CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the special meeting to order at 6:42 p.m. All present joined in a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL: The clerk called the roll call and recorded it as follows:

PRESENT: Mike Buswell       Mary Isaac       Nicole Satin
         Steve Choi         Alissa Hall       Jason Marsh
         Steve Lemoine      Kelly Mallozzi     Donna Seidell
         Dawn Cantafio      Christopher DeCruze Tony Scinto
         Kevin Shively      Dede Robinson      Bill Mecca
         Lissette Colón     Olga Leiva         Thomas Whitmoyer
         Joy Colon          Ashley Gaudiano (By Conference Call)

ABSENT: Carl Massaro

ALSO PRESENT: First Selectman Vicki A. Tesoro, Town Attorney Daniel Schopick, Chief Administrative Officer Kathleen McGannon, Democratic Registrar of Voters Jean Rabinow, Republican Registrar of Voters Tracy Vonick, Redistricting Committee Chairman Laurel Anderson

PUBLIC HEARING: The Chair OPENED the Public Hearing for Resolution TC29-54 at 6:45 p.m. There were eight (8) people present to speak. (Public Comment Attached) The Chair CLOSED the Public Hearing at 7:07 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:  
1. RESOLUTION TC29-54: Moved by Cantafio, seconded by Mallozzi
   BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDAINED, That in accordance with Sections 9-169 and 9-169b of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Chapter 6, Section 6-1 of the
Trumbull Town Code is hereby amended by redividing the Town of Trumbull into seven (7) voting districts. Said districts shall be divided in accordance with the metes and bounds description attached hereto. Said revised voting districts shall be effective commencing with the Primary elections to be held on August 9, 2022.

Moved by Marsh, seconded by Cantafio to waive the reading of the Committee minutes. VOTE: Motion CARRIED 11-9 (AGAINST: DeCruze, Choi, Lemoine, Scinto, Robinson, Leiva, Colón, Seidell, Buswell)

It was noted seven people sat on the committee, 4-3 (with unaffiliated represented)

Councilman Lemoine also a member of the Redistricting Committee read some of the highlights of the Minority Report:

- The committee did not actively seek to engage the community in the process of drawing council districts, it did not contact or make any presentation to distinctive community stakeholder groups, including political parties, civic associations, and communities of interest. The town council majority, scheduled no public hearings on redistricting until tonight. They had this Minority Report well over a month before tonight, where that could have been scheduled. In 2020 the final draft of the redistricting committee was submitted on June 26, 2020. And on July 25 2020, a public hearing was scheduled so that the public had a month to look at the results of that. Legal notice was served, this time around this council tried to ram it through during a L&A committee meeting. It shows no concern for the public.
- By rejecting the committee majority’s motion to consider districts less than seven, the public was excluded from being heard.
- The majority party politicized the committee by not having a balanced committee and rejected a minority party Councilman. Co-chairs from each party we're not appointed. The size of the committee was determined by the first selectman, council chair and majority party.
- There was a month worth of meetings that were left on the table. This committee could have met the month of March to consider other options. It was an entire month where discussion could have been, and the public could have been involved. It was because of what he considers discrepancies on the committee's report.

Moved by Lemoine, seconded by Scinto to reject the report and send back to committee.

Councilman Marsh noted several points had been raised by Mr. Lemoine, and others who have spoken tonight with regard to the unbalanced committee. The resolution forming the committee of having seven members was submitted by a minority councilman Massaro for consideration on the January agenda. To say that it was this administration proposing the committee is not accurate, Mr. Massaro proposed the resolution. We had a committee, people were elected to that committee, and much was made about Mr. Kelly being on the committee. Mr. Block was on the committee, who was a candidate for first selectman and an officer in the RTC. Councilman Marsh asked the committee members in the minority party, were they ever denied the right to speak at a meeting? Councilman Lemoine noted
he had been cut off many times. Anytime the subject of less than seven came up he was cut off. When the committee’s guidelines were set on the first night, the head of the Democratic town council made it so that nothing less than seven would ever be discussed. It was not bipartisan. He confirmed the committee voted but it was not bipartisan.

Councilman Marsh noted some of Mr. Block’s suggestions were adopted by the committee. Councilman Marsh confirmed he read the minority report and it is in the record. The committee’s meetings were open to the public, and there were at least twelve meetings and were noticed on the website, to say there is a lack of transparency would be disingenuous.

Attorney Schopick noted the only question on the floor is to send this back to the Redistricting Committee. It is not appropriate to get into the substance of the resolution, if the matter is sent back to the committee there would be no more discussion.

