

## **Municipality: Addison**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 2:40:06 PM

Form Submitted By: Marilla M Webb, Town Clerk/Treasurer

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

The Addison BCA reviewed ADD-4 District proposal and rejected the proposal. The Addison BCA recommends that the 2012 District of ADD-3 remain unchanged.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Addison Map – None/not applicable

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Addison, Panton, Ferrisburgh, Vergennes and Waltham make up the current ADD-3 District. It is the Addison BCA's recommendation that the ADD-3 District remain the same, the lines remain unchanged and ADD-3 remain a two Representative District.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Towns of Addison, Panton, Ferrisburgh, Vergennes and Waltham make up the Addison Northwest School District. The Bixby Library serves primarily this area. The current ADD-3 District follows the already established sense of community for the 5 towns. This established connection as a community is in keeping with the spirit of the goal of this exercise versus just the mathematics.

## **Municipality: Alburgh**

Date the BCA Met: Have not met yet

Date of Form Submission: 11/2/2021 8:56:36 AM

Form Submitted By: Connie Boutin, Justice of the Peace

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Grand Isle County

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Town of Grand Isle

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

cmboutin@yahoo.com

### **Rationale and comments:**

The proposal is to divide the town of Grand Isle starting at Hyde Road. This will make voting a disaster. Would you need two tables on voting day and many people will not know how to vote depending on their address. So they might not vote at all. Please either leave the county like it is now or put Alburgh back with the rest of the county like it used to be. But DO NOT DIVIDE THE TOWN OF GRAND ISLE. Not sure who makes these decisions but it's clear that they have never worked at the polls or understand how close the citizens of Grand Isle County are.

## **Municipality: Alburgh**

Date the BCA Met: November 15,2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 2:55:43 PM

Form Submitted By: Donna Bohannon, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

NONE

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

GI-1

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

NONE

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Alburgh BCA supports the proposed new district as it would give the residents of Alburgh and the northern towns of Grand Isle County more direct representation.

## **Municipality: Arlington**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 11:33:37 AM

Form Submitted By: Robin Wilcox, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

District BEN-3 - Arlington, Sandgate and Sunderland. One member district. Total size-3900. A copy of the map will be emailed as an attachment

### **Rationale and comments:**

Sunderland shares many common interests with Arlington including infrastructure, a water system, and a Post Office. There is ongoing social interaction between Arlington and Sunderland within our school system, and our Recreational Park, Geographically, Arlington and Sunderland border each other with easy access on the many roads and bridges that join the two towns. The political ties between the two Select Boards is evident in their shared participation in area committees regarding recycling, trash communication districts as well as the regional commission. The two Select Boards co-sponsor services and have a long running tradition of working together. The two town highway crews often help each other out, and the Town of Sunderland even allocates funds for the upkeep of Arlington Recreation Park. The BCA of Town of Arlington strongly urges the Apportionment Board to include Sunderland in the BEN-3 one-member district with Arlington and Sandgate.

## **Municipality: Baltimore**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/14/2021 4:25:48 PM

Form Submitted By: Deborah Bean, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Windsor 3-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Windsor 2

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The new district would include Weathersfield, Cavendish and Baltimore

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Baltimore BCA agreed that the new proposed district would be acceptable. The other towns in the district, although larger, are also rural in nature. We have similar problems and issues in common as well as goals. We would like better broadband and highway support. Our concern is leaving the district in which our schools are located.

## **Municipality: Barre City**

Date the BCA Met: October 27, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/27/2021 6:44:53 PM

Form Submitted By: Amanda Kay Gustin, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WAS-6-1, WAS-6-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Barre City Board of Civil Authority voted to recommend that we return to the previous apportionment plan of a two-member single district, with the legislative district matching the city boundaries.

### **Rationale and comments:**

BCA members made the following comments in support of maintaining the two-member single district:

- Barre City is a contiguous whole, and can best be represented together; the issues that face the city do not stop at legislative lines
- The districts as proposed by the LAB cross Ward lines in ways that might be confusing for Barre City voters, who would a slightly more complicated path to voting
- Electing two representatives city-wide offers more opportunities for non-traditional candidates, including from multiple parties
- Prior to the BCA meeting, we sought public comment from registered voters & residents in Barre City; 14/16 respondents indicated they would prefer to keep the two-member district

## **Municipality: Barre Town**

Date the BCA Met: October 27, 2021, October 20, 2021, October 14, 2021, October 6, 2021, October 23, 2019 - informational hearing

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 2:42:43 PM

Form Submitted By: Tina Lunt, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Washington 5-1 and Washington 5-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The recommended district for Barre Town is a single town-wide two-member at-large district. This would respect existing geographic boundaries with neighboring municipalities and would not impact the proposed districts adjacent to Barre Town.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Title 17 of the Vermont Statutes and Chapter II of the Vermont Constitution allows for two-member districts in the House of Representatives. Barre Town has been a two-member district since 1980. The Board of Civil Authority strongly believes this configuration has served the Town residents exceedingly well for more than four decades.

The Barre Town population has remained stable for the past decade (2010-2020 population change = -1). The current population of 7,923 falls within the +/- deviation of 10% for a two-member district. The town is "right-sized" for two members to effectively represent the interests of the entire community.

Barre Town is a contiguous district partially surrounding the City of Barre. It is largely a residential community with a number of medium-high density neighborhoods dispersed throughout the municipality. Barre Town is also home to designated industrial and commercial zones as well as mixed-use zones to support a broad economic base. All facets of the Town's governance structure recognize the municipality as a single entity. Maintaining a single town-wide district ensures the equitable representation of the Town's common interests (e.g. public safety, roads and infrastructure, education funding, economic stability).

Residents have benefited by having two town-wide representatives in the Legislature. Each representative may have unique knowledge and skills that can enhance their ability to better serve the interests of individual community members. Two representatives are likely to have different personalities and communication skills, affording residents options for dialogue and discussion.

The Legislative Apportionment Board has proposed creating two single-member districts in Barre Town. While this proposal would reduce the canvassing area for a candidate, it would generate an unnecessary fracture in the community; a political division without purpose.

An artificially-imposed division line poses a significant risk of pitting neighbor against neighbor in matters before the legislature, a needless hazard in the present political climate.

Under the proposal, the imposed geographic limits could result in an ill-qualified candidate seeking office which, in turn, could lead to suppressed voter participation.

Establishing two single-member districts within the municipality is certain to cause long-term confusion for voters and an added burden for poll workers.

Elections will be more costly due to additional staffing expenses as well as expenditures for public outreach and education.

In closing, should the Legislature decide to adopt the recommendation of the Legislative Apportionment Board to establish all single-member districts, then the Board of Civil Authority requests the division line in Barre Town be set as identified in the Legislative Apportionment Board Proposal. If a decision is made to deviate from the proposed division line, the Board of Civil Authority firmly requests that it be permitted to testify in front of the legislator. But most importantly, the Board of Civil Authority requests that Barre Town be kept as-is, as a single district with two members serving at-large.



**Municipality: Barton**

Date the BCA Met: 11/4/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 10:40:13 AM

Form Submitted By: Kristin Atwood, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORL-4

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

none

**Rationale and comments:**

The bca finds that this proposed district would result in more local representation of our community.

## **Municipality: Belvidere**

Date the BCA Met: October 29, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/3/2021 1:19:12 PM

Form Submitted By: Cathy Mander-Adams, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

N/A

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

LAM-1

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Belvidere Board of Civil Authority is comfortable with the proposal by the LAB members. The suggestion that Belvidere combine with Johnson and Waterville is an advantage to Belvidere as we are combined with these towns through school and family activities (i.e. school district and sporting activities) and we share community interests. We also utilize county services with these town as well. Belvidere feels a two representative district is a greater advantage to Belvidere when our representatives do not live in our town. However, if we stay connected to Waterville and Johnson, we feel a greater connection will exist.

## **Municipality: Bennington**

Date the BCA Met: 10/26, 11/8 & 11/9

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 7:48:22 AM

Form Submitted By: Cassandra Barbeau, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Bennington 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

none

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Bennington BCA respectfully requests that we remain our current two two-member districts with the following borders:

BENNINGTON- 2-1 That portion of the town of Bennington not included in BENNINGTON-2-2.

BENNINGTON-2-2 That portion of the town of Bennington encompassed within a boundary beginning at the point where the boundary line of Bennington and Pownal intersects with VT Route 7; then northerly along the eastern side of the centerline of VT 7 to the intersection of Monument Avenue; then northerly along the eastern side of the center-line of Monument Avenue to the intersection of Dewey Street; then northerly along the eastern side of centerline of Dewey Street to the intersection of West Main Street; then southeasterly on the southern side of the centerline of West Main Street to the intersection of North Street; then northerly along the eastern side of the centerline of North Street to the intersection of County Street; then easterly along the southern side of the centerline of County Street to the intersection of Park Street; then northerly along the eastern side of the centerline of Park Street to the intersection with Roaring Branch River; then easterly along the centerline of the river to the intersection with VT Route 9; then easterly along the southern side of the centerline of of VT 9 to the boundary of the town of Woodford; then southerly along the Woodford town line to the boundary of the town of Pownal; then westerly long the Pownal town line to the point of beginning.

### **Rationale and comments:**

While it is clear the LAB wishes to create single-member districts Statewide, the

Bennington BCA feels that all Vermont Towns are not the same. Some may be better served as single-member districts, however, some are better served as two-member districts. After much discussion on October 26th and at a follow up meeting held on November 9, 2021, regarding the pros and cons of single vs. two-member districts, the general consensus is that two two-member districts have worked for Bennington for many years and we do not believe a change is necessary. We have fair and balanced representation with two of three major parties. At the follow up meeting on November 9th, the Bennington BCA voted by majority (two abstentions) to remain two two-member districts.

The LAB proposal, while proposing better deviation than current lines in Bennington, does not consider all of the criteria for creating district lines as outlined in statute. In fact, the current proposal by the LAB pits two incumbents (criteria 4) against one another in two different districts. The Town of Shaftsbury will be ripped in half and their current representative will be forced to run against one of Bennington's long-time representatives. The proposal also clearly violates criteria 1 by not preserving existing political subdivisions.

It should not go without saying, we have looked at alternate options.

New York is to our West. Pownal is to our South and is proposed to be with the Town of Stamford, and even so, is still at a negative deviation. We would have to split the Town of Pownal to meet our needs. I have reached out to the Town of Woodford and their BCA is supporting the LAB proposal to place them with mountain towns to the East (Ben-Wdm1) which is already at -9.84% deviation. On November 8, 2021, we held a joint meeting with BCA members from the Town of Shaftsbury. The residents of Shaftsbury understandably do not want to have their Town split in two. They are pursuing their own plan to remain intact with other nearby Towns. At that joint meeting, Shaftsbury had already reviewed their population and if they are to pursue their plan, they do not have the residents to give to Bennington.

The Town of Bennington has a population of 15,333. To meet the minimum -10% deviation, which is a suggestion, not written in statute, we are short 101 people. That is approximately sixty-six one-hundredths of a percentage of our total population.

The Bennington BCA voted, by majority with two abstentions, at our November 9th meeting, and respectfully requests of the LAB, to remain as we are, two two-member districts with our current district lines as they are. Bennington District 2-1 is within range and Bennington District 2-2 is not within range. We believe it best meets the criteria as written in statute by 1) preserving existing political subdivision lines, not only

in Bennington but nearby Towns; 2) recognizing and maintaining geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and interests; 3) uses compact and contiguous lines and 4) recognizes incumbencies of our representatives and those in nearby Towns. Moving forward with the Legislature, minor adjustments could be made within Town borders to make the districts closer in deviation, if need be.

The Vermont Supreme Court has stated that the nonnumerical criteria in the above paragraph “not only are important but are related to one another in that they share a common purpose of assuring more effective representation.” In re: Reapportionment of Towns of Hartford, Winsor and West Winsor, 160 VT. 9, 20 (1993).

The Bennington Board of Civil Authority appreciates your hard work and consideration.

## **Municipality: Benson**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 1:52:56 PM

Form Submitted By: Daphne Bartholomew, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-5

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

No change proposed

**Rationale and comments:**

After discussion, the Benson Board of Civil Authority was generally in favor of the district as proposed. Economically and educationally our community is more oriented toward Fair Haven and Rutland County than toward the Addison County towns to our north.

## **Municipality: Bethel**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 12:26:37 PM

Form Submitted By: Pamela Brown, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-13 and ADD--WSR-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

n/a

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Windsor-Rutland (Bethel, Pittsfield, Rochester & Stockbridge).

See email sent on November 15, 2021 entitled "Bethel Windsor-Rutland Reapportionment Response"

### **Rationale and comments:**

See email sent on November 15, 2021 entitled "Bethel Windsor-Rutland Reapportionment Response"

## **Municipality: Bolton**

Date the BCA Met: November 1, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 2:45:23 PM

Form Submitted By: Amy Grover, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Chi-Was-1

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

None.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Bolton Board of Civil Authority met on November 1, 2021, and is providing the following comments to the Vermont Legislative Apportionment Board:

1. We appreciate the efforts to create a balance of populations of the towns by creating a district, Chi-Was-1, which includes two small towns (Bolton & Huntington), a gore (Buels Gore), and part of a larger town (Waterbury).
2. Although we feel that Bolton has been well represented by the current two-member representative district, the Bolton BCA supports the single representative Chi-Was-1 district as proposed, in the belief that this single representative district might most aptly represent Bolton and provide a larger opportunity for an elected representative from the Town of Bolton.
3. As the Vermont Legislative Apportionment Board is fully aware, we support legislative redistricting which will keep the five town (Bolton, Jericho, Huntington, Richmond, Underhill) Mount Mansfield Unified Union School District (MMUUSD) intact within the boundaries of a single legislative Senate District.

Thank you.



## **Municipality: Braintree**

Date the BCA Met: 11/02/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/14/2021 6:59:21 PM

Form Submitted By: Megan O'Toole, Selectboard Chair

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Braintree BCA did not recommend any changes to district, and neither supports nor opposes the proposed WAS-ORA district. The Braintree BCA did discuss the advantages of having a smaller district made up of almost entirely rural communities, but does feel connected to the greater Randolph area and sees disadvantages of not being in a district with most/all of the Town of Randolph.

**Municipality: BRANDON**

Date the BCA Met: 11/2/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 10:44:43 AM

Form Submitted By: SUSAN GAGE, TOWN CLERK

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUTLAND-6

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUTLAND-6

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Rutland-6 - Town of Brandon - Representative Jerome - NO CHANGES RECOMMENDED

**Rationale and comments:**

Brandon will be best served by being a single district with a legislator that represents only our town. The legislator can focus directly on our town.

## **Municipality: Brattleboro**

Date the BCA Met: 10/25/2021; 11/1/2021; 11/8/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 6:17:49 PM

Form Submitted By: Hilary Francis, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WDM-4-1; WDM-4-2; WDM-4-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

An email will be sent along with the counter proposed map, metes and bounds, and parcel map that is referenced in our proposed metes and bounds.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Brattleboro Board of Civil Authority considered and researched both the LAB proposal and the alternative LAB proposal. In both of these proposals, either 709 or 484 people were relocated into different districts.

Brattleboro is unique in that it has a Representative Town Meeting [ 24 App. V.S.A. ch. 107, § 2.04]. Town Meeting Members (TMM's) are non-partisan and elected by District. In both the LAB proposal and the Alternative proposal, between 6 and 9 TMM's are relocated.

A third proposal was developed which has 4,054 residents in WDM 4-1, 4,079 in WDM 4-2 and 4,051 in WDM 4-3, resulting in deviations from the ideal of -5.4%, -4.8% and -5.5%, respectively. In this third proposal, 348 people and 3 TMM's move districts.

In order to obtain that result, the proposal follows census tracts, defined in metes and bounds language by property lines in order to complete the map.

In summary, we find that the Brattleboro BCA's proposal is less disruptive in its formation of "representative districts with minimum percentages of deviation from the apportionment standard" and which are "compact and contiguous" "insofar as practicable."

## **Municipality: Bridgewater**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 12:09:10 PM

Form Submitted By: Nancy Robinson, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Rut-13

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The preference of the Bridgewater Board of Civil Authority is to remain within the current District of RUT-WDR-1 although census numbers are higher than the ultimate goal. If this proposal cannot be accomplished, Bridgewater's primary concern is to maintain the entire town within one house district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Bridgewater's primary concern and goal is to maintain the town within one house district by keeping the town "whole and not to be split" between districts.

## **Municipality: Bridport**

Date the BCA Met: November 4, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 3:37:09 PM

Form Submitted By: David Bronson, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-RUT-1 and others

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

BCA voted to reject all of these proposals and insist that the starting point be an unbiased computer model with all being single member districts

### **Rationale and comments:**

summarizing some individually made comments includes: trying to remove from the process the politics of political parties and legislators in favor of a computer program using weighted parameters of: minimum deviations of population represented; preservation of existing political subdivision lines; recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests; and use of compact and contiguous territory under Section 1903 of V.S.A. Title 17.

## **Municipality: Bristol**

Date the BCA Met: November 2, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 4:03:54 PM

Form Submitted By: Sharon Lucia, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-6 and ADD-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ADD-4

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA suggests that the Town of Bristol be its own one-member district (ADD-4) especially with the growth that continues in the Town. If the Town is not able to be its own one-member district (ADD-4), then it should stay with one or more of the surrounding towns in the same school district (Monkton, New Haven, Starksboro and/or Lincoln if they stay in school district) and remain a two-member House district (ADD-4).

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Board of Civil Authority ("BCA") for the Town of Bristol ("Town") believes that splitting up the ADD-4 two-member House District into the proposed one member districts of ADD-6 and ADD-7 is a mistake. The Town realizes that the population has changed in the past 10 years but splitting the town is not the right move. First, the Town is close enough to the population number (approximately 4,200) that was proposed for a one-member House district. Second, the Town has its own downtown commerce center which serves the surrounding towns in the current ADD-4 district. Third, the Town has been growing over the last year and continues to grow. Currently construction has begun on a residential 20-unit complex and a business park located on West Street. Several landowners have also subdivided their properties over the last year bringing in new residents.

According to Vermont State statute, in addition to the deviation percentages there are three statutory directives that the Apportionment Board and the Legislature are to be guided by. They are "(1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests; and (3) use of compact and contiguous territory." (17 V.S.A. § 1906b(c)).

The BCA does not agree with adding the Town of Middlebury to the proposed Add-7 district as it's an entirely different school district and will not have the same goals or concerns. The BCA believes that by splitting up the Town and moving into a different school district the State is not preserving the existing political subdivision lines for the school and/or for the community.

The BCA also does not agree with splitting North Street leaving one side of the road in the ADD-6 district and the other side of the road in ADD-7 district with each having its own House member. This is not keeping the Town in a compact and contiguous territory nor is it in keeping the political ties or community ties together.

## **Municipality: Brookfield**

Date the BCA Met: 11/08/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/13/2021 11:53:18 AM

Form Submitted By: Kathryn Threlkeld, Selectperson

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORA-WAS-ADD

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

None

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Brookfield Board of Civil Authority recommends the current district remaining as-is, with two representatives for the five towns in the district. Brookfield, Braintree and Randolph especially, because they share the same school system, mental health and hospital services, policing services and many other services. It was the consensus of the Board that the ORA-WAS-ADD should not be changed, and if there are any other proposed changes in the future Brookfield should NOT be separated from Randolph.



## **Municipality: Brookline, VT**

Date the BCA Met: 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 3:23:16 PM

Form Submitted By: Stanley E Noga, Jr., Selectperson Authorized by BCA to submit response

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WDM-6, WDM- 2, WDM-7, WDM-8. Brookline is in WDM-6. Others involve modification.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None kept as LAB proposes

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

It is suggested that the entire towns of Brookline, Athens, Newfane, Townshend and Grafton be placed together in one district due to educational, religious, social, economic and access reasons. See attached document and maps sent to [sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov).

### **Rationale and comments:**

See attached maps and reasons as emailed to [sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov).

Brookline has nothing in common with Westminster and Rockingham. We have much in common with Newfane, Townshend, Athens and Grafton. The resulting ratio is less than 0.05%.

## **Municipality: Brookline, VT**

Date the BCA Met: 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 3:56:04 PM

Form Submitted By: Stanley E Noga, Jr., BCA member and Selectperson

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WDM-6, WDM-2, wdm-7, WDM-8, Brookline is currently in WDM-6.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None kept as proposed by LAB

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Join towns of Brookline, Athens, Newfane, Townshend and Grafton into a district with no splits involved. Ratio is 0.0499 with district population of 4,501.

### **Rationale and comments:**

It is asked that the proposed Windham District 6 be abandoned and that the towns of Newfane, Townshend, Athens, Brookline and Grafton be joined for a House Voting District. The WDM - # can be determined by the "LAB".

Westminster, southern portion of Rockingham and Brookline have very little in common:

- 1) There is no direct road access from Brookline to Westminster or the southern portion of Rockingham.
- 2) The steep Putney Mountain Range geographically separates the two towns.
- 3) Westminster has its own school system.
- 4) Brookline has no historical association with Westminster while it was once part of the Town of Newfane.
- 5) Route 30, a state highway, passes through Newfane and Townshend while Brookline and Athens are a short drive off Route 30. Westminster is accessed by state highway Route 5 along the very eastern portion of the state.
- 6) Westminster has no connections with Brookline of either a social, religious or services nature.

Reasons for connecting Brookline, Athens, Newfane, Townshend and Grafton are:

- 1) The local hospital, Grace Cottage Hospital is located in Townshend and both serves and employs people of the four towns.
- 2) There is a large grocery store on Route 30 just north of the Newfane – Townshend town line which serves this area. There is a building supply store in Newfane.
- 3) Emergency services provided by Rescue, Inc. encompass these towns and not Westminster.
- 4) After school activities entail local families of these towns to include sports, theatre, graduation, etc.
- 5) Many of the families in the proposed district are inter-related.
- 6) Social events such as October Fest, Hospital Fair, Famers' Market etc. take place in these several towns.
- 7) Restaurants along Route 30 serve this area.
- 8) Places of religious worship are located in Newfane, Grafton and Townshend.
- 9) Brookline residents participate in the volunteer fire department in Newfane and said department serves both towns. Townshend has its own volunteer fire department.
- 10) Brookline education is accessed in Newfane for elementary school students and Townshend for upper grades. There is a private school with facilities in both Newfane and Townshend for students who desire an alternative means of education.
- 11) Brookline is home of a Day Care business which serves this area.

