

**County Board Redistricting  
1971**

## I. Standards

- A. Should a reapportionment plan achieve any of the following standards in addition to population equality? If so, which ones?
1. Majority opinion
    - a. Unanimous acceptance of the standards of compactness and contiguity
    - b. Majority acceptance of the the standards of community interest in order of town, geographic characteristics, economic characteristics, ethnic and cultural characteristics.
  2. Minority opinion
    - a. Compactness and contiguity to be the only standards
    - b. Economic interest not to be a factor
    - c. Necessary to protect some groups by giving them special treatment
- B. What should not be a standard of reapportionment?  
Majority favored removal of political characteristics (parties) but felt it was impossible to avoid
- C. Should reapportionment standards apply equally to all legislative bodies?  
Majority favored equal representation in all legislative bodies.

## II. Methods

- A. Should a method of reapportionment/redistricting possess any of the following characteristics?
1. Majority wanted objectivity, timeliness, efficiency, accountability,
  2. Flexibility or adaptability were not understood.
- B. Should a method of apportionment/redistricting involve any of the following?
1. Legislature-yes
  2. courts-yes
  3. executive-yes
  4. citizens-yes
  5. political parties-no
  6. special commission-yes
    - a. Majority- Although there was no consensus question pertaining to the Common Cause model of Reapportionment Commission, the majority favored such a commission
    - b. Minority- Minority expressed concern over the accountability and objectivity of such a commission and felt the legislature should retain reapportionment responsibility
- C. What should be the roles of the following?
1. legislature
    - a. majority- select members of commission
    - b. minority- create reapportionment plan
  2. courts
    - a. courts are to review plan, not make plan. Supreme court should have original jurisdiction over malapportionment cases
  3. executive
    - a. Majority-executive is not to be included in the plan
    - b. minority-the executive is to give credibility to plan
  4. citizens.
    - a. Citizens to voice concerns at hearings and bring malapportionment cases to court
  5. political parties-
    - a. Majority felt that political parties <sup>influence is</sup> unavoidable.-impact through legislature, appointment to commission-not to be called on for themselves
- D. What concerns should be considered when coordination the redistricting at various levels?
1. Cooperation and advanced planning with various levels of government
  2. ~~Minority- divided political districts <sup>were</sup> unimportant (1)~~

Feb 24 - Tuesday  
Wednesday

TO: ELEANOR FITCH

FROM: CORINNE GOLDGAR and BARBARA HOFFMAN

RE: REDISTRICTING OF THE OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1. Enclosures:

- 1) redistricted map of Outagamie County
- 2) redistricted map of Appleton
- 3) list of population figures for the districts outside of Appleton
- 4) copies of 4 letters and statements made by the LWV of Appleton  
(sorry about the sad condition of some of them --- the best I can say is that I think they are legible.)

2. Points to notice on the MAP:

- 1) Wards and supervisory districts are co-terminal in Appleton and Kaukauna.
- 2) The Council of Governments got block-by-block figures for Appleton, Kaukauna, Kimberly, Little Chute, New London, and Seymour.
- 3) In dividing the towns, use was made of aerial photographs and spot counts (i.e. counting houses and then multiplying by four.)
- 4) District #13 contains parts of the city of Appleton, the village of Kimberly, and the town of Buchanan. Districts #36, 38, and 42 also combine parts of cities, villages, and towns.
- 5) In District #41, rivers were used as boundaries because the lack of crossings could cause polling places on the opposite bank to be less accessible to some voters.

3. Points to notice about POPULATION DEVIATION:

- 1) The four Outagamie districts (fifth one is in Calumet) south of the Fox River in Appleton are larger than those north of the river. The river was accepted as a natural barrier.
- 2) The deviation between the Appleton districts is as small as could be obtained without dividing blocks.
- 3) The largest deviation is in District #39 which contains the town of Oneida; the deviation is almost 7%. The LWV did not quarrel with this because we did not want to seem to be against the Indians; and, further, if any group were to be over-represented, it might be a good thing for it to be the Indians.

4. Attitude and action of the LWV of Appleton:

We feel that this is a good map if not a perfect one. Our three major objectives in action on the map were districts based on the principle of "one man, one vote" and co-terminal wards and supervisory districts, both of which we achieved, and a county board substantially reduced in size,

which we did not achieve. Our main argument with the map would be the deviations allowed in order to have straight lines for boundaries. We have accepted this map as it is because we are mainly an Appleton organization (only 4 out of 112 members live outside the city), and we doubted that we would improve our public relations by raising a squawk on behalf of citizens of other municipalities who were making no peep on their own.

Our letters and statements are only the visible part of the iceberg of the League's action campaign. We assume that you do not want to know all the murky details of the submerged chunk, but we would be willing to bring it all to the surface upon request.