

**Report of the Legislative Apportionment Board On the
Proposed House Reapportionment**

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Legislative Apportionment Board Members	4
Introduction	5
Role and Function of Legislative Apportionment Board	5
Constitutional and Statutory Principles	7
Individual District Proposals	11
Conclusion	112
Appendices	113

Acknowledgements

The Apportionment Board gratefully acknowledges the invaluable assistance of a number of dedicated individuals for their assistance and support throughout the Board's labors.

- David Crossman, from the Secretary of State's staff, for his unstinting and skilled assistance in scheduling meetings, deciphering and mastering the Maptitude software, attending meetings of the Board and of Boards of Civil Authority, and contributing to the drafting of this report.
- Will Senning, from the Secretary of State's staff, for taking and editing detailed and accurate Minutes of the Board's many meetings.
- Scott Reilly, from the Secretary of State's Archives staff, for research support.
- Secretary of State Jim Condos and Deputy Secretary of State Brian Leven, for providing and sustaining invaluable staff support for the Board's work.
- Michael Chernick and BetsyAnn Wrask, of the General Assembly's Legislative Counsel, for historical perspective and drafting assistance.
- The family members and work associates of the Apportionment Board members, for their support, patience and tolerance of the time demands of the Board's work.

Legislative Apportionment Board Members

Thomas A. Little, Shelburne, Vermont, Special Master and Chair, is Vice President and General Counsel at Vermont Student Assistance Corporation in Winooski, Vermont. He served in the Vermont House of Representatives for the sessions from 1992 through 2002. Currently, he is Chair of the District 4 Environmental Commission.

Megan Brook, South Burlington, Vermont, is the President & CEO of Volunteers For Peace, a nonprofit organization promoting international voluntary service as an effective means of intercultural education, service learning and community development. She is on the State Coordinating Committee of the Vermont Progressive Party and is its Chittenden County Chair.

Frank Cioffi, St. Albans, Vermont, is President of the Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation, the regional economic development corporation serving Chittenden County, Vermont. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Vermont.

Gerry Gossens, Salisbury, Vermont, is a retired Intelligence Officer who has over 20 years' experience in local and regional government. He chaired the Salisbury Selectboard, as well as the Vermont Water Resources Board. He also served two terms in the Vermont House of Representatives and two terms in the Vermont Senate.

Steve Hingtgen, Montpelier, Vermont, is a small business owner. He served in the General Assembly from 1999 to 2004, representing Burlington's Old North End and downtown neighborhoods.

Neale Lunderville, South Burlington, Vermont, is assigned to the Smart Grid program and special projects at Green Mountain Power Corporation. He served as Secretary of Administration and Secretary of Transportation in the administration of Governor James H. Douglas.

Robert Roper, Stowe, Vermont, currently is the host of True North Radio. He previously was Chairman of the Vermont Republican Party, Executive Director for the Vermont Chapter of FreedomWorks and Executive Director for Vermonters for Better Education.

Introduction

Sections 13, 18 and 73 of Chapter II of the Vermont Constitution mandate reapportionment of the Vermont Senate and House following the release of the decennial U.S. Census. The General Assembly enacted Chapter 34A of Title 17, establishing the Legislative Apportionment Board (the Board) to prepare and file proposed Senate and House plans to adjust district boundaries to reflect shifts in population and assure substantially equally representation.

The 2010 Census counted 625,741 residents in the state. This is up 16,914 residents from 2000, a 2.8% increase. Dividing the 2010 population by our 150 House of Representatives seats yields an ideal district population of 4,172 for a single-member district, and 8,344 for a two-member district. This report refers to these district populations as the ideal district population.

The Board reviewed a plan that made adjustments to the existing districts only where a district's population deviated from that of the ideal district by more than nine or ten percent; these proposed changes also resulted in revising adjoining districts owing to the unavoidable "ripple" effect inherent in the reapportionment effort. The Board also reviewed a plan with all single-member districts, and adopted this as the Board's tentative plan by a 4-3 vote. The final plan adopted by the Board proposes significant changes to the tentative plan, looking quite different from both the current plan and the tentative plan. Respect for town lines played a significant role in drawing the final map. .

All of the Board's working proposals, and the detailed Minutes of the Board's 19 meetings, are available to assist in the next phase of the apportionment process as it moves to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Role and Function of Legislative Apportionment Board

Every ten years, following the release of the U.S. Census data, state law requires reapportionment of Vermont's House and Senate districts "in such manner as to achieve substantially equal weighting of the votes of all voters in the choice of legislators." 17 V.S.A. §1901. The process starts with the Legislative Apportionment Board. The Board has a statutory duty to draw up a tentative proposal for changes to House district lines; to share that tentative proposal with town Boards of Civil Authority; and then to draw up a final proposal.

The Board was constituted in 2010 and has seven members. Each of the three major political parties chose a member; Governor Douglas appointed one member from each

party and the Chief Justice of the Vermont Supreme Court appointed the Board's Chair.¹ The Board's meetings were open to the public and its records are public records.

The Board looked at each House district's percentage deviation from the ideal district population. Each existing House district has a positive or negative deviation percentage. For example, a district with a population of 4,372 has 200 residents over the apportionment standard, and a deviation of +4.79 %. A district with a population of 3,820 has 300 residents under the standard, and a deviation of -7.75 %. To the extent that a district has a significant negative deviation, it is over-represented. And, to the extent that a district has a significant positive deviation, it is under-represented or under-represented. The difference between the district with the highest positive deviation and the lowest negative deviation is the "overall deviation" of the Vermont House apportionment.

The law requires House districts with "minimum" deviation percentages. The law does not define "minimum," but Vermont and U.S. Supreme Court decisions tell us an overall deviation under 10% is presumptively constitutional and one somewhat greater than 16% is probably constitutional if it advances rational state policy(ies).

In addition to the overall deviation, the Board is guided by three policies: (1) preservation of existing political subdivision lines; (2) recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests; and (3) use of compact and contiguous territory. When ruling on a challenge to a redistricting plan, the courts give significant weight to these non-numerical factors. Avoiding putting a steep mountain in the middle of a multi-town district may yield district lines that are not intuitive from looking at a flat map of the state. The Vermont Constitution also directs that in setting the House district lines we should adhere to county boundaries

As mentioned, the Board's work to draw a new plan for House districts proceeded in two general phases. The first phase was the creation of a draft, tentative plan by the end of June for review by Boards of Civil Authority. Under statute, any town that is divided into two or more districts or that is put in a district with another town is given an opportunity to comment on the Apportionment Board's plan before it is finalized.

With 24 of 108 current House districts having double digit positive or negative deviations, some district adjustments are clearly required.

In July, the towns and cities proposed to be subdivided or placed in a district with one or more other towns had the right, acting through their Boards of Civil Authority, to comment on the initial plan and propose different district boundaries. Over 150 towns took advantage of this opportunity. In some cases, this involved two or more towns trying to collaborate on a new mapping solution to a shared district line. The Board then

¹ Gerry Gossens was chosen by the Vermont Democratic Party, Robert Roper was chosen by the Vermont Republican Party, and Steven Hingtgen was chosen by the Vermont Progressive Party. Governor Douglas appointed Democrat Frank Cioffi, Progressive Megan Brook and Republican Neale Lunderville. Chief Justice Paul Reiber appointed Thomas A. Little as Special Master and Chair.

reviewed the various town recommendations. The Board made a diligent effort to defer to the consensus recommendations of affected towns and cities. The Board then prepared a final proposed district map, approved by a vote of 4-2 (with one member absent), and delivered it to the Clerk of the House of Representatives on August 15, 2011. This written report completes the Board's duties, subject to responding to questions from the House and Senate as they review the Board's work.

Constitutional and Statutory Principles

The 2001 Board's report presents a well-written explication of the constitutional and statutory principles that govern or guide this Board's work, and we include this in Appendix 1 with this Board's endorsement. The 2001 report includes an analysis of the Vermont Supreme Court's important 1993 decision, In re Reapportionment of Town of Hartland, where the Court decided consolidated reapportionment disputes involving the constitutional and statutory issues of (i) substantial voting equality, (ii) geographical compactness and contiguity, and (iii) patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. 160 Vt. 9 (1993).

Since the 2002 reapportionment, the Vermont Supreme Court has issued one redistricting decision, In re Reapportionment of Towns of Woodbury and Worcester, 177 Vt. 556 (2004). The residents of the Washington County towns of Woodbury and Worcester unsuccessfully challenged the reapportionment of their districts, arguing that placing their towns in the new Lamoille-Washington-1 two-member district violated the requirements of compactness and contiguity and did not respect county lines. The case did not involve a challenge based on population deviation.

The Supreme Court appointed a special master who took testimony and issued findings of fact on the Town's claims. "The master found that all four towns have one or more boundaries in common with another town in the district, and that the T-shaped district 'in fact is contiguous and relatively compact.'" *Id.* at ¶ 12. The Court also noted that the challenged plan "places ninety-eight towns in districts that cross county lines, which is not unusual. In fact, in this respect it is identical to the 1992 reapportionment plan we upheld in *Hartland*, 160 Vt. at 31, 624 A.2d at 336." *Id.* at ¶ 16. The Court concluded that the two Towns had failed to clear the strong presumption in favor of a plan adopted by the General Assembly.

In addition to an analysis of population numbers, there is need for a credible argument demonstrating how the other standards beyond equality are met. In the *Mahan* case, the United States Supreme Court said 16.4% "approach[es] tolerable limits." It explained that the ultimate inquiry is whether the legislature's plan "may reasonably be said to advance [a] rational state policy," and if so, "whether the population disparities among the districts that have resulted from the pursuit of this plan exceed constitutional limits." *Mahan v. Howell* 410 U.S. 315, 318 (1972).

Substantial Equality

In the Board's House proposal, town lines are a "rational state policy" shaping the districts with an overall deviation of 20.30 %, with a low of 3754 residents per House member in the Chittenden-11 district (Charlotte; a -10.02 % deviation) and a high of 4601 residents per House member in the Rutland-Bennington-1 district (Middletown Springs, Pawlet, Tinmouth, Wells and 616 residents of Rupert; a +10.28 % deviation). This compares to the 18.99 % overall deviation of the House districts after the 2002 reapportionment. Fourteen proposed districts have deviations greater than nine percent, and only two of these exceed ten percent.

In each case where the Board's plan proposes a district whose deviation exceeded nine percent, the Board did so only after careful consideration of the available alternatives and with due attention to the Section 1903 criteria (the "rational policies" informing the Board's decisions on population deviations) that argued for those town combinations notwithstanding the resulting deviation. The Board believes that its meeting Minutes and the record it has created of its draft proposals, and its initial and final proposal, establish that the overall deviation is justified by the important non-numerical factors the Vermont Supreme Court has looked to when assessing the substantial fairness of an apportionment plan.

Geographical Compactness and Contiguity

The compactness of a legislative district is generally accepted as an important factor in assessing the soundness of an existing or proposed district's boundaries. Common sense tells us that a non-compact district that stretches out in a narrow band over a long distance, over mountains and valleys, is likely at risk of not capturing a community or group of communities that share common cultural, social, political and commercial ties and interests.

The Maptitude for Redistricting software can measure compactness using seven different approaches. The Apportionment Board in 2001 used two of these seven methodologies, the "Roeck" score and the "Polsby-Popper" rating, to measure the compactness of the current and proposed House districts.

The Roeck test is an area-based measure that compares each district to a circle, which is considered to be the most compact shape possible. For each district, the Roeck score computes the ratio of the area of the district to the area of the minimum enclosing circle for the district. The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact. The Roeck test computes one number for each district and the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation for the plan. (Roeck, E. C., Jr. Measuring the compactness as a requirement of legislative apportionment. *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 5:70-74, 1961.)

The Polsby-Popper test computes the ratio of the district area to the area of a circle with the same perimeter: $4\pi\text{Area}/(\text{Perimeter}^2)$. The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact. The Polsby-Popper test computes one number for each district

and the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation for the plan. (Polsby, D. D., and R. D. Popper. The third criterion: compactness as a procedural safeguard against partisan gerrymandering. *Yale Law and Policy Review*, 9:301-353, 1991.)

The 2011 Apportionment Board continued this practice, finding the two methodologies to be reasonably easy to understand and for the sake of consistency with the 2001 Apportionment Board report. Appendix 2 is a spreadsheet with the Roeck scores and Polsby-Popper ratings of all of the proposed districts. By both measurements, the Board's proposed districts are, on average, slightly more compact than the existing districts. Under the Board's proposed plan, the towns in all districts are contiguous.

Adherence to County Boundaries and Other Existing Political Subdivisions

This criterion places a significant value on avoiding subdividing towns and crossing county lines when drawing House districts. In the Board's proposal, 20 districts involve subdivisions of towns. Of these, 10 involve towns where both today and in prior apportionments, the town's population is too large for even a two-member district (making subdivision unavoidable),² and 17 districts cross county lines. This compares with the 2002 statistics, where 17 districts subdivided towns and 19 districts crossed county lines.

This criterion provides the opportunity to address the ebb and flow of the Board's approach to drawing the House district proposals, in the context of the 2001 Board's report (at p. 4) discussion on the degree or change to the status quo. The Board's first pass at a tentative redrawing of the current districts to respond to population shifts was an incremental approach, proposing changes only to the districts where deviations were excessive (and to the districts necessarily impacted by those district line changes). As the Minutes of the Board's meetings show, this was rejected by a majority of the Board in favor of a plan with 150 single-member districts.

A majority of the Board members articulated their view that the Board's role should not be restricted to making only the smallest changes to the existing districts necessary to satisfy statistical voting equality. Consistent with this view, the Board's responsibility is to ask whether the existing districts are the best plan for voters today, and to propose a plan that takes a fresh look at all districts and attempts to better achieve electoral fairness while meeting explicit statutory and constitutional apportionment objectives. A primary focus of the Board was the creation of smaller districts wherever possible. Smaller districts provide for a closer relationship between the elected House member and his or her constituents and better accountability. Smaller districts also reduce the cost of and the time required for campaigns, resulting in the likelihood that more Vermonters might find it possible to run for office.

This initial plan was shared with the Boards of Civil Authority of the towns either divided into two or more districts or combined in a district with one or more other towns.

² Both under the 2010 and 2000 U.S. Census reports, these 10 towns are: Bennington, Burlington, Colchester, Essex, South Burlington, Rutland City, Barre City, Brattleboro, Hartford and Springfield.

During July and early August, over 150 towns convened meetings of the Boards of Civil Authority to review, discuss, debate and react to the Board's initial proposal. These responses are posted on the Board's section of the Secretary of State's Web site. In addition, individual Board members convened meetings of single or joint Board of Civil Authority meetings to respond to questions, explain the reapportionment process, and hearing comments about the initial proposal. These meetings involved the towns of Underhill and Jericho; Waterbury and Duxbury; Waitsfield, Warren and Fayston; Winooski; Randolph, Braintree, Brookfield and Roxbury; Castleton, Hubbardton, Fair Haven and Pittsford; and St. Albans Town and St. Albans City.

While some small towns in two-member districts supported the proposal to place them in smaller, single-member districts, a substantial majority of the towns currently in two-member districts objected to the initial plan's proposal to convert them to single-member districts. While these objections came predominantly from towns that would have been divided, a significant number of towns not proposed to be divided sated a clear preference for remaining in a two-member district (reflecting generally a preference for the status quo and the view that it is better to have two Representatives than one).

The Board studied these responses carefully. Some of the responses proposed changes that conflicted with other responses, and some proposed districts with population deviations that exceeded reasonable constitutional limits. The Board strove to incorporate as many of the responses into its final proposal as possible, with the proviso that the Board members in some cases simply did not reach consensus and had to take a divided vote.

The result is a final plan from the Board that increases the number of single-member districts from the current 66 to 84, thus reducing the number of two-member districts from 42 to 28.³ The Board's final plan looks different from the current plan, but also quite different from the Board's own initial plan. This came from a healthy interchange of ideas and proposals among Board members and, more importantly, from an unprecedented engagement between the towns and the Board.

Patterns of Geography, Social Interaction, Trade, Political Ties and Common Interests

As noted at Page 4 of the 2001 Board's report, "in the Hartland case, the Supreme Court explained that these criteria 'are an implementation and extension of our constitutional requirements that the legislature 'seek to maintain geographical compactness and contiguity and to adhere to boundaries of counties and other existing political subdivisions.'" Hartland decision at 21-22.

The Board pored over the prior apportionment plans, and state and local maps; studied the topography of the state; and considered the comments, criticisms and counterproposals of over 150 towns. The Board members drew upon personal experiences in local government throughout the state and, in some cases, prior

³ These totals for the 2011 LAB proposal do not include the 10 seats designated for Burlington, thus the amount of single- vs. two-member seats only adds up to 140.

experiences in the reapportionment process.⁴ The Board made a concerted effort to combine in districts towns with good road connections, and commercial, social, cultural and other common ties and interests. It is inevitable that this effort may miss connections and common interests that are less formal or obvious to someone not from a town or district but which are important factors in knitting towns into strong representative districts. The Board is confident that it has missed many less formal connections and common interests that are the hallmark of community identity and cohesion, and understands that the General Assembly will continue this effort.

Individual District Proposals

The balance of this report presents the Board's proposals for the individual House districts, county by county (including districts that cross county lines). The Board chose to follow the report format of the 2001 Board, as that format tracks the statutory redistricting criteria and yields useful and pertinent information, and the Board believes that following the same format will assist Vermonters and the General Assembly to follow district changes and proposals over time.

This report does not refer to the six physiographic regions of the State developed by Vermont's State Geologist Edward Hitchcock in the mid-nineteenth century. This came as a result of deadline pressures exacerbated by the extraordinary volume of town responses to the Board's initial plan, and not any judgment by the Board that those regions and how they are (or are not) shared by towns in a proposed district are not relevant to the Board's analysis.

The 2001 Board report included information on the residence of each incumbent House member relative to the existing and proposed new districts. Incumbencies are not among the statutory criteria which the General Assembly has directed the Apportionment Board to consider, and the Board chose to not identify and take into any account incumbencies, believing that to do so would introduce that factor into the redistricting process at too early a stage.

The Board and its staff have labored to achieve accuracy in these district proposals, and invite comments to correct any errors or omissions.

Addison County

The existing Addison County House districts (three two-member districts and three single-member districts) presented no population deviation problems, with the possible exception of the current Addison-5 district (Bridport, New Haven and Weybridge), which has a negative deviation of -9.44. The Apportionment Board's initial proposal for these towns had them in nine single-member districts, with deviations ranging from +2.13

⁴ Board Chair Little was a member of the House in the apportionment years of 1992 and 2002. Member Gerry Gossens was on the Senate committee with jurisdiction over the process in 2002. Member Steve Hingtgen was a member of the House Committee on Government Operations in 2002.

(Addison-7-1, a portion of Middlebury) to -10.09 (Addison-1, Panton, Vergennes and Waltham). Nine towns reported through their Boards of Civil Authority various degrees of support for the initial plan; four towns opposed the initial plan; and eight towns did not file a report. These reports, and the reports of all towns that filed a report, are found at <http://vermont-elections.org/2011ReapportionmentBCAfeedback.html>.

The strongest concerns came from Monkton, which under the initial proposal would be split into two districts (Addison-2 with Ferrisburgh, and Addison-4 with Lincoln and Starksboro). Starksboro and Lincoln supported Monkton's plea to not be subdivided. While the Apportionment Board weighed these concerns, it also considered the support for the interim plan from towns that favored being in smaller, single-member districts. See, for example, the reports from Addison and New Haven (Addison-4 in the initial proposal).

At the end of its deliberations, the Board chose to not subdivide Monkton. This decision triggered an unwinding of the significant district changes that had resulted in the initial proposal's reshuffling of the Addison county districts. The upshot was that the Board's final proposal leaves these Addison County towns and their districts unchanged except for the placing of Granville and Hancock in with two Windsor County towns (Bethel and Rochester) in the single-member Windsor-Addison-1 district.

Addison-1

Addison-1 is a two-member district made up of the Addison County towns of Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton and Waltham, and the City of Vergennes. This is the current Addison-3 district.

In 1992, these five towns, plus Bridport, formed a two-member district. In 1982, these five towns (Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton, Vergennes and Waltham) were together in a two member district. In 1974, the district contained Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton, Vergennes, Waltham and Weybridge for two members. The first apportionment plan in 1965 joined Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton and Vergennes with New Haven and Waltham in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The district has a total of 7,897 residents, according to the 2010 Census. This is a negative deviation of 447, or -5.36% less than the 8,344 ideal for a two-member district.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.46 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.56. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These four towns and one city are in northwestern Addison County. They are all members of the Addison Regional Planning Commission and the Addison County Solid Waste Management District. All are members of the Vergennes Union High School

District, and are located within the same Environmental District for Act 250 and other state permit purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. These five towns have been configured together in a two-member district, sometimes with another town added in, since 1965. Route 22A connects Addison, Panton and Vergennes, running north and south. Otter Creek forms the boundary between Panton and Waltham, and it runs through Vergennes and Ferrisburgh. Vergennes, Middlebury and the Burlington area are the principal commercial centers that serve this area.

Addison-2

Addison-3 consists of the Addison County towns of Bridport, New Haven and Weybridge, with a total population of 3,778 for one House member.

Currently, these towns are in the Addison-5 single-member district.

In 1992 and 1982, New Haven, Cornwall and Weybridge were part of a single-member district with a part of Middlebury. In 1974, New Haven was part of a single-member district with Lincoln, Monkton and Starksboro; and Weybridge was associated with Waltham, Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton and Vergennes in a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan in 1965, New Haven and Waltham were a single-member district with Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton and Vergennes; and Weybridge joined Middlebury and Ripton in a two-member district.

In 1992, Bridport was combined with Vergennes, Waltham, Addison, Ferrisburgh, and Panton in a two-member district. The 1982 plan placed Bridport, Orwell and Shoreham with Benson in a single-member district. In 1974, Bridport and Whiting were combined in a one-member district with Cornwall, Leicester and Salisbury. In the first apportionment plan in 1965, Bridport and Cornwall made a single-member district with Salisbury and Leicester.

Substantial Equality. The district has a total of 3,778 residents, according to the 2010 Census. This is a negative deviation of 394, or -9.44% less than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.29 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.32. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These three towns are farming communities in western and central Addison County. They are all members of the Addison Regional Planning Commission and the Addison County Solid Waste Management District. Although not members of a single union high school district (Bridport and Weybridge are in the Middlebury Union High School District, and New Haven is in the Mt. Abraham Union High School District), they are

located within the same Environmental District for Act 250 and other state permit purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 17 is the major East-West highway linking these three towns. There are other town roads linking these towns, which generally look to Middlebury for shopping and commerce.

Addison-3

Addison-3 consists of the Addison County towns of Bristol, Lincoln, Monkton and Starksboro, with a total population of 8,922 for a two-member district.

Currently, these towns are in the Addison-4 two-member district.

The 1992 and 1982 reapportionment plans put Bristol in a single-member district alone, and Lincoln, Monkton and Starksboro were a stand-alone single-member district. The 1974 plan made Bristol a single-member district, but put Lincoln, Monkton and Starksboro with New Haven in a single-member district. The first reapportionment plan from 1965 placed Bristol and Lincoln in a single-member district and Monkton and Starksboro with Hinesburg in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 2010 population of this district was 8,922. This is a positive deviation of 578, or +6.93 more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.47 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.56. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions .All four towns are within Addison County and are members of the Addison Regional Planning Commission. All are members of the Addison County Solid Waste Management District and within the same Environmental District, for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. All are members of the Mt. Abraham U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Bristol, Lincoln, Monkton and Starksboro form the northeast quadrant of Addison County, and share the geography of the Green Mountains. Routes 17 and the Lincoln Gap Road connect Lincoln to Starksboro and Monkton via Bristol.; Route 116 connects Bristol and Starksboro. Monkton's connection to Bristol and the other towns of the district is by the Monkton-Bristol Road. The New Haven River begins in Lincoln and runs through Bristol. The Little Otter Creek connects Monkton and Bristol. Bristol is the largest commercial and community center in the district.

Addison-4 ⁵

Addison-4 consists of the Addison County towns of Orwell, Shoreham and Whiting, and the Rutland County town of Benson, with a total population of 3,990.

Currently, under the 2002 plan, these four towns form the Addison-Rutland-1 district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans put Whiting with Goshen, Leicester, Ripton, Salisbury, Sudbury and Hancock in a single-member district. The 1974 House plan placed Whiting in a single-member district with Leicester, Salisbury, Shoreham and Cornwall. The first apportionment plan in 1965 put Whiting in with Orwell, Benson, Shoreham and West Haven in a single-member district.

In 1992 and 1982, Orwell and Shoreham and Benson were in a single-member district with Bridport. In 1974, Orwell, and Shoreham and Benson were in a single-member district with Hubbardton and West Haven. In the 1965 plan, Orwell, Shoreham and Benson were in a single-member district with West Haven and Whiting.

Substantial Equality. The district's population of 3,990 is 182 shy of the ideal, a deviation of -4.36%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.47 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.46. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Three of these towns are in Addison County, and the fourth lies in Rutland County. They do not share a single union high school district (Orwell and Benson are in the Fair Haven U.H.S.D.; Shoreham is in the Middlebury U.H.S.D.; and Whiting is in the Otter Valley U.H.S.D.). The towns span two different county regional planning commissions and state Environmental District. In its July 8, 2011 recommendation to the Board, the Benson Board of Civil Authority made clear its preference to be in a district with Orwell and Shoreham, notwithstanding the cross-county-line issue.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Shoreham, Orwell and Benson share a western border with Lake Champlain and the State of New York, and are connected by Route 22A running north and south and connect to Whiting by local east-west roads and indirectly via Route 30. All towns are characterized by dairy and other types of agriculture.

Addison-5

The proposed Addison-4 district consists of the Addison County towns of Cornwall, Goshen, Leicester, Ripton and Salisbury, with a total population of 4,173.

⁵ Note - This District should properly be named the Addison-Rutland-1 District.

These towns, plus Hancock, are currently in the Addison-2 single member district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans combined Goshen, Leicester, Ripton and Salisbury with Sudbury, Whiting and Hancock as a single-member district. The 1974 House plan placed Leicester, Salisbury, Cornwall in a single-member district with Whiting, while Goshen was combined with Granville, Hancock, Pittsfield, Rochester and Stockbridge in a single-member district and Ripton was included with Middlebury in a two-member district. The first apportionment plan in 1965 put Goshen with Brandon and Pittsford in a two-member district; Leicester and Salisbury together with Cornwall and Bridport as a single-member district; and Ripton with Middlebury and Weybridge as a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 2010 population of this district was 4,173. This is a positive deviation of 1 resident, or a deviation of +0.02%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.46 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.32. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of the towns are in Addison County, and are members of the Addison County Solid Waste Management District the Addison County Regional Planning Commission. Cornwall, Ripton and Salisbury are members of the Middlebury U.H.S.D; Goshen and Leicester are members of the Otter Valley U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The towns form the southeastern quadrant of Addison County. Lake Dunmore is shared by Leicester and Salisbury. Route 30 links Sudbury and Cornwall through Whiting. Route 7 connects Leicester and Salisbury. Goshen is served by Route 73, although no major roads connect it directly to the rest of the district. Brandon and Middlebury are the principal commercial centers of the area

Addison 6

Addison 6 is a two-member district with a population of 8,496, made up of the entire town of Middlebury. Currently this district is the Addison-1 two member district.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, part of Middlebury was aligned with Cornwall, New Haven and Weybridge, while the remaining part of Middlebury qualified as a two-member district. In 1974, Middlebury and Ripton formed a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan in 1965, Middlebury, Ripton and Weybridge constituted a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 2010 population of this district was 8,496. This is a positive deviation of 152 residents, or a deviation of +1.82%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.63 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.75. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Middlebury is in Addison County. It is a member of the Addison Regional Planning Commission and the Addison County Solid Waste Management District, and hosts its own union high school for the area (Middlebury U.H.S.D).

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Middlebury is the shire town of Addison County, and serves as the commercial and social center of the county. Middlebury is the home of Middlebury College; Porter Medical Center, Inc., the regional medical facility; and the Sheldon Museum. Route 7 runs through the town, running north and south. Routes 30, 23 and 125 enter the district from the west.

In response to the Board's initial proposal to split Middlebury into two single-member districts, its Board of Civil Authority's July 18, 2011 report strongly urged the Board to maintain the current two-member district. The Apportionment Board agreed to the request.

Bennington County

The driving factor for the Apportionment Board's final proposal for the districts in Bennington County was the -13.76% negative deviation in the current Bennington-3 district (Glastenbury and Shaftsbury). Addressing this was made quite challenging by virtue of the fact that all of the current Bennington County house districts have negative population deviations (excepting only Bennington-4: Manchester, at +5.25%), some significant (e.g. Bennington-5 at -9.49%: Arlington, Rupert, Sandgate and Sunderland). Finding the population from contiguous towns to add to the Bennington-3 district was difficult, and triggered a series of decisions that resulted in two districts containing towns (Woodford, Pownal and Stamford) that reported clear dissatisfaction when responding to the Board's initial plan. The Board tried many times to achieve a final proposal that addressed these concerns, but was unable to do so.

