

MINUTES
REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE
Public Meeting/Hearing
Ward Redistricting
July 14, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Scott Atkins
Ms. Colleen Coble
Mr. Eugene Gerke
Ms. Michelle Gadbois
Mr. Wiley Miller
Mr. Rob Monsees
Mr. Bob Pugh

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. Terry Smith

ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Rachel Bacon - City of Columbia - Planning
Mr. Mitch Skov - City of Columbia - Planning
Mr. Tim Teddy - City of Columbia - Planning

4) OVERVIEW - CHAIR

MR. PUGH: All right. Again, good evening, everyone. My name is Bob Pugh; I'm the chairman of the 2011 Redistricting Committee -- Reapportionment Committee, I guess you could call that. I want to point out a few things, some administrivia, if you will. There are an abundance of handouts, show maps and data, wall maps down here in front. Just everything that the Committee has seen and knows, we're sharing with you this evening. I also want to point out some things for you and you can share with your friends. If you could go to the Columbia, Missouri website, gotocolumbia.com -- gotocolumbiamo.com, on the home page, you'll see a title, Featured information, Ward Redistricting Reapportionment Committee Public Meeting. You punch that and you'll get into all the data and more than you will see tonight. There also is a poll or an opinion survey available for people to answer and make comments on what we're about. It's also interesting, the marvels of modern technology. You can even go and go into Google Earth and see the wards maps -- on wards maps superimposed from Google Earth, which I find truly remarkable. I have no idea how people do that, but anyway, I'm 71 years old and completely out of date. First thing I think we need to do is talk about what we're challenged with here this evening. And this is quite a bit of verbiage here, but let me try to outline what the Committee has been challenged with -- or

charged with. By September 15, 2011, we're supposed to recommend a map or maps showing the redistricting that we recommend to the City Council. The challenge is that -- you can expect this -- the wards should be equal in populations as existing data permits. Of course, that is not practically possible to have every ward have an equal number of people. If you took the average Columbia population -- the population of Columbia in 2010 and divided by six, you'd come up with a number of 18,063 [sic] in each ward. But that's what we try to drive toward. The Committee should also honor, to every extent possible, existing neighborhood associations, neighborhoods, business districts, and other recognizable demographic features where possible. We have to do that. We have that -- interesting, the technology allows us to superimpose the existing recognized neighborhood associations and their geographic boundaries onto these maps. So that has been rather a simple process, and we are challenged to honor those neighborhood associations and not split them down the middle. The wards should be compact as possible. They should be contiguous. You can't have them skip all over town and put people in the northeast part of Columbia into the southwest ward, or something like that. So those are our challenges. It's fairly straightforward and with the technology we have available, it's rather easy to draw boundaries, because that is our challenge. Let's take a look now at the members of the Commission -- the Committee here. I'm Bob Pugh. Colleen Coble is sitting at my left, is First Ward representative. Scott Atkins, on my left, is Second Ward. Gene Gerke's over here to the Third Ward. Rob Monsees is the Fourth. Michelle Gadbois is the Fifth. Terry Smith, who is not here this evening, and Wiley Miller is an at-large representative. So the Committee consists of eight people. Terry Smith was unable to attend tonight. It's interesting as a footnote on Terry Smith: He was a member of the 2001 Redistricting Committee, so he has some wisdom and experience in this, and he's shared that with us. Okay. Let's take a look at what we're dealing with. This is the existing ward map, as it exists today with the boundaries, showing the population. The total population of Columbia, according to the 2010 census is 108,500 people. Now, you take a look at this, and we don't need to dwell on this too much, but you can clearly see that the Second Ward and the First Ward are out of balance: The Second has too many people; the First does not have enough. The Fourth is a little short, and the Fifth is a little long. The Sixth Ward and the Third Ward are pretty close to what we would call, again, our target of 18,063 people. So our primary challenge is to equalize the population within the First Ward and the Second Ward and to a lesser extent and Fourth and Fifth. So here it is, the population showing the ward and the population difference from the average. Okay? You can see that the First Ward is short 4,570 people; the Second Ward is long 3,241; the Third Ward, 548, pretty good shape; the Fourth Ward is short, which is interesting if you -- just historically. The Fourth Ward at one -- I think at the beginning was -- in 2001, probably had the most population and now it's turned out short. It's

primarily being a function of land being blocked by annexation and not able to grow. The First Ward is always going to be a victim, if you will, if we continue -- and we do intend to -- I'll make a note here that the Committee has decided to retain the First Ward, in essence as a center-city or core ward. That background on that, that was adopted -- that notion was adopted in 1991, redistricting and restructuring of the wards. It was endorsed again in 2001, and the Committee has, again, endorsed that general concept that the First Ward would retain what we know as the core or center-city ward. So you can see what our challenge is. We have to move boundaries to balance population. It's rather straightforward, if you take it in the simplest way. The technology that the City has -- and I want to commend the City Staff for the effort they've done -- and the technology they have, it makes it relatively easy. Much easier than I can imagine in '91, '81, '71, back when there was -- this technology did not even exist. So we can move rather quickly. Actually, we've moved quick enough that we are pretty much, if you will, ahead of schedule, and we're not at all worried that we're going to be stressed to meet our September 15th deadline. And I do want to commend the Staff of the Planning Department for their help in this. These people know what they're doing. They produced this Power Point that you'll see tonight. So let me go back and say the first part of our hearing tonight is what I call show and tell. We're going to show you and tell you what we know and what we have done so far. The second phase is you're going to tell us what you think. So it's show and tell and then tell. And we'll listen attentively. Your comments will be recorded, verbatim, and the Committee, we will see all these comments in verbatim and we will read them and assess them and consider them at our next meeting. So a couple of administrative rules: If you wish to make a comment, please come forward up here to the podium, state your name and your address. If you are representing an association or organization, please let us know who you represent. I ask you to try to limit your comments to five minutes or more [sic]. If you cannot and think you need a little more time, I'm going to be pretty liberal with that, but we just can't go on and on and on and on. I also ask you to not repeat -- try to not be repetitive. If one person makes a statement, it'll be recorded and noted. We're pretty open-minded people, and we don't need to be reminded. So let's go on now to what we've done. What is this thing here? This is the existing. Okay. We challenged -- we asked the Staff at our first meeting, Would you take a pass, a first pass, at drawing a boundary to accommodate a target population of approximately 18,063 people per ward, and we -- knowing that's not possible, ideally, but make a pass at it. We know the First Ward, particularly, is short and it has to be stretched. Its boundaries have to be realigned somehow to get more people in the First Ward. The Second Ward has to give up some folks into some -- probably the First Ward primarily, of course. The Third Ward and the Sixth Ward, pretty much in sync, not too far off. The Fourth and Fifth, we have to tinker with that a little bit. So that's what we did here. We have what we call Trial A. A lot of confusion.

Somebody says we got A, B, no C, and a D. I don't know why the hell we don't have a C, but it's gone. Okay. It fell apart, thrown on the cutting-room floor. I'm going to ask the Staff to generally outline here -- I think it's hard to see -- understand where the boundaries -- the boundary streets are as a point of reference, and explain their methodology in arriving at Trial A. Mitch or Tim?

5) PUBLIC HEARING - TRIAL MAPS A, B, and D

MR. TEDDY: Chairman, Mitch Skov, Senior Planner, will give the presentation in just a moment, but in introducing him, I just wanted to provide a bit of background to our audience in addition to what Chairman has covered this evening. We're going to show four maps. The one we call the base is nothing more than the existing ward map, so that's already been shown. Trial A, which is the one we originally included in the public notice for this meeting; Trial B, which is one of two alternatives that the Staff produced, and that was in response to a Committee request that we provide, at least as examples, not necessarily recommendations, but examples of a changed ward geography so you'd have something to respond to. So A and B were produced by the Staff. As mentioned there is not a C. C was one that was left behind because it didn't meet the Committee's established criteria, so we moved on to D. D is one that comes from the Committee itself. It was proposed by a member, and then as recently as this Tuesday was discussed by the whole Committee as an additional map that we want to share with you this evening. So with that, I'll let Mr. Skov take it away, and he's going to focus on where the key boundary shifts are in these trials.

