

CITY OF CRANSTON
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting of Sept. 16, 2021 – APPROVED MINUTES

The Cranston Redistricting Commission met on Sept. 16, 2021, in a meeting advertised in accordance with the Rhode Island Open Meetings Act on Sept. 13, 2021. The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Randall Jackvony, at 5:16 p.m. It was held in Council Chambers, Third Floor at Cranston City Hall, 869 Park Ave., Cranston, RI 02910-2786.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randall Jackvony, Gary Vierra, Quilcia Moronta

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

NON-MEMBERS PRESENT: Nicholas Lima (Registrar / Director of Elections), Maria Giarrusso (GIS Manager), Steve Frias (Charter Review Commission Chairperson)

The chair declared a quorum present.

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER (NO VOTES TO BE TAKEN)
- II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 8-10-2021 (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
- IV. PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS – COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON (NO VOTES TO BE TAKEN)
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. THE COMMISSION MAY HEAR FROM STAFF AND REVIEW THE 2020 CENSUS REDISTRICTING DATA RELEASE (NO VOTES TO BE TAKEN)
 - B. THE COMMISSION MAY HEAR A REPORT FROM STAFF ON THE STATUS OF THE STATE REAPPORTIONMENT PROCESS AND VOTE TO SUPPORT AN INCREASE IN THE 3,000 VOTER PRECINCT CAP (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
 - C. THE COMMISSION MAY REVIEW, DISCUSS, AND ACT UPON A PRESENTATION FROM STAFF ON THE FIRST DRAFT REDISTRICTING MAP, SCENARIO A1* (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
 - D. THE COMMISSION MAY DISCUSS GUIDANCE FOR STAFF IN ACCEPTING VARIOUS FORMS OF FEEDBACK AND MAP FORMAT SUBMISSIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
 - E. THE COMMISSION MAY DISCUSS AND PLAN FOR A PUBLIC HEARING TO BE HELD TO REVIEW AND SOLICIT FEEDBACK FOR DRAFT REDISTRICTING SCENARIOS (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)
- VII. ADJOURNMENT (VOTE MAY BE TAKEN)

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Jackvony asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

MOTION: By Mr. Vierra and seconded by Mr. Jackvony to approve the agenda as posted.
PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 3-0

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jackvony made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting of Aug. 10, 2021.

MOTION: By Mr. Jackvony and seconded by Ms. Moronta to approve the meeting minutes of 8-10-2021.
PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 3-0

PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mr. Jackvony had no acknowledgements at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was one member of the public present, however they declined to provide testimony. Various maps, including Scenario A1, were on display in Council Chambers and available for the public to review and draw on with markers.

NEW BUSINESS

A. THE COMMISSION MAY HEAR FROM STAFF AND REVIEW THE 2020 CENSUS REDISTRICTING DATA RELEASE

Mr. Lima said it has been an exciting few weeks with the release of the census redistricting data. He said the redistricting map gallery has been available for a couple of weeks now on the city website, and that Maria Giarrusso has put a lot of work into polishing and improving the interactive maps and data made available to the public.

Ms. Giarrusso said the census data was released on Aug. 12. She said she has put together several data viewers to visualize the data and aid the Commission in the drawing of draft map scenarios. Part of analyzing the data is seeing how much the population of each of the current six wards has changed from 2010 to 2020.

The redistricting map gallery contains direct links to census data, population reports for wards and precincts, including breakdowns by total registered voters, race, Hispanic origin, and other demographic information, PDFs and raw data and shapefiles for all map scenarios, an in-house plan comparison tool that Ms. Giarrusso built, and maps that showcase census data, population change, and other information related to elections and the 2020 Census data release.

Ms. Giarrusso presented each item on the map gallery and described what users can do to view various layers of data. She went into detail, using the large television monitor in Council Chambers, explaining how to easily navigate each map and turn on and off various features. Users are able to search a specific address, view voting districting information, all published 2020 Census data, tax assessor data, and toggle aerial

photography on the maps. She said users can use the Census Data Viewer to automatically add up total population and registered voters in multiple census blocks by shift-clicking several blocks, and the program will make an instant calculation and display the totals on screen.

Mr. Vierra asked if geographies such as census tracts are included in the viewer, and Ms. Giarrusso said they are, along with block groups and blocks. Each can be toggled on and off in the map view options. He asked about the availability of other census data, such as housing. Mr. Lima said like redistricting data, other 2020 Census products, such as income or housing, have been delayed, and he's read many datasets won't be released until after the summer of 2022. Ms. Giarrusso said there may be some ACS data available from recent American Community Survey releases.

