephensville" as communities of interest, while Plan A was not able to. Preserving these two communities resulted in a bit more "squiggly" lines.

2) Both Plan A and Plan B contain significantly more "squiggly" lines than the Current Districts at least in the rural parts of the county. It does seem that in the City of Appleton, the districts were made a bit more contiguous.

We followed municipal boundaries whenever possible as well as natural boundaries such as rivers/streams. Outagamie County has rivers, particular in the NW part of the county, that are known as "meanderers" - which are very squiggly; We also have some very jagged municipal boundaries that are the product of parcel by parcel annexations over time within a multi-jurisdictional urban area.

Why the odd shapes and notches in some of the districts? It's not nearly as bad as the salamander district that spawned the name gerrymander or some of the state legislative districts but still, why not keep to compact districts with close to straight lines as much as possible - I get that natural barriers like rivers should be accounted for.

In some cases you see odd shapes because the census block data were also oddly shaped and in some cases we had to grab those oddly shaped blocks in order to maintain the +/- 3% ideal population # (to meet the equal protection clause of the US constitution).

Odd shaped districts that stand out to the naked eye include:

District 28 (Why the notch in the NW corner) We tried to keep Greenville sanitary district together as much as possible (as an identified "community of interest". Greenville has a large population just north of 15 that would have put us over ideal pop if included in 27 or 29. (Principals - Preserve Communities of interest; Equal Population)

District 3 (Appendage in SW corner) - Followed City of Appleton Municipal boundary District (Principal: Preservation of Political Subdivisions)

District 8 (Odd square in NE corner) - Followed Kimberly Municipal boundary (Principal: Preservation of Political Subdivisions)

District 10 & 11 border (very jagged) - Followed Buchanan/City of Kaukauna Municipal boundary. (Principal: Preservation of Political Subdivisions)

District 13 & 32 border (odd notch) - Oddly shaped blocks because of the river. Tried to follow roads/rivers whenever possible.

Please advise to the rationale behind these.

Thanks

PS: I have a slight preference to Plan A.....thought it might be because the red lines are easier to see than the orange ones..

Thanks for soliciting our input.

Marcel Farina  
Appleton, WI