MR. SKOV: Hi. As Mr. Teddy enumerated, I am going to talk about all three trials just at once -- or in order, as opposed to stopping after each trial. Trial A is what you see up on the screen now, and in the handout you should have that map as well. The most, I think, obvious thing that's changed in Trial A is the First Ward boundaries have been extended both to the west and to the east from their current boundaries. On the west it takes in some land that's currently in the Second Ward and it actually extends further west along Broadway to Fairview, up Fairview to Worley, and then up Stadium Boulevard to I-70. On the east side of the First Ward, the extension is basically the area between College and Old 63, and between Business Loop on the north and Broadway on the South. And Fourth and Fifth Ward needed to be adjusted as well. The boundary between those two wards is adjusted to make the MKT Trail the boundary further to the west from where it currently is. If you look at the map closely, you can see a line in the Fourth Ward section. It follows Hinkson Creek up to Chapel Hill Road and then down Scott Boulevard. That's the area that's currently in the Fifth Ward. Ironically, this is the area that was in the Fourth Ward prior to 2001, but as part of that redistricting, it was shifted to the Fifth. So that's the boundary change there. There's also a change between the Fourth and the Second Ward boundaries. There's a portion of the Fourth Ward from north of Smith Drive and west of Scott that would be placed into the

Second Ward. And then the last boundary change is between the Second and the Third Ward, on sort of the northeast portion of the screen there. The boundary would stay the same along Oakland Gravel Road and Paris Road further south, but north of Brown School Road, there's a section that would be placed into the Third that's currently in the Second Ward. It would be -- the boundary would be east of Rangeline and, again, north of Brown School Road. Trial B is -- again, the major change or the most obvious change, I believe, is the difference in the First Ward's configuration. It does transfer property from the Second Ward, north of I-70, along the east side of Rangeline Street, Route 763, up to Blue Ridge Road, then east to Bear Creek, and on up to Smiley and Oakland Gravel Road. And then it follows the existing boundary -- what is the existing boundary between Second and Third back down to the Business Loop -- or pardon me -- to the Interstate 70. Fourth and Fifth Ward boundaries, the same boundary change as is shown in Trial A is also proposed in Trial B. Again, the MKT Trial becomes the boundary west of where it currently connects to Hinkson Creek and extends on west to Scott Boulevard. And that would be the boundary between the two wards, and I would assume, extended beyond that for annexation purposes, it would remain the north/south boundary between the two wards. The Fourth -- I wanted to mention that the Fourth and Second Ward boundaries do stay the same as Trial A, again that section north of Smith and west of Scott go into the Second Ward. Trial D is the third of the maps to view tonight. The difference here is not only is there a addition of additional territory on the west side of the boundary of the First Ward and the east side, similar -- I believe exactly the same boundaries as what as shown in Trial A, but there's a section of the current Fourth Ward that would be transferred to the First Ward. This is an area south of Broadway, west of Providence Road, east of Maplewood, and then north of Stadium, and then along the MKT back up to Providence. So there's a significant amount of territory south of Broadway here that would go into the First Ward. Other First Ward changes, again, there's some property on the far south, which is currently in the First Ward. This is area that's on the campus between College and Providence Road and north of Stadium, there are some blocks that are currently in the First Ward that would be in the Sixth and some that would be in the Fifth. Second and Third Ward changes, the same configuration at the northeast between the Second and Third as in A would be shown there. Again, north of Brown School Road, that area would be added to the Third that's currently in the Second. Fourth and Second Ward boundary changes, same as Trial A., same boundary changes being made between the Fourth and the Second. The Fourth and Fifth Ward boundary configuration is different in Trial D, in that it actually expands the ward south of Chapel Hill Road and then east of Scott. It would include, for example, the Thornbrook subdivision and some other subdivisions in that vicinity, and also include some areas south of the MKT and west of Forum and north of Nifong. But, as you can see, it's a variation of the boundary in the other two trials, between

the Fourth and the Fifth. And there's one other change between the Fifth Ward and the Sixth. The boundary moves from currently where -- it's currently along Providence Road, and it moves east of there along the access road to Green Meadows Road, then south and takes some territory that's currently in the Sixth into the Fifth. We do have the demographic data available for each of the trials as well as the base, if there are any questions, but we can display this at your request when you're -- if that's something you're interested in. I don't know that I have anymore to say about the trials at this point. Tim, do you have anything you want to add?

MR. TEDDY: No. Are there any questions from the Committee?

MR. PUGH: Committee members wish to say anything before we start with public comment phase? Again, I want to point out that we're endeavoring to drive the ward populations as close as we can to what we call the average or is also known -- is described as the target, 18,063 people in each ward. We haven't yet really decided on the variance, how far we would allow a ward population to vary from that average. However, it's, I think, generally right now accepted -- in the 2001 it was about 5 percent, plus or minus. So one ward could be 5 percent over the target and another ward might be 5 percent under. We'll be working that further and finally make a final decision on how far we want these maps to vary when we present that to the City Council. As you can see, the demographic data here is quite detailed, and it's available to you to read and see. It's also on the City website in quite a bit of detail. Again, I want to reinforce how amazing the technology has advanced that allows us to do this. It's made our job and the Staff's job much easier, and almost in real time. Although, tonight we are not going to do any real-time boundary adjustments. That would lead to chaos, I think. So let's start the process and why we're here, to hear from you and your comments, criticisms, and suggestions of where we stand today. I want to point out that there are no decisions been made at all regarding any of these three maps. All we've done is offer them for public comment. We are going -- we may end up with another product. I doubt it. We may tweak these a little bit to get them more refined, but we're going to try to keep our inventory down to about these three points, to focus on them. And sooner or later, before September 15th, the Committee, and I will ask them for a vote, whether they -- what map they might prefer to forward or what maps they might prefer. In 2011 there were two maps offered to the City Council. One very similar to D, by the way, then the City Council voted four to three, I believe, to accept what we now have, the existing ward boundaries. So, okay. Let's start. We want to hear from you. We're open-minded. Again, I remind you, please state your name and address. If you represent an organization or a neighborhood association, please say so. Try to limit your comments to five minutes, however, I'm fairly liberal, but I do -- there is a limit to my patience.

MS. BACON: I would like to also add that if you want a particular map on the screen while you're talking, just indicate to us, and we'll be happy to put it up there for you.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. KENDRICK: Hi. Kip Kendrick, and I live at 1601 Windsor Street and also 1601 Bike Boulevard, to some people, I guess.

MR. PUGH: Oh, that's Bike Boulevard. Yeah. I've been over there.

MR. KENDRICK: I am the president of Benton-Stephens Neighborhood Association. First of all, just before I get started, the numbers were different tonight on the population. Just curious as to why the changes tonight.

MR. SKOV: Well, we discovered a discrepancy on one block that in the first -- the initial data we put out there, the population of the First Ward showed as higher because there was a block at the northeast corner of Stadium and Providence that's in the campus that based on the map was in the First Ward, but based on the description of the City ordinance was actually in the Sixth Ward. So that was changed, and even though it was only one block, it was 1,100-some people in that one block because of the presence of the dorms. So that block has been adjusted to show up as being in the Sixth in the base map, so I think the two numbers that were different from the initial stuff that were put out for ward populations are for Ward One and Ward Six. But just the one block made that difference.

