

**EXECUTIVE & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
JUNE 15, 2011**

Chairwoman Holzheimer Gail called an Executive & Finance Committee Meeting for **WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2011 AT 7:00 PM** in the Euclid Municipal Center Council Chamber.

AGENDA

NORTHERN OHIO DATA & INFORMATION SERVICE (NODIS)  
ON  
NEW WARD BOUNDARIES AS REQUIRED FROM 2010 CENSUS DATA

Members Present: Gilliham, Scarniench, Jones, Minarik, Langman, Van Ho, Holzheimer Gail.  
Excused: O'Neill, Wojtila

Councilman Langman moved to excuse Councilman O'Neill and Councilman Wojtila. Councilman Van Ho seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Others Present: Law Director Frey, Clerk of Council Cahill.

President Holzheimer Gail – As you are aware, our Charter requires that after census data becomes available, Council is required to look at the ward boundaries and adjust so that they are similar in size and that benchmark is within 5%. Director Frey and I went through a process. We asked for proposals from a couple of firms that have done this before and are considered experts in the field. Interviewed them and chose NODIS. Dr. Mark Salling is from Northern Ohio Data & Information Service out of Cleveland State University, Maxine Levin College of Urban Affairs. If Dr. Salling, would you like to make some remarks or get right into our process?

Dr. Salling – I'm at the Northern Ohio Data Information Service which is a program within the Urban College of Cleveland State University. We do a lot of census kinds of things, demographic analysis, mapping, etc. We've also developed the data base for redistricting the State of Ohio for the third decade in a row. This is our area of expertise and interest.

Knowing that the 2010 Census was to be released we have been preparing for communities like Euclid to redraw their ward boundaries. Every ten years it is pretty much mandated to revisit the ward boundaries and the populations within the wards given the new population numbers that the census produces.

We've taken the City of Euclid, put the existing 8 ward boundaries on a map of the 2010 census data and went through a process first, with Director Frey and Council President, to look at initially what are the issues that are involved in having to redraw the boundaries; how simple, how complex might the task be. We went through some thinking about that and came up with some ideas and then your Council President brought it back to each of you on the Council to discuss some of those options and then subsequently we met at Cleveland State University and discussed it further and came up with a few more options, including the one that we're looking at this evening as the preferred option at this point in time.

Let me describe a little bit about the map and the data that is involved here. The census bureau provides data every ten years for redistricting purpose. The purpose of the census is largely to help do this very process that we're talking about, not just for wards but also for Congress and State legislatures. What they provide is the population and also the population by race and voting age and also Hispanic Ethnicity and also the number of housing units and vacant housing units in a file they call Public Law 94 171 Database. That database has that data that I mentioned, population, population by race, population by race and voting age. For units of geography, the smallest unit of geography is called the census block. A census block, if you look at your maps in front of you and I've got one up here, the census blocks are seen as the boundary lines, the thin black boundary lines on the map. Census blocks are termed by the census bureau and they're basically made up of the streets of the community plus some other features like maybe streams or railroad lines and a few other feature types that are permanent and physical that when the field workers go out there and they want to go see where the block boundary is, they can easily identify where the boundary of that block is. Usually in urban areas they are streets and that's what we have here. We also have the highway and the railroad line adding a number of blocks, cutting right through the center of the city but they usually have zero population in them.

The process that we go through is we first put together a map of all the blocks and population of each of the blocks along with a set of other data including population by race. The census bureau provides population by race for a number of a categories. The major race categories, Black, African-American, Asian, American Indian, Hawaiian and whom am I forgetting? Hispanic is not a race category. Hispanic is considered a separate category all by itself. You can be Black and Hispanic. You can be White and Hispanic. You can be Asian and Hispanic. Someone from the Philippines for example might put themselves down self answered in the census as being Asian in race but also Hispanic in origin. They do have these race categories and they allow people to answer up to six possible combination of race. Some people we have recognized over the last few decades that people often want to consider themselves multiple races instead of just one race. Recognizing that, starting in 2000 census, the census bureau allowed people when they were filling out their census form to indicate that they were of two races or three races and up to six races, that's the data we get back from them.

