

**Commission on Reapportionment  
Meeting Minutes**

**DATE & TIME:** December 8, 2021, 2021 – 6:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meetings. Meeting ID: 87673035652  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Chairman Regis Obijiski  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Fawn Tantillo  
**PRESENT:** 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair, Sarah DeStefano, 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vice Chair Andy Monk, Kenneth Panza, Travis Rask and Kathleen Waithe  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Donna Lutz (with notice)  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes

**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Rob Leibowitz, Ulster County Department of Planning, Ulster County Attorney Kristin Kumar; Michael Baden, Supervisor Town of Rochester; Carol Nolan.

Chairman Obijiski called the meeting to order at 6:03.

---

**Motion No. 1:** To approve the minutes of November 10, 2021 as corrected.

**Motion By:** Commissioner Panza  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Monk

**Discussion:** Commissioner Rask corrected the minutes to reflect he was absent from that meeting.

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk, Panza, Rask and Waithe  
**Voting Against:** None  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 6  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Minutes Approved**

---

Public Comment on Agenda - None

**Old Business**

**Guidance for Public Participation**

Chairman Obijiski gave a brief overview of the background and purpose of the guidelines then gave the floor to 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair Monk to begin the review and edit of the draft Guidelines for Pubic Participation.

**Motion No. 2:** To discuss the draft guidelines and any amendments or edits.

**Motion By:** Commissioner Rask  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner DeStefano

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Monk read each paragraph and made changes approved by consensus and/or approved by formal motions to amend.

**1<sup>st</sup> Section -.**

The Ulster County Commission on Reapportionment (**COR**) welcomes public input into the process of redrawing 23 existing County Legislative districts based on population shifts according to the US Census data of 2020 and following applicable laws adjusting that data. Redistricting requires compliance with federal and state laws and rules as well as expectations outlined in our County’s Charter. Ulster County will retain its 23 districts, but the boundaries of these districts may look different than what is currently in place. Reasons for potential changes are expanded upon below in a question-and-answer format. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the seven commissioners of the COR to decide by majority vote on a final redistricting plan. Any plans submitted by the public as guidance are appreciated but may not ultimately impact the creation of the new voting districts. Further information about the commission’s membership and open meetings is available elsewhere on the County’s COR webpage.

Adding the language “23 existing Legislative” in the first sentence approved by consensus

---

**2<sup>nd</sup> Section**

**What are the redistricting tools needed to participate in redistricting and where can they be found?**

The software the COR has selected to use for redistricting purposes is **Maptitude Online Redistricting** from Caliper. The software can be accessed using an internet browser. Any member of the public who wishes to engage in the redistricting process can access this software by [Clicking here](#).

This section approved as presented

---

**3<sup>rd</sup> Section**

**Motion No. 3:** Motion to amend by inserting language from the County Charter describing the redistricting process before the section heading “What are some of the rules requiring compliance and expectation to keep in mind for redistricting?” To wit:

## § C-10 Commission on Reapportionment

“Evaluate existing legislative districts ... and reapportion them as necessary to meet established standards in state and federal law for equal and fair representation of all people in Ulster County, keeping districts compact and contiguous while taking also into account existing town, city, village and election district boundaries, defining geographic features, and equal population within applicable law, but giving no consideration to providing advantage to one or another political party.”

**Motion By:** Commissioner Panza

**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Monk

**Discussion:** See Transcript

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioner Panza

**Voting Against:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk, Rask and Waithe

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 1

**No. of Votes Against:** 5

**Disposition:** Motion to amend fails

**Motion No. 4:** To strike the headers “Primary Considerations:” and “In addition to the above;” under the section heading, “What are some of the rules requiring compliance and expectations to keep in mind for redistricting?”

**What are some of the rules requiring compliance and expectations to keep in mind for redistricting?**

### **Primary Considerations:**

- **Equal Population:** Each district must include 7,815 residents, with a deviation no more than 5% plus or minus. That means a district can be **no larger than 8,207** on the +5% side or **no smaller than 7,424** on the -5% side.
- **Contiguity:** A district must ~~should~~ be one piece, physically connected, not two or more separate pieces. A rule of thumb is that persons should be able to travel within any district without requiring them to cross through another district.
- **Compactness:** A district is compact if it is without contorted, dispersed, spikey, or squiggly boundaries. A rectangle or circle shapes are better examples of compactness than a hotdog or salamander shape.

### **~~In addition to the above~~**

- Existing **town, city, village, election district boundaries, and defining geographic features** (e.g., streams, bodies of water, mountain ranges ~~railroad tracks~~) should be taken into consideration.
- **Not Gerrymandered:** Districts should not favor or discriminate against political parties, incumbents, or candidates.

These expectations are not intended to discourage anyone from participating in mapping but rather to ensure that good ideas are considered on their merits instead of being excluded because an important requirement was overlooked.

**Motion By:** Commissioner Panza  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Monk

**Discussion:** See Transcript

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk, Panza, Rask and Waithe  
**Voting Against:** None  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 6  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Motion to amend approved.**

In this same section in the Contiguity section, replacing the word “should” with the word “must” was approved by consensus.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet – replacing the words “railroad tracks” with the words “mountain ranges” was approved by consensus.

---

#### 4<sup>th</sup> Section

##### **The COR is only considering completed plans that include all districts:**

Mapping districts is a bit like pressing down a part of a big balloon that causes a reshaping of that balloon elsewhere. In other words, if you have a great idea on redrawing one district of interest, you must also draw the other twenty-two to ensure that your district of interest makes sense in the context of the other districts that must be drawn. Drawing one district in isolation has little merit to a plan where every shape and size affects the whole.

**This paragraph of was approved as presented.**

**Motion No. 5:** Add language to identify the Maptitude tools to confirm a redistricting plan is complete after the paragraph with the heading “The COR is only considering complete plans that include all districts,” To wit:

##### **What is a Complete Redistricting Plan?**

Maptitude provides tools that confirm a redistricting plan is complete.

- The **Maptitude Districts Table** must show all 23 districts have populations of 7,815 residents, with a deviation no more than 5% plus or minus.

- The **Maptitude Plan Integrity Menu** confirms there are no Unassigned Areas in the redistricting plan.
- The **Maptitude Plan Integrity Menu** confirms there are no Non-Contiguous Districts.

If the redistricting plan is free from errors, it can be submitted to the Commission for consideration. The deadline for submitting completed redistricting plans is February 28, 2022.

**Motion By:** Commissioner Panza  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Monk

**Discussion:** Commissioners Panza and Monk accepted the additional language “to ensure that your plan is considered by the commission. Plans submitted after this date may not be reviewed by the commission.” See Transcript for more details.

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioners Obijiski, Monk, Panza, Rask and Waithe  
**Voting Against:** Commissioner DeStefano  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 5  
**No. of Votes Against:** 1  
**Disposition:** **Motion to amend approved.**

5<sup>th</sup> Section

**Where are the instructions on how to use Maptitude Online Redistricting?**

When you click the link provided, you will be required to establish an account with a username and password. Once completed, a user will find a six-page **Quick Start Guide**. You can refer to this guide as you go along or you may want to print out the six pages and have them by your side until you gain a level of comfort. If you are familiar with the basics of using a mouse—clicking, dragging, maximizing, minimizing, saving—you will likely have few problems.

This paragraph of was approved as presented.

**Is technical support on navigating the software available?**

~~Technical support by the County (TBD)~~

Availability of personal technical support for public participation is very limited.

- If, for some reason, the Maptitude website is not working or unavailable, you may contact the Ulster County Information Services (UCIS) [HERE](#) .
- Resolving most questions, Maptitude’s Quick Start Guide, [HERE](#) , provides step-by-step instructions, and Maptitude’s web page where your mapping takes place also offers a horizontal bar of links such as “Tips” and “Help”

- If there are questions not covered by Maptitude’s instructions, email the commission at our address found [HERE](#), and your questions and comments will be directed to a person who can respond appropriately.

Language for technical support provided by Mr. Leibowitz was accepted by consensus.

**When may the public get started, and is there a deadline?**

Plans from members of the public should be submitted no later than **February 28, 2022**.

**Motion No. 6:** To add the statement “Members of the public that have submitted maps may be invited to present their maps to a meeting of the COR” at the end of the paragraph above.

**Motion By:** Commissioner Panza  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Waithe

**Discussion:** See Transcript

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioner Panza and Waithe  
**Voting Against:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk and Rask

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 2  
**No. of Votes Against:** 4  
**Disposition:** **Motion to amend fails**

**What if a school class, citizen group, or club composed of several persons wants to participate, will each of them receive an attentive review?**

In this case, we would recommend that ~~you follow a protocol similar to the one that COR itself is following everyone creates an individual plan, submits it to the group for peer review, shares ideas, implements aspects of the plan by consensus, votes on the best plan, and your group~~ submits one plan as a collective exercise. Submitting one plan that was created by a group of individuals working together would certainly get more attention than submitting multiple plans individually.

**Motion No. 7:** To strike the phrase “you follow protocol similar to the one that COR itself is following”.

**Motion By:** Commissioner Panza  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Monk

**Discussion:** See Transcript

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk, Panza, Rask and Waithe  
**Voting Against:** None  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 6  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Motion to amend approved.**

**Motion No. 8** To strike the language “everyone creates an individual plan, submits it to the group for peer review, shares ideas, implements aspects of the plan by consensus, votes on the best plan, and” add the words “your group”

**Motion By:** Commissioner Monk  
**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Waithe

**Discussion:** See Transcript

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk, Panza, Rask and Waithe  
**Voting Against:** None  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 6  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0  
**Disposition:** **Motion to amend approved.**

---

**What if a school class, citizen group, or club composed of several persons wants to participate, will each of them receive an attentive review?**

In this case, we would recommend that your group submits one plan as a collective exercise. Submitting one plan that was created by a group of individuals working together would certainly get more attention than submitting multiple plans individually.