Mr. Vierra asked if the 5 percent population variation is in the city charter or state law. Mr. Lima explained that the target population is not statutory but is based off of past practice, which stems originally from court precedent and the "One Person, One Vote" decision that requires voting districts to have roughly equal population. He said the larger the district, the less deviation typically allowed, so at the state level, congressional districts have a 1 percent deviation, while wards and General Assembly districts are typically within plus or minus 5 percent. He said in some cases it can be as high as 10 percent, however the standard the city has followed in recent redistricting processes is 5 percent, which is what was included in the enabling resolution for this Commission passed by the City Council in the spring.

Mr. Lima said that precincts are different, as they constitute registered voters, and not total population, under R.I. Gen. Laws § 17-11-1. State law sets maximum precinct sizes of 3,000 voters, which can be exceeded by up to 500 voters with approval from the state Board of Elections; the minimum precinct size is 500 voters, although the state Reapportionment Commission's enabling language directly conflicts with that, setting the minimum at 100, and allows for even fewer with "where practicable" language. Mr. Lima said there is one precinct in Cranston, created by state General Assembly lines in 2012, that has zero registered voters.

Ms. Moronta asked how the plan comparison tool shows differences. Ms. Giarrusso showcased the options to turn on and off 2012 approved boundary lines, and explained the shaded areas on the map reflect changes from 2012 to the current scenario under consideration.

B. THE COMMISSION MAY HEAR A REPORT FROM STAFF ON THE STATUS OF THE STATE REAPPORTIONMENT PROCESS AND VOTE TO SUPPORT AN INCREASE IN THE 3,000 VOTER PRECINCT CAP (VOTES MAY BE TAKEN)

Mr. Lima said he attended the first meeting of the state Reapportionment Commission last week and provided testimony in public comment regarding the need to consider increasing the current cap of 3,000 registered voters set in state law, as well as informing the state of some of the work the Cranston Redistricting Commission has undertaken thus far to identify neighborhoods and communities of interest, clean up street file data, and prepare for the 2020 Census data release.

Mr. Lima said that several precincts in Cranston are currently at or over the 3,000-voter cap, which is problematic for elections administration as it forces the Board of Canvassers to identify new polling locations that may be less ideal than the original location being split off of.

An example is Precinct 0730, currently the largest precinct in the state, which has 3,500 voters assigned to Orchard Farms Elementary School in Western Cranston. Under current law, if the precinct remains that large, in 2022 that precinct will have to be divided into two precincts, even though Orchard Farms is ideally located and well-suited to handling a high volume of people, with great ADA accessibility and plenty of parking. If the precinct had to be split, since Orchard Farms has a gym and a cafeteria, it would probably involve voters from one part of the current precinct going to the gym, and the remainder to the cafeteria. This is confusing for the voters and poll workers, since the ballot styles are identical and there is otherwise no reason the voters can't vote in the same room. Furthermore, this requires double the voting equipment and the recruitment and training of another entire set of poll workers, which is an extraordinary waste of staff time and money. Orchard Farms is lucky, as it has two available rooms; in other large precincts, an entirely new location may need to be found to split voters up into, which is unlikely to be as centrally located or accessible as the ideal location. The 3,000 cap seems to cause more problems than it solves, and is now artificially low due to changes in voter patterns.

Mr. Lima said it has been clear since 2016 that mail ballot use is on the rise, which peaked in 2020 due to the pandemic. Going forward, mail ballots will continue to be utilized by a high percentage of voters. Combined with the dramatically increased use of early voting, it's now reasonable to predict that in a precinct of 3,000 registered voters with a 66 percent turnout, 500 may vote early, 500 may vote by mail, and 1,000 may vote at the polls on election day. This means that precincts capable of handling 3,000 voters under state law are in reality only serving one third of their capacity, however, the Board of Canvassers is nonetheless forced to identify additional polling places to comply with the law.

Mr. Lima said this issue is further complicated by the state often creating pocket precincts, where a small number of registered voters exists in an "island" between representative and senate lines. These pocket precincts take up additional polling locations that would otherwise be available for use to split larger precincts. He said that with 31 voting districts presently, the city's available unused polling location inventory can be counted on one hand, and there are few viable options available that aren't already in use.

