

November 8, 2011

INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION
2011 NOV - 9 PM 3:10

Lake County Redistricting Commission Members:

The following proposed plan is submitted to the Commission for its consideration under I.C. 36-2-2-4 and I.C. 36-2-3-4, and the procedures adopted by the Commission at its September 29, 2011 meeting. An electronic map of the Commissioner Districts and a separate electronic map of the County Council Districts are incorporated by reference in this plan. The plan also incorporates population and demographic data from the 2010 decennial census for both Commissioner and Council Districts.

County Commissioner Districts:

As required under I.C. 36-2-2-4(d), Lake County Commissioner Districts must:

(1) be compact, subject only to natural boundary lines (such as railroads, major highways, rivers, creeks, parks, and major industrial complexes);

"Compact," as used in this statute, is not defined by Indiana law, and can be measured in many ways for different mathematical purposes. However, in *Vigo County Republican Cent. Committee v. Vigo County Com'rs*, S.D.Ind.1993, 834 F.Supp. 1080, a federal district court used the measure of internal boundary lines as the measure of compactness for a county council district plan. The proposed Lake County commissioner district plan has 44.68 miles of internal boundaries.

In the *Vigo County* case, the court noted that a plan was more visually compact when districts were nearly square in shape and with straighter boundary lines. In the proposed Lake County commissioner plan, the commissioner districts are visually compact, and follow straight lines, except in two cases where rivers are used as boundaries.

The *Vigo County* court also noted that following a river (and other natural boundaries) was a legitimate reason for a variation from compactness. The proposed plan follows the Little Calumet River in dividing District 1 from District 3 in North Township, and follows this same river in dividing District 1 from District 2 in Calumet Township.

(2) contain, as nearly as is possible, equal population;

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2010 decennial census, is 496,005. If it were possible to divide the county into three commissioner districts with *exactly* equal population, the "ideal district" would contain a population of 165,335.

The three commissioner districts in the proposed plan contain almost exactly equal population:

District 1 has a population of 165,218 (which is 117 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.07% from ideal).

District 2 has a population of 165,599 (which is 264 persons more than ideal, or a deviation of +0.16% from ideal).

District 3 has a population of 165,188 (which is 147 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.09% from ideal).

The "total mean deviation" under the proposed plan (a measure obtained by adding the percentage deviation from the smallest district to the percentage deviation from the largest district) is 0.25% (0.09+ 0.16).

This is significantly closer to ideal than the district populations of the districts created in 2001. The "total mean deviation" under the plan created in 2001 was 0.90% (-0.4+0.5).

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2000 decennial census, was 484,564. Dividing the county into three commissioner districts with exactly equal population, the "ideal district" would have contained a population of 161,521.

The three commissioner districts in the 2001 plan were as follows:

District 1 had a population of 160,799 (which was 722 persons fewer than the ideal, or a deviation of -0.4% from ideal).

District 2 had a population of 162,323 (which was 802 persons more than the ideal, or a deviation of 0.5% from ideal).

District 3 had a population of 161,442 (which was 79 persons fewer than the ideal, or a deviation of -0.05%).

and (3) not cross precinct lines.

The proposed plan does not cross precinct lines, as those boundaries were in effect on September 29, 2011 (the date the Indiana Election Commission adopted procedures for the submission of redistricting plans). On November 7, 2011 documents approved by the Lake County Board of Elections and Registration were filed with the Indiana Election Division as part of the process of making "additions and corrections" to the precinct boundaries previously provided by the Indiana Election Division to Lake County for review under I.C. 3-11-1.5-38. The documents filed with the Election Division on November 7, 2011 are incorporated by reference into this plan.

It is possible that these "additions and corrections" to the boundaries of Lake County's precincts may require revisions to this plan to add or delete the names of newly created or merged precincts, and, in the case of any precincts whose borders form the boundaries of proposed commissioner districts under this plan, to revise those boundaries to reflect these additions and

corrections. Other alterations to demographic or other technical data may also be necessary. The petitioner(s) request that the Commission make any revisions to this proposed plan necessary to conform precinct boundaries and data with the additions and corrections made by Lake County.

Additional Factors:

In addition to the requirements for the county commissioner district plan set forth in statute, other factors for consideration were identified by the Commission at its September 29, 2011 meeting. These included recognizing "communities of interests" such as townships, school corporations, and municipalities.

With the exception of North Township and Calumet Township, the proposed county commissioner district plan does not split any township lines. The plan created in 2001 split five townships.

With the exception of the Lake Ridge school district, the proposed county commissioner plan does not split any school districts. In fact, the proposed plan reduces the number of school districts that are split. The plan created in 2001 split six school districts.

Under the proposed plan, Crown Point, Gary and Griffith are the municipalities which are split.