Laurel Anderson explained the criteria used is on the second page of the report. Several guidelines were agreed to by every member of the community. There were things like looking into using the census data, always not splitting census blocks and most important for the registrar's of voters reducing the number of split voting districts with the addition of a fourth state rep district that made things almost like tossing 20 oranges and 15 apples in the air at the same time. As Mr. Block suggested they started in the north and worked around clockwise. In the middle of town is a census block that looks like a banana and it runs almost the entire length of that district they could not split that up. There's some other really strange anomalies in Trumbull which they’re hoping the engineering department will discuss with the census people and take care of that before the next redistricting because it made it very challenging. One of the other things they swore they would not look at was voter rolls and they never looked at where sitting council people live. Those are the guidelines six committee members at the time agreed to. Those were the guidelines that ruled them. The committee agreed on this plan because it was the most cohesive in numbers, they were very close to having equal representation, amazingly close as a matter of fact, and only having three splits. The center of their purview was to come up with districts of substantially equal population.

It was questioned how one would gerrymander if you are not looking at voter data. It was noted Mr. White was a volunteer assisting the committee. The council discussed the definition of gerrymandering. It was noted gerrymandering is the intent of balancing a certain district in one party's favor over another party and if you don't look at party registration, you can't do that. So it would not be possible to gerrymander.

The Chair noted the motion is to reject the report and send it back to committee. The clerk called the roll call vote and recorded it as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Buswell</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Isaac</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following council members left the meeting at 7:32 p.m.: Buswell, Robinson, Seidell, Leiva, Colón, Lemoine, Choi, DeCruze, Scinto.

It was confirmed by the town attorney there was still a quorum and a vote could continue. Moved by Cantafio, seconded by Mecca to call the question. VOTE: Motion CARRIED by unanimous consent.

It was noted by Councilman Mallozzi that she was on the committee, Mr. Lemoine was not cut off and that none of what was in the minority report was discussed at their meetings.

The Clerk called the roll call vote and recorded it as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Buswell – Not Present to Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Isaac</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dede Robinson – Not Present to Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Mecca</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Satin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Seidell – Not Present to Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Choi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alissa Hall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Marsh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissette Colón</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gaudiano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Leiva</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Colon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lemoine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mallozzi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Cantafio</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher DeCruze</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Scinto</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Shively</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Whitmoyer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE: Motion FAILS 9-11 (IN FAVOR: DeCruze, Choi, Lemoine, Scinto, Robinson, Leiva, Colón, Seidell, Buswell)
Lissette Colón – Not Present to Vote
Ashley Gaudiano
Olga Leiva – Not Present to Vote
Joy Colon
Steve Lemoine – Not Present to Vote
Kelly Mallozzi
Dawn Cantafio
Christopher DeCruze – Not Present to Vote
Tony Scinto – Not Present to Vote
Kevin Shively
Thomas Whitmoyer

VOTE: ADOPTED unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to discuss and upon motion made by Marsh, seconded by Cantafio the Town Council adjourned by unanimous consent at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

________________________________
Margaret D. Mastroni
Town Council Clerk
Local District Boundary Description  
(Revised 3/1/22)

District 1
Northerly: The Monroe town line.
Easterly: The Shelton town line, Booth Hill Road, each in part.
Southerly: Strobel Road, Pinewood Trail, Bear Den Road, Hemlock Trail, Strobel Road again, northerly along Booth Hill Brook, Oldfield Road, Old Stream Lane, Brookhedge Road, Brookside Drive, Country Club Road, Daniels Farm Road, Rte 25 Expressway, each in part.
Westerly: Rte 25 Expressway, Monroe Turnpike (Rte 111), each in part.

District 2
Northerly: Country Club Road, Brookside Drive, Brookhedge Road, Old Stream Lane, Oldfield Road, southerly along Booth Hill Brook to Strobel Road, Strobel Road, Hemlock Trail, Bear Den Road, Pinewood Trail, Strobel Road again, Booth Hill Road, the Shelton town line, each in part.
Easterly: Wild Rose Lane, Foxwood Road, Ironwood Road, Copper Kettle Road, Red Fox Lane, Primrose Drive, Huntington Turnpike (Rte 108), each in part.
Southerly: Unity Road, Merritt Parkway (Rte 15), each in part.
Westerly: Reservoir Avenue, along the line of the 134th State Assembly District, White Plains Road (Rte 127), Daniels Farm Road, each in part.

