

REPORT OF THE TEMPORARY REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMISSION
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

April 25, 2001

Pursuant to section 42.6 of the 2001 Code of Iowa, the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission submits this report to the General Assembly regarding the plan for congressional and legislative redistricting submitted by the Legislative Service Bureau to the General Assembly on April 12, 2001.

HEARINGS

The Commission held three public hearings on the plan on April 17, 18 and 19, in Sioux City, Iowa City and Des Moines respectively. The Iowa City hearing was also accessible to the public at Iowa Communications Network satellite sites in Mason City, Dubuque, Spencer, Waterloo, Council Bluffs, Bettendorf and Ottumwa. As required by law, summaries of testimony and information presented at the hearings are attached to and by this reference made a part of this report.

REDISTRICTING STANDARDS

Section 42.4 of the 2001 Code of Iowa states that the following redistricting standards must be met in establishing new congressional and legislative district boundaries:

1. Districts shall be established on the basis of population and shall each have a population as nearly equal as practicable to the ideal population.
2. For congressional districts, each district shall be composed of whole counties. For legislative districts, the number of counties and cities divided into more than one district shall be as small as possible.
3. Districts shall be composed of convenient contiguous territory.
4. Districts shall be compact in form; however, the first three standards take precedence over compactness.
5. A district shall not be drawn for the purpose of favoring a political party, incumbent legislator or member of Congress, political party, or other person or group.
6. Each state representative district shall be wholly included within a single state senatorial district. To the extent possible and consistent with the first five standards, each Senate and House district shall be wholly included within a single Congressional district.
7. A new districting plan shall not be used prior to the primary election of 2002.

COMMENTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislative Service Bureau staff has presented a proposed congressional and legislative redistricting plan to the General Assembly and the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission has listened to and received testimony presented at three public hearings across the state and via electronic mail.

1. The Commission hereby unanimously makes the following recommendations concerning congressional and legislative redistricting:

- a. The General Assembly should study ways to require cities to consider adjusting precincts based on substantial population changes. These adjustments should take place in the calendar year prior to the year in which the decennial census is taken, and those adjusted precincts should be used for purposes of legislative redistricting.
- b. To enhance the ability of the public to consider the first proposed redistricting plan prior to commenting on the plan, the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission public hearings should be held no fewer than 7 days after the release of the first proposed redistricting plan to the General Assembly.
- c. The General Assembly is encouraged to examine whether school districts should be treated as political subdivisions in the legislative redistricting process.
- d. The primary goal in congressional and legislative redistricting is to create districts based on population equality and the other standards enumerated in Iowa Code chapter 42. The Commission received comments from the public urging the consideration of the issues of urban-rural mix of population, areas of economic interest, and historic inter-area connections in creating redistricting plans. However, no objective geographic map-building units exist from the Census Bureau to consider these issues in creating redistricting plans.
- e. Irregular city precinct lines continue to be a concern as expressed in the 1991 report of the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission.

2. After three days of informative hearings and careful review of the first proposed redistricting plan, the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission recommends that the General Assembly reject the first proposed congressional and legislative redistricting plan.

The following members concurred in the Commission's recommendation to reject the first proposed redistricting plan submitted by the Legislative Service Bureau:

MR. ROBERT MALLOY, CHAIRPERSON

MR. LANCE EHMCKE

MS. LINDA PRIMMER

The following members did not concur in the Commission's recommendation to reject the first proposed redistricting plan:

MS. JO McCARTY

MR. JOSEPH O'HERN

Additional comments from Commission members are attached to this report.

SUBMISSION OF REPORT

This report is submitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly.

