Thanks Tad. I will go ahead and complete those later today or Monday.

Jim T.

Troupis Law Office LLC
7609 Elmwood Ave
Suite 102
Middleton, WI 53562
608.807.4096

Jeff and Scott are both ok with the Gaddie retention letter and the flat $5000 option for the Handrick retention.

-----Original Message-----
From: McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2011 12:38 PM
To: Ottman, Tad; McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Cc: Sarah Troupis; Sandy Tabachnick; adamfoltz@gmail.com
Subject: Letters of Retention--Gaddie & Handrick

Eric and ALL,

Attached are three draft letters of retention. There are two for Joe H., as I understood from our meeting last week that the Speaker and Majority Leader were not certain which they preferred. Joe has confirmed that he is fine with both, but would prefer the 5,000, unlimited, retention.

The Gaddie letter reflects the agreement we have already reached.

I have kept these purposely vague, on the assumption they may one day be made public. There is, for example, no description of how Joe would report his time, and no obligation he provide detail.

In addition, both letters point-blank state the retentions may be terminated at any time, and both require ongoing confidentiality.
We could make these much more comprehensive, but given the relationship with both Joe and Keith G., that is not necessary. Each will perform those tasks assigned, so we do not need to provide much detail.

If you have any comments or edits to the letters, please let me know and we will make those changes. ADAM & TAD-Please confirm which of the two alternatives the Speaker and Majority Leader would like.

Thanks.

Jim T.
Yes, I actually spoke with Don today and he told me to forward it to him for his review. If Don needs to sign it, he's close by.

Eric M. McLeod  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700  
Post Office Box 1806  
Madison, WI 53701-1806  
(608) 257-3501 (firm)  
(608) 283-2257 (direct)  
(608) 692-1371 (cell)  
(608) 283-2275 (fax)  
emmcleod@michaelbest.com  
www.michaelbest.com

---

Yes, the idea was to meet here, so that would work, although I think Don Millis wanted to look over the contract before it was signed.

On Tue, Feb 15, 2011 at 5:30 PM, McLeod, Eric M (22257) <EMMcLeod@michaelbest.com> wrote:

No problems. Is he coming here? If it's not signed before he gets here, it can be signed at that time.

Eric M. McLeod  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700  
Post Office Box 1806  
Madison, WI 53701-1806  
(608) 257-3501 (firm)  
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
Adam and I were tentatively planning on meeting with Joe Handrick on Thursday afternoon, primarily to discuss preparation for meetings with legislators. I assume there are no problems with this assuming the contract is signed in time. Let me know if you see any problems or if you would like to attend.

Thanks

Tad Ottman

258.2291

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

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.
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

No problems. Is he coming here? If it's not signed before he gets here, it can be signed at that time.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
(608) 257-3501 (firm)
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
(608) 692-1371 (cell)
(608) 283-2275 (fax)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com
www.michaelbest.com

From: tottman [mailto:tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 5:29 PM
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Cc: Jim Troupis; adam.foltz
Subject: Meeting with Joe Handrick

Adam and I were tentatively planning on meeting with Joe Handrick on Thursday afternoon, primarily to discuss preparation for meetings with legislators. I assume there are no problems with this assuming the contract is signed in time. Let me know if you see any problems or if you would like to attend.

Thanks

Tad Ottman
258.2291
Good by me.
Jim

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

Confirmed on my end.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
(608) 257-3501 (firm)
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
(608) 692-1371 (cell)
(608) 283-2275 (fax)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com
www.michaelbest.com

How does Tuesday at 2:00 sound?

Tad

On Tue, Mar 1, 2011 at 2:31 PM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:
Next week is relatively open for me. Early in the week might be better, but really preference. TAD—suggest a day and time that works for you and Adam.

Thanks.

Jim

James R. Troupis
Troupis Law Office LLC
jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com

ph. 608-807-4096

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: McLeod, Eric M (22257) [mailto:EMMcLeod@michaelbest.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2011 11:41 AM
To: totman; Jim Troupis; adam.foltz
Subject: RE: Meeting this week or early next

Monday is out for me. Friday works the best, anytime during the day.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806

(608) 257-3501 (firm)
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
(608) 692-1371 (cell)
(608) 283-2275 (fax)
Is there a time we can get together either later this week or early next to talk about the principles we need to be most conscious of and concerned about in map drawing this cycle? I would also like to discuss contingencies in the event we need to proceed with a map sooner rather than later.

My schedule is open anytime except for late tomorrow afternoon and early Monday morning.

Thanks,

Tad Ottman

Senator Scott Fitzgerald

608.258.2291

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

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.
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.
Tad or Adam,

With 3/11 or today as the start date, could you prepare a timeline of actions with the exact ‘final’ date for action. It would be helpful for all of us to see (and keep in mind) when, under the present statute, the districts could be passed and signed into law.

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.
Eric,
I've not been able to reach Keith, but left clear messages. As soon as I do I'll have him give you a call. If you do not hear from him by mid-day tomorrow call him.
His personal cell is 405-314-7742
Office 405-325-4989

Also, he said he did not get the retention letter. Last I knew I thought you wanted to send it from MB&F in order to have the Trust responsible.

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.
Would you like to do it by video? We did one the other day from MB&F if you'd like to try.

Jim

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

Great. That works on this end. We'll call you from a speaker dish.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
(608) 257-3501 (firm)
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
(608) 692-1371 (cell)
(608) 283-2275 (fax)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com
www.michaelbest.com

Eric, Just called and missed you. Let's talk at 3 p.m. if you are available.

Jim

Troupis Law Office LLC
7609 Elmwood Ave
Suite 102
Jim,

Are you available for a call this afternoon to discuss Gaddie and related issues?

Name a time later in the afternoon if that works.

EMM

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
(608) 257-3501 (firm)
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
(608) 692-1371 (cell)
(608) 283-2275 (fax)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com
www.michaelbest.com

Tad and Adam,
Did you get a chance to decide when you would like Gaddie to come in? Just wanted to let him know today so he can make plans.
Thanks.
Jim T.