Mr. Lima said there was a cap of 1,900 voters up until 2012, and his predecessor Jackie Caruolo worked with the Board of Elections, Rhode Island Town and City Clerks' Association, and the General Assembly that year to raise it to 3,000. Mr. Lima said the clerks wanted a higher cap at the time, but the General Assembly settled on the 3,000 number after protests from good government groups like Common Cause. He said that now, with clear evidence in shifting voting patterns, the time is ideal to review that number again. Mr. Lima said e-pollbooks were also not in use in 2012, which have contributed to dramatically shorter lines since their widespread adoption in 2018.

Mr. Lima stressed to the state Reapportionment Commission that if the legislature is to act to increase the 3,000 number, it must do so early in the session, so local boards of canvassers have flexibility when precinct lines are drawn next spring. While the state Commission has no authority to do so, he is hopeful they will pass a statement of support, or that the members thereof, most of whom are legislators, will co-sponsor and push for legislation early next session. Mr. Lima said he would like to send a formal letter from the Cranston Redistricting Commission to the state expressing support for this concept, and is asking for authorization to do so.

Mr. Vierra asked when the state commission must complete its work by, and Mr. Lima said the enabling resolution requires their final report to be submitted to the General Assembly by Jan. 15.

Mr. Lima said he believes the other 38 cities and towns will agree with us on this, and in many cases, since most do not have wards, the 3,000 cap causes even bigger problems in finding adequate polling locations than it does in Cranston. He said he will ask the RITCCA for their formal support.

Mr. Jackvony asked if we should propose a number. Mr. Lima said he doesn't want to suggest a number to the state outright, because he feels a statewide conversation should take place to settle on a number that makes sense for most cities and towns and not just Cranston. Mr. Lima said that, if pressed, he thinks 4,000 voters is a good starting point, which can always be reviewed in future years by the legislature once there is turnout data from more election cycles on the continued use of early voting and mail voting. Mr. Lima said he has heard from staff at the Board of Elections that they are working on their own legislation, however, they are more focused on increasing the cap for special elections than the 3,000 number.

Mr. Jackvony asked what the BOE is proposing for special elections, and Mr. Lima said they haven't determined a number, but it could be as high as 10,000. Mr. Lima said changing the 3,000 number is a fairly straight-forward proposal, and he is a little concerned about the BOE's push for changing the special election number over-complicating the discussion in the General Assembly, since the two issues are very much separate in their effect.

Mr. Vierra asked what the city's deadline is to complete the redistricting and reprecincting process. Mr. Lima said it must be done by the time candidates declare in late June 2022, but ideally, we should be done in early May, to allow time for the Board of Canvassers to have a city-wide mailer prepared and sent to all 60,000 registered voters informing them of their new districts, wards, and precinct numbers, as well as their new default polling locations in 2022 and for the next 10 years. Mr. Lima said we don't have a statutory deadline, but we have a practical deadline to complete our process. He said the Council should complete the redistricting process and the Board of Canvassers should complete its reprecincting process in April.

Mr. Vierra asked if there is a reporting date for the Cranston Redistricting Commission back to the Council. Mr. Lima said the final report needs to be to the City Council following the state completing the redrawing of their lines, according to the enabling resolution. He said he expects that by mid-February, ideally. Once the report is

submitted to the Council, it will be referred to the Ordinance Committee for another round of public hearings, and upon final adoption by the full Council, the final plan also needs to be approved by the Mayor, who has veto power over any ordinance. The General Assembly also has to take action to ratify the plan late next spring, however that is more of a formality. Mr. Vierra asked how the Board and Commission should work together to finalize wards and precincts next spring. Mr. Lima explained the process in detail, which is highly contingent on how the state draws their lines, which can be disruptive for precincting and ballot design if there are pocket precincts or if the 3,000 voter cap remains in place. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Lima said that as an elections administrator, he would be comfortable if each of the six wards were divided into four precincts, yielding a total of 24 polling places. He said that would be feasible with a slight increase in the 3,000 number, and even now could possibly be accomplished with existing lines, if state district lines were not a factor and we were drawing precinct lines in a vacuum. Mr. Lima said that would allow the city to use its best polling locations and poll workers, with each precinct being served by a well-staffed, centrally located and ADA-compliant polling place. Currently, there are several wards with five or six polling places, due to state lines, which requires the use of less-than-ideal locations.