Respectfully Submitted,

MR. ROBERT MALLOY, CHAIRPERSON

MR. LANCE EHMCKE

MS. JO McCARTY

MR. JOSEPH O'HERN

MS. LINDA PRIMMER

**SUMMARY OF THE SIOUX CITY PUBLIC HEARING
ON THE APRIL 12, 2001 REDISTRICTING PLAN**

April 17, 2001

The first hearing of the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission was called to order at 7:03 p.m., Tuesday, April 17, 2001, in the City Council Chambers, 405 6th Street, Sioux City, by Mr. Robert Malloy, Chairperson. Other members of the Commission present were:

Mr. Lance Ehmcke
Ms. Jo McCarty
Mr. Joseph O'Hern
Ms. Linda Primmer

Also present were:

Ms. Diane Bolender, Director, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Ed Cook, Legal Counsel, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Gary Rudicil, Senior Computer Systems Analyst, Legislative Service Bureau
Ms. Jodi Steenhoek, Redistricting Specialist, Legislative Service Bureau

Other interested persons were also in attendance.

Chairperson Malloy introduced the Commission members and the Legislative Service Bureau staff to the audience.

Following an introduction of the Legislative Service Bureau staff, Ms. Bolender provided an historical perspective of redistricting in Iowa from the 1960s to the present, as well as a discussion of the overall duties of the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Cook described the criteria used by the Legislative Service Bureau during the redistricting process. He stated that Congressional and legislative districts must be as equal in population as practicable, conveniently contiguous, compact, and no demographic or political data can be considered when creating the districts. Every attempt is made to keep cities and counties with smaller populations entirely within single legislative districts, however, geographic and population constraints do not always allow this. Mr. Cook also discussed the procedures followed by the Legislative Service Bureau when creating the proposed Congressional and legislative districts. Mr. Cook concluded his remarks by describing the process by which the legislature votes on redistricting plans.

The following testimony was received at the Sioux City public hearing:

NAME/ADDRESS/ORGANIZATION	COMMENTS	+/-
Pat Gill/Woodbury County Auditor-Recorder (written remarks provided)	The proposed plan is fair for Iowa, Sioux City and Woodbury Co.	+
Nancy Streck, Ida Grove, IA/citizen (written remarks provided)	The proposed plan does not give rural areas a voice compared to the adopted 1991 plan; 1991 legislative plan had better overall variance; the proposed Congressional district 5 is too large in area and difficult to traverse.	-
Maria Rundquist, Sioux City, IA/ Republican Latino Coalition (written remarks provided)	The proposed Congressional plan creates east Iowa districts that are too powerful and pairs two Congressmen. It eliminates much of the rural-urban blend in districts.	-
Dewey Gall/citizen	Impressed by Iowa redistricting law and the proposed plan looks good.	+
Robert Rice, Sioux City, IA/Woodbury County Republican Party chairman	It appears there are two urban Congressional districts and three rural districts in the proposed plan, and there should be a better balance in the districts. He wondered why existing districts are not used as a basis for new plans, but said the redistricting process appears to be objective.	-
Gene Hill, Sioux City, IA/citizen	The redistricting process in Iowa is commendable. The proposed Congressional district 5 is large in area but is acceptable. Hopes gerrymandering can be relegated to the classroom.	+
Janet Olson, Sioux City, IA/citizen	The redistricting process used in Iowa is commendable, and the proposed redistricting plan appears to be good for Sioux City and should be adopted. The plan honors county boundaries.	+
Michael Peters, former legislator	Proposed House districts 1-3 are good and the plan should be adopted.	+
Joel Arends, Sioux City, IA/citizen	The proposed plan does not fully embrace the "one person-one vote" ideal because the Congressional districts have an overall population variance range greater than those in the adopted 1991 plan.	-
John Lavelle, Sioux City, IA/citizen	The proposed plan is excellent, it reflects population shifts, and geographic compactness is very good. It is important to start with a clean slate.	+
Larry Twait, Sioux City, IA/citizen	The Legislative Service Bureau should be commended for its work on a redistricting plan that also meets the criteria of the Iowa Code. The legislature should approve the plan and remove partisan politics from the	+

	process. The census took a snapshot of Iowa one year ago, and that has already changed.	
Tom McMorland, Sioux City, IA/citizen	The proposed plan is fair and should be adopted. Redistricting plans should not be created to protect incumbent legislators.	+
Mary Willey, Sioux City, IA/citizen	Plan is marvelous and appears to meet the one person-one vote ideal. Using historical patterns can be a pretext for protecting incumbency.	+
Norman Newsom, Sioux City, IA/citizen	Noted changes in the number of counties in the proposed Congressional district, but took no position on the plan.	