We get data from people who answered only one race. We also get data from people who answered up to six races. When compiling this data for this exercise, we included not only the one race total, but also the totals for anybody who indicated that they were African American. If we looked at where to draw boundaries, we considered not only total population but also the Black or African American population distribution within the city as well. To make sure we are looking at all the numbers possibly we were looking at both the one race, African American population and also the African Americans who indicated across anyone of those possible six categories that they were African American. That's a larger number. It is usually about 2%, nationally it is 2% of the population indicates more than one race. Not a large number but there are some.

What we did in this exercise is we had a computer and we had the map on the computer with all the blocks and the wards and a table below. This computer application allows you to then as you move boundaries around, as you select blocks to move one ward to another, to see what that population looks like or map looks like, most of the information in the table changes and also the other categories, the population by race and also the voting age population. We also included, I forgot to mention the voting age population by race. We had the one race, African-American total and we also had the voting age, 18 and over of African-American population in there. The one race and the total across all six categories.

You've got the table in the map in front of you that shows those numbers that we came up with for this option. There were six options that we produced over this period of time that we were doing this exercise.

The program as it works, as I said, you move the boundary, you pick a block and you move it from one ward to assign it to a different ward, the numbers change. We had to look at the total population and there's a range as was mentioned. The general rule of thumb was the population of the ward should be roughly equal and no further than 5% off the average of all the populations for the eight wards. Those numbers, the target number was 6,115 and 5% more than that is what the 6420. The number 5% less than that was 5809. We were always keeping an eye on making sure that the wards fell within that range. Then we were looking at the African American population as well because as Director Frey can talk about, the city has an issue in terms of making sure that it meets compliance with the Justice Department's concern about making sure that there is adequate representation on Council of the African American population as you know.

Did you want to add anything at this point about that subject?

Director Frey – As Council is well aware, either those who were on Council at the time of the Voting Rights Act, or subsequently the Council, we were required as part of the order issued by the District Court to have two minority majority districts of the eight ward districts that were created from that voting rights litigation. Those were in the current wards 1 and 3. That definition of an effective majority minority district is one that has a voting age population of approximately in our case, the population being African American. So a voting age population of 60% of that ward. Both wards 1 and 3 fit that definition.

Given the change in the population demographics with the 2010 census and the majority of the residents of the City of Euclid being African American, first of all it would take some calculation to determine the percentage of the residents that are African American and of voting age, in other words, 18 or older. But the target would be to have 3 to 4 out of 8 wards that would have an effective minority majority voting age population. That's the guidance. We have all of the other factors that have always been in play, that being the compact wards, recognizing to the extent possible the precinct boundaries; recognizing traditional or natural divisions, Euclid Creek for instance is a natural division. Historic division has been streets like 260<sup>th</sup> or Babbitt Rd., or Euclid Ave. and so forth. Recognizing those factors, neighborhood associations, the compactness of the ward, the spread in population that Dr. Salling has talked about the plus or minus 5%, then these effective minority majority districts. Those are all of the things that you sit down and start to look at.

President Holzheimer Gail – The one other factor that I would just like to add is given the fact that we just re-changed our wards in 2007, there seemed to be a consensus that we wanted to try to make as few changes as possible to impact the least number of residents with another change in their ward. That was part of our consideration as well.

Director Frey – If I could add one more thing, there's a very practical factor that has to be considered and it favors that same approach of disturbing the least number of areas of the city. That is because we are running up to elections and we have to provide the Board of Election with the new ward boundaries and they have to map them, they will take our street description that you have before you tonight that we believe to the best of our mapping ability matches this option 6 plan, if that's what's approved by Council that would go to the Board of Elections, they have to map those wards. The Board itself has to approve, the Board of Elections has to approve those new ward mapping as being accurate and then the nominating petitions will be compared to the voting roles within those new mapped districts. We're working on a timeframe that puts a pretty substantial burden on the Board of Elections and of course for candidates it puts a burden on ensuring the collection of sufficient and valid signatures comes from within these new ward boundaries. All of those things argue in favor of making the least number of dramatic change as possible.