District 3
Northerly: Monroe town line.
Easterly: Monroe Turnpike (Rte 111), Rte 25 Expressway, each in part.
Southerly: Whitney Avenue, Main Street (Rte 111), Stonehouse Road, West Rock Road, Fieldcrest Drive, Old Coach Lane, Wedgewood Road, Asbury Road, Dayton Road, Old Village Lane, Limerick Road, Cromwell Road, Madison Avenue, Monitor Hill, Mariner Circle, Inverness Road, Deepdene Road, each in part.
Westerly: Easton town line.

District 4
Northerly: Deepdene Road, Inverness Road, Mariner Circle, Monitor Hill, Madison Avenue, Cromwell Road, Limerick Road, Old Village Lane, Dayton Road, Asbury Road, Wedgewood Road, Meadow View
Drive, North Lynnwood Drive, Oakland Drive, Clemens Avenue, Ridgeview Avenue, Home Street, George Street, Lake Avenue, each in part.

Easterly: Main Street (Rte 111).

Southerly: Bassick Road, Blackhouse Road, Madison Avenue, Fairview Avenue, each in part.

Westerly: The Easton town line.

District 5

Northerly: Fairview Avenue, Madison Avenue, Blackhouse Road, Bassick Road, Main Street (Rte 111), Melrose Avenue, Edison Road, Woosley Avenue, Thorburn Avenue, Moorland Road, Suzanne Circle, Lawrence Road, Geraldine Circle, Geraldine Place, each in part.

Easterly: Reservoir Avenue.

Southerly: The Bridgeport town line.

Westerly: Fairfield Town Line, Easton Town Line, each in part.

District 6

Northerly: Old Coach Lane, Fieldcrest Drive, West Rock Road, Stonehouse Road, Main Street (Rte 111), Whitney Avenue, each in part.

Easterly: Rte 25 Expressway, Daniels Farm Road, White Plains Road, along the line of the 134th State Assembly District, Reservoir Avenue, each in part.

Southerly: Geraldine Place, Geraldine Circle, Lawrence Road, Suzanne Circle, Moorland Road, Thorburn Avenue, Woosley Avenue, Edison Road, Melrose Avenue, each in part.

Westerly: Main Street (Rte 111), Lake Avenue, George Street, Home Street, Ridgeview Avenue, Clemens Avenue, Oakland Drive, North Lynnwood Drive, Meadow View Drive, Wedgewood Road, each in part.

District 7

Northerly: Merritt Parkway (Rte 15), Unity Road, Huntington Turnpike (Rte 108), Primrose Drive, Red Fox Lane, Copper Kettle Road, Ironwood Road, Foxwood Road, Wild Rose Lane, each in part.

Easterly: The Stratford town line.

Southerly: The Bridgeport town line.

Westerly: Reservoir Avenue.
Notes:

1. In the boundary descriptions above, the dividing lines between districts run down the middle of the named streets and watercourses. So, for example, when a District 5 boundary is described in part as “Northerly: Fairview Avenue ...” the middle of Fairview Avenue is the dividing line, and all the houses south of that north boundary are in the district, and all of the houses north of that line are in another district, in this case District 4.

2. The terms “northerly,” “easterly,” “southerly,” and “westerly” are approximate. For example, a street that is part of a northerly boundary may run east-west, northeast-southwest, southeast-northwest, etc.
1. Marshall Marcus of 91 Stonehouse Road supports the final report of the committee for realignment of the existing seven districts. He has seen and heard a lot of disharmony in town in the last few weeks. Because there is a general misconception that they were redistricting and splitting into 10 which was done by our last charter revision. This committee was not charged to redistrict, but to realign and have equal districts in terms of population. There is a very small difference, as he has gone through the seven districts population, maybe a half percent if that. We have census blocks that may not be split by federal law and have been dealt a raw hand by the redistricting of the state legislative districts. Trumbull is now in four districts. We used to have only one split district. Having worked at the polls it’s problematic, now we're going to have three, and can't avoid this because it's been dealt to us. He feels the metes and bounds working with the census block have been thought out quite well. Not everyone's going to be happy. I wasn't happy when I found myself moved out of district three to district six, when we went back to seven, and I had to drive past my old voting place to vote. This happens, we can't make everyone happy. But we can make everyone's vote equal. And if we are supposed to be one person, one vote, and we have to have as equal and amount of citizens and residents in every district as possible, while preserving the US Census Blocks, that's why he supports this report as submitted to the council. And urged that it be adopted.

