

**SPECIAL MEETING
SPECIAL REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE
(PUBLIC HEARING)**

August 30, 2001

6:00 PM

Chairman Rivard called the special meeting to order.

Chairman Rivard called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Fern Gelinas.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Bob Rivard, Fern Gelinas, William Gardner (late)

Chairman Rivard advised that the purpose of the special meeting is to provide citizens an opportunity to express their views concerning a proposed amendment to the Manchester City Charter to adjust the boundaries of the City's 12 wards; that anyone wishing to speak must first step to the nearest microphone when recognized and recite his/her name and address in a clear, loud voice for the record; that each person will be given only one opportunity to speak; and any questions must be directed to the Chair.

The Clerk presented the proposed amendment to the Manchester City Charter:

The proposed amendment to provide for the adjustments to the boundaries for the City's 12 wards is summarized/explained below, and the summary/explanation is followed by the actual text of Charter Section 5.33 Wards as proposed.

SHALL THE CITY OF MANCHESTER APPROVE THE AMENDMENT OF THE CHARTER TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY'S 12 WARDS AS SUMMARIZED AND EXPLAINED BELOW?

SUMMARY/EXPLANATION: Section 5.33 of the City Charter describes the perimeter boundaries of the 12 wards that make up the City of Manchester. The proposed changes adjust these ward boundary lines to account for population changes identified in the 2000 census and in accordance with the principle of "one man/one

vote". In addition to adjusting the ward boundaries, the proposed amendment provides that a list of all roads and streets contained in each ward shall be kept current and on file in the Office of the City Clerk. If you favor this proposal, vote YES; if you do not favor it, vote NO.

Tenure of Office. This Charter amendment shall take effect June 1, 2002. When this Charter amendment takes effect the incumbents of all elected officials shall continue to hold the same until the expiration of their respective terms.

Chairman Rivard stated before we take the first speaker I just want to take a couple of minutes and tell you what I think happened here and what we attempted to do and then we will move on. It is my understanding that the Constitution requires us to reorganize or redraw ward lines every 10 years and it is something that apparently this City is required to do and none of the members, including the late arrival of Billy Gardner, volunteered for. We were drafted somehow and we accepted the job. We had a few simple things to do I thought and what it was was really to redraw the ward lines and make them as pure and close to our goals as possible. It is a pretty simple exercise. If you have too many people in one ward, you have to take some out. If you have too few people in one ward, you have to try to add to it. The magic number was 8,989 in most cases and we attempted to accomplish that by moving numbers around and when you start off you will notice that in Ward 1 they were 1,100 people short. There were 115 too many in Ward 2. There were 522 too many in Ward 3. The closest ward was Ward 4 where we only had 31 too few. In Ward 5 we had to pick up 144. In Ward 6 we had to reduce it by 1,689. We had to add 802 to Ward 7. We had 100 more in Ward 8 than we needed. We had 329 less in Ward 9. On the West Side we had 338 more in Ward 10, 398 more in Ward 11 and 738 too many in Ward 12. So it was a pretty simple exercise. If you have too many you have to give it up and if you don't have enough we are going to try to help you out. There is no magic formula here. The goal was to keep it within the 1.5% margin that is allowable and Mr. Gardner can answer that question because he is the gentleman who has the numbers. If you look at it, when you go across the bottom all of our goals, I believe, were met. Before I recognize the first speaker I want to thank Fern Gelinis and Bill Gardner for the time they put in on this little exercise and Frank Thomas and his staff who worked many, many hours on this. We couldn't have done it without them because it was an engineering type project that required engineers and computers and stuff we didn't have. I would like to thank Leo Bernier and his office who were very helpful and last but not least those people who ran around the City and took the census and gave us all those census blocks that created this exercise and brought us here this evening. With that, I want to thank you folks for being here this evening.

Chairman Rivard called for those wishing to express their views.

