

Redistricting. As you know the redistricting committee that met early this year and did a survey process and NPA meetings noted a few preferences that we are keeping in mind

- The most important thing is preserving current neighborhoods
- People wanted smaller wards so they have more access to their councilors and candidates and I personally also to keep wards small for future elections. Even in our small ward races people have raised \$15,000 and I think larger wards would only increase that number. I think someone needing to raise tens of thousands of dollars to become a first-time councilor is not ideal for democracy.
- Ideally wanted to retain multiple representatives as councilors.

And a note that will be moving to a ranked-choice voting system for councilors.

The Mayor has said that he would veto anything with more than 14 councilors – he believes the council works better with the smaller size created since he became mayor.

For me, this then means that the **most logical map has 7 wards with 2 councilors each**. However, this map does not have the votes. I like it because it basically keeps Ward 1 the same. However, none of the councilors in the NNE or the ONE support this and others, including me, see it as problematic in that it takes a small slice of the ONE and adds it to the NNE. It doesn't preserve those neighborhoods and further lumps them in with folx that have very different needs and preferences (being in the densest part of Burlington and very close to downtown vs being in the most suburban part of Burlington). Our neighbors here have been VERY vocal that this is unacceptable to them - it seems the folx who have weighed in on this would rather have one representative than be lumped in with a neighborhood they don't identify with. **This one is seemingly off the table.**

So the next step is **8 wards with two councilors each**. This does a fairly good job of keeping neighborhoods together after downsizing the outsized Ward 1. Again the Mayor will veto this, so we would need eight votes to override. **This one is TBD - maybe still on the table.**

The other option is **lots of (12-14) small single-wards**. This would also be vetoed by the Mayor, and we don't seem to have the votes for this and I too have my concerns. Given the small size we would have a UVM only ward. This means essentially a sophomore would have to run for UVM's city council and school board for us to not have an election there every year. If a junior or senior ran, they wouldn't even have the option to stay in their position as they would be forced out of residential housing - that doesn't seem sustainable. **This one is seemingly off the table.**

The **6 ward map (wasn't created, but you can sort of see it in the 12 ward map)**. This at least seems a little more fair in that it evenly creates the split between the ONE and the NNE as opposed to having a small group from the ONE joining the ONE. However, it's still wildly unpopular for those groups who want to continue with their NPA and polling stations and it of course goes against the spirit of having smaller wards as it even increases the relatively large Ward 1. **Not sure where this one stands, but I am still inclined to support it as a compromise.**

Mark Barlow, Joe Magee, Ben Traverse and I will be meeting to discuss this as a working group. I will post the above and the information on our first meeting to FPF as soon as I have that information.

University of Vermont - Trinity Campus. This has become a gnarly issue. So at the end of last year UVM told the administration that they would not be continuing the MOU with the City started in 2009. This is an MOU that both lays out voluntary taxes as well as enrollment per bed count. I'm not sure it's

enforceable or if we just choose not to enforce it - over the past few years UVM hasn't even been complying with getting the numbers to us although the numbers have been complain or close to it. The President has been clear with his staff and the Mayor that he will not be signing another one.

UVM has been increasing their undergraduate enrollment. If we take their word for it, this has been unintentional - a function of more people than expected enrolling after being accepted to UVM. At the same time, according to some folx in the University, they are likely to increase their graduate student enrollment as they seek to separate undergraduate and graduate courses more to obtain their R1 designation.

Amidst all of this is the expansion of Trinity campus and the rezoning to reduce the setback. I am a no on this and will encourage all of the other councilors to vote no on this. Based on the meetings between the President and the Mayor, UVM is highly likely to posture this as us being anti-housing and that a no vote for this is a vote for less housing, but as we all know we have been waiting for far longer than I've been on the council to hold UVM accountable. I am not willing to trade more housing for less accountability as it seems likely that UVM will build more housing but then more than fill that with increased enrollment. UVM first has to be a willing partner in trying to collaborate on housing strategy in the city before we can talk about what they can and cannot do, and if they won't come to the table, then we aren't negotiating. We shouldn't be bullied into letting them do whatever they want.

One other bit of news. Joe and I were slammed with a mix of August primaries and me trying to plan for my departure at work, but we are still planning a Public Safety Townhall now maybe at the end of October or early November. I will keep you all posted and apologize for the delay!

Zoraya