

Redistricting Commission Public Meeting
 City of College Park
 Hybrid Meeting – City Hall and Zoom
 Monday, September 26, 2022
 7:00 p.m.
 Final Minutes

Members	Present	Absent
Betty Colonomos	X	
Val Graham	X	
Alan Hew	X	
John Krouse	X	
Delmar Nelson	X	
Nathan Rickard	X	
Marilyn Yang	X	
Fritz Leopold	X	
D.W. Rowlands ¹	X	
Jordan Dewar	X	
Robert Day	X	
Staff and Others		
Bill Gardiner, Assistant City Manager	X	
Suellen Ferguson, City Attorney	X	
Jacob Vassalotti, City GIS Analyst		X
Sam Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting		X
Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting		X
Carleveva Thompson, Contract Secretary	X	

¹Left meeting at 8:31 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Day called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

II. Review and Approval of the Agenda

The Commission reviewed the agenda and Mr. Day asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. Rickard motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Second by Ms. Dewar. All members in favor, no opposed. Motion carries, 11-0-0.

III. Discussion of the Comments, Questions, and Requests made at the Public Meetings

Mr. Day asked the Commission to provide feedback and comments based on the public comments that were received at the September 1st and September 12th public meetings. The Commission discussed the following:

1. Main concerns were keeping the neighborhoods together.
2. Address the comments regarding keeping the districts together and why the Commission made the decision to split certain neighborhoods.
3. Use the 2023 numbers as they are more reflective of the City.
4. The public may be confused due to the criterion and not looking at the charge provided to the Commission by the City Council.
5. District 3 residents believed the consultant's maps were better, although the Commission believed the maps were not.
6. Explain and show to the public that the consultant's maps were more damaging to neighborhoods than the maps drafted by the Commission.
7. Map 3A seems to be the most favorable because it keeps Old Town with Calvert Hills.
8. Every district was affected by the redistricting and not just district 3.
9. Explain why the consultant's maps did not fulfill the requirements of the Commission.

IV. Discussion of changes to the draft maps and the number of maps to present to Council

Mr. Day asked the Commission to make a decision on which map the Commission would like to recommend to the Council. Members of the Commission suggested Map 3A.

Ms. Rowlands motioned for the Commission to recommend to the Council to choose a map based on the 2023 population in maps 3A, 3B, or 3C. Second by Mr. Hew. All members in favor; no opposed. Motion carries, 11-0-0.

V. Finalization of Report and Presentation to Council on September 27, 2022

The Commission discussed updating section 6 in the final report and will present the 2023 population maps (3A, 3B, and 3C) to the City Council.

VI. Adjournment

Mr. Rickard motioned to adjourn the meeting. Second by Mr. Leopold. All members in favor, no opposed. Motion carries, 11-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Carleveva Thompson, contract secretary