Benjamin Baroody, 1181 Bridge Street, Manchester stated:

First of all, I know that this has been a pretty tough job for you. Thank you for your efforts. I know it must have been a lot of long hours and burning eyes going over the numbers and the lines and everything. I am a State Representative from Ward 6 and I have a lot of constituents there who I would like to speak for, especially in the area of our voting place, which is St. Pius Church. A lot of these people are being taken out of our ward. I grew up in Ward 6 on Bridge Street Extension. This has always been part of the ward. That is the old neighborhood. I know that we have had a lot of growth in Ward 6 both on Bodwell Road and off of Wellington Road. In speaking for the old neighborhood that we would like to preserve, we are taking people out of Ward 6 right now who can actually walk to the poll. We have people on both ends of the ward and I believe Ward 6 area wise is perhaps two or three times bigger than any other ward so we have a big area that we cover but the people over on Cohas Avenue and Wellington Road have quite a distance to travel to the polls who are staying in Ward 6 and the people who could actually walk to the polls are being taken out. It is a concern for them and like I said it is an old established neighborhood and there are a lot of elderly people there who I am sure wouldn't want to be disturbed and I wouldn't want to see them disturbed. Also what we are doing with this present plan is we are taking out our last public building, Weston School. Ward 6, I don't believe, will have a public building in it. If St. Pius decides next time around not to let us vote there, where are we going to vote? We won't have a school that is actually in our district. I don't have all of the numbers and you do and I know that it has been a tough job but I think that looking at the area of Eastern Avenue where there are a lot of condominiums and apartments and I believe a 1,500 people live in that area and it is only one or two streets and I would suggest that you look at that and try to replace them. I don't know how many people are on Bodwell Road, which is close to Ward 7 – at least 800 people. I just think that if we took another look at Ward 6 it would be helpful to the people in our community and our area.

Robert Rowe, 18 Jones Road, Amherst, NH stated:

I am really here as an observer as a member of the redistricting committee in Concord for the House of Representatives. I am one of the two representatives from Hillsborough County. I was more concerned with how the representatives are going to be dispersed among 12 wards. It is unfortunate that Manchester is dropping from 36 to 35 representatives. Obviously 12 goes into 36 much easier than 12 goes into 35. There is a concern among our committee that they would like to minimize the floatorial districts and what I am concerned about is how they are going to be divided in Manchester although our committee has nothing to do with ward lines. I guess my question is has any consideration been given to

redividing the wards into 14 wards rather than 12 wards? Obviously that would only give us one floatorial district with 34 representatives being in the 14 wards.

Chairman Rivard stated consideration was given at the beginning of our committee meetings and we voted to run with the 12 ward concept because we believed it would be the least disruptive for the City of Manchester and that we could deal with the State Representatives situation differently with floating type districts as you said where you would have one represent one or two wards. We haven't really got to that yet but we did think about having 14 wards and we decided on 12.

Mr. Rowe asked when will you be giving us your plans as to the floatorial district.

Chairman Rivard answered I really haven't given it that much thought. We were trying to get the district lines resolved first and once we get that approved...there aren't many options. There are three or four options only. We are going to have to do something with 11 representatives. How we decide to do that we really haven't spent a lot of time on because we have been trying to get this plan done.

Mr. Rowe replied I thought that it had been settled at this stage.

Chairman Rivard responded I have not discussed that with anybody. We thought that we would do the district lines first.

Mr. Gelinas stated if we decided on 12 wards, that is it.

Chairman Rivard stated there are a lot of schemes to get this thing to work. Again, I am sure some people might like it and some might not. I guess the ultimate power in that particular exercise lies in Concord, I think. Isn't that true? I am not an expert but Mr. Gardner could probably answer that.

Mr. Gardner stated it was their choice that the City remain at 12 wards. Some numbers had been offered like 7 wards or 14 wards and a few people had thought about maybe changing the number of wards but the Aldermanic Board decided that they were going to ask this committee to do the redistricting based on 12 wards. We were doing what we were asked to do. If the decision is 12 wards then you and your committee will then have to decide how you are going to divide Manchester with 12 wards and get 35 representatives. It will be your call.

Mr. Rowe replied it was my understanding that the control of the redistricting of a City is within the City. We have no control over that. As to apportioning the...and I also thought that the decision of apportioning representatives among the wards was with the City. I may be wrong.