The Board's initial proposal split the two current Bennington two-member districts into four single-member districts. The Bennington Board of Civil Authority's July 18, 2011 report expressed strong interest in retaining the current two-member districts, and the Apportionment Board deferred to Bennington.

Bennington-1

Bennington-1 is a single-member district consisting of the entire town of Manchester, with a 2010 population of 4,391.

Under the current (2002) plan, Manchester comprises the single-member Bennington-4 district.

Manchester was a single-member district of its own under the 1992 plan. In 1982, Manchester was joined with Danby, Dorset, Landgrove, Mount Tabor, Peru and Winhall in a two-member district. The 1974 and 1965 also had Manchester in a two-member district with Dorset, Landgrove, Mount Tabor, Peru and Winhall.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 4,391. This is a positive deviation of 219 residents, a deviation of +5.25%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.64 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.79. By definition, this one-town, one-member district is contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is all within one county, and preserves all other existing political subdivisions.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This one-town, one-member district completely satisfies these criteria.

Bennington-2

Bennington-2 is a single-member district consisting of the towns of Arlington, Sandgate and Sunderland, plus 98 residents of Rupert. Its 2010 population was 3,776.

This is the current Bennington-5 district.

The 1992, 1982, 1974 and 1965 plans placed Arlington, Sandgate and Sunderland in a single-member district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Rupert in a single-member district with Middletown Springs, Pawlet and Wells. The 1974 plan placed Rupert, Pawlet and Danby in a single-member district. The 1965 plan had Rupert in a single-member district with Pawlet and Wells.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 3,776. This is a negative deviation of 396 residents, a deviation of -9.49%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.46 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.54. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All towns in the district are within Bennington County, and members of the Bennington Regional Planning Commission. These towns send their high school students to Burr & Burton Academy in Manchester. All towns are served by the same Environmental District for Act 250 and other state land use programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Sunderland is linked to Arlington by Route 7A and Route 313, and through Arlington north to Sandgate and Rupert by north-south local roads. The district includes parts of three physiographic regions—the Taconic Mountains, the Valley of Vermont and Green Mountains. Manchester is the commercial center of the region, although work, shopping and recreation lead some residents to Bennington, Rutland or into the State of New York.

The Rupert Board of Civil Authority's July 28, 2011 report expressed the preference to re-unite Rupert but only if the entire town could be placed in a district with the towns to its north with which it shares a school district (Pawlet, Wells and Tinmouth), and not in a district with Arlington, Sandgate and Sunderland. The Apportionment Board went with Rupert's second choice, which is to remain split as under the current (2002) plan.

Bennington-3

Bennington-3 is a single-member district consisting of Glastenbury, Shaftsbury and Woodford, with a 2010 population of 4,022.

Glastenbury and Shaftsbury form the current Bennington-3 district, while Woodford currently is in the Bennington-1 district with Pownal.

The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Shaftsbury and Glastenbury with a part of Bennington to form a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Shaftsbury was entitled to elect one House member on its own and Glastenbury was not included at all (apparently because, at that time, there were no voters⁶ in Glastenbury at the time).

The 1992 and 1982 plans made Woodford part of a single-member district with Readsboro, Stamford and part of Bennington. In 1974, Woodford was joined with part of Bennington in a single-member district. In 1965, Woodford was included in a two-member district with a part of Bennington.

Substantial Equality. At 4,022, this single-member district is 150 residents shy of a perfect district, a deviation of -3.60%.

⁶ Apportionment in 1965 and 1974 was based on the ideal number of registered voters per representative, Act 97 of 1965 defined a legal voter as a citizen who was eligible to vote in the presidential election immediately preceding the respective apportionment effort. In 1982, this was changed to the current standard based on population.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.48 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.59. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All three of these towns are Shaftsbury and Glastenbury are Bennington County towns, and members of the Bennington Regional Planning Commission. For Act 250 and other state land use permits, both towns are within the same Environmental District. Voters in Glastenbury cast their ballots in Shaftsbury.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 7 runs the length of Shaftsbury, north and south, and a small part of that highway runs along the western border of Glastenbury. It is not possible to drive from Woodford to Glastenbury, except via Bennington and Shaftsbury, but this is due to the lack of any discernible roads in Glastenbury, likely due to its population of 8. All three towns are influenced by the Green Mountains, with rolling hills or mountains. Bennington is the regional commercial center serving the area.

The Board notes that separate reports from the Boards of Civil Authority of Shaftsbury and Woodford oppose placing them together in the Bennington-3 district, arguing that they do not share sufficient common interests and road connections. Woodford prefers to stay in its current single-member district with Pownal, a view shared by the Pownal Board of Civil Authority (the two towns are currently working on a school consolidation effort). For its part, Shaftsbury prefers to address the population deficit in its current district by adding a portion of North Bennington to it; while this proposal has not been presented to the Bennington Board of Civil Authority for its reaction, that reaction would likely be negative.

The Apportionment Board does not disagree with the points raised by Woodford, Pownal and Shaftsbury, but was unable to figure out alternative district combinations with population deviations that worked across the balance of Vermont's southeast quadrant

Bennington-4-1

Bennington 4-1 is a two-member district consisting of the westerly and northerly portions of the town of Bennington, with a 2010 population of 7,997.

This is the current Bennington 2-1 district.

In 1992, the legislature subdivided Bennington into two two-member districts and then assigned parts of Bennington to a single-member district with Readsboro, Stamford and Woodford and another with Glastenbury and Shaftsbury. In the 1982 plan, Bennington was divided into two two-member districts, with a part of the town joining Readsboro, Stamford and Woodford for a single-member district and another part linked to Glastenbury and Shaftsbury in another single-member district. The 1974 plan gave the town two two-member districts, a single-member district Bennington shared with

Woodford and another single-member district with Pownal. The first apportionment plan, from 1965, gave Bennington two two-member districts and another two-member district with Woodford.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 7,997. This is a negative deviation of 347 residents, a deviation of -4.16%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, Bennington-4-1 earns a Roeck score of 0.49 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.56. By definition, this two-member, portion-of-one-town district is contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Bennington is one of the shire towns of Bennington County (the other being Manchester). It is a member of the Bennington Regional Planning Commission. Bennington is also a member of the Mount Anthony U.H.S.D., and contains the regional high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Bennington is divided into two two-member districts, preserving the town's identity in a manner that the town has supported through prior apportionments. The areas of this district are well connected by a grid of streets and roads, and the commercial center is the town itself. The town hosts its own school system.

Bennington-4-2

Bennington 4-1 is a two-member district consisting of the south easterly portions of the town of Bennington, and being all parts of the town not included in Bennington 4-1. Its 2010 population was 7,767.

This is the current Bennington 2-2 district.

In 1992, the legislature subdivided Bennington into two two-member districts and then assigned parts of Bennington to a single-member district with Readsboro, Stamford and Woodford and another with Glastenbury and Shaftsbury. In the 1982 plan, Bennington was divided into two two-member districts, with a part of the town joining Readsboro, Stamford and Woodford for a single-member district and another part linked to Glastenbury and Shaftsbury in another single-member district. The 1974 plan gave the town two two-member districts, a single-member district Bennington shared with Woodford and another single-member district with Pownal. The first apportionment plan, from 1965, gave Bennington two two-member districts and another two-member district with Woodford.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 7,767. This is a negative deviation of 577 residents, a deviation of -6.92%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, Bennington-4-1 earns a Roeck score of 0.63 and a Polsby-Popper rating of

0.70. By definition, this two-member, portion-of-one-town district is contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Bennington is one of the shire town of Bennington County (the other being Manchester). It is a member of the Bennington Regional Planning Commission. Bennington is also a member of the Mount Anthony U.H.S.D., and contains the regional high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Bennington is divided into two two-member districts, preserving the town's identity in a manner that the town has supported through prior apportionments. The areas of this district are well connected by a grid of streets and roads, and the commercial center is the town itself. The town hosts its own school system.

Bennington-5

Bennington-5 consists of the towns of Pownal and Stamford; its 2010 population was 4,351.

Pownal currently is in the single-member Bennington-1 district with Woodford. Stamford currently is in the single-member Windham-Bennington-1 district with the Bennington County town of Searsburg and the Windham County towns of Dover, Readsboro, Somerset and Wardsboro.

The 1992 and 1982 plans made Pownal a district unto itself, while Stamford was part of a single-member district with Readsboro, Woodford and part of Bennington. In 1974, Pownal and a part of Bennington formed a single-member district. In 1974, Stamford was joined in a two-member district with the Bennington County towns of Readsboro and Searsburg, and the Windham County towns of Dover, Marlboro, Somerset, Whitingham and Wilmington. In 1965, when the legislature first apportioned itself by number of registered voters, Pownal and Stamford were placed in a two-member district with Dover, Readsboro, Searsburg, Whitingham and Wilmington.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population of 4,351 is 179 residents greater than an perfect district, a deviation of +4.29%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.49 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.69. The two towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Pownal and Stamford are in Bennington County, and are members of the Bennington Regional Planning Commission District. Pownal and Stamford are members of different union high school districts (Pownal is a member of the Mount Anthony U.H.S.D.; Stamford is a member of the Windham Southwest Supervisory Union). The same Environmental District serves the towns for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The towns share a common boundary, although road travel between the two is limited to a single local road as the southern-most peaks of the Green Mountains separate the towns (as evidenced by the Long Trail running close to the towns' common boundary). Although on the map, this situation would appear to be no worse than the transportation challenges between Pownal and Woodford in the current Bennington-1 district, both Woodford and Pownal reported to the Board that they strongly prefer to stay together in their current single-member district. The Apportionment Board does not disagree with these concerns, but retaining that status quo was unsustainable in the context of crafting a plan that worked for the population deviations of Vermont's southeast quadrant

Bennington-Rutland-1

The Bennington-Rutland-1 district consists of the Bennington County towns of Dorset, Landgrove and Peru, and the Rutland County towns of Danby and Mt. Tabor. The district's 2010 population was 4,130.

These towns form the current Bennington-Rutland-1 single-member district.

The 1992 reapportionment plan placed Dorset, Landgrove, Peru, Danby and Winhall in a single-member district. In 1982, Dorset, Landgrove, Peru, Danby, Mt. Tabor and Winhall were part of a two-member district with Manchester. The 1974 plan had Danby, Pawlet and Rupert together in a single-member district, with Dorset, Peru, Landgrove, Winhall and Manchester in a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Dorset, Landgrove, Peru and Winhall were together with Manchester in a two-member district.

In 1974, Mt. Tabor was linked in a single-member district with Mt. Holly, Tinmouth and Wallingford. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made a two-member district out of Danby, Middletown Springs and Mt. Tabor, plus Clarendon, Ira, Shrewsbury, Tinmouth and Wallingford.

Substantial Equality. The 4,130 population of this district is 42 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -1.01%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.62 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.66. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district breaks the Bennington-Rutland county line. Dorset, Landgrove and Peru are Bennington County towns, while Danby and Mt. Tabor are Rutland County towns. Danby and Mt. Tabor form the southeastern corner of Rutland County. Danby and Mt. Tabor are members of the Carrier Memorial U.S.D. Landgrove and Peru are in the Flood

Brook U.H.S.D.; Dorset sends its high school students to Burr and Burton Academy in Manchester.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 7 runs north and south between Dorset, Danby and Mt. Tabor. Peru is linked to Mt. Tabor by Route 10, which continues on to Danby. Peru is linked to Dorset by majors roads connecting through Manchester. The commercial centers serving the district are Manchester or Rutland.

Caledonia County

Currently, the Caledonia County towns are placed in three two-member districts and two single-member districts, with population deviations ranging from a high of +5.02% (Caledonia-4: Burke, Lyndon and Sutton) to a low of -8.88% (Caledonia-3: St. Johnsbury). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed seven single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +9.25% (Caledonia-6: most of Lyndon) to a low of -5.44% (Caledonia-1: Hardwick and Walden).

Barnet and Ryegate reported support for the Board's initial proposal, which was to keep the status quo of the Caledonia-1 district. Stannard and Walden opposed leaving Stannard out of the current Caledonia-2 district (Hardwick, Stannard and Walden). None of the other small towns in the district filed reports. Lyndon and St. Johnsbury reported that they strongly favor staying in two-member districts as currently configured. The Apportionment Board's final proposal follows to the preferences of Lyndon, St. Johnsbury and Stannard. The proposal pulls Groton back into a Caledonia County district, and allows Cabot to move into a district with other Washington County towns. The resulting range of population deviations is the same as the current range - a high of +5.02% and a low of -8.88%.

Caledonia-1

The Caledonia-1 district consists of the towns of Hardwick, Stannard and Walden, with a 2010 population of 4,161.

These towns currently form the single-member Caledonia-2 district

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Stannard joined with Hardwick and Walden to make up a single-member district. In the 1974 reapportionment plan, these three towns were joined with Danville, Peacham and Woodbury as a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Hardwick and Walden made up a single-member district, while Stannard was in a single-member district along with Albany, Craftsbury, Greensboro and Wolcott.

Substantial Equality. With a 2010 population of 4,161, this district is 11 residents less than an ideal district, a deviation of -0.26%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.54 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.65. These three towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These towns are in Caledonia County, and are members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association (the regional planning commission for the area). Hardwick and Stannard are members of the Hazen U.H.S.D. (located in Hardwick). Walden tuitions its high school students. Both towns are within Environmental District #7 (St. Johnsbury) for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Hardwick and St. Johnsbury are the commercial centers of this area. Route 15 connects Hardwick with Walden. Stannard connects to Walden by Stannard Mountain Road and Skunk Hollow Road.

Stannard's July 30 report strenuously objected to the Board's initial placement of it in the Orleans-Lamoille-Caledonia-1 district. The Board was able to accommodate Stannard's request to remain in its current district configuration without undue disruption of the balance of the plan in this area of the state.

Caledonia-2

The Caledonia-2 district consists of the Caledonia County towns of Danville, Groton and Peacham, with a 2010 population of 3,950.

Under the 2002 plan, Danville and Peacham are together with the Washington County town of Cabot in the single-member Caledonia-Washington district with Cabot. Groton currently is combined with the Orange County towns of Newbury and Topsham in the single-member Orange-Caledonia-1 district.

The 1992 plan also had Danville, Groton and Peacham as a single-member district. In 1982, the plan placed Danville and Peacham with Sheffield and Wheelock as a single-member district, with Groton joining Newbury and Ryegate as a single-member district. The 1974 House plan brought together Danville and Peacham with Hardwick, Stannard, Walden and Woodbury in a two-member district; Groton, Newbury and Ryegate were together as a single-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan placed Danville, Groton and Peacham together in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. With a 2010 population of 3,950, this district is 222 residents less than an ideal district, a deviation of -5.32%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.32 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.47. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Danville, Groton and Peacham are all within Caledonia County, and form its southwest corner. The towns are members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association and the Northeast Kingdom Waste Management District and are served by Environmental District #7 (St. Johnsbury office) for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Groton State Forest is in parts of Groton and Peacham.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The Peacham-Groton road connects those two towns, by way of northwestern Ryegate. Town roads connect Peacham and Danville. The commercial centers of the area are Danville and St. Johnsbury.

These towns did not file reports comments on this proposed district, which did not change from the Board's initial to final plan.

Caledonia-3

The Caledonia-3 district consists of the Caledonia County towns of Barnet, Ryegate and Waterford, with a 2010 population of 4,162.

This proposed district is identical to the current Caledonia-1 single-member district.

In 1992, Barnet, Ryegate and Waterford were joined in a single-member district, while in 1982, Barnet and Waterford were joined with Kirby and a part of St. Johnsbury to make a single-member district, while Ryegate was a single-member district with Groton and Newbury. In 1974, Barnet and Waterford joined with Concord to make a single-member district and Ryegate was in a single-member district with Groton and Newbury. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Barnet and Waterford joined with Concord in a single-member district and Ryegate was linked with Newbury in another single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 4,162, is only 10 fewer than an ideal district, a deviation of -0.24%.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 91 and 5 connect Ryegate and Barnet; Route 93 links Barnet and Ryegate (or Routes 2 and 18 through St. Johnsbury). St. Johnsbury is the commercial center serving the area.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.35 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.45. All towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

The three towns share a common eastern boundary—the Connecticut River and the border with New Hampshire. They are all members of the Northeastern Vermont

Development Association and the Northeast Kingdom Waste Management District. All three towns re in state Environmental District #7.

Caledonia-4

The Caledonia-4 district consists of the town of St. Johnsbury, with a 2010 population 7,603.

This district currently forms the two-member Caledonia-3 district.

The 1992 plan made St. Johnsbury a two-member district. In 1982, a major part of St. Johnsbury was a two-member district, while the remaining part was in a single-member district with Barnet, Kirby and Waterford. In 1974 and 1965, St. Johnsbury was subdivided into one two-member and one single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 7,603, is 741 less than an ideal district, a deviation of -8.88%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measures of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.53 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.73. As a single-member district subdivided from a town, the contiguity factor is satisfied.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. St. Johnsbury is the shire town of Caledonia County. It is a member of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association. The regional high school is St. Johnsbury Academy, a private school. This proposal keeps the town intact and in the two-member district it has enjoyed since 1992.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. St. Johnsbury is the commercial center of the county (along with Littleton, New Hampshire). Route 2 travels east and west through the town; Interstates 91 and 93 and Route 5 are the principal north-south highways. The Passumpsic River runs north to south through town. The town is within the Connecticut River watershed. The regional high school is St. Johnsbury Academy, a private school. The town contains the Fairbanks Museum, St. Johnsbury Athenaeum and Fairbanks Scale plant.

The Board's initial plan subdivided a portion of St. Johnsbury into a single member district and joined the balance of the town with a portion of Lyndon in a single-member district. By letter dated July 21, 2011, St. Johnsbury reported that its Board of Civil Authority strongly opposed this and requested maintenance of its current two-member district. The Board was able to accommodate the town's request to remain in its current district configuration without undue disruption of the balance of the plan in this area of the state.

Caledonia-5

The Caledonia-5 district consists of Burke, Lyndon and Sutton, with a 2010 population of 8,763; this continues the current Caledonia-4 two-member district.

The 1992 plan made Lyndon, Burke and Sutton a two-member district. In 1982 the plan put Lyndon, Burke and Sutton together with East Haven as a single-member district. The 1974 and 1965 plans merged Lyndon, Burke and Sutton with East Haven, Kirby, Newark, Sheffield and Wheelock in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 8,763, is 419 greater than an ideal district, a deviation of +5.02%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.38 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.52. The two towns in this district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Burke, Lyndon and Sutton are all in Caledonia County, members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association, and are under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #7 (St. Johnsbury office) for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 5 runs north from Lyndon to Burke and Sutton. , and Route 114 connects Lyndon and Burke. St. Johnsbury and Lyndonville are the commercial centers of the area. Lyndon Academy serves Lyndon, while all three of these towns are in the Caledonia North Supervisory Union. Lyndon is home to the Caledonia County Fairgrounds and Lyndon State College.

The July 18, 2011 meeting of the Lyndon Board of Civil Authority voted to oppose the Apportionment Board's initial proposal to subdivide the current Caledonia-4 district into single-member districts. Sutton and Burke did not file reports with their reaction to the initial proposal. The Board was able to accommodate Lyndon's request to remain in its current two-member district configuration without undue disruption of the balance of the plan in the Northeast Kingdom.

Chittenden County

Currently, the Chittenden County towns are placed in twelve two-member districts and eleven single-member districts, with population deviations ranging from a high of +27.80% (Chittenden-3-8, a portion of South Burlington) to a low of -11.12% (Chittenden-3-1, the New North End of Burlington). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +9.47% (Chittenden-6-1, a portion of South Burlington) to a low of -7.89% (Chittenden-10-1, a portion of Shelburne).

All but four towns (St. George, Bolton and Westford and Buel's Gore⁷) responded with comments on the initial plan. Of the towns that responded, three supported the initial plan (South Burlington, Shelburne and Charlotte), one gave a mixed review (Huntington), and ten opposed it (the ten opposing towns included Waterbury, a Washington County town). The towns in two-member districts (Williston, Essex, Colchester, Winooski, Jericho, Underhill and Milton) wish to remain in some form of two-member district as close to the current configuration as possible.⁸ Hinesburg wants to become a single-member district by itself and not share population with the single-member Charlotte district.

The Board adjusted the initial plan to accommodate the preferences articulated by the towns that filed reports, with some exceptions.

The Board determined that Burlington's population warrants ten districts, not nine, and this required removing the Burlington residents from the current Winooski two-member district. This left Winooski short of the population needed to support a two-member district; following the example of the 1992 plan, the Board included a portion of Colchester in the Winooski district, from the St. Michael's College campus. Winooski supported this move while Colchester opposed it. This line change resulted in a shift of the intra-Colchester dividing line to address a population deviation issue.

Hinesburg's request for the return of two small portions of the town, from the Charlotte district, was not supported by Charlotte. The Board went with Hinesburg's request, concluding that the principle of keeping towns whole outweighed the resulting -10.02 negative deviation for the Charlotte district.

The initial plan placed 674 Waterbury residents into a single-member district with Bolton, Buel's Gore and Huntington; the balance of Waterbury would form a single-member district. In its written report and at a Board of Civil Authority meeting convened at the town's request by the Apportionment Board Chair, Waterbury made its strong dissatisfaction with the initial proposal abundantly clear. The Apportionment Board wrangled with this issue until close to the end of its final meeting. By a split vote of 4-2, after considering Waterbury's report and the deviation and contiguity challenges raised in this area of the state, the Board settled on the proposed Chittenden-Washington-1 proposal, which includes a different division of Waterbury from the initial proposal but does not accommodate Waterbury's request.

Chittenden-1-1

This two-member district consists generally of the portion of Colchester west of Interstate 89, with a 2010 population of 8,336 residents.

⁷ Richmond did not respond, but under the law, since the initial plan retained Richmond intact as a single member district on its own, the initial plan was not sent to Richmond for its comment.

⁸ Burlington's report "rejected" the Board's initial plan for the Burlington districts, and the text of its report, together with the Minutes of the City's July 11, 2011 Board of Civil Authority meeting, do not enable the Apportionment Board to discern the City's position on single- versus two-member districts.

In the current plan, Colchester is divided into two districts, with two members each. The proposed Chittenden-1-1 district is largely the current Chittenden-7-2 district, with a portion added in from the existing Chittenden-7-1 district to reflect a shift in population between the two districts. This district includes residents from a portion of the Jasper Mine Road side of the Malletts Bay area of Colchester, south of Route 2; these residents now are in the other Colchester two-member district (Chittenden-7-1).

In 1992, nearly all of Colchester was split into two two-member districts, and a portion of the St. Michael's College campus was combined with Winooski to form a two-member district. In 1982 Colchester was split into two two-member districts. In 1974 and 1965, Colchester qualified for a two-member district, with a small part of that town aligned with Milton in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 8,336, is 8 fewer than the ideal district, a deviation of -0.10%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.46 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.38. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). This proposal continues the subdivision of Colchester into two-member districts. Colchester has a high school serving residents of both Colchester districts.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. There is an extensive system of local roads in the district. The greater Burlington commercial centers serve this district.

Chittenden-1-2

The two-member Chittenden-1-2 district consists of the all of Colchester not in the proposed Chittenden-1-1 district or the proposed Chittenden-5 district, generally the east side of the town plus the residents west of Interstate 89 and north of Route 2. The 2010 population of this district was 9,112.

This district is based largely on the existing Chittenden-7-1 district, minus some residents shifted to the proposed Chittenden-1-1 district, and less some residents from the St. Michael's College campus area, who are shifted to the two-member Winooski district (Chittenden-5).

In 1992, nearly all of Colchester was split into two two-member districts, and a portion of the St. Michael's College campus was combined with Winooski to form a two-member district. In 1982 Colchester was split into two two-member districts. In 1974 and 1965,

Colchester qualified for a two-member district, with a small part of that town aligned with Milton in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 7,668, is 676 fewer than the ideal district, a deviation of -8.10%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.30 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.33. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). This proposal continues the subdivision of Colchester into two-member districts. Colchester has a high school serving residents of both Colchester districts.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. There is an extensive system of local roads in the district. The greater Burlington commercial centers serve this district.

Chittenden-2-1, 2-2 and 2-3

Chittenden-2-1 is a two-member district with boundaries identical to the Village of Essex Junction, with 8,173 residents. Chittenden-2-2 is a two-member district with 9,112 residents, consisting of the Town of Essex outside the boundaries of the Village of Essex Junction. Chittenden-2-3 is a single-member district with a population of 4,331 residents, made up of the Town of Westford and a part of the town of Essex that is not included in Chittenden-2-2. The Chittenden-2-1 district boundaries correspond to the current (2002) Chittenden-6-1, Chittenden-2-2 corresponds to the 2002 Chittenden-6-2 district and Chittenden-2-3 corresponds to the 2002 Chittenden-6-3 district.

In 1992, Essex was split into a two-member district on its own and with a part of Westford and a part of Milton in a second single-member district. In 1982, the reapportionment plan split Essex into two two-member districts. In 1974, Essex and Westford shared a two-member district. In 1965, the first apportionment plan awarded Essex a two-member district and a part of a single-member district with Jericho.

Substantial Equality. The population of the Chittenden-2-1 district, at 8,173, is 171 fewer than ideal district, a deviation of -2.05%. The population of the Chittenden-2-2 district, at 9,112, is 768 greater than ideal district, a deviation of +9.20%. The population of the Chittenden-2-3 district, at 4,331, is 159 greater than ideal district, a deviation of +3.81%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, these districts earn Roeck scores of 0.32, 0.56 and 0.52; and Polsby-Popper

ratings of 0.26, 0.52 and 0.65, respectively. These districts satisfy the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

These districts are in Chittenden County and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Essex has its own high school. Students from Westford enjoy a tuition program for high school, and many attend Essex high School. This proposal continues the subdivision of Essex into two two-member districts and a shared single-member district with Westford.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. There is an extensive system of local roads in the district. The greater Burlington commercial centers serve this district.

Chittenden-3

Chittenden-3 is comprised of the towns of Jericho and Underhill, both within Chittenden County and together making up a population of 8,025, for a two-member district.

These towns currently are in the two-member Chittenden-8 district with Bolton.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Jericho and Underhill also were part of a two-member district with Bolton. In 1974, the three towns joined with Richmond for a two-member district and in 1965, in the first apportionment plan, Jericho and a part of Essex formed a single-member district, and Underhill joined Bolton, Huntington and Richmond in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 8,025 population of this district is 319 fewer than the ideal district, a negative deviation of -3.82%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.50 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.59. Both towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Jericho and Underhill are northeastern towns of Chittenden County, and both are members of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. They are also part of the Mt. Mansfield U.H.S.D. For Act 250 and other state permit programs, they are governed by Environmental Commission # 4 (Essex Junction).

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. These towns are linked by Route 15 and Pleasant Valley Road. Browns River runs from Underhill through the northern part of Jericho. The Burlington area serves as the principal commercial center for the district.

Chittenden-4-1 through 4-10 (Burlington)

In the Board's initial plan, the Board proposed to secure the extra population needed to keep Winooski a two-member district by including a portion of Colchester in the Winooski district, instead of a group of Burlington residents as is the case with the current Chittenden-3-6 two-member district. This resulted in an increase in the population available for districts in Burlington equal to the 2010 Burlington census population of 42,417. This population is more than enough to sustain ten districts in Burlington, up from its current nine.

The Board's initial plan laid out ten single-member districts for Burlington. The Burlington Board of Civil Authority, in a July 29, 2011 letter from Burlington Mayor Bob Kiss, did not comment on the ten proposed districts or make a counter proposal; the letter simply stated that the Board of Civil Authority rejected the initial plan. The Minutes of the Board of Civil Authority's July 11 meeting reflect concerns that some Board of Civil Authority members felt that they did not have sufficient information or time to fully assess and respond to the initial proposal.

The Apportionment Board considered this input and determined to not include specific single-or two-member districts in its final plan for Burlington. Instead, the Board proposes that Burlington have ten House members.

Substantial Equality. The 2010 Burlington population of 42,417 is 697 greater than the ideal ten-member district, a positive deviation of 1.67%⁹.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, these districts earn a Roeck score of 0.38, and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.36. The Burlington districts will satisfy the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These districts are in Chittenden County and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Burlington has its own high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. There is an extensive system of major (Routes 2, 7 and 127) and local roads in Burlington, linking all parts to each other. Burlington serves as its own commercial center.

Chittenden-5

The Chittenden-5 two-member district includes all of Winooski and 1,063 residents from the St. Michael's College area of Colchester, with a 2010 population of 8,330 residents.