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.

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

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.

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

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.
Good Morning Tad and Adam,

Sounds like the latest map went well with the leadership. Congratulations on walking that fine line....

Gaddie was gone last week, as you know, on a cruise. Did you talk with him about this week? Also, Adam—were you able to prepare those materials for the MALDF? I would like to send them today, if that is possible.

Hope you had a great weekend. Let me know the schedule for this week when you have a moment.

Jim
Eric,

Ken Mayer returned from Ireland and is willing to come to work for us. I asked him to reach out to Cannon to also assist as they are co-authors on a number of papers. He is going to do that tonight. Professor Grofman has called back and would like to help, as well. I strongly believe Prof. Grofman is essential to our efforts as he brings to any three judge panel three decades of national and international redistricting work on both sides of the aisle. He has been recognized by courts as perhaps the single most respected political scientist addressing matters of redistricting. There is no doubt we will end up in Court of whatever is passed, and so having a stable of powerful experts is essential. Without Grofman in 2001 we would not have succeeded in getting the map we did get as Easterbrook followed his direction in drawing the map.

We will need to put everyone under confidentiality and retention agreements which will require retainers. Let's discuss this tomorrow and get folks under contract before the map becomes public. They will want to review it ASAP.

I hope things went well today at the caucus. I am sorry I was here in Washington. I did meet with the General Counsel at the RNC and reported on this and other issues. Unfortunately I missed Dr. Hofeller.

Jim

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

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.
FYI

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Andy Speth <adspeth@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 21, 2011 at 1:31 PM
Subject: Talking points
To: Tad Ottman <tottman@gmail.com>, Adam Foltz <adamfoltz@gmail.com>

1) The proposed map is fair and legal.

2) The district lines have been drawn to comply with the U.S. Constitution, which requires a standard of one person, one vote. In other words, all congressional districts must have population equality. The same number of people reside in each congressional district within each state based on the state’s population. In Wisconsin, the population per district must be 710,873.

3) The current congressional map splits 11 counties, the proposed map splits 12. The current congressional map splits 19 census places (municipalities). The proposed congressional map splits 17 census places (municipalities). 15 splits are to preserve county lines from being split and 2 splits are made to achieve 0 deviation (Bayside and New Berlin).

4) The proposed map reflects a population loss in the City of Milwaukee causing most districts on the southern half of the state to shift north and west and most districts on the northern half of the state to shift south and east.

5) The proposed map keeps the current political make-up of the districts intact. The 7 districts won by President Obama remain Democratic districts and the 1 district won by Senator McCain remains Republican.
I can meet then.

Eric M. McLeod  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700  
Post Office Box 1806  
Madison, WI 53701-1806  
(608) 257-3501 (firm)  
(608) 283-2257 (direct)  
(608) 692-1371 (cell)  
(608) 283-2275 (fax)  
emmcleod@michaelbest.com  
www.michaelbest.com

Tad

Can we plan on meeting at 3:00 tomorrow? Let me know if that doesn't work for anyone.

Thanks,

Tad

On Mon, Jun 27, 2011 at 11:14 AM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupiaslawoffice.com> wrote:

Then I will reschedule the 10 a.m. conference call.

Jim

Troupis Law Office LLC  
7609 Elmwood Ave  
Suite 102  
Middleton, WI 53562  
608.807.4096
Unfortunately, the only time that works for Senate GOP caucus is 10:00 on Wednesday.

On Mon, Jun 27, 2011 at 10:49 AM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Good anytime. (only out from 10-2 on Wens.)

I am also gone on Friday, so may we please have the caucus not on Friday?

Thanks.

Jim T.

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:tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 9:51 AM
Can we get together sometime tomorrow afternoon (2:00 or later) to talk about briefing the caucus this week? Hopefully we'll also have all the bill drafts by then.

Thanks,

Tad
Tad and Adam,
I do not understand what the Hispanic community wants by switching population from Carpenter to Larson. Are they saying move 8 & 9 into 19, and then 7, 20 and 21? i.e. keep the two senate districts as a pod, but simply switch two assembly from one to the other? Or, is this something different—as in moving 8 into one and 9 into another? That would seem to me to be illegal as we would be fracturing the Hispanic population. Just wondering if you can figure it out and what is up.
I spoke to Ray about this as well, and really don’t understand what is wanted here that would be legally acceptable.
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.
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

From: tottman [tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 2:27 PM
To: Jim Troupis
Cc: adamfoltz@gmail.com; Taffora, Raymond P (22244); McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Subject: Re: MAI.DEF
Attachments: AD 8 and 9 60-54 split.pdf

Jim,

This is a map I worked on over the weekend that has AD 8 at 60% VAP and 9 at about 54% VAP. It will be interesting to see how this compares with what they have come up with.

Speaking with Sen Zipperer, he wants to proceed with a Wednesday hearing.

On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 2:24 PM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Tad & Adam,

I spoke to the attorneys at MALDEF. They have been working with the maps and would like to propose a middle ground where 8 has 65% Tot pop/60% VAP and 9 has 60% Tot Pop/53% VAP. (And North District/South District configuration.) They are sending me their proposal and would like to talk again tomorrow. I’ll send that as soon as I have it so you can see if it would work.

They are also reaching out today to Milwaukee connections in the Latino community so this will likely become a more dynamic process.

They will certainly consider testifying, but need to know when (Wens or Fri and the process).

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.
Rick, we are in 412 east. Meeting is ongoing now. Are you on the way?
Jim

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 12, 2011, at 9:44 AM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Rick,

The schedule is for the hearing to start at 10, and you will be the second witness—between 10:45-11:15.

We would like you to address meeting the minority representation criteria—we match or better the last map drawn by the Court. Tad will give you a call to give you the numbers and process, and whatever else you may need.