Mr. Gardner responded the City Charter states how many wards there will be and the City Charter currently says there will be 12 wards and describes the boundaries of the 12 wards. The proposal that is being heard this evening will keep the same number of wards and change the description of the boundaries but if this proposal gets to the ballot and the people of Manchester approve it, Manchester will have 12 wards of roughly equal population and then your committee will have to decide how you are going to take 35 representatives and fit them within the 12 wards and there are a number of different ways that can be done but it is going to be your call to decide how to do it. You can't amend the City Charter. Only the voters of the City can so if Manchester decides to stay at 12 wards, you are going to have to work with that number when you decide what kind of districts you are going to make in Manchester.

Raymond Buckley, 24 Gabrielle Street, Manchester stated:

I am on the legislative redistricting committee as a member of the Executive Committee and I believe I am the only one from Hillsborough County. First I want to start off by obviously expressing my appreciation and gratitude for the amount of effort and work that Chairman Rivard and Bill Gardner and Fern Gelinis put into this and Frank Thomas as well. It is hard work and it is not always an easy thing to do. Before I get into what I wanted to discuss I want to just touch on what my colleague just spoke on. The House Legislative Redistricting Committee has not voted to apportion 35 members to Manchester so not only is it not in the purview of this Committee but your task is simply to divide up Manchester by wards. It is not to actually address the apportioning. What we will be doing is apportioning the House seats per ward and then the other configuration. What this Redistricting Committee did is divide up the wards themselves and make them as fair as possible. With that, it would be impossible for you to have devised a plan on 35 representatives because we have yet to tell you whether Manchester is going to retain 36 or if it is going to have 35. We could have House District 6 include Bedford or include Litchfield or include Goffstown because they are bordering communities in the county. Please don't think that you need something more on your plate to do. Actually at first glance when you look at the numbers as configured here it looks great. The fact that out of a population of 107,000, approximately 5,500 are being shifted from one ward to another. When you are looking at the numbers, if you look at it this way, it is like hey you guys did a pretty awesome job but it is not just numbers. Those actually represent people. What I thought would be important for the public record would be to talk a little bit about what interest is in there and I know that I came to your first organizational meeting months ago and I thought it would be important to include the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which really governs a lot of what we do. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a civil rights legislation that was adopted to insure that minority voters have an opportunity to participate in the

electoral process and elect candidates of their choice free of discrimination. The Act contains two principal sections. Section II, which applies to all jurisdictions and Section IV, which only applies to certain jurisdictions and we don't have to deal with the preclearance here in Manchester. There are communities in New Hampshire that have to have preclearance. Section II, which governs all, says "prohibits abridgement of the right to vote for reasons of race, color or membership in a language minority group." Generally challenges under Section II involve claims that minority voting rights have been diminished either by fragmenting minority populations among different districts, over concentrating minorities in one or more districts or placing a minority group in a large multi-member district. While intentional discrimination against minorities clearly violates Section II of the Voting Act, it is not necessary to prove that a redistricting plan was adopted with a discriminatory intent in order for the plan to be found in violation. If a plan has a practical effect of denying minorities an effective means of participating in the political process, the plan violates the Act. What I would like to do is share with you what we passed in the House with the redistricting committee just days ago. Our general criteria for redistricting is: 1) one person, one vote; 2) convenient contiguous territory; 3) voting strength of racial or language minorities not diluted; 4) no town or ward divided; and 5) County Commissioners and House of Representatives within county lines. The second part is criteria applicable to redistricting plans for the NH Housing County Commissioner. It says: 1) regardless of the office of which a redistricting plan is considered, no town or ward will be divided; 2) redistricting for the NH House seats will be done by the County and House District and will not cross county lines; 3) districts should not dilute the voting strength of racial or language minorities; 4) districts should be composed of convenient contiguous territories; and 5) districts should be drawn in such a manner as to adhere to the one person, one vote principal. Then specifically dealing with House Legislative seats it is: 1) districts should be substantially equal in population; 2) population of a district should not deviate from the ideal by more than 5% plus or minus and the ideal population for each House district is 3,089; 3) districts shall be composed of convenient contiguous territory and contiguity by water is sufficient if the water is not a serious obstacle to travel within the district; 4) districts should not dilute the voting strength of racial or language minorities; 5) districts should attempt to preserve communities of interest. That was actually deleted but I do want to talk about that. In most State plans, they have a portion where they talk about communities of interest and although we don't specifically have that laid out in what the House passed, that doesn't necessarily mean that the Senate isn't going to pass their version with that criteria. What that is is when we take a look at putting together our districts and I thought it was important and that is why I thought I expressed it in June that when you took a look at the wards you look at the similarities of interest of the citizens in that particular ward. The similarities of interest can include social interests, cultural, racial, ethnic and economic interests.