In Crown Point, 72.4% of population would be in the new District 3 and 27.6% of the population in Crown Point would be in the new District 2. It is important to note that the city of Crown Point falls into two townships, Ross and Center. In this proposed plan, both townships remain intact and are not split. Likewise, all school districts within these two townships remain intact. In short, the split in Crown Point follows township and school district lines.

In Gary, 97.6% of the population would be in the new District 2 and 2.4% of the population would be in the new District 1. The split in Gary was needed to help District 2 remain an African-American Majority Minority Voting District.

In Griffith, 99.4% of the population would be in the new District 1 and 0.6% of the population would be in the new District 3. This split is due to a portion of Griffith crossing a township boundary line.

Under the proposed county commissioner district plan, one district (District 2) would contain a "majority minority" population: an African-American population of 52.90% (and voting age population of 50.48%). The remaining districts would contain African-American populations of 22.26% (District 1) and 2.35% (District 3).

County Council Districts:

As required under I.C. 36-2-3-4(d), Lake County Council Districts must:

(1) be compact, subject only to natural boundary lines (such as railroads, major highways, rivers, creeks, parks, and major industrial complexes);

As noted in the discussion of county commissioner districts above, "compact," as used in this statute, is not defined by Indiana law, and can be measured in many ways for different mathematical purposes. However, in *Vigo County Republican Cent. Committee v. Vigo County Com'rs*, S.D.Ind.1993, 834 F.Supp. 1080, a federal district court used the measure of internal boundary lines as the measure of compactness for a county council district plan. The proposed Lake County council district plan has 109.88 miles of internal boundaries.

(2) not cross precinct lines.

The proposed plan does not cross precinct lines, as those boundaries were in effect on September 29, 2011 (the date the Indiana Election Commission adopted procedures for the submission of redistricting plans). On November 7, 2011 documents approved by the Lake County Board of Elections and Registration were filed with the Indiana Election Division as part of the process of making "additions and corrections" to the precinct boundaries previously provided by the Indiana Election Division to Lake County for review under I.C. 3-11-1.5-38. The documents filed with the Election Division on November 7, 2011 are incorporated by reference into this plan.

It is possible that these "additions and corrections" to the boundaries of Lake County's precincts may require revisions to this plan to add or delete the names of newly created or merged precincts, and, in the case of any precincts whose borders form the boundaries of proposed council districts under this plan, to revise those boundaries to reflect these additions and corrections. Other alterations to demographic or other technical data may also be necessary. The petitioner(s) request that the Commission make any revisions to this proposed plan necessary to conform precinct boundaries and data with the additions and corrections made by Lake County.

(3) contain, as nearly as is possible, equal population;

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2010 decennial census, is 496,005. If it were possible to divide the county into seven county council districts with *exactly* equal population, the "ideal district" would contain a population of 70,857.86. Since exact equality cannot be achieved, the number of 70,858 is used for analytical purposes.

The seven county council districts in the proposed plan contain almost exactly equal population:

District 1 has a population of 70,700 (which is 158 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.22% from ideal).

District 2 has a population of 71,026 (which is 168 persons more than ideal, or a deviation of +0.24% from ideal).

District 3 has a population of 71,189 (which is 331 persons more than ideal, or a deviation of 0.47% from ideal).

District 4 has a population of 70,756 (which is 102 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.14% from ideal).

District 5 has a population of 70,696 (which is 162 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.23% from ideal).

District 6 has a population of 70,835 (which is 23 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.03% from ideal).

District 7 has a population of 70,803 (which is 55 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.08% from ideal).

The "total mean deviation" under the proposed plan (a measure obtained by adding the percentage deviation from the smallest district to the percentage deviation from the largest district) is 0.70% (-0.23+ 0.47).

This is significantly closer to ideal than the district populations of the districts created in 2001. The "total mean deviation" under the plan created in 2001 was 2.41% (-1.10+1.31).

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2000 decennial census, was 484,564. Dividing the county into seven council districts with exactly equal population, the "ideal district" would have contained a population of 69,223.

The seven council districts in the 2001 plan were as follows:

District 1 had a population of 69,837 (which was 614 more than the ideal, or a deviation of 0.89% from ideal).

District 2 had a population of 69,522 (which was 299 more than the ideal, or a deviation of 0.43% from ideal).

District 3 had a population of 68,463 (which was 760 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -1.10% from ideal).

District 4 had a population of 68,697 (which was 526 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.76% from ideal).

District 5 had a population of 68,766 (which was 457 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.66% from ideal).

District 6 had a population of 69,148 (which was 75 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.11% from ideal).

District 7 had a population of 70,131 (which was 908 more than ideal, or a deviation of 1.31% from ideal).

and (4) include whole townships, except when a division is clearly necessary to accomplish redistricting.

As the attached chart indicates, the proposed county council plan includes five "whole townships", the same number as under the 2001 county council plan. The division of Calumet, Hanover, North, Ross, Hobart and St. John townships is clearly necessary to achieve population equality between the council districts.

