I believe Fitchburg is now OK.

I spoke with both Denise Solie and Jason (who is advising the Mayor who is out of the state today).

For some reason, they seemed to think the overall exemption provided in SB150 section 4 and the school district exemption in current law were somehow linked and the latter would negate the former. They now seem comfortable. The language added on Friday (Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to compel a county or city to alter or redraw supervisory or aldermanic districts.".) is giving them additional comfort.

Denise will do her best to make sure no one from the city continues to claim state action is negatively affecting her cities ability to create districts they desire.

---

Joe, you should go back to Mayor Shawn and tell him his request is outside the "footprint" of SB 150 and suggest a way(s) for him to create Fitchburg's "second majority-minority district" if that is the Mayor's real concern. Perhaps Tad or Adam could join your conversation with Shawn.

Ok?

...and if Fitchburg's issue is "occasioned by the creation of the new state legislative districts," then no amendment is necessary because SB 150 itself solves it.

The only argument in favor of fixing it is they continue to state they can't draw their districts the way they wish and create a second minority district. That's not true, but it is bad PR. "If we can get this simple addition added to SB 150, I think it will allow us to create "majority minority" aldermanic districts in Fitchburg, which would truly represent the diversity of our city for the next 10 years and the desire of our non-partisan, citizen redistricting panel." -- the Mayor (from the email below).
Guys:

See below. Fitchburg has this request outstanding and we must decide whether to “fix” Fitchburg’s issue by a Senate floor amendment or not.

In my view, unless the problem that Fitchburg has is occasioned by the creation of new state legislative districts, then we should decline Fitchburg's request. We have been saying all along that SB 150’s "surgery" on the local redistricting process is confined to allowing the municipalities to fix ward divisions occasioned by the state’s new legislative districts. Fitchburg’s issue, as I understand, is not with our redistricting plans, but with other portions of existing state law.

I believe that we shouldn’t open the door to requests to re-write sec. 5.15 unless such a request is occasioned by the creation of new legislative districts.

Agreed?

Ray

Ray -

I just got off the phone with the mayor and was able to follow-up on the conversation he and I had the other day.

I don’t see any harm in their proposal to create a new exception to the minimal ward requirement for municipalities with multiple school districts.

There are two distinct issues here involving Fitchburg: One involves the difficulty dealing with multiple school districts and one involving a proposed legislative plan that requires wards to be divided.

The issue with the school districts is likely pre-existing issue and is not triggered by SB 150 or the state redistricting map. If it is, in fact, triggered by SB 150 or the state legislative plan, it is also fixed already by SB 150. Any ward division issues that are triggered by the state redistricting map are addressed by SB 150 Section 4 which permits the drawing of wards outside of the prescribed population ranges.
The language suggested by the city would seem to address this pre-existing issue by adding an additional exception to current law for municipalities with multiple school districts.

The other issue is whether the proposed redistricting maps force the city to alter its aldermanic seats or its efforts to create minority districts.

Please read the attached news article. This article suggests that the state redistricting plan and/or SB 150 is affecting the ability of the city to create minority districts. As I understand it SB 150 or the state redistricting proposal does not, in any way, cause any county or city to redraw any county supervisory or aldermanic district. In fact, SB 150 specifically allows wards to be drawn below the otherwise prescribed population minimums to accommodate the state plan.

Referring to the memo from Jason Schmidt, he says "Ward 15 would be divided." If this division is the result of the state redistricting proposal and/or SB 150, then the city does would be able to drop the population of the multiple wards that are created below the population threshold. If, however, he is referring to the "old" ward 15 (in place since 2001) and the need to divide that because it is in 2 school districts, then the language proposed by the city would fix that.


In summary, I would encourage the committee to adopt the proposal from the city of Fitchburg as outline in the memo from Jason Schmidt.

From: Shawn Pfaff [mailto:Shawn.Pfaff@city.fitchburg.wi.us]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 10:45 AM
To: rptaffora@michaelbest.com
Cc: Denise Solie; Mark Sewell
Subject: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment

Ray:

It was great to see you the other day in the Capitol at the Redistricting hearing. I know you've been following the issue closely.

As we discussed, we have a unique situation in Fitchburg (three school districts in our city) when it comes to the minimum ward requirement as I explained with my testimony. I have attached a backgrounder memo prepared by our city legal and planning staff that explains our issue and suggests our simple remedy for it.

If we can get this simple addition added to SB 150, I think it will allow us to create "majority minority" aldermanic districts in Fitchburg, which would truly represent the diversity of our city for the next 10 years and the desire of our non-partisan, citizen redistricting panel.
I have cc’d our city attorney Mark Sewell and our Redistricting Chair Alder Denise Solie in case you have any technical questions.