Councilman Langman – Law Director Frey, do you know how the residents that are affected by the change will be notified by the Board of Elections?

Director Frey – I had a number of conversations with a fellow by the name of John Eddy at the Board of Elections. He was tasked to get back to me when I emailed the Director Ms. Platen about this process. He said that depending on the wholesale nature of the change, either just the affected residents will be notified by the Board of Elections, or if the changes are, and I'll get to in a second, if those changes are significant, than the entire community would be notified.

One of the things that might happen, if you recall, a couple of years ago the County reduced the number of precincts. We were exempt by Board of Elections decision from that process because we had just gone through the voting rights matter. They may take this opportunity, the new ward boundaries and go through that re-precincting. If that happens, I would expect all of the voters will be notified. We would not have as many precincts as we have. They would be larger in both population and geography and that would require a notification. Practically speaking, I think they would notify everybody. Obviously, for instance if my precinct 4A, if it stayed precinct A, those of us who were already in that precinct wouldn't necessarily need to be notified, just those people who were changed into that precinct. It maybe that's enough of a change that they would just notify the entire community. That's a Board of Elections decision. At least the people who will be changed will be notified by the Board.

Councilman Langman – Do you know the timeframe of that change?

Director Frey – They intend to work, if we send this down to them Tuesday morning, they have a Board meeting next Thursday and their intention is to get the remapping done as long as it isn't substantial and get it on that Board agenda. That's one of the reasons why the less change the better from their perspective.

President Holzheimer Gail – For the sake of the public, if we could walk through where the changes are proposed.

Dr. Salling – I also wanted to mention CSU acts as a facilitator in this process, so we make no decisions but we did help the process along. In these working sessions we would take the instructions, in terms of which blocks to move and which ideas, where to change boundaries, etc., and implement them. We also made suggestions about population totals perhaps but those were in a consulting/advisory sort of fashion.

The plan that is before you is up here and it shows, you're probably better off looking at the maps in front of you. We have Ward 8 which is going to be in this plan expanded to the north to include this large area of a block that includes 334 people according to the census bureau. It will expand into this area and for balancing population purposes, it was decided to also add the three blocks to the north of that one which include areas above Wildwood and Zeman roads, north of them, include blocks of 41 people, 14 people and 65 people. This is an area that is being added to Ward 8.

In the meantime in order to balance the population again, the population in the southern portion of the ward is being moved into existing Ward 2, south of Ivan, running almost all the way over to N. Lakeland Blvd. with exception of sort of triangular block that has 16 people in it.

In terms of Ward 1, the ward boundary stays relatively the same and in order to meet the population numbers the boundary was moved so it moved to the east of the old boundary at Chardon and moves up instead to 219 and includes a fairly large area block that includes 58 people and another couple of blocks that have 15 and 36. When we first started in the process the first time it was discussed, we started here and looked for ways in which the population could be increased because we needed to add population to this ward and rather than crossing the creek down here and adding this very substantial large area across the creek and running up the hill if you will to some residential areas, running off of Chardon Rd. and therefore putting people who were simply across the street in that area into a different ward, that would have happened if we grabbed this large block that runs along the creek. We decided the best way to gain population for Ward 1 was to go up in this area, more to the north. Once we did that, we recognized we needed to make some other changes so several alternatives were considered. As you can see Ward 2 lost some area to Ward 3 and over to Heritage Dr. So from Heritage Drive to the east would now be in Ward 3 and include a large block that has 152 people in it and a couple of other smaller blocks in it with 13 and 14.

