



INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE
Minutes – October 25, 2021

Regular Members:				Alternate Members:	
X	Jennifer Waggoner (District 1)	X	James Torrey (District 4)		1. Ellen McKean (District 5)
X	Alan Laisure (District 1)	X	Stefan Ostrach (District 4)		
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)		
X	Laura Fenimore (District 4)	15	Total Regular Members		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 6:00 p.m.
2. Introductions and Credentialing:
Vice Chair Dybens led introductions.
3. Public comment:
Public comment suggestions were made requesting the county to: 1) make it easier to find the redistricting maps on the county website; 2) Enlarge the maps so they are easier to read; 3) add a link on front page of the website to access them (instead of having to navigate to the IRC page).
4. Approval of Draft Minutes:
Chair Munro asked if there was any discussion or adjustments on the draft committee minutes from October 18, 2021. The minutes were unanimously approved among voters present.
5. Staff Updates:
Ms. Williams reported that she updated the website (map organization, naming) per the committee's request last week.
6. Conflict of Interest Discussion:
Chair Munro reported that County Counsel sent the committee a memorandum explaining what constitutes a conflict of interest (Attachment A) and that she sent the committee a FAQ sheet (Attachment B) on the subject. Chair Munro led a conversation with the committee requesting disclosure of any potential conflicts of interest.

Member Torey: He has donated to the campaigns of two of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and worked on campaigns as a volunteer.

Member Hamilton: She has volunteered for commissioners; is a County employee; and is Chief Steward of her union. She has never had money transactions with the BCC.

Member Corcoran: He has contributed time to one current commissioner. No money transactions.

Member Newell: She has volunteered and worked on commissioner campaigns as a union staffer. She negotiated the last LCOG Senior and Disabled Services contract for the union.

Member Rivera: She is a County employee; President of AFSCME; and worked on three of the current commissioner's campaigns. No money transactions personally, but AFSCME has donated financially to the commissioners.

Member Cronin: He has a company called, Emerald Empire Consulting, which produces mail, radio and television ads and digital media for candidates. He worked with three of the current commissioners, Bozievich, Berney, and Buch in 2018 and 2019. He contacted the Oregon Government of Ethics Commission (OGEC) to see if this is a conflict of interest. The written opinion is attached to these minutes (Attachment C). OGEC informed him to disclose this information as a potential conflict of interest. Member Cronin is married to Ellen McKean (IRC committee alternate). Since being on this committee, Member Cronin has accepted a position with Housing Oregon, which is a non-profit, based out of Portland. He no longer work at Homes for Good.

Member Pelton: She made a monetary donation to a current commissioner prior to working on this committee.

Member Laisure: He is a friend of one of the commissioners and hasn't discussed the details of this committee work with them.

Member Grier: He was appointed to the Lane County Planning Commission 40 years ago. Previously, he made donations on behalf of non-profits for two of the current commissioners.

Member Fisher: She worked for a previous commissioner, Pete Sorenson. She has made monetary donations to several candidates.

Alternate Member McKean: She is connected to Emerald Empire Consulting via her marriage to Member Cronin. She has previously volunteered for commissioners.

Member Ostrach: He has previously contributed monetarily to commissioners.

Member Hamilton asked if anyone on this committee is gaining financially (personal or business) from current commissioners. Chair Munro stated that conflict of interest is about future financial gain (not past gain). No committee member has stated they will be receiving financial gain from the commissioners in the future.

Member Waggoner: She has contributed and volunteered for campaigns and was a political consultant for 20 years, but not for the commissioners.

Chair Morgan: She has contributed and volunteered for campaigns. She serves on the KLCC Public Radio Foundation Board and doesn't have any editorial say or influence over the news team. She volunteers to raise money for the station.

Member Dybens: Her employer is boarded partially by the current BCC.

7. Review Newly Adjusted Maps (R&S)

Map R – Member Dybens

- Map R is a revised version of Map N.
- Realigned the southern border between District 1 and District 5 East
- This concept aligns districts based on charter descriptions

Member Rivera asked if Member Dybens had a preference between her Map R and Map H. Member Dybens prefers Map R.