Mr. Vierra asked Mr. Lima to provide more information about pocket precincts. Mr. Lima explained how they come about, and what problems they cause for election administration. He cited Precincts 0704 and 0720 as current illustrative examples that only serve a few hundred voters, and because their geographic area has no viable polling place, those voters have to travel well outside the district to vote. He said prior to the law change in 2012, Cranston had over 50 polling locations, which meant that many individual locations had to serve as the polling place for two precincts, which was confusing for voters and unnecessarily difficult to manage and staff.

Mr. Vierra said it's clear that up to half of voters are now voting by mail or early voting, and he can see the issue from an elections administration perspective. He asked what role the General Assembly has in creating precinct lines. Mr. Lima said the Board of Canvassers draws the lines, but the nature of the process means the lines are, by and large, following General Assembly-drawn district lines, unless they draw lines within wards that create voting areas that are too big, which then have to be subdivided further by the Board into multiple precincts.

Mr. Lima said he knows the state Commission can't change the precinct cap number, but his main objective is to make sure they are aware of this issue and it's on the state's radar in tandem with the 2022 redistricting process conversation. He said he believes good government groups like Common Cause would not be opposed to a modest increase in the number, because recent voter turnout data is supportive of it and it simply makes sense. Discussion continued.

MOTION: By Mr. Jackvony and seconded by Mr. Vierra to authorize the Registrar to draft a letter to the state Special Commission on Reapportionment and leadership of the General Assembly on behalf of the Cranston Redistricting Commission in support of increasing the 3,000 voter precinct cap.

PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 3-0

C. THE COMMISSION MAY REVIEW, DISCUSS, AND ACT UPON A PRESENTATION FROM STAFF ON THE FIRST DRAFT REDISTRICTING MAP, SCENARIO A1*

*The meeting notice contained a link to the city website that included an interactive plan comparison map for Scenario A1. Printed maps were also available for public inspection in the Canvassing Authority office.

Mr. Lima reviewed the shaded areas of the Scenario A1 redistricting plan, and explained the data columns in the redistricting report provided to the Commission and members of the public. Mr. Lima said every ward and precinct line shown on the map follows a neighborhood or sub-neighborhood line as defined in the summer, which are all comprised of major roads, natural features like rivers, or highways and rail lines.

At the Ward 4 and Ward 5 boundary, an adjustment is made to swap population in two areas to move population from Independence Way into Ward 4 and eliminate a “shark fin” shape that jumps over I-295 into territory that makes more sense to include in Ward 5. The switch balances the population between the two wards and creates a key line, I-295, to separate them without having to break up neighborhoods. A further adjustment is made by the Rte. 37 cloverleaf on-ramp, which involves no population changes, but better complies with the neighborhood boundaries and is in keeping with using I-295 itself as the ward boundary.

Mr. Lima said the hope is the state will use some or all of these ward lines as their own lines, as a deviation from them could cause pocket precincts or result in neighborhoods being split up. That is ultimately up to them; the best we can do now is make the suggestion and wait for the state to finish its work before formulating a “final” plan to send to the Council next spring.

Mr. Lima reviewed additional changes between Wards 5 and 3 that involve no changes in voters or population, and are done to incorporate wetlands near the cemetery into the same ward geography, complying further with the neighborhood map. This also corrects the 2012 shape of Ward 3’s western and northwestern border, which was odd because of the way the census block lines in the area are drawn. He said the lines were probably reflective of old river hydrology.

An additional change was made between Ward 5 and Ward 6 in the Woodridge and Dean Estates area. He said this area specifically was discussed in the neighborhoods hearings this summer, where it is preferable to use the pipeline as the ward boundary rather than Sagamore Rd. Using Sagamore unnecessarily splits up the sub-neighborhood, because it forces residents on either side of the same street into different wards and different polling places. The pipeline, which runs behind those houses on the back property line, works much better as a ward boundary as a result.

Because of a drop in population at the ACI of nearly 1,000 people, the population of Ward 6 saw a decline. Adding the Sagamore Rd. area, as well as an adjacent sub-neighborhood along Budlong Rd., ensures Ward 6 has an even population distribution with the other wards. That sub-neighborhood is currently the southern tip of Ward 3, which Mr. Lima described as presently in the shape of a “tornado.”