Respectfully Submitted, Brookline BCA

## **Municipality: Burlington**

Date the BCA Met: 11/8/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 8:34:16 AM

Form Submitted By: Amy Bovee, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

4 BCA members expressed a preference for changing all of the proposed districts to two-member districts.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

1 BCA member expressed a preference for single member districts as presented.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Please see meeting minutes emailed to [sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov)

### **Rationale and comments:**

Please see meeting minutes emailed to [sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov)

## **Municipality: Calais**

Date the BCA Met: Monday November 1st, 2021 and Tuesday November 9th, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 5:50:28 PM

Form Submitted By: Jeremy Weiss, Town Clerk, BCA Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WA-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Calais in its entirety and East Montpelier in its entirety as a 1 member district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Calais Board of Civil Authority (BCA) held a well-attended public informational meeting on Monday, Nov. 1, 2021. We reviewed your proposed plan to combine Calais, Woodbury, Worcester and a sliver of East Montpelier in a new proposed district WA-3.

The Calais BCA held a follow-up meeting on Tuesday, Nov 9th, 2021 and voted the following:

1) First choice: The Calais BCA voted to express our strong interest in combining Calais with East Montpelier in its entirety into a new district. The district would meet the requirements of 17 V.S.A. § 1903 Periodic reapportionment; standards. This new district shares common boundaries, is geographically linked, has common political ties, common interests, and social interactions among residents. We share municipal services including a fire district, a school district and the two towns together are a compact and contiguous territory. Further, the population total of the two towns according to the Census data provided is an ideal match coming in at 4,259 residents creating a deviation from ideal of -28 residents, a -.6% deviation which is almost a perfectly sized district.

The Calais BCA felt strongly that towns should not be split up into different districts whenever possible.

2) Second choice: Should the LAB choose to move the proposed WA-3 in its final proposal to the legislature, the Calais BCA expressed strongly that the lines should be redrawn around the village of Adamant (instead of along the Route 14 corridor as originally proposed) as the residents in that area have more in common politically and

geographically. The East Montpelier BCA in their meeting on reapportionment expressed support for both options as evidenced in their meeting minutes.

We sincerely hope that the LAB will respect the wishes of our local municipalities who know and understand our neighboring towns.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy Weiss

Calais Town Clerk

## **Municipality: Cambridge**

Date the BCA Met: November 2, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 2:36:41 PM

Form Submitted By: Mark Schilling, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

After a discussion which addressed both positive and negative points, a motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendation, particularly recognizing the importance of maintaining Cambridge as a single block. The vote was five for, five against. The BCA chose to report the tie vote as their only comment.

## **Municipality: Castleton**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 9:12:08 AM

Form Submitted By: Nedra Boutwell, Town Clerk, for BCA

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Rut-2

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

None

### **Rationale and comments:**

Castleton being our own district would be our first choice. We feel Castleton is unique as we are the second largest community in our county, we have a University and Lake Bomoseen. However, if the proposed district is changed, we would encourage the board to include Hubbardton with Castleton. Our towns have a long-standing history of sharing, we share a transfer station, elementary and middle schools, a library, a recreation department, Castleton Community Center, Meals on wheels service routes, and Lake Bomoseen.



**Municipality: CAVENDISH**

Date the BCA Met: 11/08/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 10:46:27 AM

Form Submitted By: DIANE M MCNAMARA, TOWN CLERK

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

2022 District: WDR-2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

WINDSOR-2                      Cavendish, Weathersfield and Baltimore

**Rationale and comments:**

The Town of Cavendish Board of Civil Authority is in agreement with the proposed change to District WDR-2. Feels it's a good idea and has no problem with it at all.

## **Municipality: Charlotte**

Date the BCA Met: 10-28-2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/28/2021 1:50:31 PM

Form Submitted By: Mary A. Mead, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHI-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We would like the boundary of CHI-1 changed to depict the actual boundaries of the Town of Charlotte only, with no additional land/voters from the Town of Hinesburg.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA voted unanimously to have Charlotte be a single District with our own single Representative. Our population falls within the 10% deviation required by law on its own with no additional voters from Hinesburg. Hinesburg's population also falls within that 10% requirement on their own. Both Towns are in agreement that we should each be on our own with our own Representative, and the numbers fall within the legal requirement for apportionment.

## **Municipality: Chester**

Date the BCA Met: November 2, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 11:29:08 AM

Form Submitted By: Deborah J. Aldrich, Town Clerk & Heather Chase, BCA Chair, Town Clerk and BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WDM-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The proposed district for Chester is WDM-7, Chester, Grafton, Athens and Windham.

Chester would like to stay in the present district Windsor 3-1, with Andover, Baltimore and a small portion of North Springfield. Both are one member districts.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Chester BCA feels that the district should stay the same and that Chester should remain with Andover. We should be with towns that we are familiar with, stay in Windsor County and with our school districts. Title 17, Chapter 34A, 1903 (2) states; recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests. Chester and Andover have a relationship between schools, library, recreation and fire/ambulance services. There was also concern about overlapping Counties and grant applications being two different districts. The BCA, unanimously, would like to keep the district as is.

## **Municipality: Chittenden**

Date the BCA Met: November 4, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 2:05:42 PM

Form Submitted By: Roberta Janoski, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-12

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N/A

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Chittenden, VT Board of Civil Authority (CBCA) recommends a Vermont House of Representatives district that comprises the towns of Chittenden (1237 population), Mendon

(1149 population), Killington (1407 population), and Pittsfield (504 population). The proposed

district would include the entire population of each of the four towns and would consist of a

district located entirely in Rutland County.

The CBCA proposed district would uniquely and almost perfectly meet the Legislative Apportionment Board's (LAB) responsibility under Title 17 V.S.A. Section 1903 of forming

districts which have an "ideal" population of 4,287, with minimal positive or negative deviation.

The CBCA proposed district's total population is 4,297, which represents a positive deviation of

.2 percent or 10 people. Furthermore, the CBCA believes the recommended district conforms

very well to the additional criteria; ie. 1) Preservation of existing political subdivision lines,

2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties,

and common interests, and 3) use of compact and contiguous territory.

It should also be noted that Chittenden has historically been in a district that has not had a

single town (or portion of a town) significantly dominant over the other member towns in the

district. The CBCA believes this relatively “equal” representation between individual towns in a

district is desirable and promotes good will for all parties concerned. Clearly, if the legislature

were to adopt the tentative plan proposed by the LAB, the partial Rutland Town component

(2479 population) in the district would outweigh the combined Chittenden and Mendon (partial)

populations (2150 combined) significantly

**Rationale and comments:**

The Chittenden, VT Board of Civil Authority (CBCA) met on November 4, 2021 to review and

discuss the Legislative Apportionment Board’s (LAB) tentative plan for the VT House of Representatives district in which Chittenden is located. After reviewing the information provided, and discussing the LAB’s criteria used in proposing the tentative district, it was

immediately determined that we would recommend changes.

The primary reason for the CBCA to recommend changes was the fact that the Town of Mendon had been split into two districts. The Town of Chittenden and the Town of Mendon have

significant, important and long standing relationships that the CBCA believes should be

maintained in a single representative district. The K-8 school system in Chittenden (Barstow

School) is a unified school district between Chittenden and Mendon. All decisions regarding

Barstow School (budgets, facilities, working agreements, policies, ect.) are made in concert with

the voters of Mendon and represent the largest expenditures the respective communities vote

on.

In addition to the school relationship with Mendon, the two towns have interaction and coordination on various other important matters. For example, the two towns work closely with

each other to plan and implement our Emergency Management Plans, and we jointly developed

and support a Volunteer Emergency Shelter at Barstow School. The purchase, installation and

maintenance of a whole school generator system was possible due to the coordinated efforts

from both towns. The CBCA believes that having the residents of Mendon split between two

legislative districts would be problematic, inefficient, and confusing. Our current district relationship with Mendon should not be altered.

Given the aforementioned desire to keep Mendon "whole" in our district, the CBCA discussed a

variety of options and/or combinations that would satisfy the LAB's objectives. While there are

several configurations that could work as a proposed district of 4,287, the percentage of deviation resulting from these possible combinations range from modest to approaching ten

percent. Given the nearly perfect fit our recommended district is, we felt it was clearly the

superior option to pursue, and therefore have focused our efforts there.

With respect to the other two towns in the recommended district, Killington and Pittsfield, the

CBCA also finds great compatibility, synergies, and familiarity with our town. Killington was a

member town in our previous district and offers numerous recreational, social, and employment

opportunities to the town. Similarly, Pittsfield, while not in our previous district, is very similar to

Chittenden in that our relationship to the recreational community is strong. The VAST (snowmobiling) trail system is connected to our towns at numerous locations and the substantial

“bedroom” community status for the recreational industry is apparent. The CBCA would also

be remiss if we did not mention the extraordinary efforts made by all of the four recommended

towns after Tropical Storm Irene disaster in 2011. The unwavering support by countless volunteers supplying caravans of emergency supplies and assistance was truly remarkable.

The magnitude of these neighboring communities working together through their volunteer fire

departments and other organizations represents a strong bond that should be acknowledged.

In summary, the Chittenden Board of Civil Authority respects and appreciates the difficult

challenge the Legislative Apportionment Board has before it. We also appreciate the ripple

effect changes in proposed districts create. That said, we nevertheless believe that our

recommended district of Chittenden, Mendon, Killington, and Pittsfield is such a natural fit, for all

of the reasons identified above, and undoubtedly numerous others, that it warrants your

thoughtful consideration. We also understand Mendon has arrived at a similar conclusion.

Respectfully submitted,

CBCA



## **Municipality: COLCHESTER**

Date the BCA Met: 10/29, 11/8, 11/12/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 2:11:06 PM

Form Submitted By: JULIE GRAETER, TOWN CLERK

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

9-1, 9-2, 9-3, 9-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

NONE

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Colchester BCA's recommendation is keeping the divisions that currently exist, 9-1 & 9-2. The existing district lines make two representative districts with similar population within acceptable deviations and have two Representatives in each for a total of four Representatives.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA's vote was to recommend not changing to single district representatives. They want to keep Colchester representation whole with the current two district- four representatives focused on Colchester. With that in mind, the current two districts and the proposed LAB four single districts have that same outcome, both have four VT Representatives solely focused on Colchester issues.

Currently, District 9-1 has a population of 8817; deviation of 2.83% and District 9-2 has a population of 8707; deviation of 1.55%. Deviations of both districts are well within the acceptable 10%. The LAB proposed four single district deviation's total is 13.88%

Currently the two, two-person districts are able to fit into the Colchester High School Gym. Four districts with additional equipment and related supplies will cause a financial, logistical, and staffing burden to Colchester.

Voters in Colchester will be confused and frustrated by a four-district line change. These feelings can lead to voter disenfranchisement and lower participation.

Thank you for all your efforts.

## **Municipality: Corinth**

Date the BCA Met: 11/9/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 6:43:01 PM

Form Submitted By: Allegra Shumway, BCA Chair

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORA-4

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

None

### **Rationale and comments:**

We, the Corinth Board of Civil Authority, are unanimously pleased with the proposed ORA-4 district.

At present, Corinth is in ORA-1, which is a district with six towns and two representatives. It covers a wide geographic area with a disparate population, and is served by multiple school districts and multiple service districts of the Agency of Human Services, the Agency of Transportation, the Department of Public Safety, Regional Planning Commissions, and other service providers. It has been viewed in Corinth as an unwieldy and unfortunate arrangement since its inception, and the proposed smaller ORA-4 district with a single representative would bring welcome relief. We feel the proposed district would better represent our interests and improve communication between residents and the legislature.

Not only do we regard the proposed 2022 apportionment plan as an improved situation for our own town, but we also applaud the change to single-representative districts throughout the state. In general, single-member districts provide more effective representation for voters and contribute to a more responsive democracy. We recognize that the process of arranging Vermont into 150 districts of approximately equal population is arduous and requires difficult decisions. We commend the members of the Legislative Apportionment Board for their dedication and hard work.

While the proposed plan is a vast improvement for Corinth, we commiserate with towns which the proposal would split between two districts. This seems particularly unfortunate when a small piece of one town would be attached to a larger, dissimilar population center. People in these areas may feel a loss of their voice. We are not able to make specific recommendations because we are not parties to any of these situations. However, we would encourage the LAB to listen closely to recommendations from the people involved and to minimize these situations as much as possible.

## **Municipality: Danby**

Date the BCA Met: November 4, 2021 and November 12, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 9:35:27 AM

Form Submitted By: Janice Arnold, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Bennington-Rutland

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Do not agree.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

District remain same as previous.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Our concern being, a southern district, is that a small geographical area is controlling the State with the southern half not being adequately represented causing more disparity. The southern areas within the State of Vermont being a champion for less advantage, should look at equality among the geographical areas.

## **Municipality: Dover**

Date the BCA Met: 11/3/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/5/2021 3:33:26 PM

Form Submitted By: Andy McLean, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-WDM-1, BEN-1, BEN-2-2, BEN-2-3, BEN-2-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

#### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

BEN-WDM-1

Remove Glastenbury and Woodford. Add Stamford.

BEN-1

Remove Stamford. Add Woodford. Add a portion of both BEN-2-2 and BEN-2-3 along Bennington's Southern border totaling 250 people.

BEN-2-2

Remove a strip along the Southern border of 125 people to add to BEN-1.

BEN-2-3

Remove a strip along the Southern border of 125 people to add to BEN-1.

BEN-2-1

Add Glastenbury

#### **Rationale and comments:**

November 4, 2021

Legislative Apportionment Board

Re: Dover, Ben-Wdm-1

Hi folks,

The Town of Dover's Board of Civil Authority met on November 3, 2021 to consider your proposed reapportionment map. First, the amount of work involved in the reapportionment process is mindboggling. Thank you for your dedication and for getting us the map well before your deadline.

We would respectfully request a few changes:

(Please, see attached/emailed map.)

#### BEN-WDM-1

Remove Glastenbury and Woodford. Add Stamford.

- Our district is working well. Our people have similar concerns. We are rural, mountain towns with internet and cell coverage concerns, per pupil weighting concerns, low paying service industry job concerns, and affordable housing concerns that are not shared by our neighbors in more populated towns. At least the solutions to these problems tend to be different for us, rural folks.
- BEN-WDM-1, historically, has seen substantial changes every ten years with reapportionment and we do not believe that, in this cycle, it should change again. Our district is working and our population is relatively stable, and so we believe reapportionment would be an unnecessary hardship.
- Our current configuration is covered by the same local newspaper, a more important factor than folks from more populated areas might appreciate.
- Our district is currently covered by two school supervisory districts. Your proposal would mean that there would be three different supervisory districts.
- The district you have proposed for us deviates below the recommended number of people per district more than almost any other proposed district. Dover's population gain was perhaps more due to the covid bump than any other town. It would make sense, since our district's population is not a problem that you make our district closer to the target population thinking of continuity for us in the future.

#### BEN-1

Remove Stamford. Add Woodford. Add a portion of both BEN-2-2 and BEN-2-3 along Bennington's Southern border totaling 250 people.

- This district is losing population. Our district should not be reworked to fix this problem when a solution more in line with your statutory goals exists. Our proposed

change would result in the same number of people represented in BEN-1 as you are currently proposing for our district.

- Given the mountain ridge between Stamford and Pownal and the Route 8/Route 100 link between Stamford and the rest of our district, Stamford should remain with Readsboro in BEN-WDM-1.

#### BEN-2-2

Remove a strip along the Southern border of 125 people to add to BEN-1.

- This district would still have over 4,000 people. Population centers are used to intra-town districts. This line could easily follow roads excluding the more urban part of Bennington.

#### BEN-2-3

Remove a strip along the Southern border of 125 people to add to BEN-1.

- This district would still have over 4,000 people. Population centers are used to intra-town districts. This line could easily follow roads excluding the more urban part of Bennington.

#### BEN-2-1

Add Glastenbury

- The population in Glastenbury is completely cut off from the rest of your proposed BEN-WDM-1 district. If you look at a nighttime satellite photo of Southern Vermont, that big, inky black void in the middle lies between these folks and the rest of the district. Interestingly, your inclusion of Glastenbury in our district makes perfect sense if you want to increase the statutory “compactness” of our district. The reality on the ground in a mountain state gives the lie to this as a goal.

Again, thank you for all of your work in this thankless task! We can relate and are appreciative.

Sincerely,

Andy McLean

Dover Town Clerk

## **Municipality: Dummerston**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 1:07:11 PM

Form Submitted By: Laurie Frechette, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WDM-5

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

No changes to WDM-5 were recommended.

**Rationale and comments:**

Our BCA was content leaving the district reapportionment as presented.



## Municipality: East Montpelier

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 4:09:39 PM

Form Submitted By: Rosie Laquerre, Town Clerk

### District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:

WAS-3/WAS-4

### District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:

None

### Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:

The BCA does not feel the current configuration of WAS-3 and WAS-4 is fair or feasible. It believes strongly that EM should remain as one unit in whatever larger configuration is chosen. In the event that a change from the current district must be made, we suggest three alternatives involving the same five towns: two variations of single member districts (1A and 1B) and also a two-member district.

It should be noted that the EM BCA has not discussed these ideas with any of the other towns.

To summarize other possibilities brought up:

1A – East Montpelier and Middlesex form single-member district: deviation= -2.1%

Calais, Woodbury, and Worcester form a single-member district: deviation= 17.12%

1B - East Montpelier and Calais form a single-member district: deviation= 0.65%

Middlesex, Woodbury, and Worcester form a single-member district: deviation= 14.37%

2 - All five towns form a two-member district: deviation= 7.51%

These calculations were based on the census numbers you provided:

Calais                      1661

East Montpelier	2598
Middlesex	1779
Woodbury	928
Worcester	964

**Rationale and comments:**

To the Legislative Apportionment Board (LAB)

The East Montpelier Board of Civil Authority (BCA) met on Monday, November 8 with members of the community in attendance. Discussion focused on the splitting of the town of East Montpelier (EM) to be included in both the WAS-3 and the WAS-4 districts as outlined in the tentative draft released recently by the Legislative Apportionment Board (LAB). The BCA voted unanimously to oppose the creation of the legislative districts as proposed. There was no one at the meeting who spoke in favor of the proposed new districts.

Currently, East Montpelier is part of a single member district composed of the towns of East Montpelier and Middlesex—each in its entirety. The changes in population noted in the 2020 census do not mandate any change in this particular district. In fact, were the district left as it currently is, the deviation from the ideal representation would be - 2.1% as opposed to 7.32% under the tentative proposal. Clearly, it is not the 2020 census numbers of the EM/Middlesex district that pose a problem. It appears that in the creation of WAS-3, the three small towns of Calais, Woodbury, and Worcester didn't total as many as the LAB desired, so a small section of East Montpelier, housing 404 residents, was added.

However, in coming up with this proposal—carving out a small portion of East Montpelier (including one of its two village centers)—the LAB has violated the other, non-numerical standards for reapportionment outlined in 17 V.S.A. § 1903 (b) (1-3) which read as follows:

- (1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines;
- (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests;
- (3) use of compact and contiguous territory

Failure to preserve the existing political (town) subdivision lines is obvious and needs no further explanation except to note that many of the interactions of residents with the state legislature revolve around affairs of the town or city in which they live. Which leads readily into criterion (2).

It is the strong belief of the BCA and the citizens attending the November 8 meeting (many of whom live in the small part of EM assigned to WAS-3) that the residents of that part of EM would be completely disenfranchised with regard to issues regarding their town and its relationship to the VT legislature. This is in addition to the disruption of normal flows of social interaction, commerce, and other common interests.

With regard to criterion (3), while the part of EM appended to WAS-3 is contiguous, it is clearly an add-on and is not at all compact; nor does it lend itself in any way to making the 404 residents of the area feel in any way a part of the other three towns.

In addition to flying in the face of the legislatively mandated criteria, the newly-proposed district makes the running of elections far more complex. A separate operational center must be set up with its own printed ballots, tabulator programming, check list, and staffing.

The meeting on November 8th meeting included, also, discussion about the general underlying issue of single- vs. multi-member districts. The sense of the meeting was that the greater accountability and fairness issues sometimes touted as benefits of single member districts are heavily outweighed by the legislatively mandated criteria cited above—the maintenance of a sense of community being primary.

## **Municipality: Essex**

Date the BCA Met: 11/03/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 8:12:56 AM

Form Submitted By: Dawn Hill-Fleury, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHI-6, CHI 10-1, CHI 10-2, CHI 10-3, CHI 10-4, CHI 10-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Essex Board of Civil Authority recommends that the district lines be redrawn to encompass the existing Essex-Westford School District boundaries as currently exists in CHI 8-1, CHI 8-2 & CHI 8-3.

The Essex BCA also requests that municipal lines for the Village of Essex Junction, Town of Essex and Town of Westford be considered when possible and that the result is 6 representatives, whether single or two-person representative districts.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback during the decennial redistricting process.

The Essex Board of Civil Authority (BCA) met November 3, 2021 and discussed the Tentative

Reapportionment Proposal and its impact on the region currently represented by the CHI-8-2,

CHI-8-1, and CHI-8-3 legislative districts. The Essex BCA notes that its existing legislative districts are in an area that has experienced significant population growth since the last redistricting process, and that additional gains are projected in the decade ahead.

The Tentative Reapportionment Proposal contemplates 6 single member districts that would

encompass Essex Junction, Essex Town, Milton, South Burlington, and Westford. These draft

districts are not consistent with the existing boundaries of the Essex Westford School District

(EWSD) and the municipalities therein (Essex Junction, Essex Town, and Westford).

Instead of the Tentative Reapportionment Proposal, the Essex BCA recommends that the new

legislative districts remain within the existing geographic footprint of the EWSD. Additionally,

given ongoing population trends, the Essex BCA asks the Vermont Legislative Apportionment

Board and General Assembly to consider creation of districts that total 6 State Representatives

spanning the area of the EWSD, and municipalities therein, including the possibility of 2-member

districts. We believe this is the best option to ensure the needs of Essex Junction, Essex Town,

and Westford voters are met through the next decade.

Thank you for reviewing our comments. We appreciate your consideration and welcome your

feedback.

## **Municipality: Fair Haven**

Date the BCA Met: November 2,2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 8:30:31 AM

Form Submitted By: Suzanne Dechame , Town Clerk and Chris Cole , Selectman Chair, Town Clerk and Chair of Selectboard

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-3

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

9. The BCA recommends changes to the proposed RUT-5 district. Our district has historically been represented by two members. The proposed RUT-5 district reduces this to one member. The BCA recommends that the district Fair Haven is located within continue with two representatives. The BCA firmly disagrees with the Town of Hubbardton being split amongst two districts and at the same time also being split with representation among two counties. The Town of Hubbardton should be contained within one district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

10. The BCA believes that a two member district gives citizens better access to their representatives. For the Town of Hubbardton to be represented by representatives in two different districts and split between Rutland and Addison County will bring confusion and diminish access to their representatives. Hubbardton in all actuality has shared many of their services with the Town of Castleton, including their previous union school district.