2. Joe Pifko of 158 Plymouth Avenue indicated he was here to ask the council to reject this proposal this evening. First, he just became aware of it a couple of days ago, he did a search on the internet of the CT POST and the Trumbull times, he could not find any mention of it whatsoever. There's a lack of transparency. Most people know nothing about it. He thought all seven districts we're all set up a couple years ago, or at least a year ago, and had no idea this was going on. The lack of transparency is significant. He thinks that if you're going to have this, this has to be something
that lasts, not something that you change every two years, because
who's in office, this should be standard, this should last for years
and years. And because of that the committee should be equal, not
a majority lead, it should be equal. And you should have co-chairs,
one from each party, and you certainly do not have the chairman of
a major party on that committee. Thirdly, he looked at it, and
watched, district six is going in and out of streets. It is the
definition of gerrymandering. He asked to reject this proposal
tonight.

3. Richard White of 169 Church Hill Road noted in the redistricting
committee’s final packet, they list the various legislation, He
brought attention to chapter two legislative branch, section two
composition and election. (See attached). The key phrase is voting
districts establish a consistent, substantially equal population. The
seven district plan does that. Only districts of one district, three
district, seven and 21 districts are allowed by our town charter.
One is allowed by statute but then we would be exempt from the
minority representation requirements and would require no more
than a 14 to seven split. I hope we can all agree 21 districts is silly.
When the majority report asked the redistricting committee also
investigate in three through six districts, only three is allowed by
our town charter, they would need two thirds members of the town
council that change from our current seven. Basically, we don't
have the votes to consider it to be districts. Neighborhood roads:
there's concern that too many neighborhood roads is in the metes
and bounds description. Our district boundaries are drawn using
primarily town borders, roads, bodies of water and house districts,
with the exception of house districts, these are the same boundaries
that are used to define census blocks which contain the measure of
population that the redistricting committee used to define the
districts. Each road in town is given a classification by our
engineering department, limited access highways such as State
Road 15, and 25, which are used in District State Highways like
State Route 127 and 110, connector roads like Unity and Stone
house and local or neighborhood roads. He reviewed the metes and
bounds description of the plan in front of you, and the vast majority of boundaries are from town boundaries, state highways and connector roads, less than 20% of the length of the boundaries are being drawn from neighborhood roads. In fact, district seven contains only town boundaries and state numbered highways. Our charter does not require substantially equal population and be drawn using specific linear features, however, the plan before you is focused on equal population. It is compact, and also drawn primarily from significant features. District six, this topic seems to generate the most questions before the L&A committee a few weeks ago. In general, he agrees it is unfortunate when any member of our town council is moved out of the district. However, it's happened many times before and it's happened to more than one individual this time. While our committee attempted to limit change to all people on our existing districts, the committee did not look at any voter information, including current town council members. District one and three have the least change, as you can see in the bottom chart that's up there on the right hand side, followed by districts two and seven. The change was introduced primarily to the change in House District 122. Districts four and five had the most change due to the introduction of house 112, significant changes to House Districts 134 and 123. District six, somewhere in between it is not the most changed district in town. The committee reviewed seven different plans and multiple variations of these plans. All of them included districts four, five and six. They had to do the State House District changes. Is it possible to reduce the changes to Mr. Massaro’s current district which was the focus of much of the last L&A meeting. In his opinion, yes. But not without increasing the number of split districts, having more than one split within a district or introducing more change to districts four and five. It would be a balance and it would shift from one part of District Six to another. If the town council wants the redistricting committee to review current town council members, voting districts, and send the plan back before the committee to review and make any possible slight changes.
4. Cindy Penkoff of 101 Columbine Drive - See written comment attached.

5. Patricia Kelly 15 Gibson Avenue indicated she is a town resident who talks to a lot of people, who knew nothing about this, as in a lot of many other things that go on in this town. It's a topic that is not discussed outside of social media. Everybody wants to have a conversation and bring townspeople into it. Let's make sure we bring the focus outside of social media, outside of a 6:30 pm Monday meeting and more accessible to the public to make them more aware. To point out, with the fact that we talked about realigning the district's, she thinks the word right here in this resolution is more proper, “The Trumbull Town Code to redivide the town of Trumbull” is pretty much where we're focused on in the past few years. Let's stop. let's continue to move forward.

6. Liz Parenzan of 26 Meadowview Drive does not agree with this resolution. For the reasons previously mentioned. There were many things that had to be done that were given to all of you to work on. But to not to be able to have an equal amount of people on each side of the aisle, telling their story, and making sure that all of their concerns were heard is really upsetting, because it does do a lot to one side, the Republicans, and to the other side, the Democrats, they're like, yeah we're going do this. With the way the makeup of the committee is, they have no chance. Is that the way we want to run things around here? She seriously hopes this will be reconsidered, just going back and seeing the things, the most important things that they are looking for to be brought in the mix. And if they can have some of those things to make it a little bit more fair, she thinks that that would do well, for everyone and the residents.