If you really take a look at...first I have to apologize because this would be a lot easier if the Legislative Committee has moved forward and purchased the software that is readily available. It is not going to be available to us for a few weeks. There is the technology to instantly show you a map of the economic breakdowns and all of the other different cultural breakdowns that the census has. Unfortunately we couldn't share that with you because there was a serious mishap at the State House. When we talk about the communities of interest and what I thought was interesting was when you look at the West Side, which is essentially a community of interest, that is pretty much preserved under your plan. You look at the North End and that is pretty much preserved. When I noticed in the paper the other day the fact that when you look at the map there is still that, and this was my concern earlier, that the essential area of Ward 3 and the West Side of Ward 5 which have a distinct cultural...they were at one time a singular ward prior to the 1970 redistricting plan, they have a distinct natural cultural togetherness. That was the place where immigrants came into and that is why I mentioned at your first meeting in June that you should take a look at that and take it into consideration. Whether or not our ward lines have actually fallen into compliance with the Voters Rights Act, nobody has challenged that but at the end of that sentence is the word "yet." I would hope that we would have somebody take a look at this who is an expert on that to see if we are setting ourselves up for a challenge. One thing that I think could be a very serious and drastic challenge is of the 103 elected officials here in the City of Manchester, only one is an African American and as was noted in the newspaper last Friday that one African American seems to be placed in a different ward. That could be something that would be a very serious legal challenge to the entire plan. I would think that as you move forward you also take a look at Ward 6. Just as you preserved the North End and just as you preserved the West Side, I think what happened in that central area, the heart of what many of us think of as Ward 6, seems to have been dramatically changed. If there is another way of taking a look at that, I certainly would appreciate it. The bottom line is by the numbers you guys did an awesome job. I think everybody should be very appreciative of the amount of work and effort that it takes to do this. I would hope that this isn't an end result but a working document that can be looked at and discussed as a community and that this is considered a first step. I know that the Board does have to adopt it fairly soon and that we have to have this placed on the ballot and ready for the absentees for the general election but I would hope that you take into consideration some of the comments that have been made this evening and maybe see if there is any way of revisiting some of it. In closing, when you take a look at the numbers themselves, I think you guys did a remarkable job of trying to bring it in with the deviation being at a very low level. I think you should be very proud of that effort. Thank you.

Kathy Sullivan, 192 South Mammoth Road, Manchester stated:

I, too, would like to reiterate some of the prior comments regarding some of the hard work that you have all put into this. I know that it is a difficult job and it is a thankless task because no matter what you came up with, somebody was going to have a complaint but you knew that going in. Thank you, though, for your hard work. Two issues, which are very similar to the issues raised by Representative Buckley that I want to address have to do with the Ward 5/Ward 4 issue with Representative Lionel Johnson. As Representative Buckley stated, out of over 100 elected officials in Manchester we have only one African American and putting aside legal issues and all the rest of that, it is a question of what is right.