I think our ask is not too heavy of a lift.

Thanks for your attention,
Shawn
(608)628-3275

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Unless otherwise expressly indicated, if this email, or any attachment hereto, contains advice concerning any federal tax issue or submission, please be advised that the advice was not intended or written to be used, and that it cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties.

The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please return it to the sender immediately and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system. If you have any questions concerning this message, please contact the sender.

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Any advice expressed in this writing as to tax matters was neither written nor intended by the sender or Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c. to be used and cannot be used by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer. If any such tax advice is made to any person or party other than to our client to whom the advice is directed and intended, then the advice expressed is being delivered to support the promotion or marketing (by a person other than Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c.) of the transaction or matter discussed or referenced. Each taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer’s particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

This e-mail and any attachments may contain privileged or confidential information. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, dissemination or action taken in relation to the contents of this e-mail and any of its
attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original e-mail and destroy any copies or printouts of this e-mail as well as any attachments. To the extent representations are made herein concerning matters of a client of the firm, be advised that such representations are not those of the client and do not purport to bind them.
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Friday, April 01, 2011 2:24 PM
To: tottman; adam.foltz; Joseph W. Handrick; McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Subject: RE: Most segregated cities in America

Very dramatic. Thanks.
Jim

Troupis Law Office LLC
7609 Elmwood Ave
Suite 102
Middleton, WI 53562
608.807.4096
jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com

This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments thereto.

From: tottman [mailto:tottmanagmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 01, 2011 2:04 PM
To: adam.foltz; Joseph W. Handrick; McLeod, Eric M (22257); Jim Troupis
Subject: Most segregated cities in America

From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2011 8:40 AM
To: Taffora, Raymond P (22244); tottman; adamfoltz@gmail.com; jhandrick@reinhartlaw.com
Cc: McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Subject: RE: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment

Per all the subsequent emails, I also agree. As we discussed yesterday on a much more important issue in Milwaukee on the districts themselves, the legislation is final absent some catastrophic potential result.

Jim

James R. Troupis
Troupis Law Office LLC
jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com
ph. 608-807-4096

From: Taffora, Raymond P (22244) [mailto:rtaffora@michaelbest.com]
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2011 8:02 AM
To: tottman; adamfoltz@gmail.com; Jim Troupis; jhandrick@reinhartlaw.com
Cc: McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Subject: FW: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment

Guys:

See below. Fitchburg has this request outstanding and we must decide whether to "fix" Fitchburg's issue by a Senate floor amendment or not.

In my view, unless the problem that Fitchburg has is occasioned by the creation of new state legislative districts, then we should decline Fitchburg's request. We have been saying all along that SB 150's "surgery" on the local redistricting process is confined to allowing the municipalities to fix ward divisions occasioned by the state's new legislative districts. Fitchburg's issue, as I understand, is not with our redistricting plans, but with other portions of existing state law.

I believe that we shouldn't open the door to requests to re-write sec. 5.15 unless such a request is occasioned by the creation of new legislative districts.

Agreed?

Ray

From: Joseph W. Handrick [mailto:jhandrick@reinhartlaw.com]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 11:34 AM
To: 'Shawn Pfaff'; Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Cc: 'Denise Solie'; 'Mark Sewell'
Subject: RE: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment
Ray -

I just got off the phone with the mayor and was able to follow-up on the conversation he and I had the other day.

I don't see any harm in their proposal to create a new exception to the minimal ward requirement for municipalities with multiple school districts.

There are two distinct issues here involving Fitchburg: One involves the difficulty dealing with multiple school districts and one involving a proposed legislative plan that requires wards to be divided.

The issue with the school districts is likely pre-existing issue and is not triggered by SB 150 or the state redistricting map. If it is, in fact, triggered by SB 150 or the state legislative plan, it is also fixed already by SB 150. Any ward division issues that are triggered by the state redistricting map are addressed by SB 150 Section 4 which permits the drawing of wards outside of the prescribed population ranges.

The language suggested by the city would seem to address this pre-existing issue by adding an additional exception to current law for municipalities with multiple school districts.

The other issue is whether the proposed redistricting maps force the city to alter its aldermanic seats or its efforts to create minority districts.

Please read the attached news article. This article suggests that the state redistricting plan and/or SB 150 is affecting the ability of the city to create minority districts. As I understand it SB 150 or the state redistricting proposal does not, in any way, cause any county or city to redraw any county supervisory or aldermanic district. In fact, SB 150 specifically allows wards to be drawn below the otherwise prescribed population minimums to accommodate the state plan.

Referring to the memo from Jason Schmidt, he says "Ward 15 would be divided." If this division is the result of the state redistricting proposal and/or SB 150, then the city does would be able to drop the population of the multiple wards that are created below the population threshold. If, however, he is referring to the "old" ward 15 (in place since 2001) and the need to divide that because it is in 2 school districts, then the language proposed by the city would fix that.