7. Mark Block 60 Ridgeview Avenue. Having served on the redistricting committee and being the primary author of the Republican minority report, he was here tonight to be the voice of many opposed to the partisan redistricting committee report by the majority and a process which was done to serve the interests of some while disenfranchising hundreds of residents by shifting
district lines, confusing voters even more than in 2021 and providing no measurable benefit to our community. Council Democrats, he has no doubt will make the case tonight and some committee members will do the same as they have, that in other settings through public comment beforehand that council member residences were not looked at, census blocks could not be touched, house districts should not be split. You name it, it will be set. But the actions don't match the words because they often don't. The redistricting committee, established by this town council was snatched from the outset, the Democratic majority, including the chair of the party, all the while offering the minority party no opportunity for the committee to choose its own chair, as is nearly always the case. Importantly, voting no to the opportunity to look at anything less than seven districts. Vote after important party line vote, to reach a predetermined conclusion. Are we redistricting to ensure some district candidates would have a leg up in the upcoming municipal election? As council members some of you may be saying, well, what can I do? Especially now. Others will rubber stamp the partisan report as you do on virtually every resolution brought to the floor. So I'm here tonight to urge you to be a part of a new movement that begins to show Trumbull residents that the ways of the past don't serve the future of our community. While town council leadership may not feel there is a need for open district forms, community wide public dialogue with elected leaders, serious discussion or listening to stakeholders, he disagrees. Not just here tonight, but across town. So he urged the council to change the narrative. You can start by rejecting the partisan report by the redistricting committee and doing something that really gives residents something to talk about in a good way. Starting again and starting tonight.

8. George Saris of 601 White Plains Road indicated there were a few things concerning him. One was the lack of transparency, that the first gentleman mentioned, there was nothing that was given to the town people to mention what was going on. So we couldn't have any kind of input into what was going on. He was also concerned
about the fact the chairman of one of the parties was on the committee and heavily weighted to one side as opposed to the other, it seems if we're going to be transparent, we should be able to have equal representation from all people, and especially not the person that is the chairman of the party. That seemed rather confusing to him. The council members not in each district, was another thing that has been mentioned, that seemed rather strange that you would divide the various districts in such a way that the council members are not there, that just seems rather foolish to me, and not allowing the party to choose their own representation seems to be rather foolish and heavy handed. That would be his biggest concern is that there seems to be a heavy handed aspect to this. Looking at the map, he would love to have been able to see that clearly. The one lady that came up just a few minutes ago mentioned, looking at the map online, was almost impossible to see where the divisions were and to get some kind of idea as to why is it like this. Looking at the map right now he sees this kind of tail and wonders why is that tail there? It seems rather strange to have the lines drawn that way. He is opposed to that and would like them to go back and deal with the issues so there is more transparency and where there is more of an even handed approach to the redistricting because that is important. It's never right to have one party overruling another one in a heavy handed way because at some point it will change and then we just begin to get into that same mentality where those that are in power take advantage of it inappropriately. He would like to see more of an even handed approach to the whole redistribute situation.
CHAPTER II. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
Section 2. Composition and Election

[SIC] The number of voting districts in the Town shall be established from time to time upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the members of the Council present at a meeting duly warned for such purpose. Voting districts so established shall consist of substantially equal population. The boundaries of voting districts in the Town shall be set from time to time by a majority vote of the Council. [SIC]

Number of Voting Districts Only 1, 3, 7, and 21 districts are allowed by our Town Charter. One is allowed by State Statute, but we would no longer be exempt from minority representation, and would require no more than a 14 to 7 split. 21 is silly.

When the minority report asks that the Redistricting Committee also investigate 3 through 6 districts, only 3 is allowed by our Town Charter, but they would have needed 2/3 of the members of the Town Council to change from 7. Basically, you do not have the votes to consider 3 districts.

Shape of Voting Districts As I discussed before the L&A Committee a few weeks ago, the 7 district plan before you has substantially more “compact” shapes than our statewide house districts and are more compact than our current plan.

Our Town Charter does not require substantially equal population AND a pleasant shape. However, the plan before you is focused on equal population AND is also compact.

Neighborhood Roads There is concern that too many neighborhood roads were used in the metes and bounds description. Our district boundaries are drawn using town borders, roads, bodies of water, and House Districts. With the exception of House Districts, these are the same boundaries that are used to define US Census Blocks which contains the measure of population that the Redistricting Committee used to define the districts.