Chairperson Malloy informed the audience that redistricting information can be accessed on the Iowa legislature's website at www.legis.state.ia.us.

There being no additional public comments, the hearing was adjourned at 7:57 p.m. by Chairperson Malloy.

Comments by Pat Gill for Redistricting Plan Public Hearing in Sioux City on 4/17/01

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission and members of the Legislative Service Bureau, I would like to welcome you to Sioux City and thank you for selecting Sioux City to hold this first hearing.

I first would like to thank the Legislative Service Bureau for the effort that they have made to put forth to create a fair plan. It was evident ten years ago that Iowa has a good plan to create new districts and it is still evident today.

Then LSB is a nonpartisan arm of the legislature and in creating this plan, it has met the requirements of the law as far as population and compactness guidelines. It is a fair and legal plan for Iowa, Woodbury County and Sioux City. The mean deviation is .02% for congressional districts and the difference between the smallest and the largest district is just 483 people. That is outstanding!

Ten years ago when I reviewed the first plan on the floor of the Iowa house, I was struck by the fact that the plan I was looking at was pure of political chicanery and I would have a very difficult time justifying not voting for it. As I looked and read about this year's version I was struck again with that feeling. I think it is important in this day of partisan bickering that the legislature pass and the governor sign this plan in order to give the reapportionment process much needed credibility.

For western Iowa, this plan creates a western Iowa congressional district that will assure representation for similar geographic interests. For Woodbury County it makes legislative districts more compact and more representative of similar interests.

This is good and fair plan for Woodbury County and for the state of Iowa. Lets pass it and get on with more the important work for the people of Iowa.

Redistricting Public Hearing Talking Points

Reasons for the Iowa Legislature to consider rejecting the redistricting proposal:

- Compared to the 1991 redistricting proposal, the new plan sacrifices voter representation for geographic compactness.
- In 1991, the redistricting proposal had a .05 population variance between legislative districts; the 2001 proposal has a variance of .08 (the closer to 0.0 the more equal representation i.e. one person, one vote).
- State Senate districts under the new proposal vary by as much as 1,000 persons based on actual population.
- Geographic boundaries created by proposed Congressional districts isolate all of Western Iowa from other regions in the state.
- ^{DISTRICT 5} One representative to Congress will serve almost half of the state while four will serve the other half.
- The new proposal in effect creates two powerful urban districts: 1) Des Moines – Ames and 2) Cedar Rapids – Davenport –Dubuque. Are not Western Iowa communities like Sioux City key to the economic success of the state?
- The compactness of the 2001 proposal eliminates much of the urban/rural blend unique to Iowa.
- Two U.S. Congressman are thrown together, one of which, regardless of politics, is arguably one of the most influential men in Washington, D.C. (House Budget Chair Jim Nussle). Why would Iowa want to potentially sacrifice such prominence?

**SUMMARY OF THE IOWA CITY PUBLIC HEARING
ON THE APRIL 12, 2001 REDISTRICTING PLAN**

April 18, 2001

The second hearing of the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission was called to order at 6:38 p.m., Wednesday, April 18, 2001, in the Iowa City School District Administration Building, 509 South Dubuque Street, Iowa City, by Mr. Robert Malloy, Chairperson. Other members of the Commission present were:

Mr. Lance Ehmcke
Ms. Jo McCarty
Mr. Joseph O'Hern
Ms. Linda Primmer

Also present were:

Ms. Diane Bolender, Director, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Ed Cook, Legal Counsel, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Gary Rudicil, Senior Computer Systems Analyst, Legislative Service Bureau
Ms. Jodi Steenhoek, Redistricting Specialist, Legislative Service Bureau

Other interested persons were also in attendance in Iowa City and via the Iowa Communications Network (ICN) at satellite sites in Mason City, Dubuque, Spencer, Waterloo, Council Bluffs, Bettendorf, and Ottumwa.