Jim

James R. Troupis

Troupis Law Office LLC

jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com

ph. 608-807-4096

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.
Has anything changed on this? Please let me know how long you want me to talk. I'm thinking 15 minutes if not shorter. Has there been any analysis of the ability to create more majority minority districts?

From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 5:55 PM
To: Eisenberg, Richard
Cc: totman; adamfoltz@gmail.com; McLeod, Eric M (22257); rptaffora@michaelbest.com; Sarah Troupis
Subject: FW: (WisPolitics) REPORT -- 8 July 2011

Rick,

See below the links to the various maps and information as well as the WisPolitics summary.

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.
ADDING TO A HOT POLITICAL SUMMER, THE REDISTRICTING BATTLE BEGINS

Republican legislative leaders released proposed maps this afternoon to dramatically overhaul Wisconsin's political boundaries, pairing 22 lawmakers -- 10 Dems and 12 Republicans -- with other incumbents in the new districts.

Map lines have circulated for weeks as majority lawmakers prepared to push them through ahead of this summer's recall elections, which could flip control of the state Senate. But the offices of Assembly Speaker Jeff Fitzgerald and Senate Majority Leader Scott Fitzgerald refused to detail the changes other than releasing the statutory language that would redraw the boundaries.

Senate Minority Leader Mark Miller, D-Monona, immediately pledged a legal challenge.

"This latest attempt at a partisan power grab by Republicans is another sad example of their disdain for the law and why people have lost faith in their leadership," he said. "There is no question that the Republicans' partisan political redistricting plan will be challenged in court. The unconstitutional means they employ to try to protect their legislative majorities subvert the public interest in fair, competitive elections and are unquestionably grounds for a strong legal challenge."

The Fitzgeralds only released a short statement.

"Republicans have been keeping our promises and getting the job done since Day One," they said. "We started with jobs bills to improve the economy; we balanced the budget on time and turned a deficit into a surplus; and now we're fulfilling our constitutional requirement to properly reapportion the state's legislative and congressional districts."

Assembly Org planned to meet Monday to approve an extraordinary session starting 11 a.m. July 19 to take up redistricting as well as legislation to extend unemployment benefits using federal funds, on tax incremental finance districts (AB 87/SB 55) and a change to a TIF district in Pleasant Prairie (AB 105/SB 147). Senate Org planned to vote on approving the extraordinary session via paper ballot. The date irked Dems because it will be the same day as the first recall general election, pitting Dem Sen. Dave Hansen against Republican challenger David VanderLeest.

The pairs in the Assembly could significantly shake up the Milwaukee Dem caucus.

The pairs are: Fred Kessler, D-Milwaukee, and Don Pridemore, R-Hartford; Sandy Pasch, D-Whitefish Bay, and Jim Ott, R-Mequon; Dave Cullen, D-Milwaukee, and Dale Kooyenga, R-Brookfield; Josh Zepnick, D-Milwaukee, and Peggy Krusick, D-Milwaukee; Andre Jacque, R-Bellevue, and John Klenke, R-Green Bay; Tyler August, R-Walworth, and Amy Loudenbeck, R-Clinton; Chris Danou, D-Trempealeau, and Mark Radcliffe, D-Black River Falls; Andy Jorgensen, D-Fort Atkinson, and Steve Nass, R-Whitewater; John Steinbrink, D-Pleasant Prairie, and Samantha Kerkman, R-Genoa City; and Karl Van Roy, R-Green Bay; and John Nygren, R-Marinette.

The Assembly maps provided often don't offer enough detail to pinpoint changes in the district lines. The draft of the Senate bill to make the changes only includes a list of
municipalities in the districts and census tracts.

In the Senate, the only paired lawmakers are freshman GOP Sen. Van Wanggaard, R-Racine, and longtime Dem Sen. Bob Wirch of Pleasant Prairie, who's one of three Dems under recall threat (see more below). Under the proposed map, the cities of Kenosha and Racine would be put together in one district while the rural parts of those counties would be pulled together into a separate district. Now, each of the lawmaker's districts largely covers their own counties.

Making the move would make the new Kenosha-Racine district solidly Dem. But it would shore up the 21st SD for Republicans. Since GOP Sen. George Petak lost the district in a 1996 recall election, only Dem Kim Plache has held it for more than one term.

The maps provided by legislative leaders only include districts lines transposed over county boundaries and include no ward information. Only close ups of Dane and Milwaukee counties include any cities and towns.

Here are some brief details of the Senate maps compared to current boundaries:

1st SD: Still largely represents the peninsula in northeaster Wisconsin. Held by Sen. Frank Lasee, R-DePere.

2nd SD: Moves west to include most of Outagamie County, more of Shawano County and more of Waupaca County. Held by Sen. Rob Cowles, R-Green Bay.


5th SD: Pushes boundary westward into Waukesha County to pick up more GOP territory. Now held by Sen. Leah Vukmir, R-Wauwatosa.


7th SD: District appears to continue representing southern Milwaukee County, but map is not detailed enough to ascertain how far into the city of Milwaukee the district may go. Now held by Sen. Chris Larson, D-Milwaukee.

8th SD: District appears to move westward to pick up more of Washington and Waukesha counties and northward along Lake Michigan to pick up more of Ozaukee County. Now held by Sen. Alberta Darling, R-River Hills.

9th SD: District shifts in Sheboygan County to cover eastern two-thirds, rather than the northern half of the county as it now does. Sheds piece of Fond du Lac County. Now held by Sen. Joe Leibham, R-Sheboygan.

10th SD: Loses western third of Pierce County. Now represented by Sen. Sheila
Harsdorf, R-River Falls.

11th SD: Moves westward to pick up part of Rock County, while losing some territory in Waukesha and Jefferson counties. Now held by Sen. Neal Kedzie, R-Elkhorn.

12th SD: Picks up more of Oconto County. Now held by Sen. Jim Holperin, D-Conover.

13th SD: Loses some of southern Jefferson County, picks up piece of eastern Dane County. Now held by Sen. Scott Fitzgerald, R-Juneau.