To further balance things the Ward 3 also picked up existing population in Ward 2, in this area down in the southeast part of the city. Picks up a variety of blocks down in this area. One thought was at one point we were considering whether or not because Ward 3 had to grow in population as well, whether it make sense to go north of the freeway and that sort of thing. We tried a couple of options and settled on this one that does not go across the highway which would be a significant issue in terms of natural boundaries, if you will. Instead it was decided this is a better option to gain population in 3 is to go into here.

Wards 4 and 5 are unaffected. They were able to stay as they are now in this option. Ward 7 is effected because of the large population it had to lose some. That's the area up in here that I talked about before. Other options were considered on Ward 7 including possibly splitting population in a block. A couple of the blocks were looked at. Because of the concentration of population and some very large apartment complexes there, it would be very difficult to split the population into two parts basically that most of the population was mostly concentrated in one large apartment building in this area so it would be very difficult to attain the population

numbers that we were after by doing that. There were issues there. We also looked at another block a little to the west for the same reason but the same kind of factors were also at play where there were very large populations, very difficult to break up that block in a meaningful way. Furthermore, breaking up a block has other issues involved in terms of defensibility of making that decision if someone had a problem with that and wanted to challenge the estimation of the population being involved in splitting that block, it could possibly cause some issues in terms of a challenge and you'd have to defend the methodology used to come up with the estimates. We did come up with some estimates for this possible break, just for discussion purposes at least. It didn't seem to make a major difference way to satisfy the notion of moving population out of 7 into another ward.

I think I covered all the areas of change. I don't know if I explained them all well enough but I'm certainly happy to take questions.

President Holzheimer Gail – We noticed one small little piece that went from 2 to 3 we might want to look at.

Councilwoman Scarniench – There's a couple of things, one to do with the map and then one to do with the legislation because I think I don't belong in Euclid anymore. I'll do the legislation first. When you look at Ward 1, it comes to 219, the western side of the street. But no where in Ward 2 does it say the eastern side of the street forward comes to Ward 2. So we don't belong anywhere and I don't know if that's just a slip or what because I can't find where that is. Like Coulter, I don't see where that fits into any of these little pieces parts that are written here.

Director Frey – I don't think Coulter serves as a boundary.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Right but 219 does. In Ward 1 it goes to the western side of the street. Ward 2 should then be the eastern side of the street. I don't see where I start over there.

Director Frey – That is a fair point and why we tried to have this to you this evening so that you can go through with a map, with what you were given tonight, although I don't know if that has the detail unless you recognize the streets.

Councilwoman Scarniench – It should show that I start at the eastern side of 219.

Director Frey – I would ask that you look at your specific ward and try to start it where the Ward starts, where it says you start and follow that line and see if that picks up all of your ward. I appreciate it, we're missing in Ward 2, we're missing the east side of 219. We'll look at fixing those. I would appreciate if any of you find those to please let me know, tomorrow if you can so we can get, or if not until Friday, so we can get this corrected. It is a tough process to try to provide those street descriptions because they're not all streets first of all. The boundaries are not all streets, it is the railroad, it is the corporation limit, it is Euclid Creek. We have tried to pick those up. The good news are Ward 4, 5 & 6 didn't change, so we didn't touch those. None the less it would be prudent to look at Wards 4, 5 & 6 and make sure they are properly described on the map. Specifically the ward we did change, 1, 2, 3, 8 & 7, I would ask that you pay particularly close attention and make sure we have closed a complete lap, if you will around the ward.

Councilwoman Scarniench – I know we talked about this the other day but now I'm reading this. The Elsmere, 243, Hawthorne area; as I'm reading this, I guess I need to explain exactly what it means. Because it says the northeastern along the centerline of Elsmere Dr. Does that mean the north side of the street is mine or the south side of the street is mine? We're talking only about three houses.

Dr. Salling – The south side would be in Ward 2.