Chairperson Malloy introduced the Commission members and the Legislative Service Bureau staff to the audience.

Following an introduction of the Legislative Service Bureau staff, Ms. Bolender provided an historical perspective of redistricting in Iowa from the 1960s to the present, as well as a discussion of the overall duties of the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Cook described the criteria used by the Legislative Service Bureau during the redistricting process. He stated that Congressional and legislative districts must be as equal in population as practicable, conveniently contiguous, compact, and no demographic or political data can be considered when creating the districts. Every attempt is made to keep cities and counties with smaller populations entirely within single legislative districts, however, geographic and population constraints do not always allow this. Mr. Cook also discussed the procedures followed by the Legislative Service Bureau when creating the proposed Congressional and legislative districts. Mr. Cook concluded his remarks by describing the process by which the legislature votes on redistricting plans.

The following testimony was received at the Iowa City public hearing:

NAME/ADDRESS/ORGANIZATION	COMMENTS	+/-
Rod Sullivan, Iowa City, IA/citizen	The proposed plan should be accepted. Politics should not be brought into the process. The districts appear compact, and the urban legislative districts make sense. The plan does achieve the goal of one-person-one vote.	+
Tim Hagle, Iowa City, IA/citizen	The plan can be improved and should not be adopted. Congressional district deviations are worse than the 1991 plan. Johnson County on the edge of a rural district is not ideal, and the legislative plan's absolute variances are much greater than Congressional plan variances. Senate plan includes Coralville in a western Johnson County rural district and pairs incumbents.	-
Rich Phillips, Muscatine, IA/Muscatine County Attorney	He believes the proposed plan does not consider the urban-rural mix in Iowa, and districts should not concentrate in urban areas. The proposed Congressional district 5 is too large, and it contains no incumbent.	-
Margaret McDonald, Iowa City, IA/citizen	Believes incumbents in proposed Congressional district 1 should not be paired.	-
Janelle Rettig, Iowa City, IA/citizen	Maps of the proposed districts should be more easily accessible. Areas with close economic ties should be allowed to remain in the same Congressional district, such as Iowa City/Cedar Rapids area.	-
Eric Rosenthal, Cedar Rapids, IA/citizen	Opposes the proposed redistricting plan, and believes the plan aggravates the stress already present between urban and rural legislators. Believes that it is difficult to create the plans in a non-partisan manner and then scrutinize them in a partisan manner.	-
Bruce Johnson, Cedar Rapids, IA/citizen	He is concerned that one-third of Iowa is represented by one Congressional district. More equitable representation for rural areas is needed so that more than one Congressman represents western Iowa.	-
Ed Failor, Jr., Muscatine, IA/citizen	He believes the proposed redistricting plan was not created in a non-partisan manner. Also, a large western Iowa Congressional district is not compact. The one-person-one vote ideal is not achieved because district variances are not as good as in the current districts.	-
Merlin Hulse, Cedar County/former state Senator	Opposes the redistricting plan and believes that the 2000 census was not accurate in some areas. There are too many open districts in the proposed legislative plan.	-
Guy Geinzer, Cedar Rapids/citizen	Rapidly growing areas have not been equally represented	

