

## SpeakUp Dane! Redistricting Survey

December 2015

Results

*Comments given by: Bruce Jamison, Ross Shrago, Thomas Yager, Paul Malischke, Brenda Swenson, Karen McKim, non-member 170*

---

### **What do you think of “A. Possible Criteria for Mapping Process”? Do you agree with these criteria? Are there criteria that are missing?**

- I fear "public engagement" will boil down to a few with more time than sense bogging down the process. Engage the public to shape the mapping rules and committee makeup. Then let the committee run the process. Tight mapping rules should limit controversy and the need for extended redistricting discussions.
- yes
- Agree
- There is no detail on who will be controlling the process and how they would be picked.
- looks Good
- Like the criteria for the process. Am wondering (don't have a suggestion) about the process for approval of the maps once drawn--county supervisors, I assume, with only an up-or-down vote?
- The criteria sound good, but some seem hard to define. What is "fair"? What is meant by "Accountable"? That those creating the map must defend it?

### **What do you think of “B. Possible Criteria for Map Content”? Do you agree with these criteria? Are there criteria that are missing?**

- I would need to better understand why incumbent is on this list. I would also leave "diversity" out of the process. Let the process be blind to race, religion, sex etc.
- I'm not in favor of gerrymandering a district for minorities unless it falls into the criteria of compactness or neighborhood integrity
- Remove Incumbency
- LOOKS GOOD
- On the surface, they look good, but I need more info. For example, would the maps be drawn specifically to give minorities representation, or to make sure they were not isolated in only a few districts?
- Wisconsin doesn't seem to define what it means by "communities of interest."

### **Why is the manner in which the voting maps are drawn important to you?**

- Voters selecting politicians not the reverse.
- I'm tired of partisanship. We need representatives with more balanced views
- Very Important. One of the Root Causes of \$ corrupting politics
- BECAUSE IT SHOULD BE FAIR TO EVERYONE
- Seats need to be as competitive as possible. Safe seats make officials unresponsive to their constituents.
- Our county has areas of great contrast: wealth and poverty, urban and rural, students and elderly. Maps should ensure that constituencies get fair representation and are not diluted so their perspectives are not heard.

**How would you prioritize these criteria? Are any of them more or less important to you?**

- political/neighborhood integrity
- Remove Incumbency
- NO
- Impartial (nonpartisan) is my biggest concern.
- I think the order in which they are listed is a good priority order as well.

**Is there anything else you would like to tell us to consider as we prepare for the next redistricting process in 2021?**

- I hope the state gets on with this, too
- THANK YOU For your Work....please keep on working on Redistricting Reform
- Consider these two items: 1) Try to formulate a method that can be used by other counties in Wisconsin. Dane County should set the example that others can follow. For instance, having retired judges overseeing the process will not work for other counties that may not have retired judges. 2) Require that there be at least one set of maps proposed that results in coterminous boundaries with the City of Madison. This may involve reducing the number of alders in the city so of course the Common Council will squash it early if allowed to do so. However, there are advantages to coterminous boundaries such as making elections easier, more efficient, and less prone to errors. Also, citizens will be able to more easily understand who their representatives are.
- NO
- Only how important this work is, but you know that.
- Keep the process transparent.