Each road in the town is given a classification by our Engineering Department. Limited access highways like SR-15 and SR-25, state highways like SR-127 and SR-110, connector roads like Unity and Stonehouse, and local (or neighborhood) roads.
I have reviewed the metes and bounds description of the plan in front of you and the vast majority of the boundaries are from town boundaries, state highways, and connector roads. Less than 20% of the length of the boundaries are being drawn from neighborhood roads.

Our Town Charter does not require substantially equal population AND be drawn using specific linear features. However, the plan before you is focused on equal population, is compact, AND is also drawn primarily from significant features.

**District 6** This topic seemed to have generated the most questions before the L&A Committee a few weeks ago. In general, I agree that it is unfortunate that any member of our Town Council be moved out of an existing district. While the committee attempted to limit change to all people in our existing districts, the committee did not look at any voter information, including current Town Council members.

Districts 1 and 3 have the least change followed by Districts 2 and 7 primarily due to changes in House District 122. Districts 4 and 5 have the most change due to the introduction of House District 112 and significant changes to House Districts 134 and 123.

The Committee reviewed seven different plans and multiple variations of those plans. All of them included changes to Districts 4, 5, and 6.

Is it possible to reduce the changes to Mr. Massaro’s current District 6? Yes, but not without increasing the number of split districts, having more than one split within a district, or introducing more change to Districts 4 and 5.

If the Town Council wants the Redistricting Committee to review current Town Council members voting districts, then send the plan back before the committee for review.
I. Edison Road

"The near zero percent (0%) deviation required cutting in and out of some odd streets/delineators which would have been much clearer and could have made for better, more compact, and concrete districts (i.e., a border line all the way down Edison Road versus only halfway) [sic]." (from Minority Report)

Possible (in green): Swap 46 people north of Edison Road in District 5 with 111 people south of Edison Road from District 6.

Problem (in orange): 231 people remain south of Edison Road in District 6.
II. Compactness

"Republican party members agreed that while compactness should be a requirement for a close union of area rather than a requirement dependent upon a district being of any shape or size, it is subservient to the requirement of substantial equality of population among districts." (from Minority Report)

Iso-Perimetric Quotient (IPQ) or Polsby-Popper Test or Cox's Circularity.

Note: a perfect circle would have a value of 1 and a perfect (thin) line would approach a value of 0.

\[ IPQ(d) = \frac{4 \times \pi \times \text{area}(d)}{\text{perimeter}(d)^2} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area Square Feet</th>
<th>Perimeter Feet</th>
<th>Compact IPQ</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>116,587,121</td>
<td>62,191</td>
<td>0.3788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>114,565,385</td>
<td>54,451</td>
<td>0.4856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>116,528,372</td>
<td>53,274</td>
<td>0.5160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>72,687,791</td>
<td>38,670</td>
<td>0.6108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>60,662,998</td>
<td>45,072</td>
<td>0.3752</td>
<td>Constrained by House 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>74,297,527</td>
<td>52,539</td>
<td>0.3382</td>
<td>Constrained by Pequonnock River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>99,242,925</td>
<td>64,413</td>
<td>0.3006</td>
<td>Constrained by House 122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trumbull
- Minimum: 0.3006
- Maximum: 0.6108
- Range: 0.3102
- Average: 0.4293
- Standard Deviation: 0.1028

State (All)
- Minimum: 0.1419
- Maximum: 0.7273
- Range: 0.5853
- Average: 0.3890
- Standard Deviation: 0.1101

Note: there are other measurements of compactness that can be investigated. Several of which can be derived directly from IPQ and others that include moment of inertia or convex hull.

Note: there are other measurements such as complexity and circularity that can be investigated.
III. District Renumbering

"District lines should have been renumbered in a fashion more closely aligned to where they currently exist." (from Minority Report)

Districts 1 and 3 are only slightly changed and are numbered properly. Districts 2 and 7 could be swapped, but are numbered properly. Districts 6 and 4 could be swapped, but District 6 is numbered properly. Focus on Districts 4 and 5 and use House Districts to help resolve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>Districts (Current)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 (blank)</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts (Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>14.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.08%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.26%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.92%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.93%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.75%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>House Districts</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts (Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am here to speak against the redistricting plan being put forth this evening. But I have to ask, did you even look at what you put forth to the public to make a decision or a statement on? You asked the public to come out and speak tonight on a map that is barely legible and looks nothing like the neighborhoods you claim to support.

In 2017, I requested, along with many others, that the town, if so inclined to redistrict, wait until the 2020 census was done and do it right and based on accurate information. With this administration so hell bent on rushing this through though, I believed there must be more to it than a misleading petition and argument looking to change it back to 7 districts.