## **Municipality: FAIRFAX**

Date the BCA Met: 11/04/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 12:11:26 PM

Form Submitted By: DEBORAH WOODWARD, TOWNCLERK/TREASURER

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

FRA-7, FRA-2, LAM-5, AND A PORTION OF FRA-8

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

NONE

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

This BCA unanimously recommends, rather than reapportioning part of Fairfax, to combine all of Fairfax with Fletcher and Fairfield to create a two representative district. If necessary, this BCA would also be amenable to acquiring some constituency from FRA-8 (Georgia) in an effort to help the state balance districts. \*Please find the attached map.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The House of Representatives Tentative Reapportionment Proposal (TRP) outlay of FRA-7 is problematic for a number of reasons. Title 17: Elections; Chapter 043A: Periodic Reapportionment (17 V.S.A. § 1903) standards were not adhered to in the current TRP. The standards in particular that this BCA feel are not reflected in the TRP are preservation of “communities of interest” including “patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests” as well as preserving “contiguous territory”. Specifically, the outlay of FRA-7 not only disrupts the contiguous territory of the Town of Fairfax, it cleaves off the most vibrant areas. The section the TRP is looking to move to LAM-5 is the hub of commerce and social interaction for Fairfax. Folks from all parts of town connect in this exact area of town to get their prescriptions, drop off mail, get hardware, deposit a check, get a pizza, grab a cup of coffee, and much more. This alteration also crosses county and school district lines, further discounting Fairfax’s communities of interest.

This BCA also understands that Fairfax has outgrown being a one representative town. We contend that much of this growth and vibrancy is found in the area that the TRP looks to annex away from Fairfax in this TRP. Disjointing the town in this way seems unconscionable to this BCA and we therefore submit a friendly alternative. In an effort

to keep Fairfax intact, keep county lines intact, and truly preserve communities of interest, we have voted unanimously to propose keeping the 2012 apportionment for Fairfax and adding the towns of Fletcher and Fairfield to create a 2 representative district. \*Please find the attached map. This should bring the census numbers into line as needed in the reapportionment process. This BCA has also voted to include a reapportionment of some of the Georgia constituency in an effort to bring the census numbers even further in compliance should that be necessary. This may aid the Vermont State Apportionment Board with Georgia's growth and current reapportionment to Milton. In the eyes of this BCA, moving those Georgia constituents to the district proposed here would also keep county lines and communities of interest intact. Lastly, our proposal keeps intact educational communities of interest in that the Franklin West Supervisory Union includes Georgia, Fairfax, and Fletcher schools. These areas share students, teachers, families, and even sports teams.

Again, we feel this recommendation for reapportionment is more consistent with the 17 V.S.A. § 1903 standards and keeps one of the few quickly growing areas of Vermont intact from a town, county, and community standpoint.

The map is being emailed to you.



## **Municipality: Ferrisburgh**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 10:39:15 AM

Form Submitted By: Jean Richardson, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD- 3 and ADD -4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Not Applicable

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Ferrisburgh BCA unanimously rejects the proposal to create two new, one-person Districts, ADD-3 and ADD-4, and recommend that the existing ADD-3 District lines remain unchanged, continuing to include all of Ferrisburgh, Vergennes, Panton, Addison and Waltham in a two-person District.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Proposal is to create two one-person Districts as follows - based on the total population of 643,050, divided by 150 House Districts , the “ideal size” of a one-person District is 4,287; and the “ideal size” of a 2 person District is 8,574.

Proposed District - ADD- 3 comprising the west half of Ferrisburgh, plus Panton, Addison, Weybridge.

Population 4,067, which is 5.13% less than the ideal 4,287

Proposed District - ADD – 4 comprising the east side of Ferrisburgh and Vergennes

Population 3,957, which is 7.7% less than the ideal 4,287

### **ANALYSIS**

Do we want to divide Ferrisburgh in 2? NO

Although it would make it easier and cheaper for the Representative to campaign, it would be divisive, require two voter Checklists, increase administrative costs, add stress, and weaken our community.

Measured against 17 VSA 1903 criteria/policies:

- (1) It would NOT preserve existing political subdivision lines;
- (2) It would NOT recognize and maintain patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests
- (3) It is a compact and contiguous territory.

THUS: Dividing Ferrisburgh in two fails the statutory policies and is not acceptable.

Do we want to combine the two proposed one-person districts into one district? NO

If we simply combine the two proposed one-person districts, and create a new two-person district configuration, we would have a total population of 8,024, comprising Ferrisburgh, Vergennes, Panton, Addison and Weybridge

The Population of Weybridge is 814; The Population of Waltham is 446.

The Ideal size, 8,574, minus size of new district, 8,024 = 550 or 6,4% less - compared with 7.8% less for the present 2 person District configuration. This is a minor difference numerically, but the loss of Waltham would break up a long standing community connection and resources that have long been shared.

If we KEEP our SAME two-person district, how does that measure up to the policies at 17 VSA 1903?:

Our present ADD-3 District is a two-person District comprising Ferrisburgh, Vergennes, Panton, Addison and Waltham.

This is also our Addison NW Unified School District, Bixby Library District, Fire District and Emergency Services District.

And, a two-person District gives each voter more choice.

The total population is 7,897, which is 677, or 7.8% less than the "ideal" size of 8,574, but within 10% deviation

- (1) It DOES preserve existing political subdivisions;
- (2) It DOES recognize and maintain patterns of Geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests- ... such as the Unified School District, shared Fire District and Emergency Services, shared Bixby Library district and strong sense of community;
- (3) It is a compact and contiguous territory.

THUS: Our present District configuration meets the statutory policies.

The Ferrisburgh BCA is unanimous in voting to remain the same 2 person District

## **Municipality: Geogia**

Date the BCA Met: 11/4/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 8:55:45 PM

Form Submitted By: Alan Parent, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

FRA-8

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA of the town of Georgia recommends to the LAB keeping the entire town of Georgia as one voting district as it currently is.

### **Rationale and comments:**

To whom it may concern,

The town of Georgia Board of Civil Authority (BCA) met on November 4, 2021 to review the proposed redistricting boundaries as submitted by the Legislative Apportionment Board (LAB) and posted to the Secretary of State's website at <https://sos.vermont.gov/apportionment-board/>.

It is our desire to inform the LAB of our displeasure with the proposed district as drawn for FRA-8. As drawn, the new district carves out a very small portion of the southern most portion of Georgia that is adjacent to Route 7. This small section is then distributed into the proposed CHI-3-1 in the town of Milton and in Chittenden County.

The Georgia BCA is extremely concerned that such a proposal will have long lasting consequences on the proposed 198 residents of our town. Such consequences are detailed below.

- Voter confusion: impacted residents will struggle to understand where to vote and why they are going to a different county to cast a ballot.
- Different County: Georgia residents will be forced to cast a vote in Chittenden County and be represented by a much large town of Milton. This will ensure that their Franklin County needs and desires are not met.

- Voter Apathy: voters may be disenfranchised to even cast a vote with the assumption that their ballot does not matter since their voice is such a small factor in a much larger town of a differing county.
- Cost Effectiveness: said residents may have to visit two different polling stations to cast ballots for town issues or town officials will be forced to print small amounts of local ballots to accommodate their needs. This issue can have ramifications on ballot tallies.

With the above said, the Georgia BCA would appreciate the LAB consider keeping the entire town of Georgia as one voting unit. The impact on our deviation, if allowed to remain as one precinct, will only be 8.4%. This small amount is much too small to disenfranchise members of our town from voting all together. We would greatly appreciate your reconsideration on this matter.

The Georgia BCA is formally asking that the LAB keep the entire town of Georgia (FRA-8/FRA-1) as one voting district.

Thank you

Alan Parent,

Chairperson Georgia Board of Civil Authority

## **Municipality: GLover**

Date the BCA Met: November 08, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 10:27:31 AM

Form Submitted By: Jessica Sweeney, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Orleans-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Orleans-4

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Glover BCA Accepts the reapportionment as proposed.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The reason for going with the proposed drawing is more accountability for one person, better access to one person. The person that would most likely to be our representative will be a familiar face, whom we would have confidence into accurately represent our values and perspectives.

## **Municipality: Goshen**

Date the BCA Met: 11/02/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 10:00:50 AM

Form Submitted By: Rosemary McKinnon, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ADD-1

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

ADD-1 No change, fine as is.

### **Rationale and comments:**

We are pleased that you left us with the towns that we also share a school district with. Our issues/concerns are many times shared concerns.

## **Municipality: GRAFTON**

Date the BCA Met: 11/01/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/13/2021 10:49:08 AM

Form Submitted By: Christopher R. Wallace, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WDM-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

-

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

WINDHAM-3            Athens, Brookline, Grafton, Rocking-

ham, Windham, and that part of

Westminster encompassed within a

boundary beginning at the intersec-

tion of the Rockingham town line with

Interstate 91; then southeasterly

along the centerline of Interstate 91

to the intersection with the Saxtons

River; then easterly along the center-

line of the Saxtons River to the inter-

section with Saxtons River Road (VT

121); then southeasterly along the

centerline of Saxtons River Road to

the intersection of Church Avenue;

then easterly along the centerline of

Church Avenue to the intersection of

Saxtons River Road; then northerly



along the centerline of Saxtons River Road to the intersection of Forest Road; then southerly along the centerline of Forest Road to the intersection with the Saxtons River; then northeasterly along the centerline of the Saxtons River to the intersection with the Connecticut River.

**Rationale and comments:**

The BCA of the Town of Grafton voted unanimously in favor of maintaining a 2-Representative District, rather than changing to a 1-Representative District as the LAB proposed. Our rationale is that a two-Representative District allows Grafton voters increased access to State Legislators, increased potential for diversity of political representation within the State House, and allows for a better balance of representation between the smaller rural Towns (such as Grafton) and the larger primate Town within the legislative district.

The BCA of the Town of Grafton also voted unanimously to maintain the current WDH-3 District configuration (see paragraph 9, above). Our rationale for maintaining the status quo is that Grafton currently shares strong affiliations with the current primate Town within our District (Rockingham): we are both located in Windham County, we are both members of the same (WNESU) School District, we share the Saxtons River watershed, and we have strong historic, social, cultural and economic ties - none of which we share to any similar extent with the Town of Chester, which is part of Windsor County and part of the TRSU School District.

Our rationale for leaving the LAB-proposed single-Representative WDM-7 District is that it would dilute the representation of the interests of the voters of a smaller rural Town such as Grafton in favor of those of a larger primate Town (Chester), with which we do not share the same common political, educational, environmental, economic, social and cultural connections and interests that we share with Rockingham and the other member Towns (Athens, Brookline, Windham, and part of Westminster) in our current WDH-3 Legislative District.

## **Municipality: Grand Isle**

Date the BCA Met: October 26; November 9

Date of Form Submission: 11/16/2021 1:04:26 PM

Form Submitted By: Michael Inners, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

GI-CHI-1; GI-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

none

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

1) Retain current GI-CHI-1 two-member district with current Lamoille River/I-89 boundary in Milton.

2) If single-member district plan is retained, exchange portion of Grand Isle proposed for GI-1 and North Hero for Milton portion, creating GI-1 with entire towns of Grand Isle, South Hero, and North Hero. Reform proposed GI-1 as GI-FRA-1 including Isle La Motte, Alburgh, and sufficient portion of adjoining Franklin County (i.e. Swanton.) Consolidate remainder of Swanton in a single FRA-9 district and propagate boundary changes as needed.

### **Rationale and comments:**

See separate attachment for detailed rationale. Summary:

1. The Grand Isle BCA strongly objects to the LAB proposal and any plan which divides the Town of Grand Isle between two districts. Grand Isle County has strong shared interests and comprises a single school supervisory district. Grand Isle, North Hero, and Isle La Motte comprise a single unified union school district. The plan divides both educational districts between two legislative districts. Administering multiple legislative elections within the town will complicate election administration, raise costs, and contribute to voter confusion.

The proposal exchanges a low deviation two-member district (1.2%) for two single-member districts with a deviation spread of 8.54% between them.

During public comment, no member of the public or the BCA expressed support for this plan. A large majority of the public (and all members of the BCA) expressed strong opposition,

2. The preferred choice is to leave the current two-member district essentially intact, covering all five GI County towns. The population deviation is very small (1.2%) with the current boundaries. It does not divide any of the Grand Isle educational units and retains the common interests of the Grand Isle County communities. Voters are familiar with this district, which has existed in this form for almost 20 years.

The Grand Isle BCA unanimously favors these district boundaries.

3. The second choice, if the LAB continues with the "single-member" framework, is to combine South Hero, Grand Isle, and North Hero into a single district. This district population would be 4,699 This is similar in population to the proposed GI-SH-Milton district (4596) and has a deviation (9.6%) only somewhat higher than the proposed district (7.21%). This is near the high limit, but still less than 10%. We recognize that this would require additional population to be added to the northern district, as Alburgh and Isle La Motte alone do not have sufficient population to be a viable district. However, the LAB proposal already contemplates dividing Swanton between two districts.

A single member of the Grand Isle BCA did not support this recommendation.

## **Municipality: GRANVILLE**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 2:59:17 PM

Form Submitted By: KATHY WERNER, TOWN CLERK

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-WSR-1 Recommend NO CHANGES

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ADD-WSR-1 Recommend keeping the proposal as is.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

ADD-WSR-1 Granville BCA members were in agreement they were favorable of the proposed redistricting, favorable of having one representative, and favorable of sharing representation with the Towns of Ripton, Hancock, Rochester, and Bethel.

### **Rationale and comments:**

ADD-WSR-1 Granville BCA members were in agreement they were favorable of the proposed redistricting, favorable of having one representative, and favorable of sharing representation with the Towns of Ripton, Hancock, Rochester, and Bethel.

## **Municipality: Groton**

Date the BCA Met: 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 5:30:10 PM

Form Submitted By: Carrie Peters, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

CAL-5

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

none

### **Rationale and comments:**

Groton being in with towns in our same county is a positive, total population is comparable to previous alignment, we think this new district will be a benefit to our town.

## **Municipality: Guildhall**

Date the BCA Met: November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 6:27:19 PM

Form Submitted By: George Blakeslee, Town Clerk/BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

none

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORL-ESX-2

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

none

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Guildhall BCA does not see any problem with the addition of the three additional towns to the existing district.

## **Municipality: Hancock**

Date the BCA Met: 11/11/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 1:36:49 PM

Form Submitted By: Roger Comes, BCA Chair

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ADD-WSR-1

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

ADD-WSR-1

**Rationale and comments:**

We aren't recommending any change that the state has recommended. We do have a concern about less representation in the VT legislature. Going from 3 reps to 2 reps.

## **Municipality: Hartford**

Date the BCA Met: November 4, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 8:55:29 AM

Form Submitted By: Lisa M. O'Neil, Hartford Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WSR-3; WSR-6; WSR-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Hartford BCA recommends retaining the current apportionment districts (as established in 2012) as described in the link referenced above <https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/section/17/034/01893>; The descriptions are re-stated below: (I also e-mailed copies of the maps to: [sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov)).

HARTFORD (known as WDR-4-1 in 2012): This is a single member district containing the towns of Barnard, Pomfret, and that portion of the town of Hartford encompassed within a boundary beginning at the point where the boundary line of Hartford and the town of Norwich intersects with Newton Lane; then southerly along the western side of the centerline of Newton Lane to the intersection of Jericho Street; then westerly along the northern side of the centerline of Jericho Street to the intersection of Dothan Road; then southerly along the western side of the centerline of Dothan Road to the intersection of VT Route 14; then westerly along the northern side of the centerline of VT Route 14 to the intersection of the centerline of Runnels Road and VT Route 14; then at a right angle to a utility pole marked 137T/6 ET&T/3>/136MP Corp/156/40030 on the south edge of Route 14; then southerly in a straight line across the White River to the junction of Old River Road and the beginning of Costello Road; then southerly and easterly along the centerline of Costello Road to its end on U.S. Route 4; then westerly along the northern side of the centerline of U.S. Route 4 to the boundary of the town of Hartland; then westerly and northerly along the town line of Hartland to the boundary of Pomfret; then northeasterly along the town line of Pomfret to the boundary of Norwich; then southeasterly along the town line of Norwich to the point of beginning.



HARTFORD (known as WDR-4-2 in 2012): This is a two-member district described as follows: That portion of the town of Hartford not located in WINDSOR-4-1.

**Rationale and comments:**

The BCA voted unanimously to recommend the Alternate Plan, as drafted/proposed by Jeanne Albert, for Hartford's Legislative Districts for the following reasons:

- Demographically and geographically, Hartford residents see themselves as one community with similar interests, regardless of their location in Town. The Eastern portion of Hartford is the most densely populated and the most closely connected. Dividing our current two-member district into two separate one member districts divides our community in an unnatural way. The Seven Member Select Board members are elected at-large and serve the entire community rather than by ward or neighborhood; The Town of Hartford is a single School District rather than a unified district with other communities. The five-member School Board is also elected at large to serve the entire community.
- Increasing the number of districts would cause voter confusion (many Hartford residents are still unsure which district to vote in when they come to the central polling location). Increasing the number of single member districts could necessitate an additional polling place exacerbating voter confusion and frustration. The current District configuration has been in place for three decades; the existing model is working and serves our townspeople well. At a time when the State and local communities are trying to inspire voter participation further splitting the Hartford community as proposed by LAB could lead to voters feeling separated from town matters and disenfranchised, resulting in voter apathy.
- Adding a third legislative district makes administering elections challenging. The BCA has concerns over logistical challenges if an additional polling place is needed. Our current, central polling place accommodates two districts but adding a third district could require an additional polling location. The BCA members could not readily identify an additional available facility to conduct a secure, safe election. In addition, three districts would increase costs, require additional tabulators & programming, and increase time and staffing to manage and tabulate election results.
- Leaving Hartford as two districts, UNCHANGED, does NOT affect any other districts therefore it would not create a ripple effect across the State.

- The modest population growth within our two districts leaves the total numbers within the acceptable deviation range for a two-member district.

## **Municipality: Hinesburg**

Date the BCA Met: October 27, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 12:47:45 PM

Form Submitted By: Melissa Ross, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Ch-1 and Ch-8

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N/A

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Districts we reviewed include the proposed Ch-1 and Ch-8. We are proposing that Hinesburg be a single member district in its entirety. Both Ch-1 and Ch-8 would be single member districts in the scenario we would support. I have not included a map as it seemed unnecessary since both districts would follow the boundaries of the towns in question, i.e., Hinesburg and Charlotte.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Hinesburg Board of Civil Authority met on October 27, 2021 to review the proposal from the Legislative Apportionment Board (LAB) for the Legislative Districts currently known as CHI 4-1 and CHI 4-2. The 2021 LAB proposal allocates approximately 400 residents of Hinesburg to be included in a district with the Town of Charlotte in the newly numbered CHI-1. This represents a very large increase in the number of Hinesburg residents who would not be included in a Legislative District with the majority of the town. Currently, approximately 25-30 people are included in CHI 4-1 which is a district including the Town of Charlotte in its entirety plus the small southwest corner of Hinesburg. Those residents of Hinesburg who have been voting in CHI 4-1 have not been happy with this arrangement. They have been expressing their frustration continuously since the last census and reapportionment in 2011. In short, they feel disenfranchised.

Per Vermont Statutes Annotated Title 17 Sec. 1903(b), "the representative and senatorial districts shall be formed consistent with the following policies insofar as practicable": (1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interactions, trade, political ties, and common interests; (3) use of compact and contiguous territory. After some discussion,

the following motion was made and approved unanimously by the 12 members of the BCA who were present at the meeting on October 27, 2021:

So moved that the Board of Civil Authority make a recommendation to the Legislative Apportionment Board that the Town of Hinesburg be a single member district to be known as CHI-8 contiguous with the boundaries of the Town so as to include all members of our community in said District. Seconded. The vote was unanimous to make such a recommendation to the Legislative Apportionment Board on behalf of the citizens of Hinesburg.

The Hinesburg Board of Civil Authority strongly recommends that Hinesburg be re-united as a single seat district to include the entire town with no portion being included in a district with the Town of Charlotte. Hinesburg is a very cohesive community with lots of citizen involvement. . The residents in the Southwest corner who have been part of the Chittenden 4-1 district for the past ten years are extremely resentful of having been “cut off” from the rest of the town for the purpose of Legislative representation. Furthermore, the boundaries of the two districts in question as drawn by the LAB seem arbitrary and don’t respect the long-standing legal boundaries of the Towns. The boundary of the proposed CH-1 comes within sight of the Hinesburg town hall and the village itself. There are many areas that border Charlotte that were not included in the Charlotte CH-1 district, and other areas that are far removed from the Charlotte border where the line seems arbitrary.

The Hinesburg BCA was unanimous in our agreement that Hinesburg should be returned in its entirety to a single seat district. Both Hinesburg and Charlotte are in agreement with this proposal and no other proposed districts would be impacted. Though we recognize that both communities deviate from the ideal district size of 4287, neither exceeds the threshold of 10 percent. We have been in communication with the Town of Charlotte and both towns would like to be their own single-member legislative district. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

## **Municipality: Hubbardton**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 4:12:48 PM

Form Submitted By: Dawn Custer, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Add-Rut-1 and Rut-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA recommends the Town of Hubbardton in its entirety become part of the Rut-5 district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Hubbardton and the other members of the Rut-5 district share the same school district. There are no shared interest with Add-Rut -1. Hubbardton has one building suitable for a voting. We do not have another facility with room capable of holding an election. There is no common ground with towns in Addison County. The select board of the town has been working hard to make sure the citizens feel the town is whole. For many years Route 30 has been a mental divide in the town - Eastside vs Westside. By dividing the town into two legislative districts and using Route 30 as a dividing point, the town's goodwill and sense of unity that has been achieved will be at risk. The BCA reached this decision unanimously.

## **Municipality: Huntington**

Date the BCA Met: November 1, 2021; September 29, 2021; August 30, 2021; February 15, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 7:26:52 PM

Form Submitted By: Heidi Racht, Town Clerk, CVC, CMC, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

n/a

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Chittenden/Washington

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We applaud and support a one-member District of Bolton, Buels Gore, Huntington and Waterbury.

### **Rationale and comments:**

We feel that this is a more equitable district as the municipal units are closer in size, thus allowing for an opportunity for any of the towns to elect the representative.

## **Municipality: Hyde Park**

Date the BCA Met: 10/26/2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/29/2021 11:15:49 AM

Form Submitted By: Kimberly Moulton, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

LAM-2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Not recommending a change.

**Rationale and comments:**

Overall consensus of the BCA is that Hyde Park will be better represented with one representative. They also felt that the representative will be more accountable to the voters. Hyde Park BCA very happy that the town is not being split in any way.

