

**Calvert County Redistricting Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes of January 14, 2022**  
**3:00 p.m. – Circuit Courthouse, BOCC Hearing Room**  
**175 Main Street, Second Floor**  
**Prince Fredrick, MD 20678**

**MEMBERS:**

- Present:* Kara Dudley, Democratic Central Committee Appointee *virtually*  
Judy MacWilliams, Republican Central Committee Appointee *in-person*  
Michael Hawkins, NAACP Calvert Branch Appointee *in-person*  
Wilson Parran, Commissioner Appointee *in-person*  
Stephen Zimmerman, Commissioner Appointee *in-person*  
Luke Macaulay, Commissioner Appointee *in-person*  
Ronald Clark, Commissioner Appointee *virtually*  
Edward Bailor, Commissioner Appointee *in-person*
- Absent:* Dawn Collins, League of Women Voters Appointee
- Staff:* John Norris, County Attorney *in-person*  
Mark Willis, County Administrator *in-person*  
Ashley Staples-Reid, Special Projects Program Manager, County Administrator *in-person*  
Lionel Sewell, GIS Supervisor, Technology Services *in-person*  
Joseph Strozier, GIS Analyst, Technology Services *in-person*  
Kristen Scott, Executive Administrative Aide, Calvert County Election Board *in-person*  
Gail Hatfield, Elections Administrator, Calvert County Election Board *in-person*

**I. General Business & Administrative Matters**

- (1) Call to order – determine quorum  
Chairperson Parran determined a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. For the record, Dawn Collins is not present due to a death in the family.
- (2) Approval of January 14, 2022 open agenda  
**Motion:** Judy MacWilliams motioned to approve the open agenda  
**Seconded:** Michael Hawkins seconded  
**Action:** Motion carries 8-0-1
- (3) Approval of January 7, 2022 open meeting minutes  
**Discussion:** Kara would like to clarify under NB2(c) that she was dissenting and would like to have the minutes to reflect as such. Staff will make those modifications prior to posting.  
**Motion:** Judy MacWilliams motioned to approve the open minutes as modified  
**Seconded:** Stephen Zimmerman seconded  
**Action:** Motions carries 8-0-1

**II. New Business**

- (1) Review and discussion of requested data sets
  - (a) Minority Population per Census Blocks
    - (i) Kara Dudley noted that there are concentrated areas with minority populations. Staff displayed and explained the interactive map for the public to view the numbers discussed by the committee.
  - (b) Minority Population per District
    - (i) Chairperson Wilson Parran noted that the minority population among the 3 districts is distributed relatively evenly at around 25% per district.
  - (c) 3 meaningful proposals from the Election Board

- (i) Staff reviewed the current boundaries as well as 3 proposals created by the election board.
  1. Proposal 1: Judy MacWilliams asked Gail Hatfield if any changes would create the need to add additional precincts. Gail Hatfield indicated that it is a possibility, but she believes that she could just shift voters around the current precincts with this specific proposal. Stephen Zimmerman asked Gail Hatfield why they chose to shift the district 1 line on the west side of the county and not the east. Gail Hatfield stated that the census block on the east side of the county holds a dense population that would throw off the distribution among the 3 districts, also that it is extremely difficult to split census blocks. Chairperson Wilson Parran recapped that this proposed change would impact roughly 1,400 voters (1,432 exact), moving them from district 2 into district 1.
  2. Proposal 2: Staff indicated that the change made in proposal 1 is also in proposal 2, but also move the current 2-7 and 2-6 precincts (upper west side) into district 3. This caused district 3 to be too populated so staff then moved the current 3-2 and 3-3 precincts into district 2 to evenly distribute the population among the 3 districts while normalizing the boundaries. Staff indicated that this change would impact 12,161 voters. Judy MacWilliams asked if this would impact the towns of Chesapeake and North Beach to which Gail Hatfield confirmed that they do not cross any town limits. Chairperson Parran asked which precinct Sunderland currently falls in and staff indicated that it is currently 3-3 but would be moved to district 2 under this proposal.
  3. Proposal 3: Staff indicated that this proposal would include the changes in proposal 1 but also move current precinct 2-7 into district 3 and split current precinct 2-6 at Lower Marlboro Road, with the north end being in district 3 and the south end being in district 2. Additionally, the boundary line between districts 2 and 3 would split current precincts 3-2 and 3-3. Staff indicated that this would impact 5,644 voters.
- (ii) Gail Hatfield indicated that staff attempted to mirror how the boundary lines where in 1980, which would then place roughly 36k-37k people into district 3, pushing the population distribution out of the required minimum 10% differential.
- (iii) Kara Dudley requested a list of all potential locations that staff can consider if they needed to add a precinct in order to accommodate any boundary changes.
- (iv) Stephen Zimmerman questioned whether they could move the census block in the Scaggs Road area into district 2. Gail Hatfield stated that it is shaped like a barbell and would be difficult to split, so ideally would need to have the block completely in either district 2 or 3.
- (v) Edward Bailor questioned how changing the boundaries would impact the number of polling places, stating, in theory, the same individual would go to the same polling place regardless of district affiliation. Gail Hatfield stated that scenario would cause split district precincts, which is something she would like to avoid due to the complexity administratively.
- (vi) Luke Macaulay asked if staff could quantify the cost associated with changing the boundaries. Gail Hatfield noted that there would be a cost, but the amount would fluctuate depending on if any new precincts would be required. Luke followed up if whether staff thought additional precinct(s) would need to be additional in any of the 3 proposals, to which Gail Hatfield state that most likely proposal 3 would require an additional precinct(s). Additionally, Gail Hatfield stated that, administratively, there would be a cost, noting that she would more than likely need to bring on temporary staff sooner than historically done in past election years.