Turns out there was, especially when you add charter changes to the mix. Taking away the will of the people by guaranteeing seats to candidates of any given major party. It seems they did not and do not trust the voters of this town to elect who they want to represent them. And I’m sorry, but I am not buying that people need to drive 4 minutes less to vote. The numbers for voter turnout and the history of our town’s voter turnout, simply does not support that. And this redistricting proposal has created longer driving times for some. Not to mention the confusion you create.

Once this became a guaranteed move by this administration, again, repeatedly you were asked to wait and do it right the first time. Nope, couldn’t miss that opportunity we will just fix it later. Why do something twice when you can do it right the first time? The simple answer by this majority seems to be, “Because we can”. Sound familiar?

And looking at the newest map, the blatant use of power to gerrymander is glaringly evident. The most obvious was intentionally cutting the minority leader and a State Representative out of the town
districts you just got done putting them in. That is what happens when you specifically take a hard left turn on a map and make a quick U-turn; people tend to notice. Nothing subtle there. And the fact that they put 4 of the republican town council members in the same voting district, guaranteeing no matter how good they are at their job and how much their districts like them, some will not be able to rerun for their seats.

But I think one of the most hypocritical things I see about all of this is the makeup of this committee in charge of performing something that should be fair to all concerned and bipartisan. There is no way on God’s green earth that the head of a local major party gives even the appearance of bipartisanship let alone fairness. And he just happens to be the head of the party that has a majority on this committee. How is that bipartisan? That same leader that for some reason does not understand that having 4 State Reps speaking for us in Hartford is a good thing. Maybe it’s the fact they are all Republican voices that really bothers him.

This map is blatantly unfair and should not only go back to committee, but that same committee member should be replaced and the committee balanced by allowing the Republican party to nominate their own members to the committee with an equal representation. And unlike the current committee, they should choose their own chair.

When Mr. Kelly railed meeting after meeting during the last administration about “Republican party line votes”, should we have expected his party to do better? This committee and this body are certainly not examples of that. This committee was given options for more balanced districts and disregarded them.
Mrs. Tesoro and Gaudiano, as leadership, have failed to live up to their ideals and their promises; to be fair and to listen to all sides. This is an opportunity to change that perception. Trumbull voters and taxpayers deserve better, demand better and will continue to fight for better.

Cindy Rentoff
101 Columbia Dr.
Trumbull
203-974-1057
birdiebagie2@hotmail.com
My letter to the TC for tonight's vote on redistricting and 4 vs 7 Districts for voting. If you have not emailed your objections or your thoughts on the subject, please do so. I hope what I have written will move you to be a part of the process. Send your emails to: townscouncil@trumbull-ct.gov

Dear Council Members,
Below I will attach my original objection to the 4 vs 7 model being debated and proposed by the council. But I have additional concerns.

Redistricting should not happen or even voted on prior to the 2020 Decennial Census being completed, which as many of you are aware has been delayed due to COVID and will not be completed, barring any additional delays, until the end of Oct. beginning of Nov. And while COVID has delayed the outcome of the Census it has also caused more consequences than any of us could have imagined.

Based on many conversations I have had with parents and others: the quarantine and the job losses have changed the households of many families. In the beginning many 20 and 30 somethings living in other states or other parts of this state decided to "come home" and quarantine as a family. Many of those situations became permanent due to fear, illness and/or a drastic reduction in income and job loss from companies and businesses that just did not make it. Making it economically impossible for more than a few to return to their apartments and homes elsewhere.

As census workers started to hit the streets just last week, these changes will change the landscape of many communities. These changes and how to count them have been discussions at the forefront of training these workers. How do I know this? Because I have trained hundreds of them over the past 2 weeks as a Census Field Supervisor.

More polling places, in a small town like Trumbull are not necessary; the "problem" can be solved by adding a line to the polling districts for just 1-3 letters and streamlining the lanes before 11am in the morning when 60% of the people in Trumbull vote. Additional polling spots cost more money and in a town that could not fund its education system appropriately and feel the need to cut meals to poll workers, basically nickel and diming the budget, I do not see the logic in making this a priority. I think it is misplaced and lacks vision; in this case a vision that is about 6 yrs old.

What you may have thought to be a "good idea" 6 years ago was no more than a political talking point and is no longer applicable. As I can guarantee you many of the people that signed that now ancient petition no longer live in this town and at the very least this idea should be tabled and re-evaluated after we have recovered from this hideous virus and have a better handle on the outcome of what has been heaped upon us in just a few short months. These changes will be long lasting and the recovery and changes to our town need to be a part of the future landscape.

As I said at the last public comment, I will say again as this was my original objection, but is now complicated by the above.