Mr. Lima said the neighborhood to the north along the eastern side of Budlong Road, along with the entire Forest Hills neighborhood, are moved from Ward 3 into Ward 2. This reunites Forest Hills into the same ward, as the 2012 map broke it up between Ward 2 and Ward 3, which used small residential streets as the dividing boundaries instead of major roads. Plan A1 creates a clear boundary between Ward 2 and Ward 3 using Park and Reservoir Avenues exclusively.

The population switch in Forest Hills creates an overpopulation in Ward 2, which is corrected by Ward 3 acquiring the entire Stadium and Spectacle neighborhoods. In the 2012 map, Stadium is also split between Ward 3 and Ward 2, with everything east of Cranston Stadium being in Ward 2. This map puts all of Stadium into Ward 3. Additionally, the 2012 map oddly cut off portions of the west Spectacle Pond sub-neighborhood, isolating several dead-end streets that are otherwise part of Ward 3's geography in Ward 2. Residents of those streets have to drive through Ward 3 to access any other part of Ward 2. Mr. Lima said Plan A1 corrects this by reuniting the entire Spectacle Pond area into one neighborhood contained completely within Ward 3.

Mr. Lima said that the 2020 Census data showed Ward 1 grew faster than any other ward. He said he believes this is because of better counting along the Providence boundary which is a result of work the Cranston Board of Canvassers did with the Cranston Census Complete Count Committee and the U.S. Census Bureau from 2017-2020. Additionally, Mr. Lima said he thinks there are more younger families with children in the area, which translates to a significant population increase. Because Ward 1 grew so fast, it now exceeds the 5 percent maximum deviation and must lose territory compared to the 2012 adopted plan.

Mr. Lima said the area south of Friendly Community, in particular the parts of Auburn that are north of Park Ave and east of City Hall, are the ideal areas of Ward 1 to transfer to Ward 2. He said any other area that Ward 1 borders would involve breaking up a neighborhood, such as South Auburn, in order to balance out the population numbers. This plan actually reunites the entire Auburn neighborhood into Ward 2, while keeping the Friendly Community in Ward 1.

Mr. Lima said two additional adjustments are made in Scenario A1. One involves reuniting a few dozen people on the western part of northern Pontiac Ave, instead using Rte. 10 as the boundary between Wards 1 and 2. The other change involves moving the Ward 1 boundary west, away from the railroad tracks, and instead using I-95 as the remainder of the Ward 1 and 2 boundary. This change incorporates Wellington Ave into Ward 1, which makes sense from a neighborhood perspective. It also creates a scenario where the entire boundary between the two wards is made up of only Rte. 10 and I-95, which is ideal in complying with the Charter's directive to keep neighborhoods together and use major roads as ward lines.

Mr. Lima said the Hispanic/Latino population increased dramatically since 2010 in Cranston, growing from 8,000 people to over 15,000. He said Plan A1 establishes a majority-minority district in Ward 3, if all minority groups are taken together, which he believes would be the first in the city's history. He said that even as drawn now, Ward 3 is now a majority-minority district based off of 2020 Census numbers, although its current odd shape somewhat dilutes it as compared to Plan A1. Still, Mr. Lima said, Ward 3 is without question now the most diverse ward in the history of the city.

Mr. Lima reviewed additional demographic changes, including increases in the Asian and Black/African-American population in the city. He said census respondents identifying as multi-racial went from 2,142 in 2010 to 7,126 in 2020, which is a 232 percent increase. Mr. Lima said a big part of that is because the Census Bureau improved its methodology in how it asks that question, including providing more space for people to respond, in addition to the changing demographics and increased diversity of the city seen across all six wards.

Mr. Vierra said these numbers validate the effort the Board of Canvassers undertook earlier this year to establish a bilingual elections clerk position in the Canvassing Authority office.

Mr. Jackvony said Ward 3 in particular looks more cohesive as proposed in Ward 3, compared to the elongated shape it has in the 2012 plan. Mr. Lima said it's a dramatic change, and the Forest Hills and Stadium/Spectacle changes are the largest change in population proposed in Scenario A1, although it makes sense because it unites three large neighborhoods that are currently broken up while balancing the population figures and complying with the new Charter language to respect major roads and natural features in drafting ward lines.

Mr. Lima added that the changes made to Ward 1 reduced the population not only below the 5 percent threshold, but enough overall to allow it to continue to grow at an accelerated rate over the next 10 years without it overcoming the deviation again in short order.

The members felt the rationale used in drawing Scenario A1 was sound.

