



INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

Minutes – October 18, 2021

Regular Members:				Alternate Members:	
X	Jennifer Waggoner (District 1)	X	James Torrey (District 4)	X	1.Laura Fenimore (District 4)
X	Alan Laisure (District 1)	X	Stefan Ostrach (District 4)		2.Ellen McKean (District 5)
X	LaRece Rivera (District 1)	X	Linda Hamilton (District 4)		
X	Natalie Fisher (District 2)	X	Madison Newell (District 4)		
X	George Grier (District 2)	X	Tony Corcoran (District 5)		
X	Morgan Munro (District 3)	X	Ashley Pelton (District 5)		
X	Natalie Dybens (District 3)	X	Kevin Cronin (District 5)		
	Vincent Murphy (District 3)	14	Total Regular Members	1	Total Alternates as Regular

Staff:

X	Judy Williams, IRC Liaison	X	Cheryl Betschart, County Clerk	Steve Dingle, County Counsel
	Laura Holtgrieve, Minutes	X	Kyle Overstake, LCOG GIS	Bob Denouden, LCOG GIS

1. Call to Order:

Chair Munro called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

2. Introductions and Credentialing:

Vice Chair Dybens led introductions. Alternate Member Fenimore will be a voting member during tonight's meeting.

3. Public comment:

A representative for Lane County Farm Bureau and Lane Family for Farms and Forests reported that the draft maps don't reflect land use, public safety issues, and challenges in the rural areas. A suggestion was made to include Walterville, Jasper, and Deerhorn areas into the Springfield district.

4. Staff Updates:

Ms. Betschart reviewed Lane County precincts and districts. Based on the current combinations, there are 413 splits in Lane County, the highest number with 28 splits in one precinct 714 (meaning 28 ballot styles need to be created). There are several reasons to minimize split districts. It's important to ensure the secrecy of the ballot for the voter. When there is a bigger area within a district combination, you have more voter representation and it's more difficult to identify how that person may or may not have voted. Other reasons are to minimize proofing errors as a higher number of styles increases the complexity of the ballot process, keep election costs down that are ultimately paid by the districts and tax payers, and minimize voter confusion. For example, if moving a portion of the Eugene population and adding it to Springfield's population results in voters calling the election office because they do not understand why they are in that district and think they have the wrong ballot. This occurred in a prior cycle which caused confusion because voters didn't know their district line had moved.

Alternate Member Fenimore asked why islands appear in the Precinct 4400 Splits map. Ms. Betschart replied that all cases in the area don't have to be congruent if the County has had a past practice where something wasn't contiguous or there were splits. The County Clerk has no control over it and can't change it. There are rare instances, as in this case, it would have created a bigger issue with the secrecy of the ballot than with the split.

Mr. Overstake provided feedback on some of the map submissions:

- Plan B – Suggested aligning Districts 4 and 5 to state boundaries to avoid isolating a single or small number of voters via a split.

- Plan C - Suggested aligning Districts 3 and 4 to state boundaries.

Ms. Betschart stated that County Commissioners gave the County Clerk authority to make minor adjustments. She'd like to have the same ability this time for the lines that can't be controlled. The County Clerk doesn't have the authority to change representative, senate or congressional lines, only commissioner lines.

- Plan H – District 2 extends outside the boundary and some of district 5 comes into District 2.

Member Ostrach would prefer that adjustments be made prior to submitting the maps to the County Commissioners. Ms. Betschart agreed with the recommendation.

5. Reaction to October 14, 2021 Maps:

Member Ostrach liked Map J because it kept River Road and Santa Clara together and also kept them in District 1, which is mostly unincorporated in Lane County.

Member Torrey likes Member Ostrach, Waggoner, and Grier's maps. The maps seem to provide a template that members of the committee could use to make adjustments and Mr. Overstake could share impacts.

Member Pelton reported that Map J looks like some neighborhoods were cherry picked based on what the layers show. She'll send Ms. Williams a report she developed of what was or was not included in neighborhood lines on the draft maps and requested that the map be distributed to the committee for review.

6. Review New Maps:

- Member Ostrach reviewed his map. His main concern is to keep River Road and Santa Clara together in one district. He's opposed to dividing these areas.
 - Member Cronin stated that some of the University East Campus area is in district 5, which will need to be corrected.
 - Member Torrey would like to see all of the Bethel School District boundary in District 4.
- Member Waggoner reviewed her map. Her emphasis is keeping neighborhood associations together within the city limits of Eugene and not combining any portion of District 2 with Eugene. She noted that all of her changes are outlined in her summary.

- Member Cronin stated that Member Waggoner’s map splits up the River Road, Santa Clara, and Bethel School Districts. The map brings in two different areas, West and North Eugene into the East Lane district.
- Member Ostrach doesn’t like that the map divides River Road and Santa Clara.
- Member Dybens reviewed her map. Districts 3 and 4 have the largest growth and can’t fit all of the Eugene neighborhoods into these two districts. She centered Districts 3 and 4 the central area of North and South Eugene.
- Member Ostrach doesn’t like that the map divides River Road and Santa Clara.

7. What comes next?

Chair Munro reported that there are nine maps to consider. The committee discussed:

- Decide who wants their maps to be considered or removed.
- Discuss River Road, Santa Clara and Interstate 5 corridor issues.
- Member Fisher asked if moving Springfield into Interstate 5 causes a split that would confuse voters. Chair Munro stated that parts of Eugene might make more sense to be in Springfield. The committee discussed the idea of providing feedback to the Board of County Commissioners that the District names in the Charter are out-of-date in terms of their designated boundaries.
- Member Waggoner stated that River Road, Santa Clara, and Bethel can’t be kept together and still in North Eugene and meet population goals. Keeping West Lane without incorporating some of these areas is a priority.

After discussion, Chair Munro requested the committee to go back and review maps to see if they can be reconfigured to accommodate the requests during this conversation and to review the spreadsheet Member Pelton prepared.

Member Grier motioned for the committee to submit three maps. Member Hamilton seconded the motion. The committee discussed this request.

Member Ostrach motioned to table the motion of submitting three maps. Alternate Member Fenimore seconded the motion. The committee voted to not table the submission of three maps. Member Grier motioned amended his motion to state, “submit three or less maps.” Member Laisure seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Alternate Member Fenimore asked if the committee can adjust a current map and resubmit, e.g., Map A and then Map A1. Chair Munro replied, yes.

Member Grier asked what the map voting process will be. Chair Munro asked the committee to email her with ideas/requests for a rank/choice voting process. Chair Munro, Member Dybens, and Ms. Williams will prepare a list of options to be discussed at the October 21, 2021 meeting.

8. Items for Next Agenda

- Review 10/14/21 and 10/18/21 Minutes
- Review Map Voting Process Proposal
- Review Revised Maps

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.