⁹ It should be noted that the deviation, Roeck and Polsby-Popper numbers for Burlington as a 10-seat "block" may not be statistically comparable to other districts.

Currently, the Winooski portion of this district is in the two-member Chittenden-3-6 district with a portion of Burlington, and the Colchester portion is in the two-member Chittenden-7-1 Colchester district.

In 1992, Winooski was a two-member district with a small part of Colchester (a portion of the St. Michael's campus), and the remaining part of Colchester was split into two two-member districts. In 1982, Winooski was a two-member district, while Colchester was split into two two-member districts. In 1974 and 1965, Winooski was entitled to a two-member district for a major part of the city, with a smaller part associated with Burlington as a single-member district, while Colchester qualified for a two-member district, with a small part of that town aligned with Milton in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 2010 population for this district was 8,330, 14 under the ideal district size, a negative deviation of -0.17%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, this district earns a Roeck score of 0.55 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.43. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County and is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Winooski has its own high school as does Colchester.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 15 connects Winooski and this part of Colchester. This part of Colchester orients to Winooski for many commercial purposes.

Chittenden-6-1, 6-2, 6-3 and 6-4

Chittenden-6-1, 6-2, 6-3 and 6-4 make up the City of South Burlington, with four House seats and a population of 17,904 residents.

South Burlington currently holds four single-member districts: Chittenden-3-7, Chittenden-3-8, Chittenden-3-9 and Chittenden-3-10.

In 1992, the plan subdivided South Burlington into three single-member districts, and combined a part of South Burlington with a part of Burlington. In 1982, South Burlington was subdivided into three single-member districts. In 1974 and 1965, the city's subdivision was one two-member district and one single-member district

South Burlington grew by over 3000 people in the last decade. The growth primarily took place in the southeast quadrant of the city and the result was one of the four districts had a deviation of over +27%. The Apportionment Board's goals in redistricting South Burlington were to keep the city divided into four, single-seat districts, maintain current political district lines as much as possible, and equalize district size to within an acceptable range.

Substantial Equality. Chittenden-6-1 contains 4,567 residents, which is 395 more than an ideal district (a deviation of +9.47%); this proposes changes to the current Chittenden-3-7 district. Chittenden-6-2 contains 4,265 residents or 93 more than a perfect district (a deviation of +2.23%); this proposes changes to the current Chittenden-3-8 district. Chittenden-6-3 has 4,518 residents, which is 346 residents more than the norm (a deviation of +8.29%); this proposes changes to the current Chittenden-3-10 district. Chittenden-6-4 has 4,554 residents, or 382 more than an ideal district (a deviation of +9.16%); this proposes changes to the current Chittenden-3-9 district.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude’s measure of compactness, these districts earn the following Roeck scores and Polsby-Popper ratings, and all satisfy the contiguity principle.

Chittenden-6-1	Roeck score of 0.44; Polsby-Popper rating of 0.47.
Chittenden-6-2	Roeck score of 0.49; Polsby-Popper rating of 0.37.
Chittenden-6-3	Roeck score of 0.34; Polsby-Popper rating of 0.29.
Chittenden-6-3	Roeck score of 0.38; Polsby-Popper rating of 0.34.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These districts are in Chittenden County and within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). This district continues the long-standing division of South Burlington into single-member districts. South Burlington has its own high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. There is an extensive system of local roads in the district. The greater Burlington commercial centers serve this district.

Chittenden-6-1. This district represents the south west portion of the City. The western edge of this district borders Lake Champlain, the southern boundary follows the City boundary, and neither these nor the northern boundary of the current Chittenden 3-7 district are changed. The eastern boundary, from Swift Street to Nowland Farm Road, has moved from Spear Street to Dorset Street. The line runs down Spear Street south of Nowland Farm Road to the border with Shelburne.

Chittenden 6.2. This district represents the south east quadrant of the City where extensive population growth took place since the 2000 census. The northern, eastern and southern boundaries of this district (Chittenden-3-8) have not changed. The western boundary moved from Hinesburg Road to behind houses on the western side of Elsom Parkway for the section between Williston Road and Winding Brook Drive. This district contains all residents from both sides of Elsom Parkway, as the Board agreed with input from South Burlington that it was important to keep the community of Mayfair Park together. This resulted in splitting a census block; for this reason, the Board expects the actual number of residents in this district may be about 65 higher than 4,265. The western boundary between Swift Street and Nowland Farm Road moved from Spear Street and Pinnacle Drive, east to Dorset Street as explained in the above district. This line now runs

from the intersection with Nowland Farm Road straight to the border of Shelburne on Spear Street without the previous detour down Allen Road and Locust Hill.

Chittenden 6.3. This district represents the northwest portion of South Burlington. The southern and western boundaries of this district have not changed. The northern boundary runs along Williston Road from the western border with Burlington to Dorset Street. It runs south on Dorset Street to Kennedy Drive and connects to Chittenden-6-2 at the corner of Winding Brook Drive and Elsom Parkway.

Chittenden 6.4. This district represents the north east portion of South Burlington. The east, north, west boundaries follow the South Burlington city line dividing it from Burlington, Colchester and Williston and this boundary has not changed. The southern boundary, which currently runs directly down Williston Road, now heads south at Dorset Street to Kennedy Drive, east on Kennedy Drive and north to the corner of Manor Woods and Elsom Parkway. This district does not include residents on the west side of Elsom Parkway and we expect the district size may be approximately 65 residents less than 4,554. This district will now include the City Center area of South Burlington, which is located south of Williston Road.

Chittenden-7

The two-member Chittenden-7 district consists of the town of Williston, with a 2010 population of 8,698 residents.

Currently, Williston comprises the two-member Chittenden-2 district.

In 1992, Williston was split into two single-member districts, one of them including the town of St. George and part of the town of Shelburne. In 1982, Williston and Richmond together formed a two-member district. In 1974, Williston was a single-member district by itself. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Williston shared a two-member district with Charlotte, Shelburne and St. George.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 8,698, is 354 greater than the ideal district, a deviation of +4.24%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.60 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.49. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Williston is a town in Chittenden County, and as a member of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden Solid Waste District. The town is a member of the Champlain Valley U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 89 and Route 2 transect the town and the Winooski River forms its

northern border. Williston still retains a rural character in its northern and eastern sections, but the western section is dominated by the dense retail centers at Tafts Corners and an industrial-commercial core along Industrial Park Road. Williston and the Burlington area are the principal commercial centers for the district.

Chittenden-8

The two-member Chittenden-8 district consists of all of Milton except the 1,754 residents of West Milton who are in the two-member Grand Isle-Chittenden-1 district. This district's 2010 population was 8,598 residents.

Currently, this portion of Milton is in the two-member Chittenden-9 district (the Board's proposal for the new Chittenden-8 district includes more residents in the Grand Isle-Chittenden-1 district than at present).

In 1992, a part of Milton was combined with a part of Essex and a part of Westford in a single-member district, while the rest of Milton formed a two-member district. In 1982, the reapportionment plan made Milton a two-member district. In 1974, part of Milton was a single-member district and the balance of Milton shared a two-member district with Colchester. In 1965, the first apportionment plan made Milton a single-member district of its own and a share in a two-member district with Colchester.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 8,658, is 254 greater than the ideal district, a deviation of +3.04%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.52 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.58. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is all in Chittenden County. Milton is a member of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden Solid Waste District. The town has its own high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 89 and Route 7 transect the town. Williston and the Burlington area are the principal commercial centers for the district.

Chittenden-9

The Chittenden-9 single-member district consists of Richmond, with a 2010 population of 4,081 residents.

Richmond currently comprises the Chittenden-4 single-member district.

In the 1992 plan, Richmond was a single-member district. In 1982, Richmond and Williston were joined as a two-member district. In 1974, Richmond was joined with Bolton, Jericho and Williston in a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Richmond shared a single-member district with Bolton, Huntington and Underhill

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 4,081, is 91 fewer than the ideal district, a deviation of -2.18%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.52 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.69. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Richmond is a member of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden Solid Waste District. It is part of Mount Mansfield U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 89 and Route 2 transect the town, along the Winooski River. The Jericho Road heads north; Hinesburg Road and Huntington Road head west and south. The Williston and Burlington areas serve as the principal commercial centers for the district.

Chittenden-10-1 and 10-2

Chittenden-10-1 and 10-2 are two single-member districts. Chittenden-10-1 encompasses a part of the Town of Shelburne. Chittenden-10-1 is generally all of Shelburne westerly and southerly of a line beginning at the intersection of Spear Street and the Shelburne-Charlotte town line, then proceeding northerly along the center line of Spear Street to Munroe Brook, then westerly along the thread of Munroe Brook to Shelburne Bay. Its 2010 population was 3,843. Chittenden-10-2 consists of the balance of Shelburne and the town of St. George, with a 2010 population of 3,975 residents.

In 1992, Shelburne was split into three single-member districts, one of which included a part of Shelburne with Charlotte, another including St. George and a part of Williston, and the third containing only a part of Shelburne. In 1982, most of Shelburne was in a two-member district with Charlotte, and a small portion was in a single-member district with Hinesburg and St. George. In 1974, Shelburne shared a two-member district with Charlotte, and St. George was placed in a single-member district with Hinesburg and Huntington. The first apportionment plan in 1965 assigned Shelburne and St. George to a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. Chittenden-10-1 has a population of 3,843 residents, which is 329 fewer than the norm (a deviation of -7.89%). Chittenden-10-2's population of 3,975 is 197 less than a perfect district (a deviation of -4.72).

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.56 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.63. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Richmond is a member of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden Solid Waste District. Shelburne is part of the Champlain Valley U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 116 passes through the edge of both Shelburne and St. George and is the only link road. The western boundary of Shelburne is Lake Champlain and New York State.

Chittenden-11

The single-member Chittenden-11 district consists of the town of Charlotte, with a 2010 population of 3,754 residents.

Charlotte, and two small sections forming the southwest and northwest corners of Hinesburg, currently are in the Chittenden-1-2 district.

In 1992, Charlotte was joined with a part of Shelburne in a single-member district. In 1982, Charlotte was joined with a part of Shelburne in a two-member district. In 1974, Charlotte and Shelburne shared a two-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan placed Charlotte with Shelburne, St. George and Williston in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 3,754, is 418 fewer than the ideal district, a deviation of -10.02%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.61 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.79. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Charlotte is a member of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden Solid Waste District. It is part of Champlain Valley U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 7 runs north and south through Charlotte. Charlotte's western boundary is Lake Champlain and New York State. Lewis Creek wanders through the town on the south and the LaPlatte River does the same on the north. The commercial center for the district is the Burlington and Williston areas.

Chittenden-12

The single-member Chittenden-12 district consists of the town of Hinesburg, with a 2010 population of 4,396 residents.

Hinesburg, minus two small sections forming its southwest and northwest corners of Hinesburg, currently is in the Chittenden-1-1 district.

In 1992, Hinesburg was a single-member district itself. In 1982, Hinesburg was linked with St. George, and a portion of Shelburne to form a single-member district. In 1974, Hinesburg was included in a single-member district with Huntington and St. George. The 1965 apportionment plan placed Hinesburg in a single-member district by itself.

Substantial Equality. The population of this district, at 4,396 is 224 greater than the ideal district, a deviation of +5.37%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.62 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.75. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in Chittenden County. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #4 (Essex office). Hinesburg is a member of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden Solid Waste District. It is part of Champlain Valley U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 116 runs north and south through Hinesburg, connecting it to South Burlington on the north and Starksboro on the south. The commercial center for the district is the Burlington and Williston areas.

Chittenden-Washington-1

The Chittenden-Washington-1 single-member district includes the Chittenden County towns of Bolton and Huntington, and Buel's Gore, and 1,086 residents from the Washington County town of Waterbury, for a total population of 4,236.

Currently, Bolton is in the two-member Cittenden-8 district with Jericho and Underhill, while all of Waterbury is in the two-member Washington-Chittenden-1 district with Duxbury, Buel's Gore and Huntington.

Substantial Equality. The 2010 population of this district was 4,236, 64 more than the ideal district, a positive deviation of +1.53%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.30 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.32. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district continues the longstanding county split involving the Huntington-Waterbury House district, with Bolton now in the mix. The district is within the jurisdiction of two different Environmental Districts (#4 and #5). Bolton and Huntington are part of the Mount Mansfield U.H.S.D., while Waterbury is in the Harwood U.H.S.D..

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Bolton and Huntington are not linked by any roads; the Long Trail does connect the two towns. Bolton and Waterbury are linked by Route 2 and Interstate 89. Huntington is not linked to Waterbury by any road (this is true of the existing Washington-Chittenden-1 district). The commercial center for the district is the Burlington and Williston areas for Huntington, Buel's Gore and Bolton, and Waterbury for the Waterbury portion of this district.

Essex County

Essex County, the furthest reach of the Northeast Kingdom, has 6,306 residents according to the 2010 U.S. Census. Prior reapportionments have secured two House seats for the county, by including in these districts towns from Caledonia and Orleans Counties. The 2011 Board's plan preserves the status quo in this regard.

Currently, the Essex County towns are placed in two single-member districts, with population deviations ranging from a high of -4.55% (Essex-Caledonia-1) to a low of -10.16% (Essex-Caledonia-Orleans-1). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed only one change, moving Bloomfield (population 221) from the Essex-Caledonia-1 district to the Essex-Caledonia-Orleans-1 district, to reduce the -10.16% deviation in the latter and keep both districts above a -10.0% deviation.

Three of these 22 towns and gores filed reports (Guildhall, Kirby and East Haven). Guildhall supported the Board's initial plan, as did East Haven although with some dissatisfaction that apparently goes back to prior plans (see its July 16, 2011 report). Kirby requested to be taken out of the Essex-Caledonia-1 district and placed in a district with Lyndon and/or St. Johnsbury, towns with which it has greater economic, school and county ties. The Board considered Kirby's report, but declined to do so as removing its 493 residents from the Essex-Caledonia-1 district would push that district's negative

deviation to lower than -19%.

Essex-Caledonia-1

The Essex-Caledonia-1 district consists of the Essex County towns of Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory, plus the Caledonia town of Kirby. The proposed district's 2010 population was 3,761.

These towns currently are joined with Bloomfield in the single-member Essex-Caledonia-1 district.

In the 1992 plan, Kirby, Bloomfield, Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory were together a single-member district. In 1982, Kirby was merged in a single-member district with Barnet, Waterford and part of St. Johnsbury. In those decades, Bloomfield, Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory joined with Ferdinand and Lemington in another single-member district. In 1974, Kirby joined with Burke, East Haven, Lyndon, Newark, Sheffield, Sutton and Wheelock in a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Kirby was part of a two-member district with Burke, East Haven, Lyndon, Newark, Sheffield, Sutton and Wheelock, while Bloomfield, Brunswick, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory formed a single-member district with Canaan, Lemington, Warner's Grant and Warren Gore. That year, Concord was part of a single-member district with Barnet and Waterford, and Norton was aligned with Brighton and Charleston. Unorganized towns were not mentioned in that year's plan.

Substantial Equality. With a 2010 population of 3,761, this district is 411 residents fewer than an ideal district, a deviation of -9.85%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.37 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.29. These towns are contiguous, but extend over a long stretch of the Northeast Kingdom. The proposal's moving of Bloomfield into the Essex-Caledonia-Orleans district improves this slightly.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Kirby is in Caledonia County; the other seven towns are in Essex County. All eight towns are members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association; Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory are members and the Northeast Kingdom Solid Waste District. All towns are included in Environmental Commission #7 (St. Johnsbury office) for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The Connecticut River and the New Hampshire border run along the eastern edge of this district. Route 2 connects Concord, Lunenburg and Guildhall; Route 102 continues from Guildhall to Brunswick along the river. The Victory-Guildhall Road links those two towns, and Concord is connected to Victory along the Victory Road. The

commercial centers that serve the district include several New Hampshire towns.

Essex-Caledonia-Orleans-1

The Essex-Caledonia-Orleans-1 district is a single-member district that consists of the Caledonia County town of Newark; the Essex County towns of Averill, Brighton, Bloomfield, Canaan, East Haven, Ferdinand, Lemington, Lewis and Norton, plus Avery's Gore, Warner's Grant and Warren Gore; and the Orleans County town of Westmore. Its 2010 population was 3,969. It is the only House district in the plan that includes towns of three different counties and is the district which includes the highest number of towns.

These towns, excepting Bloomfield, form the current Essex-Caledonia-Orleans district. Currently, Bloomfield is in the Caledonia-Essex-1 district.

The 1992 plan placed Averill, Avery's Gore, Brighton, Canaan, East Haven, Ferdinand, Lewis, Norton, Warner's Grant, Warren Gore and Newark in a single-member district; Westmore was part of a two-member district with Albany, Barton, Craftsbury, Glover, Greensboro, Sheffield and Wheelock. In 1982, Averill, Avery's Gore, Brighton, Canaan, Newark, Norton, Warner's Grant and Warren Gore were a single-member district with Lewis; East Haven was placed with Burke, Lyndon and Sutton in a single-member district; and Ferdinand and Lemington joined Bloomfield, Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory in another single-member district. In the 1974 plan, Averill, Avery's Gore, Canaan, Ferdinand, Lemington, Lewis, Norton, Warner's Grant and Warren Gore were joined with Bloomfield, Brunswick, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory in a single-member district, while Brighton was part of a single-member district with Charleston, Morgan and Westmore and East Haven was part of a single-member district with Burke, Kirby, Lyndon, Newark, Sheffield, Sutton and Wheelock. In 1965, in the first apportionment plan, Brighton was part of a single-member district with Charleston and Norton; Canaan and Lemington were part of a single-member district with Bloomfield, Brunswick, Granby, Guildhall, Lunenburg, Maidstone and Victory. The 1965 plan did not include any mention of Averill, Lewis, Warner's Grant or Warren Gore.

Substantial Equality. With a population of 3,969, this district is 203 residents short of an ideal district, a deviation of -4.87.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.45 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.36. These towns are contiguous, but range over a very large swath of the Northeast Kingdom.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. The towns in this district are in three different counties. They are all members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association, and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #7 (St. Johnsbury office) for Act 250 and other permit programs. Averill, Avery's Gore, Brighton, East Haven, Ferdinand, Lewis and Warren Gore are

members of the Northeast Kingdom Waste Management District. Some of the towns border Canada or the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 114 links Newark, Brighton, Warren Gore, Norton and Canaan. Brighton is connected to Brunswick by Route 105. Route 102 runs along the Connecticut River and the New Hampshire border through Lemington and Canaan.

Franklin County

Currently, the Franklin County towns are placed in five two-member districts and one single-member district, with population deviations ranging from a high of +9.86% (Franklin-2, Fairfield, Fletcher and St. Albans Town) to a low of -17.09% (Franklin-3, St. Albans City). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +8.44% (Franklin-2-2) to a low of +2.71% (Franklin-6, Fairfax).

Of the 15 Franklin County towns, the Board received reports and recommendations about the Board's initial plan from ten. Swanton strongly urged the Board to retain the two-member Franklin-5 district (Swanton and Sheldon); Sheldon did not file a report. Franklin strongly objected to being split and put into two different districts. Highgate was comfortable with the initial plan but expressed some concern about Franklin's situation; one other member of the current two-member Franklin-6 district, Berkshire, opposed splitting up that two-member district. Following a joint meeting of their Boards of Civil Authority, St. Albans Town and St. Albans City reached a consensus against the initial plan, but provided Board member Frank Cioffi suggestions that ultimately led the Board towards a final plan that it expects will suit the Town and the City.

Georgia endorsed the initial plan's proposal to place it in a single-member district by itself as it had been in the 1992 plan. Fairfax did not comment on the initial plan. Belvidere objected to the initial plan's proposal to remove it from its current affiliation with Cambridge and Waterville and place it in a district with Enosburgh and Montgomery, preferring instead an alignment with Johnson. Enosburgh objected to the initial plan, preferring to stay in a single-member district with Bakersfield instead of a combination with Belvidere and Montgomery; Montgomery, for its part, endorsed that combination.

In developing its final plan, the Board accommodated the requests of Swanton, Franklin, St. Albans Town and St. Albans City (we believe), and Belvidere; left Highgate in its current district; and was unable to fashion a plan that gave Enosburgh what it wanted. Under the final plan, deviations range from a high of +8.22% (Franklin-5, Georgia) to a low of -4.55% (Franklin-4, Enosburgh and Montgomery).

Franklin-1

The Franklin-1 two-member district consists of Swanton and Sheldon, with a 2010 population of 8,617 residents.

Currently, Swanton and Sheldon are together in the two-member Franklin-5 district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Swanton and Alburg in a two-member district. The 1974 and 1965 plans combined Swanton and Highgate in a two-member district. The 1992 and 1982 plans combined Sheldon and Fairfield in a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Sheldon and Franklin were part of a single-member district with Berkshire.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 8,617 residents. This is a positive deviation of 273, or +3.27% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.29 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.31. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County. These towns are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Swanton is a member of the Missisquoi Valley U.H.S.D.; Sheldon sends its high school students to either that union high school or to Bellows Free Academy in St. Albans.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 105 and local roads connect these two towns.

The Swanton Board of Civil Authority's July 26, 2011 report opposed the Apportionment Board's initial proposal to create two single member districts here, and strongly supported retaining its two-member district with Sheldon. Sheldon did not file a report.

Franklin-2

Franklin-2 is a two-member district made up of the towns of Berkshire, Franklin, Highgate and Richford, with a 2010 population 8,940.

These towns comprise the existing Franklin-6 two-member district established in 2002.

The 1992 plan made a two-member district out of Berkshire, Richford, Bakersfield and Enosburg. In 1982, Berkshire and Richford together formed a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Berkshire and Franklin combined with Sheldon for a single-member district. In the 1974 and 1965 plans, Richford and Montgomery formed a single-member district.

The 1992 and 1982 reapportionment plans placed Franklin and Highgate together in a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Franklin and Sheldon were part of a single-member district with Berkshire. In 1974 and 1965, Highgate was part of a two-member district with Swanton.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 8,940 residents. This is a positive deviation of 596, or +7.14% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.24 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.42. The towns in this district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County. The towns in this district are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Franklin and Highgate are in the Missisquoi Valley U.H.S.D. Richford has its own high school; Berkshire students attend either the Richford high school or the Enosburg high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district combines four rural towns. Local roads and Route 207 connect Highgate to Franklin; Route 120 connects Franklin to Berkshire, and Route 105 connects Berkshire to Richford. Additionally, Route 105 serves as an east-west highway serving these towns, in some cases via Enosburg Falls.

Franklin-3-1

Franklin-3-1 is a single-member district made up 2,547 residents of St. Albans City and 1,619 residents of St. Albans Town, with a total 2010 population of 4,166 residents.

All of St. Albans Town is currently in the two-member Franklin-2 district with Fairfield and Fletcher. All of St. Albans City is now in the two-member Franklin-3 district.

In 1992, a portion of St. Albans Town shared a two-member district with St. Albans City, and the remainder of the Town was a single-member district. The 1982 plan split the Town into one single-member district with Georgia and another single-member district on its own. In 1974 and 1965, the Town qualified for one single-member district on its own and as part of another single-member district with Fairfax and Fairfield.

In 1992, the City shared a two-member district with a part of St. Albans Town. The 1982 plan gave the City of St. Albans a two-member district. In 1974 and 1965, the City had one single-member and one two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 4,166 residents. This is a negative deviation of 6, or -0.14% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.23 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.33. The contiguity principle is satisfied with this district.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County, but breaks both the Town and the City into two different House districts. Both are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, the Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Management District, and Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. They are the two members of the Bellows Free Academy (St. Albans) U.H.S.D. They have engaged in merger discussions from time to time.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district contains rural, farming area, lakeshore seasonal and recreational uses, and dense St. Albans City urban and suburban areas. Route 7 and Interstate 89, along with Routes 36 and 38, are the main roads in the district. The selection of these two portions of the Town and the City was made following feedback from members of the Boards of Civil Authority of the Town and City.

Franklin-3-2

Franklin-3-2 is a single-member district made up 2,199 residents of St. Albans City and 2,263 residents of St. Albans Town, with a total 2010 population of 4,462 residents.

All of St. Albans Town is currently in the two-member Franklin-2 district with Fairfield and Fletcher. All of St. Albans City is now in the two-member Franklin-3 district.

In 1992, a portion of St. Albans Town shared a two-member district with St. Albans City, and the remainder of the Town was a single-member district. The 1982 plan split the Town into one single-member district with Georgia and another single-member district on its own. In 1974 and 1965, the Town qualified for one single-member district on its own and as part of another single-member district with Fairfax and Fairfield.

In 1992, the City shared a two-member district with a part of St. Albans Town. The 1982 plan gave the City of St. Albans a two-member district. In 1974 and 1965, the City had one single-member and one two-member districts.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 4,462 residents. This is a positive deviation of 290, or +6.95% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.40 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.40. The contiguity principle is satisfied with this district.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

This district is entirely within Franklin County, but breaks both the Town and the City into two different House districts. Both are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, the Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Management District, and Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. They are the two members of the Bellows Free Academy (St. Albans) U.H.S.D. They have engaged in merger discussions from time to time.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district contains rural, farming area, lakeshore seasonal and recreational uses, and dense St. Albans City urban and suburban areas. Routes 7, 36 and 38 are the main roads in the district. The selection of these two portions of the Town and the City was made following feedback from members of the Boards of Civil Authority of the Town and City.

Franklin-3-3

Franklin-3-3 is a single-member district made up 2,172 residents of St. Albans City and 2,117 residents of St. Albans Town, with a total 2010 population of 4,289 residents.

All of St. Albans Town is currently in the two-member Franklin-2 district with Fairfield and Fletcher. All of St. Albans City is now in the two-member Franklin-3 district.

In 1992, a portion of St. Albans Town shared a two-member district with St. Albans City, and the remainder of the Town was a single-member district. The 1982 plan split the Town into one single-member district with Georgia and another single-member district on its own. In 1974 and 1965, the Town qualified for one single-member district on its own and as part of another single-member district with Fairfax and Fairfield.

In 1992, the City shared a two-member district with a part of St. Albans Town. The 1982 plan gave the City of St. Albans a two-member district. In 1974 and 1965, the City had one single-member and one two-member districts.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 4,289 residents. This is a positive deviation of 117, or +2.80% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.29 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.47. The contiguity principle is satisfied with this district.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

This district is entirely within Franklin County, but breaks both the Town and the City into two different House districts. Both are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, the Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Management District, and Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. They are the

two members of the Bellows Free Academy (St. Albans) U.H.S.D. They have engaged in merger discussions from time to time.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district contains rural, farming area, lakeshore seasonal and recreational uses, and dense St. Albans City urban and suburban areas. Route 7 and Interstate 89, along with Routes 36 and 38, are the main roads in the district. The selection of these two portions of the Town and the City was made following feedback from members of the Boards of Civil Authority of the Town and City.

Franklin-4

The Franklin-4 single-member district consists of Enosburgh and Montgomery, with a 2010 population of 3,982 residents.

Currently, Enosburgh is in the single-member Franklin-4 district with Bakersfield, and Montgomery is in the single-member Orleans-Franklin-1 district with Jay, Lowell, Troy and Westfield.

In 1992, Enosburgh was in a two-member district with Bakersfield, Berkshire and Richford, while Montgomery was in a single member district with the Orleans County towns of Jay, Lowell, Troy and Westfield. In 1982, Enosburgh was part of a single-member district with Montgomery. In 1974, Enosburgh was placed in a single-member district with Bakersfield and Fletcher and Enosburgh was in a single-member district with Bakersfield in 1965. In 1974 and 1965, Montgomery was in a single-member district with Richford.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 3,982 residents. This is a negative deviation of 190, or -4.55% less than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.52 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.57. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County. These towns are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Enosburgh has its own high school. Montgomery students attend high school in either Richford or Enosburgh.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 118 connects Richford and Enosburgh. Enosburgh has many dairy farms; in Montgomery, the hills and mountains restrict farming to the somewhat narrow river valleys. The commercial center for Enosburgh is Enosburg Falls and St. Albans, and Montgomery looks to Enosburg Falls and Richford for commerce.

The Enosburgh Board of Civil Authority met on July 21, and expressed a preference for its current district-mate of Bakersfield, but indicated it “could live with” being combined with Enosburg and Belvidere. The Apportionment Board’s final proposal dropped Belvidere from this proposed district in order to keep Belvidere in a Lamoille County district.

The July 21, 2011 letter from the Montgomery Board of Civil Authority endorsed the Apportionment Board’s initial plan. As noted above, the final plan dropped Belvidere but the Board expects that this would not have changed Montgomery’s view.

Franklin-5

Franklin-5 is a single-member district consisting of the town of Georgia. Its total 2010 population was 4,515 residents.

Georgia currently is in a two-member district with Fairfax, Franklin-1.