14th SD: Picks up piece of Adams County, adds territory in Columbia County and adds small sections of northern Dane County. Now held by Sen. Luther Olsen, R-Ripon.

15th SD: Loses southeast corner of Rock County, picks up some of southern Dane County and picks up southeastern one-third of Green County. Now represented by Sen. Tim Cullen, D-Janesville.

16th SD: Sheds parts of Columbia County and northern and eastern Dane County. Now held by Sen. Mark Miller, D-Monona.

17th SD: Loses parts of Iowa and Sauk counties, picks up rest of Richland County. Now held by Sen. Dale Schultz, R-Richland Center.

18th SD: Largely unchanged. Now held by Sen. Randy Hopper, R-Fond du Lac.

19th SD: Loses some of Outagamie County. Now held by Sen. Mike Ellis, R-Neenah.

20th SD: Swaps some territory in Sheboygan County with the 9th and picks up northeastern third of Fond du Lac County. Now held by Sen. Glenn Grothman, R-West Bend.

21st SD: Switched from a largely Racine County district to one that includes rural and suburban areas of Racine and Kenosha counties. Now represented by Sen. Van Wanggaard, R-Racine.

22nd SD: Switched from a largely Kenosha County district to one that includes stretch along Lake Michigan from city of Kenosha through city of Racine. Now represented by Sen. Bob Wirch, D-Kenosha, who would be drawn out of his district.

23rd SD: Swaps portions of Eau Claire County to represent the eastern half rather than the northern one-third. Now represented by Sen. Terry Moulton, R-Chippewa Falls.

24th SD: Picks up portions of Jackson and Monroe counties, loses southern half of Adams County, adds southwestern corner of Waushara County. Now represented by Sen. Julie Lassa, D-Stevens Point.

25th SD: Loses most of Sawyer County, picks up corners of Dunn, St. Croix and Polk counties. Now held by Sen. Bob Jauch, D-Poplar.

26th SD: Continues to largely represent Madison. Now held by Sen. Fred Risser, D-Madison.
27th SD: Loses southern half of Green County, picks up eastern third of Iowa County, and adds portions of Sauk and Columbia counties. Now held by Sen. Jon Erpenbach, D-Middleton.

28th SD: Largely unchanged. Now held by Mary Lazich, R-New Berlin.

29th SD: Swaps Price County for most of Sawyer County. Now held by Sen. Pam Galloway, R-Wausau.

30th: Area in Brown County included in district changes. But exact differences hard to ascertain. Now held by Sen. Dave Hansen, D-Green Bay.

31st SD: Loses portion of Jackson County, all of Monroe County that it had represented and swaps area represented in Eau Claire County to have the western half rather than the southern two-thirds. Now held by Sen. Kathleen Vinehout, D-Alma.

32nd SD: Loses areas in Richland County. Now held by Sen. Dan Kapanke, R-La Crosse.

33rd SD: Loses portion of Washington County and becomes more concentrated around city of Waukesha and surrounding area. Now held by Sen. Rich Zipperer, R-Pewaukee.

See a statewide map of the legislative boundaries:
http://www.wispolitics.com/1006/11_2266_1_leg_maps_and_tables.pdf

See the legislative redistricting bill:
http://www.wispolitics.com/1006/11_2266_1_leg_redistricting_SB_2_.pdf

See the amendment on the 8th and 9th Ads:
http://www.wispolitics.com/1006/large/11a1388_1_SA_to_leg_redistricting_SB.pdf

House map helps Duffy

The map of House districts would swap several areas of the 7th and 3rd CD's to make the former more Republican and the latter more Dem. Duffy would pick up growing St. Croix County on the western edge of the state, while shedding all of Portage and most of Wood counties, which would be added to the 3rd. Duffy would also lose the southern third of Chippewa County.

See the congressional map:
http://www.wispolitics.com/1006/large/11_2265_2_cong_maps_and_tables.pdf

See the language of the congressional redistricting bill:
http://www.wispolitics.com/1006/11_2265_2_cong_redistricting_SB.pdf

Companion bill impacts munis

Today's release also includes a companion bill that could force some municipalities to tear up the new maps they’ve approved for city and county offices and start over.
Redistricting is typically a bottom up process with local governments finishing their maps first and the state and federal district boundaries then drawn off those to keep wards intact.

But the legislation requires municipal ward plans to reflect the boundaries on April 1 of the year of each federal census. Now, those wards have to reflect municipal boundaries on Aug. 1 of the year following a census. The change would be retroactive.

The legislation would also dictate that if muni wards would have to fit the legislative and congressional boundaries lawmakers draw.

See the local redistricting bill:
http://www.wispolitics.com/1006/11_2296_1_Local_redistricting_SB_2_.pdf
Tad & Adam,
You can let the chair know that Manny Perez and others from the Latino community will be there to testify for a 60-54 map. You will need to have a large map showing that district—you should prepare that and bring it with. You should still, I think, talk about the three alternatives. That way it looks like what it is—and effective negotiation of something the community wants.
Congratulations!
Manny is talking right now to MALDEF to coordinate their testimony.
Jim
From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 7:51 AM
To: Taffora, Raymond P (22244); McLeod, Eric M (22257); tottman@gmail.com
Subject: RE: FW: Column - Thoughts?

I too had provided edits yesterday.
Looks fine.
Jim

James R. Troupis
Troupis Law Office LLC
jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com
ph. 608-807-4096
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: Taffora, Raymond P (22244) [mailto: rptaffora@michaelbest.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 6:14 PM
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257); 'tottman@gmail.com'; 'jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com'
Subject: Re: FW: Column - Thoughts?

I made a few changes and gave them to Andrew.

From: McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 05:09 PM
To: tottman <tottman@gmail.com>; Taffora, Raymond P (22244); Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com>
Subject: RE: FW: Column - Thoughts?