## **Municipality: Irasburg**

Date the BCA Met: 11/3/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 2:10:07 PM

Form Submitted By: Danielle Ingalls, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ORL-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Irasburg, Albany, Coventry, Brownington is the Irasburg BCA's recommended district. All Town's border and have similar small Town structure.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Irasburg's BCA disagrees with the reapportionment Board recommendation as it groups Irasburg with Town's (aside from Albany) that have differing views. Irasburg's BCA feels that it would be better matched with its neighboring Towns that currently share a school district and have had interactions with frequently. Those Town being Albany, Coventry, Brownington. WE ask that you please look at this again before finalizing your suggested edits to the current district model. We do realize that some changes had to be made. We suggest considering grouping Glover with Craftsbury and Greensboro as they border each other and are more aligned in their views.



## **Municipality: Isle La Motte**

Date the BCA Met: 11/8/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 12:55:29 PM

Form Submitted By: Sarah Noble, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

GI-CHI

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

BCA recommends no change to the district map

**Rationale and comments:**

The Isle La Motte Select board does not agree or approve of the possible reapportionment that is currently being considered.

Our district currently works very well the way it is. we are a small county and to break it up into 2 seems disadvantageous and confusing at best. We do not support dividing the town of Grand Isle into 2 pieces. It has taken enough time for our voters to get used to the somewhat confusing Senate race with the majority of Grand Isle County (Isle La Motte, North Hero, Grand Isle and South Hero) being combined with Colchester. Why make additional changes to further confuse our voters when what we have in our House District is working very well for Grand Isle County? Additionally, the number, population wise, fall well within your recommended/allowable deviations for two representatives.

We strongly oppose the reapportionment. It is our understanding that the Town of Grand Isle feels as Isle La Motte. Please leave out county as it is currently apportioned.

## **Municipality: Jamaica**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 2:11:40 PM

Form Submitted By: Sara Wiswall, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

#### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Option 1 –Jamaica, Winhall, Stratton, Wardsboro, Windham (2020 Census Population: 3945)

Option 2- Jamaica, Stratton, Wardsboro, Windham, Townshend (2020 Census Population: 4054)

Option 3- Peru, Landgrove, Winhall, Wardsboro, Jamaica, Stratton (2020 Census Population: 4204)

Option 4-Jamaica, Stratton, Winhall, Wardsboro, Townshend (2020 Census Population: 4787)

Option 5 -Jamaica, Stratton, Winhall, Londonderry (2020 Census Population: 4546)

#### **Rationale and comments:**

The Jamaica BCA, after much consideration, have determined that the proposed reapportionment by the legislative apportionment board is not in the best interest of Jamaica. We have proposed five other options but do not feel that Sunderland fits into the same district as Jamaica. Please refer to our entire statement that will be submitted to [sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.bcafeedback@vermont.gov).

## **Municipality: Jericho**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/5/2021 9:40:05 AM

Form Submitted By: Michael Weinberg, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHI-4, CHI-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Jericho BCA strongly recommends that the current Jericho - Underhill district remain as two towns with two representatives.

### **Rationale and comments:**

We strongly support the current two town/two representative model to the House of Representatives. Underhill and Jericho together elect two representatives and have done so for decades. There has been a long standing tradition which has been continuously honored by the major parties that one representative comes from Underhill and one from Jericho but that they both represent both towns. This has been beneficial to the citizens of both towns because they have had two officials to turn to when they felt a need to converse with their representative. Underhill and Jericho currently share many municipal and community resources, some of which are schools, the Deborah Rawson Memorial Library, the Underhill-Jericho Fire Department, the Underhill Jericho Park District, the Jericho Market, etc. We would advocate that Underhill and Jericho continue to have a two member representative district and that no changes to this status quo be effected.

We feel it is important to keep the flexibility of having two member districts to respect the differences across the state. In respect to Town Government and management of elections it is very important to respect Town lines. By keeping Jericho intact in a 2 member representative district the running of elections is more efficient. If Jericho were divided into 2 different single member districts that would require increased staffing at a shared polling location for Jericho's two districts. There would be two different ballots and increased associated costs in printing the ballots, coding the vote tabulators and two different vote tabulators. There is a potential for increased

confusion to the Jericho resident if they move between districts and decreased awareness as to what district that they live in. This will increase confusion with same day voter registration as well as the complexity of keeping two different districts separate while processing early/absentee ballots. This confusion may not only be on the voters part but the trained election official. With the trend of increasing mail in ballots, there will be extra steps needed to ensure that voters receive the correct ballot for their district. For voters that live in the section of Jericho that is split off, they will be voting in a separate district for August and November elections but join the rest of the Jericho voters during March elections and other special town elections.

## **Municipality: Kirby**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 9:00:31 AM

Form Submitted By: Wanda Grant, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

N/A

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORL-ESX-2

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

The district as drawn by the Legislative Apportionment Board basically includes the same towns as the present district that the Town of Kirby belongs to with the addition of Newark, East Haven and Ferdinand. Seven (including Kirby) of the eleven towns in the proposed district belong to the NEK School Choice District so share a common interest.

## **Municipality: Lincoln**

Date the BCA Met: Nov. 10 and 11, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 12:49:43 PM

Form Submitted By: Sally Ober, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Addison-6 (proposed house district) change to Addison-4 (in Jeanne Albert's draft proposal)

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

The Lincoln BCA recommends keeping Addison-4, (a 2-member district) in Jeanne Albert's draft proposal.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Lincoln BCA rejects the 1-member, Addison-6 district as presented on the LAB proposed map. We recommend changing this to be a 2-member district, as proposed in Jeanne Albert's scenario, as Addison-4. The 2-member district we accept would include Lincoln, Bristol, Starksboro, and the Eastern side of Monkton.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Lincoln BCA rejects the 1-member, Addison-6 district as proposed by the LAB. The following are criteria we see as favorable in developing house districts:

(1) We favor a 2-member district. (2) Districts should connect towns with common interests (3) A district should respect municipal boundaries and be created to make geographical sense (4) Avoid gerrymandering (5) Maximize efficiency of voting and minimize costs of running elections (6) Promote racial and socio-economic equity.

Examples of municipalities in our region sharing common interests with Lincoln are Starksboro, Bristol, Monkton, New Haven, Buell's Gore, and Ripton. Examples of some of the common interests we share with these towns are being members of the Mount Abraham Unified School District, the commerce and trade of our local businesses, the New Haven River watershed, and mutual aid for emergency services. With Ripton we share an interest in preserving our local community schools.

## **Municipality: Lyndon**

Date the BCA Met: October 28, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 12:48:26 PM

Form Submitted By: Dawn R. Dwyer, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CAL-3 & CAL-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Caledonia - 4 : Burke, Lyndon and Sutton. This district has two representatives.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Board Members are strongly opposed to splitting Lyndon into two different districts (CAL-3 & CAL-7). Our representative(s) should represent every Lyndon citizen with one voice in our State Legislature. The proposed change would be very divisive to have different parts of Lyndon, which have been arbitrarily divided (by an interstate), represented by Representatives with very different views of what is best for our town. In such divisive times, we don't need an additional political wedge between citizens of the same town.

Proposed CAL-3 would be made up of a portion of Lyndon's population of 1,499 and a portion of St. Johnsbury's population of 3,013 making Lyndon dramatically outnumbered. The portion of St. Johnsbury included in CAL-3 includes the commerce center which has a very different emphasis and need than the rural part of Lyndon. There is concern that Lyndon residents in this district will have their vote "diluted" because they are outnumbered 2:1 and it's likely a candidate from Lyndon will never get elected in that district. It is felt that Lyndon residents in CAL-3 would essentially have no voting power being outnumbered so significantly by St. Johnsbury residents.

It is the recommendation of the Lyndon Board of Civil Authority to continue being a part of the three town CAL-4 district with two representatives; Burke with a population of 1,651, Lyndon with 5,491 and Sutton with 913 for a total of 8,055 citizens with two representatives.

## **Municipality: Manchester**

Date the BCA Met: 10/25/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/1/2021 11:05:35 AM

Form Submitted By: Anita L. Sheldon & Cynthia Kilburn, Town Clerk? Clerk of BCA & Chair of BCA

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

N/A

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Benn-4

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

While we have seen the benefit of having two representatives from Manchester in the former Benn-4 district, we support fair representation throughout Vermont's various towns.



## **Municipality: Marshfield**

Date the BCA Met: 11/02/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/16/2021 2:38:11 PM

Form Submitted By: Christopher Bellamy, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WAS-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The legislature proposes changing the present one member district of WAS-2 composed of the towns of Marshfield, Plainfield, and Calais to be instead comprised of the towns of Marshfield, Plainfield, and Cabot.

The Marshfield Board of Civil Authority concurs with this proposal

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Marshfield Board of Civil Authority met on November 2, 2021 to discuss this matter, and a spirited discussion

ensued. Several members noted that our current representative (who resides in Calais) is well-known, accessible, highly competent, and by virtue of her tenure has become an influential and potent voice for our current district. It was noted by one member of the board that Cabot seems more demographically aligned with the towns of Marshfield and Plainfield and another member pointed out that we are more geographically aligned as well, along the Route 2 corridor, and that we share some school functions with Cabot as well. One member expressed the view that Marshfield, Plainfield, and Cabot seem like a contiguous are, and Calais seems like "somewhere else".

After much back and forth as to the merits of the proposed legislative change, a motion was made and seconded to approve the new configuration of Marshfield/Plainfield/Cabot, and the motion passed by a vote of 10-2.

## **Municipality: Mendon**

Date the BCA Met: October 26, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/3/2021 3:09:45 PM

Form Submitted By: Nancy Gondella, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Rut-12, Rut-13

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

#### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA of the Town of Mendon recommends the Towns of Mendon, Chittenden, Killington, and Pittsfield in their entirety be combined as one single district. According to the 2020 census, the combined total population for these four towns totals 4,297, the ideal sized district according to LAB methodology.

As possible alternatives, combining Mendon, Chittenden, Killington, and Stockbridge (total population – 4,511) or Mendon, Chittenden, Killington, and Bridgewater (total population – 4,696) would be acceptable. Both of these combinations are over the suggested 4,297 district size, but within a 10% variance.

#### **Rationale and comments:**

The priority for the Town of Mendon is to keep the Town together in one district. We are a small community with few services of our own. We are working to build a stronger sense of community and dividing the Town into two districts will hamper those efforts. While we have no library, no fire department, no school, and no post office in our town, we strive to find ways to come together as one. We fear that making us the smallest voice, by far, in each of the currently proposed districts will hamper those efforts.

We believe a town should be divided only when absolutely necessary, as the division makes elections more difficult to manage. Many town offices are small, and do not have the budget, space, or volunteers to handle the additional workload required to have two separate ballots, an additional tabulator, and possibly two polling locations.

Creating a Mendon, Chittenden, Killington, Pittsfield district makes a lot of sense in that, Mendon and Chittenden share a K – 8 school, which is located in Chittenden. Further, many students from Pittsfield attend the elementary school in Killington. Three of the four communities enjoy high school choice, and all are located in Rutland County.

The four towns have a history of working together. As an example, during the aftermath of Tropical Storm Irene, all four towns joined together to provide and coordinate the services that were disrupted in each community. Chittenden was a great resource in getting necessities to the other three communities when portions of the towns were isolated due to the storm. Mendon was a hub for the distribution of medications, groceries, pet food, etc. which were then delivered by the constable to local pick-up places in each town.

Another factor shared by the four towns is the configuration of major roads in the area. Routes 4 and 100 are the economic gateways and lifelines to these four same communities. Route 4 runs through Mendon and Killington and intersects with Route 100 running both south and north to Pittsfield. Meadowlake Drive off Route 4 is the main artery from Mendon to Chittenden.

Further, each Town enjoys the economic benefits of the Killington Ski Resort. All have ski houses and second homes used by skiers. Many seasonal employees of the Resort are housed in Mendon, and the Towns of Mendon, Pittsfield, Chittenden, and Killington all have hotels/motels and restaurants benefitting from and providing services for the local ski industry.

## **Municipality: Middlebury**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 10:04:57 AM

Form Submitted By: Ann Webster, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-2-1, ADD-2-2, ADD-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

District ADD 2-1 follows the Middlebury town line boundary to the west, follows the northern town line boundary as far east as, and excluding, Seymour Street and then turns south following the natural Otter Creek River shoreline until crossing the river to include Main Street and Bakery Lane. The line continues south until Creek Road then turns northeast, including Deerfield Lane until reaching US Route 7. The line follows US Route 7 southeasterly until reaching the Middlebury town line boundary to the southeast. The line turns west following the Middlebury town line boundary until reaching the southernmost corner of the Middlebury town line boundary to the west.

District ADD 2-2 follows the westerly Middlebury town line boundary to the north of Seymour Street then turns in a northerly direction along the Middlebury town line boundary including Halpin Road. The line turns and continues south encompassing Grey Ledge Road, Juniper Lane, and Painter Hills Road, but dissecting Painter Road. The line continues south to where it dissects Quarry Road near Orchard Lane. The boundary line then turns northeasterly following Quarry Road to where it meets US Route 116/Case Street and turns south. Following along US Route 116/Case Street until, and excluding Dow Farm Lane. The line then continues southerly including Munson Road, Birch Drive and Schoolhouse Hill Road, but excludes Burnham Drive and Fred Johnson Circle. The line continues south dissecting East Main Street and then turns west until connecting with US Route 7. The Westerly border of proposed district ADD 2-2 runs along the easterly border of proposed district ADD 2-1 as described above.

District ADD 7 follows the northeasterly Middlebury town boundary line from east of Halpin Road and north of Sheldon Lane to where it connects with the westerly Bristol

town line boundary and continues along the Bristol town line boundary with New Haven and Monkton until reaching Bristol Pond. Turning south the line follows along the shore of Bristol Pond until dissecting the downtown area of Bristol. Then making a U shape the line follows along US Routes 17 & 116 to where the routes split. The line follows US Route 17 on Drake Woods Road then turns south connecting to the easterly Bristol town line boundary. The line then continues to follow the Bristol town line boundary with Lincoln and Ripton until connecting with the easterly Middlebury town line boundary.

Recommended District would follow the Middlebury town line boundary completely being one two-member district.

**Rationale and comments:**

Middlebury BCA Recommends maintaining the district now known as Addison-1 in its present configuration. The proposed three one-member districts does not adequately consider the three statutory principles that should be used in conjunction with population to determine districts. These three principles include:

1. preservation of existing political lines;
2. recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests;
3. use of compact contiguous territory.

During discussions all BCA members present supported keeping Middlebury as one cohesive unit with no section of the town split off to be combined with another town. If population demanded, two BCA members supported dividing Middlebury into two one-member districts if the district boundaries gave better consideration to the three principles noted above.

BCA members noted proposed divisions within the town which were unreasonable or appeared to be based only on population calculation.

1. District ADD-2-1 has an inflated population compared to registered voters in the district due to including 2500 Middlebury College students and the residents of two senior living communities. Although, all are integral parts of the community geographically, socially, and economically they do historically have lower participation rates than the town as a whole, at least in part due to the transitory nature of the population, and thus ADD-2-1 would likely suffer from exceptionally low voter turnout.

2. The division noted above also has the impact of dissecting a portion of what we would consider our downtown district encompassing a commercial and governmental center.

3. East Middlebury is a small section of town which maintains a strong connection with the rest of Middlebury for the same reasons noted in number 1 above, but is also a unique community housing a fire station, a library, and a post office and maintains a water system. The current proposal cuts East Middlebury into two separate districts.

4. Proposed district ADD-7 takes a small easterly portion of the town of Middlebury, along with a small section of East Middlebury, and combines it with a section of Bristol. This combination would put about 1/8th of our population into a district that does not even share the same school district. There is no reason geographically, socially, politically or by shared common interest to create this alignment and may be detrimental in regard to our resident's legislative representation.

Our understanding is that the LAB is endeavoring to create districts that do not deviate from ideal district population Statewide by more than 10%, creating districts somewhere in the range of -5% to +5% deviation from ideal. The current proposal creates three separate districts in Middlebury with each having a population deviation of over 5% and two of the districts having a deviation of over 7%. The lowest deviation being -5.76% and the two higher deviations being -7.44% and -7.91%.

Keeping Middlebury as one two-member district has a population deviation of +6.74% from ideal. Higher than the 5% recommended for a deviation in either direction, but lower than two of the current proposed districts. The current proposed districts do not improve the deviation percentage for our area.

Middlebury is a small enough town that we do not have any kind of natural division to our population. We all elect one Selectboard. We all support both public libraries, both fire departments, one police department, and all reside within the same public school district.

## **Municipality: Middlesex**

Date the BCA Met: 11.2.2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 11:56:19 AM

Form Submitted By: Board of Civil Authority, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

NONE

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WAS-4

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

NONE

### **Rationale and comments:**

By a unanimous vote, the Middlesex BCA endorsed the proposed configuration of WAS-4 that keeps Middlesex merged with East Montpelier for demographic, historical and practical reasons. The Board is opposed to cutting off Middlesex from East Montpelier so that East Montpelier can merge with Calais. Doing so would unfairly isolate Middlesex. In addition, the BCA notes the proposed configuration keeps Worcester in Washington County instead of in a bi-county district.

## **Municipality: Milton**

Date the BCA Met: Wednesday, October 27, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 12:12:52 PM

Form Submitted By: Kristin Beers, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

GI-CHI-1, CHI-3-1, CHI-3-2 and CHI-6

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

On October 27, 2021, the Milton BCA voted unanimously to keep our current two 2-member districts GI-CHI and CHI-10 as they exist.

- a) The description of GI-CHI would remain the same, as listed in 17 V.S.A. §1893: “Alburgh, Grand Isle, Isle La Motte, North Hero, South Hero and that portion of the town of Milton encompassed within a boundary beginning at the mouth of the Lamoille River and Lake Champlain; then along the river upstream to the Interstate 89 bridge crossing the Lamoille River; then northerly along the centerline of Interstate 89 to the boundary of the town of Georgia; then along the Georgia town line to Lake Champlain; then southerly along the lakeshore to the point of the beginning. 2 House Representatives.”
- b) The description of CHI-10 would also remain the same, as listed in 17 V.S.A. §1893: “Milton, except that portion of the town in GRAND ISLE-CHITTENDEN. 2 House Representatives.”

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Milton BCA voted unanimously to keep our current two 2-member districts GI-CHI and CHI-10 as they exist. The numbers are well within the desired limits, creating less confusion for the voters. The current GI-CHI district has a population of 8,283 with 2 representatives, which is a deviation from the ideal of -145.5, only -3%. The current CHI-10 district has a population of 9,039 with 2 representatives, which is a deviation from the ideal of 232.5, only 5%. These numbers are within the allowed 10% deviation (over or under). The Milton BCA strongly believes that our current districts work, without encroaching the borders of the town. If divided into 4 districts, voters will feel disconnected, unrepresented, disenfranchised and like they don't belong to Milton. The



LAB proposal will not only carve Milton up, but (from vast experience working with voters) will add to the confusion, even more than we already have with our two current districts. In today's climate, we don't want to increase voter confusion. Also, the vertical line that the LAB used to divide the proposed GI-CHI-1 and CHI-3-1 districts is not easily described, nor obvious to any resident of Milton. The LAB appears to have used a small stream of water through an area of town, where it would be much clearer to use streets or larger landmarks, such as Interstate 89 or the Lamoille River. As a group, the BCA agreed unanimously that we do not accept the LAB's proposed reapportionment. In the event that the final decision is to create single member districts, the BCA wants to make clear that we do NOT want the Town of Milton carved up as the LAB proposes. It is not necessary to add a piece of Georgia and remove a piece of Milton to maintain adequate numbers.

## **Municipality: Montpelier**

Date the BCA Met: November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 3:28:01 PM

Form Submitted By: John J. McCullough III, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Proposed WAS 7-1 and WAS 7-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N.A.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Montpelier Board of Civil Authority recommends that the proposed districts, consisting of two one-member districts covering the City of Montpelier, be combined into a single two-member district covering the entire City of Montpelier.

### **Rationale and comments:**

A majority of the Board of Civil Authority was not persuaded that dividing the city into two districts would be any fairer or more democratic than the current single district. The majority of the Board believed that the statutory criteria of "(1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests; and (3) use of compact and contiguous territory."

## **Municipality: Moretown**

Date the BCA Met: 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 7:17:52 AM

Form Submitted By: Stephen Magill, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WAS-11

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WAS-11

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Moretown BCA determined that we would like to have WAS-11 combined with the proposed WAS-8, that is, the towns of Moretown, Duxbury, Fayston, Waitsfield, and Warren into a two member district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

We determined that the town of Moretown would like to EITHER be made into the one member district proposed by the LAB, or be made into a two member district consisting of the towns of Moretown, Duxbury, Fayston, Waitsfield, and Warren. These five towns are all share commerce, are in the same watershed, and are in the same school district (HUUSD). Additionally, these towns are already a two member district for the Vermont house.

## **Municipality: Morgan**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 9:59:25 AM

Form Submitted By: Donna Young, BCA Chair

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORL-ESX-1

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

No changes recommended.

**Rationale and comments:**

We recommend keeping the district as drawn by the Legislative Apportionment Board.

We feel that the interests of Morgan residents better align with the other towns in the proposed district than they do with the towns in our current district.

## **Municipality: Morristown**

Date the BCA Met: 10/25/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 10:10:45 AM

Form Submitted By: Sara Haskins, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

LAM-3 and LAM-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Morristown BCA recommends combining the proposed LAM-3 & LAM-4 districts into 1 two member district instead of 2 one member districts. This would be a district of Elmore, Wolcott, all of Morristown and 877 members of Stowe for a total count of 8867 and within the acceptable deviation.

### **Rationale and comments:**

This proposal aligns more with the geographical location and shared school district than the current two member district towns. Most students in the four towns attend either one of the two middle and high schools in the area and most of the proposed towns are accustomed to holding school elections together. The BCA also feels strongly that it is in the best interest for our community to keep all of Morristown in the same district and not split our community into two districts.

## **Municipality: Mount Tabor**

Date the BCA Met: 11-09-2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 7:55:54 AM

Form Submitted By: Bill Basso, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-RUT

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

BEN-RUT

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

No objection to District changes

### **Rationale and comments:**

No objection to District changes

## **Municipality: New Haven**

Date the BCA Met: November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 10:40:27 AM

Form Submitted By: Pam Kingman, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Addison-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The New Haven Board of Civil Authority were all in favor of keeping single member districts.

However, they were divided in half on who supports the proposed Add-5 District ( New Haven / Waltham / Monkton) and who supports keeping Add-5 District the same (New Haven / Weybridge / Bridport).

### **Rationale and comments:**

The New Haven BCA made the following motions:

Taborri Bruhl made a motion to accept the following 2 items: 1) single member districts. 2) The New Haven BCA is divided on staying with the current district or going with the proposed district, considering the makeup of the towns. Motion seconded by John Roleau. Vote by roll call 8 yes / 0 no

Kathy Barrett made a motion to recommend keeping District 5 (New Haven / Weybridge / Bridport Add-5) the same. Motion seconded by Harvey Smith. Vote by roll call 4 yes / 4 no

The New Haven BCA discussed the make up of Bridport compared to Monkton, and were clearly divided on who is more of a farming town or a bedroom community.