The population of each township in Lake County is set forth below:

North: 162,855
Calumet: 104,258
Hobart: 39,417
St. John: 66,741
Ross: 47,890
Hanover: 12,443
Center: 31,756
Winfield: 10,054
West Creek: 6,826
Cedar Creek: 12,097
Eagle Creek: 1,668

The townships with the largest population are those in which county council district divisions are proposed under this plan. The proposed plan does not increase the number of township splits.

Additional Factors:

In addition to the requirements for the county council district plan set forth in statute, other factors for consideration were identified by the Commission at its September 29, 2011 meeting. These included recognizing "communities of interests" such as school corporations, and municipalities.

The proposed county council district plan does not split school corporation lines, other than the following: Hammond, East Chicago, Munster, Highland, Gary, River Forest, Hobart, Lake Central, Merrillville and Hanover School Districts.

The current county council district plan and the proposed county council district plan split an identical number of school districts (ten).

The proposed plan does not split municipal corporation lines much more than the current plan. Some divisions were necessary to achieve population equality and to prevent "packing" of African-American voters.

Under the proposed county council district plan, two districts (Districts 2 and 3) would contain a "majority minority" population: an African-American population of 60.9% and 62.4%(and voting age populations of 59.3% and 59.7%). None of the remaining proposed districts contain sufficient African-American population for a "majority minority" district

The petitioner(s) respectfully requests that the Lake County Redistricting Commission adopt orders to establish these proposed county commissioner and county council districts.

Dan Dernulc
2293 N. Main Street
Crown Point, IN 46307

Rick Niemeyer
2293 N. Main Street
Crown Point, IN 46307

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E. Holcomb", written over the typed name of Eric Holcomb.

Eric Holcomb
Chairman
Indiana Republican Party
47 S. Meridian, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

King, Brad

From: Matt Zapfe [mzapfe@indgop.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 2:27 PM
To: King, Brad
Cc: Dumezich, Daniel A.; Dan Dermulc
Subject: Lake County Redistricting Plan
Attachments: Lake County Redistricting Narrative.docx

INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION
2011 NOV -9 PM 3:10

Brad,

On behalf of Eric Holcomb, Dan Dermulc and Rick Niemeyer, I am sending the electronic version of their Lake County Redistricting plan. In this email, I have attached the narrative of the plan. In subsequent emails, I will send the maps and supporting documentation for the proposed commission and council districts.

Please acknowledge receipt and let me know if you have any questions.

Matt Zapfe, Executive Director
Senate Majority Campaign Committee
47 S. Meridian St., Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Office: (317) 685-1084
Mobile: (317) 696-7788
Fax: (317) 685-1291
mzapfe@indgop.org

Visit us online at: www.indsenaterepublicans.org
Follow us on Twitter at: www.twitter.com/insmcc

November 8, 2011

Lake County Redistricting Commission Members:

The following proposed plan is submitted to the Commission for its consideration under I.C. 36-2-2-4 and I.C. 36-2-3-4, and the procedures adopted by the Commission at its September 29, 2011 meeting. An electronic map of the Commissioner Districts and a separate electronic map of the County Council Districts are incorporated by reference in this plan. The plan also incorporates population and demographic data from the 2010 decennial census for both Commissioner and Council Districts.

County Commissioner Districts:

As required under I.C. 36-2-2-4(d), Lake County Commissioner Districts must:

(1) be compact, subject only to natural boundary lines (such as railroads, major highways, rivers, creeks, parks, and major industrial complexes);

"Compact," as used in this statute, is not defined by Indiana law, and can be measured in many ways for different mathematical purposes. However, in *Vigo County Republican Cent. Committee v. Vigo County Com'rs*, S.D.Ind.1993, 834 F.Supp. 1080, a federal district court used the measure of internal boundary lines as the measure of compactness for a county council district plan. The proposed Lake County commissioner district plan has 44.68 miles of internal boundaries.

In the *Vigo County* case, the court noted that a plan was more visually compact when districts were nearly square in shape and with straighter boundary lines. In the proposed Lake County commissioner plan, the commissioner districts are visually compact, and follow straight lines, except in two cases where rivers are used as boundaries.

The *Vigo County* court also noted that following a river (and other natural boundaries) was a legitimate reason for a variation from compactness. The proposed plan follows the Little Calumet River in dividing District 1 from District 3 in North Township, and follows this same river in dividing District 1 from District 2 in Calumet Township.

(2) contain, as nearly as is possible, equal population;

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2010 decennial census, is 496,005. If it were possible to divide the county into three commissioner districts with *exactly* equal population, the "ideal district" would contain a population of 165,335.

The three commissioner districts in the proposed plan contain almost exactly equal population:

District 1 has a population of 165,218 (which is 117 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.07% from ideal).

District 2 has a population of 165,599 (which is 264 persons more than ideal, or a deviation of +0.16% from ideal).