	the last ten years. Census is taken at a moment in time. Less attention should be paid to rural areas, and the redistricting plan should take into account the economic interests between Linn and Johnson counties.	
Bob Welsh, Iowa City, IA/citizen	The proposed legislative plan is not acceptable because it pairs Senator Dvorsky with two other incumbents, but the legislature should approve the plan because it was created in a non-partisan manner.	+
Sarah Kobliska, Marion, IA/citizen	The proposed plan district variances are too great, and she is concerned by the division of school districts in Linn County into more than one legislative district. She believes that population variances were overlooked in order to keep political subdivisions whole.	-
Tracy Strange, Cedar Rapids, IA/citizen	Voter representation is overlooked for geographic compactness, and the plan should be opposed.	-
Holley Egelston, Cedar Rapids, IA/citizen	Western Iowa will not have a voice because the proposed Congressional district 5 is too large.	-
Amanda Ragan, Mason City, IA/citizen	The plan is fair.	+
De Byerly, Mason City, IA/citizen	One Congressman should not represent one-third of Iowa, and variances should be closer to zero.	-
Jim Nelson, Britt, IA/citizen	Congressional districts 3 and 5 are too large in area, and Congressional district 1 should not pair two incumbents. There should be more of an urban-rural blend in districts.	-
Werner Hellmer, Dubuque, IA/citizen	The proposed plan sacrifices voter representation for geographic compactness. Congressional district 5 is too large in area, and the plan has created two economic areas of interest in Des Moines-Ames and Cedar Rapids-Dubuque-Davenport.	-
Grant Veeder, Waterloo, IA/citizen	The proposed districts are representative of the population of the state, and supports the proposed plan.	+
Leon Mosley, Waterloo, IA/citizen	There are too many counties in proposed Congressional district 5. He believes there should be an urban-rural mix in the districts. The population variances are too high.	-
Russ Knoll, Cedar Falls, IA/citizen	Noted that two proposed Congressional districts contain just seven and nine counties, and Congressional districts 3 and 5 are too large in area. There should be an urban-rural mix in districts.	-
Bob Krause, Waterloo, IA/former Iowa Representative	Believes that going past the first proposed plan introduces the possibility of gerrymandering. Geographic compactness cannot be omitted from	+

	consideration. The plan is fair and should be passed.	
Jason Hutcheson, Cedar Falls, IA/citizen	Applauds non-partisan drawing of plan. Two influential incumbent Congressmen should not be paired, and opposes adoption of the plan.	
Al Schafbuch, Benton County/citizen	Proposed western Congressional district is too large in area. Not enough of an urban-rural mix in districts. The proposed plan appears partisan in nature, and should be defeated.	-
Mary Gaskill, Ottumwa, IA/citizen	Favors plan because it is fair and follows statutory guidelines. Noted that current Congressional district 3 is as sprawling as proposed Congressional district 5. Creates competitive districts across Iowa.	+
Lisa Smith, Ottumwa, IA/citizen	All Iowans should have equal representation in Congress, and the proposed districts should have less variance than the current districts. Districts in urban areas should be more evenly mixed with rural areas..	-
Gregg Steensland, Council Bluffs, IA/citizen	The proposed Congressional district 5 is more compatible with the western Iowa area than the current Congressional district 4. The plan is fair and created in a non-partisan manner, and should be adopted in a non-partisan manner.	+
Rick Keith, Aurelia, IA/citizen	Does not support the proposed Congressional districts.	-
Loras Schulte, Norway, IA/citizen	The overall district variance is too large, and there will be a confrontation between urban and rural areas with the proposed plans. Even though the plan is created in a non-partisan manner, it does not appear non-partisan. He noted Linn and Johnson Counties are in different proposed Congressional districts. The plan should not be adopted.	-
Allen Bohanan, West Branch, IA/citizen	West Branch is located in two Congressional districts in the proposed plan, but believes the plan is fair and districts are more compact than current legislative districts. The plan should be adopted.	+
Pat Jensen, Iowa City, IA/President, Johnson County League of Women Voters	Noted that redistricting plans are developed without partisan input as in other states, and the proposed districts all meet the 1% variance guidelines. Plan meets statutory guidelines and should be adopted.	+
Laura Kamienski, Iowa City, IA/citizen	A non-partisan process does not imply a non-partisan outcome, and the plan should not be adopted. Economic interests should also be considered during the redistricting process.	-