**This paragraph of was approved as presented.**

---

**What are the deadlines for the COR Reapportionment Plan?**

- **Feb 28, 2022** - *Plans from members of the public should be submitted by this date.*
- **May 20, 2022:** A draft reapportionment plan must be completed and made available 10 days prior to one or more scheduled public hearings.
- **Jul 20, 2022:** The commission shall have finalized, adopted by majority vote, and filed the reapportionment plan with the County Board of Elections.

Adding a bullet with the language “Feb 28, 2022 - Plans from members of the public should be submitted by this date” was approved by consensus.

---

**Motion No. 9:** To approve the Guidance for the Public as amended.

**Motion By:** Commissioner DeStefano

**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Waithe

**Discussion:** See Transcript

**Voting in Favor:** Commissioners Obijiski, DeStefano, Monk, Panza, Rask and Waithe

**Voting Against:** None

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 6

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Disposition:** Guidance for the Public Approved as amended,

(Final amended Guidance for the Public attached to these minutes.)

#### **New Business**

**Group Mapping Exercises** - The committee discussed working with Mr. Leibowitz on maps as small groups. He also offered to work with commissioners one on one.

**Public Comment** Supervisor Baden discussed sharing his map and his public participation during the previous redistricting process.

Chairman Obijiski asked if there was any other business. Hearing none:

#### **Motion to Adjourn**

**Motion Made By:** Commissioner DeStefano

**Motion Seconded By:** Commissioner Waithe

**No. of Votes in Favor:** 6

**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Time:** 7:30 PM

**Respectfully submitted by:** Fawn Tantillo

**Minutes Approved:**



## **Guidance for Public Participation In Redistricting**

The Ulster County Commission on Reapportionment (**COR**) welcomes public input into the process of redrawing the 23 existing County Legislative Districts based on population shifts according to the US Census data of 2020 and following applicable laws adjusting that data. Redistricting requires compliance with federal and state laws and rules as well as expectations outlined in our County's Charter. Ulster County will retain its 23 districts, but the boundaries of these districts may look different than what is currently in place. Reasons for potential changes are expanded upon below in a question-and-answer format. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the seven commissioners of the COR to decide by majority vote on a final redistricting plan. Any plans submitted by the public as guidance are appreciated but may not ultimately impact the creation of the new voting districts. Further information about the commission's membership and open meetings is available elsewhere on the County's COR webpage.

### **What are the redistricting tools needed to participate in redistricting and where can they be found?**

The software the COR has selected to use for redistricting purposes is **Maptitude Online Redistricting** from Caliper. The software can be accessed using an internet browser. Any member of the public who wishes to engage in the redistricting process can access this software by **[Clicking here](#)**.

### **What are some of the rules requiring compliance and expectations to keep in mind for redistricting?**

- **Equal Population:** Each district must include 7,815 residents, with a deviation no more than 5% plus or minus. That means a district can be **no larger than 8,207** on the +5% side or **no smaller than 7,424** on the -5% side.
- **Contiguity:** A district must be one piece, physically connected, not two or more separate pieces. A rule of thumb is that persons should be able to travel within any district without requiring them to cross through another district.
- **Compactness:** A district is compact if it is without contorted, dispersed, spikey, or squiggly boundaries. A rectangle or circle shapes are better examples of compactness than a hotdog or salamander shape.
- Existing **town, city, village, election district boundaries, and defining geographic features** (e.g., streams, bodies of water, mountain ranges) should be taken into consideration.
- **Not Gerrymandered:** Districts should not favor or discriminate against political parties, incumbents, or candidates.

These expectations are not intended to discourage anyone from participating in mapping but rather to ensure that good ideas are considered on their merits instead of being excluded because an important requirement was overlooked.

### **The COR is only considering completed plans that include all districts:**

Mapping districts is a bit like pressing down a part of a big balloon that causes a reshaping of that balloon elsewhere. In other words, if you have a great idea on redrawing one district of interest, you must also draw the other twenty-two to ensure that your district of interest makes sense in the context of the other districts that must be drawn. Drawing one district in isolation has little merit to a plan where every shape and size affects the whole.

### **What is a Complete Redistricting Plan?**

Maptitude provides tools that confirm a redistricting plan is complete.

- The **Maptitude Districts Table** must show all 23 districts have populations of 7,815 residents, with a deviation no more than 5% plus or minus.
- The **Maptitude Plan Integrity Menu** confirms there are no Unassigned Areas in the redistricting plan.
- The **Maptitude Plan Integrity Menu** confirms there are no Non-Contiguous Districts.

If the redistricting plan is free from errors, it can be submitted to the Commission for consideration. The deadline for submitting completed redistricting plans is February 28, 2022 to ensure that your plan is considered by the commission. Plans submitted after this date may not be reviewed by the commission.

### **Where are the instructions on how to use Maptitude Online Redistricting?**

When you click the link provided, you will be required to establish an account with a username and password. Once completed, a user will find a six-page **Quick Start Guide**. You can refer to this guide as you go along or you may want to print out the six pages and have them by your side until you gain a level of comfort. If you are familiar with the basics of using a mouse—clicking, dragging, maximizing, minimizing, saving—you will likely have few problems.

### **Is technical support on navigating the software available?**

Availability of personal technical support for public participation is very limited.

- If, for some reason, the Maptitude website is not working or unavailable, you may contact the Ulster County Information Services (UCIS) [HERE](#) .
- Resolving most questions, Maptitude’s Quick Start Guide, [HERE](#) , provides step-by-step instructions, and Maptitude’s web page where your mapping takes place also offers a horizontal bar of links such as “Tips” and “Help”
- If there are questions not covered by Maptitude’s instructions, email the commission at our address found [HERE](#), and your questions and comments will be directed to a person who can respond appropriately.

### **Who is eligible to participate?**

Anyone who is a resident of Ulster County may participate.

### **When may the public get started, and is there a deadline?**

Plans from members of the public should be submitted no later than **February 28, 2022**.

### **What if a school class, citizen group, or club composed of several persons wants to participate, will each of them receive an attentive review?**

In this case, we would recommend that your group submits one plan as a collective exercise. Submitting one plan that was created by a group of individuals working together would certainly get more attention than submitting multiple plans individually.

### **If a member of the public submits a strong and useful plan, will it be used by the COR?**

To be clear, the COR appreciates all public input, and may incorporate ideas presented to us in maps created by the public. However, the final maps will ultimately be voted on and approved by the commission.

### **What are the deadlines for the COR Reapportionment Plan?**

- **Feb 28, 2022** - Plans from members of the public should be submitted by this date.
- **May 20, 2022:** A draft reapportionment plan must be completed and made available 10 days prior to one or more scheduled public hearings to be held no later than May 20, 2022.
- **Jul 20, 2022:** The commission shall have finalized, adopted by majority vote, and filed the reapportionment plan with the County Board of Elections on or before July 20, 2022.

**Commission on Reapportionment  
Meeting Transcript**

**DATE & TIME:** December 8, 2021, 2021 – 6:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meetings. Meeting ID: 87673035652  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Chairman Regis Obijiski  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Fawn Tantillo  
**PRESENT:** 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair, Sarah DeStefano, 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vice Chair Andy Monk, Kenneth Panza, Travis Rask and Kathleen Waithe  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Donna Lutz (with notice)  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes

**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Rob Leibowitz, Ulster County Department of Planning, Ulster County Attorney Kristin Gumar; Michael Baden, Supervisor Town of Rochester; Carol Nolan.

---

**Regis Obijiski**

Okay, okay, it's 6:03 and I'm calling this meeting to order the Commission on reapportionment to date is December 8, 2021. So, for the benefit of the guests either on Zoom or on the telephone, Fawn, would you mind doing a roll call off the five commissioners that are here?

**Fawn Tantillo**

Yes, the six commissioners, I believe.

**Regis Obijiski**

Six. Okay.

**Fawn Tantillo**

We have Regis Obijiski.

**Regis Obijiski**

Here.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Oh, I can see you're here. But you froze up on us, Sarah, Sarah DeStefano

**Sarah DeStefano**

Here.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Andy Monk.

**Andy Monk**  
President

**Fawn Tantillo**  
Donna Lutz let us know she couldn't be here tonight. Travis Rask.

**Travis Rask**  
Here.

**Fawn Tantillo**  
Kenneth Panza.

**Kenneth Panza**  
Here.

**Fawn Tantillo**  
And Kathleen Waithe.

**Kathleen Waithe**  
President.

**Regis Obijiski**  
Oh, good. Okay. All right. Well, thank you. Thank you, everyone. And good evening, and welcome. All the commissioners were emailed an agenda. Thank you Fawn for for all of that. And you know, with that, there were some some attachments. And so the minute minutes and the transcript were for the meeting of November 10th were all part of that package. For I guess these documents as well as those previous meetings do we have Pete we have guests tonight to fun. On on telephone or, or zoom?

**Fawn Tantillo**  
Michael Baden and Carol Nolan are with us, along with Rob Leibovich and Christine Gumar from the ..a... Rob is from the planning office and Kristen, from the attorney's office.

**Regis Obijiski**  
Okay. Okay. Great. So, for the minutes of November 10, I asked for a motion to accept those minutes.

**Travis Rask**  
Um, I just want make a motion to, to change some of the minutes actually, I think I believe it showed that I was present. I was not present for the last meeting.

**Fawn Tantillo**  
Okay.

**Regis Obijiski**  
Okay. Terrific. So would somebody like to make a motion to accept the minutes

**Fawn Tantillo**

As amended.

**Regis Obijiski**

With that amendment, as amended, as amended.

**Kenneth Panza**

So moved to accept the minutes of November 10, as amended.

**Regis Obijiski**

All right, Ken, second, seconded by by Andy. Thank you. All those in favor?

**Committee Members**

Aye. Aye.