Manchester, I like to think of and it has become over the years a very welcoming diverse community. Most of us sitting in the room are here because our grandparents or great grandparents immigrated from someplace else. It is a mix of racial and ethnic diversity and that is a great thing. That is what makes Manchester in great part unique from the rest of the State of New Hampshire with the exception of perhaps Nashua. I would like the message to be from Manchester that we welcome diversity and if we take away Representative Johnson's district from him the message we are sending is not that we are welcoming. The message we are sending is not a very good one. It is just not a good message that we are sending out to the people. Putting that aside, Representative Johnson is one of the good guys. I mean he works hard and represents his constituents. He doesn't ask anybody for anything for himself. He does a really good job and I just think it would be unfortunate to take someone like that out of his district when he has done a good job for the people in his district. The second issue does have to do with Ward 6. Again, I understand that it is difficult to do these ward lines. When I first came back to Manchester after graduate school I lived on Webster Street and one election I voted in Ward 1 and a few months later at the Presidential Primary I voted in Ward 3. When my husband and I bought our house on South Mammoth Road we were in Ward 6 and the next election we ended up being in Ward 8. I understand that those things happen but with respect to Ward 6, there is a natural neighborhood there. I grew up on Island Pond Road and have family who still live there. I went to the same church where the voting place is when I was a child. A lot of the people go to the same schools and have the same interests. It is that whole area that is bounded by Mammoth and Candia Roads going out towards 293. It used to be Cochas, but now it is really Island Pond Road and the reservoir area. That is a neighborhood. You drive around there and that is a neighborhood. You want to talk about commonality of interest, that is a neighborhood. If you specifically look at Island Pond Road for example, the section of Island Pond Road between Mammoth and that natural geographic boundary, 293, is half a mile. The plan that is being presented here breaks Island Pond Road up so you end up having maybe .2 miles in Ward 7 and .3 miles in Ward 6. That is a small road to break up like that. There are only 18 houses that are actually located on

Island Pond Road and Bill you know this because you grew up in that area. There are four sub-divisions located off of Island Pond Road. Again, all of those subdivisions access on Island Pond Road. Unless you go east on Island Pond Road, the only other way of getting out of there is if you go down over Cohas. That is a neighborhood. It is the same street that is used, the same water pipes and sewer pipes. If there is a movement for sidewalks, it is going to benefit everybody on that street and in those subdivisions. There is no natural geographic boundary that breaks up Island Pond Road. Now I understand that there is a paper street that is on the plan that extends from Benjamin to the north but that street is not there. It is a wooded area. It is not going to be built. At least I would be surprised if it were built. There is no natural, geographic break. That is a neighborhood and just as you tried so hard to work with the West Side to keep that traditional West Side three Aldermen representation and three wards, I think it is only fair to give the same type of consideration to that section of Manchester, the east Section of Manchester, with Ward 6. In addition to that, there are a lot of people there who have voted in that ward forever. Like I said I grew up on that road. My father has voted in Ward 6 for over 50 years. That is a neighborhood. When you have people with that type of investment in the area and that type of history in the neighborhood to break them up into pieces just doesn't make sense. I understand that it is a question of engineering and moving some lines around, but I think you have to take the engineering and put a dose of human engineering into it as well, not just drawing lines, to see what common interests draw people together. I would just ask you not to break up that neighborhood, especially when you look at the results of what Representative Baroody said people today who can walk to St. Pius Church and vote and yet you are going to take them out but at the same time you are keeping people in who live so far away out in the Bodwell Road area or going to the north in the other direction. Let's try to keep that neighborhood together and keep it as one ward. From an Aldermanic representation standpoint, it only makes sense to have one Alderman representing that area. I would ask you to reconsider that...and I know that there are people here and I talked to Donna Soucy about this earlier who will be more than happy to go down and talk to Frank Thomas if possible to look at some of the engineering and work with the software that he has to see if there is some tinkering that could be done to perhaps just move some of these things around and keep those neighborhoods together. I know that Frank does a great job and I think that he may be able to find an answer to this particular dilemma.

Donna Soucy, 91 Alexander Drive, Manchester stated:

I don't want to repeat a lot of the things that other people have said this evening but first I would like to thank all of you for the work that you did. No matter how many people are here speaking in favor of or in support of the proposal, everyone respects the fact that this was a difficult task and that the end result given the numbers was a success. The problem is that the numbers don't really talk about