## **Municipality: Newark**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 3:00:30 PM

Form Submitted By: Amber Holden, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ORL-ESX-2 & CAL-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

n/a

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

ORL-ESX-2 is the district that the Legislative Apportionment Board proposes Newark be included with.

The LAB's proposed CAL-4 is the district that the Newark Board of Civil Authority recommends Newark be added to. The Towns currently proposed to be in the CAL-4 district are Wheelock, Sheffield, Sutton and Burke. I have emailed an attachment to the address provided above, highlighting the district lines that the Newark BCA recommends for the CAL-4 district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

After review, discussion and consideration the Newark BCA unanimously agreed to make the following recommendations to the Vermont House of Representatives:

- We are not in support of the proposed district plan for the Town of Newark and recommend Newark be removed from the proposed ORL-ESX-2 District and be added to the proposed CAL-4 District
- We have reviewed 2 proposed districts:
  1. ORL-ESX-2 This is the district that the Legislative Apportionment Board proposes Newark be included with
  2. CAL-4 This is the district that the Newark Board of Civil Authority recommends Newark be added to.



- We have taken into consideration the population numbers for both the proposed ORL-ESX-2 and the CAL-4 districts and do not feel our request will significantly deviate from the LAB's desired population, since currently the ORL-ESX-2 has a positive deviation (4544 5.99%) and the CAL-4 district has a negative deviation (4005 -6.58%).
- The Town of Newark is more culturally, historically and economically aligned with the four towns in the proposed CAL-4 district. Newark is part of Caledonia County, as are all of the other 4 towns in the proposed CAL-4 district. Newark is contiguous with two of the Towns in the proposed CAL-4 district (Sutton and Burke). We are a member of the Kingdom East School District, as is every other town in the proposed CAL-4 district. The towns included in the proposed ORL-ESX-2 district are more drawn to the Connecticut River Valley region, Newark does not share the same history with this region. A majority of Newark's market towns, good and services and employment opportunities are within Caledonia County and not the Connecticut Valley area.
- Given all these factors we feel our recommendation to add Newark to the CAL-4 district would allow for a more cohesive district and accurate representation.

Thank you,

Sincerely The Newark Board of Civil Authority

## **Municipality: Newbury**

Date the BCA Met: 11/02/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 9:47:54 AM

Form Submitted By: Alma Roystan, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Ora-Cal, we do not want changes made we want to stay as is.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Keep Ora-Cal as is no changes

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We want to keep our current Ora-Cal district as it is we do not want any proposed changes made.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Twelve members of the Newbury BCA met on November 2, 2021 and unanimously voted to NOT change our District. Newbury does not have much in common with Orange and we have very little interaction, as we do with Groton and Topsham. We share a school district with Groton as well as mutual aid in terms of emergency services and highway services. We also do inter-library loaning. Newbury residents interact with Groton on a much more regular basis than Orange. It was noted this proposed change seems to go against all the principals they were basing the proposed changes on such as matching towns who are similar and alike, towns that share highway or emergency service agreements and getting groupings close to the 4287 number. This proposed change puts us even further away from that number. We feel preservation of the existing Ora-Cal district and the fifty plus year relationship between Newbury, Groton and Topsham is vital to our communities

## **Municipality: Newfane**

Date the BCA Met: Nov 4, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 4:03:45 PM

Form Submitted By: Carol Hesselbach, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WDM-2

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

None

### **Rationale and comments:**

The district that includes Newfane is not recommended as being changed from what it has been. It has worked fine and we have no suggestions for changes.

## **Municipality: Northfield**

Date the BCA Met: 11/2/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/3/2021 11:52:41 AM

Form Submitted By: Kim Pedley, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Was-9 & Was-10

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA requests that LAB relook at the division in respect to the divide between Northfield & Berlin in respect to the population base.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA voted to and requests that we main a two-seat district to include ALL of Northfield & Berlin.

If this is not granted we request that the LAB relook at the division in respect to the population base.

## **Municipality: Norwich**

Date the BCA Met: October 25, 2021 and November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 11:51:01 AM

Form Submitted By: Bonnie J Munday, Norwich Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Recommends changing WSR-5 and WSR-ORA-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Keeping the 2012 District WDR-ORA-2 a two-member District made up of Norwich, Sharon, Strafford and Thetford.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Norwich BCA prioritizes maintaining all of the town in the same district and prefers maintaining the current district. This two-member district does not present the problems that some multi-member districts do, because it is relatively compact and there is affinity among the four towns. If the LAB insists on proposing a single-member district, the Norwich BCA would accept that only if all of Norwich is in that district.

## **Municipality: ORWELL**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 11:51:13 AM

Form Submitted By: ELIZABETH WALKER, TOWN CLERK

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Addison Rutland - 1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Town of Orwell BCA voted to keep the existing District of Addison-Rutland to include the Towns of Shoreham, Orwell, Benson and Whiting. Moving to the proposes Addison-Rutland 1 moves us further North away from our current school district and cross town mutual services with Benson.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Town of Orwell at our BCA Meeting on November 8, 2021 recommended the following change based on Criterion 5. In making a proposal(for dividing initial districts) under this section, the boards of civil authority shall consider (1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests; (3) use of compact and contiguous territory; (4) incumbencies.

The Town of Orwell and the Town of Benson work closely together with our Road Crew, Emergency Services and School. Moving us further North will impede our ability to continue this relationship as we will have different representation.

## **Municipality: Panton**

Date the BCA Met: November 2, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 1:40:14 PM

Form Submitted By: Paula Moore, Justice of the Peace, Panton Board of Civil Authority

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Addison-3; Addison-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N/A

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Panton BCA approved a motion stating that if redistricting is needed, Panton should remain in a district with Vergennes. The BCA did not recommend the composition of a new district.

But based on the rationale detailed below, it is highly desirable to keep the five towns that currently comprise Addison-3 together. The BCA did not take action on whether a one-person district is more effective for legislative representation, but opinion was voiced that two people representing the current Addison-3 has been very effective.

### **Rationale and comments:**

This proposed reapportionment will profoundly affect the social and community cohesion of this geographical area. While the proposed redistricting makes sense with the population figures, the reality of how Panton relates to Vergennes makes the proposed redistricting untenable to us. The Panton Board of Civil Authority respectfully requests that the town of Panton remain in the same legislative district as Vergennes.

Below is the rationale for our request, which we believe aligns with the Legislative Apportionment Board's stated purpose of "creating districts where towns share common interests."

1. Panton is part of the Addison Northwest School District. We need to have a unified voice in Montpelier for our school district, which is centered in Vergennes. The proposed reapportionment would fragment that representation with the inclusion of Weybridge, which is part of the Addison Central School District. This proposed change is

not synchronistic with the Addison Northwest School District's boundaries. Also, while the new proposed district has two elementary schools within its boundaries, Weybridge and Ferrisburgh Central, Panton elementary aged students attend neither one of them.

2. Panton is part of the Bixby Memorial Free Library, one of the five towns (all of the current Addison-3) which pays a per capita assessment to the library for service. For the five towns (Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton, Vergennes, and Waltham), this is our local library.

3. Panton's emergency services are all provided by Vergennes. This includes fire, ambulance, and back-up police services.

4. Panton is part of the Vergennes-Panton Water District. Splitting the partners in this critical public utility, resulting in two different representatives, is a deep concern.

5. Panton's social/economic center is Vergennes. We are intrinsically connected to Vergennes: the shopping; restaurants; places of worship; and organizations such as the Boys & Girls Club and the Lions Club.

6. Panton has common interests with Vergennes in public policy issues. Currently there are three issues of grave concern to Panton. 1) Dealing with the boundary disputes between Panton and Vergennes. Having the same elected officials represent all of us means that the involved communities will be represented fairly. 2) The Proposed Bypass (Vergennes Economic Corridor). This is another issue involving Vergennes that will impact Panton due to the boundary disputes and resulting noise and traffic. 3) Water infrastructure. We are faced with failing water lines in both towns. Having the representation centralized ensures fairness and efficiency in addressing the water issues.



**Municipality: Pittsfield**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 10:38:09 AM

Form Submitted By: Tricia L Fryer, Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

none

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-13

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

n/a no changes

**Rationale and comments:**

n/a no changes

## **Municipality: PITTSFORD**

Date the BCA Met: NOVEMBER 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 1:42:40 PM

Form Submitted By: HELEN MCKINLAY, TOWN CLERK & TREASURER

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

PITTSFORD REVIEWED RUT-7 AND RECOMMENDS KEEPING AS PROPOSED.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

NONE.

### **Rationale and comments:**

WE REVIEWED NEIGHBORING TOWNS AND POINTS WE HAVE IN COMMON. THE BCA THOUGHT CHITTENDEN WOULD BE A GOOD MATCH NUMBER WISE AND WITH SCHOOL, POLICE AND ANIMAL CONTROL IN COMMON.

CHITTENDEN'S RECOMMENDATION TO GO WITH MENDON, KILLINGTON & PLYMOUTH CHANGED OUR MINDS.

## **Municipality: Plainfield**

Date the BCA Met: November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 9:57:29 AM

Form Submitted By: Linda Wells, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WAS-2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Plainfield BCA approved the proposed change as drafted by the Leg Apportionment Board for Plainfield to be included in the WAS-2 District including the towns Plainfield, Marshfield, and Cabot.

**Rationale and comments:**

The Plainfield BCA decision was based on the similar town sizes, and all towns being located along the Winooski River. One member quoted "it sort of binds us all together".

## **Municipality: Plainfield "corrected response"**

Date the BCA Met: November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 10:15:58 AM

Form Submitted By: Linda Wells, Town Clerk/BCA

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WAS-2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA approved the change to District WAS-2 to include Plainfield, Marshfield, and Cabot.

**Rationale and comments:**

The BCA decision was based on the towns being of similar size, all located along the Winooski River, and also the towns are now connected having been joined into the Caledonia Central Supervisory Union. Now Twinfield and Cabot schools have joined students from both schools into their sports activities bringing the towns closer together.

## **Municipality: Poultney**

Date the BCA Met: November 03, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 2:48:30 PM

Form Submitted By: Betsy Wescott, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-1

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-4

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

n/a

**Rationale and comments:**

n/a

## **Municipality: Proctor**

Date the BCA Met: 11/1/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 3:05:30 PM

Form Submitted By: Ben Curtis, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-7

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We recommend adopting the stat's proposed RUT-7

### **Rationale and comments:**

We fell we will be better represented in a one representative district.

## **Municipality: Putney**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 1:22:34 PM

Form Submitted By: Jonathan Johnson, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

House (WDM-5)) and Senate (there are currently two draft districts)

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Vermont House of Representatives: Retain WDH-4 as a two-member district.

Vermont Senate: Adopt the Jeanne Albert draft map creating WM two-member Senate District

### **Rationale and comments:**

House (currently Windham-4) The Putney BCA does not support the draft map creating WDM-5 and supports keeping a two-member district consisting of the towns of Dummerston, Putney and Westminster with the addition of the town of Brookline if needed to meet population targets. The town of Putney shares environmental protection interests with Dummerston, Westminster and Brookline in both the Pinnacle/Windmill Ridge Mountain line and the Connecticut River corridor.

Dummerston, Putney, and Westminster have a strong historical and geographical unity that would be best served by maintaining the existing relationships. For example, we have a number of farms that operate in two or all three towns in the district.

Dummerston, Putney, and Westminster share a Zip Code. In addition, Putney shares a school district and joint ownership of a gravel pit with Dummerston. All towns will benefit from having two house members to represent us.

Senate: The Putney BCA supports adopting the Jeanne Albert draft map which creates a county-wide district consisting of the majority of Windham County as a two-member district. The Albert map has a modest population deviation of less than one percent (0.77%) and reflects compact geographical unit. Moreover, the two-member district

reflects a current governmental unit with common judicial, law enforcement, and administrative functions.

By contrast, the Hansen draft map creating WHM-WEST has a significant population deviation of -6.26%. WHM-West creates a district that encompasses two distinct regions separated by a high ridge. Some of the towns are in the West River valley and have different needs and interests than the other towns in the draft district located in the Connecticut River corridor.



## **Municipality: RANDOLPH**

Date the BCA Met: NOVEMBER 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 5:42:20 PM

Form Submitted By: GEORGE PHILLIPS, BCA CHAIR

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ORA-5, WAS-ORA

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N/A

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

A TWO-MEMBER DISTRICT COMPRISED OF THE TOWNS OF BRAINTREE, BROOKFIELD, GRANVILLE, ROXBURY, AND RANDOLPH. THIS IS THE CURRENT ORA-WAS-ADD DISTRICT.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The LAB recommended change fails to meet the criteria of 17 V.S.A. 1903 (b) (1) & (2). It is most practical to reapportion in a manner consistent with these policies by using a traditional two-member district.

1. The BCA proposal preserves existing political subdivision lines. The LAB recommended change would not follow the boundary of the Town of Randolph.
2. The BCA proposal recognizes and maintains the social and political ties associated with the long-standing representative district. The LAB recommended change would break these ties.
3. The BCA proposal recognizes and maintains, in particular, the close social, trade, political ties and common interests of Randolph, Brookfield and Braintree. For example, the towns have long shared a school supervisory district, union high school, and services such as our solid waste transfer station and senior center. The LAB recommended change would not recognize and preserve this community.
4. The LAB recommended change severs the community with a particularly egregious artificial boundary that cuts through the large main village in Randolph. While it would be possible to divide the town in a way that separated fewer close neighbors, any division of the town will disrupt the close community.

5. The division of the town recommended by the LAB would cause confusion within the electorate and require considerable additional staffing and work managing local elections.

6. The inclusion of Granville, which is in the current district but is not in either of the LAB recommended districts, would bring the district closer to the ideal 4,287 population-per-representative target.

To the extent that it is appropriate for the BCA to consider factors other than the criteria in section 1903(b) it should be noted that a significant majority of the BCA felt that any benefit accrued from the smaller single-member districts would not offset the disadvantages created by severing the community.

## **Municipality: Richmond**

Date the BCA Met: October 19, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/3/2021 11:06:28 AM

Form Submitted By: Linda M Parent, Town Clerk & BCA Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHI-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

CHI-@

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We are pleased that Richmond remained one individual district with one representative

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Richmond BCA supports the one district for our town, with one representative.

We do not understand the need to change the name from CHI-1 to CHI-2.

## **Municipality: Ripton**

Date the BCA Met: Nov. 1, 2021 & Nov. 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 12:37:44 PM

Form Submitted By: Alison Joseph Dickinson, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-WSR-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

ADDISON-2

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA for the Town of Ripton hereby responds to the proposal from the Apportionment Board affecting our Town. We list below our concerns and reasons for disagreement.

1. The district proposed by the Apportionment Board groups Ripton, on the western slopes of the Green Mountains, with Hancock, Granville, Rochester and Bethel, all on the eastern slopes. This proposal is extremely concerning to the Ripton BCA because a mountain gap not only separates us from those four towns, but all our affiliations and greater community are to the west.

A majority of residents commute to Middlebury for work.

Students in grades 6-12 attend school in Middlebury.

Middlebury is our shire town.

Middlebury College is a major employer.

The nearest, most frequented, stores, services, and cultural institutions are in Middlebury.

Porter Hospital in Middlebury is the nearest health care facility.

The Addison Independent is the only newspaper that covers Ripton issues.

Ripton is a member of or served by the following, all located to the west:

Addison County Firefighters Association

Addison County Regional Planning Commission

Addison County Sheriff's Department

Addison County Solid Waste Management District

Maple Broadband Communications Union District - in planning phase (Granville, Hancock, Rochester and Bethel belong to EC Fiber and have high speed internet access.)

Middlebury Regional EMS

Riverwatch of Addison County - monitors water quality in the Otter Creek/Lake Champlain watershed. The towns to the east are in the White River watershed.

2. Being the lone town grouped with four others on the other side of one-two mountains isolates us from our areas of experience and concern. A representative would focus on the needs of the eastern towns, at the expense, we fear, of Ripton. Few people in Ripton have regular business in any of the other towns, especially Bethel.

3. The Ripton BCA has wrestled with complex town matters that require compromise and difficult choices. We are sympathetic that reapportionment is complex, but feel strongly that tweaking the existing system of more geographically and economically connected communities to accommodate the census changes is preferable. Our small population (739) is little more than 15% of the size of an ideal district, so not likely to cause a huge swing in the actual numbers of any district with which we are included. We understand the rationale for single-member districts (we are in one), but think keeping two members in cohesive communities (Middlebury and Bristol) makes sense.

Ripton Board of Civil Authority: Anza Armstrong, Laureen Cox, Alison Joseph Dickinson, Perry Hanson, Timothy Hanson, Richard "Kim" Kimler, Warren King, Bonnie Swan

Addendum

We are reminded of the old plot layouts of the Town that were originally laid out in Connecticut in 1781 without any consideration as to where the land actually lay. When the settlers finally viewed the land they acquired they found that some of the lots ended up being on mountain tops, in gorges, or sometimes, if the buyer was lucky, on actual (semi-) tillable land. In a similar way, the district proposed by the Apportionment Board seems like it was made without consideration of the realities on the ground as it puts two ridges of the Green Mountains between us and other proposed member towns. To further point out the isolation between Ripton and the other towns in the proposed

district, the State Highway District splits between the Northwest and Southeast Maintenance District at the top of Middlebury Gap. It's not just the Breadloaf/ Worth Mountain gap that needs to be surmounted to get to Hancock and Rochester—Bethel is also separated from Rochester by another mountain ridge, requiring navigating the Bethel Mountain Road or following the circuitous route following 100 and 107. Google maps shows the trip from Ripton to Bethel as 33 miles and takes 45 minutes. Pity the poor state representative who tries to go to all the town meetings in one evening!

## **Municipality: Rochester**

Date the BCA Met: November 15, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 12:42:21 PM

Form Submitted By: Julie Smith, Town Clerk, BCA Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-WSR-1 Granville, Hancock, Rochester, Stockbridge, All of Bethel

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ADD-WSR-1 Granville, Hancock, Rochester, Bethel

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Board of Civil Authority has asked the legislature to consider switching out the Town of Ripton (ADD-WSR-1) for the Town of Stockbridge (RUT-13) and adding all of Bethel (ADD-WSR-1) & (RUT-13) for the ADD-WSR-1 district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The comments made during our board meeting supporting the decision of switching the Town of Ripton for the Town of Stockbridge was unanimous. The board felt it was important in keeping ties with our connecting towns that share common interests such as schools and roads. Adding the Town of Stockbridge is important because of the Route 100 corridor and the fact that the Town of Rochester share roads in common with the Town of Stockbridge. We have very strong ties with the Rochester-Stockbridge Unified District School system as it was forced to merge. We would like to continue in building the relationship between the two towns. Switching out the Town of Stockbridge and the Town of Ripton would have equal exchanges because both towns have populations in the 700's. We are very happy to see the proposed redistricting to include our town with the towns of Hancock, Granville and Bethel. Geographically we all have shared interests. We felt the Town of Ripton would be better served with one of its surrounding towns or common boundaries. We commented on the fact that it would make sense to keep Bethel in its entirety and not break up the town into two districts.

## **Municipality: Rockingham**

Date the BCA Met: October 26, 2021 Rockingham BCA met 12 members voted in favor of a Proposal 1 having a 2 member district and 3 Selectboard members voted in favor of this as well. Saxtons River Village Trustees met on November 1 2021 and voted unanimously for proposal 1 a

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 10:07:57 AM

Form Submitted By: Kathleen Neathawk, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Windham District 6 (keeping Saxtons River with Rockingham)

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

District 8 adding Saxtons River back

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We are sending a hard copy along with results from Rockingham and Saxtons River.

### **Rationale and comments:**

a letter will be sent to the LAB board



## **Municipality: Rupert**

Date the BCA Met: Nov. 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 4:05:09 PM

Form Submitted By: Andrea Lenhardt, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

BEN-RUT-2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We DO NOT recommend that proposed district be changed.

**Rationale and comments:**

The Rupert Board of Civil Authority SUPPORTS the proposed boundaries for District BEN-RUT-2. We feel this district, which remains unchanged for us, works well to group us with neighboring towns sharing similar interests.

## **Municipality: Rutland City**

Date the BCA Met: November 3 and 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 9:27:09 AM

Form Submitted By: Henry A Heck, Rutland City Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Rutland City 5-8, 5-9, 5-10, 5-11 (City calls them 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4 State refers to them as 5-8, 5-9, 5-10, 5-11)

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

NONE!

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Rutland City BCA has evaluated their current single member districts and finds that moving 80 (People) from their Ward 4 from Ward 1, will meet the standards necessary.

### **Rationale and comments:**

10. Rationale and comments:

The Rutland City Board of Civil Authority strongly recommended maintaining the existing four wards with single representation making just one change in district line between 5-1 and 5-4 to effectively move three contiguous blocks with a combined population of 114 people into 5-4 from 5-1.

Criterion 1: (Chapter II ss73 Vt. Constitution. This minor adjustment to district boundary lines meets the standard of substantial equality (within the desired 10% deviation measure for the ideal population of 4,287) and in fact closes the gap between the four districts to within 1.5% of each other.

This recommendation achieves equality of representation and provides a population of 3,893 people represented in Ward 5-4 and 3,994 people represented in Ward 1. The recommendation maintains as is - without change both Ward 5-2 with a population of 3,936 and Ward 5-3 with a population of 3,984.

Criterion 2 and 3: (Chapter II ss13 Vt. Constitution) The BCA recommended apportionment maintains geographic compactness and contiguity. This criterion aims to foster effective representation by ensuring that representatives are accessible to the people they represent.

Following the requirements that districts should be compact and contiguous, the Constitution also dictates that districts should follow existing boundaries of counties, towns, or other political subdivisions.

Criterion 4: (17 V.S.A. ss1903) The BCA recommended apportionment and maintenance of the existing four City ward structure achieves the criterion that legislative districts should be communities bound by shared values and interests which thus can be given effective voice in Montpelier.

Criterion 5: (17 V.S.A. ss1906B) "In making a proposal under this section, the boards of civil authority shall consider 1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interest; (3) use of compact and contiguous territory; (4) incumbencies.

Under state statute, only Boards of Civil Authority are directed to weigh incumbency when proposing the sub-division of initial, multi member districts. While these are districts with single representation. The apportionment board proposal removes the incumbent from Ward 5-2 and places him in Ward 5-1. The BCA apportionment recommendation maintains the current structure of Ward 5-2 and does not displace the incumbent.

For all these established reasons cited above the Rutland City Board of Civil herby recommends the Legislative Apportionment Board adopt our proposed (unanimously) approved re-apportionment plan as submitted.