In a world that is turned upside down with "leaders" who speak about community, freedom and fairness yet practice something very different over the past few years, this should not even be up for debate. We need a system that continues to allow us to vote for more of our representatives and not less. What gives the voter more power; especially during a time when we feel as if we have so little of it? 7 districts or 4 and the answer is quite clear: 4.

In a world where people are willing to die to come to this country because of our freedoms and our rights, why on earth would you be looking to limit any of them? So, you may have to travel an extra 5 minutes to vote. Seriously? That is a problem in the greatest nation on earth? That is no reason to change this process. As a matter of fact it is petty and small and just goes to show how spoiled people are.

I urge you, as a council to make the right decision and table this discussion until we know what the future looks like in Trumbull. We can have this discussion again; this is not a do or die situation. There is no time clock. Do not do something just because you can. Choose real leadership and choose not to do something because it is the right choice and continues to give the voters of Trumbull more of a say in their representation and not less.

Thank you.

Cindy Penkoff
Paul S. Lavoie Issues Statement on 7 District Petition
Registrars of Voters Can Address Concerns Without Redistricting

Trumbull, CT (August 7, 2017) – Paul S. Lavoie, the Republican candidate for First Selectman, has issued the following statement regarding the petition for a referendum on 7 council districts:

"It is important to balance the requests of citizens while adhering to local and state law governing redistricting. I am aware of the legal analysis and opinion of this petition, as I am not an attorney. I will solely address the facts and concerns of the Citizens for 7 Districts. The petition was circulated to Trumbull residents claiming that the move to 4 districts has harmed voter turnout. On the contrary, voter turnout is a result of a combination of many factors: the personality of the candidates running for office, the specific issues facing the town, the "Get Out The Vote" effort conducted by campaigns and even the weather on Election Day. The petition considers none of these factors and presumes that only the 4 district model is to blame. Over the last five municipal elections, Trumbull's voter turnout by percentage has been: 40.09% in 2007, 51.19% in 2009, 48.01% in 2011, 40.38% in 2013 and 47.70% in 2015. The elections in 2013 and 2015 were the only municipal elections with the 4 district model and the percentage turnout in those years are very similar to the turnout in 2007 and 2011 under the 7 district model. In fact, the rise in turnout in 2009 was more of a product of community anger towards the Democratic administration for proposing an 11.6% tax increase in the previous budget year than anything else." Lavoie stated.

Lavoie continued, "In regards to the concerns of longer wait times to vote in Trumbull compared to other communities, I have yet to see supporting evidence of these facts from the petitioning citizen group. Regardless of evidence, these concerns can be addressed simply by working with the Registrars of Voters to add additional lines and checkers at polling locations as well as determining if new locations would be more conducive to the voting public. If all of the issues claimed by the organizers of the petition can be addressed by working with the Registrars of Voters, why is it necessary to overhaul the voting districts prior to the next U.S. Census in a few short years and why is the only solution 7 districts? Simply put, more council districts equals more guaranteed council seats for the minority party. This is not a Republican talking point. Michael Redgate, who is currently running as an unaffiliated petitioning candidate for First Selectman, recently stated in a July 6, 2017 Trumbull Times article that, "There is no data that supports the number of districts is responsible for low voter turnout." Redgate further stated that, "If the Democrats had a super-majority there would be no petition." added Lavoie.

Lavoie continued, "Redistricting normally occurs following the completion of a U.S. Census. The Town was in violation of one person one vote as redistricting had not occurred for nearly 30 years resulting in unequal representation from an influx of 3,000 new residents. The 8-district model which was approved in 2012 conformed with one person one vote, reduced split State Assembly districts which in turn reduced election costs and provided more choice in candidates and less guaranteed party controlled seats."

Lavoie concluded, "My philosophy has always been that if we think there may be a problem, then let's investigate it and get the solid information necessary to find a reasonable common sense solution. That's why I believe the best approach is to wait for the next census data to arrive and work with our Registrars of Voters in the interim to address the current concerns. I would like to set up a meeting between the Registrars of Voters and the Leaders of the Citizens for 7 districts together to work on a solution to these issues. It makes common sense to solve our problems by working together, not by lawsuits or other means.

Finally, the Connecticut General Assembly will redistrict Connecticut House and Senate districts following the completion of the 2020 U.S. Census. Any changes will affect local voting districts and will require the formation of another Redistricting Committee here in Trumbull to analyze if we need to make changes. A bipartisan panel of citizens reviewing the most up-to-date information is the best way to address this issue. The town should not limit itself to one solution or another and be open and flexible when approaching redistricting in the future."