Todd Versteegh, Iowa City, IA/citizen	Opposes the plan, and is concerned with the combination urban-rural districts in the proposed plan, because they are heavily weighted to urban areas.	-
Hyman Joseph, Iowa City, IA/citizen	Proposed Congressional district variances are very small given that they must follow county boundaries, and supports the plan.	+
Tom Slockett, Iowa City, IA/citizen	Real issue is whether a non-partisan agency should draw the redistricting plans. He noted that the proposed Congressional district variances are insignificant. Given the charge, the plan is fair and should be adopted.	+
Susan Pampirin, Davenport, IA/citizen	Any plan will cause election upsets to the party in power, but does not believe a second redistricting plan would create anything different. Supports adoption of plan. Strong candidates will survive.	+
Glen Sailsbury, Dysart, IA/citizen	Supports passage of the proposed redistricting plan. However, had some concerns about the variances.	
Russ Knoll, Cedar Falls, IA/citizen	Proposed districts should provide a balance between urban and rural populations, and opposes the plan.	-
Frank Sage, Waterloo, IA/citizen	Congressional districts could be more compact, and opposes the plan.	-

Chairperson Malloy thanked the ICN technicians for their assistance in the broadcast of the hearing. The hearing was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

**SUMMARY OF THE DES MOINES PUBLIC HEARING
ON THE APRIL 12, 2001 REDISTRICTING PLAN**

April 19, 2001

The third hearing of the Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Thursday, April 19, 2001, in the Wallace State Office Building Auditorium, 502 East 9th Street, Des Moines, by Mr. Robert Malloy, Chairperson. Other members of the Commission present were:

Mr. Lance Ehmcke
Ms. Jo McCarty
Mr. Joseph O'Hern
Ms. Linda Primmer

Also present were:

Ms. Diane Bolender, Director, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Ed Cook, Legal Counsel, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Gary Rudicil, Senior Computer Systems Analyst, Legislative Service Bureau
Ms. Jodi Steenhoek, Redistricting Specialist, Legislative Service Bureau

Other interested persons were also in attendance.

Chairperson Malloy introduced the Commission members to the audience.

Following an introduction of the Legislative Service Bureau staff, Ms. Bolender provided an historical perspective of redistricting in Iowa from the 1960s to the present, as well as a discussion of the overall duties of the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Cook described the criteria used by the Legislative Service Bureau during the redistricting process. He stated that both Congressional and legislative districts must be as equal in population as practicable, conveniently contiguous, compact, and no demographic or political data can be considered when creating the districts. Every attempt is made to keep cities and counties with smaller populations entirely within single legislative districts, however, geographic and population constraints do not always allow this. Mr. Cook also discussed the procedures followed by the Legislative Service Bureau when creating the proposed Congressional and legislative districts. Mr. Cook concluded his remarks by describing the process by which the legislature votes on redistricting plans.

The following testimony was received at the Des Moines public hearing:

NAME/ADDRESS/ORGANIZATION	COMMENTS	+/-
Alan Fisher, Des Moines, IA/citizen	The plan is good and should be adopted. No matter what plan is proposed, incumbents will be paired into new districts.	+
Arlyn Hodson, Des Moines, IA/citizen	The plan is good and the legislature should approve it.	+
Peter Rogers, Marshalltown, IA/citizen	The Congressional districts are not compact, especially district 5 is too large in area. Districts 3 and 5 have too much of Iowa's population. District 5 is too rural, and therefore poor balance between urban and rural population mix. The population variances in the Congressional plan are too large compared to 1981 and 1991 districts. Some Senate and House districts are not compact or conveniently contiguous..	-
David Lord, Perry, IA/former state Representative	The proposed plan pits urban against the rural interests. Congressional district 5 is too rural, and Polk County should be included with more rural counties. Legislative districts should also have an urban and rural mix of population. The Senate district variances are too large. The concept of one-person-one vote is lacking in the plan.	-
Mitch Hambleton, Dallas Center, IA/citizen	Proposed House district 39 appears like two islands joined together. The mix of part of Dallas and all of Greene Counties does provide an urban-rural mix of population, but a legislator may find it difficult to serve in this district. Opposes adoption of the plan.	-
Steve Scheffler, West Des Moines, IA/citizen	Proposed Congressional plan pairs two influential incumbents. The economic corridor between Warren and Polk Counties is missing in the proposed Congressional plan, as is the corridor between Iowa City and Cedar Rapids. Opposes adoption of the plan.	-
Michael Kennedy, Des Moines, IA/citizen	The proposed Congressional plan is radically different from existing districts, and there should be a more equitable blend of urban and rural centers of population. He agreed with statements made by Arlyn Hodson and David Lord, and opposes the plan.	-