**Regis Obijiski**

Anyone opposed? Okay. Great. Carried. The minutes are approved. Thank you very much. Are there any questions or comments from the commissioners about any of the agenda tonight? And if you have any, any concerns, just just speak up? Speak up now. Please. Any concerns? Any of our any of our guests that have a question about the agenda? On the agenda? Please speak up. Okay, very good. Okay, the first, the first item of oldbusiness. On the agenda is this draft document, the draft document called the "Guidance for Public Participation in Mapping." So, I'm going to give a little bit of a an extended introduction, I hope you don't mind. I think it's it would be worthwhile for purposes of clarification. So this document really has a double intention. One is to welcome the public in the redistricting process. And the second is to make the public very, very clear with guidelines on what is expected, you know, for those who wish to participate. So all commissioners were emailed a copy of of that draft the draft document and asked to consider either agreement or to propose helpful insights or changes during the discussion period of the motion. And Andy has volunteered to, Andy Monk, volunteer to facilitate the discussion. And we hope to reach a consensus in an orderly review of the document and Andy is, I think, prepared to do that. At the at the end, I'll ask Andy to kind of summarize the consensus points to ensure that we all have an adequate understanding of the entire document. Then, at that point, I'll call for a vote of the commissioners on the entire draft, which would include the changes that were generated by the discussion. If there's a majority of votes to support the amended document, then then we, we have it and the writing team will wordsmith the document to incorporate those changes. And I think we can trust them to do it. And once done with that, if the committee could send that to me as as chair for disposition, so that I could send it on to the county or actually, Fawn can really direct it for proper disposition, such as vetting, and, and then final, and then the final posting of the document to our webpage on the county, on the county site. So, once posted, hopefully before the end of this month, because I think we're under a time gun, it feels like that, to me, I may not may not do but I think it would be it would be worthwhile to get the word out this month, even if it's at the end of the month, so that people have a couple of months, at least two, maybe three depends on what you decide, months to, to get to get this all together. So I apologize for somewhat of a long introduction to this, but I just wanted to make sure that that everybody tonight feels heard and is comfortable with this, with this

process. So let's, let's begin with a motion to accept the guidance for public participation in mapping that document with changes to the draft arrived at by consensus. So who would like to make that motion? Just to get us started?

**Sarah DeStefano**

And actually (inaudible) now , Regis, what exactly is the action that we're voting to take?

**Regis Obijiski**

Okay, what we're, what we're, what we're looking to do is to, to approve eventually, a document which you and committee that that you worked on, the writing committee, along with any amendments, changes, improvements, whatever we decide by consensus are helpful to that draft.

**Travis Rask**

Are we doing the amendments? We're doing the amendments tonight? Correct.

**Regis Obijiski**

We're doing amendments tonight. And that would be part of the discussion of the motion. So I just in order to get this kicked off, I need a motion to to to accept the draft with amendments as the guidance document.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Mr. Chairman, might I suggest you make a motion to discuss the draft?

**Regis Obijiski**

Oh,

**Travis Rask**

Yeah, I like that.

**Regis Obijiski**

That would be good to separate it.

**Fawn Tantillo**

That's the way we do resolutions. We start with a motion to discuss.

**Regis Obijiski**

Okay, let's let's start with that, a motion to discuss this discuss this draft, which will be dealt with right afterwards. So...

**Fawn Tantillo**

I'll make, I'll make a motion to discuss.

**Regis Obijiski**

Alright, Travis moves second. Sara, thank you very much. Okay, so discussion, I'm going to turn this over to Andy, who has volunteered to put this together and to field interest and amendments to what was put together. So Andy, would you like to kick us off?

**Andy Monk**

Yeah, Thank you so much, we just so what I'm going to do is go ahead and share my screen. I want to thank Ken for providing us with the redline document because in the Google doc it provides each comment as its own kind of pre populated item. Since Ken had a majority of suggestions, what I'll do is share that document but we'll go through the whole thing. And others will have the opportunity to add their own suggestions here in the context of this meeting. So I'm going to do that now if I can figure it out this one oh, I have a I have to open my system preferences to allow this

**Fawn Tantillo**

And I'm having trouble with my pen. I'll be right back.

**Andy Monk**

Why may I have to quit zoom in order to allow screen sharing. Should I just quit and come right back?

**Fawn Tantillo**

That would be fine. Okay,

**Andy Monk**

I will do that. Be right back. Alright, so sorry about that. Let's try this one more time. Okay, is everyone able to see this document on the screen? Perfect. All right, great. So, um, what I will do is I'll go ahead and read the paragraph by paragraph as well as some suggestions that were already entered into the document. And then we can either take suggestions for addition, or just approve paragraph by paragraph. If people have suggestions in addition to what's already here, I'm going to enter them as a suggestion live like typing while the person is making suggestions and that way we can vote on the suggestion before it's actually incorporated into the document. So that's the process that I'll use. So it opens with "The Ulster County Commissioner reapportionment COR, welcomes public input into the process of redrawing legislative districts based on population shifts, according to the US Census data of 2020 and following applicable laws, adjusting the data. Redistricting requires compliance with federal and state laws and rules as well as expectations outlined in our county's charter. Ulster County will retain its 23 districts, but the boundaries of these districts may look different than what is currently in place. Reasons for potential changes are expanded upon below and a question answer format. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the seven commissioners of the CR to decide by majority vote on final redistricting plan. Any plan submitted by the public as guidance are appreciated but may not ultimately impact the creation of the new voting districts. Further information about the Commission's membership and open meetings is available elsewhere on the county's COR webpage." So is everyone good with that first paragraph,



**Fawn Tantillo**

I would make one, two suggestions. In the first sentence, you're we're assuming that the public understands that we have 23 legislative districts. And I would just say in the very first sentence in the process of redrawing the 23 legislative districts in the second sentence, the county reapportionment welcomes public input into the process of redrawing. 23 legislative , county legislative districts.

**Andy Monk**

Like that?

**Fawn Tantillo**

Yes, sir.

**Andy Monk**

All right. And then I repeated myself. We can deal with capitalization after so let's can we vote on incorporating that change everyone?

**Travis Rask**

I will accept that first change to the first paragraph.

**Andy Monk**

All right, perfect. I need to expand my Zoom meeting. So are we can I have the of the commissioners? Can you all raise your hand? If you agree, I can now see all of you which I couldn't before. Okay, Kathy, did you you're on mute?

**Fawn Tantillo**

Do we have a ...

**Kathleen Waithe**

I have a question? Uh huh. The Commission's membership, what does that mean? I mean, what do you mean, when you say further information about the Commission's membership? That part.

**Andy Monk**

Oh, I see what you mean. I, I think that sentence means like, further information about who we are, and and can be obtained by our website, but we could certainly...

**Kathleen Waithe**

No, that fine, I just wanted to know what that was.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. Cool. All right. So it seems like we're good to go. I'm going to go ahead and accept that into the draft. Okay, so next paragraph. "What are the redistricting tools needed to participate in redistricting? And where can they be found? The software the COR has selected to use for redistricting purposes is map titude. Online redistricting from Caliber, the software can be accessed using an internet browser, any member of the public who wishes to engage in the redistricting process can access the software by

clicking here" and then that would be a live link to the caliber site, which is actually like a very long kind of ugly looking URL. So that's why it's behind those words, "clicking here". Everyone good with that? Seems like it. Okay. And then Ken suggested inserting language from the county charter describing the duties of the commission. I am not sure that we want to include charter language in a public facing document just because I feel like they kind of don't need to know exactly what our responsibilities are. But I'm totally open to being overruled on that and incorporating into the document. I wonder what everyone else thinks?

**Kenneth Panza**

Well, since I proposed it, let me say that. Yeah, that doesn't, you know, explain the the entire possibilities of the commission, it just really explains what the redistricting is meant to accomplish. And the subjects which are related to that. So you know, it's a single really a single sentence out of the out of the charter.

**Andy Monk**

Got it. I wonder, I think that makes sense, Ken, and I, I'll go ahead and read at what's there so far, just because I will refresh my memory while doing it. "evaluate existing legislative districts and reapportion them as necessary to meet established standards and state and federal law for equal and fair representation of all people in Ulster County, keeping districts compact and contiguous while taking also into account existing town, city, village and election district boundaries, defining geographic features and equal population within applicable law, but giving no consideration to providing advantage to one or another political party." I wonder if we might take that and incorporate it because some of it is sort of in the in the first paragraph. And then we also do get to it later in, you know, about like, what it? Is that what our considerations are? Just Does that make sense, Ken? Or do you think it should really be like,

**Kenneth Panza**

Yeah, I saw that as a preamble to the second to the following section, outline each of those parameters in more detail.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah, that makes sense.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I tend to agree with Andy's or initial thinking on this, that this, this sentence does not give really any context. This is supposed to be a cheat sheet for the public to understand, and where we're saying, you know, keeping districts compact, and contiguous, doesn't really provide much context. It also makes this longer and redundant then when it's again described below. So I think if there's anything in this sentence that we're not providing in the bulleted list below, perhaps we go about adding it to the bulleted bullet list below. But I don't think we're serving the public by providing, you know, a legalese paragraph that does not really give them that much context or further information, and which is already available to them, as you know, on our site as part of the Commission rules.

**Andy Monk**

What do you what do you guys think if we split the difference if we add some of this language into the paragraph above, and then refer to the bulleted list at the bottom and say, like more information on the considerations of the commission is available below cuz I agree, Kenneth, we don't really get into it until we actually get into it. So maybe a reminder that it's further down, would be helpful.

**Kenneth Panza**

I don't see a split. I mean, it's a line from the charter. I really don't see any. But I think splitting it, this destroys the purpose of repeating the charter language. You certainly can. I mean, points below. Elaborate on that, that language, and certainly those are appropriate. But I think splitting that doesn't really, if you want to, you know, the idea is to explain what the Charter actually says.

**Sarah DeStefano**

The point of this document is to serve it as an addition to the charter and not just be the charter. And to me that this is not providing any context. It is available document and this is supposed to provide a cheat sheet with considerations for the public. That paragraph doesn't add anything to this document as far as I'm concerned.

**Andy Monk**

I see that Kathy has a comment. Also.