MR. KENDRICK: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it. Again, I represent Benton-Stephens Neighborhood. And first of all, shamelessly, I will make a plug for Benton-Stephens, and Mr. Pugh heard this the other day, but we were contacted -- I was contacted about a week and a half ago now, I guess, by MSN.com to name Benton-Stephens as a top college-town neighborhood in the United States. So I guess, by default, that makes Benton-Stephens top in Columbia? Maybe, I don't know. Again, that's just default. So I wanted to start out tonight by saying that we held a Benton-Stephens Neighborhood Association; we had over 40 people in attendance. It was a week ago tonight actually. And we used it as a brainstorming session to talk about the pros and cons of Trial A, Plan A. But then we also used it to discuss Plan B as well, something, by then, it looked like had been actually pulled off the table for discussion, was going to be brought forward to the public anyway for comment. So I think that during that brainstorming session, I was very much open to -- you know, to hearing from constituents on the process. I wanted to hear the pros for Plan A, but it was fairly difficult for us to come up with pros for being moved out of Benton-Stephens -- or being moved out of the Third Ward. My primary concern is there's no numerical reason to mess with the Third Ward. There's no numerical reason. We're currently at 18,631, and according to the numbers that were presented to us tonight, that makes us the only ward that you don't have to touch. So, I guess, we're trying to understand why Benton-Stephens is singled out on two of the three plans that are being brought forward

tonight. As Benton-Stephens president and representative, I feel like I need to be a strong spokesperson for the neighborhood, especially in this process because this is very important. Long-term implications, minimum of ten years; once we're in the First Ward, I can't imagine that we'll be brought out any time soon. So we start looking at 20, 30 years down the road. Now, with moving another neighborhood out of -- into the central-city ward -- what has been designated a central-city ward, a lot of people in my neighborhood, I heard concerns that would actually dilute the voice of the downtown community. Right now Benton-Stephens is the only thing that keeps Ward Three part of downtown. By moving that out, we potentially lose another vote on the City Council. In 2001 the reapportionment committee -- and I know you guys are using some of their past information in making your own decisions, such as the central-city ward. But in the proposal that went forward to the City Council, they stated the importance of protecting the downtown voice, and it was stated in there that in order to do so, they thought a goal should be to increase the number of wards to two or more wards -- two or three more wards that actually are located within the central city. So they understood that having a central-city ward that contains your entire central city, is potentially damning -- or damaging. I'm sorry. Excuse my language -- potentially damaging to your central city. We have a very vibrant downtown and it's -- you know, it's definitely become much more vibrant, I would think, within the last 15 to 20 years. And I've been in Columbia for the last seven years, and I would think part of that has to do with representation currently on the City Council, and how more than one ward touches downtown. One of -- another concern with Plan A and also Plan D is that, again, there's no numerical reason to mess with the Third Ward. Plan A, if you look at what it does to Ward One, it creates a population of 19,141, with a variance from the intended population of 5.85 percent, so that's somewhat concerning as well to us. Now, Plan B, we've lobbied hard, we feel, to get Plan B brought back to the City's attention, and we appreciate that. Just out of curiosity, in the crowd tonight, who is in favor of Plan B? If you feel comfortable, please stand up. Plan B, as in best. Can someone please get a count for the record? Can I have that just be noted for the record that 52 people in the room are actually for Plan B? I just want to spend a moment talking about Plan B. Plan B makes perfect sense and get at the heart of the issue. The issue is you have a Ward Two and a Ward Five that grew too fast, a Ward Four and a Ward One that grew too slow, so it makes perfect sense to all of us -- I believe all 52 of us in the room that are in favor of Plan B, that you would then carve off part of Ward Five and put it into Ward Four, you carve off part of Ward Two and put it into Ward One to get at the heart of the issue the easiest. Now, one of your directives that you gave for the maps were, Ward boundaries should minimize the movement of existing boundary lines where possible. Well, I'm here tonight to tell you it is possible and it is Plan B. One other thing that we really like about Plan B is that it gets at the heart of the 2001 issue, the reason why Ward One is currently Ward One. Ward One is

currently Ward One because they wanted to increase representation for the African American community. By taking part of section B that is highlighted -- I'm sorry -- section -- Ward Two and moving it into the First Ward, you balance the African American population between Ward One and Ward Two. The consequence of that would hopefully be better representation for the African American community and, in fact, continuing on the goals set by the 2001 committee. Now, I just have one final parting question for the Committee, and it would be great to have an answer, but why is creating a larger central-city ward that includes Benton-Stephens given more weight than one of the directives that calls for minimizing movements of existing boundaries? Again, I'll repeat, just for the record, there is no numerical reason to move Ward Three. Benton-Stephens has been in Ward Three for 40 years and we intend to stay there. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. KENDRICK: Is there any questions?

MR. PUGH: Any of the Committee members have any questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. KENDRICK: Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Very well done. Anybody else? Next please, give us a comment.

MR. PARKER: Hi. My name is Dick Parker. I live at 215 Sexton Road. That's in Ward One. Pardon me. I'm speaking to the same point and would -- I will try to be extremely brief. Obviously, Ward Three is fairly close to what it needs to be. Combining part of Ward Two with Ward One, as in Plan B, simplifies the thing. The appearance of including Benton-Stephens into Ward One, and requiring other changes in Ward Three to balance having taken it out, the appearance of that is that it was done solely to influence the political situation in Ward Three. That's a very bad appearance for us to be working with. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: I may comment on that. It may appear that way, but that was not at all the motive or purpose. This was a neutral Staff deal, so don't impugn any motives into these -- into that ward -- Trial A, please. It was -- it does not exist. All right.

MS. FOWLER: Good evening. My name is Pat Fowler. I live at 606 North Sixth Street. I'm here on behalf of the board of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association; I'm the Board president. Our Board members are also here and I'll ask them to stand. Thank you. Our Association met earlier this week to discuss the three trial maps before you this evening. We oppose Trial A outright. We agree with our neighbors to the east of us: There is no numerical reason for moving Benton-Stephens out of the Third Ward and into the First Ward. In order to better understand Trials B and D, as in David, we ask that the City Staff and the Committee seek, gather, and publish additional information about Columbia, including: -- and I have a list and I'm going to give you a copy -- Voter registration by ward, voter turnout by ward in recent elections, the number of registered rental units by ward. I note that the chart has housing units, but there's a difference in housing units and

rental units. Population growth trends as forecast by City Planning, and using your reciprocal relationship with the Columbia Public Schools, their forecast data, which I understand is more precise than the City's; the mean income of households by ward; the amount of funding set aside in the next fiscal year, and spent in the last five fiscal years in each of the wards for infrastructure, expansion, construction, repair, or replacement; and as a safeguard, I'd ask each of you as Committee members to double check what we're asked for and to include categories of data that we might not be knowledgeable enough to know about. All of the available data needs to be available to us in sufficient time for us to read and understand it so that we can become better informed as your recommendation makes its way to Council. There are straightforward reasons for asking for this data to be readily available to us. First, as citizens, we pay for the organizations that gather it. Second, each of us has differing levels of access to that data now: Those in the business and University communities, being the most in the know; the average citizen who works, takes care of their family has less time to persistently pursue those numbers. We have this process -- for this process to have integrity, we need full disclosure of all the qualities that make up any given group of citizens' clout, their success in advocating for their wards, and their interests, and their awareness of the implications of each of these trial maps. We as citizens do not want to be the last ones to the party, where we find out after the fact that our end result has served one quality or characteristic of access and influence over another. I am aware that you believe you cannot officially take these qualities of access and influence into consideration, but each of us is human and each of us is doing the calculations in our head about who will gain and who will lose in this reapportionment. To pretend otherwise, does not pass credibility with any of us. We need to know more about the data already in the possession of ready, the City and its economic partners, and then we need to be transparent in sharing that data equally so we can be certain that those qualities are not unduly influencing the outcome of this reapportionment. And I have copies for each of you. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. PUGH: Any questions? Thank you, ma'am.

MS. FOWLER: Thank you.

