

## Walls, Heather

---

**From:** Jen Wilson <tcfjen@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 20, 2021 2:34 PM  
**To:** County Council - Redistricting Commission  
**Subject:** Redistricting comments & suggestion  
**Attachments:** edits to Aberdeen-Havre de Grace plan.JPG; Statistics\_edits to Aberdeen-Havre de Grace plan.JPG

### [EXTERNAL SENDER]

Dear Redistricting Commission Members,

I would like to provide comment on the redistricting maps you are currently considering.

Any map change done solely for the purpose of gaining one more republican representative in an already republican controlled Council, is doing a disservice to our citizens. No group can have a well-rounded discussion on any issue if they are excluding ideas and opinions that are divergent from their own. Having relatively balanced populations within voting districts is also critically important to prevent 1 person's vote from counting more or less than those votes cast in other districts.

I also think it is important for you to consider this as more than just a numbers game. Vitally important to citizens is the quality of representation a Council member is able to provide to their constituents. Commissioner Robey's proposal to split District D would create two districts each containing vastly different regions of our County. This proposal, if enacted, would require a Council member to debate the needs of their own constituents before even debating with their fellow Council members. In this case, neither the rural area nor the more urban area would be represented well by their Council person. Why further divide people, when you can unite them over common concerns?

Looking at the Aberdeen-Havre de Grace plan, it is worth questioning the rationale of including rural areas around Level in a district with the municipalities. If the goal is to provide the municipalities with a united representation, why include rural areas north of I-95? Unless the sole purpose is to help officials annex these rural areas into their cities for more urban development. While this may be the goal of the cities, it has not happened yet and should not be decided during a Councilmanic redistricting.

Mayor McGrady is quoted in an August 25, 2021 Aegis article extoling the benefits of how "a compact district would also help ensure elected officials are responsive to and aware of their community's priorities and issues." And while he is also quoted as saying his plan "tightens up the districts to better represent not just the two cities, but the whole county," I disagree that his plan achieves this goal. The proposal may well help the municipalities, but it will not provide quality representation to the rural areas being lumped in with them. I imagine the citizens in these rural areas do not share the same concerns as the mayors of these two cities. The concerns of the rural areas will be vastly overshadowed by those of the municipalities.

I believe my attached version, while not perfect, is a step toward a more equitable map in terms of the quality of representation that could be provided to citizens. Each region of our County has its own nuanced concerns and issues. As you move forward, please reconsider any changes that will cause citizens to be poorly represented, as those changes will not serve the best interests of our County.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Wilson

Harford ▾

C 43,198 -380

District Selector

	District	Population	Deviation
Un	0	0	0
A	43,117	-461	
B	43,077	-501	
C	43,198	-380	
D	42,678	-900	
E	43,922	344	
F	45,473	1,895	

District Details

Colors

Overlays

County

Precinct

Block

Tools ▾

+

-

+

-

Castletown

Rising Sun

Bel Air

Havre de Grace

Aberdeen

Perryman

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Joppatowne

Edgewood

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Perry Hall

Towson

Parkville

Middle River

Essex

Butlertown

Dundalk

North

inium

imore

ID	Population		Shapes		Partisan Lean		
	Total	+/-			Dem	Rep	0th
Un	0				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
A	43,117	-1.06%			51.49%	45.52%	2.99%
B	43,077	-1.15%			27.84%	68.76%	3.40%
C	43,198	-0.87%			33.85%	62.60%	3.56%
D	42,678	-2.07%			22.83%	73.99%	3.18%
E	43,922	0.79%			39.91%	56.20%	3.89%
F	45,473	4.35%			52.04%	44.44%	3.52%
	<b>43,578</b>	<b>6.41%</b>			<b>36.69%</b>	<b>59.88%</b>	<b>3.43%</b>

### Notes

- This water-only precinct is unassigned: 24025ZZZZZ.
- The 6.41% population deviation is within the 10% threshold tolerated by the courts.
- Four districts lean Republican, none lean Democratic, and two fall in the 45–55% competitive range.