**Kathleen Waithe**

I just wanted to ask you, Andy, I understand Ken and I understand Sara's reason what was your initial reason for not wanting to include this particular paragraph.

**Andy Monk**

Um, I just felt that we... everything that's in that paragraph is elsewhere in the document. And although like, it might not be helpful, but upon reading it further, I do see how a more immediate reference to the fact that we will expand upon the concerns or the criteria that we're using could actually be helpful because it would let you know like preview to the public that we will get into it, so they don't stop reading right at the start.

**Kathleen Waithe**

And what was your reason, Ken? Providing clarification, is that why you wanted it inserted here?

**Kenneth Panza**

Not so much clarification, but more is a definitive statement.

**Kathleen Waithe**

I see.

**Kenneth Panza**

What the purpose of the reapportionment is.

**Kathleen Waithe**

I see.

**Kenneth Panza**

Qualifications are below.

**Kathleen Waithe**

Okay.

**Andy Monk**

All right. So In that case? It seems like there's kind of mixed, mixed feelings on the commission. So can I see a show of hands of who thinks we should enter that whole paragraph probably modified slightly, maybe without the ellipsis. And some like minor edits, but more or less as it is,

**Kenneth Panza**

It was an amendment which...

**Andy Monk**

Sorry,?

**Kenneth Panza**

...I sent in to move to insert that paragraph, but I would not accept modifications to the charter language.

**Andy Monk**

Oh, okay. So who who would move to? We're not... do...Fawn, I'm sorry, that for the process, do does Ken need to make a movement to insert it and then we vote on it? Or how does that work? Now?

**Kenneth Panza**

I made a motion to amend the document to include this particion. Paragraph.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. So I'll

**Kenneth Panza**

So someone would second that motion. That amendment. And then you would vote on it.

**Fawn Tantillo**

You would need the second, then you need to vote on it.

**Andy Monk**

Okay, well, I'll go ahead and second it so that we can get to the vote. And then with that motion...

**Fawn Tantillo**

And just to be clear, if you don't have a second, you can take no action.

**Andy Monk**

Right.

**Fawn Tantillo**

And then it doesn't get amended. Or, you know, just to be clear,

**Andy Monk**

Okay.

**Fawn Tantillo**

You don't have to vote if you don't get a second.

**Andy Monk**

I'll still second it anyway, and then we can vote? I think that's yeah, probably, I mean, easier in some way. So can I see a show of hands? Who would like to include that paragraph exactly as it is into the document? All right.

**Travis Rask**

I mean, my question is, if we include that paragraph, then we kind of, we got to, we got to, like you said, just for redundancy purposes, we almost have to redo the document.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah, I, I think as it's written, I wouldn't vote to include it, which is why I didn't so I think we can just

**Travis Rask**

Okay, yeah. I'm fine..

**Andy Monk**

So

**Fawn Tantillo**

I think it's addressed multiple times in the document already. Yeah, I can understand if we want to, if we wanted to put this in from the beginning and then redo the document. But I, I'm not in favor of redoing the document.

**Andy Monk**

Okay, So,

**Travis Rask**

So, I'm not voting for it.

**Andy Monk**

In that case, that motion does not pass. So we'll keep going then. So the next thing is, sharing with the public what the criteria are that we're looking at when we're making these districts and then the subject heading is "what are some of the rules, requiring compliance and expectations to keep in mind for redistricting." I had originally separated them into two sections, one for primary considerations and one in addition to the above, I'll read it that way. And then we can discuss Ken's motion to strike the heading. Primary considerations are equal population ease, each district must include 7850 residents with the deviation no more than 5% plus or minus that means a district can be no larger than 8207 on the plus 5% side and no smaller than 7424 on the minus 5% side. Continuity. A district should be one piece physically connected, not two or more separate pieces. A rule of thumb is that a person should be able to travel within any district without requiring them to cross through another district. And compactness, a district is compact if it is without contorted, dispersed, spiky or squiggly boundaries. A rectangle or circle shapes are better examples of compactness than a hotdog or salamander shape. And then in addition to the above existing town, city, village election district boundaries and defining geographic features (eg streams, bodies of water railroad tracks,) should be taken into consideration. I actually will we'll get to that. And then not gerrymander districts should not favor or discriminate against political parties, incumbents or candidates. I would actually like to ask for clarification, because the reason I divided those two is that my understanding is that the top three are legal requirements of our work that cannot be, you know, gone against in any way and that the bottom to that existing, you know, physical boundaries and not gerrymandering. We're not actually legal requirements of the commission's work, but instead were, you know, best practice guidelines. Is that correct?

**Fawn Tantillo**

In this the statement that Ken had addressed above was um, was not gerrymandering in that charter language?

**Andy Monk**

I can't Oh, in here.

**Travis Rask**

Yeah.

**Kathleen Waithe**

No

**Travis Rask**

...district boundaries....

**Unknown**

No.

**Andy Monk**

Well, it sort of is.

**Travis Rask**

So that's so I, I am actually in favor of pulling away the titles because in my opinion, based on that language from the charter, they all do kind of represent equal, equal parts.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah, that makes sense. So Ken has already made the motion to remove the subject headings. And I'll second it again to get the vote. All those in favor? I actually am in favor now because of Travis. Okay, perfect. So we'll go ahead and do that. I think that I can incorporate them by. No, I can't. Sorry.

**Fawn Tantillo**

So I wanted to ask the question. Yes, In continuity. On continuity, the second one Continuity, I can't say the word tonight for some reason. You have "the district should be one piece." Shouldn't it be, why isn't it "the districts must be one piece"?

**Travis Rask**

I like that as well.

**Andy Monk**

Okay, so that actually and that's nice as well. Clear. So continuity, not districts. So we all agree on must. I do?

**Sarah DeStefano**

Yeah.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. Perfect. Okay. So, the other thing though? Oh, I wanted to add "mountains" to this list of geographical features. Does anyone disagree with that? I think it's more important than railroad tracks, for example.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I agree

**Andy Monk**

Do we agree to change "railroad tracks" to "mountains"? Okay.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Who would disagree and say railroad tracks or...

**Kenneth Panza**

Where does the law say that the district must be contiguous?

**Sarah DeStefano**

That's just the law on districting. I think that's even a Supreme Court decision made it's part of this is federally controlled as well.

**Kenneth Panza**

I don't think there is federal control of the legislative districts. Me, I think we have looked at the charter language.

**Andy Monk**

There, I think also, like...

**Sarah DeStefano**

There are federal law, federal laws that govern election. Election Law, generally speaking, I don't know it, I don't know it off the top of my head anymore, but I'm happy to look into it and provide it in between meetings.

**Andy Monk**

I think it's also okay for us to require that districts that are submitted to us be contiguous just because like I personally don't want non contiguous districts from the public, muddying up our work. So I think this document is our instructions to the public and could even potentially be like... It's what we want from them. So even if it's slightly different than what we're actually bound by legally, it might be okay, just to leave that.

**Fawn Tantillo**

True, that's a good point. And you're right, this is from this what we're trying to vet from the public.

**Andy Monk**

Right.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I think though, it's also a function of the program that it may not, Rob, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that there is a function in Magnitude that allows you to check for contiguity. Maybe it's just compactness, but

**Robert Leibowitz**

It allows you to find the things that you missed. So that would have with the continuity. And it also has some compactness measures as well in there, and are some more advanced things that are aren't on the online version that are in the desktop for that, we'll just throw some calculations out there.

**Andy Monk**

Right. Alright. So then below the expectations, "These expectations are not intended to discourage anyone from participating in mapping, but rather to ensure that good ideas are considered on their merits instead of being excluded because of important requirement was overlooked." I think that's pretty self explanatory, and is a nice way to kind of welcome people like, reaffirm that we're excited for these suggestions. But also, just like these are why we're giving these guidelines. "The COR is only considering completed plans that include all districts. Mapping districts is a bit like pressing down on a part of a big balloon that causes a reshaping of that balloon elsewhere. In other words, if you have a



great idea on redrawing one district of interest, you must also draw the other 22 to ensure that your district of interest makes sense in the context of the other districts that must be drawn. Drawing one district in isolation has little merit to a plan where every shape and size affects the whole." Are we all good with that? <ake sense? Okay. And then, Ken, thank you for suggesting "What is the complete redistricting plan" because of course, we didn't say and I think this addition is very valuable to the document: "what is a complete redistricting plan. Mapitude provides tools that confirm a redistricting plan is complete." We completely left that out and I'm so glad that Kenadd it. "The Maptitude districts table must show all 23 districts have a population of 7815 residents with a deviation of no more than 5% plus or minus. The Maptitude plan integrity menu confirms there are no unassigned areas and the redistricting plan and the Maptitude plan integrity menu confirms there are no non contiguous districts. If the redistricting plan is free from errors, it can be submitted to the Commission for consideration. The deadline for submitting the completed risk plans is February 28, 2022." I think that's great. And so I definitely enthusiastically second the motion to add that.

**Kenneth Panza**

Well, I make the motion,

**Andy Monk**

I see a show of hands Isn't that a little earlier, though?

**Regis Obijiski**

Well, I just have a quite a question on the February 28. That yeah, that is that date. Okay. With, with, with everyone, because that that would give the public two months to to do their redistricting?

**Andy Monk**

I think we may want to push that out a little bit. Now that I think about it.

**Regis Obijiski**

That is the question here, right, it's, it seems it seems tight.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah.

**Travis Rask**

Can you repeat... the process?

**Sarah DeStefano**

You also have to keep in mind...

**Travis Rask**

What's that Sarah?

**Regis Obijiski**

Sarah, go ahead.

**Sarah DeStefano**

No, go ahead, Travis. I'm sorry.

**Fawn Tantillo**

No, that was just my question was, is that is it because we want continued participation from the public throughout the process? Or do we want to limit that,

**Regis Obijiski**

Well, there's going to be public participation throughout the process as regard to public hearings, you know, there's that.

**Travis Rask**

Right.