The 1992 plan placed Georgia in a single-member district. In 1982, Georgia was linked with a part of St. Albans town in a single-member district. In 1974, Georgia was placed in a two-member district with Alburg, Grand Isle, Isle La Motte, North Hero and South Hero. In the first apportionment plan, Georgia was part of a single-member district with South Hero, Westford and a part of Milton.

Substantial Equality. The district’s 2010 population was 4,515 residents. This is a positive deviation of 343, or +8.22% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude’s measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.66. The contiguity principle is satisfied with this district.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County. Georgia is a member of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, the Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Management District, and Environmental District #1 (St. Albans) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Georgia tuitions its students to high schools in other towns, principally BFA-St. Albans and BFA-Fairfax.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district is largely rural, with Route 7 its main road, linking it to commerce in St. Albans to the north and Chittenden County to the south; Interstate 89 also provides a main commuting route to Chittenden County.

Franklin 6

Franklin-6 is a single-member district consisting of the town of Fairfax. Its total 2010 population was 4,285 residents.

Fairfax currently is in a two-member district with Georgia, Franklin-1.

The 1992 plan placed Fairfax with Fletcher in a single-member district. In 1982, Fairfax was placed with Westford in a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Fairfax was part of a single-member district with Fairfield and a portion of St. Albans Town.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 4,285 residents. This is a positive deviation of 113, or +2.71% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.33 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.61. The contiguity principle is satisfied with this district.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County. Fairfax is a member of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, the Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Management District, and Environmental District #1 (St. Albans) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Fairfax has its own high school, Bellows Free Academy Fairfax.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district is largely rural, with Route 104 its main road, linking it to commerce in St. Albans to the north and, via Interstate 89, to Chittenden County to the south.

Franklin-7

Franklin-7 is a single-member district made up Bakersfield, Fairfield and Fletcher, with a 2010 Census population of 4,490.

Bakersfield is currently in the single-member Franklin-4 district with Enosburgh. Fairfield and Fletcher are now in the two-member Franklin-2 district, with St. Albans Town.

The 1992 and 1982 reapportionment plans made Fairfield and Sheldon a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Fairfield was aligned with Fairfax and St. Albans Town in a single-member district. The 1992 plan placed Fletcher with Fairfax in a single-member district. In 1982, Fletcher and Cambridge were coupled with Waterville to form a single-member district. In 1974, Fletcher was part of a single-member district with Bakersfield and Enosburgh. In 1965, Fletcher and Cambridge were assigned a two-member district with Belvidere, Johnson, Hyde Park, Eden and Waterville

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 4,490 residents. This is a positive deviation of 318, or +7.62% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.46 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.44. The towns in this district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Franklin County. These towns are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, the Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Management District, and Environmental District #6 for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. None of these towns has its own high school, and each makes various tuition arrangements for students.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district is rural. Route 108 connects Fletcher and Bakersfield, and Route 36 connects Bakersfield to Fairfield. In addition, Fairfield Road/South Road connects Fletcher directly to Fairfield. For commerce, Fairfield looks to St. Albans, as does much of Bakersfield (parts of Bakersfield are closer to Enosburg Falls and are drawn to its commercial center, however). Fletcher looks to both Cambridge and St. Albans in this regard.

Grand Isle County

Currently, the Grand Isle County towns comprise a single two-member district with a portion of Milton, with a population deviation of -0.73. The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed to break the district into two single-member districts, with deviations of +5.23% and +3.88%.

The Boards of Civil Authority from five of these towns (including Milton, which is currently subdivided in this district) urged the Board to retain the current two-member district configuration, emphasizing the desire of the island towns to remain together. None of these towns supported the initial plan; two towns did not file reports (South Hero and North Hero).

In its final plan, the Board retains the current district structure, but at Milton's request added approximately 400 more residents from the West Milton part of that town.

Grand Isle-Chittenden-1

The Grand Isle-1 two-member district consists of Alburgh, Isle La Motte, North Hero, Grand Isle, South Hero and 1,754 residents from the part of Milton known as West Milton. The district's 2010 Census population was 8,724 residents.

Currently, these towns are in the Grand Isle-Chittenden-1-1 two-member district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Alburgh¹⁰ with Swanton in a two-member district, and Grand Isle, Isle La Motte, North Hero and South Hero in a single-member district. The 1974 plan put Alburgh, Isle La Motte, North Hero, Grand Isle and South Hero together with Georgia as a two-member district. In 1965, in the first apportionment plan, Alburgh, Grand Isle, Isle La Motte and North Hero shared a single-member district, and South Hero was joined with Georgia, Westford and a part of Milton to form a single-member district.

In 1992, a portion of Milton was placed into a two-member district with a portion of Essex and a portion of Westford; the balance of Milton was a two-member district on its own. In 1982, the reapportionment plan made Milton a two-member district by itself. In 1974, Milton took a single-member district and shared a two-member district with Colchester. In 1965, the first apportionment plan awarded Milton a single-member district of its own and a share in a two-member district with Colchester, and named Westford along with Georgia, South Hero and a part of Milton as a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The district's 2010 population was 8,724 residents. This is a positive deviation of 380, or +4.55% more than the ideal.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.28 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.35. These towns are contiguous, although in some places only by virtue of bridges and causeways.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Alburgh, North Hero, Grand Isle and South Hero are in Grand Isle County, while West Milton is in Chittenden County. The Island towns are members of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #6 (St. Albans) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. West Milton is in a different planning region, and is in Environmental District # 4. The towns of this district all border on Lake Champlain. Milton sends its students to Milton High School. The Island towns have no high school, and offer various options to families to send students to high schools elsewhere in Vermont and New York.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 2 runs north and south through the Islands (excepting Isle La Motte, reachable by Route 129 from Alburgh), and at the southern end of South Hero connects across the causeway to Milton (going through a portion of Colchester), via Mayo Road. A substantial amount of the district's economy is based on recreation and farming. The Burlington area is the commercial center for the district, although Alburgh and Isle La

¹⁰ Act No. 84 of 2008 directed legislative council to change the spelling of both the village and town of Alburgh, in accordance with the change of name order that the state board of libraries issued on April 18, 2006.

Motte also have commercial ties in Swanton and St. Albans.

Lamoille County

Currently, the ten Lamoille County towns are placed in four single-member districts and one two-member district, with population deviations ranging from a high of +14.31% (Lamoille-3, Eden and Johnson) to a low of -4.29% (Lamoille-Washington-1, Elmore and Morrystown, plus the Washington County towns of Woodbury and Worcester). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +3.91% (Lamoille-2-2, a portion of Morrystown) to a low of +2.52% (Lamoille-4, Eden and Hyde Park).

Belvidere reported its dissatisfaction with being placed in a district with two Franklin County towns (Enosburgh and Montgomery). Cambridge, Waterville, Eden and Stowe did not file reports.¹¹ Johnson, Hyde Park and Morrystown objected to the splitting of Morrystown; Hyde Park also objected to placing Wolcott out of the County. Elmore objected to being placed in a district with three Washington County towns (Calais, Woodbury and Worcester), and advocated for a district combining itself with Wolcott and Morrystown. Wolcott and Morrystown concur with this proposal from Elmore.

The Apportionment Board's final plan retains the four single-member and one two-member district approach for the Lamoille County towns. The final plan accommodates the requests of all of the towns that filed reports with recommendations. The resulting deviations range from a high of +3.84% (Lamoille-1, Cambridge and Waterville) to a low of -9.06% (Lamoille-2, Belvidere and Johnson).

Lamoille-1

The Lamoille-1 district consists of the Lamoille County towns of Cambridge and Waterville, with a 2010 population of 4,332 residents.

Under the current (2002) plan, these two towns are in the single-member Lamoille-4 district with Belvidere.

The 1992 plan made Cambridge part of a single-member district with Belvidere and Waterville. In 1982, Fletcher and Cambridge were coupled with Waterville to form a single-member district. In 1974, Cambridge joined Johnson, Stowe and Waterville in a two-member district. In 1965, Cambridge and Waterville were combined in a two-member district with Fletcher, Belvidere, Johnson, Hyde Park and Eden.

Substantial Equality. With 4,332 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 160 over the ideal district, a deviation of +3.84%.

¹¹ As with Richmond, Stowe did not respond, but under the law, since the initial plan retained Stowe intact as a single member district on its own, the initial plan was not sent to Stowe for its comment.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude’s measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.35 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.41. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Lamoille County. These towns are members the Lamoille Union High School District. Additionally, they are all part of Environmental District #5 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 109 connects Waterville and Cambridge. The local commercial center is Jeffersonville, located in the northwest corner of Cambridge.

Lamoille-2

The Lamoille-2 district consists of Belvidere and Johnson, with a 2010 population of 3,794 residents.

Under the current plan, Johnson is in the single-member Lamoille-3 district with Eden. Belvidere is currently in the single-member Lamoille-4 district with Cambridge and Waterville.

In 1992, Johnson was part of a single-member district with Eden. The 1982 plan placed Johnson with Belvidere and Eden in a single-member district, while Waterville was part of another single-member district with Fletcher and Cambridge. In 1974, Johnson was combined with Waterville, Cambridge and Stowe, in a two-member district. In 1965, Johnson was placed in a two-member district with Waterville, Belvidere, Cambridge, Hyde Park, Eden and Fletcher.

The 1992 reapportionment plan placed Belvidere in a single-member district with Cambridge and Waterville. In the 1982 plan, Belvidere and Eden were part of a single-member district with Johnson. In 1974, Belvidere, Eden and Hyde Park were part of a two-member district with Elmore and Morristown. The first apportionment plan in 1965 placed Belvidere, Eden and Hyde Park with Cambridge, Fletcher, Johnson and Waterville in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 3,794 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 378 shy of the ideal district, a deviation of -9.06%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude’s measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.39 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.43. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Lamoille County. These towns are in the same high school district, Lamoille U.H.S.D., and are in the Lamoille North Supervisory Union as well.

They are part of Environmental District #5 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. No passable road connects these two towns, and traffic between them flows through Eden or Cambridge-Waterville. The local commercial center for Johnson is itself, and for Belvidere is Jeffersonville (in Cambridge).

Notwithstanding the lack of a connecting road, the Board of Civil Authority of Belvidere, in a July 27, 2011 letter, urged the Apportionment Board to place Belvidere in a single-member district with Johnson. The Minutes of the July 21, 2011 meeting of the Johnson Board of Civil Authority suggest that Johnson would be agreeable to a single-member district with Belvidere.

Lamoille-3

The Lamoille-3 district consists of the entire town of Stowe, with a 2010 population of 4,314 residents.

Stowe currently is the sole town in the Lamoille-1 single-member district.

In 1992 and 1982, Stowe and Morristown shared a two-member district. In 1974, Stowe was part of a two-member district with Cambridge, Johnson and Waterville. The first apportionment plan (1965) put Stowe with Morristown and Elmore in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 4,314 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 142 over the ideal district, a deviation of +3.40%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.56 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.60.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Stowe is in Lamoille County, is a member of the Lamoille County Planning Commission and the Lamoille Regional Solid Waste Management District. Its students attending public schools go to Stowe schools.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 100 runs through the town north to south; Route 108 runs over Smuggler's Notch to reach Jeffersonville, past the ski areas, although the Notch itself is closed to through traffic during the winter months. The town is in the Green Mountains. The Waterbury River flows through it.

Lamoille-4

The Lamoille-4 single-member district consists of the Lamoille County towns of Eden and Hyde Park.

Under the 2002 plan, Eden is in the single-member Lamoille-3 district with Johnson, and Hyde Park is in the single-member Lamoille-2 district with Wolcott.

The 1992 reapportionment plan placed Eden with Johnson in a single-member district; and put Hyde Park with Wolcott in a single-member district. In the 1982 plan, Eden and Belvidere were part of a single-member district with Johnson, while Hyde Park was aligned with Elmore and Wolcott in a single-member district. In 1974, Eden, Hyde Park and Belvidere were part of a two-member district with Elmore and Morrystown. The first apportionment plan in 1965 placed Eden and Hyde Park with Belvidere, Cambridge, Fletcher, Johnson and Waterville in a two-member district

Substantial Equality. With 4,277 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 105 over the ideal district, a deviation of +2.52%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.55 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.58. Both towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Eden forms Lamoille County's northern border with Franklin County, and both towns belong to the Lamoille County Planning Commission and the Lamoille Regional Solid Waste Management District. They are also members of the Lamoille U.H.S.D. Hyde Park is the shire town for Lamoille County

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 100 connects Eden and Hyde Park. The Green River Reservoir is in Hyde Park and Eden. The commercial center is Hyde Park or Morrisville.

Lamoille-5

The two-member Lamoille-5 district consists of the Lamoille County towns of Elmore, Morrystown and Wolcott.

Under the 2002 plan, Wolcott is in the single-member Lamoille-2 district with Hyde Park, while Elmore and Morrystown are part of the two-member Lamoille-Washington-1 district with the Washington County towns of Woodbury and Worcester.

In 1992, Elmore was combined with the Washington County towns of Worcester, Middlesex and part of Montpelier in a single-member district. In 1982, Elmore was in a single-member district with Hyde Park and Wolcott. In 1992 and 1982, Morrystown was

combined with Stowe to form a two-member district. In the 1974 and 1965 plans, Elmore and Morrystown were combined with Stowe to form a two-member district.

In 1992, Wolcott was placed in a single-member district with Hyde Park. Under the 1982 plan, Wolcott was combined with Hyde Park and Elmore to form a single-member district. In 1974, Wolcott was in a single-member district with Albany, Barton, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro. The 1965 placed Wolcott in a single-member district with Albany, Craftsbury, Greensboro and Stannard.

Substantial Equality. With 7758 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 586 fewer than the ideal district, a deviation of -7.02%.

Geographic compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.42 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.45. The towns within the district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All three towns are within Lamoille County and are members of the Lamoille County Planning Commission and the Lamoille Regional Solid Waste District.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests.

Orange County

Currently, the 17 Orange County towns are placed in three single-member districts and two, two-member districts, with population deviations ranging from a high of +6.09% (Orange-2, Bradford, Fairlee and West Fairlee) to a low of -8.75% (Orange-Addison-1, Braintree, Brookfield, Granville and Randolph). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +6.93% (Orange-1, Newbury, Orange and Topsham) to a low of -9.54% (Orange-3, Bradford and Fairlee).

The seven towns in the Board's Orange-1 and Orange-2 initial plan disagreed about it. Topsham and Corinth endorsed the initial plan, Corinth explaining that it prefers the single-member district to its current six town, two-member district. Newbury, Orange and Washington expressed varying degrees of clear opposition to the initial plan, and proposed an alternative. The alternative, however, would create an unacceptable Orange-1 district with a population deviation of +13.99. Chelsea expressed reservations about the initial plan, but voted to not oppose it. Vershire did not file a report. The Apportionment Board chose to make no changes to the initial proposal, being unable to reconcile the competing requests with the population deviation and contiguity challenges presented.

Of the five towns in the Board's Orange-3 and Orange-4 initial plan, three object to it (Bradford, Fairlee and Thetford), and two did not file reports (Strafford and West

Fairlee). Bradford prefers its current configuration with Fairlee and West Fairlee, and argues against putting Fairlee and West Fairlee in separate districts (since the first reapportionment plan, these two towns have been in the same district). Fairlee wishes to remain in a district with West Fairlee, while Thetford prefers to stay in its current two-member district (Windsor-Orange-1) with Norwich, Sharon and Strafford. West Fairlee did not file a report. The Board gave weight to these concerns, but found that putting West Fairlee and Fairlee in the same district caused population deviation problems in both the Orange-1 and Orange-2 districts, and chose to leave the initial plan unchanged (which brought Strafford and Thetford into Orange County districts).

As noted in greater detail below, the Board struggled to accommodate the preferences of Randolph, Roxbury and Barre Town, and did so to some extent but without meeting all requests.

The Apportionment Board's final plan proposes seven single-member districts for the Orange County towns (and Roxbury and a portion of Barre Town). The resulting deviations range from a high of +6.93% (Orange-1, Newbury, Orange and Topsham) to a low of -9.54% (Orange-3, Bradford and Fairlee).

Orange-1

The Orange-1 single-member district consists of the Orange County towns of Newbury, Orange and Topsham, with a 2010 population of 4,461.

Newbury and Topsham currently are in the single-member Orange-Caledonia-1 district, with the Caledonia town of Groton. Orange is currently in the two-member Orange-1 district, with the towns of Chelsea, Corinth, Vershire, Washington and Williamstown.

The 1992 reapportionment plan placed Newbury and Topsham with Groton in a single-member district, while Orange was part of a two-member district with Chelsea, Tunbridge, Vershire, Washington and Williamstown. In 1982, Newbury was positioned with Groton and Ryegate in a single-member district, and Orange and Topsham were part of a two-member district with Chelsea, Tunbridge, Washington and Williamstown. In 1974, Newbury was part of a single-member district with Groton and Ryegate; Orange joined Chelsea, Orange and Washington in a single-member district; and Topsham was in a single-member district with Bradford and Corinth. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, put Newbury with Ryegate in a single-member district; Orange with Barre Town in a two-member district; and Topsham with Bradford, Chelsea, Corinth, Washington and Williamstown in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 4,461 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 289 over the ideal district, a deviation of +6.93%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.41 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.51. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Newbury, Orange and Topsham are Orange County towns, forming the northern side of the county. They are in different regional planning commissions and solid waste districts.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 302 and 25 connect Orange and Topsham. Route 302 also connects Topsham to Newbury via Groton and Ryegate; town roads connect Topsham to Newbury. Newbury borders the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire. Whereas Orange and Topsham residents regard the Barre-Montpelier area as the nearest commercial center; Newbury residents will look to Bradford or Woodsville, New Hampshire.

Newbury's July 29, 2011 letter to the Board cites a lack of common interests, and topographical differences, between itself and Orange and urged the Board to consider placing Newbury instead with towns to the north and west where it believes its affinities (including mutual aid arrangements, farmers markets, and school systems) are clear and longstanding. Orange responded to the Board's initial plan by letter dated July 26, 2011, in which it explained the reasons it wishes to be placed in a district with the towns with which it shares more in common: Chelsea, Vershire and Washington. Topsham's correspondence concurred with the district as proposed.

The Apportionment Board considered these requests and supporting points, but in the context of putting together a plan that addressed the population deviations for all of central and east-central Vermont, was unable to do so. The Board encourages the General Assembly to continue this effort.

Orange-2

The Orange-2 single-member district consists of the Orange County towns of Chelsea, Corinth, Vershire and Washington, with a 2010 population of 4,374.

These towns are located in the current Orange-1 two-member district, together with Williamstown and Orange.

In 1992, Chelsea, Vershire and Washington were part of a two-member district with Orange and Williamstown. In 1982, Washington and Chelsea were combined with Williamstown, Orange, Topsham and Tunbridge in a two-member district. In 1974, Washington and Chelsea were part of a single-member district with Orange and Tunbridge. The 1965 apportionment plan made a two-member district out of Washington, Brookfield, Chelsea, Corinth, Topsham and Williamstown.

In 1992, Corinth and Bradford made up a single-member district. In 1982, Corinth, Vershire and Bradford were a single-member district. In 1974, Corinth and Bradford were associated with Topsham in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 4,374 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 202 over the ideal district, a deviation of +4.84%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.63 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.72. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Each of these four towns is in Orange County, and Chelsea is the shire town. Chelsea, Corinth and Vershire are members of the Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee Planning Commission and are under the jurisdiction of the state's District 3 Environmental Commission for state land use permits.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 113 and 110 interconnect these towns. West Corinth Road connects Corinth and Washington. Whereas Washington and Chelsea residents regard the Barre-Montpelier area as the nearest commercial center, Vershire and Corinth look to Randolph or Bradford..

Chelsea and Corinth reported no objections to the proposal (and Corinth sees it as an improvement over its current two-member district (Orange-1). In its August 1, 2011 letter, Washington recommended swapping Orange into this district in exchange for Corinth, arguing that Orange and Washington have stronger common interests, including membership in the same school supervisory union. Vershire did not comment on the initial proposal.

The Board was unable to identify a plan for these two districts that accommodated the preferences of each town that commented.

Orange-3

The Orange-3 single-member district consists of the Orange County towns of Bradford and Fairlee, with a 2010 population of 3,774.

These two towns currently are combined with West Fairlee to form the Orange-2 single-member district.

In 1992 and 1982, Fairlee, Thetford and West Fairlee comprised a single-member district. In 1974, those three towns joined with Vershire to make a single-member district. In the first apportionment plan in 1965, the three towns made a two-member district with Bradford, Stafford and Vershire.

In 1992, Bradford and Corinth made up a single-member district. In 1982, Bradford, Corinth and Vershire were a single-member district. In 1974, Bradford and Corinth were associated with Topsham in a single-member district. In the first apportionment, in 1965,

Bradford joined Fairlee, Stafford, Thetford, West Fairlee and Vershire in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 3,774 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 398 under the ideal district, a deviation of -9.54%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.37 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.35. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Bradford and Fairlee are in Orange County, and both border on the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire. Both belong to the Two-Rivers Ottauquechee Regional Commission. They are in different union high school districts: Fairlee is in the Rivendell K-12 school system, Bradford in the Oxbow school system.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 5 and Interstate 91 connect these two towns. The commercial center for the district is Bradford, White River Junction or several New Hampshire towns.

Fairless's July 26, 2011 report urges the Board to place West Fairlee in this district, citing as reasons: (i) the two towns share common problems and interests with Lake Fairlee and Lake Morey and have collaborated on these issues; (ii) they share a common name and history, and were once a single town; and (iii) the towns are members of the Rivendell Interstate School District. Bradford's July 25, 2011 report requests also requested that West Fairlee be kept in a district with Fairlee and Bradford. West Fairlee endorsed the proposed district.

The Board considers the concerns raised by Fairlee and Bradford to have substance. However, while moving West Fairlee to the Orange-3 district would not skew that district's population beyond acceptable limits, removing West Fairlee from the proposed Orange-4 district would leave that district with a -13.2% deviation. Accordingly, the Board did not make the requested switch.

Orange-4

The Orange-4 single member district consists of the Orange County towns of Strafford, Thetford and West Fairlee, with a 2010 population of 4,338.

Strafford and Thetford currently are in the two-member Windsor-Orange-2 district. West Fairlee is now in the single-member Orange-2 district, with Bradford and Fairlee.

In 1992 and 1982, Thetford, Fairlee and West Fairlee comprised a single-member district. In 1974, the three towns joined with Vershire to make a single-member district. In the first apportionment plan in 1965, the three towns made a two-member district with Bradford, Stafford and Vershire.

In 1992, Strafford was part of a two-member district with Norwich, Royalton and Sharon. In 1982, Strafford was part of a single-member district with Royalton and Sharon from Windsor County. In 1974, Strafford shared a two-member district with Norwich, Pomfret, Royalton and Sharon. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Strafford and Vershire joined Bradford, Fairlee, Thetford and West Fairlee in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 4,338 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 166 over the ideal district, a deviation of +3.98.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.45 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.46. These three towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These towns are within Orange County. They belong to the Two-Rivers Ottauquechee Regional Commission and are in the same Act 250 land use planning jurisdiction, the District 3 Environmental Commission. West Fairlee is in the Rivendell Interstate School District with Fairlee and Vershire. Thetford is home to Thetford Academy, a private secondary school that serves as the high school for a number of towns in southeast Orange County.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. These towns are in the center of Orange County. Route 132 connects Strafford and Thetford, which connects with West Fairlee by Routes 113 and 244. There may be no clear commercial center for the district, although White River Junction, Randolph and Hanover, New Hampshire, are contenders.

Strafford did not file a report with the Board; West Fairlee did not object to the district as proposed. Thetford filed a report dated July 12, 2011, in which it requested to stay in its current two-member district (the Windsor-Orange-2 district). The Board found that granting this request would cause a ripple affecting a series of other districts, and declined to grant the request.

Orange-5

The Orange-5 district consists of all except 788 of Randolph's 4,778 population, making this district's population 3,990.

This district currently is part of the two-member Orange-Addison-1 district, together with the balance of Randolph, the Addison County town of Granville, and the Orange County towns of Braintree and Brookfield.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Randolph, Braintree and Brookfield made up a two-member district. In 1974, Randolph, Braintree and Brookfield were associated with Bethel in a two-member district. In 1965, Randolph and Braintree were in a two-member district

with Bethel, while Brookfield was placed in a two-member district with Williamstown, Chelsea, Corinth, Topsham and Washington.

Substantial Equality. With 3,990 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 182 under the ideal district, a deviation of -4.36%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.50 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.50. As a subdivision of a single town, the contiguity principle is satisfied.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of this proposed district is within Orange County, and it does not cross into any other political subdivisions.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district is at the hub of Randolph's centers of commerce, cultural and other common interests, including the Gifford Medical Center.

Members of the Boards of Civil Authority of Randolph, Braintree, Brookfield and Roxbury meet on July 26, 2011, and their discussions are reflected in the Minutes of the Randolph Board of Civil Authority of that date. Although no vote was taken regarding the Apportionment Board's proposal and the Randolph participants favored remaining in the current two-member district, suggestions were made that the line dividing Randolph would be better drawn differently as shown on the map attached to those Minutes. The Apportionment Board has revised its proposal to follow that suggested line.

Orange-Washington-1

The Orange-Washington-1 single-member district consists of the Orange County towns of Braintree and Brookfield, that portion of Randolph not included in the Orange-5 district, plus the Washington County town of Roxbury. The district's 2010 population was 4,017 residents.

Currently, Braintree, Brookfield and all of Randolph are in the two-member Orange-Addison district, together with the Addison County town of Granville. Roxbury is currently in the two-member Washington-2 district with Moretown and Northfield.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Braintree, Brookfield and Randolph made up a two-member district, while Roxbury was in a two-member district with Moretown and Northfield. In 1974, Braintree, Brookfield and Randolph were associated with Bethel in a two-member district, while Roxbury went with Berlin and Northfield in a two-member district in 1974 and 1965. In 1965, Randolph and Braintree were in a two-member district with Bethel, while Brookfield was placed in a two-member district with Williamstown, Chelsea, Corinth, Topsham and Washington.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Roxbury was in a two-member district with Moretown and

Northfield. In 1974 and 1965, Roxbury was combined with Berlin and Northfield in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 4,017 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is only 155 under the ideal district, a deviation of -3.72%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.54 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.43. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Roxbury is a Washington County town, while the rest of this district lies in Orange County. Braintree, Brookfield and Randolph are all members of the Two-Rivers Ottauquechee Regional Commission and Environmental Commission #6 for Act 250 and other state land use purposes; Roxbury is not. Roxbury sends its students to Northfield High School, while the other towns in this district send theirs to Randolph Union High School.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 12 connects Randolph, Braintree and Brookfield and Roxbury. As for commercial centers, Roxbury looks to Northfield, Braintree to Randolph and Brookfield to either Randolph or Barre-Montpelier.

Members of the Boards of Civil Authority of Randolph, Braintree, Brookfield and Roxbury meet on July 26, 2011, and their discussions are reflected in the Minutes of the Randolph Board of Civil Authority of that date. Although no vote was taken regarding the Apportionment Board's proposal and the Randolph participants favored remaining in the current two-member district, suggestions were made that the line dividing Randolph would be better drawn differently as shown on the map attached to those Minutes. The Apportionment Board has revised its proposal to follow that suggested line.

Orange-Washington-2

The Orange-Washington-2 single-member district consists of all of the Orange County town of Williamstown, plus 451 residents from Barre Town. Its 2010 population is 3,840 residents.

Williamstown currently is in the two-member Orange-1 district, with the Orange County towns of Chelsea, Corinth, Orange, Vershire and Washington. Barre Town currently is a two-member district by itself, the Washington-4 district.

In 1992, Williamstown and Washington were part of a two-member district with Chelsea, Orange, Tunbridge and Vershire. In 1982, Williamstown and Washington joined Chelsea, Orange Topsham and Tunbridge in a two-member district. In 1974, Williamstown was linked with part of Barre City and Barre Town in a single-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan made a two-member district out of Williamstown, Washington,

Chelsea, Corinth and Topsham.

The 1992, 1982 and 1974 plans gave Barre Town a two-person district. In the first apportionment, in 1965, Barre Town and Orange shared a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 3,840 residents under the 2010 Census, this district has 332 fewer residents than the ideal district, a deviation of -7.96.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.63 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.65. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Williamstown is an Orange County town, while Barre Town a Washington County town and is subdivided under this proposal. Williamstown and Barre Town are in separate school districts but they are both in District Environmental District 5.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 14 connects Williamstown to this section of Barre Town. Williamstown looks to Barre City, lying in the middle of Barre Town, as its principal commercial center.

On July 27, the Barre Town Board of Civil Authority reviewed the Apportionment Board's proposals for the three districts involving Barre Town: Orange-Washington-2, Washington-7-3 and Washington-7-4. It voted to recommend keeping the town intact and in its current two-member district, its district since 1982. The Minutes of that meeting set forth the reasons for the vote. As the Apportionment Board has noted elsewhere in this report, the districting for Barre Town reflects efforts to respond to its concerns, the need to balance population deviations, and a division on the Board over the priority to be given to single-member districts.

