**Town of Islip Re-Districting**

**On-line Forum**

**Wednesday February 17th, 2021**

1. **Overview**
	1. **Presenter - William K. Moss III - NAACP, President of Islip Town Branch**
	2. **Key Communication Points**
		1. In a settlement of a lawsuit brought against the Town of Islip by a number of Hispanic residents of the town citing a lack of representation of this minority group, the Town of Islip leadership created a new Council District format for the Town Council.
		2. The re-districting plan was developed to cure the issues of a lack of representation of the LatinX population in Islip by drawing a council district, which provides a Hispanic majority of voters. This district, Council District 01, is concentrated in the Brentwood and Central Islip areas.
		3. While this solution as currently cures this specific issue with the creation of a Latino majority Council District One, the drawing of the new Districts creates issues for other communities in the Township.
		4. Show visual of the map
2. **Issues with the Current Plan**
	1. **Presenter - Vincent Vertuccio - Co-Chair Mobilize Suffolk Blue**
	2. **Key Communication Points**
		1. The Current Re-districting plan is built off Election Districts, which do not conform to any of the pre-existing geographic metrics currently used in the U.S.
			1. **Villages/Hamlets** - Each village or hamlet in Islip is unique from every other one with has its own cultural and civic groups and specific issues. Citizens identify themselves as being from their village if asked where they are from - e.g. Ronkonkoma, Bayport or West Islip - not by Election or Council District. Six designated villages are split in this recommendation: Brentwood, Central Islip, Islandia, Islip, Sayville and West Sayville are all split across different districts in this recommendation
			2. **Zip Codes** - Seven Zip Codes have portions of their overall coverage split between the newly created Council Districts. These include Bay Shore, Brentwood, Central Islip, Islandia, Islip, Sayville and West Sayville.
			3. **School Districts** - Also concerning is the splitting of School Districts across different Council Districts. School Districts are the form of government closest to the actual electorate and issues that they face locally. With this map, they will no longer have a consolidated voice for their issues. Central Islip, Connetquot and Sayville/West Sayville School Districts are cut across different Council Districts
			4. **Cherry-picking of Election Districts -** Beyond the issues of how this map was drawn without utilizing standard geographic breakdowns, Election Districts were split off from their specified villages with the objective of retaining as many Republican votes as possible in order to retain their current majority rule of the township.
				1. Of the 15 ED's split from their villages or zip codes, 67% had a Democratic registration advantage versus Republicans.
				2. A total of the split districts had a 48% vs. 21% Democratic to Republican registration skew.
			5. **This is particularly concerning in the case of the Central Islip community, which has been split between 3 different council districts. The composition of the Council Districts looks like blatant gerrymandering.**
3. **Impact on Communities**
	1. **Central Islip**
		1. **Marvin Smith, NAACP member and resident**
	2. **West Sayville**
		1. **Dr. James Bertsch, Sayville Citizens for Political Activation**
4. **Recommended Cure - Fix Original Council District Plan to correct issues note above**
	1. **Presenter - Ed O'Donnell - Sayville Citizens**
	2. **Key Communication Points**

A revised plan for re-districting was createduses the Court directed map as a template while keeping communities together. This was done by:

* + 1. Moving ED's back to a configuration with towns that are now in the same Council District. This puts the Central Islip School District into District Two intact.
		2. Moving West Sayville to ED 4, which keeps the Sayville School District intact.
		3. Districts are all contiguous.
		4. The revised plan balances out both the demographics and population differences between districts. (see Appendix)
	1. **Demographic Composition Comparison by District**
		1. The Revised Option provides a more even distribution of registered voters across each of the four new Council Districts. While District Four has a slightly higher deviation than in the Original Option, the deviation levels in Revised Option are much more even in the other three Districts. Overall, the deviation levels are within the +/- 5.0% desired level.
		2. In terms of demographics, the Revised Option provides a greater voice to minority populations via a greater concentration of African American and Hispanic citizens by providing a greater concentration of such citizens in Districts Two and Three rather than spreading these groups across all three districts.
1. **Conclusion and Next Ste**ps
	1. **Presenter - William K. Moss III - NAACP, President of Islip Town Branch**
	2. We are looking to the Town to rectify this issue prior to the 2021 Election so that the new council districts are drawn in a fair and unbiased manner.
	3. If these districts are not fairly re-drawn we will file a lawsuit against the Town of Islip for discriminating against the Black minority population of the township.
	4. According to an article in Newsday on 12.16.19, "The Town of Islip has spent nearly $3 million this year fighting a federal voting rights lawsuit, according to town financial documents. The money has come from the town's fund balance reserve, town officials said. The 2019 budget had originally allocated $180,000 for outside professional legal fees."
	5. This is not even the full amount of money spent on this suit as it only counts the money spent up until December 2019.
	6. Bottom line, the current administration from the Town of Islip wasted taxpayer money on this lawsuit with the only objective being to keep themselves in power. Unless they fix the issues with their "cure" we will have no choice but to file another suit.
2. **Questions - Ed O'Donnell**

**Appendix -**

A. Populations by District

B. Demographic Composition by Hamlet

C. Demographics by District

D. Registration and Voting Patterns for the ED's split from Towns in Original Option

E. Current District Map

F. Revised Council District Map

**A. Populations by District**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Index** |  | **Index** |
|  | **Revised** | **Mean Pop.** | **Original** | **Mean Pop.** |
| **District** | **Total Pop.** | **Deviation** | **Total Pop.** | **Deviation** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| One | 87260 | 95.34 | 88096 | 105.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Two | 91484 | 99.96 | 80997 | 96.58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Three  | 93381 | 102.03 | 86330 | 102.94 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Four | 93976 | 102.68 | 79820 | 95.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 366,101 |  | 335243 |  |
| Avg. | 91525 |  | 83866 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| source: 2010 Census Demographics by Zip Code for the revised map. Original map demographics from Town lawsuit. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix**