MR. SKALA: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Karl Skala. I live at 5201 Gasconade Drive. I've worn several hats in the past. I don't like hats much, so I'm not wearing one now except for as a citizen of the Third Ward. I will say that I'm quasi representing the Hominy Branch Neighborhood Association. We just lost our chair. He's taking a job in Charlotte, North Carolina, and the summer has not allowed us to get together to meet to discuss this. So I'm just speaking on my own behalf, and I shouldn't take very long at all. The way I see this, from the current base map, the target is 18,083 people. Ward One

is the smallest; in terms of variance, it has a negative 25 percent from that target. Ward Two is the largest; it has a positive of 18 percent. Ward Three is closest to the ideal; it's just 3 percent off. Ward Four is the second smallest; it is 12 percent smaller than the largest. Ward Five is the second largest; it's 9 percent bigger. And Ward Six is the third largest; it's 7 percent bigger. That's the base map that we have right now. The simplest solution and the one that is your charge according to the first -- Part A of the resolution, that's to equalize the population, suggests that you add to Ward One from Ward Two, you add to Ward Four from Ward Five, and you leave Ward Three and Ward Six as is. Plan B comes closest to that solution. I was reminded when I was looking at reapportionment that I actually testified at the last reapportionment in 2001. I'd almost forgotten that, but, essentially, I was kind of saying the same thing. And that gets to the second point that I'm trying to make and that is, aside from the primary goal, which is just to adjust the numbers, the goal of reapportionment is to balance the population changes, as I alluded to, but the representational aspects may also be considered. Diversity -- and I'm talking about diversity, not necessarily race, but diversity of density, land use or infrastructure, there are a whole host of other variables, and not homogeneity ought to be encouraged within every ward. I still maintain that the healthiest thing for us as a community is to encourage diversity within each and every ward, rather just than homogeneity. I'd be happy to take any questions.

MR. PUGH: Questions, Committee? Thank you, sir.

MR. SKALA: Thank you.

MS. BUCKLEY: Hello. My name is Annette Kolling Buckley, and I'm president of the Northland-Parker Neighborhood Association, and I imagine nobody will clap when I get done talking.

MR. PUGH: Your address, please.

MS. BUCKLEY: Oh, 2738 Northland Drive. The Northland-Parker Neighborhood Association was the first neighborhood association in Columbia, which is in Ward Two, which is the area on map -- Plan B that you're wanting to put into the First Ward. In 1975 I moved to Columbia and I lived in various parts of Ward One until 1992, when I built that home on Northland Drive, which became part of Ward Two. In 1977 I opened my business, which was Columbia Books, and it was on Ninth Street for 29 years. So I was downtown in Ward One for 29 years, so I know a lot about Ward One and Ward Two. I'm now over in Ward Three because I relocated my business and left downtown. The premise that you have that Ward One should be the city's core, if you take our neighborhood, it's not part of the city's core. It's north of the interstate. It's around the Albert-Oakland Park, and we are -- the Northland-Parker Neighborhood Association is part of the Vanderveen/Derby Ridge whole neighborhood, as a whole, and we have worked together a lot over the years on various issues in our neighborhood. We have different issues in our neighborhood than Ward One

has. I mean, Ward One -- being downtown all those years, I know. You've got the problems with the density and you're next to the University and so you have a lot more different issues. In our neighborhood the issues have been more like zoning and development, land use, things like that, which are completely different. We're a suburban neighborhood. The other thing that was brought up about the demographics of the population of our neighborhood that you're proposing to add to Ward One. We have the Bear Creek Public Housing Development in there. We have four mobile home parks. All along Vandiver, which is just north of the interstate, is a whole band of businesses, which is just like downtown: Property owners that don't vote and have no say in the neighborhood and the ward they are in. Chris Burnam, who has been a wonderful neighbor in our neighborhood, is probably the largest property owner in our neighborhood. He owns eight-plexes, fourplexes, apartments, two of the mobile home parks, a lot of the houses, and much of that's rental. I would say, as an educated guess from someone who lives in that neighborhood, about half of our population is rental, so it's people that come and go. It's not people that are there permanently. And then you've got the business owners, who have a vested interest, but have no say. So you really can't count them, because even though they're there every day, they don't really have any representation because they don't live there. By moving that into that portion of the First Ward, for one thing, it's north of the interstate, and issues of downtown -- I mean, my business now is over on Gordon Street, which is on -- is just east of all of this, and what happens downtown has more effect on me there, in the Third Ward, than that particular neighborhood in the Second Ward. Downtown has -- and the University has really no impact in there because it's too far away. I mean, I agree that you have to move something from the Second Ward because that ward has grown a lot. Our particular little area around Oakland Park really hasn't grown that much. What happens in Derby Ridge and Vanderveen, that has a very definite impact on our neighborhood, and by splitting that like that, we cannot work together as a neighborhood as a whole on issues because it's going to have two different Council members. And if I call up someone in my neighborhood, I would have to call the First Ward person, even though it would be something that would affect the Second Ward. And from past experiences with, you know, lots of trips to the City Council, it really helps to be able to have your representative in your neighborhood, so to speak. And this really doesn't make a good fit for our neighborhood. It would not help our neighborhood at all, I don't really think. We'd just be tacked onto Ward One as something to help, you know, meet the population standards. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Thank you, ma'am. Questions, members? Yes, sir?

MR. MILLER: I do have one. If I understood you, the movement of your community into the First Ward would divide your community organization?

MS. BUCKLEY: Yeah. Because you've got the boundary on Blue Ridge and you've got the Derby Ridge and all that with the school and the Vanderveen subdivision, that's all north of that, and they are part of our neighborhood as a whole, because the Albert-Oakland Park sort of is like a middle ground that we all kind of revolve around, and so anything that affects the perimeter of that park, really affects all of us. And we have -- as neighborhoods we work together a lot on, you know, issues of, you know, development and, you know, roads, and, you know, things like that.

MR. MILLER: Okay.

MS. BUCKLEY: So this would split us right in half.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HAHN: Thank you. I'm Allen Hahn, and I live at 3711 Woodridge Court. And I am also serving as chair of our neighborhood association, but I must confess, since I have been out of town for the last eight days, I have not had an opportunity to talk with my neighbors, and so please accept the fact that I speak only for myself. But I have lived in this neighborhood, which is Woodridge Neighborhood on the southwestern part of the Third Ward, and I've done so since 1969. It is a neighborhood of single-family homes with varying socioeconomic status on different portions of the neighborhood, and yet we all seem to get along quite well. As I looked at and had an opportunity for -- over the web, while I was out of town, to look at some of the different proposals, it seems to me that maintaining the Third Ward as it is, is a salutary proposal. And I would think that we should support -- I would hope my neighbors would support the Plan B, which does maintain our neighborhood within its current boundaries, and also, I think, presents a reasonable and modest diversity that I think we'd all like to hope for. Thank you very much.

MR. PUGH: Are there questions, Committee? Thank you, sir.

MR. HASHEIDER: Hello and good evening. My name is Jay Hasheider. I live at 1403 Windsor. And I want to start off by saying that in preparing for my remarks tonight, I was reminded of a story that I heard several years ago. It was about a guy who shows up at a farm and he wants -- he asks the farmer, How much would it cost to fill my pickup full of turnips? And guy said, Well, I probably could put a ton of turnips in there for about \$2,000. And he says, Okay. He goes in, sells them in the city for a dollar apiece, and a couple days later sees the farmer, and the farmer says, How'd it go? And he says, Well, he said, not to good. I didn't make any money. And the guy said, Well, I heard what you're selling it for, so what are you going to do? And he said, Well, next time I think I'm going to get a bigger truck. Well, we don't have a turnip problem here, but we've got a population balance problem. And I just kind of want to point out what caused this problem. And if you look at the map, what you'll see is a big, big area -- a big perimeter of Columbia. All of the wards are on the perimeter except for one. Over the years we've annexed and annexed and annexed and no

wonder all of these wards have grown. Why has Ward One so little in population? Because it doesn't have any room for annexation. So we have a problem here because we thought we were doing something good 20 years ago when we started a central-city ward, but, in actual fact, what we've created is this ward that doesn't have any vibrancy, any potential to grow with the rest of the city. And so every decade we're going to visit this problem again. Now, if you look at the map on the B map -- if you would put that up -- what you see is that instead of this corralled, constrained ward, that at least it's making some overtures to get to the point where it can grow in a natural sense, along with the other wards, and we wouldn't have to face this problem again. So my simple point is that we don't need a bigger truck. What we need to do is change the central-city ward so that it has some access so that it can grow out and be just like the other wards. Thank you very much.

MR. PUGH: Questions, Committee? Thank you, sir.