Orleans County

Currently, the 19 Orleans County towns are placed in three two-member districts and one single-member district (and Westmore is in the single-member Essex-Caledonia-Orleans district), with population deviations ranging from a high of +15.03% (Orleans-Franklin-1, Jay, Lowell, Westfield, Troy and Montgomery) to a low of -4.0% (Orleans-1, Brownington, Charleston, Derby, Holland and Morgan). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +10.00% (Orleans-2, Newport City) to a low of -7.48% (Orleans-Lamoille-Caledonia-1, Craftsbury, Greensboro, Wolcott and Stannard).

Derby's Board of Civil Authority objected to the initial plan's proposal to subdivide the town; the other towns in the proposed Orleans-5 district (Brownington, Charleston, Holland and Morgan) did not file reports with the Apportionment Board. Coventry

reported that as a small town, it preferred the initial plan's proposal to place it in a new single-member district with three other small towns, as opposed to its current two-member district. One of those small towns, Coventry, on the other hand, prefers being in the current two-member district. Lowell strongly prefers to remain in a district with towns to its north instead of the initial plan's proposal to group it with Irasburg, Coventry and Albany. Lowell proposed a preferred district, but its population deviation came in at +24%. Craftsbury, Greensboro, Albany and Glover all reported they want to be together in a single-member district. Wolcott adamantly opposed inclusion in a district with two Orleans County towns. Newport City¹² and Newport Town, and six other towns, did not file reports.

The Apportionment Board agreed to not split Derby, leaving the current Orleans-1 two-member district intact. The Board arranged the district lines to put Glover, Craftsbury, Greensboro and Albany together, as they all requested. Wolcott's request was granted, and the final proposal places it in with Elmore and Morristown. The final plan puts Stannard back into its current district with Hardwick and Walden, as it requested. The Board did not reconcile the divergent preferences of Irasburg, Lowell and Coventry, and kept them together with a portion of Newport City large enough to achieve a reasonable population deviation.

The Board's final plan proposes five single-member districts for the Orleans County towns (with Westmore remaining in its current single-member Essex-Caledonia-Orleans-1 single-member district). The resulting deviations range from a high of +3.64% (Orleans-2, Barton, Sheffield and Wheelock) to a low of -7.67% (Orleans-1-2, Coventry, Irasburg, Lowell and a portion of Newport City).

Orleans-1-1

The Orleans-1-1 district consists of all of Newport City with the exception of that portion in the Orleans-1-2 district, with a 2010 population of 3,865 residents.

Under the current plan, Newport City is in the Orleans-2 two-member district with Coventry, Irasburg and the town of Newport.

The 1992 reapportionment placed Newport City in a two-member district with Coventry, Irasburg and the town of Newport. In the 1982 plan, the Newport City, the town of Newport and Coventry were a two-member district. In the 1974 plan, Newport City, the town of Newport and Coventry joined in a two-member district with Brownington. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Newport City and the town of Newport formed a two-member district by themselves.

Substantial Equality. With 3,865 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 307 under the ideal district, a deviation of -7.36%.

¹² As with Richmond and Stowe, Newport City was in a single-member district by itself in the initial proposal and was therefore not sent the plan for comment.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.47 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.39. As a single-member district encompassing nearly the entire City, this district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This Newport City district is entirely within Orleans County. Newport City is a member of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association and of the North Country Union High School District. Additionally, it is part of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. This proposal subdivides a portion of Newport City containing 724 residents in order to keep the deviation in the Orleans-1-2 district at an acceptable level. This is not desirable, but the Board found no reasonable alternative that preserved the deviation solutions to the other districts in this area.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. As the area's commercial hub, the district serves as its own source of common interests for business.

Orleans-1-2

The Orleans-1 single-member district consists of the Orleans County towns of Coventry, Irasburg, Lowell and 724 residents of the southwesterly portion of Newport City, with a 2010 population of 3,852.

Coventry and Irasburg are now in the two-member Orleans-2 district, with the town of Newport and Newport City. Lowell is in the single-member Orleans-Franklin-1 district with the Orleans County towns of Troy and Westfield, and the Franklin County town of Montgomery.

The 1992 reapportionment plan placed Irasburg and Coventry in a two-member district with Newport City and the town of Newport, and put Lowell, Jay, Troy and Westfield together with Montgomery in a single-member district. In the 1982 and 1974 plans, Irasburg, Lowell, Jay, Troy and Westfield made up a single-member district. In 1965, the year of the first apportionment plan, Coventry and Irasburg were part of a two-member district with Barton, Brownington, Glover and Westmore, while Lowell, Jay, Troy and Westfield shared a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 3,852 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 320 under the ideal district, a deviation of -7.67%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.34 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.37. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Orleans County. These towns are members of the

Northeastern Vermont Development Association and Newport City, Lowell and Coventry are members of the North Country Union High School District. Irasburg is a member of the Lake Region Union High School District. Additionally, they are all part of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. This proposal subdivides a portion of Newport City containing 724 residences in order to keep the deviation in the new district at an acceptable level. This is not desirable, but the Board found no reasonable alternative that preserved the deviation solutions to the other districts in this area.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 5 and 14 link Coventry to Irasburg, while Lowell is connected to Irasburg by Route 58. The commercial center is Newport City

At its July 20, 2011 meeting, the Coventry Board of Civil Authority voted to oppose the Apportionment Board's initial plan (which included Albany in this grouping of towns), and in favor of retaining the existing Orleans-2 two-member district. At its July 25 meeting, the Irasburg Board of Civil Authority voted to support the initial plan, citing the benefits to Irasburg of being in a smaller district, and concerns about being dominated by Newport City in the existing two-member Orleans-2 district. At its July 28, 2011 meeting, the Lowell Board of Civil Authority voted to oppose the Apportionment Board's initial plan, explaining that it has significantly more in common with the towns of Jay, Troy and Westfield that with Lowell lie in the "Missisquoi Valley Corridor" between the Lowell Mountain Range and the Long Trail ridgeline. Newport City did not file a report commenting on the initial plan, as the tentative proposal had originally placed the entirety of the City in a single-member district.

The Apportionment Board tried to reconcile these responses with the population deviation challenges of the Orleans County towns and their neighboring towns, but was not successful.

Orleans-2¹³

The Orleans-2 single-member district consists of the Orleans County town of Barton, and the Caledonia County towns of Sheffield and Wheelock, with a 2010 population of 4,324 residents.

Currently, Barton, Sheffield and Wheelock are in the two-member Orleans-Caledonia-1 district with the Orleans County towns of Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro.

Sheffield and Wheelock were together with the Orleans County towns of Albany, Barton, Craftsbury, Glover, Greensboro and Westmore as a two-member district under the 1992 plan. In 1982, Sheffield and Wheelock were linked with Danville and Peacham as part of a single-member district. In the 1974 and 1965 plans, Sheffield and Wheelock joined Burke, East Haven, Lyndon, Newark and Sutton in a two-member district.

¹³ Note – Because this district crosses county lines, it should have been named Caledonia-Orleans-1.

The 1992 plan placed Barton and Glover in a two-member district with the Orleans County towns of Albany, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro, and the Caledonia County towns of Sheffield and Wheelock. In 1982, Barton, Glover, Albany, Craftsbury and Greensboro were linked with Westmore in a single-member district. In the 1974 plan, Barton, Glover, Albany, Craftsbury and Greensboro were linked with Wolcott in a two-member district. Under the first apportionment plan, from 1965, Barton and Glover were part of a two-member district with Brownington, Coventry, Irasburg and Westmore.

Substantial Equality. With 4,324 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 152 higher than the ideal district, a deviation of +3.64%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.29 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.44. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is in both Orleans County and Caledonia County. These towns are members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association, and all are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #7 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Barton sends students to Lake Region Union High School in Orleans, while Sheffield and Wheelock are members of the Millers Run Union School District.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 91 links Sheffield and Barton. Sheffield and Wheelock have local road connections, and Lyndonville is a hub that both have in common. Barton, Lyndonville and St. Johnsbury are the commercial centers serving this district.

Orleans-3

The Orleans-3 two-member district consists of the Orleans County towns of Brownington, Charleston, Derby, Holland and Morgan. The district has 8,010 residents according to the 2010 Census.

All of these towns are currently in the Orleans-1 two-member district.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Brownington, Charleston, Derby, Holland and Morgan also formed a two-member district. In the 1974 plan, Brownington was aligned with Coventry, the town of Newport and Newport City in a two-member district; Charleston and Morgan were included in a single-member district with Brighton and Westmore; and Derby and Holland shared a single-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan made Brownington part of a two-member district with Barton, Coventry, Glover, Irasburg and Westmore; Charleston part of a single-member district with Brighton and Norton; and Derby, Holland and Morgan as another single-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 8,010 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 334 shy of the ideal district, a deviation of -4.00.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.58 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.50. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Orleans County. These towns are members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association, and all are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Charleston, Derby, Holland and Morgan are members of the North Country Union High School District, while Brownington is a member of the Lake Region Union High School District.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 5A links Brownington, Charleston and Derby. Route 111 crosses through Morgan into Derby. Two town roads lead into Holland from Morgan. The Clyde River runs from Charleston into Derby and is fed by waters from Seymour Lake in Morgan. Newport City is the commercial center for these towns.

Orleans-4

This district consists of the Orleans County towns of Albany, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro in a single-member district with a 2010 population of 4,031 residents.

Under the current (2002) plan, Albany, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro are in the two-member Orleans-Caledonia-1 district with the Caledonia County towns of Sheffield, Wheelock and Barton.

The 1992 plan placed Albany, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro in a two-member district together with Barton, and the Caledonia County towns of Sheffield and Wheelock. In 1982, Albany, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro were combined with Barton and Westmore in a single-member district. In the 1974 plan, Albany, Craftsbury, Glover and Greensboro were linked with Barton and Wolcott in a two-member district. The first apportionment plan, from 1965, brought together Albany, Craftsbury and Greensboro with Albany and Stannard to form a single-member district; and Glover joined with Barton, Brownington, Coventry, Irasburg and Westmore in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. With 4,031 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 141 under the ideal district, a deviation of -3.38%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.61 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.74. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

These towns all are within Orleans County. All are under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #7 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Craftsbury sends its high school students to Craftsbury Academy. Albany and Glover are members of the Lake Region Union High School District, while Greensboro is a member of the Hazen Union High School District.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 14 and local roads connect Albany to Craftsbury and Greensboro; Glover is linked to Craftsbury via Mud Island Road to South Albany Road. Route 16 connects Glover and Greensboro. Hardwick serves as the center of much commerce for these towns.

Orleans-5

The Orleans-5 single-member district consists of the Orleans County towns of Jay, Newport, Troy and Westfield, with a 2010 population of 4,313.

Under the current (2002) plan, Jay, Troy and Westfield are in the Orleans-Franklin-1 single-member district, and the town of Newport is in the Orleans-2 two-member district with Coventry, Irasburg and Newport City.

The 1992 reapportionment plan put Jay, Troy and Westfield together with Lowell and Montgomery in a single-member district. In the 1982 and 1974 plans, Jay, Troy and Westfield combined with Irasburg and Lowell to make up a single-member district. Under the first reapportionment plan in 1965, Jay, Troy, Westfield and Lowell shared a single-member district

The 1992 reapportionment placed the town of Newport in a two-member district with Coventry, Irasburg and Newport City. In the 1982 plan, the town of Newport, Coventry and Newport City were a two-member district. In the 1974 plan, the town of Newport, Coventry and Newport City joined in a two-member district with Brownington. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, the town of Newport and Newport City formed a two-member district by themselves.

Substantial Equality. With 4,313 residents under the 2010 Census, this district is 141 over the ideal district, a deviation of +3.38%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.58 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.50. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

This district is entirely within Orleans County. These towns are also members of the Northeastern Vermont Development Association and of the North Country Union High

School District. Additionally, they are all part of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 105, 101, 242 and 100 interconnect the towns in this district. The commercial center is Newport City

Rutland County

The 28 Rutland County towns currently are distributed among 14 single-member districts (including three districts shared with Windsor County towns and one district shared with Bennington County towns) and two, two-member districts. The current population deviations generally are negative or flat, ranging from a high of +2.21% (Rutland-5-4, a portion of Rutland City)¹⁴ to a low of -16.37 (Rutland-1-2, Clarendon, Ira, Proctor and West Rutland). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +8.49% (Rutland-1, Brandon and Sudbury) to a low of -7.57% (Rutland-Bennington-1, Pawlet, Tinmouth, Wells and a portion of Rupert).

Twenty Rutland County towns filed reports with comments and recommendations. The Apportionment Board attempted to satisfy as many requests as the significant low population deviations and contiguity requirements allowed. In this County in particular, local solutions that worked for a grouping of two, three or four towns created map conundrums not far away.

The Board agreed with Benson's concerns and recommends keeping it in its current district. West Haven, Fair Haven, Castleton, Hubbardton and Pittsford, at a meeting convened at their request by Board member Gerry Gossens, spoke unanimously and strongly against the initial proposals of Rutland-2, Rutland-3-1 and Rutland-3-2. The Board restored the current Rutland-2 two-member district (Castleton, Fair Haven, Hubbardton and West Haven), but was unable to fully grant the requests of Pittsford and Brandon. The towns along the spine of the Green Mountains historically have presented deviation problems and contiguity challenges during the reapportionment process, and this time around was no different. The Board believes that it gave at least partial relief to the concerns expressed by Weston, Mount Holly, Wallingford, Shrewsbury, Ira, Middletown Springs and Pittsfield, and has hope that the General Assembly can do better. The initial and final Board plans leave the four Rutland City districts unchanged.

The Apportionment Board's final plan proposes eleven single-member districts and two, two-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +10.28% (Rutland-Bennington-1, Middletown Springs, Pawlet, Tinmouth, Wells and a portion of Rupert) to a low of -7.38% (Rutland-6, Ira and Poultney).

¹⁴ The Windsor-Rutland-2 district has a positive +6.69% deviation, but it contains only one Rutland County town, Pittsfield.

Rutland-1

The Rutland-1 district consists of the Rutland County towns of Brandon and Sudbury. The district's 2010 population was 4,526.

Brandon currently comprises the Rutland-7 one-member district, while Sudbury is in the one-member Rutland-6 district with Pittsford.

In 1992 and 1982, Brandon joined Pittsford in a two-member district. In 1974, Brandon was combined with Sudbury in a single-member district. Under the first apportionment, in 1965, Brandon, Pittsford and Goshen were together in a two-member district. The 1992 and 1982 plans put Sudbury into a two-member district with the Addison County towns of Goshen, Leicester, Ripton, Salisbury, Whiting and Hancock. The 1965 apportionment plan placed Sudbury in a single-member district with Castleton and Hubbardton.

Substantial Equality. The 4,526 population of this district is 354 more than the 4,172 ideal, a deviation of +8.49%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.52 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.61. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Both towns are in Rutland County. Both are members of the Otter Valley Union High School District, and both are under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 73 connects these two towns. The commercial centers serving the district are Rutland and Brandon.

Rutland-2

The Rutland-2 two-member district consists of Castleton, Fair Haven, Hubbardton and West Haven, with a 2010 population of 8,421.

These four towns comprise the existing Rutland-2 district.

The 1992 reapportionment plan made Castleton, Fair Haven and West Haven a two-member district. In 1982, Castleton, Fair Haven and West Haven joined Hubbardton in a two-member district. In 1974, Castleton was linked with Poultney and Wells in a two-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan placed Castleton with Hubbardton and Sudbury in a single-member district; and Fair Haven was a single-member district by itself.

The 1992 reapportionment plan put Hubbardton with Benson, Orwell and Shoreham in a single-member district. In 1974, Hubbardton and West Haven were part of a single-member district with Benson, Orwell and Shoreham. The 1965 apportionment plan placed West Haven with Benson, Orwell, Shoreham and Whiting in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 8,421 population of this district is 77 greater than the 8,344 ideal, a deviation of +0.92%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.42 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.29. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of these towns are in Rutland County and are under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Each is a member of the Fair Haven Union High School District.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 22A connects West Haven and Fair Haven; Routes 4 and 4A connect Fair Haven to Castleton, and Route 30 connects Castleton to Hubbardton. Fair Haven has the largest commercial district of these four towns, but much commerce for them is found in Rutland.

Rutland-3

The Rutland-3 district consists of Proctor and West Rutland, with a 2010 population of 4,067.

Proctor and West Rutland are currently in the Rutland-1-2 two-member district with Clarendon and Ira.

In 1992 and 1982, Proctor and West Rutland formed a two-member district with Clarendon and Ira. In 1974, West Rutland and Ira were joined with Middletown Springs in a single-member district, while Proctor was a member of a two-member district with Chittenden, Pittsford and Sherburne (Killington). The first apportionment plan, in 1965, put Proctor and West Rutland each in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,067 population of this district is 105 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -2.52%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.35. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Both towns are in Rutland County and under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Both towns are in the Rutland Central Supervisory Union, and each has its own high school

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. A ridgeline separates Proctor from West Rutland, and no roads go directly from one to the other. Travel between the two towns is by Route 3 through Proctor, into a portion of Rutland Town known as Center Rutland, and then over to West Rutland on Route 4. Rutland is the commercial center serving the district.

Neither of these towns responded to this proposal in the initial plan

Rutland-4

The Rutland-4 district consists of Rutland Town, with a 2010 population of 4,054.

Rutland Town is currently in the Rutland-4 single-member district.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Rutland town was its own single-member district. In 1974, Rutland Town and a part of Rutland City shared a single-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Rutland Town was split between a part that shared a two-member district with Rutland City and another part that shared a two-member district with Chittenden and Mendon.

Substantial Equality. The 4,054 population of this district is 118 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -2.83%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.42 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.16. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Rutland Town is within Rutland County, is a member of the Rutland County Planning Commission, and is under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 4 and 4A are the principal east-west highways; Routes 7 and 3 are the principal north-south routes. The commercial center serving the district is Rutland Town and Rutland City.

Rutland-5-1, 5-2, 5-3 and 5-4

Rutland City makes up Rutland-5-1, 5-2, 5-3 and 5-4. With a population of 16,495, it is entitled to four House seats.

Rutland City currently is divided into the Rutland 5-1, 5-2, 5-3 and 5-4 single-member districts.

The 1992 and 1982 reapportionment plans gave Rutland City one two-member district and three single-member districts. In 1974, Rutland City had three two-member districts and one single-member district. In 1965, the City had three two-member districts and split a fourth two-member district with Rutland Town.

Substantial Equality. The population of Rutland-5-1 is 4,134 or 38 fewer residents than a perfect district (a deviation of -0.91%). Rutland-5-2, at 3,998 residents, is 174 fewer than the norm (a deviation of -4.17%). Rutland-5-3 has 4,099, which is 73 fewer than an ideal district (a deviation of -1.75%). Rutland 5-4, with 4,264 residents, is 92 greater than the ideal (a deviation of +2.21%).

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, these districts earns the following scores: Rutland-5-1 earns a Roeck score of 0.45 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.45. Rutland-5-2 earns a Roeck score of 0.60 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.64. Rutland-5-3 earns a Roeck score of 0.57 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.60. Rutland-5-4 earns a Roeck score of 0.50 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.48. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Rutland City is the shire town of Rutland County, is a member of the Rutland County Planning Commission and the Rutland County Solid Waste District, and is under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 7 is the principal north-south highway; Route 4 and 4A run east and west through the City. The commercial center serving the district is Rutland City.

Rutland-6

The Rutland-7 district consists of Ira and Poultney, with a 2010 population of 3,864.

Currently, Poultney and a portion of Ira form the single-member Rutland-1-1 district. The other part of Ira currently is in the two-member Rutland-1-2 district with Clarendon, Proctor and West Rutland.

The 1992 and 1982 reapportionment plans gave Poultney a single-member district by itself. In 1974, Poultney was part of a two-member district with Castleton and Wells. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made Poultney a single-member district by itself.

In 1992 and 1982, Ira was combined with Clarendon, Proctor and West Rutland to form a two-member district. In 1974, Ira joined West Rutland and Middletown Springs in a single-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, put Ira in a two-

member district with Danby, Clarendon, Middletown Springs, Mount Tabor, Shrewsbury, Tinmouth and Wallingford.

Substantial Equality. The 3,864 population of this district is 308 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -7.38%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.38. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Both towns are in Rutland County and under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Poultney has its own high school. Ira sends its high school students to Poultney.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. There are no roads directly between Ira and Poultney. One must use Route 140 through Middletown Springs and then Route 133, to get to Ira from Poultney or, alternatively, Route 30 north from Poultney, west on Route 4, and then south on Route 133. Rutland is the commercial center serving the district.

By report dated July 19, 2011, the Ira Board of Civil Authority commented on the Apportionment Board's initial proposal (which proposed to put Ira in a single-member district with Clarendon and Shrewsbury). The report strongly supported reuniting all of Ira in a single House district, and expressed some concern about losing a second representative (going from a two- to a single-member district). Poultney did not file a report with the Board.

Rutland-7

The Rutland-7 district consists of Chittenden and Pittsford, with a 2010 population of 4,249 residents.

Pittsford is now in the one-member Rutland-6 district with Sudbury. Chittenden is currently in the single-member Rutland-Windsor-1 district with Killington, Mendon and Bridgewater.

The 1992 and 1982 plans put Pittsford with Brandon in a two-member district. In the 1974 plan, Pittsford joined Proctor, Chittenden and Sherburne (now Killington) in a two-member district. Under the first apportionment, in 1965, Pittsford was combined with Brandon and Goshen in a two-member district.

Under the 1992 apportionment plan, Chittenden was currently in the same single-member Rutland-Windsor-1 district with Killington, Mendon and Bridgewater as in the 2002 plan. In 1982, Chittenden, together with Mendon and Killington joined Shrewsbury in a single-member district. In 1974, Chittenden was in a single-member district with Killington,

Pittsford and Proctor. The first apportionment, in 1965, placed Chittenden in a single-member district with Mendon and Rutland Town.

Substantial Equality. The 4249 population of this district is 77 more than the 4,172 ideal, a deviation of +1.85%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.48 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.48. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These towns are in Rutland County and are under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. Pittsford is a member of the Otter Valley Union High School District. Chittenden tuitions its students to a high school of choice, generally either Otter Valley U.H.S. in Brandon or one of the Rutland City schools, Rutland High School or Mount St. Joseph.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Local roads link Chittenden and Pittsford. The commercial center serving the district is Rutland.

Rutland-Bennington-1

The Rutland-Bennington-1 district consists of Middletown Springs, Pawlet, Tinmouth, Wells and 616 residents of Rupert, with a 2010 population of 4,601 residents.

Middletown Springs, Pawlet, Wells and this portion of Rupert are currently in the single-member Rutland-8 district. Tinmouth currently is in the Rutland-3 single-member district with Shrewsbury and Wallingford.

The 1992 and 1982 reapportionment plans placed Middletown Springs, Pawlet and Wells with Rupert in a single-member district. In 1974, Middletown Springs shared a single-member district with Ira and West Rutland, and Wells was in a two-member district with Castleton and Poultney. The 1974 plan had Pawlet, Rupert and Danby together in a single-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made a two-member district out of Middletown Springs, Tinmouth, Danby, Mount Tabor, Clarendon, Ira, Shrewsbury and Wallingford. In the 1965 plan, Rupert, Pawlet and Wells formed a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,601 population of this district is 429 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +10.28%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.39 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.43. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions.

Middletown Springs, Pawlet, Tinmouth and Wells are in Rutland County, and Pawlet is in Bennington County, and are in their respective Environmental Districts (#1 for Rutland County and # 8 for Bennington County). Poultney has its own high school. Pawlet and Rupert are members of the Currier Unified Elementary School District. Schools from Middletown Springs, Poultney, Tinmouth and Wells form the Rutland Southwest Supervisory Union.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Routes 30 and 153 link Rupert to Pawlet. Route 30 continues from Pawlet north to Poultney, and Route 140 runs east from there to Middletown Springs and then on to Tinmouth. Fair Haven and Rutland are the commercial centers serving the district.

Rutland-Windsor-1

The Rutland County towns of Killington, Mendon and Pittsfield join the Windsor County town of Bridgewater and Stockbridge in a single-member district with a 2010 population of 4,088 residents.

Bridgewater, Killington and Mendon are currently in the single-member Rutland-Windsor-1 district with the Rutland County town of Chittenden. Pittsfield and Stockbridge are currently in the single-member Windsor-Rutland-2 district with Bethel and Rochester.

Bridgewater. In 1992, Bridgewater was in a single-member district with Chittenden, Killington and Mendon. In 1982, Bridgewater was part of a two-member district with Barnard, Plymouth, Pomfret, Reading and Woodstock. In 1974, Bridgewater was combined with Barnard, Plymouth, Reading and Woodstock in a two-member district. The first apportionment, in 1965, placed Bridgewater in a two-member district with Barnard, Killington, Plymouth, Pomfret and Woodstock.

Killington. The 1992 apportionment plan put Killington in a single-member district with Bridgewater, Chittenden and Mendon. In 1982, Killington was joined with Chittenden, Mendon and Shrewsbury in a single-member district. In 1974, Killington was with Chittenden, Pittsford and Proctor in a single-member district. The first apportionment, in 1965, placed Killington in a two-member district with Barnard, Bridgewater, Plymouth, Pomfret and Woodstock.

Mendon. In 1992, Mendon was in a single-member district with Bridgewater, Chittenden and Killington. In 1982, Mendon was joined with Chittenden, Killington and Shrewsbury in a single-member district. In 1974, Mendon was in a two-member district with Clarendon and Shrewsbury. The first apportionment, in 1965, placed Mendon in a single-member district with Chittenden and Rutland Town.

Pittsfield. In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Pittsfield was combined with Bethel, Rochester and Stockbridge in a single-member district. In 1974, Pittsfield was joined with

Rochester, Stockbridge, Goshen, Granville and Hancock in a single-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made a single-member district out of Pittsfield, Rochester, Stockbridge, Granville and Hancock.

Stockbridge. In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Stockbridge was combined with Bethel, Pittsfield and Rochester in a single-member district. In 1974, Stockbridge was joined with Pittsfield, Rochester, Goshen, Granville and Hancock in a single-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made a single-member district out of Stockbridge, Pittsfield, Rochester, Granville and Hancock.

Substantial Equality. The 4,088 population of this district is 84 less than the ideal, a deviation of -2.01%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.49 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.45. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Three of these towns are in Rutland County and three are in Windsor County. Bridgewater and Killington are in the Woodstock U.H.S.D. The other towns in this district are not members of a union high school district, and none has its own high school. The towns are in the Environmental District associated with their respective counties, likewise with their regional planning organizations.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 100 connects Pittsfield to Stockbridge, and then runs on to Killington and Bridgewater. Killington connects with Mendon by Route 4, which also connects Killington to Bridgewater. These towns share narrow valleys and high peaks, and also share in the year-round tourism economy generated by the Killington resort and nearby recreational centers. The Green Mountain National Forest is in Pittsfield and Stockbridge.

Rutland-Windsor-2

The Rutland-Windsor-2 two-member district consists of the Rutland County towns of Clarendon, Mount Holly, Shrewsbury and Wallingford, and the Windsor County town of Ludlow. Its 2010 population was 8,906 residents.

Ludlow and Mount Holly currently are in the Windsor-Rutland-1 single member district with Plymouth. Shrewsbury and Wallingford are now in the single-member Rutland-3 district with Tinmouth. Clarendon is currently in the two-member Rutland-1-2 district with Proctor, West Rutland and a portion of Ira.

Clarendon. In 1992 and 1982, Clarendon joined Ira, Proctor and West Rutland in a two-member district. In 1974, Clarendon was part of a single-member district with Mendon and Shrewsbury. Under the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Clarendon was combined with Ira, Danby, Middletown Springs, Mount Tabor, Shrewsbury, Tinmouth and

Wallingford in a two-member district.

Ludlow. The 1992 reapportionment put Ludlow with Shrewsbury and Plymouth in a single-member district. In the 1982 and 1974 plans, Ludlow was combined with Cavendish and Weathersfield in a two-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, combined Ludlow with Mount Holly, Londonderry and Weston in a two-member district.

Mount Holly. The 1992 reapportionment put Mount Holly in a single-member district with Tinmouth, Wallingford, Mount Holly and Mount Tabor. In the 1982 plan, Mount Holly, along with Tinmouth and Wallingford, formed a single-member district. The 1974 plan put Mount Holly together with Mount Tabor, Tinmouth and Wallingford in a two-member district. Under the 1965 apportionment plan, Mount Holly joined with Ludlow, Londonderry and Weston in a two-member district.

