

To the Editor January 13, 2020

This is a follow-up to my letter published December 24, 2019 in the HTR on a countywide advisory redistricting referendum, intended for the spring election ballot.

My previous letter was digitally copied to all 14 county supervisors with Yes votes on this issue, including my own supervisor. The responses? With the exception of one, (not the one you would think), was just crickets.

So maybe I was not clear enough in my, and others, objection to the undemocratic veto of a majority vote of our elected representatives, and our desire for them to override this blatant partisan insult to a participatory democracy.

The [State Statutes \(59.17\)](#) allows the County Executive to veto a resolution approved by the County Board.

*59.17(6) (6) County executive to approve or veto resolutions or ordinances; proceedings on veto. Every resolution adopted or ordinance enacted by the board shall, before it becomes effective, be presented to the county executive. If the county executive approves, the county executive shall sign it; if not, the county executive shall return it with his or her objections, which objections shall be entered at large upon the journal and the **board shall proceed to reconsider the matter.***

It appears however that this reconsideration did not happen, as Chairperson Jim Brey has not scheduled a meeting to vote on a reconsideration, or an override of the County Executive's veto. There is also a timing factor here, publication in the newspaper for the 4 weeks prior, and we should not rule out the prospect of them trying to run out the clock on this.

So let us try again, this time including our disappointment in not just those who voted against their constituents best interests, but also in those supervisors who voted for it. Follow through regarding this veto is required by state statute and their job descriptions. This occurred despite the fact that a nonfinancial veto override of a board vote has historically been a very rare and unusual event.

Any supervisor can request a special meeting to attempt a veto override. An override of a veto requires a two-thirds approval (or super majority) of the Board. Since the original resolution passed on a 14-11 vote there needs to be 17 votes to override. I am told those three votes are not there at this time, but at least two supervisors may be on the fence. This would require them to write a new resolution regarding the redistricting issue to be presented for the full Board to consider.

You will have an opportunity to express your opinion in the Spring election this April 7, as all 25 seats are up for re-election.

So let us now name them, and shame them.

Voted Against the voters right to have a say in elections

District 7*Norbert Vogt, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)

District 8 Mike Williams, (incumbent) opposed by Bill Schlei

District 9 Dave Gauger, (incumbent) opposed by Kenneth Sitkiewitz and Seth Damrow

District 18 Nick Muench, (incumbent) opposed by Ralph Koslowski

District 19 James Falkowski, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)

District 16 *Bob Cavanaugh, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)

District 21 Rick Gerroll, (incumbent) opposed by Morgan Sickinger

District 22 David Dyzak, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)

District 25 Kenneth Swade, (incumbent) not running for reelection, no opposing candidate (write-in)

District 10 Don Zimmer, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)

District 12 Kevin Behnke, (incumbent) opposed by Maura Yost

* Amenable to a change of mind?

Voted For the voters right to have a say in elections

District 1 Todd Holschbach, (incumbent) not running, Mark Linsmeier unopposed (write-in)
District 2 Dave Nickels, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 3 Rita M. Metzger, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 4 James N. Brey, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 5 John L. Brunner, (incumbent) opposed by Tyler Martell
District 6 Paul (Biff) Hansen, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 11 Randall S. Vogel (incumbent) not running for reelection, Jamie Aulik unopposed (write-in)
District 13 Jonathan M. Neils, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 14 James M. Baumann, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 15 Catherine E. Wagner, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 17 Susie L. Maresh, (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 20 Chuck J. Hoffman (incumbent) not running, Lee L. Engelbrecht unopposed (write-in)
District 23 Ricky L. Henrickson (incumbent) no opposing candidate (write-in)
District 24 Tye Geimer (incumbent) not running for reelection, versus Charles Hagen Sr.

So to you supervisors who do not yet fully understand the full ramifications, implications, and importance of this issue, please have a look at the following:

Michigan voters approve anti-gerrymandering Proposal

Michigan voters gave a big "yes" to a ballot proposal that would significantly change the way Michigan's political lines are drawn for congressional and state legislative districts. It will create a 13-member citizens redistricting commission made up of four Republicans, four Democrats, and five people who identify with neither party. Gerrymandering is now outlawed by the Michigan state constitution, i.e. against the law.

<https://www.freep.com/story/news/politics/elections/2018/11/06/proposal-2-michigan-gerrymandering/1847078002/>

The "Iowa Model" for Redistricting Nonpartisan Staff Draw Maps in Iowa--Legislature Votes on Them

Iowa stands alone in how it handles redistricting responsibilities. Traditionally, state legislatures are responsible for redistricting. That is true for legislative redistricting in 37 states, and for Congressional redistricting in 43 states. Other states give this responsibility to a commission.