the identity of Manchester. As Kathy Sullivan said, you worked very hard and had a principal from the beginning that you would retain the Merrimack River as a dividing line to keep the three wards on the West Side intact. I wholeheartedly support that. I think everyone supports that and thinks that was a great idea and fortunately mathematically there was just enough room to allow us to continue to do that in Manchester. There are wards in Manchester that have a specific identity. Ward 3 is the downtown ward. Everyone refers to Ward 3 as the downtown ward. Ward 5 is the inner City ward. Ward 5 is the ward where immigrants and new people coming into the City often land and then move on afterwards but it is sort of the welcoming ward to a lot of our immigrants. Ward 1 is the North End ward. Each ward in this City has a distinct identity and I believe that Ward 6 also has a distinct identity. The problem with the proposal here before us tonight is that although mathematically it works, it ignores that distinct identity. The heart and the soul of Ward 6 is the area around the polling place. It is the oldest part of the ward. It is the part of the ward where people have lived for 40 or 50 years. A second generation is moving into that area of the ward and it is the people who most closely identify themselves with Ward 6. Now I understand that Ward 6 has grown more than any other ward. Ward 6 is going to lose. Ward 6 under any scenario loses people. That is fine. I accept that but I guess I have difficulty in understanding why the people who have the most vested interest and the people who have the clearest identity with the ward are the people who are being removed. There are people on either end of the ward...the ward land wise is enormous. There are people in the northern part of it and people in the southern part of it who are newer people to the community. They are newer developments. I realize those are large numbers, but I don't think those people have the same relationship and the same feeling about Ward 6. I don't think those people are the identity of Ward 6. I am more than willing to work with any of you to offer any suggestions. I just hope that as you said earlier you will listen to some of the comments that are made this evening and that this isn't your final proposal. I hope you take one last look at trying to retain what I believe is a community in and of itself that shouldn't be split in half. Thank you.

Alderman Real Pinard, 1784 Candia Road, Manchester stated:

First of all I would like to thank the Committee – Bill, Fern and Bob for the outstanding job. I know that we don't agree on everything and this is one that I don't agree fully with. You have taken Ward 6 and you are breaking up a neighborhood in five different categories. I don't know how familiar you are with Ward 6, but the particular area around the church and I just got done passing out 600 leaflets to those houses but to take Ward 6 and break it out into seniors and juniors and whatever else...Bodwell Road is probably the area that is perhaps 35 to 45 years old. Wellington Road is about the same. To take the heart of Candia Road to Hanover Street and up Alexander Drive and in that area, it is mostly senior citizens and I was talking to a lot of them yesterday. They don't want to

move. They have been there for years. Henry Sullivan, a good friend of mine, has lived on Island Pond Road for years and always voted and ran for Governor in Ward 6. All I am asking the Committee to do is take another look at Ward 6. I know that the government says one person, one vote, but you have to look at it the people's way. I think the people should have a choice. Like I said I passed out 600 leaflets. There were four of us from Ward 6. That is discouraging but some of us have to stand up and bring this message to you. I want to again thank you for your fine work.

Billy Dodd, 181 Mammoth Road, Manchester stated:

Thank you guys for the work that you did. I know it was a hard job. I am probably one of the most affected people by this redistricting. I have to come up and ask exactly the basis of the one person, one vote rule. Is there a certain number of people that the state representatives are supposed to represent? Like for every 2,500 people in a ward there is one state representative? How does that work?

Mr. Gardner stated I believe it is 3,089. For every 3,089 there will be one state representative.

Mr. Dodd asked and the state representatives are elected by the wards that we have in the City here.

Mr. Gardner answered that decision is made by the Legislature. The first decision will be how many representatives Manchester will be entitled to. You divide 3,089 into 107,000 or whatever Manchester's population is and you will get a number. I think that number is 34.6 or 34.7.

Mr. Dodd asked and we have 34 state representatives.

Mr. Gardner answered well they will probably round it off and make it 34 although I understand that they haven't officially done that yet. That is probably what will happen.

Mr. Dodd asked do they try to evenly break that number down by the wards.

Mr. Gardner answered typically it is broken down by wards although the Legislature could say they could all run at large. It is up to the Legislature to decide that. Typically it is broken down by wards in the big cities. In the small cities they run at large like in Berlin or Lebanon or Franklin.

Mr. Dodd asked so if one ward has 6,000 people they would be allocated two state representatives theoretically and if another ward had 9,000 people they would be allocated three state representatives correct.

Mr. Gardner answered theoretically.

Mr. Dodd asked but you would still only come up with 35 for the City.

Mr. Gardner answered if that is what the decision is that Manchester will get 35.

Mr. Dodd stated I am trying to find out why the population of each ward has to be almost precise. Why can't there be a variation?