**Regis Obijiski**

This the, the mapping itself, you know, that's it's a pretty limited time.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I also, um, I tend to think that we need time to be able to review these, and if we have them going much further into March, then we're reviewing them. Like, if we pick the end of March, we're reviewing them in April. And we have to kind of roll this up in the middle of May. And so I think that's why when the subcommittee discussed this date, that's why we picked it because, unfortunately, the completion date sort of requires us to do it earlier so we can actually consider what's submitted. And, you know, I think if we move it out another month, unfortunately, we're just, it'll be a scramble to review them, or we won't review them at all. So in order to maximize our ability to actually even look at them and consider weigh them and consider them, it does need to be sooner.

**Regis Obijiski**

I'll go along with that.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Rob, did you have do you have a comment you wanted to make on that?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Yeah, I did not have to be done until July 22.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Had to be ....

**Regis Obijiski**

Well, May 20. Is the is the first is the draft that you have to have done to before the hearings? July 20th is the final. Right.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Right. I just, I just think giving more time is better. I mean, you don't it, I don't think you're actually going to get that many completed plans. So, I mean, they have to go through a whole process. I know a couple of people have already done and probably took about seven hours or so to do. So, I think more time is better. I would at least go another two weeks personally. But that's up to you

**Fawn Tantillo**

By the by our March meeting. Is that something that we want to say? Then we can review through till April.

**Andy Monk**

Guess my other follow up? Question is how we want to review these in general like, I, I don't think it's gonna require a formal meeting for us to look at each plan. Like we don't have to vote on them, you know, like, we just have to look at them. So I was in the meeting where we picked that date. And I was involved in that decision. But now I'm wondering, you know, what is the review process for these submissions?

**Fawn Tantillo**

Yeah. And that's, I guess that's, that's more or less what we need to define then. that if we're, if we're going to just use them as background, you know? Because that's what that's my concern.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah.

**Sarah DeStefano**

Personally, I think if you go much longer, you're not going to use them at all. And so this is all futile. I think you need them earlier, we're going to need to start really buckling down by the end of February and what these maps look like, and I don't, I don't know that we really will use them at all. I don't say that to say that we shouldn't but it's just a matter of time constraints.

**Regis Obijiski**

Lets vote on this

**Fawn Tantillo**

What you're doing here is not a local law or anything. If you decide to amend this date, if you get into February, and people are trying to submit plans and complaining that they don't have enough time. You could always go in and change this date and give them an extra two weeks extension.

**Andy Monk**

Could we also just continue accepting plans after this deadline and just let that be a thing?

**Fawn Tantillo**

That's an option.

**Robert Leibowitz**

That's not a bad idea. You can do after a deadline, say" it's at your own"...

**Kenneth Panza**

... discretion.

**Robert Leibowitz**

It's a... it's like it may or may not be reviewed, if it's received. That's whenever date you decide.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Or you could say here "to ensure your plan is considered by the Commission,"

**Kenneth Panza**

I mean, like, extend the date, but it's very hard to bring back a date.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Right. Exactly

**Travis Rask**

Yeah.

**Andy Monk**

So how about that, with the addition of that last couple of words at the end the redistricting plan blah, blah, blah. The deadline for submitting complete redistricting plans is February 28 2022, to ensure that your plan is considered by the Commission. That's like you can still submit after that, but we might not see it. Right.

**Kenneth Panza**

I'll accept that amendment to the amendment or journalistic change to the amendment

**Robert Leibowitz**

You might want to say something like "plans submitted after that date may or may not..." You may want to put that in there. Then.

**Andy Monk**

After that final sentence?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Yeah, "plans submitted after that day do not guarantee that they will be reviewed", but condition something like that.

**Andy Monk**

How does that look to everyone?

**Regis Obijiski**

Looks fine.

**Travis Rask**

Okay. I'm happy with it.

**Andy Monk**

So now I'll second, I'll second Ken's amended amendment for a vote. Can I see a show of hands? All those in favor? Okay, perfect. Thank you.

**Fawn Tantillo**

I'm, Sorry. My screen froze. Who? Who moved in seconded that. I apologize.

**Andy Monk**

Oh, I seconded Ken's original motion. And we all approved it.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I actually didn't, because I actually we didn't really talk much about I guess it's approved. So I was on mute before. So unfortunately, I didn't get to state what I was trying to say. But I think that the complete redistricting plan is entirely redundant. To be honest, it does say elsewhere, all of these numbers. And obviously that would if we're asking them to do this, it's complete, but I guess we've already voted on it. So I do think that they are two completely different topics and the date and the the addition. And I think going forward, we should be considering paragraphs as they are rather than

**Andy Monk**

Sorry about that, Sarah, I just as a point of clarification, I agree that the numbers and stuff is those are already in other parts of this document. What I liked so much about this is that it really points to specific parts of the software to ensure like these are the three checks you should be performing to ensure that your plan is complete.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I think thought in our, in our subcommittee meeting, we, we discussed about how if you have a document that's too long people stop reading and stop paying.

**Andy Monk**

That's true.

**Sarah DeStefano**

And I think that we you know, that was what we just we had a subcommittee meeting where we discussed it at length. And I, I think that's something we really need to keep in mind as we go through this document further is how long is this document? And how, how much compliance are we going to get with it if it's so long that it's just being ignored?

**Kenneth Panza**

Well, if people don't follow the directions...

**Sarah DeStefano**

I don't think that this paragraph assists us in compliance, I think it'll, it just lengthens the document, but it's been voted on so.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. But thank you anyway, for that. I mean, that's a good point of clarification that we do want to keep that in mind keeping it short as we go through. The next paragraph is "Where are the instructions on how to use Maptitude online redistricting. When you click the link provided, you'll be required to establish an account with a username and password. Once completed, a user will find a six page quickstart guide, you can refer to the guide as you go along. Or you may want to print out the six pages and have them by your side until you gain a level of comfort. If you are familiar with the basics of using a mouse: clicking, dragging, maximizing, minimizing saving, you will likely have few problems." Are we all good with that paragraph? Looks like I see nodding. Okay, good. "Is technical support on navigation on navigating software available?" That answer is no. Right?

**Regis Obijiski**

No, there isn't more of an A there's an extended extensive response to that. Look...

**Robert Leibowitz**

I sent one to Regis . Yeah, no,

**Regis Obijiski**

Yeah, no, it's not it's not it's not there on on on Ken's because it came afterwards. Oh, got it.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Would you like me to dig it up?

**Andy Monk**

Was that? Was that an email? Rob?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Yeah, actually Regis had the final version of it.

**Regis Obijiski**

It was it was sent it was sent to us with the agenda and everything else from Fawn. Maybe three, maybe three bullets. You click here, click here. Click here. You recall that?

**Sarah DeStefano**

I do. I know it was sent us in a second draft.

**Regis Obijiski**

Well, it was it was sent by it was sent by Fawn ust a couple days ago.

**Kenneth Panza**

Put in the draft personality agenda.

**Regis Obijiski**

Send the agenda. Exactly.

**Andy Monk**

Oh, yeah. And the agenda. Okay. I'm sorry. I missed that agenda here. I was looking at all the Google documents not the agenda. Alright. Yes, thank you. I will. I will add it later. Can Do we agree that I'll just put this once I have my digital stuff together.

**Regis Obijiski**

Sure. Is there.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah. Okay, it's there. Okay, perfect. Um, okay. So Okay, "Who is eligible? Who is eligible to participate? Anyone who is a resident of Ulster County may participate? When May the public get started? And is there a deadline plans for members of the public should be submitted no later than February 28 2022? I feel like we can just leave that because we already put the deadline with the caveat that we might accept future plans later. Ken you had a question though? Will we ask for a verbal explanation of the submitted plan from the submitter? I know that the Commission may ask for a presentation should be included. I don't think we would do that. But I'm, I'm open to everyone else's input on that.

**Kenneth Panza**

My question was just putting in a warning so that, you know, people would be aware that we may ask them to present their plan to the commission, not that there's requirement.

**Kathleen Waithe**

I have a question. This is probably a very simplistic question. It's very, it's a little challenging for me to vote one certain to make the decision on what we're discussing. So I just have a very simple question, because I think I'm missing something here. I guess my question is...I'm trying to articulate it in the right way. What percentage or how much of a burden? Or responsibility? Is the redistricting redistricting to for the public, as opposed to us? Is it 50/50? Is it equal? Or?

**Fawn Tantillo**

It's not equal at all? It's our it's our say is the final, final say? So basically, we can say that no public participation is allowed if we really wanted to Kathy,

**Kathleen Waithe**

That's what that's what I thought, because I, because it seems to me that it's, it seems, I guess, I'm going back to what Sarah, or her original thought was a few months ago, that it seemed you were very accommodating to the public. And and I'm not against that. It's just that's why my question is, if if it was

a joint effort, then I understand why, you know, where I kind of agree with Sarah, that we're, we're emphasizing the deadline, the deadline, and so on. So I guess that's why I'm asking this question. I'm trying to understand, you know, are we working side by side with them? And if so, I understand why we're putting this in and why they why they have to understand and the the the language we have to put it in for them to understand and, and have access to it, etc, etc. I guess quite simply, if not, then why are we putting again, the date the deadline? Like I said, what? I don't mean to? I don't want to

**Regis Obijiski**

Kathy, I'll start. I'll start off with this. I mean, right. In the very beginning, we say that this is responsibility of the seven commissioners to make these decisions. Okay, on districting. We have, you know, right from the very beginning, welcome the public, there's a certain precedent that that has taken place, and with the group before us and 2010 -2011 to welcome, welcome public input. What we're saying here is we welcome it, but it this that the input, we want you to know has a rigor to it. And the rigor is that you have to follow all these rules, and you just can't say, I really don't want I don't want my district divided up the way it was the last time. I mean, you could say that if you wish, and you could put that in an email. It just doesn't count. What we're saying is if you want if you want to do this, you have to you have to look at all 23 districts. Not just look at them but create them. And that's a, that's a, that' a, that's a pretty heavy lift.