District 3 has a population of 165,188 (which is 147 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.09% from ideal).

The "total mean deviation" under the proposed plan (a measure obtained by adding the percentage deviation from the smallest district to the percentage deviation from the largest district) is 0.25% (0.09+ 0.16).

This is significantly closer to ideal than the district populations of the districts created in 2001. The "total mean deviation" under the plan created in 2001 was 0.90% (-0.4+0.5).

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2000 decennial census, was 484,564. Dividing the county into three commissioner districts with exactly equal population, the "ideal district" would have contained a population of 161,521.

The three commissioner districts in the 2001 plan were as follows:

District 1 had a population of 160,799 (which was 722 persons fewer than the ideal, or a deviation of -0.4% from ideal).

District 2 had a population of 162,323 (which was 802 persons more than the ideal, or a deviation of 0.5% from ideal).

District 3 had a population of 161,442 (which was 79 persons fewer than the ideal, or a deviation of -0.05%).

and (3) not cross precinct lines.

The proposed plan does not cross precinct lines, as those boundaries were in effect on September 29, 2011 (the date the Indiana Election Commission adopted procedures for the submission of redistricting plans). On November 7, 2011 documents approved by the Lake County Board of Elections and Registration were filed with the Indiana Election Division as part of the process of making "additions and corrections" to the precinct boundaries previously provided by the Indiana Election Division to Lake County for review under I.C. 3-11-1.5-38. The documents filed with the Election Division on November 7, 2011 are incorporated by reference into this plan.

It is possible that these "additions and corrections" to the boundaries of Lake County's precincts may require revisions to this plan to add or delete the names of newly created or merged precincts, and, in the case of any precincts whose borders form the boundaries of proposed commissioner districts under this plan, to revise those boundaries to reflect these additions and

corrections. Other alterations to demographic or other technical data may also be necessary. The petitioner(s) request that the Commission make any revisions to this proposed plan necessary to conform precinct boundaries and data with the additions and corrections made by Lake County.

Additional Factors:

In addition to the requirements for the county commissioner district plan set forth in statute, other factors for consideration were identified by the Commission at its September 29, 2011 meeting. These included recognizing "communities of interests" such as townships, school corporations, and municipalities.

With the exception of North Township and Calumet Township, the proposed county commissioner district plan does not split any township lines. The plan created in 2001 split five townships.

With the exception of the Lake Ridge school district, the proposed county commissioner plan does not split any school districts. In fact, the proposed plan reduces the number of school districts that are split. The plan created in 2001 split six school districts.

Under the proposed plan, Crown Point, Gary and Griffith are the municipalities which are split.

In Crown Point, 72.4% of population would be in the new District 3 and 27.6% of the population in Crown Point would be in the new District 2. It is important to note that the city of Crown Point falls into two townships, Ross and Center. In this proposed plan, both townships remain intact and are not split. Likewise, all school districts within these two townships remain intact. In short, the split in Crown Point follows township and school district lines.

In Gary, 97.6% of the population would be in the new District 2 and 2.4% of the population would be in the new District 1. The split in Gary was needed to help District 2 remain an African-American Majority Minority Voting District.

In Griffith, 99.4% of the population would be in the new District 1 and 0.6% of the population would be in the new District 3. This split is due to a portion of Griffith crossing a township boundary line.

Under the proposed county commissioner district plan, one district (District 2) would contain a "majority minority" population: an African-American population of 52.90% (and voting age population of 50.48%). The remaining districts would contain African-American populations of 22.26% (District 1) and 2.35% (District 3).

County Council Districts:

As required under I.C. 36-2-3-4(d), Lake County Council Districts must:

(1) be compact, subject only to natural boundary lines (such as railroads, major highways, rivers, creeks, parks, and major industrial complexes);

As noted in the discussion of county commissioner districts above, "compact," as used in this statute, is not defined by Indiana law, and can be measured in many ways for different mathematical purposes. However, in *Vigo County Republican Cent. Committee v. Vigo County Com'rs*, S.D.Ind.1993, 834 F.Supp. 1080, a federal district court used the measure of internal boundary lines as the measure of compactness for a county council district plan. The proposed Lake County council district plan has 109.88 miles of internal boundaries.

(2) not cross precinct lines.

The proposed plan does not cross precinct lines, as those boundaries were in effect on September 29, 2011 (the date the Indiana Election Commission adopted procedures for the submission of redistricting plans). On November 7, 2011 documents approved by the Lake County Board of Elections and Registration were filed with the Indiana Election Division as part of the process of making "additions and corrections" to the precinct boundaries previously provided by the Indiana Election Division to Lake County for review under I.C. 3-11-1.5-38. The documents filed with the Election Division on November 7, 2011 are incorporated by reference into this plan.