Mr. Gardner replied it has to be precise because of the Aldermanic positions. The one man, one vote also applies at your local government level so each Alderman should be representing approximately the same amount of people. You can't have one ward that is 1,000 more people than another ward. That is why every 10 years we do the redistricting, to try to bring the wards in line as close as possible. We also have the right to take some geographic situations into consideration.

Mr. Dodd asked so you are only required to redistrict every 10 years when they do the census. So between that 10 year period if things get out of whack that is just the way it happens?

Mr. Gardner answered yes.

Mr. Dodd stated if I look at your figures here, if you compare Ward 12, your proposed population on that one is 8,679 and if I go to Ward 7 your proposed population is 9,052, which is give or take around 375 people. I am going to have to ask the question because it was in the paper. If you take one of the old ward maps and look at Ward 7 and then you turn to Ward 7 in the handout here and I am only going by the studying in the short period of time I have had to look at it, I assume the dotted line on the map for Ward 7 is a new boundary line. Is that a correct assumption?

Chairman Rivard replied it depends on the color. The light ones are the old and the black ones are the new and the colored ones are the proposed. I don't know what map you are looking at. We have the original ward line as it exists and then the proposed increase or decrease.

Mr. Dodd stated if you look at that you will see that the boundary line has changed from the old map for Ward 7 and if I go up and look at the Ward 6 map on the previous page and I go to your table I am seeing that out of that Ward 6 area you gave 846 people to Ward 7. Correct?

Chairman Rivard replied yes.

Mr. Dodd stated I am only going to ask this question because it was in the paper. I assume that when you sat down and redrew the wards originally nobody knew where anybody lived and I am just going to have to take a reasonable guess that the Ward 7 line probably went right up Cilley Road, the new one and then somewhere along the line it was discovered that School Board Representative Healy was now going to be out of Ward 7 and according to the article in the area some phone calls were made and the erasers came out and he was changed so that he is back in Ward 7. Is that a valid statement?

Chairman Rivard replied that is correct.

Mr. Dodd stated I believe the statement that went along with that was to do the least disruption to a School Board representative or someone in City politics...

Chairman Rivard interjected elected officials. We did the best job we could to be the least disruptive and to hopefully not displace any elected official. We did not go door to door to see where these people lived.

Mr. Dodd stated after you discovered that... anyone in this City, anyone, we all put our pants on the same way one leg at a time. No person is any better than the next person. If a change was made to accommodate one person, I have been working hard myself for over three years to cultivate a following in Ward 6 to the way I see things should go in the City and I have a pretty good following there. I am not going to cry sour grapes but I would like to see either Mr. Healy treated like myself as a regular person and the lines go back to the way they were originally drawn and he takes his lumps the same as I do or I be treated equally like Mr. Healy. I am not going to tell you how to draw your lines up. There is a deviation of 375 here between Ward 12 and Ward 7. There is no reason why there cannot be a deviation in Ward 6 to another ward of 375. I would like to request that as an up and coming political figure I be treated equally as Mr. Healy and I would like to stay in Ward 6. I think there is room for deviation there. I would just like to be treated equally. Either Mr. Healy and I are treated the same and he goes to another ward after this election and I do the same and take my lumps and start a new following all over again or I get treated equally like Mr. Healy and be allowed to stay in Ward 6 and have the lines redrawn to accommodate that. Thank you.

Chairman Rivard asked where in Ward 6 are you.

Mr. Dodd answered I am at the corner of Candia and Mammoth Road.

Mr. Gardner stated it seems as though...well we knew Ward 6 was going to be an impossible issue if any ward was going to be an issue because 2,000+ had to be taken out because it was the largest ward in the City. I am sure that we are all receptive to the...I came from that old neighborhood where the St. Pius Church voting area is located and I just ask Ben Baroody and Donna and you and Kathy and Real if you, having seen this, do you have any suggestions as to how we can accommodate what you are asking and still try to remain as least disruptive to the citizens of the City as possible? We were trying to keep as many people in their existing ward as we could. In Ward 6 we were going to lose 2,000 even if we didn't add on at all to Ward 6. I am looking at this...I certainly would be willing to take any suggestions as to how we could do this. If it is possible, I would be willing to consider it particularly around that old neighborhood. Looking at it, if we add to Ward 6 there we have to take away from somewhere else at either the north end or the south end. That would then mean that we would have to change the wards that border on either end. I am just asking if there is any specific suggestion or have any of you sat down together and tried to come up with a plan that would be as least disruptive as possible but yet fix what you are asking us to fix.

