

## 2010 Commissioner District Census Review Committee

### \*AMENDED MINUTES OF THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2011 MEETING

**LOCATION:** North Carroll Library Branch (large meeting room), 2255 Hanover Pike, Hampstead (Commissioner District 2).

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joseph Burns, Jr.; Joseph Leeman; Frank Rammes; Richard Reese; Gail Riley; C. Scott Stone; and Francis Walsh.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Timothy Burke, County Attorney. Approximately 8 members of the public attended.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT:** 7:00 p.m., followed by the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance and an observance of a moment of silence.

1. Review and approval of agenda items – The agenda for this meeting was approved upon a Motion made by Joseph Leeman and seconded by C. Scott Stone, Vote 7-0.
2. Review and approval of Minutes from November 3, 2011 meeting – The Minutes were approved as written upon the Motion of Joseph Burns, Jr., and seconded by Joseph Leeman, Vote 7-0.
3. Review of website performance and input suggestions – Mr. Burns asked if there was any public comment on the website; no comments were submitted by either the committee or the citizens present.
4. Review and consideration of any publically submitted correspondence – **a)** emails dated, November 4, 2011 and November 9, 2011, from citizen Ross Dangel, one in support of Map 3 and the other asking list of questions regarding the redistricting process. The Committee agreed that both Mr. Dangel's emails were self-explanatory comments, the questions he raised were not under the control of the Committee to address, and neither e-mail required further discussion nor response; **b)** email dated November 9, 2011, from citizen Michael Burns commenting in support of Map 1 and in opposition to any change in the current districts; **c)** email dated November 9, 2011, from citizen Scott Strzelczyk supporting the current district map; (Map 1) and **d)** email dated November 9, 2011, from citizen Kathleen Panos supporting the current district map, (Map 1) to which Mr. Rammes commented that he believed Ms. Panos' concern is keeping Sykesville and Finksburg areas in a district, although either map puts them together.
5. Citizen participation and general comments – Mr. Burns opened the meeting to the public for comments. Mr. Don West, a resident of District 2, indicated that Map 3 is the better map for District 2. Mr. Harvey Tegeler, a resident of District 1, supports Map 1 and commented that it is not a big population shift; Mr. Gary Kerns, a resident of Finksburg, supports Map 1, commenting that Finksburg should not be a split district, as drawn in Map 3.

*See minutes for December 1, 2011 for an explanation of changes.*

6. Review and discussion of submitted District maps – Mr. Burns noted that the Committee needs to complete work on the final Committee report, therefore he instituted a final e-mail cut-off date of Friday, November 18, 2011, for additional public comments. Mr. Burns then asked the individual Board members who submitted each map, to make their personal recommendation on the two maps under consideration:
- 1) Mr. Leeman, who submitted Map 1, cited his reasons first, outlining where **a)** this is the current map and the public is already familiar with it; **b)** Gail Carter of the Elections Board asked that as few changes as possible be made to the district maps, eliminating potential voter confusion; **c)** Map 3 joins Taneytown and New Windsor together and Hampstead and Manchester together; while Finksburg is cut in half which determines density and sets them apart as separate governmental units with their own self interest. The present Manchester/Hampstead split gives the Rte. 30 corridor two Commissioners.
  - 2) Mr. Stone, who submitted Map 3, cited his reasons as **a)** Map 3 is based on one consideration -- it maintains “communities of interest”; **b)** the location of a fire department is immaterial; **c)** he tried to craft a map that puts district boundaries where citizens have the most common interests.

Mr. Burns opened the meeting to general commentary from the committee.

Mr. Rammes stated that both maps meet population requirements and keep Hampstead and New Windsor, but feels Map 3 is better than Map 1.

Mr. Reese supports Map 1 because Hampstead and Manchester and Sykesville and Eldersburg all three have their own water and/or sewer systems.

Mr. Walsh stated that when any boundaries are drawn you will always make people unhappy. Eldersburg is becoming larger. Hampstead and Manchester should go together, and that this problem should be solved.

Ms. Riley stated her support for Map 3 because it does not separate Hampstead and Manchester.

Mr. Leeman offered a critique of Map 3, because it joins Taneytown and New Windsor together; Hampstead and Manchester then are separated; Finksburg is cut in half; and Eldersburg and Sykesville are also then separated. These reasons then are furthering any consideration for 'communities of common interests' errors.

Mr. Burns read from a prepared statement, which was submitted for inclusion on the Committee website, and is attached to the minutes, a summary of parts of his report follows; Mr. Burns supports Map 1 because the established Commissioner district elections have already been held under this map and voter relationships with their duly elected representatives have already been created. Changing the maps would increase the costs involved in voter registration, and other election-related expenses, in addition to creating further potential voter confusion, which is contrary to consideration to our duty to the public, and not within the best service to the citizens of Carroll County.

Mr. Burns requested and received the following roll call vote:

Map 1 -- Mr. Reese, Mr. Leeman, and Mr. Burns in favor

Map 3 -- Mr. Rammes, Mr. Walsh, Ms. Riley, and Mr. Stone in favor

4-3 split vote in favor of Map 3 as a recommendation of the Committee.

7. Review and discussion of HB290 “staggered term” items – Mr. Stone stated that the Committee has been under the impression that it still needed to address this issue, as this item still remained open following the 2005 District Committee' actions. However, it has been determined from his research into this point (his supports submitted for inclusion as attachments) that the State Legislature repealed the provision and the issue is now moot. The Committee reviewed Mr. Stone's information and were in agreement this point was resolved.
8. Preparation details needed for the Committee’s final report – Mr. Burns stated that the final report will need to include copies of meeting minutes and to that end, asked the Committee to review previous minutes for clarity and continuity. After a discussion regarding a meeting date to be scheduled after the November 18, 2011, public comment closure deadline, it was agreed that the Committee would meet on Thursday, December 1, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. in the County Office Building. Prior to issuing its final report, the Committee will send a letter to the Delegation advising them of the Committee’s vote and recommendation at which time the formal report will follow. It was further agreed that the report should contain a Table of Contents, Committee’s Charge; Committee Chairman's report, general map analysis, meeting minutes; citizen emails received with the personal email addresses redacted; and copies of Bills 290 and 675. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the meeting on December 1, 2011 will be open to the public but not open for public comment.
9. Old business items – None.
10. New business items – None.
11. Adjourn – Motion made by C. Scott Stone and seconded by Joseph Leeman, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:

---

Timothy C. Burke  
County Attorney

263-0027\TCB\dmg\tlh\ATTORNEY\REDISTRICTING\MINUTES\Nov10-2011(Amended).doc