It is possible that these "additions and corrections" to the boundaries of Lake County's precincts may require revisions to this plan to add or delete the names of newly created or merged precincts, and, in the case of any precincts whose borders form the boundaries of proposed council districts under this plan, to revise those boundaries to reflect these additions and corrections. Other alterations to demographic or other technical data may also be necessary. The petitioner(s) request that the Commission make any revisions to this proposed plan necessary to conform precinct boundaries and data with the additions and corrections made by Lake County.

(3) contain, as nearly as is possible, equal population;

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2010 decennial census, is 496,005. If it were possible to divide the county into seven county council districts with *exactly* equal population, the "ideal district" would contain a population of 70,857.86. Since exact equality cannot be achieved, the number of 70,858 is used for analytical purposes.

The seven county council districts in the proposed plan contain almost exactly equal population:

District 1 has a population of 70,700 (which is 158 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.22% from ideal).

District 2 has a population of 71,026 (which is 168 persons more than ideal, or a deviation of +0.24% from ideal).

District 3 has a population of 71,189 (which is 331 persons more than ideal, or a deviation of 0.47% from ideal).

District 4 has a population of 70,756 (which is 102 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.14% from ideal).

District 5 has a population of 70,696 (which is 162 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.23% from ideal).

District 6 has a population of 70,835 (which is 23 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.03% from ideal).

District 7 has a population of 70,803 (which is 55 persons fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.08% from ideal).

The "total mean deviation" under the proposed plan (a measure obtained by adding the percentage deviation from the smallest district to the percentage deviation from the largest district) is 0.70% (-0.23+ 0.47).

This is significantly closer to ideal than the district populations of the districts created in 2001. The "total mean deviation" under the plan created in 2001 was 2.41% (-1.10+1.31).

The total population of Lake County, according to the 2000 decennial census, was 484,564. Dividing the county into seven council districts with exactly equal population, the "ideal district" would have contained a population of 69,223.

The seven council districts in the 2001 plan were as follows:

District 1 had a population of 69,837 (which was 614 more than the ideal, or a deviation of 0.89% from ideal).

District 2 had a population of 69,522 (which was 299 more than the ideal, or a deviation of 0.43% from ideal).

District 3 had a population of 68,463 (which was 760 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -1.10% from ideal).

District 4 had a population of 68,697 (which was 526 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.76% from ideal).

District 5 had a population of 68,766 (which was 457 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.66% from ideal).

District 6 had a population of 69,148 (which was 75 fewer than ideal, or a deviation of -0.11% from ideal).

District 7 had a population of 70,131 (which was 908 more than ideal, or a deviation of 1.31% from ideal).

and (4) include whole townships, except when a division is clearly necessary to accomplish redistricting.

As the attached chart indicates, the proposed county council plan includes five "whole townships", the same number as under the 2001 county council plan. The division of Calumet, Hanover, North, Ross, Hobart and St. John townships is clearly necessary to achieve population equality between the council districts.

The population of each township in Lake County is set forth below:

North: 162,855
Calumet: 104,258
Hobart: 39,417
St. John: 66,741
Ross: 47,890
Hanover: 12,443
Center: 31,756
Winfield: 10,054
West Creek: 6,826
Cedar Creek: 12,097
Eagle Creek: 1,668

The townships with the largest population are those in which county council district divisions are proposed under this plan. The proposed plan does not increase the number of township splits.

Additional Factors:

In addition to the requirements for the county council district plan set forth in statute, other factors for consideration were identified by the Commission at its September 29, 2011 meeting. These included recognizing "communities of interests" such as school corporations, and municipalities.

The proposed county council district plan does not split school corporation lines, other than the following: Hammond, East Chicago, Munster, Highland, Gary, River Forest, Hobart, Lake Central, Merrillville and Hanover School Districts.

The current county council district plan and the proposed county council district plan split an identical number of school districts (ten).

The proposed plan does not split municipal corporation lines much more than the current plan. Some divisions were necessary to achieve population equality and to prevent "packing" of African-American voters.

Under the proposed county council district plan, two districts (Districts 2 and 3) would contain a "majority minority" population: an African-American population of 60.9% and 62.4%(and voting age populations of 59.3% and 59.7%). None of the remaining proposed districts contain sufficient African-American population for a "majority minority" district

The petitioner(s) respectfully requests that the Lake County Redistricting Commission adopt orders to establish these proposed county commissioner and county council districts.

Dan Dernulc
2293 N. Main Street
Crown Point, IN 46307

Rick Niemeyer
2293 N. Main Street
Crown Point, IN 46307

Eric Holcomb
Chairman
Indiana Republican Party
47 S. Meridian, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

King, Brad

From: Matt Zapfe [mzapfe@indgop.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 2:30 PM
To: King, Brad
Cc: Dumezich, Daniel A.; Dan Dermulc
Subject: Proposed Commission District Materials - Lake County
Attachments: Commission 2 Demos Only.xls; Commission District 1.jpg; Commission District 2.jpg; Commission District 3.jpg; Commission District Map.jpg; Commission District Map v2.jpg; Township Split Comparison - Commission.xlsx; School District Split Comparison - Commission.xlsx; Lake County Commission - municipal split comparison.docx

Brad,


Attached, please find the maps and supporting documentation corresponding to the proposed Lake County Commission districts in the Lake County Redistricting plan submitted by Eric Holcomb, Dan Dermulc and Rick Niemeyer this afternoon.