MR. PECKHAM: Hello. My name is Nick Peckham; 15 South Tenth Street. I am the past chair of the Downtown Leadership Council and a current member of that group, but tonight I speak strictly as a private citizen. On your -- I've had a lifelong interest in urban design, particular downtown Columbia, so my remarks tonight are focused on how redistricting might affect the heart of the city. In a report to City Council, dated May 2009 and currently available on the City website, the Downtown Leadership Council defined downtown as you see on the map on your screen outlined in orange. On this map you can see that downtown has no area that is represented by the Second and Fifth Wards. I believe that downtown is very important to everyone who lives and works in Columbia, therefore I request the Committee consider tweaking Plan B or whatever plan that you end up adopting so that there can be some representation by each Councilperson in the downtown area. It is the heart of the city. Without the downtown area, I think that there would potentially be unnecessary political turf battles. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them and thank you very much.

MR. PUGH: Questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. PENN: Good evening. I'm Paul Penn; 1811 Lovejoy Lane. I'm president of the Tanglewood Neighborhood Association. Could we get Trial B up, please? As one of the other members of the northern area that's going to be -- that's proposed to be changed into the First Ward mentioned, that area is, as the map wouldn't clearly show, not as connected with the downtown and the other residential areas. A map doesn't always show it clearly, but those residential areas are far on the northern end of the area being proposed to be brought in to the First Ward. They're separated by 70, by Vandiver, by the Business Loop. So those residential areas really aren't contiguous with the other residential areas of the First Ward, therefore what is of major importance or interest or personal interest to people in the First Ward, isn't always as important to the people that might be brought in, the newer people, into

the First Ward. Discussing it with my neighbors in the Association, we all felt pretty well the same, that even though we share a common interest, like everyone does with the City, security, taxes, infrastructure, there are a lot of personal interests in our neighborhood that maybe people who we would be joining, if we were put into the First Ward, don't share. And we don't share some of the same things that they have. We would be still feeling so isolated with that major buffer of the commercial land and the interstate and all that. Any questions?

MR. ATKINS: Sir, where is Tanglewood Association? I've known where every other one is, but --

MR. PENN: It is on the very far northern end of the yellow area there on Trial B. It borders Blue Ridge. It's directly north of Oakland Park swimming pool, therefore, like I said, right on the northern tip of that.

MR. ATKINS: Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Any questions?

MR. MONSEES: How many people live in your neighborhood?

MR. PENN: In my neighborhood we have approximately 40 homes, multi-family. All -- I mean, all R-1 residential.

MR. MONSEES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. ALBERT: Kurt Albert; 1512 Windsor. I was the president of Lions-Stephens Neighborhood Association, some 30 years ago, which was later folded into the Benton-Stephens neighborhood. Ward Three, at this time, is a diverse and politically competitive ward. By removing Benton-Stephens from Third Ward, the diversity will be lost and it will become a politically safe ward. With no numerical reason to alter Ward Three, the effect is gerrymandering. Even if this is accidental, it should be avoided. The appearance of impropriety should be taken into account. Please protect our strong and diverse Third Ward. Please protect Benton-Stephens neighborhood. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. SWOPE: Hi. Bob Swope; 1401 Windsor, otherwise known as Bike Boulevard. So this is my first time living in the city, watching this process, and I just -- it's a very simple observation, but it just seems clear that the Council's mandate was to make up a plan that is as compact and contiguous and readily understandable. And I think it's clear that A and D kind of mess with things more than necessary. I mean, the more voters you shift around from one Ward to another, the more disruptive the process appears to those who live there -- they're not knowing where they're living. I think it's just clear that Plans A and D disrupt more voters than necessary. If the Committee is to follow the Council's directive, I think that it should disregard A and D, for dog, A and D -- as opposed to B for Bob. So it just seems that

it's unnecessarily -- that Ward Three is too much affected and it disturbs too much to achieve the end goal. Plan B is the best choice at this point. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Committee, questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. CALLOWAY: Good evening. My name's Steve Callaway. I am 3900 Sherman Court, resident of the Fifth Ward, and you might say that I don't have a dog in this fight, so to speak. But I'm here as president of the Minority Men's Network, and I would just like to bring to your attention, and just to remind you that in a manner similar to what you have on the Committee in front of you, diversity is extremely important in our community. And I appreciate the comments of Mr. Skala when he spoke to the diversity that is a part of the process that you're trying to undertake here in redistricting Columbia's wards, and that diversity is not just about color. Although, one of the points that the Minority Men's Network, which is made up of a group of men who do live in wards throughout the city, one of the important points to us is that diversity that exists is more than just color. And we do like the idea of a central-city ward and the opportunity that -- and the importance that we feel of having a person of color have the opportunity to represent other people in their ward, persons of color, is very important. At the same time, however, I think the point about the diversity that is in our community is an important point of emphasis that we want to emphasize and stress and encourage the Council -- this Committee to consider as well. If we're going to get forward on many of the issues that affect Columbia, whether they be some infrastructure issues or whatever they are, we're going to have to depend on what I think is the diversity, and strength and value of that diversity, among all the wards of our community. So I think we like B, as in boy, as in the best. You could say black, I don't know, but it's not about black. It's not about black. It's not just about color. You know, diversity is so much more than that, and so we just want to lend our voice to those that are promoting B. But above all else, I think what we want to do is say that diversity is extremely important to us and we've gone on record in many ways encouraging that. So thank you so much for your service. Thank you for the opportunity to be here tonight. And we're here in service to you going forward in whatever you need. Any questions?

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. BEIGER: Good evening. My name's Peter Beiger; I live at 1411 Pratt Street in the historic Benton-Stephens neighborhood. And I want to thank you all in your diligence in handling this -- the challenges of this very reapportionment process, and I hope that it becomes clearer to you who the -- what the preferred plan would be. And my question would be, are there any genuine objections to Plan B? It's simple; it's straightforward, and causes the least amount of disruption to existing wards and neighborhoods. Now, to my mind, there's one essential reason for Benton-Stephens remaining a part of Ward Three that perhaps hasn't received the attention it deserves, and that's the place of Stephens College in

the Benton-Stephens neighborhood, with her many various constituents, with diverse persuasions. And also, the vital fact that Stephens connects Ward Three with the Columbia downtown district, will all of the good reasons that implies. For this, and many reasons in my mind, and given here tonight, I feel Benton-Stephens must remain Precinct Three -- Precinct Three-D in Ward Three as presented in Trial B. And I hope that the City Council of Columbia will agree with this decision. Thank you so much. Do you have any questions?

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. BEIGER: Good evening.

MR. CLARK: My name's John Clark; I live at 403 North Ninth Street. And what I just passed out to the Committee is a population, area, and ward history from 1952 to the present. And most of the issues we're looking at here have to do with the fact that we have 18,000 people per ward, and in a variety of ways, that's probably too many. Secondly, of course, tonight you're being presented mainly with the issue of Benton-Stephens staying where it is and not being part of the First Ward. Well, of course, this is not about Benton-Stephens moving at all. You can have a much more compact First Ward and Benton-Stephens stays where it is. There may be very good reasons for Benton-Stephens to be in a central-city ward, but that's not a necessary thing. For instance, it might be very useful to have part of the Fifth Ward be the source of more voters and so forth, as opposed to Benton-Stephens. That's -- that should be open for discussion. You can take at your leisure this history of the wards. I attended the North Central meeting the other night and I attended the Benton-Stephens meeting. Seems to me there is a real consensus that goals -- that we need adequate attention to the problems, by public and private bodies, central-city issues, including the issues of creating and maintaining a robust downtown. I'm not sure; maybe there are other people that disagree with that. But I think that's an agreed goal among central-city people. I hope it is with everybody in Columbia. There is some discussion about how to do that. I think I heard everybody saying, Well, somehow or another, we have to have more clout about central-city issues in the downtown, and I don't think there's too much disagreement about that. But there's a real disagreement about whether you do that by a model that we tried for 40 years and it failed, which is the wedge model, in one way or another. When we went to six wards in 1971, we created a wedge, and for 20 years the central city and the near neighborhoods really didn't do very well. By 1990, North Central was probably almost 70 percent rental, heavy pressure in Benton-Stephens, moving across to the west. It was not good. So all the problems with central city, north of Broadway, were already in full-blown by 1990. So in 1991 somebody said, Well, let's -- somehow or another that wedge thing, where everybody's responsible for the downtown, so nobody's responsible for the downtown or the central city. They played around with something about a central city where it's really very much the same kind of wedge idea. We'll have this and some -- well,

the fact is we're now 20 years later and it's an utter failure. Things in the central city and the First Ward, but really in the central city, have really not improved much. Ask Almeta Crayton. I mean, she'll endlessly tell you. Now, we had a splurge of a lot of money coming into the First Ward and the HUD eligible area in the '90s. Where'd that come from? It wasn't local money. It was block granted home money. In 1989 that was, like, \$647,000. A few years later, it had gotten up to almost \$2 million. It's now on the decline again. We didn't fight for it. We couldn't have fought for it. We're an entitlement city. It had a tremendous effect. My neighborhood has all kinds of roads, built infrastructure, that's much better, but it is not because of the success of the representation of a central-city ward. It was as it was --

MS. COBLE: Thank you very much there, John.