I think this looks very good.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
(608) 257-3501 (firm)
(608) 283-2257 (direct)
(608) 692-1371 (cell)
(608) 283-2275 (fax)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com
www.michaelbest.com

From: tottman [mailto: tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 5:03 PM
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244); Jim Troupis
Subject: Fwd: FW: Column - Thoughts?
Any thoughts or concerns?

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Ottman, Tad <Tad.Ottman@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2011 at 5:01 PM
Subject: FW: Column - Thoughts?
To: tottman@gmail.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Welhouse, Andrew
Sent: Wed 7/13/2011 4:59 PM
To: Ottman, Tad; Fitzgerald, Scott
Subject: Column - Thoughts?

Guest Column: Sen. Scott Fitzgerald

July 13, 2011

Every ten years, the constitution requires the state Legislature to redraw the district maps for Congress, the state Senate and state Assembly. It's an important responsibility: every person in this country is entitled to an equal vote.

Since 2000, Wisconsin has gained about 323,000 residents, a 6 percent increase from 5.3 million to the current 5.6 million. We grew slower than the rest of the country, which now has nearly 10 percent more people than it did ten years ago.

Unfortunately, the 323,000 people we gained since 2000 didn't sit down and divide themselves up equally among the existing districts. Some parts of the state grew quickly, some lost population, and some districts did both at the same time.

So Wisconsin is doing what every state has to do: update the district maps to reflect ten years' worth of population changes. Our neighbor states Iowa, Illinois and Indiana already have new maps signed into law, and both Minnesota and Michigan have already passed new maps through their legislatures.

Reapportionment is a rapidly evolving process. Just a couple of decades back, new maps were literally drawn with printouts and colored pencils; today it's gotten so sophisticated that the state currently has a "Google Maps"-style interactive, zoomable, street-level map on our website. There are even websites out there offering "do-it-yourself" redistricting apps for anyone to play with the census data.

Wisconsin's reapportionment process is happening right now in the Capitol. This week, just like any other bill, public committees are taking testimony on new proposed maps that meet the constitutional and legal standards, and we expect those new maps to pass the state Legislature in the next few weeks, with plenty of time before the 2012 elections.

I'm proud to announce that the new maps conform to the constitutional and legal requirements: substantially equal population, compact, contiguous districts and deference to minority populations. Because of this, Wisconsin can avoid what's happened in previous decades: partisan gridlock and long, expensive court battles. The last time we went through this process, the gridlock meant...
a legal bill to the taxpayers well above $2 million. Fair, legal maps, passed fairly through the democratic process, can prevent a long, costly court battle, the same way you avoid a speeding ticket by driving under the limit.

Unfortunately, there are some in Madison who are less interested in this constitutional duty and more interested in mining political gain with any criticism they can think of. But at the end of the day, not everybody is going to be perfectly happy. There are more Republicans affected by pairings and the new lines than there are Democrats, 12 to ten.

But that's because there are more important standards than incumbent protection or the status quo: the constitutional and legal requirements of similar population, minority representation and compact, contiguous districts.

Republicans are keeping our promises in Madison. We balanced the budget without raising taxes on Wisconsin families, we turned a $3 billion deficit into a surplus, we're focused on jobs and improving the economy, and we're going to fulfill this constitutional duty with legal maps that reflect the changes in Wisconsin's population.

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

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.
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 12:01 PM
To: tottman@gmail.com; adamfoltz@gmail.com; McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Subject: FW : FW : MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Per below, we may have some support here. I told them I would talk to them later today, and that the Chair could set a time for them to appear—or it could be in writing. Let me know any thoughts.
Jim

James R. Troupis
Troupis Law Office LLC
jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com
ph. 608-807-4096
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: Elisa Alfonso [mailto:ealfonso@MALDEF.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 11:41 AM
To: Jim Troupis; Alonzo Rivas
Subject: Re: FW : MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Jim,
Alonzo is out this morning and won't be back until this afternoon.

In regards to the MALDEF map, we will go with the recommendation you made last night.

As for tomorrow, we are unfamiliar with the process. Does it have to be oral testimony or can it be written? Any suggestions you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

We definitely need to speak today. Please let us know when you think we can have a call after your meetings.

Thank you.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

From: Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com>
Date: Tue, 12 Jul 2011 10:35:56 -0500
To: Elisa Alfonso@MALDEF.org, Alonzo Rivas@MALDEF.org
Subject: RE: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Elisa,
I am meeting with legislative leaders this afternoon. Can we talk later this morning? The hearing will be tomorrow at 10 a.m. in Madison, and so, to the extent we can, we would like to
insure that the concerns of the Latino community are addressed. This morning I asked staff to consult with our Legislative Reference Bureau on these alternatives as they must ultimately draft any amendment.
Let me know what works.
Jim

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

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: Jim Troupis [mailto:jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 6:41 PM
To: Elisa Alfonso; Alonzo Rivas
Subject: FW: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Elisa and Alonzo,

I like your proposal. We've taken it a bit further. Here is a comparison of MALDEF's proposal to a suggestion we think might work a bit better. MALDEF's option is shown in color and our suggestion to do the same thing on the same template is shown in outline form as an overlay.

The HVAP numbers under the 2 plans:

MALDEF

AD 8 60.10
AD 9 53.00

Our Alternative

AD 8 60.52
AD 9 54.03

So this takes the same principal and improves it slightly on the numbers. Importantly, the MALDEF proposal would result in changing at least four other assembly districts in the present legislation, while this alternative would not cause those other unnecessary changes. As a result, I think the legislature could move to your suggestion—with our small changes.

Let us know what you think.

The hearing is on Wens., and if you would be willing to speak on behalf of this, we can then make sure you are on the agenda and the plan is given complete consideration.