NAME/ADDRESS/ORGANIZATION	COMMENTS	+/-
Ben Schultz, Des Moines, IA/citizen	Opposes the plan because the population variances in the proposed Congressional and Senate districts have increased since 1981. The current plan is a good start, but should be revised to achieve better population variances. Proposed districts should achieve better population variances than existing districts. An urban and rural mix of population within districts is needed.	-
Merle Fleming, Des Moines, IA/League of Women Voters of Iowa	The plan is good because it meets the statutory requirements for redistricting. Believes it is probably more difficult for legislators to represent districts with large urban-rural mixes in population.	+
Sandra Jaques, Dallas Center, IA/citizen	Opposes the plan because the Congressional and Senate district variances are greater than in the existing districts. The urban-rural balance of population in districts is important. Districts should look similar to existing districts, if possible. The plan that is adopted will be in place for ten years.	-
Ron Granzow, Des Moines, IA/citizen	Opposes the plan because it does not provide an urban and rural mix of population in many districts, such as in the proposed 5th Congressional district.	-
Susan Glick, Indianola, IA/citizen	Noted that although the current 3rd Congressional district is very stretched out, the proposed 5th Congressional district is also too large. The 4th Congressional district should be changed to provide an urban and rural mix of population. Number of counties in each Congressional district should be more equitable. It is difficult for candidates to run from such a large district. Warren County is too cut up in the Senate and House districts.	-
Max Knauer, Des Moines, IA/citizen	The disparity in district population variances in the proposed districts is minimal. Noted that North Dakota has one Congressman for the entire state, so any of the proposed Iowa Congressional districts should be easier to represent. Redistricting creates opportunities for new legislators.	+
Wanda Sears, Des Moines, IA/citizen	Opposes the proposed plan because the districts should have an urban and rural mix of population. The proposed 5th Congressional district is too large in area.	-
James Davis, West Des Moines, IA/citizen	Opposes the proposed plan because Senate district variances are too great.	-

NAME/ADDRESS/ORGANIZATION	COMMENTS	+/-
Ted Sporer, Des Moines, IA/citizen	The degree of precision required in the task of redistricting is great. Opposes the plan because the variances in the proposed Congressional districts have nearly doubled since the districts in effect in the 1980s.	-
Ed Rethman, Adel, IA/citizen	Favors the proposed plan. Commends Iowa's approach to redistricting. Iowa's population is moving from rural to urban areas, and new districts should reflect that shift.	+
John Revak, Des Moines, IA/citizen	Opposes the plan due to the lack of an urban-rural population mix in the proposed Congressional districts. The proposed 5th Congressional district is too large in area. Feared that candidates in proposed districts could win by only carrying large city areas.	-
Joe Enriquez Henry, Des Moines, IA/citizen	Favors the proposed plan because it is fair and balanced, and neither party gains a political advantage.	+
Mary Goodwin, Ames, IA/citizen	Favors the proposed plan because it is fair. Believes opposition to the plan is political in nature.	+
Joanne Fischer, Des Moines, IA/citizen	Polk County is the only urban county in the current 4th Congressional district. Noted that low population counties within the current 4th Congressional district feel they don't have a voice. She favors the proposed plan.	+
Maria Campos, Des Moines, IA/citizen	The proposed plan meets all legal requirements and is fair. Keep politics out of the redistricting process. The plan meets one-person-one vote guidelines.	+

Chairperson Malloy informed the audience that all comments provided at the public hearings will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Ehmcke noted that the Commission will now review all comments and make a report to the legislature.

In response to a question from the audience, Chairperson Malloy stated that all points of view regarding the proposed redistricting plan were heard at the public hearings.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.