Please confirm receipt and let me know if you have any questions.

Matt Zapfe, Executive Director
Senate Majority Campaign Committee
47 S. Meridian St., Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Office: (317) 685-1084
Mobile: (317) 696-7788
Fax: (317) 685-1291
mzapfe@indgop.org

Visit us online at: www.indsenaterepublicans.org
Follow us on Twitter at: www.twitter.com/insmcc

INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION
2011 NOV - 9 PM 3: 10




001

002

Lake IN

003



Whiting TN

East Chicago TN

Hammond TN

001

Mainster TN

Highland TN

Griffith TN

Dyer TN

Schererville TN

St. John TN

Gary TN

Lake Station TN
New Chicago TN

002

Highland TN

Lake TN

Hamilton TN

Winfield TN

Crown Point TN

Lakes of the Four Seasons TN

003

Cedar Lake TN

Lake Dalecarlia TN

Lowell TN

Hebron TN

Jersey TN

De Motte TN

Schneider TN

Shelby TN


Newton TN

Rosdawn TN


004

Lake Village TN


District: 001



District: 002



District: 003



Proposed Commission Districts: Demographic Data

District	Population	Ideal	Difference	% Deviation	% Black	% Hispanic	% 18+ Blk	% 18+ Hisp
001	165218	165335	-117	-0.07%	22.26%	31.02%	19.79%	27.14%
002	165599	165335	264	0.16%	52.90%	10.54%	50.48%	9.12%
003	165188	165335	-147	-0.09%	2.35%	8.44%	2.11%	7.00%

Range = 411
 High = 264
 Low = -147

Deviation = 0.25%

Current Commission Districts: Demographic Data*

District	Population	Ideal	Difference	% Deviation
001	160799	161521	-722	-0.45%
002	162323	161521	802	0.50%
003	161442	161521	-79	-0.05%

* Population numbers from the 2000 census and 2001 Lake County Redistricting

Range = 1524
 High = 802
 Low = -722

Deviation = 0.94%

*District numbers have changed from the current to the proposed plan. See maps for details.

LAKE COUNTY COMMISSION - TOWNSHIP SPLITS (CURRENT VS. PROPOSED)

Township	Current Plan	Proposed Plan
North	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Calumet	Split Twice (Three Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Hobart	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
St. John	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Ross	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Hanover	Whole	Whole
Center	Whole	Whole
Winfield	Whole	Whole
West Creek	Whole	Whole
Cedar Creek	Whole	Whole
Eagle Creek	Whole	Whole

The current vs proposed:

The proposed plan REDUCES the number of split townships in Lake County (from five to two).

The proposed plan keeps nine of eleven townships whole. The two townships that are split are only split once. While North Township is split, all school districts remain intact within the township.

The current plan keeps six of eleven townships whole. The five townships that are split are split once (four) or twice (one).

10/24/2011

LAKE COUNTY COMMISSION - School District Splits (CURRENT VS. PROPOSED)

School District	Current Plan	Proposed Plan
Hammond	Whole	Whole
Whiting	Whole	Whole
East Chicago	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Munster	Whole	Whole
Highland	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Griffith	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Lake Ridge	Whole	Split Once (Two Districts)
Gary	Whole	Whole
Lake Station	Whole	Whole
River Forest	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Hobart	Whole	Whole
Lake Central	Split Twice (Three Districts)	Whole
Merrillville	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Hanover	Whole	Whole
Crown Point	Whole	Whole
Tri-Creek	Whole	Whole

The current vs proposed:

The proposed plan REDUCES the number of split school districts in Lake County (from six to one).

The proposed plan keeps 15 of the 16 school districts whole. The one split school district is only split once and is comprised of two commission districts.

The current plan keeps only 10 of the 16 school districts intact. Five are split once and one is split twice.

10/24/2011

Lake County Commission – Redistricting

Census Place Comparison (Proposed Plan vs. Current Plan)

Under the proposed plan, the splitting of census places (cities/towns) would decrease (from six to three).