Councilwoman Scarniench – So then, Ward 3 would pick up three houses, that is what it is only three houses. Then comes to the next part of it, if I stop at the intersection of 243 and Elsmere, so the other part of 243 won't be mine either? To me it should all be one way or the other because we're talking about just a tiny little spot.

President Holzheimer Gail – That one might make sense to revert back those two little blocks at Elsmere, Hawthorne, 243 to the west of Beverly Hills. The other way, we were using Beverly Hills as the natural dividing point.

Councilwoman Scarniench – The difference between Kandy's and I ward, if she took that whole thing, that's fine with me, I don't care, it is such a tiny little thing and we're now going to split the streets.

President Holzheimer Gail – I think it would make more sense to go back to Ward 2. Those two little pieces.

Dr. Salling – South of Euclid would be in Ward 2. North would be in 3.

Councilwoman Scarniench – With the dividing line as Beverly Hills. That makes more sense to me. Telling three people that I'm not your councilman kind of a thing. Then there's a couple of houses on 243 that wouldn't be me. Hawthorne would be the same thing, you're only talking about 2-3 houses on one side of a street.

Dr. Salling – Only 27 people total in those two lots. It doesn't make a difference when you look at the total population, you're not going to go above or below.

Councilwoman Scarniench – So whatever you deem fit, whether all of it is me or it moves to Kandy.

President Holzheimer Gail – I think it makes sense to keep Beverly Hills as the dividing line.

Dr. Salling – We could make an option 7 which would move these two blocks into Ward 2 and the dividing line, north and south, between 2 & 3 would be Euclid Ave. and Beverly Hills.

Councilman Langman – Just a general question Law Director Frey. We went through the DOJ process and we asked their advice on the charter changes that were proposed and now with the redistricting. How much longer will we have to consult with them on these types of matters?

Director Frey – We are not under a continuing order with them. We don't have to have pre-approval of these changes. In fact, these changes may not be the changes that the Department of Justice, my sense is they would not be the changes the Department of Justice would have suggested to us. They will not provide advisory information to us. They will as they can with any community review what is and take enforcement action as they did here before if they deem it to be a case that warrants their attention.

Councilman Langman – Would they not need a complaint to?

Director Frey – A complaint can be made either by a private citizen, some advocacy group or the department itself has the ability to investigate. I don't know that there was a complaint the last time. It may have been and I have never known this, we surmised it was the matter with the religious land use issue that triggered a series of revenues of Euclid; hiring in our safety forces, as well as the voting rights matter. I think all stemmed from that land use dispute where the religious land use act was invoked. I don't know that for certain. I've never had anybody say this is why we looked at Euclid. I don't believe, the suit was not brought on behalf of any group or by any group or any individual. It was brought by the United States and so my sense is that there could have been the Euclid Coalition for Voting Equality could have brought that suit under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. That is not who brought it; it was brought by the Department of Justice. I don't believe there was any outside complaint.

Councilman Langman – Today, they can come back on their own volition and say these are nice changes but we want you to do something else.

Director Frey – They could. While we would like to have the resources of the United States and we don't, no government has unlimited resources. I find it not likely that they would want to invest the time and resources in this city on this matter where we have taken effective steps and continue to take effective steps. This is an effective step that we have with these numbers, darn close. You always throw in the approximate and so does the order from the court. We have three minority majority districts that have approximately 60% 18 and over minority voting population. I think that's pretty good. Could we have made wholesale changes? Probably if we just threw out everything we had just done and started brand new, we probably could have come up with different configurations but it wouldn't have met the goals of trying to keep those changes to a minimum for all the reasons that had been outlined tonight.

Councilman Langman – Bottom line, they're not going to tip their hand whether they're happy or not, just like before?