## **Municipality: SAINT ALBANS CITY**

Date the BCA Met: Tuesday November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/13/2021 1:17:45 PM

Form Submitted By: JOSEPH LUNEAU, BCA CHAIR

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

none

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Franklin-11 and Franklin-12 house

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The St. Albans City Board of Civil Authority supports both single member districts in principle and the proposed house districts of Franklin-11 and Franklin-12. The BCA would like to see a minor change whereby St. Albans City Ward 6 is not split between districts if possible.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA is satisfied with proposed map. We would prefer that St. Albans City Ward 6 fall within 1 house district if possible as this creates potential confusion during election cycles, but the BCA does not consider this to be a fatal element if Ward 6 must remain partitioned between house districts.

## **Municipality: Shaftsbury**

Date the BCA Met: 11/04/2021 & 11/07/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 3:13:03 PM

Form Submitted By: Lon T. McClintock, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Representative Districts Ben-3, Ben-2-1 & Ben-WDM-1 & Senate Districts Ben-S & Ben-Rut

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

For the Representative District: Shaftsbury, Glastenbury, and that portion of the town of Sunderland encompassed within a boundary beginning at the point where the boundary line of Sunderland and Glastenbury intersects with VT Route 7; then northerly along the eastern side of the center-line of VT 7 to the intersection of North Road; then northerly along the eastern side of the centerline of North Road to the intersection of Borough Road; then northerly along the eastern side of the centerline of Borough Road to the intersection of Sunderland Hill Road; then northeasterly along the southern side of the centerline of Sunderland Hill Road to the boundary of the town of Manchester; then easterly along the Manchester town line to the boundary of the town of Winhall; then easterly along the Winhall town line to the boundary of the town of Stratton; then southerly along the Stratton town line to the boundary of Glastenbury; then westerly along the Glastenbury town line to the point of beginning.

For the Senate District: the Bennington Senate District should include the Towns of Readsboro, Stamford, Pownal, Searsburg, Woodford, Bennington, Glastenbury, Shaftsbury, Sunderland, Arlington, Winhall, Manchester, Sandgate, Peru, Dorset, Rupert, Mount Tabor, Danby, and Pawlet as a 2 Senator District.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Proposed Senate District for Bennington County: Bennington County is served by two Senators and there is no advantage to warrant a change. No one Senator can be well versed in everything the Senate is doing. Having two Senators means our Senators can complement each other and take different areas of responsibility. Our BCA unanimously opposes creating two, single Senator Districts. As for the District, the LAB

proposal includes Wells and Tinmouth, which are in Rutland County, and are more closely aligned with the towns of Poultney, Clarendon and Wallingford. Those northerly Districts need residents.

Proposed Representative District for Shaftsbury: The proposed District splits the residents of Shaftsbury into 2 groups. About half of Shaftsbury's residents will be part of the District serving North Bennington and the other half will be part of the District serving Arlington. In both cases, residents of Shaftsbury will be a minority of the residents in each of District. Ironically, Shaftsbury (pop. 3,598) has a larger population than North Bennington (pop. 1,879) and Arlington (pop. 2,457), but is being divided so these other towns meet the District population quota. (As I understand the proposed Map, Shaftsbury is the only Town in southern Vermont having its population divided in half for the benefit of two smaller towns.)

Elimination of Shaftsbury's representative adversely affects the Town's identity and the residents sense of community. For example, Shaftsbury's current Representative will have to run for reelection against two incumbent North Bennington Representatives, with Shaftsbury having a minority of the voters. Shaftsbury residents know what this is like due to consolidation of school districts. Regional district and supervisory union boards are elected at large, meaning the entire district votes for all board seats. Shaftsbury does not elect its representative to the various school or supervisory union boards. To be elected, a Shaftsbury resident must get a majority of votes in Bennington (pop. 15,000+). This makes it very difficult for residents of small towns to elect people who reflect their values. Making Shaftsbury residents minority members of two Districts will effectively take away Shaftsbury's voice in the House of Representatives.

Shaftsbury's current District with Sunderland & Glastenbury meets District population requirements. Maintaining the current District lines will provide continuity in representation. Adding more Sunderland residents to this District will bring the District's numbers closer to optimal, and help consolidate Sunderland's representation.

Glastenbury has 9 residents, all of whom live on Glastenbury Road. Virtually all of Glastenbury is in the Green Mountain National Forest. Glastenbury is contiguous with Sunderland, Somerset and Woodford, but there are no year-round roads connecting it with those Towns. Glastenbury Road is the one road maintained year-round, and it begins at the Shaftsbury town line. The Road dead ends at Route 7, a limited access highway. For all intents and purposes, the residents of Glastenbury are geographically isolated from all abutting Towns except Shaftsbury. Virtually all of Glastenbury's municipal services are provided by Shaftsbury, including their polling place and road

maintenance. Glastenbury is in the same school districts as Shaftsbury. Glastenbury is so closely aligned with Shaftsbury it should be part of the District serving Shaftsbury.

In reaching this recommendation, members of Shaftsbury's BCA met with members of Bennington's BCA. Shaftsbury BCA members also communicated with the Town Clerks of Arlington, Bennington and Woodford. Shaftsbury's Town Administrator is a resident of Sunderland and he shared the views of the Sunderland Town Clerk with the Shaftsbury BCA. The communications were constructive, but the time provided for comment on the proposed Map was insufficient to formulate an inter-town proposal.

## **Municipality: Sharon**

Date the BCA Met: 10/26/2021, 11/8/2021, 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 7:43:42 AM

Form Submitted By: Catherine Sartor, Town Clerk/BCA Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WSR-5, WDR-ORA-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

District to remain the current, 4 town WDR-ORA-2

### **Rationale and comments:**

1. Sharon would like to maintain the current four town, two member district, comprised of Sharon, Thetford, Norwich and Strafford VT.
2. The district as currently configured, is compact and there is affinity amount the four towns.
3. We feel we are well served by our 2 current representatives, and fear that Sharon's voice would not be heard in the proposed single member district.



## **Municipality: Shelburne**

Date the BCA Met: November 1, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/8/2021 10:41:02 AM

Form Submitted By: Diana Vachon, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Chittenden 5 Shelburne and St. George. (5-1: Shelburne; and 5-2: Shelburne and St. George)

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Chittenden 5 Shelburne and St. George. (5-1: Shelburne; and 5-2: Shelburne and St. George)

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Chittenden 5 Shelburne and St. George. (5-1: Shelburne; and 5-2: Shelburne and St. George)

Keep the districts as currently defined. The proposed changes do not further the goal of V.S.A. 17 1903(b). Please see detailed rationale below.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Per Vermont Statutes Annotated 17 Sec. 1903(b), “the representative and senatorial districts shall be formed consistent with the following policies insofar as practicable:

- (1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines;
- (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests;
- (3) use of compact and contiguous territory.

In unanimous agreement, we find that the proposed adjustments to Shelburne’s legislative districts Chittenden 5-1 and 5-2 fail to meet these standards for the following reasons:

The Shelburne Road/ Route Seven corridor has been used as the principal

line of division in establishing the town boundaries rather than the existing natural division of Munroe Brook. As a result the historic Village center is bisected, with east and west sides of the highway in separate districts. The Falls district is similarly divided between those who live on the north and south side of Falls Road. In addition, to better equalize the populations of the two districts, it is deemed necessary to carve out sections on the east side of Shelburne Road at both the north and south ends of the town. These actions split up neighborhoods and do not maintain the patterns of geography and social interaction referred to in (2) above resulting in confusion for residents. Furthermore, they do not further the goal referred to in (3) above for compact and contiguous territory.

Lake Champlain is an important feature of the Town of Shelburne and we feel it has benefitted from the broader representation afforded by being part of both districts whose legislators share in the responsibilities and communications related to its environmental health and future. The proposed boundaries place all of Shelburne's considerable lakefront property in a single district (5-1). Again, this is driven by the Shelburne Road/Route Seven corridor as dividing line with no compelling rationale behind the change and without resulting in more compact or contiguous territory.

Finally, the current population size variable between Districts 5-1 (4,261) and 5-2 (4,250) is 11. The proposed population sizes, 4,282 and 4,229 respectively, will increase the variable to 53. Clearly, population equalization between the two districts will not be improved.

We therefore register our opposition to the proposed boundaries of Chittenden Districts 5-1 and 5-2 and request that the boundaries currently in existence be maintained since they better address the underlying policies in the statute

referenced above, and maintain the established historic patterns.

We further note that the boundary adjustments at issue are contained entirely within the Town of Shelburne and do not impact the eastern boundary shared with the Town of St. George, which is also part of District 5-2, nor with the Towns of South Burlington and Williston to the north or Charlotte and Hinesburg to the south. This is further evidence that there is no compelling reason to adjust the internal boundaries as proposed.

## **Municipality: Shoreham**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 10:18:10 AM

Form Submitted By: Julie Ortuno, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-RUT-1 4590

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Shoreham BCA feels that splitting Hubbardton is not right. They suggest Shoreham, Orwell, Bridport & Sudbury. Splitting towns creates more work at elections for clerks and BCA's.

### **Rationale and comments:**

It loses integrity and autonomy of towns when they split.

## **Municipality: South Burlington**

Date the BCA Met: October 28th, November 8 and November 10

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 10:59:09 AM

Form Submitted By: Donna Kinville, Clerk and Chris Shaw, Chair of BCA, Clerk and Chair of BCA

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHIT 12-1, 12-2, 12-3, 12-4, 12-5, 10-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

none

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Please see letter and schedules. We are recommending that the City of South Burlington have 5 districts all within South Burlington's boundaries based on growth already occurring and those in the pipeline.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The current recommended districts would mean that nearly 1/2 of our voters (over 9,000 residents) would have a new polling location so we recommend keeping the boundaries of the districts as close as possible to current boundaries. Please see attached letter for more details.

## **Municipality: South Hero**

Date the BCA Met: 11/8/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 1:45:25 PM

Form Submitted By: Kim Julow, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

GI-CHI-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

#### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Our first preference would be for a district made up of South Hero, Grand Isle and North Hero with 1 representative. That would include 4,699 residents which is higher than the ideal of 4,287 but our towns are linked geographically and we already work together in many ways. Our second choice would be a district made up of South Hero, Grand Isle and Isle La Motte. That grouping would include 4,248 residents which is closer to (although lower than) the ideal number of 4,287.

#### **Rationale and comments:**

The consensus of the South Hero BCA was that we agree to a single representative but we do not agree with the proposed configuration of GI-CHI-1. We feel that it is important to keep Grand Isle County together as much as possible and we want to be sure that our representative is a resident of Grand Isle County. Currently our representatives are from West Milton.

## **Municipality: SOUTH LONDONDERRY**

Date the BCA Met: 11/1/2021 11/8/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 4:50:23 PM

Form Submitted By: THOMAS CAVANAGH, SELECTBOARD CHAIR

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WINDHAM WINDSOR-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

NONE

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Districts recommended to be changed: Windham-Windsor 1 (Andover, Londonderry, Ludlow); Bennington 5 (Jamacia, Landgrove, Peru, Stratton, Sunderland, Winhall)

Bennington-Rutland (Danby, Dorset, Mount Tabor, Weston)

Recommended District Configuration: Windham-Bennington-Windsor (Landgrove, Londonderry, Peru, Weston, Winhall) single seat district

### **Rationale and comments:**

Rationale for leaving the District drawn by the LAB:

The district created by the LAB was considered using 4 criteria:

- 1) Chapter 11, §13, Vt. Constitution: "In establishing representative district, which shall afford equality of representation, the General Assembly shall seek to maintain geographical compactness and contiguity..."

The LAB's proposed district is not compact and is barely contiguous. There is roughly 1.41 miles of contiguous border between Londonderry and Andover which is the only contiguous border. The only road that connects Londonderry to Andover without leaving the district is a class 3 unpaved highway. To travel to Ludlow from Londonderry one can either leave the district and drive on Route 100 through Weston or follow Route 11 briefly out of and back into the district, after which travel would be on a series of different classes of Town Highways, both paved and unpaved. Any route from Londonderry to Ludlow sends you over "Terrible Mountain" which is a substantial geological divide of the region and often creates hazardous travel conditions during the

winter. The district is long and slender, it is not compact even if you don't consider the Mountain range that divides it. The Windham-Windsor 1 district as drawn by the LAB meets neither standard mentioned in the VT constitution

2) 17 V.S.A. §1903 (b)(1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines.

The LAB proposed district removes Londonderry entirely from the existing political lines of its current district. The same has been done to Andover and Ludlow which is concerning for all three Towns. Londonderry has no school district ties to Andover or Ludlow. Londonderry has School Choice at the High school level which is not the case in Andover and Ludlow. If "school choice" is not the prevailing norm in the district it puts Londonderry at a disadvantage because our Representative needs to advocate to maintain School Choice.

3) 17 V.S.A. §1903 (b)(2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests.

The LAB's proposed District lacks boundary continuity. It has substantial geological barriers which make winter travel challenging. There is no State Highway access entirely within the district. The Mountain range between Londonderry and Ludlow coupled with the need to travel on local backroads within the district does not demonstrate recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography. There is a distinct lack of social interaction, trade, and political ties. The clearest example of this is that Londonderry is in a different School District. Aside from being in a different School District, Londonderry is a part of a Non-operating School District for high school students which leaves Londonderry at a significant disadvantage if most of their district does not have School Choice. Although there is similarity around the Ski Resorts being an economic driver in the District, Londonderry is far more connected to the ski resorts to the South and West of Londonderry because of the geography and State Highways locations within the region. There are no shared resources such as Fire Departments, Rescue services or Trash disposal that are within this district.

4) 17 V.S.A. §1903 (b)(3) use of compact and contiguous territory.

The same comments about geography, means of travel and a lack of contiguous border that were considered under criteria #1 are applicable to this standard in State Statute.

Rationale for the District being recommended by the BCA:

The Same 4 criteria were considered for the District being recommended by the BCA



1) Chapter 11, §13, Vt. Constitution: “In establishing representative district, which shall afford equality of representation, the General Assembly shall seek to maintain geographical compactness and contiguity...”

The District being recommended is geographically compact and each town has contiguous borders with at least three other towns in the district. There are two

## **Municipality: Springfield**

Date the BCA Met: October 28, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/29/2021 2:36:15 PM

Form Submitted By: Barbara A . Courchesne, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WSR-10 and WSR-11

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Springfield Board of Civil Authority unanimously voted to reject the proposed single-member district split and to keep Springfield as a two-member single district within its existing town boundaries, as shown on the proposed map, representing as a whole its population of 9062.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Springfield Board of Civil Authority discussed at length the LAB proposed single-member district map which proposes to split Springfield in half within its town borders. The BCA is clear in its assertion that Springfield is better served within its borders as a two-member single district.

Keeping the boundaries of Springfield intact with two-member representation causes the least amount of havoc and is easily understood by voters. The population of Springfield is 9062 and is within the allowed deviation percentage. The BCA feels strongly that Springfield would more likely be efficiently and coherently represented in Montpelier if we're all pulling the same wagon and should be a two-member single district. When constituents have issues it will be confusing for them and they are better served with a choice of whom to discuss their concerns. Further, one representative may be more knowledgeable in a particular area. Residency requirements will dilute the attempt to get the populous vote thereby lowering the pool of representative candidates. For Springfield it is important that representatives work together. In some areas of the state there is a concern of suppression of certain groups but that is not the case in Springfield nor does a district split help Springfield.

## **Municipality: ST. JOHNSBURY**

Date the BCA Met: 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 8:47:55 AM

Form Submitted By: STACY JEWELL, TOWN CLERK

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CAL-3 & CAL-6

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

BCA does not agree with the proposed districts.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

BCA does not agree to the proposed change. CAL-3 should remain the same as it has been. Do not split the town in half.

House Reps 2, Scott Beck & Scott Campbell

### **Rationale and comments:**

I have emailed comment to email address.

## **Municipality: Stamford**

Date the BCA Met: October 21, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/28/2021 11:48:21 AM

Form Submitted By: Lori A Shepard, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

New Bennington-1 District and Windham-Bennington District

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

This is a description of the districts recommended to be changed:

FROM: Windham-Bennington District:

Stamford	861 pop.
Readsboro	702 pop.
Searsburg	126 pop.
Somerset	6 pop.
Dover	1,798 pop
Wardsboro	869 pop.
Total	4,361 pop. (deviation 75 or 4.92%)

TO: NEW Bennington-1 District:

Stamford	861 pop.
Pownal	3,258 pop.
Total	4,119 pop. (deviation -168 or 3.92%)

### **Rationale and comments:**

After careful review, the Board of Civil Authority does not support the change to move Stamford from the Windham-Bennington Representative District to form a new district

with Pownal, the New Bennington-1 District. The board cited several reasons, as follows:

- 1) The board questioned the equitable representation since Stamford has 861 people and Pownal has 3,258 people, according to the 2020 census. Pownal having almost four times Stamford's population could be the primary vote, which could, in effect, minimize our town's voice and concerns.
- 2) Stamford does not have much in common with Pownal. For instance, we are separated geographically by a mountain range and there is no road connecting Stamford to Pownal. The quickest way to reach Pownal is to travel through Massachusetts and around.
- 3) Stamford is the last Vermont town before entering Massachusetts. We are connected geographically by Route 100 to Readsboro. Since this route is our main connection to other towns in the state, separating us from Readsboro would essentially isolate us from the rest of the state.
- 4) Stamford and Readsboro share the same school supervisory union. The new proposal would create a legislative district with two separate school supervisory unions.

The Stamford Board of Civil Authority acknowledges that the legislative board is guided by three statutory directives, in addition to the overall deviation: 1, preservation of existing political subdivision lines, 2, recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests, and 3, use of compact and contiguous territory. The districts should be based on population, geographic proximity and economic reliance. Although the proposal seems to provide less deviation, the Board of Civil Authority sees no advantage to a grouping with Pownal. Because of the mountainous region and the many connections Stamford has with Readsboro, the Board of Civil Authority rejects the proposal to create a new district with Pownal and believes it is in the town's best interest to remain in a district connected with Readsboro.

## **Municipality: STARKSBORO**

Date the BCA Met: 11/4/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 3:08:23 PM

Form Submitted By: AMY MCCORMICK, TOWN CLERK

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

STARKSBORO LINCOLN BRISTOL - ADD-6

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Please leave as is from 2012 - Starksboro, Lincoln, Bristol & Monkton. A more detailed letter was sent to SOS BCA Feedback.

**Rationale and comments:**

Starksboro BCA agreed to leave the districts as they are - Monkton, Starksboro, Lincoln & Bristol. A more detailed letter was sent to SOS BCA Feedback. Splitting a town creates more work, misunderstandings and apprehensions within that town.

## **Municipality: Stockbridge**

Date the BCA Met: 10/28/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 12:48:10 PM

Form Submitted By: Lori Scott, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

NA

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA opened the discussion on the Vermont Legislative Apportionment Board's "tentative" Vermont House of Representatives legislative district (or districts) for Stockbridge. They viewed the current and proposed maps of the new district that Stockbridge would become part of. Stockbridge would move from the WDR-RUT district including Pittsfield, Rochester, Bethel and Stockbridge to RUT-13 made up of Killington, Pittsfield, Bridgewater, a portion of Bethel and a portion of Mendon and Stockbridge. These changes are being recommended due to population shifts from the 2020 Census.

The board expressed concern over the splitting up of towns. Lee Ann voiced that this is a long-term change until the next census. An additional concern is that this move places Stockbridge with larger communities rather than the village make up of communities that are in the current district. It is the uncertainty about the difference created between a small village and a large ski area community. They also considered that a representative might be redistricted out of their current house seat. Additionally, discussed was the concern of impacts to the Rochester-Stockbridge Unified School District with Rochester moving to another district. Kevin Travis voiced concerns about the impact on the relationship that the Planning commission is building with the White River Valley group and the shared economic development goals within that group.

The overarching concern is that this re-districting/apportionment moves Stockbridge into a district that is very different economically and how that will impact the towns planning processes for the future.

## **Municipality: Stowe**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 8:36:56 AM

Form Submitted By: Leighton Detora, Chair BCA

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

LAM 4 and LAM 6

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

None.

### **Rationale and comments:**

While the members are disappointed that Stowe has to be split, we understand the current recommendation is probably best, given the requirements faced by the LAB. That said, it is critical that this configuration, if approved, be approved as single member districts as is recommended.

Understand that the configuration as drawn would have the Stowe-Morristown district as a single member district with Stowe residents being a distinct minority. The single member district cannot be a two member district as that would cause Stowe residents to be a super minority in the district. It was designed fairly as a single member district and should be approved as such.



## **Municipality: Strafford**

Date the BCA Met: November 2, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 2:50:07 PM

Form Submitted By: Lisa M Bragg, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WSR-5 and WSR-ORA-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

n/a

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Strafford, Sharon, Thetford, Norwich four town two member district

### **Rationale and comments:**

Comments from our BCA meeting:

\*My biggest concern is for Strafford, it feels like this proposed district makes us a bedroom community of Norwich and if you are the representative where are the votes, the votes are in Thetford and Norwich the votes are not in Strafford.

\*We do not want Strafford to feel like a satellite of Thetford or Sharon a satellite of Norwich. Strafford has a 1094 and the district population is 4,550 so where is the representative going to focus their energy and time. What in the best interest of Strafford?

\*we do not see any reason for this to happen that the apportionment divides up the same people and gives us two representatives and why not if it is functional leave those two people to represent all four of us instead of breaking it into two pieces when there are no savings to the state no advantages to the state.

\*Toni indicated she was concerned about the voting part of this and that a person running from Strafford and a person running from Thetford a Strafford person will never get in office.

\*\*\*A motion as a board would be on record. Andrew made a motion that the Board of Civil Authority in Strafford strongly encourages the reapportionment board to leave the four towns two representative districts as it is currently. Curt seconded, all in favor. Motion passed.

## **Municipality: Stratton**

Date the BCA Met: October 25, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/26/2021 11:46:41 AM

Form Submitted By: Kent Young, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Bennington 5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N/A

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Bennington 5 (Stratton, Winhall, Sunderland, Peru, Landgrove and Jamaica). The BCA recommends that Sunderland and Jamaica be removed from this district and Londonderry and Weston be added to it.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The existing district, created in 2011, should be maintained in that form as closely as possible. Districts should reflect economic continuity and other similarities that can be common issues shared by the towns within a given district, so that the district's representative can defend those common factors. The Mountain Towns of Stratton, Winhall, Londonderry and Weston in the existing district rely heavily on skiing and tourism and represent an economic block that should not be carved up. More specifically, Stratton and Winhall share Stratton Resort and should not be separated into different districts. Another issue is schooling. Currently the existing district is mostly school choice. Currently, the vast majority of Stratton's students attend schools in Winhall and the Manchester area. Jamaica is more oriented toward Townshend.