Shrewsbury. The 1992 reapportionment put Shrewsbury with Ludlow and Plymouth in a single-member district. In the 1982 plan, Shrewsbury was part of a single-member district with Chittenden, Mendon and Sherburne (Killington). The 1974 plan put Shrewsbury with Clarendon and Mendon in a single-member district. The first apportionment, in 1965, joined Shrewsbury with seven other towns (Tinmouth, Wallingford, Clarendon, Danby, Ira, Middletown Springs and Mount Tabor) in a two-member district.

Wallingford. The 1992 reapportionment put Wallingford in a single-member district with Tinmouth, Mount Holly and Mount Tabor. In the 1982 plan, Wallingford was combined with Tinmouth and Mount Holly in a single-member district. The 1974 plan put Wallingford together with Mount Holly, Mount Tabor and Tinmouth in a single-member district. The first apportionment, in 1965, joined Wallingford with seven other towns (Shrewsbury, Tinmouth, Clarendon, Danby, Ira, Middletown Springs and Mount Tabor) in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 8,906 population of this district is 562 more than the ideal, a deviation of +6.74%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.44 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.52. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Four of these towns are in Rutland County and one is in Windsor County. Clarendon, Shrewsbury and Wallingford are in the Mill River U.H.S.D.; Ludlow and Mount Holly are in the Black River U.H.S.D. The towns are in the Environmental District associated with their respective counties, likewise with their regional planning organizations.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 7 connects Wallingford and Clarendon; Route 103 connects Clarendon

to Shrewsbury and continues on to East Wallingford and Mount Holly and Ludlow. Wallingford, Shrewsbury and Clarendon orient to Rutland for their commerce and other common interests; Mount Holly may look both west to Rutland and east to Ludlow for its commerce and common interests; Ludlow is its own commercial center.

Washington County

The 20 Washington County towns currently are distributed among seven single-member districts and two, two-member districts (including one shared with Buel's Gore and Huntington in Chittenden County). The current population deviations range from a high of +14.50% (Washington-1, Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren) to a low of -9.18 (Washington-3-3, Berlin and a portion of Barre City). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +9.13% (Washington-8, Berlin and a portion of Northfield) to a low of -9.06% (Washington-5, Waitsfield, Warren and a portion of Fayston).

Sixteen of these towns filed reports with comments and recommendations. The most common response was a desire to remain in the status quo district (e.g., Calais, Worcester and Duxbury). Northfield and Montpelier strongly opposed the Board's initial plan to split them into single-member districts, and Northfield expressed a strong desire to remain in a district with Roxbury. Roxbury cited strong school, social, economic and geographic ties and affinities to Northfield in opposition to the initial plan's proposal to place it in a district with Orange County towns. Notwithstanding its lawsuit challenging the 2002 plan, Worcester has grown to like its current district and prefers to stay in it, as is. Moretown, Plainfield and East Montpelier endorsed the initial plan. Barre City supports the initial plan's proposal to continue its two single-member districts, but made a counter proposal for the shared district with Barre Town that appears to be untenable in terms of population.

The Apportionment Board attempted to satisfy as many requests as was consistent with acceptable population deviations and the statutory contiguity requirement. The Board restored the Montpelier two-member district, but after many tries was unable to figure out a way to satisfy Northfield's and Roxbury's concerns and still make the central Vermont map work. Establishing a two-member district for the Mad River Valley towns, and including Duxbury with them, seemed the best solution for them, understanding that this does not suit Duxbury which wants to remain in a two-member district with Waterbury. The Board's final proposal for the Washington-4 and Washington-5 districts meets the requests of some of those towns but not all of them.

The Apportionment Board's final plan proposes eight single-member districts and three, two-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +9.13% (Washington-2-2, Berlin and a portion of Northfield) to a low of -6.86% (Washington-4, Duxbury, Fayston, Moretown, Waitsfield and Warren).

Washington-1

The Washington-1 district consists of most of the town of Waterbury, less the residents in the Chittenden-Washington-1 district. The district's 2010 population was 3,978.

The entire town of Waterbury currently is in the two-member Washington-Chittenden-1 district with the Washington County town of Duxbury, the Chittenden County town of Huntington, and Chittenden County's Buel's Gore.

Likewise, in 1992 and 1982, Waterbury was combined with Buel's Gore, Huntington and Duxbury in a two-member district. In 1974, Waterbury joined Duxbury, Middlesex and Worcester in a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Waterbury went with Middlesex and Worcester in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 3,978 population of this district is 194 fewer residents than the 4,172 ideal, a deviation of -4.65%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.42 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.47. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district splits Waterbury into two different House districts, the other of which crosses the Washington County-Chittenden County line. Waterbury is a member of the Mad River Solid Waste Alliance and the Harwood Union High School District, and shares police and rescue services with Duxbury.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This district includes portions of the Village of Waterbury and portions of the town beyond the Village. Routes 100 and Interstate 89 are the dominant travel routes through the district. Waterbury serves as its own center of commerce.

Washington-2-1

The Washington-2-1 district consists of 4,541 of Northfield's 6,207 residents, being all of the town less the portion included in the Washington-2-1 district (roughly the Northfield Falls area).

The entire town of Northfield currently is in the two-member Washington-2 district with Moretown and Roxbury.

The 1992 and 1982 plans also placed Northfield with Moretown and Roxbury in a two-member district. The 1974 and 1965 plans put Northfield with Berlin and Roxbury in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,541 population of this district is 369 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +8.84%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.41 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.33. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district splits Northfield into two different House districts. Northfield has its own school district and high school.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The regional medical center, airport and shopping mall are located in Berlin. The commercial centers serving the district are Northfield, Barre and Montpelier.

Washington-2-2

The Washington-2-2 district consists of Berlin and the 1,666 residents of Northfield not contained in the Washington-2 district. The 2010 population of this proposed district was 4,553.

Currently, Berlin is in the single-member Washington-3-3 district with a portion of Barre City, and all of Northfield is in the two-member Washington-2 district with Moretown and Roxbury.

The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Northfield with Moretown and Roxbury in a two-member district. The 1992 plan placed Berlin with a part of Barre in a two-member district. In the 1982 plan, Berlin was joined with a part of Montpelier to form a single-member district. The 1974 and 1965 plans put Northfield with Berlin and Roxbury in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,553 population of this district is 381 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +9.13%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.36. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Berlin and Northfield are in Washington County, and are members of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission and the Central Vermont Solid Waste District. They are both within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #5 for Act 250 and other state land use purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 89 and Route 12 connect the two towns north and south. The Dog

River runs from Northfield to Berlin, where it meets the Winooski River, and Berlin Pond is fed by streams from the Northfield Range, which runs through both towns. The towns are also connected by the former Central Vermont Railroad. The regional medical center, airport and shopping mall are located in Berlin. The commercial centers serving the district are Northfield, Barre and Montpelier.

Washington-3

The Washington-3 district is the two-member district consisting of the City of Montpelier. The 2010 population of this district was 7,855.

The entire City of Montpelier currently is in the two-member Washington-5 district.

In 1992, Montpelier was subdivided into a two-member district and a single-member district with Elmore, Middlesex and Worcester. In the 1982 plan, Montpelier was subdivided into a two-member district by itself, while a part of the city was linked with Berlin in a single-member district. In 1974 and 1965, Montpelier had two single-member districts.

Substantial Equality. The 7,855 population of this district is 489 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -5.86%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.43. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Montpelier is the shire town of Washington County, and the capital of Vermont. It is a member of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission and the Central Vermont Solid Waste District. Montpelier has its own high school. The district is within the District #5 Environmental District for Act 250 and other state land use permits.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The City is served by Interstate 89 and Route 2 east and west, and Route 12 north and south. The Winooski River and the North Branch flow through the City. Montpelier is its own commercial center.

Washington-4

The Washington-4 two-member district combines Duxbury, Fayston, Moretown, Waitsfield and Warren, with a total district 2010 population of 7,772.

Currently, Moretown is in the two-member Washington-2 district with Northfield and Roxbury; Duxbury is in the two-member Washington-Chittenden-1 district with Waterbury, Huntington and Buel's Gore; and Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren now

comprise the single-member Washington-1 district.

Duxbury. In 1992 and 1982, Duxbury was joined with Buel's Gore, Huntington and Waterbury in a two-member district. In 1974, Duxbury was a part of a two-member district with Middlesex, Waterbury, Worcester. The 1965 apportionment plan put Duxbury in a single-member district with Fayston, Moretown, Waitsfield and Warren.

Fayston. Under the 1992 and 1982 plans, Fayston was part of a single-member district with Granville, Waitsfield and Warren. In 1974, Fayston was combined with Moretown, Waitsfield and Warren in a single-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan put Fayston in a two-member district with Duxbury, Moretown, Waitsfield and Warren.

Moretown. The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Moretown in a two-member district with Northfield and Roxbury. In 1974, Moretown was part of a single-member district with Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren. The 1965 apportionment plan put Moretown in a two-member district with Duxbury, Waitsfield and Warren.

Waitsfield. Under the 1992 and 1982 plans, Waitsfield was part of a single-member district with Fayston, Granville, Waitsfield and Warren. In 1974, Moretown joined Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren in a single-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan put Waitsfield in a two-member district with Duxbury, Fayston, Moretown, and Warren.

Warren. Under the 1992 and 1982 plans, Warren was part of a single-member district with Fayston, Granville, Waitsfield and Warren. In 1974, Moretown joined Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren in a single-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan put Waitsfield in a two-member district with Duxbury, Fayston, Moretown, and Waitsfield.

Substantial Equality. The 7,772 population of this district is 572 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -6.86%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.51 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.53. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These towns are contiguous, are all in Washington County and within the District #5 Environmental District for Act 250 and other state land use permits. These towns (plus Waterbury) form the Harwood Union High School District.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 100 is the connecting road through these towns (technically, Route 100 passes very close to Fayston, and one takes Center Fayston Road or Route 17 into Fayston from Route 100). Warren, Waitsfield and Fayston are commonly known as the Mad River Valley, and the Mad River runs down to the Winooski River through

Moretown. The Long Trail runs through Duxbury and Fayston. The commercial centers serving the district are Waterbury and Montpelier.

As was made clear from meetings involving members of the Boards of Civil Authority from these towns (and Waterbury), Duxbury and Waterbury identify strongly with each other and wish to remain together in a House district. Likewise, Fayston, Warren and Waitsfield strongly wish to remain together, ideally in a single-member district, or a district including them and Moretown. The ingenuity of the Apportionment Board was not up for the task of accommodating these competing interests and the positive 14.5% population deviation problem of the current Washington-1 district.

Washington-5

The Washington-6 district consists of Cabot, Marshfield and Plainfield, with a 2010 population of 4,264 residents.

Currently, Cabot is in the Caledonia-Washington-1 single-member district with the Caledonia County towns of Danville and Peacham. Marshfield and Plainfield are now in the single-member Washington-6 district with Calais.

The 1992 plan created a single-member district of Cabot, Danville and Peacham and a two-member district of Marshfield, Plainfield, Calais, East Montpelier and Woodbury. In the 1982 plan, Cabot, Marshfield and Plainfield were part of a two-member district with East Montpelier and Woodbury. The 1974 plan put Cabot, Marshfield and Calais together in a single-member district, and Plainfield and East Montpelier in a single-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made Cabot, Marshfield and Plainfield a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,264 population of this district is 92 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +2.21%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.39 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.54. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Cabot, Marshfield and Plainfield are Washington County towns, and members of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission. They are all within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #5 for Act 250 and other state land use purposes. Marshfield and Plainfield are members of the Twinfield U.S.D., and some Cabot students attend high school at Twinfield.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 2 connects all three towns; Route 215 runs from Marshfield Village to Cabot. The Winooski River runs through all three towns as well. Marshfield and Plainfield are members of the Twinfield U.S.D., and some Cabot students attend high

school at Twinfield. The commercial centers that serve the district include Hardwick, Barre and Montpelier.

Washington-6

The Washington-6 two-member district consists of Calais, East Montpelier, Middlesex, Woodbury and Worcester, with a 2010 population of 7,818 residents.

Currently, East Montpelier and Middlesex constitute the Washington-7 single-member district; Calais is in the single-member Washington-6 district with Marshfield and Plainfield; and Woodbury and Worcester are in the two-member Lamoille-Washington-1 district with Elmore and Morristown.

In 1992, East Montpelier joined with Calais, Woodbury, Marshfield and Plainfield in a two-member district, while Middlesex was combined with Worcester, Elmore and a part of Montpelier in a single-member district. In the 1982 plan, East Montpelier was combined with Cabot, Woodbury, Marshfield and Plainfield in two-member district, while Middlesex and Worcester joined Calais in a single-member district. The 1974 plan placed East Montpelier and Plainfield in a two-member district; and put Middlesex and Worcester in a two-member district with Duxbury and Waterbury. The first apportionment, in 1965, put East Montpelier, Calais and Woodbury together in a single-member district, and placed Middlesex with Worcester and Waterbury in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 7,818 population of this district is 526 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -6.30%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.49 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.43. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All five towns are Washington County towns and members of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission. Calais, East Montpelier, Middlesex and Woodbury are members of the Central Vermont Solid Waste District. They are all within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #5 for Act 250 and other state land use purposes. Calais, East Montpelier, Middlesex and Worcester are members of the U-32 U.H.S.D, while Woodbury is a member of Hazen Union H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 12 connects Middlesex and Worcester, and Route 14 runs north-south between Woodbury, Calais and East Montpelier. In addition, there are local roads, such as County Road, that connect the towns. The commercial centers that serve the district are Barre and Montpelier.

Washington-7-1 and 7-2

The Washington-7-1 and 7-2 districts are two single-member district consisting of all of Barre City except the 580 Barre City residents contained in the Washington 7-3 district. The Washington-7-1 population is 4,386, and the Washington-7-2 population is 4,086.

Barre City currently is split into two single-member districts (Washington-3-1 and Washington-3-2), and shares a small portion with all of Berlin in the Washington-3-3 single-member district.

The 1992 plan subdivided Barre City into a single-member district by itself and a two-member district with Berlin. In the 1982 and 1974 plans, Barre City was subdivided into three single-member districts, but the 1974 plan also gave a part of the City to a single-member district with Williamstown and Barre Town. In the first apportionment, in 1965, Barre City had four single-member districts.

Substantial Equality. The 4,386 population of the Washington-7-1 district is 214 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +5.13%. The 4,086 population of the Washington-7-2 district is 86 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -2.06%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the Washington-7-1 district earns a Roeck score of 0.41 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.39, and the Washington-7-2 district's scores are a Roeck score of 0.57 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.55. These districts satisfy the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Both of these districts are entirely within Washington County. This proposal continues the splitting of Barre City into single-member districts that was begun in 1965. Barre City is a member of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission and the Central Vermont Solid Waste District. Both districts are within the District #5 Environmental District for Act 250 and other state land use permits.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Barre City is served by Interstate 89 and Route 302 east and west, and Route 14 north and south. Barre is its own commercial center for these districts.

Washington-7-3

The Washington-7-3 district consists of the 580 Barre City residents not included in the Washington-7-1 and Washington-7-2 Barre City districts, plus the 3,393 Barre Town residents not included in the Washington-7-4 and Orange-Washington-2 districts. This proposed district's 2010 population was 3,973.

Barre City currently is split into two single-member districts (Washington-3-1 and Washington-3-2), and shares a small portion with all of Berlin in the Washington-3-3

single-member district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans gave Barre Town a two-person district. The 1974 plan gave the Town a two-member district; it also gave a part of the Town to a single-member district with Williamstown and a part of Barre City. In the first apportionment, in 1965, Barre Town and Orange shared a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 3,973 population of the Washington-7-3 district is 199 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -4.77%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the Washington-7-3 district earns a Roeck score of 0.31 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.30. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Washington County. This proposal continues the splitting of Barre City that was begun in 1965. Barre City and Barre Town are members of the Spaulding Union High School District. Barre City and Barre Town are members of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission and the Central Vermont Solid Waste District. Both districts are within the District #5 Environmental District for Act 250 and other state land use permits.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Barre City and Barre Town are served by Interstate 89 and Route 302 east and west, and Route 14 north and south. Barre is its own commercial center for this district.

Washington-7-4

The Washington-7-4 district consists of the 4,080 Barre Town residents not included in the Washington-7-3 and Orange-Washington-2 districts. This proposed district's 2010 population was 4,080.

Barre City currently is split into two single-member districts (Washington-3-1 and Washington-3-2), and shares a small portion with all of Berlin in the Washington-3-3 single-member district.

The 1992 and 1982 plans gave Barre Town a two-member district. The 1974 plan gave the Town a two-member district; it also gave a part of the Town to a single-member district with Williamstown and a part of Barre City. In the first apportionment, in 1965, Barre Town and Orange shared a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,080 population of this is 92 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -2.21%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the Washington-7-4 district earns a Roeck score of 0.37 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.45. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is entirely within Washington County. This proposal splits Barre Town into three different House districts. Barre Town is a member of the Spaulding Union High School District, the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission and the Central Vermont Solid Waste District, and it is within the District #5 Environmental District for Act 250 and other state land use permits.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Barre Town is served by Interstate 89 and Route 302 east and west, and Route 14 north and south. Barre City and the Berlin Mall are the commercial centers for this district.

Windham County

The 23 Windham County towns currently are distributed among eight single-member districts and two, two-member districts. The current population deviations range from a high of +7.50% (Windham-3-1, a portion of Brattleboro) to a low of -12.78 (Windham-3-2, a portion of Brattleboro). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +9.44% (Windham-2, Dummerston and Putney) to a low of -5.90% (Windham-Bennington-2, Halifax, Marlboro, Readsboro and Whitingham).

Ten of these towns filed reports with comments and recommendations. The most common response was a desire to remain in the status quo district (e.g., Wardsboro, Jamaica, Stratton). Brattleboro and Vernon supported the Board's initial plan; the initial proposal made no change to Vernon's current district and the changes in Brattleboro are internal line movements that the town approved. Rockingham objected strongly to being split to form two single-member districts, citing a good balance of small and medium-sized towns in its current district. Dover expressed concern about being in a district with Wilmington for fear that the Deerfield Valley might lose a second House seat. Londonderry filed a report objecting to removing Weston (with which it shares an elementary school district) from its district and replacing it with Windham, a town isolated from Londonderry. Weston strongly objected to being taken out of its current district, citing the common interest factors listed in Section 1903 of Title 17.

As in all parts of the state, the Apportionment Board attempted to satisfy as many Board of Civil Authority concerns and counterproposals as was consistent with acceptable population deviations and the statutory contiguity requirement. In an area with many small towns (small in area and in population) such as much of Windham County, this presents a real challenge. The Board restored Rockingham to a two-member district with fewer towns (without Athens, Brookline and Windham but with all of Westminster).

Weston was moved back into the district it now enjoys (with the exception of Stratton, which the Board proposes to move into the Windham-Bennington-1 district to avoid an unacceptably high population deviation).

The Apportionment Board's final plan proposes nine single-member districts and one two-member district, with deviations ranging from a high of +9.53% (Windhama-5, Grafton, Rockingham and Westminster) to a low of -5.90% (Windham-Bennington-2, Marlboro, Halifax, Whitingham and Readsboro).

Windham-1

The Windham-1 district consists of the Windham County towns of Athens, Brookline, Newfane and Townshend, with a 2010 population of 3,930.

Athens and Brookline currently are in the two-member Windham-4 district, with Grafton, Rockingham, Windham and part of Westminster. Newfane and Townshend are now in the single-member Windham-6 district with Marlboro.

In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Athens was part of a two-member district with Dummerston, Putney and Westminster. The 1974 plan put Athens and Grafton in a two-member district with Dummerston, Putney and Westminster. The first apportionment, in 1965, joined Athens with Rockingham and part of Westminster, in a single-member district.

In 1992, Brookline and Townshend formed a single-member district with Marlboro and Newfane. In 1982, Brookline, Newfane, Townshend, Marlboro and Dover made up a single-member. In 1974, Brookline, Newfane and Townshend made a single-member district with Stratton, Wardsboro and Windham. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Brookline and Newfane were linked with Dummerston in a single-member district and Townshend joined Grafton, Jamaica, Stratton, Wardsboro and Windham in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 3,930 population of this district is 242 fewer than the 4,172 ideal, a deviation of -5.80%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.38 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.59. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All four towns are in Windham County. Athens is a member of the Bellows Falls Union High School District; Brookline, Newfane and Townshend are members of the Leland and Gray Union High School District. Each of these towns is a member of the Windham Regional Planning Commission and within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #9 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Brookline, Newfane and Townshend are members of the Windham Solid Waste Management District, Newfane is the shire town of the county.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 35 connects Athens to Townshend and then to Newfane. The West River runs through Brookline, Townshend and Newfane. The commercial center that serves the district is Brattleboro or Keene, New Hampshire.

Windham-2

The Windham-2 district consists of Dummerston and Putney, with a 2010 population of 4,566.

Dummerston and Putney currently are in the two-member Windham-5 district, with the major part of the Westminster population.

In 1992 and 1982, Dummerston and Putney were in a two-member district with Athens and Westminster. In 1974, Dummerston and Putney were part of a two-member district with Athens, Westminster and Grafton. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Dummerston formed a single-member district with Brookline and Newfane, and Putney joined part of Westminster to form a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,566 population of this district is 394 greater than the 4,172 ideal, a deviation of +9.44%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.37 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.49. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Dummerston and Putney are Windham County towns. They are members of the Windham Regional Planning Commission and the Windham Solid Waste Management District. They are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #9 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. The eastern border of Dummerston and Putney is the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire. Dummerston and Putney are members of the Brattleboro U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 5 and Interstate 91 connect Dummerston and Putney. The commercial center that serves the district is Brattleboro or Keene, New Hampshire.

Windham-3-1, 3-2 and 3-3

Brattleboro is proposed to again be subdivided into three single-member districts. A part of the town of Brattleboro is Windham-3-1, with a population of 4,182 residents. Another part of the town of Brattleboro is drawn as Windham-3-2, with a population of 3,931 residents. The third and final part of the town is designated as Windham-3-3, with a population of 3,933.

These proposed districts correspond approximately to the current Windham 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3 districts.

In 1992, Brattleboro was subdivided into three single-member districts. In the 1982 plan, Brattleboro was subdivided into three single-member districts and a part of the town was aligned with Guilford and Vernon to form another single-member district. In 1974, Brattleboro had four single-member districts and in 1965 it had five single-member districts.

Substantial Equality. The 4,182 population of Windham-3-1 is 10 more than a perfect district, a deviation of +0.24%. Windham-3-2 has a population of 3,931, which is 241 fewer than the norm, a deviation of -5.78%. Windham-3-3 has 3,933 residents, or 239 people fewer than an ideal district, a deviation of -5.73%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the districts earn Roeck scores of 0.53, 0.41 and 0.44, and Polsby-Popper ratings of 0.68, 0.53 and 0.49, respectively. These districts are all within the boundaries of the town.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Brattleboro is the largest town in Windham County, and a member of the Windham Regional Planning Commission and the Windham Solid Waste Management District. It is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #9 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Brattleboro's eastern boundary is the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 91 and Route 5 run north and south; Route 9 runs east and west through the town.

The Brattleboro Board of Civil Authority's July 28, 2011 report concurs with the Apportionment Board's minor adjustments to these districts.

Windham-4

The Windham-4 district consists of Guilford and Vernon, with a 2010 population of 4,327.

Guilford and Vernon currently constitute the single-member Windham-1 district.

These two towns also made a single-member district in 1992. In 1982, Guilford and Vernon were combined with a part of Brattleboro in a single-member district. In 1974, Guilford, Vernon and Halifax formed a single-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Guilford, Vernon, Halifax and Marlboro made a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,327 population of this district is 155 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +3.72%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.44 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.60. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Guilford and Vernon make up the southeastern corner of Windham County. They are members of the Windham Regional Commission and the Windham Solid Waste Management District, and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #9 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Vernon's eastern boundary is the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire. The southern border of Guilford and Vernon is Massachusetts. Vernon and Guilford are members of the Brattleboro U.H.S.D.

Windham-5

The Windham-5 two-member district consists of Grafton, Rockingham and Westminster. The 2010 population of the district was 9,139.

Currently, Rockingham, Grafton and part of Westminster are in the two-member Windham-4 district with Athens, Brookline and Windham.

In the 1992 plan, Rockingham was in a two-member district with Grafton, Windham and a part of Springfield. In 1982, Rockingham, Grafton and Windham were a two-member district. The 1974 plan put Rockingham in a two-member district by itself. The first apportionment, in 1965, joined combined Rockingham with Athens and a part of Westminster, in a single-member district.

In 1992 and 1982, Westminster was in a two-member district with Dummerston, Athens and Putney. In 1974, Westminster and Grafton were in a two-member district with Dummerston, Putney and Athens. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, part of Westminster was with Putney to form a single-member district, and the remaining part of Westminster was placed with Athens and Rockingham in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 9,139 population of Windham-5 is 795 more than a perfect district, a deviation of +9.53%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.50 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.46. The towns in this district are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. These three towns are in Windham County. They are under the jurisdiction of Environmental District #9 for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs. The

eastern border of Rockingham and Westminster is the Connecticut River and the State of New Hampshire. All three towns are members of the Bellows Falls U.H.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 91 and Route 5 run north and south through Rockingham. Route 103 runs northwesterly from Rockingham up to Chester. The commercial centers serving the district include Springfield and Bellows Falls (in Rockingham).

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Interstate 91 and Route 5 run north and south along the boundary of the two towns. The land is Vermont Piedmont. The commercial center that serves the district is Brattleboro.

These towns are together in a two-member district at present. Rockingham and Grafton responded to the Board's request for comment with recommendations that they remain in a two-member district, both mentioning that they also wanted Windham and Londonderry in that configuration. Londonderry's report stated unequivocally that it wanted nothing to do with a district that includes Grafton and Rockingham. Westminster did not file a recommendation with the Board. The Board chose its proposed Windham-5 configuration as part of its effort to resolve population deviation problems in the state's southwest quadrant.

Windham-Bennington-1

The Windham-Bennington-1 district consists of the Windham County towns of Dover, Somerset, Stratton, Wardsboro and Wilmington, and the Bennington County town of Searsburg. The 2010 population of the district was 4,228.

Currently, Dover, Searsburg, Somerset, and Wardsboro are in a single-member district with Readsboro and Stamford (the current Windham-Bennington-1 district). Wilmington is now in the two-member Windham-2 district with Halifax and Whitingham. Stratton is currently in the single-member Windham-Bennington-Windsor-1 district with Jamaica, Londonderry, Weston and Wardsboro.

Dover. In the 1992 plan, Dover was part of a single-member district with Jamaica, Londonderry, Stratton and Wardsboro. In 1982, Dover was part of a single-member district with Brookline, Marlboro, Newfane and Townshend. In 1974, Dover was in a two-member district with Marlboro, Wilmington, Readsboro, Searsburg, Somerset, Stamford and Whitingham. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Dover was in a two-member district with Wilmington, Pownal, Readsboro, Searsburg, Stamford and Whitingham.

Searsburg. In the 1992 plan, Searsburg was in a single-member district with Wardsboro, Wilmington, Halifax, Somerset and Whitingham and Searsburg. In 1982, Searsburg was in a single-member district with Wilmington, Halifax, Somerset and Whitingham. In 1974, Searsburg was in a two-member district with Dover, Wilmington, Readsboro,

Stamford and Whitingham. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Searsburg was in a two-member district with Dover, Wilmington, Pownal, Readsboro, Stamford and Whitingham.

Somerset. The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Somerset in a single-member district with Searsburg, Halifax, Whitingham and Wilmington. The 1974 House plan placed Somerset in a two-member district with Readsboro, Searsburg, Stamford, Dover, Marlboro, Whitingham and Wilmington. Somerset was not mentioned in the 1965 plan, apparently being considered an unorganized town or a town without voters.

Stratton. In 1992, Stratton was in a single-member district with Dover, Jamaica, Londonderry and Wardsboro. In 1982, Stratton was part of a single-member district with Jamaica, Londonderry, Wardsboro and Weston. In the 1974 plan, Stratton was in a single-member district with Brookline, Newfane, Townshend, Wardsboro and Windham. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Stratton was combined with Townshend, Grafton, Jamaica, Wardsboro and Windham in a single-member district.

Wardsboro. In the 1992 plan, Wardsboro was part of a single-member district with Dover, Jamaica, Londonderry and Stratton. In the 1982 plan, Wardsboro was part of a single-member district with Londonderry, Jamaica, Stratton and Weston. Under the 1974 plan, Wardsboro was a part of a single-member district with Brookline, Newfane, Stratton, Townshend and Windham. In the 1965 plan, Wardsboro was placed in a single-member district with Grafton, Jamaica, Stratton and Windham.

Wilmington. The 1992 and 1982 plans placed Wilmington in a single-member district with Searsburg, Somerset, Halifax and Whitingham. The 1974 plan placed Wilmington in a two-member district with Readsboro, Searsburg, Somerset, Stamford, Dover, Marlboro and Whitingham. In the 1965 plan, Wilmington was placed in a single-member district with Dover, Pownal, Readsboro, Searsburg, Stamford and Whitingham.