Director Frey – No, they won't. That's correct. They're not going to tell us you guys did good. They're not going to say we're coming in. If they decide to review this and take some action, then they're going to do that. I think we've got a good basis to show what we've done and why we did what we did and that's why meetings like tonight are important to have that record to show here are all of the things we were considering in these boundary adjustments and why we selected the ones that we did. Had we not had a municipal election this Fall and hence not had candidacy petition issues, maybe then it would have made sense to be willing to make far more dramatic changes in the ward boundaries. That's not our reality. We have elections and we have candidates who need to know where it is that they reside. In the sense if somebody was in this ward today and tomorrow they're in a different ward, they need to know that.

To the question that was raised in one of the earlier discussions, what happens of nominating petitions. Well your nominating petitions have to contain signatures from whatever ward it is, whatever the ward boundaries that exist at the time of your election. If you collected signatures from the area, Councilwoman Scarniench just mentioned that had been in, well I guess it is going to go back to Ward 2, but had it not, from the Beverly Hills area, collected signatures and that was the vast majority of her signatures on her nominating petitions. She needs to go out and collect new signatures because those signatures would no longer be valid.

Councilman Langman – Who would tell her that?

Director Frey – The Board will. They have not certified anybody as a candidate yet.

Councilwoman Scarniench – I thought I was.

Director Frey – My understanding from the Board is that there has been pre-check only. Nobody has been certified yet as a candidate.

Councilman Langman – They don't do pre-check anymore.

Councilwoman Scarniench – When I went down and I paid my money, that doesn't make you certified?

Director Frey – No, the Board certifies you as a candidate at some point.

Councilwoman Scarniench – So they haven't had that meeting yet. Okay.

Councilman Langman – I think that was it. I have another appointment to keep so I'll have to leave but I'm okay with the proposed changes. I talked to the Law Director about adjusting the language in the street descriptions.

Councilman Gilliam – Director Frey, in regards to the DOJ, Councilman Langman has asked numerous questions, but one question that I would like to ask, has there been any determination or research of the Department of Justice coming back to a city and challenging the ward boundaries drawn up by municipal authorities to your knowledge?

Director Frey – Not to my knowledge but I have not tried to find follow up enforcement cases that would have come on the heels of an earlier enforcement case. We didn't come across those when we looked at all of the voting rights cases that we looked at when we were involved in this litigation. We looked at many, many cases, I didn't see any where it was the United States versus some community and shortly thereafter there was the United States versus that same community on that same issue. You're aware that we had the Board of Education issue that followed closely on the heels of the city council. But separate political entities and separate resolutions to that. I would not consider that to be in the category that you're talking about. I think that was a logical extension if you will but not within the category of coming back and challenging the very same districts that were challenged at the earlier case. I didn't see any like that.

President Holzheimer Gail- Any other questions from Council? I would ask Ward Council to check the language from the legislation to the map changes. Dr. Salling, thank you very much, we appreciate your help.

Director Frey – Tomorrow I'm going to get option 7 that has that change back?

Dr. Salling – Jim Wyles provided you with a map as I understand it. But the streets are not adequately labeled and I apologize if that is the case. We will make sure that all the streets are labeled, especially the streets that constitute a boundary and send you something else.

Director Frey – We've tried to do that. Even on the city street map as Councilman Langman pointed out, the street that has a label that say 244 apparently has a little jog in it and becomes 245 and that was not labeled on this city map as 245.

Dr. Salling – Also could be discrepancies between what the census produces that we use versus what a commercial company would produce for example on the map.

President Holzheimer Gail – So Council is clear, these two small blocks which will make the border natural, Beverly Hills and Euclid Ave. These two blocks would go into Ward 2.

Director Frey – You're not sure because one side of the street will still be in Ward 3 and the other side is going to be Ward 2.

President Holzheimer Gail – Beverly Hills would be the border. Ward 2 would be everything east of Beverly Hills. Ward 3 would be everything west. Beverly Hills would be split. It is 27 people.

Director Frey – If there are any on the west side of Beverly Hills, those will stay in 2.

Councilwoman Scarniench – What was the number for those?

Dr. Salling – 14 & 13, 27 people involved according to the census.