The BCA recommends that Sunderland be removed from the proposed district, as it is geographically separated from the remainder of the district as it is only connected by a single dirt road through 14 miles of National Forest, which is kept closed all winter. Sunderland's population is concentrated on its western side, while Stratton's population is on its eastern side – with a vast expanse of National Forrest between. Sunderland should be associated with towns on the western side of the mountains. Lastly, the name – Bennington 5 – does not reflect the fact that Stratton is a Windham County town.

## **Municipality: SUDBURY**

Date the BCA Met: November 1st and November 15

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 2:04:17 PM

Form Submitted By: Steve Sgorbati, Town Clerk, BCA member

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Add Rut -1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Sudbury, Hubbardton, Shoreham Orwell and Whiting

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We propose a district with Sudbury, Hubbardton, Shoreham Orwell and Whiting. It doesn't divide Hubbardton and all these towns are linked.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Dear Apportionment Board, Thank you for your hard work on this difficult complicated issue. I want to submit as a resident and BCA member that we feel much more of an affinity with neighboring Hubbardton than Bridport. We share Lake Hortonia. With Bridport, we only thing we share is that both towns are in Vermont. Plus you are dividing the town of Hubbardton in two separate districts. How does that make sense?

## **Municipality: Sunderland**

Date the BCA Met: November 1, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 11:46:23 AM

Form Submitted By: Rose M. Keough, Town Clerk and BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Change Ben-3 to include Sunderland Arlington and Sandgate and add Shaftsbury to Ben-WDM-1

Peru, Winhall, Landgrove, Stratton, Jamaica and Wardsboro could then be Ben-5

### **Rationale and comments:**

Sunderland has nothing in common with the "mountain" towns. The only real connecting road is with Stratton and that road is closed during the winter months. Sunderland, Arlington and Sandgate are very close together and all use the same fire protection, rescue squad service and the park is paid for by all three towns, there are many town functions that include all three towns.

## **Municipality: Sutton**

Date the BCA Met: 11/11/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 10:09:42 AM

Form Submitted By: Patricia McClure, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Sutton BCA agrees with the proposed reapportionment map for CAL-4 but would recommend including the town of Newark

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Sutton BCA would like to welcome the inclusion of the town of Newark into the district CAL-4.

### **Rationale and comments:**

By including Newark in district CAL-4, it would keep them in the same county and they are part of the Kingdom East Unified School District.

## **Municipality: Thetford**

Date the BCA Met: 11/2/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 3:20:28 PM

Form Submitted By: Tracy Borst, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WSR-ORA-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Thetford, Norwich, Sharon and Strafford.

### **Rationale and comments:**

We are in favor of keeping our 4 town district with two representatives. We appreciate the past practice of keeping towns together, we appreciate that we've had two representatives on behalf of our 4 towns, our current two representatives for 4 towns is meeting the needs of our town. We'd like the respect of town borders, and not a splitting of towns (as the proposed splits Norwich). Our BCA voted unanimously to stay as we are, and in disagreement of the proposed new split.

## **Municipality: Tinmouth**

Date the BCA Met: November 11, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 11:53:06 AM

Form Submitted By: Stanley Wilbur, BCA Responder

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-1 and BENRUT-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Tinmouth BCA is requesting the Apportionment Board consider moving Tinmouth from BENRUT- 2 to RUT-1.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Tinmouth is a member of the of the Mill River Unified Union School District along with Wallingford, Shrewsbury and Clarendon. The Board feels legislation relating to school issues are major items facing the Legislature and would like to play a role in the election of the person representing the School District towns.

Also, Tinmouth residents tend to go East to Wallingford and Rutland rather than West to Middletown and Poultney for shopping, services and entertainment which means we have more in common with the RUT-1 Towns.

To keep the population number in line with the ideal number we suggest removing Mount Holly from RUT-1 and adding Tinmouth and Ira. Attached is a suggested realignment of Districts in our area that address our request. The spreadsheet was attached to an e-mail sent to Tom Little.

## **Municipality: Topsham**

Date the BCA Met: 1 November 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/2/2021 9:03:20 AM

Form Submitted By: Thomas Otterman, Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

OR 1, OR 4, & CAL 5.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

#### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The relationship between Topsham & Groton is quite similar to the relationship between Topsham & Orange which means that it makes little difference. The issues of Topsham better align with Groton, Orange, Washington, Corinth, Vershire, or West Fairlee. The feeling is to leave well enough alone is the appropriate approach. The effort to divide the existing 2 person OR 1 district should probably be done within that district.

#### **Rationale and comments:**

If it ain't broke don't fix it. Don't trust anything that comes from Montpelier, suspicious of political plotting. What is the deal with senatorial districts?



## **Municipality: Town of Fayston**

Date the BCA Met: 10/27/21, 11/4/21 and 11/9/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 11:55:23 AM

Form Submitted By: Patti Lewis, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WAS 11 and WAS 8 to be kept as WAS 7.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Fayston petitions the LAB to keep WAS 7 whole as it has been. Please see email to [sos.labmembers@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.labmembers@vermont.gov) for complete packet of supporting documentation.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Please see email to [sos.labmembers@vermont.gov](mailto:sos.labmembers@vermont.gov) for complete packet of rationale, comments, and supporting documentation.

Petition to Legislative Apportionment Board 2021 from Fayston

The Town of Fayston, with support from the other four towns in the current WA-7 double legislative district, respectfully requests the district be maintained in its current state. The proposed plan to divide the Town of Fayston along Route 17 to create two single size districts (WAS-11 and WAS-8) was overwhelmingly rejected by an on-line poll and two open meetings of the Board of Civil Authority. We wish to protect Fayston's integrity as a town, and as an integral part of the Mad River Valley's larger community. The five-town double district has worked well for the Mad River Valley, and the population math (8351) is well within target.

Fayston is the most mountainous town in Vermont, bordered on the west by the Long Trail running on the ridge of the Green Mountains. It is famous for two of the Mad River Valley's alpine ski areas, Sugarbush's Mount Ellen, and Mad River Glen. In addition to our residents, we have second home owners, out of state students (GMVS) and their families, and visitors year-round. We have big chunks of the Green Mountain National Forest, Camel's Hump State Forest, and two Town forests (Chase Brook and Boyce Hill).

Fayston has no downtown commercial district, but has many businesses including recreation, lodging, agriculture, services, manufacturing, education, and construction (See Appendix A for a sample of these businesses). Fayston has a modern Town Hall, and the Fayston Elementary School was distinguished as one of the top 10 in New England with recent Science NECAP scores. The school supports a record-setting 25 years of the Four Winds parent-taught nature curriculum, and provides a higher percentage of family-led PE ski afternoons than any other Valley schools. We are rich in living with the land - its mountains and streams and flora and fauna and we are an essential part of the Mad River Watershed. We are a diverse community, but we have a sense of living in a special and unique Town. We have three cemeteries and a historical society. We are cabled with optical fiber. We welcome second home-owners and visitors from around the world, as do our neighbors in Duxbury, Moretown, Waitsfield, and Warren, with whom we share our beautiful Mad River Valley. We have 34 miles of dirt roads and six miles of paved town roads, running everything from electric vehicles to log trucks. We honor our hard-working road crew. Fayston is served by State Route 17, but should not be divided by it.

The Mad River Valley, with Fayston sandwiched between Waitsfield/Warren and Moretown/Duxbury, shares history, recreation, religion, firefighting, medical care, libraries, and schools. The Mad River Valley economies have shifted away from old agriculture and forestry and have embraced new agriculture, tourism, education, and high-tech ventures. Appendix B lists organizations from Town Boards and partnerships to churches and day-care which bind the Mad River Valley together, from the top of the Mad River in Warren, and the many streams that feed it from Fayston, Waitsfield, Duxbury, and Moretown, until it flows into the Winooski River. While many of these collaborations began with Fayston, Warren, and Waitsfield (notably the 1965 Mad River Valley Planning District), we have seen the "Mad River Valley" increasingly include Duxbury and Moretown, which complete the Mad River's watershed.

The last ten years as a double legislative district have been successful. Our current Representatives Maxine Grad and Kari Dolan live in Moretown and Waitsfield, and previous representatives were from Fayston and Warren. We have a coalition of seven church groups, the Mad River Valley Interfaith Council, which operates a community pantry. We have a Senior Center and a robust Meals-on-Wheels program. The successful Neck of the Woods ch

## **Municipality: Town of Franklin**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 9:25:45 AM

Form Submitted By: Lisa Larivee, Town Clerk, BCA chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

FRA-3 Franklin merged back with FRA-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

FRA-4 as a whole town for Franklin with not small division to FRA-3

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Town of Franklin BCA board strongly urges legislature to keep the entire town in the FRA-4 district with the Town of Highgate. Do not break a small portion off of Franklin to put with district FRA-3.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Town of Franklin is a very small community that should not be split into two districts as FRA-3 and FRA-4. The BCA board strongly encourages legislature to keep the entire Town of Franklin together in district FRA-4 with the Town of Highgate. There are minimal voters in the proposed FRA-3 district break off, that would feel alienated from the rest of the community. This would create much more work for our small town and election staff with duplicate checklists, ballots, tallying, and all that is needed for elections.

## **Municipality: Town of Killington**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 9:40:27 AM

Form Submitted By: Lucrecia Wonsor, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Rutland-13

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Killington, Chittenden, Mendon and Pittsfield. See re-drawn district on map sent separately via email.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Killington Board of Civil Authority feels that for representation purposes, its interests are best aligned with the Towns of Mendon, Pittsfield and Chittenden. The Towns of Killington, Mendon, Pittsfield and Chittenden are all located within Rutland County. The total population of the recommended district would be 4,302 which is on target with the LAB's population goal. For more detail of discussion, see Minutes of Killington Board of Civil Authority dated November 8, 2021 sent via separate email.

## **Municipality: Town of Monkton**

Date the BCA Met: 11/10/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 4:29:16 PM

Form Submitted By: Stephen Pilcher, Member of BCA, Chair of Selectboard

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADD-5, ADD-6, ADD-7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Recommend that the Towns of Monkton, Starksboro, Lincoln and Bristol form a two member district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The two member district comprised of the Towns of Monkton, Starksboro, Bristol and Lincoln would have the following benefits.

1. It would match town boundaries exactly.
2. It would be a great match for the numbers of citizens for a two person district with a population of 8940 – just 2.1% over the ideal size of a two member district of 8,574.
3. There is a strong bond between the 4 towns as they share the Mount Abe Unified School District.
4. There are economic ties between Bristol and the 3 surrounding communities of Monkton, Starksboro and Lincoln. Bristol is a shopping, dining and cultural hub for the 4 towns.
5. Many services are shared across town borders in this 4 town district – including Highway department resources and emergency services.

The districts of ADD-5, ADD-6 and ADD-7 have the following problems:

1. The Town of Monkton is lumped together with New Haven and Waltham. The Town of Monkton has no strong ties to the Town of New Haven and certainly none with

the Town of Waltham. There is a fundamental difference between towns that have easy access to Route 7 and those that do not.

2. The districts of ADD-6 and ADD-7 do not follow town boundaries.
3. The Town of Bristol is split in a way that does not make sense from either social or economic perspective.
4. Lumping Bristol and Middlebury together suffers from the same problems discussed in #1. The Town of Bristol does not have strong ties to the Town of Middlebury, especially since they serve as hubs for different communities.

## **Municipality: Town of Mount Holly**

Date the BCA Met: October 28, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/1/2021 3:37:44 PM

Form Submitted By: Diana Garrow, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-1

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

RUT-1 which is the towns of Mount Holly, Shrewsbury and Wallingford are neighboring towns with many of our High School age children attending the same High School together and also keeps us in our own county of Rutland.

### **Rationale and comments:**

These three Towns have many similarities and are all within the same county. This works very well for us.

## **Municipality: Town of Royalton**

Date the BCA Met: 11/3/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 2:46:27 PM

Form Submitted By: Karmen M. Bascom, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORA-WSR-1

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

No changes are recommended for ORA-WSR-1, which is currently Royalton and Tunbridge and which is proposed to remain the same.

Sincerely,

Karmen M. Bascom, Royalton Town Clerk and ORA-WSR-1 District Clerk

**Rationale and comments:**

Royalton feels strongly about maintaining their one representative district union with Tunbridge for the next ten

years. Our population remains stable and we strongly believe in one representative districts.

Sincerely,

Karmen M. Bascom, Royalton Town Clerk and ORA-WSR-1 District Clerk



## **Municipality: Town of Rutland**

Date the BCA Met: 11/2/21 and 11/9/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 4:04:59 PM

Form Submitted By: Kari Clark, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

See letter attached to the above email address

**Rationale and comments:**

See letter attached to the above email address.

## **Municipality: Town of Underhill**

Date the BCA Met: October 12, November 3, and November 10, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/13/2021 8:16:58 PM

Form Submitted By: Patricia Sabalis, Chair, Underhill Board of Civil Authority

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHI-4 (Underhill, Jericho) and CHI-7 (Jericho)

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The recommended district is to maintain CHI-3, the single, two-member district, not divide it into two separate one-member districts as proposed.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The towns of Jericho and Underhill have comprised a single district (CHI-3) with two House representatives for many decades. Historically, this arrangement has worked well for the citizens of both towns. The Legislative Apportionment Board (LAB) proposes to divide the towns into two single-member districts: CHI-4 (which includes Underhill and a neighboring segment of Jericho) and CHI-7 (which includes the rest of Jericho). The Underhill Board of Civil Authority believes that the towns of Underhill and Jericho should remain in a single district. In reaching this conclusion, the BCA is mindful of the policies for creating districts set forth in 17 V.S.A. §1903(b): “(1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests; and (3) use of compact and contiguous territory.”

Maintaining the single district for Underhill and Jericho obviously preserves existing political subdivision lines and uses compact and contiguous territory. It also recognizes patterns of social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests. For example, the towns of Jericho and Underhill have funded and continue to jointly fund important services for the towns: (1) the Underhill-Jericho Fire Department, which has facilities in both towns and volunteer firefighters from both towns; (2) the Deborah Rawson Memorial Library, which is governed by Trustees from both towns and hosts forums and programs of interest for the residents of both towns; and (3) the Jericho Underhill Land Trust, which also has a Board of Trustees from both towns and has preserved important

lands including Jericho's Mobbs Farm and Mills Riverside Park and Underhill's Casey's Hill and Tomasi Meadow where residents from the towns enjoy hiking, skiing, snowshoeing, sledding, and mountain biking.

Residents of Jericho and Underhill serve on the Board of Trustees of the Jericho Underhill Park District. Finally, the Jericho Underhill Water District also serves residents in both towns.

Jericho and Underhill residents organize and participate in annual events like the Memorial Day parade and Harvest Market weekend. For over 65 years, the Jericho and Underhill Boy Scout troop 627 has served children from both towns. The Girl Scouts troop also includes children from both towns. Children from Jericho and Underhill attend Browns River Middle School.

Underhill and Jericho residents shop and dine together at centrally located businesses along the Route 15 and Park Street corridor (eg., Jericho Market, the aptly named Jerihill Ace hardware store, Jacobs Family Market, Jericho Farmers Market, and Jericho Cafe and Tavern).

For all of these reasons, the Underhill BCA recommendation is the same as the recommendation of the Jericho BCA — the single, two-member district (CHI-3) should be preserved.

## **Municipality: Town of Westford**

Date the BCA Met: 10/28/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 4:27:51 PM

Form Submitted By: Nanette Rogers, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

None

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

CHI-6

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

While the Board of Civil Authority does not propose any changes, it does want it noted that it prefers Westford being combined with only Essex due to sharing a school district.

## **Municipality: Tunbridge**

Date the BCA Met: 11/9/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 10:20:12 AM

Form Submitted By: Mariah Cilley, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ORA-WSR-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

ORA-WSR-1

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

Our BCA was happy with keeping it the way that it has been which was the way it was proposed for this current reapportionment.

## **Municipality: Vergennes**

Date the BCA Met: November 1, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 8:15:04 PM

Form Submitted By: Britney Aube, City Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ADDISON-4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

N/A

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Vergennes BCA recommends that the existing ADDISON-3 District remain unchanged. The existing ADDISON-3 District includes the municipalities of Vergennes, Ferrisburgh, Panton, Waltham, and Addison in their entirety. The Vergennes BCA also recommends that ADDISON-3 remain a two-member representative district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Under 17 V.S.A § 1903, when the Legislative Apportionment Board undertakes the task of reapportioning voting districts, it needs to follow certain specified criteria:

The representative and senatorial districts shall be formed consistent with the following policies insofar as practicable:

- (1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines;
- (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests;
- (3) use of compact and contiguous territory.

With regard to subsection (1), the current ADDISON-3 District completely preserves the political subdivisions of the five municipalities involved. The proposed ADDISON-4 District, on other hand, not only carves a slice out of Ferrisburgh, but there seems to be no rhyme or reason beyond the position of VT-Route 7 as to why Ferrisburgh is proposed to be divided in such a manner.

With regard to subdivision (2), the five-town community has been politically, socially, and geographically intertwined since the late 1700s. Vergennes specifically acts as a hub for social, trade, and common interests between the five municipalities. Residents of

Addison, Ferrisburgh, Waltham, and Ferrisburgh shop, dine, and socialize in Vergennes. The majority of the area covered by the current ADDISON-3 District shares a zip code. Most importantly, though, is the fact that the five towns that make up ADDISON-3 District also comprise the Addison Northwest School District. Many of the decisions we make as a representative district are intrinsically related to the decisions we make as a school district.

With regard to subdivision (3), while the proposed ADDISON-4 District is continuous; the proposal results in a sprawling ADDISON-5 District stretching from Monkton to New Haven to Waltham. This proposed district is reminiscent of some of the more questionably gerrymandered voting districts seen nationwide.

While the idea of smaller Districts with a single representative may seem to provide equity statewide, the proposed divisions leave communities divided.

Finally, the Vergennes BCA made note of the fact that the 2020 Census was held during a pandemic and did not include the 200+ Northlands Job Corps students that are typically included in the count as they were not onsite since the school was temporarily closed due to COVID-19. Additionally, the actual logistics of the Census were significantly delayed due to various legal challenges instigated by the previous White House administration. Both quantity and quality of the data collected was impacted by these happenings.

In closing, our local BCAs have discussed the proposals and agree that the proposed elimination of the ADDISON-3 District is harmful to our communities and violates statutory requirements regarding reapportionment criteria. The Vergennes BCA recommends that our five-town, two-member representative district remains intact.

**Municipality: Vershire**

Date the BCA Met: 11/11/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/13/2021 9:20:50 PM

Form Submitted By: Bonnie Strout, BCA Chair

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Orange 4

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

NA

**Rationale and comments:**

NA



## **Municipality: Waitsfield**

Date the BCA Met: November 10, 2021 via Zoom.

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 2:45:57 PM

Form Submitted By: Andreas Lehner, BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

We recommend returning District 8 (Warren, Waitsfield, southern part of Fayston) and District 11 (Duxbury, Moretown, northern part of Fayston) to a single two-member district including all five towns.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The five Mad River Valley towns (Warren, Waitsfield, Fayston, Moretown and Duxbury) are currently a single district (Washington 7) with two representatives. We have found this to be a satisfactory arrangement, and recommend continuing that arrangement.

### **Rationale and comments:**

While we understand and appreciate the advantages of single-member districts, we do not support splitting one of our neighboring towns into two parts in order to create such a district. The towns in the Mad River watershed share critical infrastructure, economic and recreational interests, and common identity, and should be kept together in the legislature. The single two-member district easily meets the apportionment goals.

## **Municipality: Walden**

Date the BCA Met: [BCA members were polled via email and telephone on Oct. 19 and 20.]

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 12:56:22 PM

Form Submitted By: Roger Fox, BCA Chair

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Caledonia-2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

[not applicable]

**Rationale and comments:**

The proposed district composition of Hardwick, Stannard and Walden has been maintained and has worked well for many years. These towns share many economic, social and cultural connections, and residents of all three of these towns have been elected to the House over time. No rationale for reconfiguring this district has come to our attention.

## **Municipality: Wallingford**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/10/2021 12:46:09 PM

Form Submitted By: Julie Sharon, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-1

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

RUT-1 as proposed by the LAB. Wallingford, Shrewsbury & Mount Holly - one-member district.

**Rationale and comments:**

The BCA did not make any changes to the district proposed by the LAB.

The primary reasons for the BCA's decision are: 1) Wallingford is in close proximity to the proposed district as drawn; 2) students from all three towns attend the same unified school district; 3) Shrewsbury and Wallingford are in the same unified school district; and 4) the majority voted in favor of adopting the proposed district.

## **Municipality: Waltham**

Date the BCA Met: Nov. 1, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/11/2021 2:05:10 PM

Form Submitted By: Linda Devino, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Addison - 5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Addison - 3

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Under 17 V.S.A § 1903, when the Legislative Apportionment Board undertakes the task of reapportioning voting districts, it needs to follow certain standards and policies:

The representative and senatorial districts shall be formed consistent with the following policies insofar as practicable:

1. preservation of existing political subdivision lines;
2. recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests;
3. use of compact and contiguous territory.

It is the opinion of the Waltham BCA that the proposed ADDISON-5 District does not follow the standards and policies listed above:

1. The current ADDISON-3 District preserves the political subdivisions of the five municipalities involved. The proposed ADDISON-5 District separates Waltham from those existing political subdivision lines. The Waltham BCA does not understand the basis or reason for this separation.
2. The current ADDISON-3 District recognizes that the five-town community has been politically, socially, and geographically intertwined since the late 1700s. The residents of Waltham utilize Vergennes as a center for work, shopping, dining, and socializing, directly aligning with the “patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties, and common interests”. Even Waltham’s Zip Code is shared with Vergennes. Most importantly is the fact that the five towns that make up the current ADDISON-3 District also comprise the Addison Northwest School District. Many of the decisions we make as

a representative district are inherently related to the decisions we make as a school district. The proposed change would severely fracture that relationship.

3. The proposed district is counter to the standards of a compact and contiguous territory. The proposed ADDISON-5 District creates a sprawling territory stretching from Monkton to New Haven to Waltham.

4. The Waltham BCA notes that the proposed district is reminiscent of some of the more questionably gerrymandered voting districts seen nationwide.

5. Although the idea of smaller districts consisting of a single representative may seem to provide equity statewide, the proposed ADDISON-5 District separates Waltham from our immediate community and further divides the surrounding communities.

**Rationale and comments:**

In summary, The Waltham BCA is opposed to the creation of an ADDISON-5 District. We have discussed the proposed district with the BCAs of our current five-town community and agree that the proposed elimination of the ADDISON-3 District is harmful to our communities and violates statutory requirements regarding reapportionment criteria.

The Waltham BCA unanimously and strongly recommends that our five-town, two-member legislative district remains intact.