Mr. Dodd replied the only thing...being in a position like this where you are out trying to talk to people and show them the way that you are thinking and getting votes at the same time, it is kind of like putting a noose around your neck. Off the top of my head right now I would have to ask a question before I answer you. Do the wards have to be completely intact? What I am trying to get at is the new proposal is going to run...the best example that I can give you is the article that was in the *Union Leader* where it shows where Ward 4 is going to pick up part of Ward 6 in the Pennsylvania Avenue/Page Street/Stevens Pond area. Is there any way to incorporate over off of Wellington Road where you have Sunset Ridge and the Wellington Hill apartments...is there any way to accommodate apartments into a change instead of houses?

Mr. Gardner responded the problem with the Wellington Road area is, if you look at the map, you don't have connecting streets up there so you would have to go...off of Wellington Road a lot of those are dead end roads. You go up the street and then it just ends so you are going to have...you would have to have one side of the street in one ward and the other side in the other ward. If you look at Wellington Road, you will see that. That area was very difficult because in the newer growth parts of the City a lot of the roads are not connected like they are in

the inner City. The roads just end. So, Sunset Ridge, that apartment complex, if you look at the map you will see that it is a dead-end up at the end there. How are you going to do that? You are going to have a squiggly line going along those roads and people on one side are in one ward and people on the other side would be in another ward. That is why the easiest thing to do was just leave that boundary the same between Ward 2 and Ward 6 because you would have an incredible looking map if you started going down those dead end streets and dividing those streets in half. We couldn't do much there.

Mr. Dodd stated right now I am looking at a full map and Ward 6 cutting over Pennsylvania Avenue to Bridge Street Extension and back over to the highway and up the center line of 93 on the other side of Stevens Pond and back over to Wellington Road and then back down. Like I said, there is a block that could go over from the point where it hits the highway back at Bridge Street Extension and over by the highway there. The apartments are there. I don't know how you could do it, but again I don't know the particulars on how many people move in and out of those apartments in a year's time and how many are here from year to year for elections. I don't know what the percentages are but I would think like myself when I bought my first house 25 years ago I lived in an apartment until I could save up enough money to buy a house. Either they are moving into another apartment or out of state or they are buying a house somewhere in the City or somewhere in the state. I don't want to call them transient people but they are apartment people and their vote is just as important as anybody else's but when you compare that to long time residents of Ward 6 I think maybe there is some validity there where we could look at doing something in that area. There is room by your own figures of 300 to 400 that you can play with from ward to ward. Again, all I am asking is that either Mr. Healy be treated like myself and if he is out of Ward 7 so be it or treat me fairly like Mr. Healy where an exception was made so that he could stay in Ward 7. I am trying to do the same thing he is. Treat me fairly like Mr. Healy so that I can stay in Ward 6. I don't know what the exact formula would be but like I said there is room for at least 400 people that you can play with. All I can do is ask you to think about it and maybe ask Mr. Healy if perhaps he wouldn't mind being out of Ward 7 and that solves the problem.

Mary Freitas, Crawford Street, Manchester stated:

I have resided in Ward 6 for over 35 years. I am one of those who is affected by the change. I live at Crawford Street near Talbot's Market. I can throw a stone to my voting place. Looking at this and studying this I wondered whether there might be some consideration for moving the population that is north of Route 101 and 93 from Ward 6. That would take a considerable population. Now I am not familiar with the formula that has been used or the manner in which you moved things around but I wondered if this hearing was intended to give you a chance to

hear us and maybe for us to be involved in some of the redistricting if we can. I would like to reiterate what the others have said about my home being in what is considered the core of the development of Ward 6. I guess that is all I have to say.

Chairman Rivard advised that all wishing to speak having been heard, the testimony presented will be referred to the Special Redistricting Committee to be taken under advisement with reports to be made to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at a later date.

There being no further business to come before the special meeting, on motion of Mr. Gelinas, duly seconded by Mr. Gardner, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee