

Redistricting Committee

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

Based on a survey of District Directors and committee discussions, the following concerns were raised.

- (1) The disproportionate number of members in District 9. Based on its geographic boundaries and membership size, some recommended dividing District 9 into two districts.
- (2) The low membership size in certain districts, namely Districts 8, 12, 15, 18 and 23. Of these districts 12 and 13 are also small in area. Some Directors recommended for these districts merge with others, for example, merge district 22 and 23.
- (3) The boundaries of Canadian districts 1, 2, 18 and 19. Some recommended that districts be either all Canadian or all US districts.
- (4) The size of the board. Some board members have expressed concern with the board was too large. They suggested that the board would be more effective and efficient if it were smaller, say 15 to 17 members. Some recommended redistricting to both address the other issues raised and to make the board smaller.

Most District Directors said that their own district was operating well and any change might present financial and working arrangement problems. Most district Directors, even if they wanted to see change, did not want their district boundaries change.

Based on the anticipated response to force change, the committee recommends that there be no overall plan for either redistricting or reducing the size of the board at this time. However, it does recommend that smaller districts strongly consider combining with a neighboring district, and that the Canadian districts work out any boundary issues between them.

The committee thanks Sandy Arlinghaus for her ACBL mappings, which will be helpful in any future redistricting study as well as for current informational purposes.