Iowa is among the states where the legislature has responsibility, but its method is unique: nonpartisan staff draws the lines with a nonpartisan approach. This webpage is a synopsis of how the "Iowa system" works. <http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/the-iowa-model-for-redistricting.aspx>

And of course, here in Wisconsin we have this four million dollar taxpayer money wasting politically partisan mess, even after a year and a half of litigation in District Court.

Federal Judges: Wisconsin's GOP Redistricting Maps Unconstitutional

*A panel of three federal judges Monday struck down state house district maps drawn in 2011 by Wisconsin Republican controlled legislature, finding the resulting districts **so blatantly partisan** that they denied Democrats a fair shot at electing candidates of their choosing.*

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/federal-court-says-wisconsin-s-gop-redistricting-maps-unconstitutional-n686991>

Supreme Court sends redistricting case back to lower court, leaving GOP-friendly map in place

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled against a Democratic challenge to Wisconsin's GOP-friendly legislative maps, sidestepping big constitutional questions the case raised about partisan gerrymandering.

The ruling came on procedural grounds, as the court found the plaintiffs lacked legal standing and sent the case back to Federal district court. This means that the court believed that the 12 Democratic voters who brought the lawsuit had not shown they had the *legal* ability to challenge the maps. Each voter lives in a single district, but they challenged the maps of all 99 Assembly districts.

This means that Democratic hopes of winning back the state Assembly remain very slender, even if the party enjoys a "blue wave" at the ballot box.

The high court also gave Democrats a chance to continue their case, leaving open the possibility they could eventually prevail after going back to the trial court. The lawsuit could continue for years even beyond the next round of map drawing that is slated for 2021.

<https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/politics/2018/06/18/supreme-court-sends-wisconsin-redistricting-case-back-lower-court/646165002/>

This means that a majority of Democratic votes will *again* not result in wins of Democratic seats, as has been true since the 2012 elections. The Republicans in Madison have setup "*Heads We Win, Tails You Lose*" Assembly district map con game, that works against all of us regardless of political party.

A representational democracy can only work if legislators have "a habitual recollection of their dependence on the people," wrote one of our Founding Fathers, James Madison.

By making it nearly impossible to vote legislators out of office, with the partisan gerrymandering of district maps is "incompatible with democratic principles," wrote Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan in the Gill v. Whitford case. President Barack Obama warned against it. So did President Ronald Reagan.

Again, all 25 seats on the County Board are up for election this spring.

The intent of this letter is to stir the citizenry out of their winter slumber and into action. Maybe it will even engage the conscience, patriotism, or political self-perseveration instincts of some of the supervisors. We can always hope, and we all should always believe in the possibility of redemption.

The spring election will take place **April 7th**, with a primary election **February. 18th**.

The spring election is also the presidential preference primary during which Wisconsin voters will choose their preference for a presidential nominee for both the Democratic and Republican parties.

Those interested in being a write-in candidate for any race have until noon on April 3 to register.

Let us get this referendum passed and behind us on February 18th, hire county supervisors that serve the interests of ALL the people, and then we can move on to the larger problem in Madison on April 7 and beyond. <https://myvote.wi.gov/en-us/>

We believe that if we cannot change their minds, we need to change their names.

**Those who vote
against the interests
of their constituents...**

**ENDANGERED
SPECIES**

**for partisan political
purposes, are in DANGER
of being voted OUT!**

Are these the dying gasps of a political party of ancient male albino dinosaurs?



Norb Vogt
(920) 682-5493
norbvogt@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Mike Williams
(920) 374-9982
mikewilliams@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Dave Gauger
(920) 323-7308
davegauger@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Nicholas Muench
(920) 901-2324
nickmuench@co.manitowoc.wi.us



James Falkowski
(920) 776-1259
jamesfalkowski@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Bob Cavanaugh
(920) 754-4593
bobcavanaugh@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Rick Gerroll
(920) 682-9337
rickgerroll@co.manitowoc.wi.us



David Dyzak
(920) 794-8276
daviddyzak@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Kenneth Swade
(920) 794-8127
kennethswade@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Don Zimmer
(920) 905-0512
donzimmer@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Kevin Behnke
(920) 323-2577
kevinbehnke@co.manitowoc.wi.us



Bob Ziegelbauer
920-683-5107
BobZiegelbauer@co.manitowoc.wi.us

**SUPPORT THE REVERENDUM BALLET MEASURE AT THE SPRING PRIMARY ELECTION ON
FEBRUARY 18TH AND VOTE IN THE SPRING ELECTION ON APRIL 7TH!**