

## **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:**

Bennington 5

### **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: 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:**

WAS-6-1, WAS-6-2

### **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: 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:**

New Bennington-1 District and Windham-Bennington District

### **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: 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:**

CHI-1

### **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: 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:**

**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: 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:**

WSR-10 and WSR-11

### **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: 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:**

**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.