

Redistricting Committee

Attached is a summary of the Redistricting Board survey.

While many (half the Board) believe that we should redistrict to make districts more balanced, almost no District Director wants their District to be reduced.

In all likelihood a major overhauling of the District boundaries will not be proposed.

Some specific issues will be addressed, specifically those mentioned in the notes that follow in the survey summary.

The committee will continue its work between NABCs and meet again in Denver.

Summary of Redistricting Survey

Committee: Al Levy, chair, Alan LeBendig, Jeff Taylor, Barbara Nist, Jonathan Steinberg, Bill Arlinghaus, Phyllis Harlan, Joan Gerard, Nadine Wood.

3/1/2005						
District #	Membership	Units	(1)	(2)	(3)	
1	5,225	6	No		No	
2	6,150	8	Yes/Yes	Note 1	No	
3	6,850	7	No	Note 2	Yes /9-11	
4	6,750	8	Yes/No	Note 3	Yes / 13	
5	3,975	13	Yes/Yes		No / 20	
6	7,100	8				
7	9,825	12	No		No	
8	3,200	5	No		No	
9	17,750	5	No		No	
10	6,175	13	Yes/Yes	Note 4	Yes / 15	
11	4,475	8				
12	3,575	5	Maybe		No	
13	5,000	3	Yes	Note 5	No	
14	4,200	9	Maybe		No	
16	3,400	8	No	Note 6	No	
16	8,150	17				
17	8,475	24	No		No	
18	3,750	28	No	Note 7	No	
19	5,675	24	Yes	Note 8		
20	4,225	28	No	Note 9	No	
21	6,950	19				
22	6,950	26	Yes/Yes		Yes	
23	3,800	9	Yes/Yes	Note 10	Yes / 13 – 19	
24	6,125	2	Yes/Yes		Yes / 9 – 15	
25	7,125	8	Yes/Yes		No/ 12 – 15	
99	1,500					
	156,375	303				

- (1) Should we redistrict? If so, should the member size of the Districts be more evenly balanced, with a variation of, say 25%?
- (2) Should the geographic boundaries of some Districts be altered? Should certain Districts combine or split?
- (3) Should we consider reducing the size of the Board by having less Districts or Board representation by some or by combined Districts or in some other manner?

Comments on above questions

- (1) Uneven size of Districts
Currently Districts range in size from 3,200 to 17,750. The average District membership is approximately 6,100. There are nine Districts that are 25% smaller than the average (Districts 5, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 23). There are four Districts greater than 25% the average (Districts 7, 9, 16 and 17). The remaining 12 Districts are within 25% of the average (Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25).

Note 1

- (a) The two smallest Districts are D8 with 3,207 and D15 with 3,414 members. Not only that but membership in both those Districts are declining. They should be merged. Florida could easily be split into two Districts and perhaps should be.
- (b) There is a strong body of opinion in Canada that would like to see a third Canadian District. In other words, combine Districts 18 and 19 East/West (instead of running North/South as they currently do). Enlarge District 20 (which is currently among the 9 under populated districts as is District 18). I would be very interested in seeing if this would work numerically. Geographically, it makes sense and would be a popular move. I discussed a third Canadian District with Dick Anderson, and he agrees with me that it is time to have District 18 East/West as the third Canadian District rather than the current trans-border North/South structure. Dick told me it isn't working. The US units vote one way; Canadian units vote the other way.

Note 2

If we really want to combine . . . District 8 should disappear into probably 13 and 15. Districts 14 and 15 should disappear in some fashion and 18 and 19 should combine with others if at all possible. At least one of the California districts need to coming. District 5 needs to go somewhere. Districts 11 and 12 need to combine with someone. This would bring us to 19 districts if everyone agreed. But frankly, I think this discussion will go the way of the unit discussion. If the district is functioning, why should we care?

Note 3

Canada is smaller than Florida. Make it two districts. Districts 5, 8, 11, 12 should be cut to two, 14 and 15 merged, California be one and the Great NW be 1. That leaves 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 24, 25 = 13 Canada = 2 Mids East = 2 Cal, and GNW. Without too much pain we are down to 19. I would like to see it get down to say 13 but that would take a lot of commitment this board doesn't have.

The boarder line in NJ is the worse defined boundary in the ACBL!

Note 4

District 10 would like to suggest that the panhandle of Florida be added to us, provided we could receive an additional regional that area holds in Sandestin. It was discussed at our District board meeting and approved on that basis. It joins the lower part of Alabama and is more closely related to District 10 than to District 9.

Note 5

District 9 could well be split into three reasonably sized districts, while District 23 has little reason for being. Where the geography is widespread, it is difficult enough for those folks to hold district-wide events now. How could we increase the geography?

I have never understood the gerrymandering of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan as part of Wisconsin. It would seem the needs of these folks might be better served by putting them in District 12. Beyond that, my district is geographically compact and do-able.

Note 6

If population equalization is truly an issue, move the western part of Arkansas into District 15. They previously petitioned to join our district, but District 10 denied their petition.

Note 7

One remote possibility might be an all Canadian Western District (Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia). The remaining parts of the District 18 and 19 would then become a District. Population wise this would result in a new Canadian District having about 4,500 members. I am not positive about numbers in District 19 South of the Border but in District 18 South of the Border the membership is about 1,700. I don't know of any great desire on either District's part for this to occur. We used to think of a natural North-South flow in our District (due to the Rockies) but this doesn't happen anymore. Our Regionals in Alberta and Saskatchewan attract far more British Columbia players than any from Montana, etc. Again mobility is a huge factor. When the Districts were established, driving was the major way to get to a tournament. Since this has changed maybe we should be thinking of change.

Note 8

While I also have many ideas about redistricting, one of those is not taking Canada out of my district. Some years ago the Canadians were given an option of redistricting along nationalistic lines, almost every member voted to keep the north south district rather than the east west district. Between 18 and 19 are some rather large mountains and my Canadians would rather travel up and down the north south corridor and fight the customs people than fight traveling through the mountains, and their expression is they would like to vote and send their money where they play to play. I personally have thought about the difficulties that occur with dual country districts, but would never support it because my players definitely would not like it. Most of all, my Americans would never forgive me for taking Penticton and Victoria out of their district.

Note 9

Mergers to be considered . . . 8 & 11, 12 & 13, if they agree. Split Florida if it wants to be split.

Note 10

Any plan we come up with will likely call for some combination of Districts 22 and 23.

Summary of summary

Should we redistrict?

No: 9 Yes: 10 Maybe: 2 Did not answer: 4

Should we reduce the size of the Board?

No: 14 Yes: 6 Did not answer: 5

The summary indicates that most Board members don't want to change the size of the Board, unless there is a natural reduction in the number of Districts.

Many on the Board want to see some redistricting. Specific suggestions are mentioned in Notes 1-9.