Jim
From: Elisa Alfonso [mailto:ealfonso@MALDEF.org]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 4:56 PM
To: 'Jim Troupis'
Cc: Alonzo aRivas
Subject: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Jim,

As promised, here is the MALDEF map we discussed this afternoon.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Elisa
From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 6:42 PM
To: tottman; adamfoitz@gmail.com; McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Subject: FW: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)
Attachments: Comparison of 54-50 maps.pdf

EMAIL I SENT BELOW to try to persuade MALDEF.
We'll see.
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: Jim Troupis [mailto:jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 6:41 PM
To: 'Elisa Alfonso'; 'Alonzo Rivas'
Subject: FW: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Elisa and Alonzo,
I like your proposal. We've taken it a bit further. Here is a comparison of MALDEF's proposal to a suggestion we think might work a bit better. MALDEF's option is shown in color and our suggestion to do the same thing on the same template is shown in outline form as an overlay.

The HVAP numbers under the 2 plans:

MALDEF

AD 8 60.10
AD 9 53.00

Our Alternative

AD 8 60.52
AD 9 54.03

So this takes the same principal and improves it slightly on the numbers. Importantly, the MALDEF proposal would result in changing at least four other assembly districts in the present
legislation, while this alternative would not cause those other unnecessary changes. As a result, I think the legislature could move to your suggestion—with our small changes.

Let us know what you think.

The hearing is on Wens., and if you would be willing to speak on behalf of this, we can then make sure you are on the agenda and the plan is given complete consideration.

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.

As promised, here is the MALDEF map we discussed this afternoon.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Elisa
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

I think the difficulty with MALDEF's proposal is that it would require at a minimum a reconfiguration of AD's 7, 19 and 20. The changes may ripple through other districts as well.

On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 5:41 PM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Tad,

I am going to forward this to them to see what they think. Would the Committee go for either?

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: totman [mailto:tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 5:35 PM
To: Jim Troupis
Cc: adamfoltz@gmail.com; McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Subject: Re: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Here is a comparison of MALDEF's proposal with one that we have worked on. MALDEF's option is the colored in option, our alternative is the outline.
The HVAP numbers under the 2 plans:

MALDEF

AD 8 60.10
AD 9 53.00

Our Alternative

AD 8 60.52
AD 9 54.03

On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 5:05 PM, Jim Troupis <irtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Here is the MALDEF proposal. See what you think. We are to talk tomorrow and let them know if we want them to testify and how they can propose this.

Let me know.

Jim

Troupis Law Office LLC
7609 Elmwood Ave
Suite 102
Middleton, WI 53562
608.807.4096
irtroupis@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.
Jim,

As promised, here is the MALDEF map we discussed this afternoon.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Elisa
Tad,
I am going to forward this to them to see what they think. Would the Committee go for either? Jim

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

Here is a comparison of MALDEF's proposal with one that we have worked on. MALDEF's option is the colored in option, our alternative is the outline.

The HVAP numbers under the 2 plans:

MALDEF

AD 8 60.10
AD 9 53.00

Our Alternative

AD 8 60.52
AD 9 54.03

On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 5:05 PM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Here is the MALDEF proposal. See what you think. We are to talk tomorrow and let them know if we want them to testify and how they can propose this.

Let me know.
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: Elisa Alfonso [mailto:ealfonso@MALDEF.org]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 4:50 PM
To: ‘Jim Troupis’
Cc: Alonzo Rivas
Subject: FW: MALDEF WI House Plan, (2nd edition)

Jim,

As promised, here is the MALDEF map we discussed this afternoon.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Elisa
I completely agree.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
608 283-2257 (Office)
608 692-1371 (Cell)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com

Play it very straight. Total VAP/VAP minority/Total Pop/Total Pop minority by the relevant district. Also, I would include with anything the prior percentages from 2001, so the comparison is always clear particularly on the Hispanic districts. While it is a bit more risky, you might want to include the total African American Population Statewide if the % is the same % as the number of now minority districts. I realize we are not to draw solely to get to that, but Prof. Esenberg thought that was one of the most important numbers demonstrating how truly fair the maps are.

Jim

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

How specific or how general do we want members to be in talking about this?

-----Original Message-----
From: Welhouse, Andrew
Sent: Tue 7/26/2011 11:24 AM
To: Ottman, Tad
Cc: Kelly, Scott  
Subject: FW: Minority Representation  

Tad,  

Any numbers or percentages to back this up?  

ajw

From: Kelly, Scott  
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 11:18 AM  
To: Welhouse, Andrew  
Subject: Minority Representation

Hi Andrew -

Do you have any talking points about how the new legislative maps are sensitive minorities?

Thanks

Scott

Scott Kelly  
Senator Van Wanggaard  
21st Senate District  
(608)266-1832  
scott.kelly@legis.wisconsin.gov
Tad,

An interesting question on what we would to get out there. Given we are going to litigation now I generally say only play the cards whey you must play them. Your excellent point on the disenfranchisement I think we should hold until the other side takes a position on disenfranchisement. No real benefit to playing that card now.

As to the splits, that’s really your call. They are all known. What the benefit is of getting into that is not entirely clear, but from a litigation perspective there does not seem to be any advantage or disadvantage that is obvious.

Jim

From: tottman [mailto:tottman@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2011 11:48 AM  
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244); adam foltz  
Subject: Discontiguity and disenfranchisement

This morning I got from LTSB a copy of their file for LRB 2261, the state legislative redistricting plan. I imported that plan back into our software and ran the report to check for unassigned and non-contiguous areas. There were no unassigned areas. I went through each individual non-contiguous area and confirmed that all fell within the allowable law.

I also took another look at the disenfranchisement report. Of the 299,704 people disenfranchised by SB 148, 164,843 of them will have the opportunity to vote in a recall election this summer. That leaves what I will term a true disenfranchisement number of 134,861.

The question is, do we want to share that number publicly at some point or wait to see it brought up in a legal setting and counter at that time.

A related question as we are getting other media inquiries on things like splits and where exactly they are. So far we have not been responding to those inquiries. Do we want to continue not responding or should we be sharing that information?
Well, it got delivered to our office and I saw it when it was emailed to all our Senators, so it's out there now. I did find it a bit confusing in places, but I didn't see any errors. I think this is what Senators are used to.