- (d) Municipalities within the county
  - (i) Confirmed that the information is listed on the interactive map that staff have provided.  
No further questions from committee.
- (e) Census designated areas within the county
  - (i) Confirmed that the information is listed on the interactive map that staff have provided.  
No further questions from committee.
- (2) Discussion of redistricting recommendations
  - (a) Kara Dudley indicated that she believes the committee should revisit several items that were discussed during the Jan. 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, including how commissioners are elected and how many commissioner districts we have in Calvert County because the public was not given notice nor a fair opportunity to weigh-in before the committee made a decision. Kara Dudley reiterated that the committee members are not here as individuals, but as representatives of the community and in order to represent their views, they need to know what they are. A proposal for a more accessible meeting outside of normal workday hours, specifically during a weekday evening, was made by Kara Dudley. Additionally, Kara proposed that the 3 maps presented by the Election Board be made available to the public, as well as maps proposing 4 and 5 commissioner election district options. Public input should also be gathered regarding in-district voting. Kara Dudley states that she feels that as a committee, they did not give the public the opportunity to let them know if they feel accurately represented. In response to Kara Dudley's comments, Chairperson Parran explained that his intention with discussing the various topics in question at the Jan. 7<sup>th</sup> meeting was to determine if they wanted to gather any additional data to make decisions, which fell under New Business Item 2 of the Jan. 7<sup>th</sup> agenda and reiterated that all meetings are held open to the public in order to provide comment. Kara Dudley expressed concern over the fact that those topics were discussed and determined on without receiving public input. County Attorney John Norris informed the members that there is no provision for a Redistricting Committee in Calvert County and that the Board of County Commissioners have enlisted this committee in order to make an informed decision regarding where the boundaries will be. Additionally, changing the number of districts and how the commissioners are elected is determine by state law and is out of the County Commissioners ability to charge a committee with determining; it would be out of the committee's purview to make recommendations outside of what it has been charged with (reviewing the current local election boundaries and forming a recommendation). Luke Macaulay agrees with County Attorney John Norris in that recommending how commissioners are elected and the number of districts is out of the purview of what the committee members have been charged. Chairperson Parran stated that in prior Redistricting Committees, they have gathered public input via survey. Chairperson Parran asked County Attorney John Norris if the committee had authority to hold a public hearing, to which John Norris indicated that they do not have the authority but can hold a town hall meeting if desired. John Norris further explained the difference between Calvert County and neighboring counties on how the redistricting lines are determined – that neighboring counties have a Redistricting Committee by-law that are charged with determining and setting the redistricting lines compared to in Calvert where the County Commissioners are charged with determining and setting the redistricting lines. However, the County Commissioners have asked that a Redistricting Committee be formed in order to provide a recommendation for their consideration. Committee member composition was review and discussed. Edward Bailor ask Kara Dudley to make a motion on behalf of her argument.

**Motion:** Kara Dudley motion to have an evening meeting for the public to provide input on the commissioner districts and how the commissioners are voted in.

**Seconded:** None

**Action:** Motion fails

**Post-Motion Discussion:** Luke Macaulay indicated that the meetings are open to the public and even if an evening meeting was held, there would be people who could not attend as well. Kara Dudley question whether the public had a valid email address they could submit questions to. Ashley Staples-Reid identified that there is contact information on the Redistricting Committee page on the Calvert County Government website that indicates herself as the point of contact, along with email and phone number.

- (3) Chairperson Parran asked that the committee members review the current map, as well as the 3 proposal maps, and be prepared to form and discuss a recommendation at the next open meeting, reiterating the deadline of Feb. 1<sup>st</sup> that the committee has given themselves.
- (4) Edward Bailor asked Election Board staff to confirm that they would be able to absorb any increase costs associated with a potential change in districting lines. County Administrator Mark Willis indicated that they are aware of the potential cost increases and they are prepared to make any needed adjustments in the budget at the direction of the County Commissioners.

### **III. Public Comment:**

Chairperson Parran asked if there was anyone from the public, either in-person or virtually, who wished to speak. There was 1 individual virtually who spoke.

### **IV. Adjournment:**

**Motion:** Michael Hawkins motioned to adjourn at 4:06pm

**Seconded:** Judy MacWilliams seconded

**Action:** Motion carries 8-0-1.