In summary, I would encourage the committee to adopt the proposal from the city of Fitchburg as outline in the memo from Jason Schmidt.
Ray:

It was great to see you the other day in the Capitol at the Redistricting hearing. I know you’ve been following the issue closely.

As we discussed, we have a unique situation in Fitchburg (three school districts in our city) when it comes to the minimum ward requirement as I explained with my testimony. I have attached a backgrounder memo prepared by our city legal and planning staff that explains our issue and suggests our simple remedy for it.

If we can get this simple addition added to SB 150, I think it will allow us to create "majority minority" aldermanic districts in Fitchburg, which would truly represent the diversity of our city for the next 10 years and the desire of our non-partisan, citizen redistricting panel.

I have cc’d our city attorney Mark Sewell and our Redistricting Chair Alder Denise Solie in case you have any technical questions.

I think our ask is not too heavy of a lift.

Thanks for your attention,
Shawn
(608)628-3275
Guys:

See below. Fitchburg has this request outstanding and we must decide whether to "fix" Fitchburg's issue by a Senate floor amendment or not.

In my view, unless the problem that Fitchburg has is occasioned by the creation of new state legislative districts, then we should decline Fitchburg's request. We have been saying all along that SB 150's "surgery" on the local redistricting process is confined to allowing the municipalities to fix ward divisions occasioned by the state's new legislativedistricts. Fitchburg's issue, as I understand, is not with our redistricting plans, but with other portions of existing state law.

I believe that we shouldn't open the door to requests to re-write sec. 5.15 unless such a request is occasioned by the creation of new legislative districts.

Agreed?

Ray.

Ray -

I just got off the phone with the mayor and was able to follow-up on the conversation he and I had the other day.

I don't see any harm in their proposal to create a new exception to the minimal ward requirement for municipalities with multiple school districts.

There are two distinct issues here involving Fitchburg: One involves the difficulty dealing with multiple school districts and one involving a proposed legislative plan that requires wards to be divided.

The issue with the school districts is likely pre-existing issue and is not triggered by SB 150 or the state redistricting map. If it is, in fact, triggered by SB 150 or the state legislative plan, it is also fixed already by SB 150. Any ward division issues that are triggered by the state redistricting map are addressed by SB 150 Section 4 which permits the drawing of wards outside of the prescribed population ranges.
The language suggested by the city would seem to address this pre-existing issue by adding an additional exception to current law for municipalities with multiple school districts.

The other issue is whether the proposed redistricting maps force the city to alter its aldermanic seats or its efforts to create minority districts.

Please read the attached news article. This article suggests that the state redistricting plan and/or SB 150 is affecting the ability of the city to create minority districts. As I understand it SB 150 or the state redistricting proposal does not, in any way, cause any county or city to redraw any county supervisory or aldermanic district. In fact, SB 150 specifically allows wards to be drawn below the otherwise prescribed population minimums to accommodate the state plan.

Referring to the memo from Jason Schmidt, he says "Ward 15 would be divided." If this division is the result of the state redistricting proposal and/or SB 150, then the city would be able to drop the population of the multiple wards that are created below the population threshold. If, however, he is referring to the "old" ward 15 (in place since 2001) and the need to divide that because it is in 2 school districts, then the language proposed by the city would fix that.


In summary, I would encourage the committee to adopt the proposal from the city of Fitchburg as outline in the memo from Jason Schmidt.

From: Shawn Pfaff [mailto:Shawn.Pfaff@city.fitchburg.wi.us]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 10:45 AM
To: rtaffora@michaelbest.com
Cc: Denise Solie; Mark Sewell
Subject: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment

Ray:

It was great to see you the other day in the Capitol at the Redistricting hearing. I know you've been following the issue closely.

As we discussed, we have a unique situation in Fitchburg (three school districts in our city) when it comes to the minimum ward requirement as I explained with my testimony. I have attached a backgrounder memo prepared by our city legal and planning staff that explains our issue and suggests our simple remedy for it.

If we can get this simple addition added to SB 150, I think it will allow us to create "majority minority" aldermanic districts in Fitchburg, which would truly represent the diversity of our city for the next 10 years and the desire of our non-partisan, citizen redistricting panel.

I have cc'd our city attorney Mark Sewell and our Redistricting Chair Alder Denise Solie in case you have any technical
questions.
I think our ask is not too heavy of a lift.

Thanks for your attention,
Shawn
(608)628-3275
Great.

Joe, you should go back to Mayor Shawn and tell him his request is outside the "footprint" of SB 150 and suggest a way(s) for him to create Fitchburg's "second majority-minority district" if that is the Mayor's real concern. Perhaps Tad or Adam could join your conversation with Shawn.