Mr. Jackvony asked if this information was available to the public. Mr. Lima said everything presented today has been online on the redistricting page of the city website. He said he would like to get additional feedback from the public on this map to determine whether we are on the right track. Mr. Lima said he would like to put it up on the city homepage and take out ads in the Cranston Herald in advance of a public hearing.

Mr. Lima said this exercise is all tentative pending what the state does, and the Cranston Redistricting Commission will have to hold additional public hearings and review map scenarios this winter and spring, even if Scenario A1 has widespread public support. We are essentially in a holding pattern until the state completes its work, which we can then respond to and propose new maps accordingly that comply with what the state chooses for lines.

Mr. Jackvony said that given our immovable deadlines next spring, the earlier we can complete any steps in this process, the better.

Ms. Moronta said she felt Scenario A1 is much better than the 2012 map, as neighborhoods are clearly distributed without being divided. Mr. Lima said the Council has final authority over any plan, so he plans to offer councilmembers the opportunity to review the work so far and ask any questions they may have. He may provide a status report to the Council at the October meeting, in particular to inform them on the record of the 2020 Census results and the changes the city has seen.

D. THE COMMISSION MAY DISCUSS GUIDANCE FOR STAFF IN ACCEPTING VARIOUS FORMS OF FEEDBACK AND MAP FORMAT SUBMISSIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jackvony said any kind of feedback could be submitted, down to a crayon-drawn map on a cocktail napkin. Mr. Lima said that's actually true, and that Ms. Giarrusso can take just about any feedback, within reason, and compile it into a web-viewable map. While all public feedback may not be in compliance with the strict guidelines the Commission has to follow, however, even out-of-compliance maps submitted by the public have the potential to include new ideas and perspectives that the Commission may find useful and could incorporate into its work. Because of this, Mr. Lima suggested that the Commission accept all feedback from the public, regardless of quality or format.

Mr. Lima said members of the public at a more advanced level can also submit map plans made with mapping software in the .JSON file format, which is translatable with the GIS mapping software Ms. Giarrusso uses. Mr. Vierra agreed that everything submitted by the public should be accepted and at the least reviewed. Mr. Lima said any public comment sent to him about redistricting will be forwarded to the entire Commission.

Mr. Lima said that John Marion from Common Cause RI reached out to the DistrictR website, which is extremely user-friendly and produces maps in a usable file format, and convinced them to add Cranston's ward information to the site. The mapping software on the site is free for anyone to use, and Mr. Lima plans to put a link to the site on the Cranston redistricting webpage. Mr. Lima said he reached out to DistrictR today, because they are still using 2010 block geometry and census data, and they responded right away, and will prioritize adding Cranston's 2020 information on their site. Mr. Lima said this is another great tool and resource for the public to engage in the process, at no additional cost for the city.

The Commission members discussed whether too many submissions could come in. Mr. Lima said they are well-equipped to receive dozens or even hundreds of submissions, and any that are submitted can be documented and entered into the record for review. Particularly because we are ahead of schedule in the process, the public now has several months in which to engage with the process and send in ideas and comments.

MOTION: By Mr. Jackvony and seconded by Mr. Vierra to accept all feedback, and where possible and viable, transfer feedback into a publicly accessible map, and to encourage members of the public to attend public hearings to provide comment and input.

PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 3-0

E. THE COMMISSION MAY DISCUSS AND PLAN FOR A PUBLIC HEARING TO BE HELD TO REVIEW AND SOLICIT FEEDBACK FOR DRAFT REDISTRICTING SCENARIOS

Mr. Jackvony said that Mr. Lima and Ms. Giarrusso have done a great job presenting detailed discussion items and maps, and have made the Redistricting Commission's work easier than it otherwise would have been without such diligence.

Mr. Jackvony said Scenario A1 is well-formulated and the Commission should solicit more feedback on the draft plan in the form of a public hearing.

MOTION: By Mr. Vierra and seconded by Ms. Moronta to hold a public hearing for feedback on Map Scenario A1 on Wednesday, Oct. 6, 2021 at 7 p.m. in Council Chambers at Cranston City Hall.

PASSED ROLL CALL VOTE – 3-0

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: By Mr. Vierra and seconded by Mr. Jackvony to adjourn.
PASSED UNANIMOUSLY – VOICE VOTE

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nicholas J. Lima
Registrar / Director of Elections
Recording Secretary to the Redistricting Commission

APPROVED, as amended, by the Cranston Redistricting Commission: October 6, 2021