MR. CLARK: Excuse me? I'm sorry, Colleen. If you'll let me complete. I would be much more impressed with that. Well, actually, I spent 20 years following all this much more closely than you did. If the city had dramatically increased in any way, the percentage of revenues -- namely tax revenues and utility rate revenues -- from its coffers, not just the federal money, that had been invested in the central city, now that would've been a change. And that would have validated the idea of having a central-city ward the way it was drawn. But I believe we now have a 40-year history of saying, You know, this wedge thing just doesn't work. And so I must admit, in 2001 I worked extensively with the Committee and I developed something called Trial 5; D is very much like Trial 5. It says, We need to have a new model to have actual clout. Now, I don't mean Ward One or me. It's basically central-city issues to get the attention, and that means realigning political lines. To do that, of course, back then I suggested we go across Broadway to the south and add three precincts from Ward Four. Now, I can tell you amazing things, and you heard Annette Weaver talk about neighborhoods working together and so forth. I mean, people in the Fourth Ward have a lot to learn from people north, along Providence and vice versa. Having people who have similar concerns and interests and people south of Broadway touching the downtown and so forth, have very -- whether it's the Third, Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Ward. That makes sense. But most importantly, the other model didn't work. It hasn't worked. That political experiment did not get the attention to central-city issues, including a robust downtown, that it needs to. And it still won't. And Route B will not do that. Now, I'm not necessarily against B, per se, but I am interested in looking much more closely at arrangements that will address this clout issue. Now, right now the Committee has said, We just can't think about more wards. Well, in 2001 they came to the conclusion, If we had just eight wards, we would probably have two to three wards with substantial central-city populations, and an entirely different Council. We would have the kind of clout behind dealing with the central-city issues as opposed to, quote, the suburban issues, that is needed to make sense over a period of time. So I'm not suggesting that you go back to the Council -- although, if you do that would be great -- and say, We think

it's time to consider more wards, and we actually have a little time to think about that. But no matter -- right now, we're going to have a big fight about this, and no matter what we conclude about this, if we're dealing with just six wards, we're probably going to be very suboptimal. So I'm hoping that out of this a bunch of people will come together and say, You know, at least eight. Now, the other side of that is, at 18,000 per ward, with the limited City Council, the idea of somebody being able to truly represent that ward is -- is difficult at best. When we got to 15,000 in 1970, we immediately changed and went to six wards. And it is not in your charge to consider more of that, but the angst and so forth here is mainly caused by large population growth and too few wards. From the central-city point of view, too few wards to give us a reasonable representation on the Council, on boards and commissions. And in the halls of administration that plan and are looking at, Well, if we put something up for a ballot and so forth, who are we going to vote, that a Councilperson representing a central-city ward can go to fellow Council people and say, You know, if there's not more for my ward, my area, the central-city, in this, don't count on my vote. This is no longer about what's good for the city as a whole. That made perfect sense when we were 30,000 people. It doesn't make any sense now. I heard Jason Thornhill, somebody blasted him for saying something about, Well, you know, that storm water stuff in the First Ward, it doesn't bother me. Well, that kind of bothers me, but Jason was standing up for his ward. If each of our Councilpersons stood up for their ward, we'd be in a better place. That and eight wards, we'd have a much better balance and we'd have a political structure that would really support our going forward for the next 20 years. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. NICHOLS: Hi. My name is John Nichols. I live at 704 North Williams in the Benton-Stephens neighborhood. And I can actually say I'm more or less kind of undecided, so you can all relax. But I want to bring up a couple points that Mrs. Fowler touched on earlier, and that's the issue of, like, owner-occupancy versus rentalship in some of these neighborhoods that are being moved around. And also the number of registered voters, because, to me, like, what I see this being all about, trying to keep all the numbers equal and everything in all the wards, it's all about representation. And there's really two ways of being represented, and that's either through your vote or through your money. And so if you look at the issue of, like, owner-occupancy or, you know, rentalship in some of these neighborhoods -- like, for instance, I was just glancing at some of the census data the other day and some of the neighborhoods, like, even in one of the census block groups on Benton-Stephens and some of the areas over on the western side that are being -- in Trial A and D are being moved into the First Ward, some of those are really high rentalship, like 80 percent renters. So -- and the First Ward has relatively higher rentalship than the rest of the city, in general, at large. So I'd be concerned that if you lump too many of the rental

properties into one district, then you have a lot of people that live in rental housing being represented by one Council member. And that could be an issue if -- the people who own the property are the ones who are paying the property taxes, so they can come to the City Council and be like, Look, I own all this property; I'm paying all this property taxes into the City coffers, you know, here are my concerns. And then you have the people who actually live in those neighborhoods coming and saying, Here are our concerns. You know, and if you're sitting on opposite sides of the table, are you listening to the voters or are you listening to the money, you know? So that's a potential issue. I'm not trying to say that, you know, people listen to money more than voters, but it's a potential issue that you want to keep in mind when you're looking at all these numbers. The other issue is registered voters, because, I mean, there is a relationship between rental housing -- you know, rentalship -- people that rent and low voter registration. Especially some of the areas -- like a lot of the student housing, people that come from other cities to live here for a couple years and then leave. They don't always bother to register to vote, or they move around every year and it's hard to keep track of where they're registered. So only the most, like, politically motivated people are going to keep up to date with all that. So, like, for instance, one of the areas in Plan D, there's a couple of little areas down in the First Ward that are on campus that are being moved around, and one of those areas is, like, between Rollins and Stadium, and College and Virginia Avenue, I think. And that area, there's six dormitories right there. That is actually the highest population density in all of Boone County is that block right there. So it probably made a lot of sense to just, like, you know, lump it over from one ward to the other, and you're, like, Oh, wow, I moved 2,000 people from ward to another, but those -- a lot of those kids probably don't vote. They just moved here, by definition of living in the dorms. You know, they make all the first-year students live in the dorms. So, those kids probably just moved here, don't know anything about local politics, don't bother registering to vote. So they're not really being counted in terms of representation. I just urge you to kind of look -- look beyond all of the numbers and statistics and kind of look at the character, you know, in terms of ownership and voter registration of these neighborhoods that you're moving around, because I think that's really important.

MR. PUGH: Thank you.

MS. WOLKEN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and the Committee. My name is Sarah Wolken. I live at 1601 Windsor Street. I don't think it's been covered. I just, out of curiosity -- I know Mr. Chairman, at the beginning in the introduction, said that the Third and Sixth Ward were the closest to the population goals that we were trying to achieve. And I'm just curious why the Third Ward was even touched then, since it was so close to the original population goal.

MR. PUGH: Why?

MS. WOLKEN: Yeah. Why part of Third Ward was moved.

MR. PUGH: It was part of the exercise, actually.

MS. WOLKEN: What?

MR. PUGH: It was part of the exercise --

MS. WOLKEN: Okay. Just trying to find --

MR. PUGH: -- of looking for population balance. It just -- that's the way it happened.

MS. WOLKEN: Okay. Okay. Well, I'm just curious because Third and Six seem to be so close to the goals anyway that it seems that that shouldn't be touched, in my opinion. But I strongly support Trial B, and I thank you for your time.

MR. PUGH: Thank you.