**Kathleen Waithe**

Okay. clarifies it somehow I was just, I was a little confused as to what the response is. You know, it just adds.

**Sarah DeStefano**

To add to that I feel like this is just consultation from the public, they may know their neighborhood better than we do. Okay, we all come from different places, and to the extent to which they know how neighborhoods are cut, maybe that can help us. And that's why I feel like, as I was saying, the deadline needs to be earlier, because if it's in consultation, that needs to be before we start making our own decisions, right? And not, after we really decided and we're receiving that still, because I also think that that is more suggestive to the public that they're more involved in this process. And they really, right. And I don't think that that's fair to the public and transparent either we, we want these maps to come in so that we can review them, see if there's something we can take from it, and then use that information. And maybe we get nothing out of it. And that's entirely fair as well. But to prolong the process, well into where we're already deciding, I think is is suggestive that there there have more of a say, like you were saying, then they really do.

**Kathleen Waithe**

That's, that's what I was getting. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying. Okay, who makes it easier? Now I understand.

**Andy Monk**

And to put a really super fine point on it, we are under zero obligation to take any of this input into consideration in our final maps, the decision is 100%, up to the seven of us at the end of the day, But as Sarah said, you know, they might think of something we didn't



**Kathleen Waithe**

Thanks for the clarification. That's what it was. Okay, thank you.

**Sarah DeStefano**

Great question, though. So thank you, totally.

**Andy Monk**

Um, so I, we we're gonna, we'll stick with this existing deadline. Um, Ken has made a motion to add a note that the Commission may ask for a presentation from individuals that submit plans. So I will. Is there a second to that motion?

**Kathleen Waithe**

I'll second, it.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. And all those in favor of adding that note to that sentence, or somewhere in the document, I guess, there though, because that's where it's highlighted.

**Kathleen Waithe**

Yes.

**Andy Monk**

All right. So we will not add that note this time. But I do think that we could certainly request that even without, without warning from the public. If someone had such an amazing idea that we wanted to invite them in

**Kenneth Panza**

What about anonymous submissions.

**Andy Monk**

What's that?

**Kenneth Panza**

Will we accept anonymous submissions?

**Andy Monk**

That's a good question. Rob, would they you wouldn't really be able to accept to put an anonymous submission, right, because you have to create an account using an email address, or is that not?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Yeah, you would have to you have to use a user. Username could be anything. And you could use it probably create using a dummy email address to if you want. But I think if they present, then, if you want me to present them, they have to reveal themselves.

**Andy Monk**

Yeah. Yeah. So I guess in some way, we may not even have a way to contact the person submitting the plan.

**Robert Leibowitz**

I mean, you. I mean, the I don't know if you want to go as far. But you can ask

**Kenneth Panza**

But the question was the other way around. Could we accept plans where we don't know the specifics..

**Sarah DeStefano**

I would say that we couldn't do so if we're voting on the person needs to be a resident of Ulster County, we would need to know who they are. I think there was discussion, the subcommittee that there is that is very difficult for us to determine. But you know, if it's, you know, Joe Biden, he lives in Washington, DC, and we know that he does not live here. You know, if it's someone from Dutchess County, that's elected official, we know they they don't live in Ulster County. Um, but I think it would be very difficult for us to have that rule in this document, and then take anonymous submissions.

**Kenneth Panza**

I'm not suggesting we put anything in the document. But I'm just you know, as a procedure for the commission, would we accept submissions from unknown anonymous sources.

**Robert Leibowitz**

There is no way to know, Ken.

**Andy Monk**

I think yeah, I think the answer is that we have no way of verifying the identities of the submitters, and that that would add a tremendous amount of extra work. I think, if someone wants to sit down and take the seven hours or whatever, to create a full district plan, clearly they have some interest in doing it. And I I mean, to directly answer your question, because I feel like no one has yet I think the answer is basically yes. Because we are not able to verify the identities of the people. So in some ways, everyone is kind of anonymous, because they could really be anybody if that makes sense.

**Sarah DeStefano**

But it's something we can take into consideration maybe, you know, I see a map that doesn't have a name on it and I don't take it as seriously and and that may very well be my approach to some of these maps should they be submitted with you know, Mickey Mouse as the name etc.

**Andy Monk**

Totally.

**Fawn Tantillo**

I just need to back up for one moment. The last vote you took not to add the language that we might ask people to present. I believe that failed four to two I just need to confirm was a Kathy and Ken that voted against in favor?

**Andy Monk**

Yes, yes. Okay. All right. Next, "What if a school class citizen group or club composed of several persons wants to participate? Will each of them receive an attentive review? In this case, we would recommend that you follow a protocol similar to the one that COR itself is following. Everyone creates an individual plan submits it to the group for peer review, shares ideas, implements aspects of the plan by consensus; votes on the best plan and submits one plan as a collective exercise. Submitting one plan that was created by a group of individuals working together would certainly get more attention than submitting multiple plans individually."Ken has moved that we strike suggesting that they follow a protocol similar to the one the Commission follows. I actually think this paragraph could be shortened further now that I'm looking at it. And I, so I will first let's vote on Ken's motion, because I don't want to confuse the issue. I have done that a lot tonight. I will second the motion to remove that sentence. Can I see a show of hands who approves removing it?

**Unknown**

I don't. That's fine.

**Andy Monk**

Okay,

**Fawn Tantillo**

Wait one second. I gotta just get that vote.

**Andy Monk**

Kathy, were you in favor? I wasn't sure.

**Kathleen Waithe**

What was the sentence? The one that you..

**Andy Monk**

This red one here, this one in this the struck out sentence?

**Kathleen Waithe**

Sure. That's, that's fine.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. So I'll go ahead. And I guess

**Fawn Tantillo**

So was there anybody opposed to that?

**Andy Monk**

I think that was unanimous, correct me if I'm wrong, everyone.

**Fawn Tantillo**

That's what I was just double check.

**Andy Monk**

Okay, um, I would have to remove that we submits one plan

**Kenneth Panza**

loss sounds.

**Andy Monk**

I'll further move that we take out these words that I've highlighted and change it to in this case, "we'd recommend that your group submits one plan is a collective exercise."

**Regis Obijiski**

That's fine.

**Andy Monk**

Can I get a second to my motion?

**Kathleen Waithe**

Second?

**Andy Monk**

And can I see a show of hands who approves? All right, thank you. submits one plans collective spending one plan but that's much shorter. That's good. Okay, next paragraph. "If a member of the public submits a strong and useful plan, will it be used by the COR. To be clear The COR appreciates all public input and may incorporate ideas presented to us in maps created by the public. However, the final maps will ultimately be voted on and approved by the Commission." We're good with that. And that's it's a nice... I think we've said it a couple times. But it's a nice clarification

**Kenneth Panza**

I made a motion on that, even though I red lined it in my document, just because I thought it was... I was confused by it. But you know, that's probably not really an issue here.

**Andy Monk**

What are the deadlines for the COR reapportionment plan, may 20? So I motion that we add the February 28 deadline if we're if we're keeping that language as of the first bullet point to we all agree.

**Committee Members**

Yes, yeah. Yes. Yes.

**Andy Monk**

I'll make this nicer. Later, but that's so we're added that's a placeholder for whatever EVENTUAL LANGUAGE may 20 22. A draft of the report cement plan must be completed and made available 10 days prior to one or more scheduled public hearings. And then July 20 2022, the commission shall have finalized blah, blah, blah, the finalized adopted by majority vote and filed the reapportionment plan to the county board of elections."

**Kenneth Panza**

You know, the part I thought confused to that statement was let the public hearings appear to have to be occur before the May 20th date

**Regis Obijiski**

Not before May 20. No.

**Andy Monk**

I don't I don't know the answer to that question. But so Regis, we're not it. Will those public hearings can be after?

**Regis Obijiski**

Yes. I mean? Yes. Yes. Okay. That's in the charter. Okay.

**Andy Monk**

So Ken, did you want?

**Kenneth Panza**

No further comments on that.

**Andy Monk**

Okay. Great. Perfect. So, in that case, I think, I think that's the document Does anyone have any additional comments or concerns? It looks like it's a little more than two pages. So it's it's a bit of a read. But I think we're already asking them to dedicate hours of their lives to making these maps anyway. So hopefully they'll get through it.

**Kenneth Panza**

If they're discouraged by the length of this document, they're not going to get through a map.  
(Laughter)

**Andy Monk**

Exactly, exactly.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I just for clarification, I can't actually can't recall now did we did we vote on that charter language? Because I didn't believe we did. But it's still in the document.

**Andy Monk**

We did not vote. We voted not to pass it. So I'm sorry. I'll get I'll remove it.

**Sarah DeStefano**

Just to ensure that it follows...

**Andy Monk**

Yes, absolutely. Thank you, Sarah, for that clarification. Okay, so with those.

**Fawn Tantillo**

You need to vote on the entire document.

**Andy Monk**

Sorry, Fawn.

**Fawn Tantillo**

You need to vote on the entire document, now, as amended.

**Andy Monk**

Do, Fawn. As a point of clarification. Can I update this public submissions line after the fact? Okay,

**Fawn Tantillo**

Yes, sir.

**Andy Monk**

So when,

**Kenneth Panza**

(inaudible) as part of the documents,

**Andy Monk**

Say that again, Ken.

**Kenneth Panza**

I think you just put that in as part of the document that we approved? Right.

**Fawn Tantillo**

He... I think he wants to clean up the language a little.

**Andy Monk**

I just want to make it nicer, the public submission, you know, plan should be free, but I don't want him to take up everyone's time doing that. So, um, can I then ask for a motion to approve the document as it is with the one final edit of making the language of public submissions just a little bit nicer?

**Sarah DeStefano**

So moved.

**Andy Monk**

okay. And a second. Sir. And, and all those in favor of approving the document. Great. Perfect. Well, the motion passes unanimously. So I will just make that one edit later tonight. And then we will, I guess, get that over to you Rob. To put it on the site?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Ah, Fawn would do that.