Ok?

...and if Fitchburg's issue is "occasioned by the creation of the new state legislative districts," then no amendment is necessary because SB 150 itself solves it.

The only argument in favor of fixing it is they continue to state they can't draw their districts the way they wish and create a second minority district. That's not true, but it is bad PR. "If we can get this simple addition added to SB 150, I think it will allow us to create "majority minority" aldermanic districts in Fitchburg, which would truly represent the diversity of our city for the next 10 years and the desire of our non-partisan, citizen redistricting panel." -- the Mayor (from the email below).

Guys:

See below. Fitchburg has this request outstanding and we must decide whether to "fix" Fitchburg's issue by a Senate floor amendment or not.

In my view, unless the problem that Fitchburg has is occasioned by the creation of new state legislative districts, then we should decline Fitchburg's request. We have been saying all along that SB 150's "surgery" on the local redistricting process is confined to allowing the municipalities to fix ward divisions occasioned by the state's new legislative districts. Fitchburg's issue, as I understand, is not with our redistricting plans, but with other portions of existing state law.
I believe that we shouldn’t open the door to requests to re-write sec. 5.15 unless such a request is occasioned by the creation of new legislative districts.

Agreed?

Ray

---

From: Joseph W. Handrick [mailto:JHandrick@reinhartlaw.com]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 11:34 AM
To: 'Shawn Pfaff'; Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Cc: 'Denise Solie'; 'Mark Sewell'
Subject: RE: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment

Ray -

I just got off the phone with the mayor and was able to follow-up on the conversation he and I had the other day.

I don't see any harm in their proposal to create a new exception to the minimal ward requirement for municipalities with multiple school districts.

There are two distinct issues here involving Fitchburg: One involves the difficulty dealing with multiple school districts and one involving a proposed legislative plan that requires wards to be divided.

The issue with the school districts is likely pre-existing issue and is not triggered by SB 150 or the state redistricting map. If it is, in fact, triggered by SB 150 or the state legislative plan, it is also fixed already by SB 150. Any ward division issues that are triggered by the state redistricting map are addressed by SB 150 Section 4 which permits the drawing of wards outside of the prescribed population ranges.

The language suggested by the city would seem to address this pre-existing issue by adding an additional exception to current law for municipalities with multiple school districts.

The other issue is whether the proposed redistricting maps force the city to alter its aldermanic seats or its efforts to create minority districts.

Please read the attached news article. This article suggests that the state redistricting plan and/or SB 150 is affecting the ability of the city to create minority districts. As I understand it SB 150 or the state redistricting proposal does not, in any way, cause any county or city to redraw any county supervisory or aldermanic district. In fact, SB 150 specifically allows wards to be drawn below the otherwise prescribed population minimums to accommodate the state plan.

Referring to the memo from Jason Schmidt, he says "Ward 15 would be divided." If this division is the result of the state redistricting proposal and/or SB 150, then the city does
would be able to drop the population of the multiple wards that are created below the population threshold. If, however, he is referring to the "old" ward 15 (in place since 2001) and the need to divide that because it is in 2 school districts, then the language proposed by the city would fix that.


In summary, I would encourage the committee to adopt the proposal from the city of Fitchburg as outline in the memo from Jason Schmidt.

---

From: Shawn Pfaff [mailto:Shawn.Pfaff@city.fitchburg.wi.us]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 10:45 AM
To: rptaffora@michaelbest.com
Cc: Denise Solie; Mark Sewell
Subject: Fitchburg Memo - Ward Reduction Amendment

Ray:

It was great to see you the other day in the Capitol at the Redistricting hearing. I know you’ve been following the issue closely.

As we discussed, we have a unique situation in Fitchburg (three school districts in our city) when it comes to the minimum ward requirement as I explained with my testimony. I have attached a background memo prepared by our city legal and planning staff that explains our issue and suggests our simple remedy for it.

If we can get this simple addition added to SB 150, I think it will allow us to create “majority minority” aldermanic districts in Fitchburg, which would truly represent the diversity of our city for the next 10 years and the desire of our non-partisan, citizen redistricting panel.

I have cc’d our city attorney Mark Sewell and our Redistricting Chair Alder Denise Solie in case you have any technical questions.

I think our ask is not too heavy of a lift.

Thanks for your attention,
Shawn
(608)628-3275

*****************************************************************************

Unless otherwise expressly indicated, if this email, or any attachment hereto, contains advice concerning any federal tax issue or submission, please be advised that the advice was not intended or written to be used, and that it cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties.

The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its
contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please return it to the sender immediately and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system. If you have any questions concerning this message, please contact the sender.