Substantial Equality. The 4,228 population of Windham-Bennington-1 is 56 greater than the ideal district, a deviation of +1.34%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.51 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.60. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Dover, Somerset, Stratton, Wardsboro and Wilmington are in Windham County, are members of the Windham Regional Planning Commission and the Windham Solid Waste Management District, and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Searsburg is in Bennington County and is a member of a different solid waste district, but is a member of the Windham Regional Commission. Searsburg is in Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Searsburg is connected with Wilmington via Route 9. Route 100 links Wilmington to Dover and Wardsboro. Searsburg is connected to Somerset and its population of 3 by Route 71, but this is often closed in the winter. Stratton is connected to Wardsboro by the Stratton-Arlington Road, and thence to Dover by Route 100. Wilmington is the most significant commercial center in this district, although Stratton sees a flow of commerce to and from the west, in Manchester.

Windham-Bennington-2

The Windham-Bennington-2 district consists of the Windham County towns of Halifax, Marlboro and Whitingham, and the Bennington County town of Readsboro. The 2010 population of the district was 3,926.

Currently, Halifax and Whitingham are in the single-member Windham-2 district with Wilmington. Marlboro is now in the single-member Windham-6 district with Newfane and Townshend. Readsboro is in the single-member Windham-Bennington-1 district with Dover, Searsburg, Somerset, Stamford and Wardsboro.

Halifax. In the 1992 and 1982 plans, Halifax was in a single-member district with Somerset, Whitingham, Wilmington and Searsburg. The 1974 House plan placed Halifax with Vernon and Guilford in a single-member district. Under the 1965 plan, Halifax was merged with Guilford, Marlboro and Vernon in a single-member district.

Marlboro. In 1992, Marlboro, Brookline, Newfane and Townshend formed a single-member district. In 1982, Marlboro was part of a single-member district with Brookline, Dover, Newfane and Townshend. In 1974, Marlboro was in a two-member district with Dover, Wilmington, Readsboro, Searsburg, Somerset, Stamford and Whitingham. Under the 1965 plan, Marlboro was in a single-member district with Guilford, Halifax and Vernon.

Whitingham. In the 1992 plan, Whitingham was in a single-member district with Wilmington, Halifax, Somerset and Searsburg. In 1982, Whitingham was in a single-member district with Wilmington, Halifax, Somerset and Searsburg. In 1974, Whitingham was in a two-member district with Dover, Marlboro, Wilmington, Readsboro, Searsburg, Somerset and Stamford. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Whitingham was in a two-member district with Dover, Wilmington, Pownal, Readsboro, Searsburg, Stamford.

Readsboro. The 1992 and 1982 plans combined Readsboro with Stamford, Woodford and part of Bennington in a single-member district. In 1974, Readsboro was in a two-member district with Dover, Marlboro, Wilmington, Readsboro, Searsburg, Somerset, Stamford and Whitingham. When the first apportionment plan was drafted, Readsboro was placed in a two-member district with Searsburg, Stamford, Dover, Pownal, Whitingham and Wilmington.

Substantial Equality. The 3,926 population of Windham-Bennington-2 is 246 less than the ideal district, a deviation of -5.90%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.48. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Halifax, Marlboro and Whitingham are in Windham County, are members of the Windham Regional Planning Commission and the Windham Solid Waste Management District, and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Readsboro is in Bennington County and is a member of different regional planning and waste districts, and is in Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. None of these towns share in a union school district.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 100 connects Readsboro to Whitingham; Route 112 goes from Whitingham to Halifax. Some local roads connect Halifax to Marlboro, but the main route to Marlboro from both Halifax and Whitingham is via Route 100 to Wilmington, then east on Route 9 to Marlboro. Wilmington is the most significant commercial center in this district, although even it (and Marlboro) looks east to Brattleboro in this regard.

Windham-Bennington-Windsor-1

The Windham-Bennington-Windsor-1 district consists of the Windham County towns of Jamaica, Londonderry and Windham, the Bennington County town of Winhall and the Windsor County town of Weston. The 2010 population of the district was 4,558.

Currently, Jamaica, Londonderry, Stratton and Winhall are in the single-member Windham-Bennington-Windsor-1 district with Weston. Windham is now in the two-member Windham-4 district with Athens, Brookline, Grafton, Rockingham and part of Westminster.

Jamaica. In the 1992 plan, Jamaica was combined in a single-member district with Dover, Stratton, Londonderry and Wardsboro. In 1982, Jamaica was part of a single-member district with Londonderry, Stratton, Wardsboro and Weston. The 1974 plan created a single-member district out of Jamaica, Londonderry, Andover and Weston. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Jamaica was combined with Townshend, Grafton, Stratton, Wardsboro and Windham in a single-member district.

Londonderry. In 1992, Londonderry was in a single-member district with Dover, Jamaica, Stratton and Wardsboro. In 1982, Londonderry was part of a single-member district with Jamaica, Stratton, Wardsboro and Weston. The 1974 plan created a single-member district out of Londonderry, Jamaica, Andover and Weston. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, created a two-member district of consisting of Londonderry,

Ludlow, Mount Holly and Weston.

Windham. In 1992, Windham was in a two-member district with Grafton, Rockingham, and a discrete portion of Springfield. In 1982, Windham was in a two-member district with Grafton and Rockingham. Under the 1974 plan, Windham was combined with Brookline, Newfane, Townshend, Stratton and Wardsboro in a single-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Windham joined Grafton, Jamaica, Stratton, Townshend and Wardsboro in a single-member district

Winhall. The 1992 reapportionment plan placed Winhall in a single-member district with Danby, Dorset, Landgrove and Peru. In the 1982 plan, Winhall was combined with Danby, Mount Tabor, Dorset, Landgrove, Manchester and Peru in a two-member district. The 1974 plan had Winhall, Dorset, Peru, Landgrove and Manchester in a two-member district. In the first apportionment plan, in 1965, Winhall was in a two-member district with Dorset, Landgrove, Manchester and Peru.

Weston. Under the 1992 plan, Weston formed a single-member district with Andover, Baltimore and Chester. In 1982, Weston was part of a single-member district with Jamaica, Londonderry, Stratton and Wardsboro. The 1974 plan created a single-member district out of Weston, Jamaica, Londonderry and Andover. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, created a two-member district of consisting of Weston, Londonderry, Ludlow and Mount Holly.

Substantial Equality. The 4,558 population of the Windham-Bennington-Windsor-1 district is 386 greater than the ideal district, a deviation of +9.25%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.44 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.37. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Jamaica, Londonderry and Windham are in Windham County, are members of the Windham Regional Planning Commission and are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes (as is Weston). Winhall is in Bennington County is in Environmental District #8 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes, but is in both the Windham Regional Planning Commission and the Windham Solid Waste District. Weston is also in the Windham Regional Planning Commission. Windham and Jamaica are members of the Leland and Gray U.H.S.D. Londonderry and Weston are members of the Flood Brook U.S.D.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Windham is connected to Londonderry via Routes 121 and 11. Routes 100/30 connect Weston to Londonderry and then to Rawsonville and Jamaica, and one drives from Jamaica to Windham by using Routes 100 and Windham Hill Road, by way of Townshend. Londonderry is linked to Winhall by Route 30. The Stratton Mountain resort is a dominant economic driver for Winhall, Jamaica and Londonderry. Manchester

is the commercial center for some of these towns, while Winhall may look more to the east in this regard and Weston also has commerce with Ludlow.

Windsor County

The 24 Windsor County towns currently are distributed among eleven single-member districts and three two-member districts. The current population deviations range from a high of +10.82% (Windsor-1-1, a portion of Springfield) to a low of -14.84 (Windsor-3, Windsor). The Apportionment Board's initial plan proposed all single-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +8.92% (Windsor-Windham-1, Andover, Baltimore, Chester and Grafton) to a low of -9.16% (Windsor-Addison-1, Bethel, Granville, Hancock and Rochester).

Fifteen of these towns filed reports with comments and recommendations. The most common response was a desire to remain in the status quo district (e.g., Hartford, West Windsor, Cavendish, Ludlow). Granville, Hancock and Rochester endorsed the initial plan's proposal to combine them, plus Bethel, in a single-member district (Bethel did not file a report). The initial plan proposed to continue to place Tunbridge and Royalton in a single-member district, and both towns agreed. Hartford strongly opposed the initial plan, which proposed to place parts of that town in four different single-member districts. Likewise, Springfield opposed losing its two-member district. A majority of the towns in the initial plan's Windsor-5 district (Cavendish and Ludlow) and Windsor-Windham-01 district (Andover, Chester and Grafton) filed strong objections to those configurations preferring the status quo in both cases.

The Apportionment Board attempted to satisfy as many Board of Civil Authority concerns and counterproposals as was consistent with acceptable population deviations and the statutory contiguity requirement. The Board restored the Springfield two-member district, albeit with a modest change to the line; the result would seem to meet the concerns of Chester and Andover. The Board's final proposal does not split West Windsor, instead combining it with Windsor and Hartland in a two-member district (an option suggested by Hartland in its July 22, 2011 report). Ludlow expressed concern about being separate from Mount Holly in the initial plan, and the final plan puts them together, although in the two-member Rutland-Windsor-2 district. The final plan agrees with Cavendish's request to stay in a single-member district with Weathersfield.

The Apportionment Board's final plan proposes nine single-member districts and two, two-member districts, with deviations ranging from a high of +8.41% (Windsor-4-2, a portion of Springfield) to a low of -9.16% (Granville, Hancock, Rochester and Bethel).

Windsor-1-1

The Windsor-1-1 single-member district consists of the Windsor County towns of Barnard, Pomfret, Sharon and 895 residents from the western portion of Hartford, with a 2010 population of 4,208.

Barnard, Pomfret and this portion of Hartford are currently in the single-member Windsor-6-1 district. Sharon is now in the two-member Windsor-Orange-2 district with Norwich, Strafford and Thetford.

Barnard and Pomfret joined a part of Hartford in 1992 as a single-member district; the remaining part of Hartford was in a two-member district within Hartford; Sharon was in a two-member district with Royalton, Norwich and Strafford. In 1982, Sharon joined Royalton and Strafford in a single-member district; Barnard and Pomfret were part of a two-member district with Bridgewater, Plymouth, Reading and Woodstock, while a portion of Hartford was combined with Norwich in a single-member district. In 1974, Barnard, Bridgewater, Plymouth, Reading and Woodstock were a two-member district; Hartford was a two-member district on its own; and Pomfret and Sharon were in a two-member district with Norwich, Royalton and Strafford. The 1965 apportionment plan gave Barnard and Pomfret a two-member district with Bridgewater, Plymouth, Sherburne (Killington) and Woodstock. Hartford consisted of a two-member district on its own, a single-member district with Norwich and a single-member district with Hartland. The 1965 apportionment plan made a single-member district of Sharon, Royalton and Tunbridge.

Substantial Equality. The 4,248 population of this district is 76 greater than the 4,172 ideal, a deviation of +1.82%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.43 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.49. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of these towns are in Windsor County. All are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #3 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Barnard and Pomfret are part of the Woodstock U.H.S.D. Sharon and Hartford are not in shared school districts.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Sharon is linked to Pomfret by Howe Hill Road and to Hartford by Route 14 and I-89. Pomfret and Barnard are linked by Stage and East Barnard Roads and Route 12. The commercial centers serving the district are Woodstock, White River Junction (in Hartford) and West Lebanon, New Hampshire.

Windsor-1-2

The Windsor-1-2 single-member district consists of a portion of Hartford plus all of Norwich. The district's 2010 Census population was 4,123.

This portion of Hartford is currently in the single-member Windsor-6-1 district. Norwich is now in the two-member Windsor-Orange-2 district with Sharon, Strafford and

Thetford.

A part of Hartford was joined with Barnard and Pomfret in 1992 in a single-member district; the remaining part of Hartford was in a two-member district within Hartford; Norwich was in a two-member district with Royalton, Sharon and Strafford. In 1982, a portion of Hartford was combined with Norwich in a two-member district. In 1974, Hartford was a two-member district on its own; and Norwich was in a two-member district with Pomfret, Sharon, Royalton and Strafford. The 1965 apportionment plan made Hartford a two-member district on its own, and a portion of Hartford became a single-member district with Norwich while another portion became a single-member district with Hartland.

Substantial Equality. The 4,123 population of this district is 49 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -1.17%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.51 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.51. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of these towns are in Windsor County. All are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #3 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Norwich is in an interstate school district with Hanover, New Hampshire. Hartford is not a member of that district.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Norwich and Hartford are linked by Route 5 and Interstate 91. The commercial centers serving the district are White River Junction (in Hartford) and Hanover and West Lebanon in New Hampshire.

Windsor-1-3

The Windsor-1-3 single-member district consists of a portion of Hartford, including the Quechee area, with a 2010 population of 4,257.

This portion of Hartford is currently in the two-member Windsor-6-2 district.

A part of Hartford was joined with Barnard and Pomfret in 1992 in a single-member district; the remaining part of Hartford was in a two-member district within Hartford. In 1982, a portion of Hartford was combined with Norwich in a two-member district. In 1974, Hartford was a two-member district on its own. The 1965 apportionment plan made Hartford a two-member district on its own, and a portion of Hartford became a single-member district with Norwich while another portion became a single-member district with Hartland.

Substantial Equality. The 4,257 population of this district is 85 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +2.04%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.35 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.39. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of this district is in Windsor County. Hartford is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #3 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This portion of Hartford contains the areas outside of White River Junction and Wilder.

Windsor-1-4

The Windsor-1-4 single-member district consists of a portion of Hartford, with a 2010 population of 4,091.

This portion of Hartford is currently in the two-member Windsor-6-2 district.

A part of Hartford was joined with Barnard and Pomfret in 1992 in a single-member district; the remaining part of Hartford was in a two-member district within Hartford. In 1982, a portion of Hartford was combined with Norwich in a two-member district. In 1974, Hartford was a two-member district on its own. The 1965 apportionment plan made Hartford a two-member district on its own, and a portion of Hartford became a single-member district with Norwich while another portion became a single-member district with Hartland.

Substantial Equality. The 4,091 population of this district is 81 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -1.94%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.14 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.24. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of this district is in Windsor County. Hartford is within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #3 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. This portion of Hartford contains White River Junction and Wilder, at the confluence of the White and Connecticut Rivers.

Windsor-2

The Windsor-2 district consists of Plymouth, Reading and Woodstock, with a 2010 population of 4,333.

Woodstock and Reading are currently in the single-member Windsor-5 district. Plymouth currently is in the single-member Windsor-Rutland-1 district with Ludlow and Mount Holly.

Woodstock and Reading were a single-member district in 1992, while Plymouth was in a single-member district with Ludlow and Shrewsbury. In 1982, Woodstock and Bridgewater were part of a two-member district with Barnard, Reading, Plymouth and Pomfret. The 1974 plan put Woodstock and Bridgewater with Reading, Barnard and Plymouth in a two-member district. The 1965 apportionment plan mixed Woodstock and Bridgewater with Barnard, Plymouth, Pomfret and Sherburne (now Killington) in a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,333 population of this district is 161 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +3.86%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.48 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.53. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. All of these towns are in Windsor County. All are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #3 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs. Woodstock and Reading are in the Woodstock U.H.S.D. Plymouth is not a member of a union high school district.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 106 links Woodstock and Reading, which is linked to Plymouth via Tyson Road and Route 100A. The commercial centers serving the district are Woodstock and White River Junction-West Lebanon, New Hampshire, although Plymouth also has commercial ties with Ludlow.

Windsor-3

The Windsor-3 two-member district consists of Hartland, West Windsor and Windsor, with a 2010 population of 8,045.

Hartland and West Windsor are currently in the single-member Windsor-4 district. Windsor now comprises the single-member Windsor-3 district.

The 1992 plan placed Hartland and West Windsor in a single-member district and Windsor in a single-member district by itself. In 1982 and 1974, Hartland and West Windsor were part of a two-member district with Windsor. In 1965, Hartland was in a single-member district with a portion of Hartford, while West Windsor, Windsor and Reading comprised a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 8045 population of this district is 299 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -3.58%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.50 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.62. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Hartland, West Windsor and Windsor are Windsor County towns, within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #7 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Hartland is a member of the Greater Upper Valley Solid Waste Management District. These towns are not in the same regional planning commission. Reading is in the Woodstock Union School District. Windsor and West Windsor are not in a union school district.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 44 links West Windsor and Windsor. Windsor is linked to Hartland by Route 5 and Interstate 91. Local roads link West Windsor and Hartland. The commercial centers serving the district are Windsor and White River Junction-West Lebanon, New Hampshire.

Windsor-4-1

The Windsor-4-1 district consists of Cavendish and Weathersfield, with a total 2010 population of 4,192.

Cavendish and Weathersfield currently form the single-member Windsor-2 district.

Weathersfield and Cavendish were also a single-member district in 1992. In the 1982 and 1974 plans, Weathersfield and Cavendish joined Ludlow in a two-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made Weathersfield and Cavendish into a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,192 population of this district is 20 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +0.48%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.46 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.52. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Both of these towns are in Windsor County, within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes. Cavendish is in the Green Mountain U.H.S.D. with Chester and Andover; Weathersfield is not part of a union high school district but sends its students largely to Springfield High School.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 131 links Weathersfield and Cavendish. Springfield serves as the commercial center for this district.

Windsor-4-2

The Windsor-4-2 two-member district consists of the lion's share of Springfield, excluding a portion of the northwesterly part of town, with a total 2010 population of 9,046.

Currently, this part of Springfield is in the two-member Windsor-1-2 district.

The 1992 reapportionment plan subdivided one part of Springfield as a two-member district and placed the remaining part in a two-member district with Rockingham, Grafton and Windham. In 1982, 1974 and 1965, Springfield was subdivided into two parts—one formed a single-member district on its own; the other linked the Town with Baltimore to form a two-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 9,046 population of this district is 702 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +8.41%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.60 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.66. This district satisfies the contiguity principle.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This district is close to the contours of the Windsor-1-2 district from the 2002 plan, and consists of all but the North Springfield area of the town. Springfield is a Windsor County town, within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 for Act 250 and other state land use permit purposes.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. The residents of this district share much in common as it consists of the bulk of the town, where the schools, commercial district, and road network are located. Springfield itself serves as the commercial center for this district.

Windsor-4-3

The Windsor-4-3 district consists of the Windsor County towns of Andover, Baltimore, Chester, and the a northwestern corner of Springfield, with a 2010 population of 4,192.

Andover, Baltimore and Chester, and a similar, but not identical, portion of Springfield, currently are in the Windsor-1-1 single-member district.

Andover, Baltimore, Chester and Weston formed a single-member district in 1992. In 1982, Andover and Chester formed a single-member district, while Baltimore was joined with a part of Springfield for a single-member district. The 1974 plan made a two-member district out of Andover, Jamaica, Londonderry and Weston; subdivided Springfield linking part of it with Baltimore in a single-member district and part of it with Chester for another single-member district. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made a single-member district out of Chester and Andover; and placed Baltimore with a part of Springfield in a single-member district.

Substantial Equality. The 4,192 population of this district is 20 greater than the ideal, a deviation of +0.48%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.54 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.57. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Andover, Chester and Baltimore, and the piece of Springfield, are Windsor County towns. These towns all are members of the Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission, and the Southern Windsor/Windham County Solid Waste Management District. Andover and Chester are members of the Green Mountain U.H.S.D. and the Chester-Andover United Elementary School District. Springfield has its own high school. Baltimore is in none of these. All four of these towns are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 11 runs from Chester into Andover; town roads connect Baltimore with Route 10 in Chester. Route 11/35 links Chester with Grafton. The commercial centers serving the district are Springfield and Chester.

The Boards of Civil Authority in Andover, Chester and Springfield all responded with a strong desire to stay linked in a legislative district. Springfield also suggested an alternate line for its shared section with the neighboring towns. The Board accommodated this suggestion, as the population numbers were within acceptable levels.

Windsor-Addison-1

The Windsor-Addison-1 district consists of the Windsor County towns of Bethel and Rochester, and the Addison County towns of Granville and Hancock. The district's 2010 population was 3,790.

Bethel and Rochester currently are in the single-member Windsor-Rutland-2 district with the Windsor County town of Stockbridge and the Rutland County town of Pittsfield. Hancock is now in the Addison-2 single-member district with Cornwall, Goshen, Leicester, Ripton and Salisbury. Granville is currently in the two-member Orange-Addison-1 district with Braintree, Brookfield and Randolph.

Bethel and Rochester were in the same single-member district with Pittsfield and Stockbridge in the 1992 and 1982 plans. The 1992 and 1982 plans combined Hancock with Goshen, Leicester, Ripton, Salisbury, Sudbury and Whiting in a single-member district. The 1992 plan placed Granville, Waitsfield and Warren with Fayston in a single-member district. In 1982, Granville, Warren and Waitsfield were part of a single-member district with Fayston. In 1974, Rochester, Hancock and Granville were combined with Pittsfield, Stockbridge and Goshen in a single-member district, while Bethel was put in two-member district with Braintree, Brookfield and Randolph. The first apportionment plan, in 1965, made a single-member district out of Rochester, Granville, Hancock, Pittsfield and Stockbridge, and put Bethel in a two-member district with Braintree, Brookfield and Randolph.

Substantial Equality. The 3,790 population of this district is 382 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -9.16%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.44 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 039. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Bethel and Rochester are Windsor County towns, while Granville and Hancock are Addison County towns. All four towns are members of the Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee Regional Commission. These towns go their separate ways in terms of school districts, although Whitcomb High School in Bethel is the likely destination of the majority of students within the district. The towns follow their counties in terms of different Act 250 and other state land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Hancock and Granville are "Route 100" towns and for this reason have much in common with Rochester. Rochester is linked to Bethel through the Rochester Gap by Bethel Mountain Road. It is difficult to identify a common commercial center serving these towns.

Windsor-Orange-1

The Windsor-Orange-1 district consists of the Windsor County town of Royalton and the Orange County town of Tunbridge, with a 2010 population of 4,057.

Royalton and Tunbridge constitute the current Windsor-Orange-1 single-member district.

Under the 1992 reapportionment plan, Royalton was in a two-member district with Sharon, Strafford and Norwich; and Tunbridge shared a two-member district with Chelsea, Vershire, Orange, Topsham, Washington and Williamstown. In 1982 Royalton was combined with Sharon and Strafford in a single-member district; and Tunbridge shared a two-member district with Chelsea, Orange, Topsham, Washington and Williamstown. In 1974, Royalton was in a two-member district with Norwich, Pomfret, Sharon and Strafford, and Tunbridge was in a single-member district with Chelsea, Orange, and Washington. The 1965 apportionment plan made a single-member district of Royalton, Tunbridge and Sharon.

Substantial Equality. The 4,057 population of this district is 115 fewer than the ideal, a deviation of -2.76%.

Geographical compactness and contiguity. Using Maptitude's measure of compactness, the district earns a Roeck score of 0.44 and a Polsby-Popper rating of 0.67. These towns are contiguous.

Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. Royalton is a Windsor County town, while Tunbridge is an Orange County Town. They are both members of the Two-Rivers Ottauquechee Regional Commission. These towns go their separate ways in terms of school districts. Royalton and Tunbridge are within the jurisdiction of Environmental District #2 (Springfield) for Act 250 and other land use permit programs.

Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. Route 110 joins Royalton and Tunbridge, running north and south, and the valley that it follows, along the First Branch of the White River, defines the geography of the district. The commercial center for the district to the north is in Randolph or Barre and Montpelier, or south to White River/Lebanon.

Conclusion

The Board read and studied the prior House apportionment proposals, and state and local maps; studied the geography and topography of each part of the state; and considered a remarkable variety of House proposals generated by Board members and Boards of Civil Authority. The Board members drew upon personal experiences in local government throughout the state and, in some cases, prior experiences in the reapportionment process. The Board made a concerted effort to draw a map that takes into proper account the population realities of our state, attention to town and county boundaries where feasible, and the non-numerical apportionment factors chosen by the General Assembly. The Board is confident that there is more than one way to draw a good, constitutional and sensible House district map, but believes its proposal presents the people of the state with a strong proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas A. Little, Special Master and Chair
September 20, 2011

**Report of the Legislative Apportionment Board On the Proposed House
Reapportionment
APPENDIX 1 – Excerpt from 2001 LAB Report**

Constitutional and Statutory Principles

The Vermont Constitution identifies three principles to use in designing the House and Senate plans for reapportionment. The General Assembly is required to provide equality of representation and to “seek to maintain geographical compactness and contiguity and to adhere to the boundaries of counties and other existing political subdivisions.” A statute restates these principles and adds another--recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests.¹⁵ Nor can incumbency be ignored, since apportionment is a political process.

a. Substantial Equality. Changes in population make all the difference in reapportionment. Without substantial equality of population, as the courts have defined it, no plan will pass muster in a review by the judicial branch. Perfect equality (4,172 people per House member) is unlikely. Substantial equality is measured by the deviation from the norm for each district and for the overall plan.

In addition to an analysis of population numbers, there is need for a credible argument demonstrating how the other standards beyond equality are met. In the Mahon case, the United States Supreme Court said 16.4% “approach[es] tolerable limits.” It explained that the ultimate inquiry is whether the legislature's plan “may reasonably be said to advance [a] rational state policy” and, if so, “whether the population disparities among the districts that have resulted from the pursuit of this plan exceed constitutional limits.”¹⁶

b. Geographical compactness and contiguity. This principle measures the shape of each district. A district strung together in a straight line may not reflect a sense of community for its member towns. A district with parts separated from each other by other districts is certainly going to find it difficult to coalesce as a single unit of representation.

The computer program used by the LAB is Caliper Corporation’s Maptitude. It calculates a compactness factor, using two measures. The first is the Roeck test, an area-based measure that compares each district to a circle (the most compact shape possible), computing the ratio of the area of the district to the area of the minimum enclosing circle. A perfect circle would have a ratio of one. The other measure is the Polsby-Popper test, which computes the ratio of the district area to the area of a circle with the same perimeter. As with the Roeck test, one represents the most compact district. Of course, none of the districts are circular, but the respective scores on these tests do provide some technical measure of the compactness of the

¹⁵ 17 V.S.A. § 1903(b). In the Hartland case, the Supreme Court regarded (b)(2) (recognition and maintenance of patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests) as a natural outgrowth of the other two constitutional principles. See 160 Vt. at 22.

¹⁶ Mahan v. Howell, 410 U.S. 315, 318 (1972).

proposed districts.

The map of the Tentative District also demonstrates contiguity: all districts are contiguous. In most cases, the entire town border is used to weld a district together. An exception such as Bennington-2, where Pownal and Woodford are together as a district and where the contact of those two towns is a line of less than half a mile in length in the northeastern corner of Pownal and the southwestern corner of Woodford, illustrates the extreme, and proves the rule.

Of this principle, the Vermont Supreme Court has written,

Voters in a community are less effectively represented when their elected representative's principal constituency lies outside their community and has interests different from their own. (Citations omitted). These considerations are particularly relevant in this state, which has a long history of preserving the independence and integrity of local government.

Similarly, compactness and contiguity requirements ultimately concern 'the ability of citizens to relate to each other and their representatives and . . . the ability of representatives to relate effectively to their constituency.' These relationships are fostered through shared interests and membership in a political community. They are undermined, however, when geographic barriers that severely limit communication and transportation within proposed districts are ignored.¹⁷

c. Adherence to county boundaries and other existing political subdivisions. This criterion is a measure of the Plan's respect for existing political subdivision lines.

Another measure of this criterion is found in the history of the various districts going back 46 years and analyzing how the alignments of different towns change in each of the previous four reapportionment plans, beginning in 1965. The practice of redesigning the House map has been conservative over time. The districts are essentially the same, with the addition or subtraction of a town from a district that is growing or not growing as much as the state's population during those years.

d. Patterns of geography, social interaction, trade, political ties and common interests. In the Hartland case, the Supreme Court explained that these criteria "are an implementation and extension of our constitutional requirements that the legislature 'seek to maintain geographical compactness and contiguity and to adhere to boundaries of counties and other existing political subdivisions.'"¹⁸

In Hartland, the Supreme Court rejected the legislature's proposal for a House plan placing the Franklin County town of Montgomery with towns in Orleans County because the

¹⁷ In re Reapportionment of Town of Hartland, 160 Vt. 9, 21-22 (1993).