**Fawn Tantillo**

Send it to me.

**Andy Monk**

Fine. Okay, perfect. All right. In that case, I will stop sharing my screen so I can see everyone's faces again.

**Travis Rask**

Great job, Andy.

**Regis Obijiski**

And that was great. Very nice. Very, very good. Okay, all right, let's, let's move on the next item on the agenda is really a new business item. And it's scheduling, group mapping exercises. And, you know, mappings are, that's our main work. We were talking about this, we know we're up against it, we know we have to, in many ways, get moving on it. But many of us are in different places. We know that the commissioners who are involved in selecting the software had a certain perhaps a certain early facility with the with the tool. Then there's Ken who did mapping with, with with and without, without the Maptitude. And then there the rest of us that are, you know, struggling along I'll I'll include myself in that group. And want to personally thank Rob, for meeting with me last Thursday to help me with a couple of couple of problems that a couple problems that I had. But you know, I'm loving jumping into it and doing it. But there's another way to go about this. And that is group mapping exercises. So Rob, if you don't mind, you want to jump in and describe what that is and how it works and how it can benefit us.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Oh, I mean, the group I don't they think that was more of how you want that to work. I when we sat down, that was more of a one to one, how do I do this? How do I do that? I'm fully happy to help any of the commissioners with that on a one on one basis. If they're not sure how to use the program, we could do that over zoom. Or they could come into the office. For a group session where you actually want to work on the county plan in a non small group non quorum situation we can schedule something like that we could either do it in your office or again on Zoom. Personally, I'd prefer during work hours for my sake, but we can work on something else, too.

**Regis Obijiski**

I guess we have to ask, is there an interest in doing some group mapping with with Rob

**Travis Rask**

With, with Rob?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Yeah, I mean, well, what let me describe what we have in our office just so I know we have mando pad which is about a 50 inch touchscreen in our office so we can, you know, big screenin a conference room so pretty people could sit down and really see it in the screen and work on so that's what we have maybe

**Travis Rask**

Maybe just like he said, like maybe just a time for like a tutorial again. I mean, like I said it couldn't couldn't hurt just to go through show us. I don't have I don't have a problem with like something along those lines, maybe not necessarily make our maps together. But other another tutorial on why what's going on wouldn't wouldn't hurt

**Fawn Tantillo**

I guess what I sort of pictured the last time we did this, we set up something in the chambers map and the whole committee sat there because they were really under a time crunch much quicker time constraint where Rob worked on the on a big map, they started with a base, I guess, one of the base maps that they liked and tweaked it, I don't remember exactly. But that whole committee was there and weighed in about moving this line here and moving that line there as a group. If you were going to do that, without it being a public meeting, you can't have more than three of you in the, you know, on the meeting at a time. But but sometimes that's helpful to see how a plan might flesh out if you're, if you know, if you're not real, any of you aren't real comfortable with doing it on your own. Sometimes that's a good way to do it. But Rob's even offered to do a one on one with you.

**Robert Leibowitz**

I mean, the way that the way we did that one time with the last commission that it was kind of how way I imagine this commissioning, working only we have more time, if they want, especially if you want to increase the number of times you meet a month, we could work on it. So we don't have to do we work from nine till three in the afternoon on a Saturday when we did it once.

**Travis Rask**

Right.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I sort of feel like maybe it's early to be considering sitting down as a group like that and and deciding. Especially if we're taking public consideration public maps into consideration. And that perhaps I am not against the idea of getting us all together in a meeting to do that. But given the open meeting laws, maybe it's better served to do it later on in the process. February, March.



**Travis Rask**

I mean, would you mind just to pick up on what Sarah saying maybe instead, would you mind just offering kind of what you just did just offering up your your services? For anyone that's requesting between now and next?

**Robert Leibowitz**

That's what I had in mind. I mean, I don't personally I don't see why, now that we have the software we have that I don't see why at your January meeting, the will commission can't work to actually start doing a map. The only thing you have to wait for feedback from the public before you start doing your own map and physically working through one, I think you're at that point, I think you're ready to go,

**Travis Rask**

We are ready to go,

**Sarah DeStefano**

I don't Well, I just don't know that I feel like I need to do it as a group yet. I do feel like I need to have more time to and I'm working on a map to work on the knowledge of I'm not as familiar with the southern edge of the county, as you know, maybe Donna is because she's from there. And I want to get a better sense of clicking around on my own before we start making decisions as a group personally. So I think it's a little early, we've we've only had the software about a month, which included a holiday, major holiday. So I That's how I feel about scheduling a group meeting at this point. I'm not against it, but I I just think it's very soon.

**Regis Obijiski**

Rob, I want to ask you, if from your experience in setting individual completion targets for ourselves. So if we take if we take February 28 as as as a moment where from from that point forward, we might be looking at other plans other plans to include in and our own, perhaps by by that point, February 28 We really should have a level of comfort least I feel like I do a level of comfort in a plan that that that I have created. And I'm willing to share. I'll just give you an example what I'm what I'm talking about. I did the 23 districts and the numbers, the numbers worked, but it didn't meet all the the contiguity and, you know, I had a lot of unassigned spots, you know, on the map when I looked at it on Rob's What did you call it the Mondo screen, whatever it was called?

**Robert Leibowitz**

Mondopad.

**Regis Obijiski**

Yeah, that that you know, it was a size of a football and I could barely see it on my my 13 inch Mac. So you know some sometimes that that that really helps. Anyway, I did the 23 and Rob says a lot of just on it. You just shared it and I said because I'm not ready. I'm not exactly proud of it yet. You know, I have a lot of holes left in it. And I'm not sure that the way I combined certain municipalities really works. And so I want to I want to do it. I really want to do it again before I share. Now our use you were saying Oh, you know, that's okay, Regis. Go ahead and, you know, go ahead and share it anyway. And, and but I don't I don't quite feel that way. So what will be the wisdom of sharing what you got like, Ken? Ken has has

his out there. I'm sure he's met the the the contiguity and everything else. And, Ken, did you share yours yet? I don't think

**Kenneth Panza**

I haven't shared it.

**Regis Obijiski**

Yeah, I mean, you share it. It's sort of like you took a picture?

**Kenneth Panza**

I didn't share it on Maptitude. But I mean, I shared it...

**Regis Obijiski**

On Maptitude. Yeah.

**Kenneth Panza**

I shared it with a report I sent to the commission.

**Regis Obijiski**

Right.

**Kenneth Panza**

See what I did. And what some of the what I took into consideration. Sure. So I mean, that I shared in mind should know, I put her Thompson back into Rochester, and then stole a few of his census blocks and put them in Gardner. But aside from that, it was pretty straightforward. Just worked off the existing map for the most part.

**Regis Obijiski**

Yeah.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Here's my take, my take, I mean, I think Sarah has a good point. Sit down, get familiar with it, get to a certain point where you're coming up with regional ideas, or at least in your mind, regionalideas. And then once you know, then once you develop a plan, and you're comfortable that share it, and then it can serve as a starting point for other people, or what what I think you're going to find are a lot of similarities. Any which way it goes, I think there are only there actually aren't that many ways to do this. And I think you're going to find a lot of similarities as you go through it, and you're just going to find it. So maybe take a couple weeks, come up with a plan on your own and share it and then we can see then you can compare and contrast the differences between them.

**Regis Obijiski**

So are you rsaying, sorry, Go ahead, Ken, please.

**Kenneth Panza**

if we share the plans on Maptitude, it does not make the plans available to the public. Also, yeah,

**Robert Leibowitz**

anybody who creates an account can use it as a starting point to use for their own that they can edit and wouldn't edit your copy, it would edit the new version that they have. So wouldn't be yours. If you follow me?

**Kenneth Panza**

Well, I mean, you've put a couple of examples out on Maptitude, you just be that then you're you go. Just make so like they could, I mean, if commissioners put their share their maps on Maptitude the general public can access that map, make their own copy of it, then make adjustments to it.

**Regis Obijiski**

Just, just getting back to target dates. Again, Rob, do you think that that each of us really need to have experience with creating a full a full map of all 23 districts by I don't know, by January?

**Robert Leibowitz**

I don't I don't know that everybody has to even know how to use the program just as long as they when when you all come together to look at a map when you're looking at one draft together to no just offer input on that draft. So there's nothing that says any commissioner actually even has to create an account on it. They don't want to.

**Regis Obijiski**

Mm hmm.

**Robert Leibowitz**

So I mean, it would help educate and inform them? Certainly.

**Regis Obijiski**

Mm hmm. I wonder if would be helpful to do something, let's say for our, our meeting next month, in January, to as an exercise, because we're real, that's what we're we don't really have, I think anything else to do except to do mapping. Right? My right about that.

**Robert Leibowitz**

I mean, if you want to as an exercise you could create, we could we could do as a trial, you know, just as a beta test, kind of, if you will, and say okay, this is what worked out the kinks in the process of what working together, like a group would be in creating your own map together. And then from there, you could say, Okay, this is how this flow is better as you go to your later meeting. So everybody's not talking over each other and whatnot.

**Regis Obijiski**

How does everybody else feel about that? I'm thinking about next month's meeting, doing exactly what what Rob is describing.

**Travis Rask**

Exciting. I'm excited for,

**Sarah DeStefano**

I guess, I wonder what the point of the public input is, though, we're going to start making them out without, they're like, we're just gonna jump in and start mapping and then not considered at all. It just seems like a lot of extra. I don't find it that's very transparent, to be honest, for us to hold ourselves out as considering public maps, but be creating maps, before there's any maps necessarily to consider. And before the deadline that we just spent an hour drafting a document for and designing a deadline on.

**Regis Obijiski**

I'm just, I'm just talking about getting a facility to do this. I mean, if you've done this already, Sarah?