On Tue, Jul 19, 2011 at 8:58 AM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

Tad,

Are you satisfied with the Leg Council memo? I frankly found it a bit confusing, but you know better what the Senators will be looking for. This will become a part of the record in the Courts.

Jim

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

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.
412 East, The Joint Finance Hearing Room.

On Wed, Jul 13, 2011 at 8:25 AM, Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com> wrote:

What room is the hearing to be in?

James R. Troupis

Troupis Law Office LLC

jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com

ph. 608-807-4096

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.
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

From: tottman [tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 11:22 AM
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257); Jim Troupis; Taffora, Raymond P (22244); Sarah Troupis; adam foltz
Subject: Revised timeline

It looks like we have a map ready. The plan is for notice of the Org committees to meet going out this afternoon. That notice will include the legislation. We are looking at a hearing next Tuesday or Wednesday with an exec 2 days later and Senate floor action on Tuesday, July 19th.
Here are some population statistics on Milwaukee that tell of story of the overall and racial trends for the city and county.

Additionally, the pairings and disenfranchisement stats are on the bottom of the sheet.

Forgive the formatting, I'll tackle that in later tonight.

Adam
### Milwaukee County Growth & Racial Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>% of County - 2000</th>
<th>% of County - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>940,164</td>
<td>947,735</td>
<td>7,571</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>233,013</td>
<td>257,579</td>
<td>24,566</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td>24.78%</td>
<td>27.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>82,406</td>
<td>126,039</td>
<td>43,633</td>
<td>52.95%</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Age Population</td>
<td>692,339</td>
<td>711,358</td>
<td>19,019</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American VAP</td>
<td>140,790</td>
<td>168,280</td>
<td>27,490</td>
<td>19.53%</td>
<td>20.34%</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic VAP</td>
<td>49,981</td>
<td>77,116</td>
<td>27,135</td>
<td>54.29%</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Milwaukee Growth & Racial Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>% of County - 2000</th>
<th>% of County - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>596,974</td>
<td>594,833</td>
<td>(2,141)</td>
<td>-0.36%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>224,050</td>
<td>239,920</td>
<td>15,870</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>37.53%</td>
<td>40.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>71,646</td>
<td>103,007</td>
<td>31,361</td>
<td>43.77%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Age Population</td>
<td>425990</td>
<td>433486</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American VAP</td>
<td>134563</td>
<td>156151</td>
<td>21,588</td>
<td>16.04%</td>
<td>31.59%</td>
<td>36.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic VAP</td>
<td>43473</td>
<td>63206</td>
<td>19,733</td>
<td>45.39%</td>
<td>10.21%</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### African American Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly District</th>
<th>2002 Court Map - BVAP</th>
<th>Census Day 2010 - BVAP</th>
<th>SB 148 - BVAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>67.08%</td>
<td>67.43%</td>
<td>61.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>62.85%</td>
<td>75.84%</td>
<td>61.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.77%</td>
<td>48.99%</td>
<td>51.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60.45%</td>
<td>55.87%</td>
<td>61.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>61.88%</td>
<td>74.11%</td>
<td>61.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
<td>58.85%</td>
<td>60.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hispanic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly District</th>
<th>2002 Court Map - HVAP</th>
<th>Census Day 2010 - HVAP</th>
<th>Amendment 1 - SB 148 - HVAP</th>
<th>Amendment 2 - HVAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58.34%</td>
<td>65.50%</td>
<td>57.24%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.94%</td>
<td>46.18%</td>
<td>57.25%</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Milwaukee ADs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pairings (10 Dems, 12 GOP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairing</th>
<th>Dem 1</th>
<th>Dem 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>krusick/zepnick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>danoukradcliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ott/pasch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>pridemore/kessler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>kerkman/steinbrink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>kooyenga/cullen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>nass/jorgenson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>august/oudenbeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>klenke/jacque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>van roy/nygren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 21</td>
<td>Wanggaard/Wirch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Temporary Disenfranchisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Disenfranchised</th>
<th>% of Population Disenfranchised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992 Court Map</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Court Map</td>
<td>171,613</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 148</td>
<td>299,704</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 8:32 AM
To: tottman; McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Subject: RE: Opening remarks/questions

On the Hispanic question, I would suggest you ‘punt’ a bit more and not use the term “unsettled” for the law (that will cause us problems later). Something like, “Given the rapid growth of the Hispanic population during the ten year cycle, which is very different than other minority growth patterns, we simply thought providing a number of alternatives would be appropriate. If there are other alternatives for other minority groups, then those can be proposed and acted on by the Committee and the legislature.”

James R. Troupis
Troupis Law Office LLC
jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com
ph. 608-807-4096
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:tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 1:21 AM
To: Jim Troupis; McLeod, Eric M (22257); Taffora, Raymond P (22244)
Subject: Opening remarks/questions

Below is my draft of what I was prepared to open my remarks with. The one change from the outline Jim had prepared that I wanted to consider was to start with the maps of the population trends and then have that lead into a discussion of the new maps. I also included the questions and potential answers, most of which we have discussed.

Please comment, correct or make any additional suggestions.

My name is Tad Ottman. I began working for the State Legislature in 1984, which incidentally was the session after the last time the Wisconsin Legislature passed reapportionment legislation. I currently work for Senator Fitzgerald. I have been involved in working on reapportionment after both the 1990 census and the 2000 census. Last fall Senator Fitzgerald asked me to work on reapportionment legislation necessary as a result of the 2010 census.

There are three core principles to any reapportionment plan:

1. Equal population
2. Sensitivity to minority concerns.
3. Compact and contiguous districts.

The plans we will present to you today were drawn in accordance with these principals.
Let me begin by describing for you the some of the population trends in the existing State Senate Districts. Adam Foltz will follow with a discussion of the same trends in the existing State Assembly Districts.

