

The Ward-Harvey Alternative Redistricting Proposal

August 25, 2021

To PCC John Kirry, Chair
MD19 Strategic Planning Committee (SPC)

INTRODUCTION. This alternative redistricting proposal is presented in reference to the MD19 Strategic Planning Committee's June 11-12, 2021, proposed redistricting of Multiple District 19's 9 current districts down to 5 for the purpose of bolstering membership in the surviving districts, plus improving leadership by limiting the number of positions needed to fulfill requirements. In that light, the subsequent "Plan of Action" submitted suggests accomplishing this through realignment of districts D, E & F on the eastern side and merging districts A, B, C, G, H & I on the western side from 6 down to 3.

While the stated reasons for this project are certainly obvious, we believe there is an alternative method that also achieves this purpose. Specifically, in looking at the SPC proposed six-club merger plan on the western side, we feel that some mergers needlessly disrupt established district leadership and procedural processes. In those cases, we feel that applying district boundary adjustments in place of some of these mergers, could eliminate much of the associated turmoil while still accomplishing the stated goals.

MERGING. While the merger process is necessary in some cases, it can also be counter-productive in others. We believe that this is especially true when applied to the proposed merger of districts C, G & I. Both C & G have a strong in-depth leadership record, and both are still reasonably close the transitional marker of 1250 members. District I is not much farther behind. As the SPC proposal clearly shows, combining C & G would create one huge new district with approximately 2400 members (highest in the MD). Consequently, this process would subsequently reduce the leadership team by 50%. While this policy maybe a positive move in some cases it would, in our view, create an additional burden in this instance on the single DG, FVDG & 2VDG left to manage it.

LEADERSHIP. The innate inability to foster effective leadership is a reason for the SPC instituting the redistricting process. No doubt there are grounds for this, and that some changes in this regard are necessary. While two districts (A & B) probably warrant such action due to reduced membership, we feel that such an evisceration of the 3 others (C, G & I) should not occur. Districts C & G have constantly shown their leadership resilience and district I has a respectable record as well. *For these reasons, reducing the western districts from 6 to only 4 seems more reasonable as it will still address membership concerns while retaining leadership stability.*

MISSION. Therefore, it is the mission of this report is to present the process that we recommend in which MD19 can achieve this goal, by necessitating the sacrifice of the two weakest districts: A & B. We believe that, as on the eastern side, the remaining districts will look to achieve membership equality through boundary adjustments, not through leadership obliteration. Furthermore, we offer concise evidence within this presentation that our plan will be successful!

RECOMMENDATION. Subsequently, it is recommended that the proposed merging of A & I not happen. Instead, it logically and geographically makes more sense to merge A & H (*reasoning: membership strength of H with close proximity to weaker A with a shared border*). District C's absorption of B also makes more sense essentially due to C's centralized positioning. For that reason, the totality of B's 600+ members can be distributed equally among districts C, G & I through shared boundary adjustments... *Essentially C would assume all of B's clubs, then many of its Olympic Peninsula (and island) area clubs would go to district I. Accordingly, some of district C's most southern clubs would transfer into district G.*

MERIT OF PLAN. The merit of this argument lies in the fact that **districts with sound leadership depth will be left intact**, gaining satisfactory membership levels through simple boundary adjustments. In a nutshell: *District C's absorption of district B would add 600+ members. District C would jettison 200 members to district I and 200 members to District G.* Here's an example of what the final outcome would look like:

- District C from 1179 to 1379
- District I from 1116 to 1316
- District G from 1186 to 1386

It would be up to the districts to negotiate and organize the transfer of clubs to reach this goal. But we perceive that this activity would be much easier to achieve compared to negotiating disruptive district mergers.

CLUB ACCEPTANCE. The resistance to the current SPC redistricting plan has already been strong. And while any restricting plan will likely meet with condescension, it is our belief that the realignment of borders, will be a much easier process to sell. Clubs knowing that district leadership, policies and procedures will remain intact, will go a long way, in our opinion, to enhance the probability of acceptance by the affected clubs.

FINALLY. Knowing that the SPC has spent considerable time and effort in the preparation and presentation of this project certainly indicates total dedication to its successful completion. Monte & I both recognize that the purpose of this proposal is not to cast dispersions SPC's performance or knowledge in this regard, but instead to present an idea extrapolated simply from a different perspective. Viewing this venture differently is a good thing and as such, it is hoped that what we uncovered will be accepted as a beneficial contribution to help fundamentally strengthen the entire process. After all, we all share the same desires and goals.

Respectfully submitted,

IPDG Doug Harvey
PDG Monte Ward