**Sarah DeStefano**

I don't I mean, I've been playing around with the software. I don't I don't completely understand what you mean, but the facility I mean, at some point, I guess in makes sense to get us all together on one of these meetings and do it. But to be doing it together to be mapping as a group, as early as January, when we have held onto the public that I don't I, I was suspect about having the public involved, because I didn't, I thought that there would only be public officials submitting maps to be 100% honest. And I was convinced that we should do it to be transparent. And I actually don't disagree with that idea. But this seems to frustrate the idea of transparency that we're now setting a deadline at the end of February and then but already going forward and creating this map without having taken any of that into consideration. It, it doesn't feel you know, like it's corresponds with what we're holding out, we're doing to be now moving forward with map creation. Before we actually even know that we've gotten this up on the website yet to offer to people.

**Regis Obijiski**

I'm not sure I'm not sure I agree with you on on that I'm not talking about coming up with a final map that commissioners all agree to, I'm just talking about creating a map. And, and, you know, what, what it takes what, what goes into it to to make it happen?

**Sarah DeStefano**

What is the difference? We're making, we're getting together and we're acting as like a, like public officials in a way we're taking action, we're working on something together. That is that is moving forward with a map creation, what is the significant difference between, you know, saying we're just getting together as a group to do it, we'll be on, whether it be in person, it'll be an in person meeting, or it'll be on Zoom, where we're sort of discussing, I mean, it's a public meeting where we're making decisions about the map, without the consultation of the public that we're holding out that we we would like to consider doesn't seem compatible.

**Kenneth Panza**

Okay, I don't really have to look at this as a educational process, with our own target date is February 28, when the commissioners would have a map, but you're not going to be able to evaluate the public maps, unless you've gone through the process yourself.

**Regis Obijiski**

That's that's kind of my point, Ken.

**Kenneth Panza**

Before the February 28, deadline when the public maps will be available.

**Sarah DeStefano**

And you've done that, Ken, you've worked on your own map. And I've been working...

**Kenneth Panza**

Burt the rest of the commissioners also have to do it now.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I'm sorry, I let you speak. And I don't know, I don't understand why you jump in on my speaking. I don't think that that's kind. I, I don't see, I don't see how the two are the same. We can work on figuring out how the software works without making decisions as a group officially.

**Kenneth Panza**

We don't make the decisions until later. But we also have a better idea of what the maps gonna look like before the 28th.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Might I offer a suggestion...

**Sarah DeStefano**

What is the point of having the public involved, we're already going to know what the map was.

**Kenneth Panza**

I never understood that anyways, but you know, the public is involved, and we ought to accept their input. But that doesn't mean what that should suppress what we do.

**Regis Obijiski**

Yeah. Alright, Ken you get us something? I'm sorry, Ken, Rob?

**Robert Leibowitz**

I don't think the I think different. I don't know if it's a different process. But as an alternative, I don't think the public can really comment on the plan until you start to put one together. So if the Commission works on several drafts, and shares them, that would be a very effective way for the public to comment

on them by actually having access to them. And that's why I thought the February 28 deadline was a little early. How can they can't respond to anything you do. But if you're already ended February 28.

**Sarah DeStefano**

But isn't that the point of the difference between the May deadline and the July deadline? Is that the public comments on the map that we come up with? And so there's plenty of time for public comment as per the Charter.

**Robert Leibowitz**

If I'm not if the May deadline is that when you have to share the draft with the public, is that what that is? Yes. So you could ostensibly come up with a final draft on May 15, then or the day before the meeting. And then so this is our draft. It doesn't have to be done two months before

**Fawn Tantillo**

The the the draft has to be available to the public 10 days before that.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Som until 11 days before. Does it have to be one final draft or several?

**Fawn Tantillo**

One point? I would just point out, Mike is a member of the public doing this 10 years ago, I believe there were something like 15 maps that the the committee looked at started out with on that Saturday morning, They had 15 maps in front of them with various solutions. The thought that you will be able to sit down at one meeting in January or February and come and walk out of that meeting in an hour with a final map I think is ambitious. But if the I also think is a useful tool for the public to see you go through the process, see where you hit a problem, see what things you are considering as you're making your maps. Where you if I recall, I think Mike Baden came up last time with like at least six maps that he submitted that each had a solution and each had a problem. Chopping Sahwangunk into three pieces or making New Paltz a donut shape. Those were really controversial things that were discussed at length by the committee back then. And those came out of various plans and the problems that the Commission hit making those decisions. So it just would start the conversations about if you look at this area and say, Well, you know, there's Do you want the district with Hurley to have part of it above the reservoir and part of the below, do you want to make, you know, you wanted still cu Shawangunk up in three pieces, they were promised ten years ago, they wouldn't happen to them again, maybe maybe it's not even an issue with taking 2000 people out of part of that district. But I would just said, I don't think it's a it's it would be an exercise. But don't think you're going to come up with anything file that you can say this is our plan.

**Sarah DeStefano**

But I think it just comes down to how comfortable this commission is with holding out to the public that we will consider their plans and moving forward with mapping as a group. Nonetheless, it does not, it does not correspond with what we're holding out to the public. It is not transparent. I personally do not feel comfortable with that. If the rest of this commission does that I'm outvoted. But I don't see how the how just because we're not doing it as a group doesn't mean we're not coming up with maps. And it

doesn't mean we won't have time. We have two and a half months, slightly more between the February 28 deadline and when we have to agree on a map. I just I don't..

**Fawn Tantillo**

I hear you.

**Sarah DeStefano**

I don't think I'm just saying like we cannot say one thing as unelected officials, essentially public officials, and do something completely different. And I just want to be on the record saying that I'm uncomfortable holding myself out to that standard. If the commission disagrees, then that is the way it is. But I just want to put that on the record that this is a lack of transparency on our part to be saying we're doing one thing and then doing completely something different.

**Kenneth Panza**

I don't think there's a lack of transparency at all. I think it's your responsibility to commission to work in parallel with the public process, get familiar with the maps to do the mapping. And one February 28 comes around to be the be educated enough and experienced enough to be able to consider the public maps.

**Sarah DeStefano**

No doubt. And we can do that as very right individuals.

**Kenneth Panza**

Well, the commission has to do it not just individuals

**Sarah DeStefano**

Learning an individual sport.

**Regis Obijiski**

Yeah, I think I think we're repeating ourselves. And we'll just we'll let this go for the time being of if you don't mind, folks. Other new other new business? Can you think of anything that we haven't? We haven't quite addressed and that we should either now today or in the near future? Under new business? Anybody? Okay. Oh, I think I'm sorry. Yeah. Go ahead. Andy.

**Andy Monk**

Kathy was saying something.

**Kathleen Waithe**

Guys, I was muted. I was I just have a question for Rob. Regarding just your services when it when are you available? Because I probably will reach out to you.

**Robert Leibowitz**

I mean, nine to five, Monday through Friday.

**Kathleen Waithe**

Okay,

**Robert Leibowitz**

I mean, you just call me like and try and fit you and if you want to come in or we can do over zoom.

**Kathleen Waithe**

Okay, thank you. Okay.

**Robert Leibowitz**

And same goes for everybody. Okay, okay.

**Fawn Tantillo**

I will email Rob's contact information to everyone.

**Regis Obijiski**

That's great. Okay. Under old business, I think that we've covered covered all of that. Does anybody who is anybody who is who's on Zoom or on the phone, have anything to comment about anything that we're doing any of our business? If you do, would you want to mute and acknowledge or self identify and I start speaking

**Mike Baden**

it's Mike Baden. I I just wanted to sort of weigh in. I believe I accidentally shared a plan. I did not intend to share it. It may be out there as a share. I talked to Rob about it. Um, that was my non familiarity with With the current software and clicking on something that I probably shouldn't have clicked on. But I, I think I really applaud what the public is saying. I mean, what the committee is saying to the public, in that you, you do value. It was a really interesting discussion tonight. And I think to weigh in on what fawn and Rob have sort of reiterated, I really doubt you're going to get that many completed plans. I am the person who took seven hours to do a plan and I wasn't entirely happy with it. And I've, I've since gone back and tweaked it some more, and I'm going to continue tweaking it to finesse it. It's a starting point, and I think, Rob is correct. And you're going to get into some challenges where there's, there's probably two ways to fix the problem. You can go one direction, or you can go the other direction. And just I think you guys are doing a great job and just sort of, you know, continue the process the way you're doing it. And it's it's gonna work out really well.

**Kenneth Panza**

So, okay.

**Regis Obijiski**

Really appreciate your wisdom, Mike and your and your experience. It's really terrific. Thank you so much. Does anyone else Mike, anything else you want to add? Okay, anyone else?



**Mike Baden**

No, actually, I just if I did indeed share a plan, which Rob said, I called Rob, and he said he saw it just know by by no means is that a finished product? And if you if you actually if you prefer to delete it for now, I'm okay with that. It was, like I said it was me clicking on the share button when I shouldn't have and it it got shared that I really wasn't intending it to be shared yet. So

**Robert Leibowitz**

Just to follow up...

**Kenneth Panza**

I don't see, I don't see your plan on the web...

**Mike Baden**

Okay then maybe I did not share.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Actually you have two shared plans.

**Mike Baden**

My I do.

**Robert Leibowitz**

Yeah. You two shared plans. But you know, when you share something that's just a starting point, that is not a submitted final plan, there's a big difference between the two. So if

**Mike Baden**

I if I have to the first one is not at all. The second one was the more refined version so

**Robert Leibowitz**

I can have them removed.

**Mike Baden**

Yeah. Yes. Probably the best bet. I'm still still working. And we'll we'll definitely we'll be sharing something not so much as a public official, which I am now but just as somebody who appreciates this process, and it's part of what got me involved in all this government stuff in the beginning. So thank you.

**Regis Obijiski**

Thanks, Mike. Thank you very much. Does anyone else have any final words? Okay, in that case, I'll ask for a motion to adjourn, please. Someone.

**Sarah DeStefano**

So moved.

**Regis Obijiski**

Thank you. Thank you. Second?

**Kathleen Waithe**

Second.

**Regis Obijiski**

Thank you, Kathy. All in favor.

**Committee Members**

Aye. Yes.

**Regis Obijiski**

Thank you. All right. Good night.