**B. Demographic Composition by Hamlet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hamlet** | **Black** | **White** | **Native** | **Asian** | **Islander** | **Other** | **Two+** | **Hispanic** | **Council****Districts** |
| Central Islip | 24 | 23 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 47 | 3 |
| Bay Shore | 20 | 35 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 39 | 1 |
| Brentwood | 12 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 69 | 2 |
| North Bay Shore | 12 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 66 | 1 |
| Baywood | 11 | 46 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 39 | 1 |
| Islandia | 9 | 48 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 2 |
| Islip | 6 | 75 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 2 |
| Hauppauge | 4 | 79 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| North Great River | 4 | 80 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 1 |
| Ronkonkoma | 3 | 73 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 1 |
| Bohemia | 3 | 85 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 |
| Holbrook | 3 | 80 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| Brightwaters | 2 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| East Islip | 2 | 86 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 |
| Oakdale | 2 | 92 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Bayport | 2 | 86 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 |
| West Islip | 1 | 91 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| West Bay Shore | 1 | 81 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 1 |
| Islip Terrace | 1 | 79 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 1 |
| West Sayville | 1 | 91 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Sayville | 1 | 91 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Great River | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 |

note: numbers represent percentages censusreporter.org

**Appendix**

**C. Demographics by District**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Revised** | **Original** | **Revised** | **Original** | **Revised** | **Original** |
| **District** | **White %** | **White %** | **Black %** | **Black %** | **Hispanic %** | **Hispanic %** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One | 52% | 22% | 16% | 20% | 49% | 54% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two | 77% | 76% | 11% | 8% | 23% | 13% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Three  | 79% | 74% | 7% | 9% | 19% | 15% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Four | 93% | 82% | 2% | 9% | 8% | 4% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| note: Hispanic is an ethnicity not a race these numbers are not additivesource: 2010 Census Demographics by Zip Code, cumulative populations for the revised districts**Appendix** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**D. Voting and Registrations by Split ED's for 2019 Election Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **Barde** | **Mullen** |  |
|  |  | **Eligible** | **sup** | **suo** |  | **council 1** | **council 1** | **council 1** |
|  | **ED** | **Voters** | **d** | **r** | **total** | **d** | **r** | **total** |
| **Bohemia** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22 | 164 | 14 | 22 | 36 | 13 | 23 | 36 |
|  |  | 22.0% | 38.9% | **61.1%** |  | 36.1% | **63.9%** |  |
|  | 223 | 775 | 73 | 179 | 252 | 78 | 168 | 246 |
|  |  | 32.5% | 29.0% | **71.0%** |  | 31.7% | **68.3%** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Brentwood** | 190 | 124 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
|  |  | 6.5% | **100.0%** | **0.0%** |  | **100.0%** | **0.0%** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Central islip** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 55 | 1479 | 158 | 96 | 254 | 160 | 64 | 224 |
|  |  | 17.2% | **62.2%** | 37.8% |  | **71.4%** | 28.6% |  |
|  | 75 | 1125 | 142 | 49 | 191 | 139 | 27 | 166 |
|  |  | 17.0% | **74.3%** | 25.7% |  | **83.7%** | 16.3% |  |
|  | 77 | 1425 | 135 | 95 | 230 | 121 | 80 | 201 |
|  |  | 16.1% | **58.7%** | 41.3% |  | **60.2%** | 39.8% |  |
|  | 168 | 1095 | 139 | 72 | 211 | 135 | 65 | 200 |
|  |  | 19.3% | **65.9%** | 34.1% |  | **67.5%** | 32.5% |  |
|  | 176 | 985 | 121 | 31 | 152 | 115 | 25 | 140 |
|  |  | 15.4% | **79.6%** | 20.4% |  | **82.1%** | 17.9% |  |
|  | 181 | 986 | 127 | 54 | 181 | 115 | 37 | 152 |
|  |  | 18.4% | **70.2%** | 29.8% |  | **75.7%** | 24.3% |  |
|  | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Islandia** | 30 | 1425 | 153 | 83 | 236 | 144 | 70 | 214 |
|  |  | 16.6% | **64.8%** | 35.2% |  | **67.3%** | 32.7% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |
| **Islip** | 139 | 1346 | 112 | 308 | 420 | 123 | 273 | 396 |
|  |  | 31.2% | 26.7% | **73.3%** |  | 31.1% | 68.9% |  |
|  | 189 | 558 | 56 | 43 | 99 | 60 | 30 | 90 |
|  |  | 17.7% | **56.6%** | 43.4% |  | **66.7%** | 33.3% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sayville** | 144 | 847 | 187 | 184 | 371 | 151 | 209 | 360 |
|  |  | 43.8% | **50.4%** | 49.6% |  | 41.9% | **58.1%** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **W. Sayville** | 18 | 856 | 165 | 146 | 311 | 147 | 151 | 298 |
|  |  | 36.3% | **53.1%** | 46.9% |  | 49.3% | **50.7%** |  |
|  | 176 | 985 | 121 | 32 | 153 | 115 | 25 | 140 |
|  |  | 15.5% | **79.1%** | 20.9% |  | **82.1%** | 17.9% |  |

**source: 2019 Suffolk County Election Results**

**REVISED MAP OPTION**