Councilwoman Scarniench – My new green triangle, the Ivan area. You said there was a little piece that wasn't part of it?

Dr. Salling – The map shows that we go over to, I wish these streets were labeled.

Director Frey – 232, there is a little triangle that is made up of N. Lakeland, E. 232 on the western edge and Ivan to the north that would not be part.

Dr. Salling – There are apparently 16 people in that block and moving them if you so chose, you could move them back into 2.

Councilwoman Scarniench – They weren't part of 2 to begin with. Back into 8 you mean? I was just wondering where that cut off was because when I went down the street, I'm going down Ivan all the way down Ivan to Lakeland.

Dr. Salling – It doesn't show that on the map but maybe that was an error in putting it together.

Councilwoman Scarniench – So everything west is part of Ward 2 then.

Director Frey – I think the reason we didn't do that Dr. Salling is there is a census block that parallels the freeway that has no people in it, that would be sticking out, like a dagger into Ward 2 if that triangular piece was not there.

Councilwoman Scarniench – It doesn't represent people is what it amounts to. I'm still going to the last house on Ivan.

Director Frey – No.

Dr. Salling – It would be possible if you wanted us to, to add this little triangular block, which has 16 people and also this block here which is zero population so that the boundary line would be pretty continuously green, which is Ward 2. I think that's fairly compact and would only affect 16 people and I don't think that changes our target numbers. Probably should make sure of that, but I think that's true. It is up to you.

Director Frey – It does not change the target number.

Dr. Salling – If you think it makes more sense, we will also make that change but I don't want to do it unless you tell us to do that.

Councilwoman Scarniench – I don't know how Councilman Van Ho feels about it. I feel people in the neighborhood should be together and that sticks out like a sore thumb to me.

Director Frey – One of the other things if I could point out, is that was part of a different neighborhood association.

Councilwoman Scarniench – There is no association there.

Councilman Van Ho – 232.

Councilwoman Scarniench – 232 has an association?

Councilman Van Ho – Yes, 232, 236.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Then you can keep it. Forget I even brought it up.

President Holzheimer Gail – That is why we did from 232 over to Babbitt is a neighborhood association.

Director Frey – That was one of the reasons we drew it the way we did as well.

Councilwoman Scarniench – That's fine. The rest of it isn't connected to an association at all. Okay, forget I asked.

President Holzheimer Gail – We will keep that one as it is.

Councilman Gilliam – One last question and Councilwoman Scarniench can chime in, according to this, Ward 1, the addition goes to 219<sup>th</sup> and it stays in the center line of 219, so the west side of 219 would be Ward 1 and the east side would be 219, Ward 2. Councilwoman Scarniench isn't that whole street part of one association, Heritage Park?

Councilwoman Scarniench – Yes it is, you can have it all.

Councilman Gilliam – I was just saying that we will once again be splitting a street that belongs to a neighborhood organization.

Director Frey – The Heritage Park neighborhood Association has been split under the current version. It remains split, not as dramatically so, it is less of an area split off than it was the last time. The difficulty in going further over was then we started losing population. We looked at that as an option of going further over. We looked at going north with Ward 1. We looked at going on the south side of Chardon Rd. with Ward 1. None of those seemed as compact when we did that as what we ended up with. That's up to Council to make that decision. You're right, we are splitting that neighborhood association, I think there are several neighborhood associations that are unfortunately split in some manner in these. We tried to respect those to the extent that we could. For instance there is a split between Ward 8 & 2. I don't know how functional the neighborhood association is, but there's a split, this shows a neighborhood association Ivan and I don't know what street is south of Ivan, on the east side of 222. That neighborhood association would be split in this representation. You can't always match all of those.

Councilwoman Minarik- In some cases, Councilman O'Neill and I share a neighborhood association and it works out actually better for the association because sometimes I can't make it, he makes it. It is almost like they have two council people that they can go to which is almost like pre-DOJ days. It can work well for the people.