Map S (previous Map O) – Member Pelton

- Only one neighborhood split, Churchill
- Keeps River Road, Santa Clara, and Bethel together in one district
- Harlow is in one district
- Springfield doesn't cross into Eugene area
- Provides the most access to political power amongst all of the neighborhoods

Member Rivera asked if Member Waggoner had a preference between her Map P and Map C. Member Waggoner stated that she dropped Map P.

Member Corcoran asked Member Pelton why she included Junction City in District 5. It is because the map follows the new state senate lines.

Member Cronin asked if Map P can be reconsidered since it's been withdrawn? Member Waggoner is willing to bring Map P back and requested that it be added back to the map options to vote on.

8. Winnow Down Maps:

Chair Munro requested the public to send their questions to her via chat. He asked the committee if they wanted to have a discussion on the maps. Member Torrey suggested asking this question after the first round of voting. The committee agreed. Ms. Williams presented an Excel sheet for voting purposes.

Map Voting - Round 1:

- The committee members voted for their first round of map choices. After voting, Map K was eliminated and the committee discussed the pros and cons of each map. Member Ostrach asked to withdraw his Map L. A screenshot of the voting outcome is shown here:

Maps	1st Choice = 3 points			2nd Choice = 2 points				3rd Choice = 1 point			Maps that get 1 point or less get eliminated						Count
	Jennifer	Alan	LaRece	Natalie F.	George	Morgan	Nat D.	Jim	Stefan	Linda	Madison	Laura	Tony	Ashley	Kevin		
Map J			1	3	3	3			3		3		2		2	20	
Map C	3	3						3		3		3				15	
Map P	2		3	1		2		2			2			2	1	15	
Map Q		2		2	1				2				3		3	13	
Map S	1	1						1		2				3		8	
Map H					2		2			1		1				6	
Map R							3				1	2				6	
Map L			2						1				1			4	
Map K							1									1	

Member Torrey asked what makes Map P stronger than Map C. Member Waggoner stated that Map C stronger and it received local support from the League of Women Voters. Clarification regarding public comment noted that the League of Women Voters did not make public comment in support of any maps. The support was from a specific individual, not the League of Women Voters.

Member Ostrach motioned to proceed with Round 2 voting. Member Laisure seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved among voters present.

Round 2:

Maps	Jennifer	Alan	LaRece	Natalie F.	George	Morgan	Nat D.	Jim	Stefan	Linda	Madison	Laura	Tony	Ashley	Kevin	Count
Map J		1	3	3	3	3			3		3		2	2	2	25
Map Q		2	2	2	2		1		2				3		3	17
Map C	3	3						3		3		3				15
Map R							3				2	2	1			8
Map H					1		2	1		1		1			1	7
Map S	1									2				3		6
Map P	2			1		2										5

Member Rivera motioned for the committee to vote on the top three maps, J, Q, and C. Member Torrey seconded the motion. Member Newell stated that the motion is too overbroad. Member Corcoran motioned to amend the original motion to state, “vote on the top 4 maps.” Member Rivera seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved among voters present. The map selection vote is included as Attachment D.

Chair Munro explained the process for the October 28, 2021 committee meeting. The committee’s task is to send three maps to the BCC with written rationale describing each map’s pros and cons and to rank them in the committee’s order of preference.

Member Laisure asked about the process for technical adjustments to the maps. Ms. Bestchart shared that the County Clerk’s office would need 1-2 days to review the final maps for technical adjustments prior to being referred to the BCC. She will ask Mr. Overstake if it’s possible to complete the review prior to the October 28 committee meeting and will advise.

Mr. Ostrach would still like to have some debate on the pros and cons of the remaining maps and asked if the committee would want to allow a process to make adjustments. Chair Munro explained that it’s late in the process to make changes. She requested the committee to email the map author if there is something in particular they wanted changed and to copy Chair Munro and Ms. Williams on the inquiry. The committee will discuss the pros and cons of current maps on October 28, 2021.

9. Items for Next Agenda

- Public comments (15 minute total limit)
- Authors to write descriptions of maps (pros and cons) and submit them by Tuesday night 10/26.
- Map Voting

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.