MS. SPLITTER: Hello. My name is Tricia Splitter. I live at 22 Aldeah Avenue. I was just glancing at the numbers. I've looked at this several times, and I keep coming back to that, Mr. Pugh, you mentioned that the goal originally was to keep the population variance under 5 percent within each ward. And Trial A is actually the only trial that does not meet that goal. So I strongly support Plan B and oppose Plan A.

MR. PUGH: You're true. I did say that and that may be desirable. The Committee hasn't -- we haven't reached a total consensus of a variance of 5 percent, plus or minus. It probably is desirable and if that is the case, then whatever we present, we'll probably try to get with -- stay within those parameters, whatever -- it might be Map Z, I don't know.

MS. SPLITTER: It just seems that looking at the numbers that might --

MR. PUGH: Yeah. Right.

MS. SPLITTER: -- those are the best to equalizing the population.

MR. PUGH: That's true. The data shows that. Right. Okay.

MS. SPLITTER: Thank you.

MR. GROSSMAN: Good evening. I'm Larry Grossman; 3205 Westcreek Circle. I'm also a property owner in the First Ward. I'm also vice president of the North Central Association -- Business Association, but I do not speak for them at this time. Ten years ago there was a -- I'm speaking in favor of Plan D. That's D. Ten years ago this Committee, or a group similar to this, sent to the City Council a plan very similar to Plan D. That plan was supported by Almeta Crayton; it was supported by the mayor; and it lost by one vote. But there were many comments that were made at the time. Why are we considering -- it was called Plan 5, I believe; is that correct? Why are we considering Plan 5 at this time? And the comments came down to, you know, If we're ever going to -- you know, there's been talk about who's going to get elected, or which player is going to be the most powerful. But maybe it's time we take a look at the First Ward and say, How do we add power to the First Ward? And I say you add power to the First Ward by adding participation. If you take a look at the voter turnout in the First Ward, it is among the lowest in the city. If you take a look at

the neighborhoods south of Broadway, it's amongst the highest. And I contend that by putting those areas into the First Ward, you create a ward that is not like it used to be. We have -- the First Ward has the largest infrastructure needs. It has had for years and years. It gets the least attention, and I maintain it's because there's a lack of participation, lack of voter turnout, a lack of people involved, which is not true across the line in Broadway -- across the line in southern -- south of Broadway. I think that you could make a great progress for that ward by doing that. I also think that, you know, the Benton-Stephens neighborhood has a whole lot more in common with the First Ward than it does on PP, and the south of Broadway has a whole lot more in common with the First Ward than north of I-70. Demographically, there is virtually no difference in any of these. They're virtually all the same. I can't see, since they are so close, that that's an issue. And so I'd just like to support Plan D.

MR. PUGH: Thank you. Next.

MR. ROOT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Jeremy Root. I live at 2417 Beachview Drive, very near to member Monsees, actually. And I just came across these maps earlier this week. Someone brought this to my attention that there was this redistricting going on, and I spent a few hours -- I'm a lawyer and work in Jefferson City -- and spent a few hours of my practice day trying to sort out the differences between them and among them. And as I've listened to the comments tonight, it strikes me that the people in the Benton-Stephens neighborhood don't want to move to Ward One. The people in the Oakland Park neighborhood don't want to move to Ward One. And I don't quite understand why they don't want to move to Ward One. I find the downtown to be the most exciting part of Columbia. I lived there ten years ago when my wife was a master's student at the University of Missouri. We lived right by Mojo's. 307 St. James was our address then, and I enjoyed living in that ward, and I was proud to be one of the people who voted for Almeta Crayton when she was elected to represent that ward for the first time. But I just -- you know, I don't know exactly why that is, without going into some concerns that I have about racial dynamics in this town and wealth dynamics in this town that are really beyond the scope of this Committee's mandate. Those are problems you are never going to fix. You don't have enough time; you don't have enough resources; you don't have enough buy-in -- you don't have the mandate, generally. But the thing that made sense to me, from my perspective, is looking at a way for the First Ward to grow in a way that it has an opportunity to grow, or at least remain stable. And among these plans -- you know, if you go with either A or D, you're just capturing kind of captive audiences. There's no -- there's no -- there's no room to grow in those communities. There's not going to be new development in those communities. And if you take Trial B, I think, in ten years, as Columbia continues to move northward, which is really the direction that I see all the growth moving in Columbia, the First Ward could extend up, and some of the divisions that are -- that you heard fears about in that community, where

they lose part of Derby Ridge and that division, that might be erased as that ward continues to grow north. And it does give the ward a place to grow. And the final comment I'll make is the president of the North Central Association asked the committee to look at voter registration patterns and voter turnout patterns, and I think that that is critical to an understanding of political power in the community. I know our Council elections are nonpartisan, but we also -- the same voters who vote in the nonpartisan elections vote in partisan elections. And I'm concerned as I look at our nation, with the divisiveness in partisan elections, and I would -- and I don't want that to increase in Columbia, any more than it already has. And I fear that if you take Benton-Stephens, which is, by my reckoning, a high-voter turnout, high Democrat neighborhood, and move -- and lump it in with the central city, which is a low-voter turnout, but also high Democrat neighborhood, what you're doing is creating really one even higher Democrat ward in Columbia, then five less Democrat wards. And that concerns me because I don't want to see that kind of rancor in our community. It's coming. It's around us. We live in it. We're in the world, but I hope we can avoid it and I hope that you take that into consideration as you decide what to recommend to the Council.

MR. PUGH: Questions, Committee? Thank you, sir.

MR. GUBERA: Hello. My name's Chip Gubera. I live at 107 Hubbell Drive, which is First Ward. I'd like to point out that the First Ward has a lot of poorer people? Right? Socioeconomic poor -- poorer people than many of the other wards. And I think that Plan A and Plan D would actually bring in people of -- you know, people who are a little well -- you know, a little better off. And it seems to me Plan B, going up Rangeline, you know, you got trailer parks and stuff like that, it would keep to the representation of lower socioeconomic that we are in the First Ward, and that would help with the voting for that type of representation. I'm afraid that the voice of the poorer person could be lost with Plan A and Plan D, and I think that that would be a mistake for the City of Columbia. Thank you. Any questions?

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. WILKERSON: Good evening. I am John Wilkerson. I'm at 18 Broadway Village, and that is in Ward Six. I'd like to mirror the comments that were made tonight. I think what concerns me, as a member of Ward Six, is the diversity issue that's been raised. And I think that looking at these boundaries on each of the trials, it's quite clear that -- I think especially -- especially in Ward -- in Trial A, I think it's clear that diversity is sacrificed in favor of homogeneity. I think the boundaries are going to have political consequence, and I know that it's been stated that that's, obviously, not an intent of the Committee, and I certainly hope that's the case, but I think it would be naïve of the Committee and of the people present tonight to not recognize those political ramifications. And I think that it's been stated well, especially by the previous two speakers this evening, kind of what that might look like. So I

would just, as a member of Ward Six, like to support Plan B. I would also like to speak really quickly to the movement of Benton-Stephens from the Third into the First. It really does, I think, move a demographic that is more likely to support and be concerned with the issues of Ward One, currently, into a smaller voice. I think that it -- I think that it -- it, as was stated earlier, dilutes -- dilutes the voice of Ward Three. And also I think the objection that was raised in reference to the movement of the portion of the Second Ward into the First Ward, ultimately kind of makes -- makes the counter-argument to that, that, you know, in order for us -- you know, as is, in order for the plans to really maintain any type of vested interest in a viable Ward One, I think it's important that there be diversity within those wards, and I think that Plan B -- you know, I understand Benton-Stephens is concerned about movement into Ward One, residents of other neighborhood associations in Ward Two are concerned about movement into Ward One, but, you know, I think the difference -- I think it's the same argument, it has to do with homogeneity, but I think it's different sides of the argument. I think that Benton-Stephens' movement into Ward One does create homogeneity, whereas the movement of the Second Ward into Ward One creates diversity within Ward One. And I think that you end up seeing two very viable wards, both Ward Three and Ward One, that have diverse representation and interest in a vital downtown. I really -- I feel very strongly that Ward Two would, hopefully, then feel a little bit more invested in downtown. So I'm a resident of Sixth, but that's kind of my take on it, and I also would like to mirror the statements earlier, you know, I just -- numerically, it doesn't -- it doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me to move -- to move Ward -- Ward Three's numbers. They look good where they are. Questions?