Dr. Salling – In this area that we were talking about before, with Ward 1 & 2, there are 217 people here. If you moved further east, you're picking up a fairly substantial population.

Councilwoman Scarniench – In other words he could have the whole of the street?

Director Frey – You'd be splitting a census block doing that.

Councilwoman Scarniench – And you don't do that?

Director Frey – Then it becomes our burden to demonstrate those numbers if challenged.

Councilman Gilliam – The real prohibited measure is that keeps them from having a census block split?

Dr. Salling – That's correct.

Councilman Gilliam – Then I understand fully why that decision was made.

Councilwoman Scarniench – If we moved it, then we'd have to run against each other and then we'd really have a problem.

Councilman Van Ho – Number one, to answer Councilwoman Scarniench's question. The neighborhood group at Ivan is not very active. Number two, I'd be happy as Mary Jo says, tag team it with you because I've got one Maydale where it ends up being tag teamed with Councilman O'Neill and it works fine. I do have one question, could the Law Director go to page 7 of this resolution. It says southerly along the centerline of Clearview Ave. to its second intersection with Fox. I'm assuming that I would have the southern half of Clearview and peripheral condos in there? Councilman O'Neill would have the northern half, am I reading that correctly? I don't have a problem with that concept, I just want to make sure I read it correctly.

Director Frey – Fox intersects Clearview twice. I don't believe that boundary changed.

President Holzheimer Gail – It did not change.

Dr. Salling – It is the same.

President Holzheimer Gail – Same issue Councilman Gilliam asked. The precincts are drawn through the middle of the street so it will be north and south.

Councilman Van Ho – I was just trying to understand what it was because I always assumed that I had all of Clearview and campaigned accordingly and talked to the residents.

Director Frey – Kenwood goes on the north side of Fox. Clearview on the south side. You have the south side of Clearview and Councilman O'Neill would have the north side of Clearview.

Councilman Van Ho – He has three-quarters of the subdivision for lack of a better way to phrase it.

Director Frey – It looks like it, yes. You have the south side of Clearview.

Councilman Van Ho – I would have those condos that are not directly on Clearview but off to the south side.

Director Frey – That's not a change in that ward boundary.

Councilman Van Ho – It was a misunderstanding on my part of where the old boundaries were.

Director Frey – That's correct, it is no different than it was.

Councilman Van Ho – Okay, I have no problems.

President Holzheimer Gail – We don't have legislation tonight. This will be on the Council agenda on Monday. It wasn't sent to Committee so we have it in front of us to look at but we don't have to act to send it back because it was not on our agenda tonight. The description will be on the agenda. We can make sure we have maps available for folks to look at. We probably should talk about how we want to notify people if the city wants to take some of that responsibility in addition to the Board of Elections. That can be for another day.

Councilwoman Minarik – Will it be on the website, the maps broken out every ward, the changes?

President Holzheimer Gail – I think we should do that yes.

Councilwoman Minarik – I want to thank you sir for doing such a good job, it's like you know our city backwards and forwards. Thank you.

Councilman Van Ho – Would it be possible Monday night when we've got all of this formalized to get a larger map for us visually impaired? If we could get one that was that size with the streets on it, I would be very happy.

Director Frey – I'm not sure we're going to have those for Monday. But we'll get them.

President Holzheimer Gail – Definitely make sure that you all have this size. We can certainly do that.

Councilman Van Ho – Soon, as quickly as possible followed by the big one.

Councilwoman Scarniench – Once the Board of Elections certifies it, then they have maps so we can buy them for a buck or two from them because I've always bought the big maps.

President Holzheimer Gail – Any final questions or comments? Appreciate everyone's willingness. I would like to thank Dr. Salling and Jim Wyles who did a lot of work through the process. Any comments from the public? Thank you.

Councilwoman Minarik moved to adjourn. Councilwoman Scarniench seconded. Yeas: Unanimous.

Meeting adjourned.