Questions and Responses:

Pairings are a sometimes inevitable consequence of reapportionment and the result of compliance with the principles of equal population, compact and contiguous districts and sensitivity to minority concerns. Legislative districts are reapportioned to be in place for 10 years. Out of 132 legislators, only 35 remain today in the seats they held in 2000. That is about 75 percent turnover for the 10 years that the districts put in place after the last reapportionment were in effect.

There are a number of correct ways to reapportion. They involve competing principles and choices have to be made. This legislation represents the choices that have been made that are consistent with the legal standards required.

Senator Fitzgerald and Speaker Fitzgerald directed us to work on a reapportionment plan in consultation with legal counsel to insure that all the appropriate legal standards were followed. SB 148 is the end result of that process. Ultimately it will be up to this committee and the Legislature to decide if this proposal becomes law.

I'm not in a position to offer testimony on the partisan makeup of these districts. The Government Accountability Board has made election data from the past 10 years available to each of the 4 caucuses through the non-partisan Legislative Technology Services Bureau.

Legally, it is a much more unsettled question as to how to draw districts that allow Hispanic voters to elect a candidate of their choice than it is for African American voters. These alternatives have been drafted in the hope that members of the Hispanic community will offer their opinion to help this committee and the Legislature decide on the best configuration of these districts.
Interesting comments in that the ‘process’ still dominates. Also, we now can be certain what they are saying which is a major plus. Notice the absence of the 50% Senate district claim and the claim that we’ve left Latino’s out. Thus, the alternative of simply redrawing within the area remains a real possibility.

Jim

Troupis Law Office LLC
7609 Elmwood Ave
Suite 102
Middleton, WI 53562
608.807.4096
jtroupis@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: Adam Foltz [mailto:adamfoltz@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2011 12:32 PM
To: tad ottman; joseph handrick; Eric McLeod; Taffora, Raymond P (22244); Jim Troupis
Subject: In case you missed this

I totally agree. We're on the same page.

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
608 283-2257 (Office)
608 692-1371 (Cell)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com

I believe that is the information I also just referred to. We've had some good articles come out about the Hispanic districts pointing out that the % that elected Hispanic Rep in the past was lower than ours and it is a nice contrast—that's the reason I like to add what the prior map had. The numbers demonstrate, without comment, how good this is for minority populations. No one should comment, just provide the numbers.

Jim

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

In my view, the information you provided during the committee hearing would be a good start. Do you have your outline handy?

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
One S. Pinckney St., Suite 700
Post Office Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
From: tottman [mailto:tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 11:29 AM
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257); Jim Troupis; Taffora, Raymond P (22244); adam foltz
Subject: Fwd: FW: Minority Representation

How specific or how general do we want members to be in talking about this?

-----Original Message-----
From: Welhouse, Andrew
Sent: Tue 7/26/2011 11:24 AM
To: Ottman, Tad
Cc: Kelly, Scott
Subject: FW: Minority Representation

Tad,

Any numbers or percentages to back this up?

ajw

From: Kelly, Scott
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 11:18 AM
To: Welhouse, Andrew
Subject: Minority Representation

Hi Andrew -

Do you have any talking points about how the new legislative maps are sensitive minorities?

Thanks

Scott

Scott Kelly
Senator Van Wanggaard
21st Senate District
(608)266-1832
scott.kelly@legis.wisconsin.gov

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

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.
McLeod, Eric M (22257)

From: Jim Troupis [jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com]
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2011 8:56 AM
To: McLeod, Eric M (22257); tottman@gmail.com
Cc: adam.foltz@legis.wisconsin.gov; Moenck, Nathan L (24438)
Subject: RE : disenfranchisement question

I would think selective elections would violate Art. IV Sec. 5 of the Wi. Constitution ("The senate districts shall be unnumbered in the regular series, and the senators shall be chosen alternatively from the odd and even—numbered districts for the term of 4 years."), and potentially violate the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

I am aware that Courts have had statewide elections and by court order also required elections in all districts, but that was by Court Order under special circumstances, not legislation. Of course, that is off the top of my head, so NATHAN—if you have case law on this could you please send that over to me and we can talk when you have some time.

It is an interesting question about having ‘more’ elections, i.e. ‘enfranchising to a greater degree’, but the counter is that you are, by the same token, treating voters differently and thus giving some voters ‘more choice’ than others. But you do not reach that question if you cannot first get by the Wi. Constitutional provision.

Let me know what you find Nathan.

Jim

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

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: McLeod, Eric M (22257) [mailto:EMMcLeod@michaelbest.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2011 9:05 PM
To: 'tottman@gmail.com'; 'jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com'
Cc: 'adam.foltz@legis.wisconsin.gov'; Moenck, Nathan L (24438)
Subject: Re: disenfranchisement question

Tad,

If I understand your question, the answer is yes. I will have Nathan Moenck pull the cases that deal with this issue from other states and come talk with you tomorrow (if he's in). I am out of the office.

EMM

Eric M. McLeod
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
608 283-2257 (Office)
608 692-1371 (Cell)
emmcleod@michaelbest.com

From: tottman [mailto:tottman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2011 05:03 PM
To: Jim Troupis <jrtroupis@troupislawoffice.com>; McLeod, Eric M (22257)
Cc: adam.foltz <Adam.Foltz@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Subject: disenfranchisement question

Is it possible as part of a redistricting plan to specify special elections in certain senate districts where disenfranchisement is occurring?

For example, could the redistricting legislation say these maps are effective for the 2012 elections. In addition, Senate Districts 3 and 15 will have a special election in 2012 for the remaining 2 years of the term, and then resume the regular cycle beginning in 2014.

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

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.
Jim,

We have been talking with our redistricting team (The Brothers Fitzgerald, Rep. Vos and Sen. Zipperer) about using the week between Finance completing their action on the budget and the Legislature going to the floor to meet and assemble the map. We have asked them to block off the week of June 6-10th from 9:00 to noon and from 3:00 to 5:00 each day to meet and put the map together.

Let me know if you are available or if you have any other questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Tad Ottman
Senator Scott Fitzgerald
608.258.2291