In the proposed:

- Crown Point, Gary and Griffith would technically be split. Specifically, the population splits would be as follows:
 - Crown Point = 72.4% of population would be in the new District 3 and 27.6% of the population in Crown Point would be in the new District 2. It is important to note that the city of Crown Point falls into two townships, Ross and Center. In the proposed plan, both townships remain intact and are not split. Likewise, all school districts within these two townships remain intact. In short, the split in Crown Point follows township and school district lines.
 - Gary = 97.6% of the population would be in the new District 2 and 2.4% of the population would be in the new District 1. The split in Gary was needed to help District 2 remain an African-American Majority Minority Voting District.
 - Griffith = 99.4% of the population would be in the new District 1 and 0.6% of the population would be in the new District 3. This split is due to a portion of Griffith crossing a township boundary line.

In the current plan, the following census places are split:

- East Chicago
- Griffith
- Highland
- Schererville
- St. John
- Merrillville

King, Brad

From: Matt Zapfe [mzapfe@indgop.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 2:33 PM
To: King, Brad
Cc: Dumezich, Daniel A.; Dan Dermulc
Subject: Proposed Council District Materials - Lake County
Attachments: Council 6 Demos Only.xls; Council District 1.jpg; Council District 2.jpg; Council District 3.jpg; Council District 4.jpg; Council District 5.jpg; Council District 6.jpg; Council District 7.jpg; County Council District Map.jpg; Township Split Comparison - Council.xlsx; School District Split Comparison - Council.xlsx; Census Place Split Comparison - Council.xlsx; Census Place Split - Proposed Council 6.pdf

Brad,


Attached, please find the maps and supporting documentation corresponding to the proposed Lake County Council districts in the Lake County Redistricting plan submitted by Eric Holcomb, Dan Dermulc and Rick Niemeyer this afternoon.

Please confirm receipt and let me know if you have any questions.

Matt Zapfe, Executive Director
Senate Majority Campaign Committee
47 S. Meridian St., Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Office: (317) 685-1084
Mobile: (317) 696-7788
Fax: (317) 685-1291
mzapfe@indgop.org

Visit us online at: www.indsenaterepublicans.org
Follow us on Twitter at: www.twitter.com/inasmcc

INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION
2011 NOV -9 PM 3:10



Whiting IN

East Chicago IN

Manassas IN

Mundelein IN

Waukegan IN

Griffith IN

Dyer IN

Schaumburg IN

St. John IN

Lisle IN

Conlar Lake IN

Lake Okauchie IN

Lowell IN

Schredder IN

Shalby IN

Newton IN

Lake Village IN

Ogden Dunes IN

Portage IN

Lake Station IN

Forest Chicago IN

Franklin IN

Merrillville IN

Wierdak IN

Green Oak IN

Lakes of the Four Seasons IN

Hobson IN


Jasper IN

Die Moller IN


Roselawn IN

8


District: 1




District: 3




District: 4



District: 6



District: 7



Proposed Council Districts: Demographic Data

District	Population	Ideal	Difference	% Deviation	% Black	% Hispanic	% 18+ Blk	% 18+ Hisp
1	70700	70858	-158	-0.22%	20.3%	33.5%	17.9%	28.8%
2	71026	70858	168	0.24%	60.9%	9.3%	59.3%	8.1%
3	71189	70858	331	0.47%	62.4%	9.2%	59.7%	8.1%
4	70756	70858	-102	-0.14%	2.6%	9.1%	2.4%	7.6%
5	70696	70858	-162	-0.23%	22.3%	33.7%	19.8%	30.3%
6	70835	70858	-23	-0.03%	11.1%	15.6%	10.3%	13.0%
7	70803	70858	-55	-0.08%	1.0%	6.4%	0.9%	5.1%

Range = 493

High = 331

Low = -162

Deviation = 0.70%

Current Council Districts: Demographic Data*

District	Population	Ideal	Difference	% Deviation
1	69837	69223	614	0.89%
2	69522	69223	299	0.43%
3	68463	69223	-760	-1.10%
4	68697	69223	-526	-0.76%
5	68766	69223	-457	-0.66%
6	69148	69223	-75	-0.11%
7	70131	69223	908	1.31%

* Population numbers from the 2000 census and 2001 Lake County Redistricting

Range = 1668

High = 908

Low = -760

Deviation = 2.41%

LAKE COUNCIL - TOWNSHIP SPLITS (CURRENT VS. PROPOSED)

Township	Current Plan	Proposed Plan
North	Split Twice (Three Districts)	Split Three Times (Four Districts)
Calumet	Split Three Times (Four Districts)	Split Twice (Three Districts)
Hobart	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
St. John	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Twice (Three Districts)
Ross	Split Twice (Three Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Hanover	Whole	Split Once (Two Districts)
Center	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Winfield	Whole	Whole
West Creek	Whole	Whole
Cedar Creek	Whole	Whole
Eagle Creek	Whole	Whole

The current vs proposed is basically identical:

Each plan keeps five townships whole

Each plan has one township that is split three time, two that are split twice & three that are split only once

The differences:

Current plan splits North Twnshp twice and the proposed plan splits it three times.

Current plan splits Calumet three times and the proposed plan splits it only twice.