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. WILKERSON: Thank you. Have a good evening.

MS. GORDON: My name is Kathy Gordon, and I live at 7 East Lathrop Road, and that's in Four-F, the portion of Ward Four that you're talking about moving to the First Ward. When I first saw that map, I was kind of surprised because the Fourth Ward is one of the ones that needs more people in it, not fewer, and so I was kind of shocked. And then, I saw, well, okay. Since you took some people out of ours, then you had to add some from the Fifth Ward. And then the Fifth Ward was too small, so you had to add some from the Sixth Ward, And on and on and on to make it balance. It just makes no sense to me. I, personally, really like being in the Fourth Ward. That's all I can say.

MR. PUGH: Thank you.

MR. MATZEN: My name is Mike Matzen. I live at 209 Tracy in the Fourth Ward, south of Broadway. On Trial A I have a question. The Benton-Stephens neighborhood, how many people does that represent?

MR. SKOV: I can answer that. The 2010 census number for Benton-Stephens specifically, that -- just that --

MR. MATZEN: Is that the yellow part?

MR. SKOV: Well, there's a little -- there are smaller areas to the north and south of Benton-Stephens that are also included, but the lion's share of the population is in Benton-Stephens, and that number's 1,876. That's the 2010 census count.

MR. MATZEN: Okay. So that little yellow part that would be moved to the First Ward --

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. MATZEN: -- would be --

MR. SKOV: The total population that would be moved would be about just under 2,000, but --

MR. MATZEN: In that yellow part?

MR. SKOV: In the yellow section that's currently in the Third that would be moved into the First in Trial A.

MR. MATZEN: Would be about 2,000.

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. MATZEN: Okay. Well, my comment then would not be applicable. I was going to ask could you just go with a revision -- a slight variation of that, where Benton stays in the Third, but that would throw your numbers way off, I guess.

MR. SKOV: Without doing something else to increase the size of the First Ward, that's correct.

MR. MATZEN: Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. AHRENS: My name is Greg Ahrens. I live at 1504 Sylvan Lane in the Third Ward. Apparently -- well, one thing I wanted to point out, currently the Second and the Third Ward both straddle I-70, so, you know, having people living on either side of I-70 is not really an issue. So I think that Plan B would add some people north of I-70 into the First Ward, it really wouldn't be a problem. And the current representative -- if I'm understanding the map correctly, the current Councilman from the Second Ward lives south of I-70, and represents all these people that live north of it. And in the Third Ward, the same thing. Another thing that I was just wondering, or an idea that popped into my head was, I guess, apparently, the trash pickup right now is done by ward, so I don't know how the drawing of these would affect that or if Public Works would change how they pick up trash -- which night you're supposed to put it out. The Committee persons of the established political parties, by statute, in the city are elected or chosen or whatever, they become members of the Central Committee of the County by ward. So some of these -- that's something that you may or may not consider. Under all three maps, I'm on the central committee of one of the established

parties and it doesn't change me, so I guess that's okay. The rental -- I guess you're pretty much stuck using the 2010 census. I was noticing that in Ward Three, currently, depending on -- on all the base map and the other three proposed, that you still have over 1,000 unoccupied homes -- unoccupied housing units in the Third Ward, which at some point, I imagine -- you know, if the President is allowed to continue to improve the economy -- the -- you know, these will fill up with people and that -- probably three or four -- two or three, four people in each unit. That's another couple 3,000 people there. And then, downtown you have all the -- you know, proposed -- there's buildings currently being built down there on Tenth Street, I think it is, and -- or maybe Hitt. Yeah, it's Hitt. Anyway, and then the art village and all that in the north area's going to be probably built up and everything, so ten years from now, have to all redraw these anyway, and that's fine. The other thing to consider is that no matter what, one Councilperson representing your interests is still going to have to get a consensus of at least a majority of the other Council people. So, you know, in issues such as Scott's Branch Trail or parks use or something that may be located in a particular person's ward -- a particular Councilman's Ward -- Councilperson -- really do affect the whole city. So really everybody should have an interest in all the various issues that occur, and requires a majority vote on the Council to happen. So, you know, people are going to have to work and cooperate and talk to, persuade, et cetera, more than one Councilperson anyway to really get something done to their advantage. So that's just some ideas that I had to throw out. Thank you.

MR. PUGH: Thank you, sir.

MS. FORBES: I'm Pam Forbes; 707 Donnelly, First Ward. When I came in here tonight, I hadn't studied all of the plans, but after looking at them and listening to the people coming forward, with my one observation, and that is that Columbia Square, I really would've liked to have seen Columbia Square in the First Ward, but I don't want to take Benton-Stephens from the Third. I think going north is probably a good idea, so I support Plan B.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

6) OTHER BUSINESS

MR. PUGH: Thank you. Seeing nobody else stepping forward, I assume that we can close the public hearing phase and I thank everybody for coming. We learned, we'll listen, and we'll try to react properly. Committee members, do you have anything to say individually?

MS. GADBOIS: I'd like to ask, if I may, about the proposal from Pat Fowler. Can the community have this information from the City? Is this all information from the City or are there other entities that would have to supply this information?

MR. TEDDY: Voter registration and turnout data, I think that would be the County. I heard -- registered rental, that would be a city database. Population growth, if there are estimates available of smaller unit population growth, that could be provided. Households by ward, that was requested, and then infrastructure expenditures, all those data would be capable of gathering from City sources.

MS. GADBOIS: I guess I would like to officially ask you to bring that forward, I guess, for our next meeting, whenever that might be.

MR. PUGH: What was your request?

MS. GADBOIS: This list of information by one of the neighborhood associations that would allow us to see, I guess, a more in-depth picture of the wards we're working with. Would we have to have a consensus on the -- for the Committee or can I, as a Committee member, ask for that? I'd like to do that.

MR. PUGH: Well, I'd prefer that we have a Committee vote on that, but I'm not willing to do that this evening. Okay? Next meeting?

MS. GADBOIS: Okay.

MR. PUGH: All right. Anything else?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there another public hearing on this?

MR. PUGH: Not yet. We have not scheduled one at this time. There may be. We may come back and listen some more. We're moving, trying to refine these maps. So one may be discarded, we may reach a majority vote to only consider one more. But we're ahead of the schedule and we've got a little time to reflect on this and take into account what you folks have said tonight. What Ms. Gadbois is requesting, we'll have to consider that, and we'll have a little bit of debate on that, I'm sure. But anyway, we're a ways from making a final decision, and we may hold another hearing. However, even if we don't, the City Council will have one at the time we present it.

MR. ROOT: I wonder what the advantage is to waiting on Ms. Gadbois' request for information. It seems -- I know you have some extra time and you're ahead of schedule, but the amount of information that Ms. Fowler listed seems to be somewhat substantial, and if the Committee is not going to be interested in gathering that information, then there's no reason for it to be gathered. If the Committee is going to be interested in gathering that information, it seems to me that it would make sense for the processes to begin as soon as possible to do that. Because I understand that some of it would require coordination with different entities, not just the City: The Columbia Public Schools, as well as the County on the voter turnout data. And it's not an unsubstantial task to gather that information. From my perspective, just as a member of the public, if that information's going to be considered, it should be sought sooner, rather than later.

MR. PUGH: You make a point, but I'm not sure, personally, at least from my point of view, that we might be walking into territory that we don't want to or is none of our business and is not relevant to our procedures. And I'd like to have -- I think everybody would like to have a little bit of time to reflect on that, and we'll call a meeting and the Staff has to respond. And maybe we will, maybe we won't. Okay?

MS. GADBOIS: And I do -- I mean, I think that's fair.

MR. PUGH: Okay. Folks, thank people for attending. Thank you for your turnout and your comments. Committee, thank you for your patience.

7) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

(Off the record.)