## **Municipality: Warren**

Date the BCA Met: November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 9:25:16 AM

Form Submitted By: Reta K Goss, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WAS 11 and WAS 8, keeping as is WAS 7

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

NONE

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Please keep WAS 7 as it stands, see attached minutes in #10

### **Rationale and comments:**

Warren Board of Civil Authority

Tuesday November 9, 2021

Present were Chairman Margo Wade, Susan Bauchner, Camilla Behn, Luke Youmell, Andrew Cunningham, Reta Goss. Representative Maxine Grad joined the meeting via Zoom.

Meeting was called to order at 6PM by chairman Wade.

The Board discussed the new proposed representative districts and the calculations which lead to the new proposed configuration. Warren, Waitsfield and ¼ of Fayston would be a one-member district with population of 4,174, the apportionment boards ideal population being 4,287. The population of the current district (Fayston, Duxbury, Moretown, Warren and Waitsfield) would be 8,018 which is below the apportionment board's ideal population for a two member district of 8574.

The Fayston BCA is proposing the 5 towns remain a 2-member district which would keep Fayston undivided. Their second choice would be to have Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren become a one-member district.

Warren, Waitsfield and Fayston all belong to the Mad River Valley Planning District and the Mad River Valley Recreation District and therefore all have very similar needs and concerns. Fayston and Warren host ski areas while Waitsfield hosts the Mad River Valley's "down Town" business center.

Representative Grad added “that the districts should be created that preserve existing political boundary lines, recognize and maintain patterns of geography, social interaction, political ties and common interest and use compact, contiguous territory.”

The board felt that keeping the five towns together as a 2-member district was ideal but would also support a 1-member district including Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren.

After discussion, the Warren Board of Civil Authority voted to join Fayston in support of their proposal that would keep Fayston as a whole and either keep the existing 2-member district intact or form a new district with the three Mad River Valley towns of Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren.

Motion to adjourn at 6:15PM made and seconded.

Minutes reviewed and approved on November 11, 2021.

Respectfully submitted

Reta Goss

Warren Town Clerk

## **Municipality: Washington**

Date the BCA Met: 11/11/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/12/2021 3:16:06 PM

Form Submitted By: Peter A. Carbee, BCA

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ORA-4, ORA-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Please see comments

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Board of Civil Authority of the Town of Washington met on Nov 11, 2021, to review the Vermont Legislative Apportionment Board's maps and recommendations to the Vermont Legislature for the reapportionment of the Vermont House and Senate.

After substantial discussion (including mention of tar and feathers) the Washington BCA wishes to express our vehement disagreement with the Apportionment Board's plan to arbitrarily divide the Town of Washington between two Districts.

The primary objection to having Washington split is in the nature of the town itself. Geographically, the town is divided along a north and south axis by the Washington Heights. This divide is substantial enough that the Town needs to contract with two separate ambulance services as response times from the one service was endangering the population of south Washington. Additionally, those residents south of the Heights receive their mail from Chelsea. We feel that if the town becomes additionally severed on an east/west axis by the Legislature we may very well lose all semblance of being an integrated community.

Additionally, the mechanics of setting up two voter check lists, or requiring proof of street residency, or setting up and staffing a second polling place so that the voters in the "west" portion of town would be able to cast their votes within their election district, would exceed "difficult" and border on "impossible" for our town.



We fully understand the one person one vote constraints imposed upon the Apportionment Board, but after reviewing the numbers, we see no reason to split the town.

If Washington (in its entirety) were to be placed in District ORA-4, comprised of the towns of Chelsea, Corinth, Vershire, and Washington, the combined population would be 4392. This would represent a 2.4% positive deviation from the ideal of 4287. This would result in leaving District ORA-2 out of the 10% range. In addition to Williamstown's 3515 residents, ORA-2 would have to pull roughly 350 to 1200 residents from the neighboring towns of Barre Town, Brookfield, or Northfield.

As an alternative, Washington (in its entirety) could join Williamstown in ORA-2. The combined population of 4547 is still well within the range. In that case, the remaining ORA-4 would need to absorb approx. 500 residents from an adjoining town, possibly West Fairlee.

Also, at the meeting last night we reviewed the Senate Map proposals. While none of the proposed Senate districts were close to ideal, we felt that the Little proposal of August 24, linking our sleepy little town with the tourist meccas of Killington and Woodstock, to be the most unrealistic.

As a Board, we apologize for the short turnaround time for our comments to be considered in your deliberations. We were only recently apprised of the Nov. 15 deadline.

As a member of the Washington BCA, I expect to join your Monday meeting via Zoom, in order to answer any questions you may have concerning our objections to your plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Carbee

accuratecounts.vt@gmail.com

802 279 8457

## **Municipality: Waterbury**

Date the BCA Met: 11/04/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/9/2021 2:24:16 PM

Form Submitted By: Robert Dostis, Vice Chair of BCA

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

districts CHI-WAS-1 and WAS-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Waterbury BCA does not recommend keeping the district as proposed. We recommend keeping it as it currently is: Washington-Chittenden-1 , a two-member district that serves the entirety of the towns of Waterbury, Bolton, Buel's Gore and Huntington

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Waterbury Board of Civil Authority recommends that the proposed districts CHI-WAS-1 and WAS-1 be changed to its current configuration as the Washington-Chittenden District, a two-member district that serves the entirety of the towns of Waterbury, Bolton, Buel's Gore and Huntington. This recommendation was passed unanimously by the Waterbury Board of Civil Authority on November 4, 2021.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Waterbury Board of Civil Authority has these reasons for proposing this change:

Regarding the benefits of the current two-member district:

- Waterbury is well-served by the current two-member district.
- The current two-member district only deviates by 21 people from the ideal population numbers, while the proposed single-member districts proposed by the LAB each deviate by 7%.
- The shared two-member district with Huntington, Bolton and Buel's Gore has worked successfully for the past decade.

Regarding the single-member districts proposed by the Legislative Apportionment Board:

- The proposed division splits the town of Waterbury and places hundreds of Waterbury residents in a minority status in the CHI-WAS-1 District. A larger group of Waterbury residents would make this division more equal.

- The proposed division of Waterbury splits up neighborhoods, and disadvantages residents of those areas that end up in WAS-CHI-1. It also divides them from their historical and cultural connections in Waterbury.
- The portion of Waterbury chosen to be placed into WAS-CHI-1 has strong commonalities with the rest of the town of Waterbury
- Waterbury's decades-long challenge with seeing itself as a separate town and village, rather than as one community – a divisive issue only resolved by the dissolution of the village in 2018 – will be reactivated with the districts proposed by the LAB.
- The proposed division in the town of Waterbury appears to be drawn specifically to gerrymander Waterbury's incumbent representatives requiring that they run against each other if they seek reelection.

## **Municipality: WEATHERSFIELD**

Date the BCA Met: Tuesday, November 9, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 4:16:14 PM

Form Submitted By: FLO-ANN DANGO, TOWN CLERK

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Weathersfield, Cavendish adding Baltimore WSR-2 4463 - no changes

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Weathersfield, Cavendish adding Baltimore WSR-2 4463

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Weathersfield, Cavendish & Baltimore

### **Rationale and comments:**

The BCA has no problem with the proposed map by adding Baltimore to our district of WSR-2

## **Municipality: wells**

Date the BCA Met: 11/4/21

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 10:57:24 AM

Form Submitted By: nora sargent, town clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

rut-4 and ben-rut-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

#### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

wells will be split into rut-4 and ben -rut 2 we oppose this, The representative will logistically not be able to get to all the areas for meeting due to the splits but if you say split middletown by East/West street the representative will be able to hit all the meetings as you have to drive through middletown to get to Ira. The town of Wells is very small and we have a hard time staffing the elections as it is and we feel we will be incapable of staffing for two checklist and two ballots and feel this will be mass confusion for the folks based on the way the town will be split. We would prefer our town stay as one district. The way it is split that is most of our population so it does not make sense to split it up again we would prefer to stay as one district.

#### **Rationale and comments:**

wells will be split into rut-4 and ben -rut 2 we oppose this, The representative will logistically not be able to get to all the areas for meeting due to the splits but if you say split middletown by East/West street the representative will be able to hit all the meetings as you have to drive through middletown to get to Ira. The town of Wells is very small and we have a hard time staffing the elections as it is and we feel we will be incapable of staffing for two checklist and two ballots and feel this will be mass confusion for the folks based on the way the town will be split. We would prefer our town stay as one district. The way it is split that is most of our population so it does not make sense to split it up again we would prefer to stay as one district.

## **Municipality: West Rutland**

Date the BCA Met: November 8,2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 1:16:02 PM

Form Submitted By: Christine Wener, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

RUT-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

RUT-2

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

West Rutland would like to keep our district as it is with Two representatives.

### **Rationale and comments:**

keeping it would give us more contacts in Montpelier and for questions we may have to either one of them.

## **Municipality: WESTMINSTER**

Date the BCA Met: NOVEMBER 1, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/2/2021 4:00:52 PM

Form Submitted By: TOBY YOUNG, BCA MEMBER, SELECTBOARD MEMBER, FORMER STATE REPRESENTATIVE

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WDM-6

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WE DO NOT RECOMMEND KEEPING DISTRICT WDM-6 AS PROPOSED.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

WE ARE PROPOSING TO KEEP OUR CURRENT DISTRICT WDH-4 AS IT NOW STANDS WITH THE ADDITION OF THE ENTIRE VILLAGE OF NORTH WESTMINSTER PLUS THE ENTIRE TOWN OF BROOKLINE. WE SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION OF TWO MEMBER REPRESENTATION. THIS MODEL HAS PROVIDED GREATER ACCESSIBILITY AND SUPPORT TO THE CONSTITUENTS OF THE DISTRICT.

### **Rationale and comments:**

WE BELIEVE THAT THE COMMITTEE HAS FAILED TO RECOGNIZE THE PATTERNS OF SOCIAL INTERACTION, POLITICAL TIES AND COMMON INTEREST. THE CONFIGURATION THAT WESTMINSTER HAS PROPOSED KEEPS THE TOWNS COMPACT AND CONTINUOUS WITH SHARED BORDERS AS THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SEEKS TO MAINTAIN.

## **Municipality: Westmore**

Date the BCA Met: Nov. 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/14/2021 6:07:21 PM

Form Submitted By: Linda Michhnewicz, BCA Designee

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

ORL ESX 1 and ORL 4

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Recommended District would be ORL 4 which would include the towns of Barton, Glover and Westmore

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Town of Westmore Board of Civil Authority is submitting our feedback and recommendation to the proposed House District Map by the Legislative Apportionment Board. After reviewing the proposed district map, we are recommending that Westmore be moved from ORL ESX-1 to ORL 4. Our recommendation is based on the common interest Westmore shares with Barton and Glover, the two towns in the proposed ORL 4 district. Those common interests include emergency services; public schools; economic and mutual government services including, as examples, public utilities, retail, banking, fuel, libraries, senior citizen services. Westmore does not have the municipal infrastructure to support these services and relies on the Barton and Glover communities to provide these vital services to our residents. Westmore does not have these strong connections to the towns in ORL ESX-1, and the geography of the region prohibits easy access to those communities.

The Westmore BCA has the "local knowledge" to advise the Legislative Apportionment Board in determining the best placement for the town in the proposed House Districts.



## **Municipality: Weston**

Date the BCA Met: October 21 and 26, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/5/2021 10:29:15 AM

Form Submitted By: Kim Seymour, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-RUT

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Weston Board of Civil Authority proposes a different configuration of the House District. We recommend combining the towns of Weston, Londonderry, Winhall, Landgrove and Peru as shown on the table.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Re: District BEN-RUT

The Weston Board of Civil Authority has met and considered the proposed BEN-RUT House District, which would combine Weston with Mount Tabor, Dorset and Danby. The Board strongly disagrees with the proposal.

We have been guided by the provision in the Vermont Constitution which provides: “In establishing representative districts, which shall afford equality of representation, the General Assembly shall seek to maintain geographical compactness and contiguity...” – Chapter II, §13, Vt. Constitution

There is further guidance from the Vermont State Archives and Records Administration; “Apart from conforming to the mathematical standard of equal representation, districts also should be compact and contiguous. The towns comprising a district should share borders and otherwise be geographically proximate to one another”.

The proposed BEN-RUT District does not conform to these criteria.

The Town of Weston and the Towns of Mount Tabor and Danby may appear to “share borders and be geographically proximate to one another” on a map, but the reality is that there is no road connection between Weston and Mount Tabor and thus no way to go through Mount Tabor to get to Danby.

The road connection between Mount Tabor and Danby is described on the Green Mountain National Forest website as “Danby-Mount Tabor Road: This road is also known as Forest Road 10 and it travels east from Danby / Mt. Tabor over the Green Mountains to the Peru / Londonderry area. Along this road, built by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930’s, there are several vistas and a picnic area, the Big Branch Day Use Area. Plenty of wildlife viewing opportunities can be found traveling along this forested road. (Closed in winter).

From the website <http://distancescalculator.com> › Vermont › Weston

“The straight distance between Weston, VT and Danby, VT is 13.35 mi, but the driving distance is 31.94 mi. It takes 1 hour 3 mins to go from Weston, Vermont to Danby.”

The proposed BEN-RUT District of Weston, Mount Tabor, Danby and Dorset is neither compact or contiguous.

The Weston Board of Civil Authority proposes a different configuration of the House District. We recommend combining the towns of Weston, Londonderry, Winhall, Landgrove and Peru as shown on this table.

LAB recommendation		Weston BCA recommendation	
Town	Population	Town	Population
WESTON	623	WESTON	623
MOUNT TABOR	210	LONDONDERRY	1919
DORSET	2123	LANDGROVE	177
DANBY	1284	PERU	531
TOTAL 4240	WINHALL	1182	
	TOTAL 4432		

Rationale for the BCA recommended House District:

The five towns that make up the recommended House District are contiguous, geographically compact, afford equality of representation and share common services, schools, health care and public services.

- Winhall shares a common border with Londonderry and along with Londonderry has been a part of the current Windham-Bennington-Windsor District along with Weston since the 2000 Census.

- Education -- Weston, Londonderry, Landgrove and Peru are together served by the Flood Brook Union School. (Winhall's private Mountain School was founded in 1998.)
- Health care – Primary care for the five towns that comprise the recommended district is centered on the Mountain Valley Health Center in Londonderry.
- Recycling and transfer – Weston, Londonderry, Peru and Landgrove are together served by the Recycling and Transfer Station in Londonderry.

As the table shows, the BCA Recommended District adds 192 more individuals to the district population than the LAB recommendation, bringing the population to 4,432. This is 4.47% above the idealized sized district of 4,287 but well within the standard of substantial equality. As noted in the Criteria section of the State Archives and Records website, districts that “have an overall deviation of 10% or less are considered to have met the standard of substantial equality”.

For all of these reasons, the Weston Board of Civil Authority respectfully urges the Legislative Apportionment Board t

## **Municipality: Whiting**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/3/2021 10:27:37 AM

Form Submitted By: Heather Bouchard, Town Clerk/Treasurer

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

We feel that the new proposal will be beneficial for Whiting.

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Whiting would like to see the new proposal for Whiting to go forward.

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

N/A

### **Rationale and comments:**

The new proposal honors the Cultural, Geography, Intact School District and Town/County lines .

We feel that they should try to split as few Town's as possible.

## **Municipality: Williamstown**

Date the BCA Met: October 27, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 10/31/2021 2:59:24 PM

Form Submitted By: Barbara Graham, Town Clerk

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Orange 2

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

After much discussion, the majority of the BCA felt a one member district was the way to go.

**Rationale and comments:**

BCA feels that the district as proposed would have better representation.

## **Municipality: Williston**

Date the BCA Met: 11/08/2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 4:23:50 PM

Form Submitted By: Sarah Mason, Town Clerk on behalf of BCA Chair

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

CHI-13-1, CHI-13-2, CHI-12-5

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

None

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

One district with two representatives comprised of as many Williston residents as statistically possible.

Proposed District CHI-12-5 be reconfigured with towns within our consolidated unified school district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

Legislative Apportionment Board

128 State Street

Montpelier, Vermont 05633-1101

The Williston Board of Civil Authority (BCA) met on November 8, 2021 to review the proposal from the Legislative Apportionment Board (LAB) for the Legislative District currently known as CHI-2. Williston is currently one district with two representatives covering the entirety of the town.

The 2021 LAB proposes:

(a) that Williston become two new districts (CHI-13-1 and CHI-13-2), each with one representative; and

(b) that a third, newly formed district (CHI-12-5), consisting of approximately 1,680 Williston residents, be shared with the City of South Burlington.

While the BCA understands that due to population growth, there is no longer a path forward for Williston to remain one district with two representatives, sharing a district

with another municipality represents a major change for the approximately 1,680 (displaced) Williston residents who will no longer be included in CHI-2.

Upon careful reflection, neither proposal presented by LAB is satisfactory to the Williston BCA.

Specifically, the Williston BCA desires:

1. That Williston remain a single, two-member district comprised of as many Williston residents as is statistically possible; and
2. That displaced residents, who cannot Constitutionally remain part of the voting district, be absorbed by a neighboring town which shares the same sense of community, the same school district, and other similar geo-political ideologies as Williston. With reference to the statutory factors set forth in 17 VSA §1903(b), Williston has a long-established sense of community and shares ideologies with the other four towns making up the Champlain Valley School District (CVSD). Conversely, Williston does not have a level of community connection with, nor does it share resources (such as a local library) with the City of South Burlington. As would be expected, So. Burlington has its own non-consolidated school system and the two communities share few county resources. Williston citizens/residents/voters are typically not acquainted with whomever is running for office in So. Burlington and they may not follow, or agree with, the politics of a city double the size of Williston.

In summary, the Williston BCA desires that the newly formed district consisting of Williston residents (currently conceptualized as CHI-12-5) be comprised of citizens who share similar, basic common interests and goals, including a consolidated school district, a library, a zip code and other social geographical commonalities. Aligning such communities will create a more cohesive and inclusive district; one that will reflect many commonalities among the citizens who will form a welcoming unit moving forward with the years of continued population growth to come in both Williston and its neighboring towns. Of note, prior to the configuration of the current districting, Williston has shared a representative within our unified school district.

After applying the factors of 17 VSA §1903(b), and after much discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded, and approved by 13 members of the Williston Board of Civil Authority:

That the Board of Civil Authority make a recommendation to the Legislative Apportionment Board and the House Government Operations Committee that: a) the Town of Williston remain a single district with two representatives; and b) the proposed

district CHI-12-5 be altered to be comprised of a newly formed group of citizens from the same unified school district (CVSD) and other shared resources between our consolidated school communities.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Andy Mikell

Chair, Williston Board of Civil Authority



## **Municipality: Windsor**

Date the BCA Met: November 8, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 9:17:21 AM

Form Submitted By: Amy McMullen, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WSR-9 and WSR-8

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Does not recommend WSR-9 and WSR-8

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The Windsor Board of Civil Authority encourages the creation of Windsor and the entirety of West Windsor as a single Representative district. (attachment emailed 11/15/2021)

### **Rationale and comments:**

1. The Windsor BCA recognizes that Windsor plus West Windsor has been a single Representative district in the past.
2. Windsor and West Windsor have strong community ties as well as sharing municipal services including police, fire, emergency response and a shared wastewater disposal system.
3. Windsor and West Windsor recently formed the Mount Ascutney School District, further strengthening community ties.
4. Attachment emailed 11/15/2021

## **Municipality: Winhall**

Date the BCA Met: November 1 , 2021 @ 9AM

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 12:43:48 PM

Form Submitted By: Elizabeth Grant, Town Clerk/ BCA Clerk/ Town Treasurer

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

**District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

**Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Winhall-1182, Londonderry-1919, Peru-531, Stratton-440, Landgrove-177=4249 for total population of our preferred District

**Rationale and comments:**

The BCA decided these towns align the best with one another and also stay within the recommended population numbers.

## **Municipality: Winooski**

Date the BCA Met: October 27, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/2/2021 9:09:59 AM

Form Submitted By: Carol Barrett, City Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Chittenden 11-1 and Chittenden 11-2

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

Chittenden (11-1) 2 member district

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Referenced in Title 17 Chapter 34 Section 1893

Previously, City of Winooski and a portion of the City of Burlington not included in Chittenden 6-1; 6-2; 6-3; 6-4; 6-5;, or 6-6. See Exhibit 1, 2 and 3; have allowed us to maintain two legislative representatives

The Winooski Board of Civil Authority unanimously requests to remain a single two-member district, which only includes Winooski residents.

### **Rationale and comments:**

In our condensed City, we have one polling place. There are concerns of additional administrative burdens, costs and staffing if two polling places need to be maintained. Two separate districts would also divide inequities in our City and possibly appear to discriminate. Issues pertaining to but not limited to representation of all residents, legislator candidate availability, and housing. It has been determined that the west side of Winooski has increased poverty levels. In March 2022, Winooski will to be the first City implementing all citizen voting and are doing our best to navigate through this new process.

## **Municipality: Wolcott**

Date the BCA Met: November 3, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/4/2021 9:27:56 AM

Form Submitted By: Belinda Harris Clegg, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

Wolcott has been happy in a two member district. Wolcott would be happy in a district with Elmore and Morrystown titled LAM-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

No

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

We recommend the a district named LAM-3 which would be Wolcott, Elmore and Morrystown be a two member district.

### **Rationale and comments:**

We have had 2 members of the Legislator represent us for a while. We as a town have reached out to both representatives many times and had positive representation. We would like to keep this.

## **Municipality: Woodbury**

Date the BCA Met: Oct 20, Nov 8, & Nov12 (all by emails)

Date of Form Submission: 11/15/2021 12:03:22 PM

Form Submitted By: Robin Durkee, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

WAS-3

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

WAS-3

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

Woodbury has more common interests & concerns with Calais & Worcester than with Elmore & Morrisville.

### **Rationale and comments:**

This change make sense with all the Towns being on the same side of the mountain.

WAS-3

## **Municipality: Woodford**

Date the BCA Met: November 2, 2021

Date of Form Submission: 11/13/2021 2:03:43 PM

Form Submitted By: Susan Wright, Town Clerk

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends changing:**

BEN-WDM-1

### **District(s) reviewed that the BCA recommends keeping as proposed:**

### **Description of District(s) recommended to be changed:**

The BCA Board prefers these towns to be in a shared district:

Woodford (355), Glastenbury(9), Somerset(6), Searsburg(126), Readsboro(702), Halifax(771), Whitingham(1344), Wardsboro(869) for a total population of 4182.

### **Rationale and comments:**

The Woodford BCA submits these reasons for the reapportionment of these towns:

-All listed towns are mountain towns

-Most of these towns have the same municipal services

-These towns would share similar local and state issues and concerns

-Representation would be more uniform if the representative is addressing shared concerns and issues instead of

completely different ones for each town.

-The total population of these towns is closer to the State's ideal sized district than the proposed district