Current plan splits St John once and the proposed splits it twice

Current plan splits Ross twice and the proposed splits it once

Current plan has Hanover whole and the proposed splits it once

Current plan splits Center once and the proposed keeps it whole

Similarities : Both plans keep Winfield, West Creek, Cedar Creek, and Eagle Creek intact.

Both plans split Hobart once.

11/5/2011

one time.

LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL - School District Splits (CURRENT VS. PROPOSED)

School District	Current Plan	Proposed Plan
Hammond	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Whiting	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
East Chicago	Whole	Split Once (Two Districts)
Munster	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Highland	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Griffith	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Lake Ridge	Whole	Whole
Gary	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Lake Station	Whole	Whole
River Forest	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Hobart	Whole	Split Once (Two Districts)
Lake Central	Split Once (Two Districts)	Split Twice (Three Districts)
Merrillville	Split Twice (Three Districts)	Split Once (Two Districts)
Hanover	Whole	Split Once (Two Districts)
Crown Point	Split Once (Two Districts)	Whole
Tri-Creek	Whole	Whole

The current vs proposed:

The current plan and the proposed plan are fairly equal in their treatment of school district boundary lines in that both plans keep 6 school districts intact. Both plans have 10 split districts, with 9 being split once and 1 in each plan being split twice.

The plans differ on which districts are split.

11/5/2011

LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL - Census Place Splits (CURRENT VS. PROPOSED)

Census Place	Current Plan	Proposed Plan
Hammond	Split Once	Split Once
Munster	Split Once	Split Once
Whiting	Split Once	Whole
East Chicago	Whole	Split Once
Highland	Split Once	Split Once
Gary	Split Once	Split Once
Griffith	Split Once	Split Once
Merrillville	Split Twice	Split Once
Crown Point	Split Once	Split Once
Hobart	Whole	Split Once
Lake Station	Whole	Split Once
New Chicago	Whole	Whole
Dyer	Split Once	Whole
Schererville	Split Once	Split Twice
Cedar Lake	Whole	Whole
Lake Dalecarlia	Whole	Whole
Lakes of the Four Seasons	Whole	Whole
Lowell	Whole	Whole
Schneider	Whole	Whole
Shelby	Whole	Whole
St. John	Whole	Split Twice
Winfield	Whole	Whole

The current vs proposed:

The current plan and the proposed plan are fairly equal in their treatment of municipal boundary lines.

The current plan has 12 census places that are intact. It splits 10 census places. Of these 10, 9 are split once and 1 is split twice.

The proposed plan has 10 census places that are intact. It splits 12 census places. Of these 12, 10 are split once and 2 are split twice.

****See "Census Place Split" reports in supporting documents for specific details***

Census Places by District and by County – Proposed Plan

	Population	% of District
District 1	70,700	
Hammond IN (part)	56,436	69.8%
Munster IN (part)	9,267	39.3%
Whiting IN	4,997	100.0%
Total District 1 Census Places	70,700	
District 2	71,026	
East Chicago IN (part)	3,187	10.7%
Gary IN (part)	43,776	54.5%
Griffith IN (part)	16,795	99.4%
Total District 2 Census Places	63,758	
District 3	71,189	
Gary IN (part)	36,518	45.5%
Griffith IN (part)	98	0.6%
Hobart IN (part)	962	3.3%
Lake Station IN (part)	3,005	23.9%
Merrillville IN (part)	23,727	67.3%
Schererville IN (part)	6,141	21.0%
Total District 3 Census Places	70,451	
District 4	70,756	
Dyer IN	16,390	100.0%
Highland IN (part)	3,936	16.6%
Munster IN (part)	14,336	60.7%
Schererville IN (part)	16,901	57.8%
St. John IN (part)	13,632	91.8%
Total District 4 Census Places	65,195	
District 5	70,696	
East Chicago IN (part)	26,511	89.3%
Hammond IN (part)	24,394	30.2%
Highland IN (part)	19,791	83.4%
Total District 5 Census Places	70,696	
District 6	70,835	
Crown Point IN (part)	7,617	27.9%
Hobart IN (part)	28,097	96.7%
Lake Station IN (part)	9,567	76.1%
Merrillville IN (part)	11,519	32.7%
New Chicago IN	2,035	100.0%
Schererville IN (part)	6,201	21.2%
St. John IN (part)	784	5.3%

	Population	% of District
Total District 6 Census Places	65,820	
District 7	70,803	
Cedar Lake IN	11,560	100.0%
Crown Point IN (part)	19,700	72.1%
Lake Dalecarlia IN	1,355	100.0%
Lakes of the Four Seasons IN (part)	3,936	56.0%
Lowell IN	9,276	100.0%
Schneider IN	277	100.0%
Shelby IN	539	100.0%
St. John IN (part)	434	2.9%
Winfield IN	4,383	100.0%
Total District 7 Census Places	51,460	