¹⁸ In re Reapportionment of Town of Hartland, *supra*, 160 Vt. at 22.

legislative record showed no evidence the House committee considered social and economic ties in designing the district.¹⁹ Two years later, after the legislature made its report, the Court concluded the decision to place Montgomery in Orleans County was neither irrational nor illegitimate, and the plan remained in place for the remainder of the decennium.²⁰

The Tentative Plan addresses these criteria, district by district. It includes a review of the roads that link towns within a district, physical features they share in common, and a look at the commercial center within the district (or the commercial center that serves the district). Vermont's State Geologist Edward Hitchcock defined the six physiographic regions of the State in the mid-nineteenth century, and those categories are used in this report. They are Champlain Lowlands, Taconic Mountains, Valley of Vermont, Green Mountains, Vermont Piedmont and Northeastern Highlands. They provide a useful tool for describing the representative districts in this Plan.²¹

Vermont towns are not city-states. Families, friendships and formal and informal social arrangements connect them, and these are lines that do not show on a map. Some share schools, whether they are in the same school district or not. Some share solid waste facilities, water and sewer, fire protection and rescue services. If, on the other hand, the only connection beyond a shared boundary for towns is a representative district, the sense of a political subdivision may be missing, and residents may feel misaligned and underrepresented. The issue goes beyond local control, and takes the form of the need for common elements beyond statistical harmony to make a district work.

¹⁹ In re Reapportionment of Town of Hartland, *supra*, 160 Vt. at 24.

²⁰ In re Reapportionment of Town of Montgomery, 162 Vt. 617, 618 (1994).

²¹ See Charles W. Johnson, *The Nature of Vermont* (1980), 22-38.¹⁰ 17 V.S.A. §§ 1906 b(c)(4) and 1906c(c)(4).¹¹ In re Reapportionment of Town of Hartland, *supra*, 160 Vt. at 32.

**Report of the Legislative Apportionment Board On the Proposed House
Reapportionment**

APPENDIX 2 - Measures of District Compactness

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
ADD-1	0.46	0.56
ADD-2	0.29	0.32
ADD-3	0.47	0.56
ADD-4	0.47	0.46
ADD-5	0.46	0.32
ADD-6	0.63	0.75
BEN-1	0.64	0.79
BEN-2	0.46	0.54
BEN-3	0.48	0.59
BEN-4-1	0.49	0.56
BEN-4-2	0.63	0.70
BEN-5	0.49	0.69
BEN-RUT-1	0.62	0.66
CAL-1	0.54	0.65
CAL-2	0.32	0.47
CAL-3	0.35	0.35
CAL-4	0.53	0.73
CAL-5	0.38	0.52
CHI-1-1	0.46	0.38
CHI-1-2	0.30	0.33
CHI-2-1	0.32	0.26
CHI-2-2	0.56	0.52
CHI-2-3	0.52	0.65
CHI-3	0.50	0.59
CHI-4	0.38	0.36
CHI-5	0.55	0.43
CHI-6-1	0.44	0.47
CHI-6-2	0.49	0.37
CHI-6-3	0.34	0.29
CHI-6-4	0.38	0.34
CHI-7	0.60	0.49
CHI-8	0.52	0.58
CHI-9	0.52	0.69
CHI-10-1	0.56	0.63
CHI-10-2	0.38	0.55
CHI-11	0.61	0.79
CHI-12	0.62	0.75
CHI-WAS-1	0.30	0.32
ESX-CAL-1	0.37	0.29
ESX-CAL-ORL-1	0.45	0.36
FRA-1	0.29	0.31
FRA-2	0.24	0.42
FRA-3-1	0.23	0.33
FRA-3-2	0.40	0.40

FRA-3-3	0.29	0.47
FRA-4	0.52	0.57
FRA-5	0.43	0.66
FRA-6	0.33	0.61
FRA-7	0.46	0.44
GI-CHI-1	0.28	0.35
LAM-1	0.35	0.41
LAM-2	0.39	0.43
LAM-3	0.56	0.60
LAM-4	0.55	0.58
LAM-5	0.42	0.45
ORG-1	0.41	0.51
ORG-2	0.63	0.72
ORG-3	0.37	0.35
ORG-4	0.45	0.46
ORG-5	0.50	0.50
ORG-WAS-1	0.54	0.43
ORG-WAS-2	0.63	0.65
ORL-1-1	0.39	0.28
ORL-1-2	0.34	0.37
ORL-2	0.29	0.44
ORL-3	0.58	0.50
ORL-4	0.61	0.74
ORL-5	0.58	0.69
RUT-1	0.52	0.61
RUT-2	0.42	0.29
RUT-3	0.43	0.35
RUT-4	0.42	0.16
RUT-5-1	0.45	0.45
RUT-5-2	0.60	0.64
RUT-5-3	0.57	0.60
RUT-5-4	0.50	0.48
RUT-6	0.43	0.38
RUT-7	0.48	0.48
RUT-BEN-1	0.39	0.43
RUT-WDS-1	0.49	0.45
RUT-WDS-2	0.44	0.52
WAS-1	0.42	0.47
WAS-2-1	0.41	0.33
WAS-2-2	0.43	0.36
WAS-3	0.43	0.43
WAS-4	0.51	0.53
WAS-5	0.39	0.54
WAS-6	0.49	0.43
WAS-7-1	0.41	0.39
WAS-7-2	0.57	0.55
WAS-7-3	0.31	0.30
WAS-7-4	0.37	0.45

WDH-1	0.38	0.59
WDH-2	0.37	0.49
WDH-3-1	0.53	0.68
WDH-3-2	0.41	0.53
WDH-3-3	0.44	0.49
WDH-4	0.44	0.60
WDH-5	0.50	0.46
WDH-BEN-1	0.51	0.60
WDH-BEN-2	0.43	0.48
WDH-BEN- WDS-1	0.44	0.37
WDS-1-1	0.43	0.49
WDS-1-2	0.51	0.51
WDS-1-3	0.35	0.39
WDS-1-4	0.14	0.24
WDS-2	0.48	0.53
WDS-3	0.50	0.62
WDS-4-1	0.46	0.52
WDS-4-2	0.60	0.66
WDS-4-3	0.54	0.57
WDS-ADD-1	0.44	0.39
WDS-ORG-1	0.44	0.67
Min	0.14	0.16
Max	0.64	0.79
Mean	0.45	0.49
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.13

**Report of the Legislative Apportionment Board On the Proposed House
Reapportionment**

APPENDIX 3 – 2011 Apportionment Board's Final District Configuration Proposal

DISTRICT	TOWNS	POPULATION	DEVIATION	% DEV	MEMBERS
<u>ADD-1</u>	Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton, Vergennes, Waltham	7897	-447	-5.36%	2
<u>ADD-2</u>	Bridport, New Haven, Weybridge	3778	-394	-9.44%	1
<u>ADD-3</u>	Bristol, Lincoln, Monkton, Starksboro	8922	578	6.93%	2
<u>ADD-4</u>	Benson, Orwell, Shoreham, Whiting	3990	-182	-4.36%	1
<u>ADD-5</u>	Cornwall, Goshen, Leicester, Ripton, Salisbury	4173	1	0.02%	1
<u>ADD-6</u>	Middlebury	8496	152	1.82%	2
<u>BEN-1</u>	Manchester	4391	219	5.25%	1
<u>BEN-2</u>	Arlington, Rupert (98)*, Sandgate, Sunderland	3776	-396	-9.49%	1
<u>BEN-3</u>	Glastenbury, Shaftsbury, Woodford	4022	-150	-3.60%	1
<u>BEN-4-1</u>	Bennington^	7997	-347	-4.16%	2
<u>BEN-4-2</u>	Bennington^	7767	-577	-6.92%	2
<u>BEN-5</u>	Pownal, Stamford	4351	179	4.29%	1
<u>BEN-RUT-1</u>	Danby, Dorset, Mount Tabor, Peru, Landgrove	4130	-42	-1.01%	1
<u>CAL-1</u>	Hardwick, Stannard, Walden	4161	-11	-0.26%	1
<u>CAL-2</u>	Danville, Groton, Peacham	3950	-222	-5.32%	1
<u>CAL-3</u>	Barnet, Ryegate, Waterford	4162	-10	-0.24%	1
<u>CAL-4</u>	Saint Johnsbury	7603	-741	-8.88%	2
<u>CAL-5</u>	Burke, Lyndon, Sutton	8763	419	5.02%	2
<u>CHI-1-1</u>	Colchester^	8336	-8	-0.10%	2

<u>CHI-1-2</u>	Colchester^	7668	-676	-8.10%	2
<u>CHI-2-1</u>	Essex^	8173	-171	-2.05%	2
<u>CHI-2-2</u>	Essex^	9112	768	9.20%	2
<u>CHI-2-3</u>	Essex (2302)*, Westford	4331	159	3.81%	1
<u>CHI-3</u>	Jericho, Underhill	8025	-319	-3.82%	2
<u>CHI-4</u>	Burlington	42417	697	1.67%	10
<u>CHI-5</u>	Colchester (1063)*, Winooski	8330	-14	-0.17%	2
<u>CHI-6-1</u>	South Burlington^	4567	395	9.47%	1
<u>CHI-6-2</u>	South Burlington^#	4265	93	2.23%	1
<u>CHI-6-3</u>	South Burlington^	4518	346	8.29%	1
<u>CHI-6-4</u>	South Burlington^#	4554	382	9.16%	1
<u>CHI-7</u>	Williston	8698	354	4.24%	2
<u>CHI-8</u>	Milton	8598	254	3.04%	2
<u>CHI-9</u>	Richmond	4081	-91	-2.18%	1
<u>CHI-10-1</u>	Shelburne^	3843	-329	-7.89%	1
<u>CHI-10-2</u>	Saint George, Shelburne (3301)*	3975	-197	-4.72%	1
<u>CHI-11</u>	Charlotte	3754	-418	10.02%	1
<u>CHI-12</u>	Hinesburg	4396	224	5.37%	1
<u>CHI-WAS-1</u>	Bolton, Buels Gore, Huntington, Waterbury (1086)*	4236	64	1.53%	1
<u>ESX-CAL-1</u>	Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Kirby, Lunenburg, Maidstone, Victory	3761	-411	-9.85%	1
<u>ESX-CAL-ORL</u>	Averill, Averys Gore, Bloomfield, Brighton, Canaan, East Haven, Ferdinand, Lemington, Lewis, Newark, Norton, Warners Grant, Warrens Gore, Westmore	3969	-203	-4.87%	1

<u>FRA-1</u>	Sheldon, Swanton	8617	273	3.27%	2
<u>FRA-2</u>	Berkshire, Franklin, Highgate, Richford	8940	596	7.14%	2
<u>FRA-3-1</u>	Saint Albans City (2547)*, Saint Albans Town (1619)*	4166	-6	-0.14%	1
<u>FRA-3-2</u>	Saint Albans City (2199)*, Saint Albans Town (2263)*	4462	290	6.95%	1
<u>FRA-3-3</u>	Saint Albans City (2172)*, Saint Albans Town (2117)*	4289	117	2.80%	1
<u>FRA-4</u>	Enosburg, Montgomery	3982	-190	-4.55%	1
<u>FRA-5</u>	Georgia	4515	343	8.22%	1
<u>FRA-6</u>	Fairfax	4285	113	2.71%	1
<u>FRA-7</u>	Bakersfield, Fairfield, Fletcher	4490	318	7.62%	1
<u>GI-CHI-1</u>	Alburgh, Grand Isle, Isle La Motte, Milton (1754)*, North Hero, South Hero	8724	380	4.55%	2
<u>LAM-1</u>	Cambridge, Waterville	4332	160	3.84%	1
<u>LAM-2</u>	Belvidere, Johnson	3794	-378	-9.06%	1
<u>LAM-3</u>	Stowe	4314	142	3.40%	1
<u>LAM-4</u>	Eden, Hyde Park	4277	105	2.52%	1
<u>LAM-5</u>	Elmore, Morristown, Wolcott	7758	-586	-7.02%	2
<u>ORG-1</u>	Newbury, Orange, Topsham	4461	289	6.93%	1
<u>ORG-2</u>	Chelsea, Corinth, Vershire, Washington	4374	202	4.84%	1
<u>ORG-3</u>	Bradford, Fairlee	3774	-398	-9.54%	1
<u>ORG-4</u>	Strafford,	4338	166	3.98%	1

	Thetford, West Fairlee				
<u>ORG-5</u>	Randolph^	3990	-182	-4.36%	1
<u>ORG-WAS-1</u>	Braintree, Brookfield, Randolph (788)*, Roxbury	4017	-155	-3.72%	1
<u>ORG-WAS-2</u>	Barre Town (451)*, Williamstown	3840	-332	-7.96%	1
<u>ORL-1-1</u>	Newport City^	3865	-307	-7.36%	1
<u>ORL-1-2</u>	Coventry, Irasburg, Lowell, Newport City (724)*	3852	-320	-7.67%	1
<u>ORL-2</u>	Barton, Sheffield, Wheelock	4324	152	3.64%	1
<u>ORL-3</u>	Brownington, Charleston, Derby, Holland, Morgan	8010	-334	-4.00%	2
<u>ORL-4</u>	Albany, Craftsbury, Glover, Greensboro	4031	-141	-3.38%	1
<u>ORL-5</u>	Jay, Newport Town, Troy, Westfield	4313	141	3.38%	1
<u>RUT-1</u>	Brandon, Sudbury	4526	354	8.49%	1
<u>RUT-2</u>	Castleton, Fair Haven, Hubbardton, West Haven	8421	77	0.92%	2
<u>RUT-3</u>	Proctor, West Rutland	4067	-105	-2.52%	1
<u>RUT-4</u>	Rutland Town	4054	-118	-2.83%	1
<u>RUT-5-1</u>	Rutland City^	4134	-38	-0.91%	1
<u>RUT-5-2</u>	Rutland City^	3998	-174	-4.17%	1
<u>RUT-5-3</u>	Rutland City^	4099	-73	-1.75%	1
<u>RUT-5-4</u>	Rutland City^	4264	92	2.21%	1
<u>RUT-6</u>	Ira, Poultney	3864	-308	-7.38%	1
<u>RUT-7</u>	Chittenden, Pittsford	4249	77	1.85%	1
<u>RUT-BEN-1</u>	Middletown Springs, Pawlet,	4601	429	10.28%	1

	Rupert (616)*, Tinmouth, Wells				
<u>RUT-WDS-1</u>	Bridgewater, Killington, Mendon, Pittsfield, Stockbridge	4088	-84	-2.01%	1
<u>RUT-WDS-2</u>	Clarendon, Ludlow, Mount Holly, Shrewsbury, Wallingford	8906	562	6.74%	2
<u>WAS-1</u>	Waterbury^	3978	-194	-4.65%	1
<u>WAS-2-1</u>	Northfield^	4541	369	8.84%	1
<u>WAS-2-2</u>	Berlin, Northfield (1666)*	4553	381	9.13%	1
<u>WAS-3</u>	Montpelier	7855	-489	-5.86%	2
<u>WAS-4</u>	Duxbury, Fayston, Moretown, Waitsfield, Warren	7772	-572	-6.86%	2
<u>WAS-5</u>	Cabot, Marshfield, Plainfield	4264	92	2.21%	1
<u>WAS-6</u>	Calais, East Montpelier, Middlesex, Woodbury, Worcester	7818	-526	-6.30%	2
<u>WAS-7-1</u>	Barre City^	4386	214	5.13%	1
<u>WAS-7-2</u>	Barre City^	4086	-86	-2.06%	1
<u>WAS-7-3</u>	Barre City (580)*, Barre Town (3393)*	3973	-199	-4.77%	1
<u>WAS-7-4</u>	Barre Town^	4080	-92	-2.21%	1
<u>WDH-1</u>	Athens, Townshend, Brookline, Newfane	3930	-242	-5.80%	1
<u>WDH-2</u>	Putney, Dummerston	4566	394	9.44%	1
<u>WDH-3-1</u>	Brattleboro^	4182	10	0.24%	1
<u>WDH-3-2</u>	Brattleboro^	3931	-241	-5.78%	1
<u>WDH-3-3</u>	Brattleboro^	3933	-239	-5.73%	1
<u>WDH-4</u>	Guilford, Vernon	4327	155	3.72%	1
<u>WDH-5</u>	Grafton,	9139	795	9.53%	2

	Rockingham, Westminster				
<u>WDH-BEN-1</u>	Stratton, Wardsboro, Somerset, Dover, Searsburg, Wilmington	4228	56	1.34%	1
<u>WDH-BEN-2</u>	Marlboro, Halifax, Whitingham, Readsboro	3926	-246	-5.90%	1
<u>WDH-BEN- WDS</u>	Weston, Londonderry, Windham, Jamaica, Winhall	4558	386	9.25%	1
<u>WDS-1-1</u>	Sharon, Barnard, Pomfret, Hartford (895)*	4248	76	1.82%	1
<u>WDS-1-2</u>	Norwich, Hartford (709)*	4123	-49	-1.17%	1
<u>WDS-1-3</u>	Hartford^	4257	85	2.04%	1
<u>WDS-1-4</u>	Hartford^	4091	-81	-1.94%	1
<u>WDS-2</u>	Woodstock, Plymouth, Reading	4333	161	3.86%	1
<u>WDS-3</u>	Hartland, West Windsor, Windsor	8045	-299	-3.58%	2
<u>WDS-4-1</u>	Cavendish, Weathersfield	4192	20	0.48%	1
<u>WDS-4-2</u>	Springfield^	9046	702	8.41%	2
<u>WDS-4-3</u>	Baltimore, Andover, Chester, Springfield (327)*	4192	20	0.48%	1
<u>WDS-ADD-1</u>	Granville, Hancock, Rochester, Bethel	3790	-382	-9.16%	1
<u>WDS-ORG-1</u>	Tunbridge, Royalton	4057	-115	-2.76%	1
113 Districts		625741			150

These numbers do not reflect changes proposed by the South Burlington Board of Civil Authority, to which the Legislative Apportionment Board concurs. CHI-6-2 would include all population residing on Elsom Pkwy, while CHI-6-4 would exclude all population residing on Elsom Pkwy. The South Burlington BCA estimates this population at 65. Please see attached correspondence from the City of South Burlington

Individual maps of these final proposed districts may be found online at:
<http://vermont-elections.org/2011LABMaps.html>

**Report of the Legislative Apportionment Board On the Proposed House
Reapportionment
APPENDIX 4 – 2011 Apportionment Board's Initial District Configuration
Proposal**

150 Single-Member Districts				
DISTRICT	TOWNS	POPULATION	DEVIATION	% DEV
				-
ADD-1	Panton, Vergennes, Waltham	3751	-421	10.09%
ADD-2	Ferrisburgh, Monkton(1023)*	3798	-374	-8.96%
ADD-3	Addison, New Haven, Weybridge	3931	-241	-5.78%
ADD-4	Lincoln, Monkton(957)*, Starksboro	4005	-167	-4.00%
ADD-5	Bridport, Orwell, Shoreham, Whiting	4152	-20	-0.48%
ADD-6	Cornwall, Goshen, Leicester, Ripton, Salisbury	4173	1	0.02%
ADD-7-1	Middlebury^	4261	89	2.13%
ADD-7-2	Middlebury^	4235	63	1.51%
ADD-8	Bristol	3894	-278	-6.66%
BEN-1	Manchester	4391	219	5.25%
BEN-2	Arlington, Rupert(98)*, Sandgate, Sunderland	3776	-396	-9.49%
BEN-3	Glastenbury, Shaftsbury, Woodford	4022	-150	-3.60%
BEN-4-1	Bennington^	4030	-142	-3.40%
BEN-4-2	Bennington^	3969	-203	-4.87%
BEN-4-3	Bennington^	3878	-294	-7.05%
BEN-4-4	Bennington^	3887	-285	-6.83%
BEN-5	Pownal, Stamford	4351	179	4.29%
BEN-RUT-1	Danby, Dorset, Landgrove, Mt. Tabor, Peru	4130	-42	-1.01%
CAL-1	Hardwick, Walden	3945	-227	-5.44%
CAL-2	Danville, Groton, Peacham	3950	-222	-5.32%
CAL-3	Barnet, Ryegate, Waterford	4162	-10	-0.24%
CAL-4	St. Johnsbury^	4500	328	7.86%
CAL-5	Lyndon(1423)*, St. Johnsbury(3103)*	4526	354	8.49%
CAL-6	Lyndon^	4558	386	9.25%
CAL-7	Burke, Sheffield, Sutton, Wheelock	4296	124	2.97%
CHI-1-1	Colchester^	3987	-185	-4.43%
CHI-1-2	Colchester^	3876	-296	-7.09%
CHI-1-3	Colchester^	4036	-136	-3.26%
CHI-1-4	Colchester^	4105	-67	-1.61%
CHI-2-1	Essex^	4332	160	3.84%
CHI-2-2	Essex^	4249	77	1.85%
CHI-2-3	Essex^	4380	208	4.99%
CHI-2-4	Essex^	4410	238	5.70%
CHI-2-5	Essex(2216)*, Westford	4245	73	1.75%
CHI-3-1	Jericho^	3979	-193	-4.63%
CHI-3-2	Jericho(1030)*, Underhill	4046	-126	-3.02%
CHI-4-1	Burlington^	3865	-307	-7.36%
CHI-4-2	Burlington^	3881	-291	-6.98%
CHI-4-3	Burlington^	4011	-161	-3.86%

CHI-4-4	Burlington^	4126	-46	-1.10%
CHI-4-5	Burlington^	4448	276	6.62%
CHI-4-6	Burlington^	4486	314	7.53%
CHI-4-7	Burlington^	4526	354	8.49%
CHI-4-8	Burlington^	4522	350	8.39%
CHI-4-9	Burlington^	4185	13	0.31%
CHI-4-10	Burlington^	4367	195	4.67%
CHI-5-1	Winooski^	4154	-18	-0.43%
CHI-5-2	Colchester(1063)*, Winooski(3113)*	4176	4	0.10%
CHI-6-1	S. Burlington^	4567	395	9.47%
CHI-6-2	S. Burlington^	4265	93	2.23%
CHI-6-3	S. Burlington^	4518	346	8.29%
CHI-6-4	S. Burlington^	4554	382	9.16%
CHI-7-1	Williston^	4333	161	3.86%
CHI-7-2	Williston^	4365	193	4.63%
CHI-8-1	Milton^	4219	47	1.13%
CHI-8-2	Milton^	4379	207	4.96%
CHI-9	Richmond	4081	-91	-2.18%
CHI-10-1	Shelburne^	3843	-329	-7.89%
CHI-10-2	Shelburne(3301)*, St. George	3975	-197	-4.72%
CHI-11-1	Charlotte, Hinesburg(186)*	3940	-232	-5.56%
CHI-11-2	Hinesburg^	4210	38	0.91%
CHI-WAS-1	Bolton, Buel's Gore, Huntington, Waterbury(674)*	3824	-348	-8.34%
ESX-CAL-1	Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Kirby, Lunenburg, Maidstone, Victory	3761	-411	-9.85%
ESX-CAL-ORL-1	Averill, Avery's Gore, Bloomfield, Brighton, Canaan, East Haven, Ferdinand, Lemington, Lewis, Newark, Norton, Warner's Grant, Warren's Gore, Westmore	3969	-203	-4.87%
FRA-1-1	Swanton^	4312	140	3.36%
FRA-1-2	Sheldon, Swanton(2115)*	4305	133	3.19%
FRA-2-1	Franklin(881)*, Highgate	4416	244	5.85%
FRA-2-2	Berkshire, Franklin(524)*, Richford	4524	352	8.44%
FRA-3-1	St. Albans Town^	4298	126	3.02%
FRA-3-2	St. Albans City^	4329	157	3.76%
FRA-3-3	St. Albans City(2589)*, St. Albans Town(1701)*	4290	118	2.83%
FRA-4	Bakersfield, Fairfield, Fletcher	4490	318	7.62%
FRA-5	Georgia	4515	343	8.22%
FRA-6	Fairfax	4285	113	2.71%
FRA-LAM-1	Belvidere, Enosburg, Montgomery	4330	158	3.79%
GI-1	Alburgh, Grand Isle(1118)*, Isle La Motte, N. Hero	4390	218	5.23%
GI-CHI-1	Grand Isle(949)*, Milton(1754)*, South Hero	4334	162	3.88%
LAM-1	Cambridge, Waterville	4332	160	3.84%
LAM-2-1	Johnson, Morristown(889)*	4335	163	3.91%
LAM-2-2	Morristown^	4338	166	3.98%

LAM-3	Stowe	4314	142	3.40%
LAM-4	Eden, Hyde Park	4277	105	2.52%
ORG-1	Newbury, Orange, Topsham	4461	289	6.93%
ORG-2	Chelsea, Corinth, Vershire, Washington	4374	202	4.84%
ORG-3	Bradford, Fairlee	3774	-398	-9.54%
ORG-4	Strafford, Thetford, West Fairlee	4338	166	3.98%
ORG-5	Randolph^	3857	-315	-7.55%
ORG-WAS-1	Braintree, Brookfield, Randolph(921)*, Roxbury	4150	-22	-0.53%
ORG-WAS-2	Barre Town(451)*, Williamstown	3840	-332	-7.96%
ORL-1	Jay, Newport Town, Troy, Westfield	4313	141	3.38%
ORL-2	Newport City	4589	417	10.00%
ORL-3	Albany, Coventry, Irasburg, Lowell	4069	-103	-2.47%
ORL-4	Barton, Glover	3932	-240	-5.75%
ORL-5	Brownington, Charleston, Derby(502)*, Holland, Morgan	3891	-281	-6.74%
ORL-6	Derby^	4119	-53	-1.27%
ORL-LAM-CAL-1	Craftsbury, Greensboro, Stannard, Wolcott	3860	-312	-7.48%
RUT-1	Brandon, Sudbury	4526	354	8.49%
RUT-2	Benson, Fair Haven, West Haven	4054	-118	-2.83%
RUT-3-1	Castleton(776)*, Hubbardton, Pittsford	4473	301	7.21%
RUT-3-2	Castleton^	3941	-231	-5.54%
RUT-4	Proctor, W. Rutland	4067	-105	-2.52%
RUT-5	Rutland Town	4054	-118	-2.83%
RUT-6-1	Rutland City^	4264	92	2.21%
RUT-6-2	Rutland City^	4134	-38	-0.91%
RUT-6-3	Rutland City^	4099	-73	-1.75%
RUT-6-4	Rutland City^	3998	-174	-4.17%
RUT-7	Middletown Springs, Poultney	4177	5	0.12%
RUT-8	Clarendon, Ira, Shrewsbury	4059	-113	-2.71%
RUT-BEN-1	Pawlet, Rupert(616)*, Tinmouth, Wells	3856	-316	-7.57%
RUT-WDS-1	Chittenden, Killington, Mendon, Pittsfield, Stockbridge	4410	238	5.70%
RUT-WDS-2	Mt. Holly, Wallingford, Weston	3882	-290	-6.95%
WAS-1	Waterbury^	4390	218	5.23%
WAS-2	Northfield^	4541	369	8.84%
WAS-3	Duxbury, Fayston(983)*, Moretown	3978	-194	-4.65%
WAS-4-1	Montpelier^	3958	-214	-5.13%
WAS-4-2	Montpelier^	3897	-275	-6.59%
WAS-5	Fayston(370)*, Waitsfield, Warren	3794	-378	-9.06%
WAS-6	Cabot, Marshfield, Plainfield	4264	92	2.21%
WAS-7	East Montpelier, Middlesex	4307	135	3.24%
WAS-8	Berlin, Northfield(1666)*	4553	381	9.13%
WAS-9-1	Barre City^	4386	214	5.13%
WAS-9-2	Barre City^	4086	-86	-2.06%
WAS-9-3	Barre City(580)*, Barre Town(3973)*	3973	-199	-4.77%
WAS-9-4	Barre Town^	4080	-92	-2.21%
WAS-LAM-1	Calais, Elmore, Woodbury, Worcester	4366	194	4.65%

WDH-1	Athens, Brookline, Newfane, Townshend	3930	-242	-5.80%
WDH-2	Dummerston, Putney	4566	394	9.44%
WDH-3-1	Brattleboro^	4182	10	0.24%
WDH-3-2	Brattleboro^	3931	-241	-5.78%
WDH-3-3	Brattleboro^	3933	-239	-5.73%
WDH-4	Guilford, Vernon	4327	155	3.72%
WDH-5-1	Rockingham^	4496	324	7.77%
WDH-5-2	Rockingham(786)*, Westminster	3964	-208	-4.99%
WDH-BEN-1	Dover, Searsburg, Somerset, Wardsboro Wilmington	4012	-160	-3.84%
WDH-BEN-2	Halifax, Marlboro, Readsboro, Whitingham	3926	-246	-5.90%
WDH-BEN-3	Jamaica, Londonderry, Stratton, Windham, Winhall	4208	36	0.86%
WDS-1-1	Barnard, Hartford(895)*, Pomfret, Sharon	4248	76	1.82%
WDS-1-2	Hartford(709)*, Norwich	4123	-49	-1.17%
WDS-1-3	Hartford*	4257	85	2.04%
WDS-1-4	Hartford*	4091	-81	-1.94%
WDS-2	Bridgewater, Woodstock	3984	-188	-4.51%
WDS-3-1	Hartland, Reading, W. Windsor(321)*	4387	215	5.15%
WDS-3-2	W. Windsor(771)*, Windsor	4324	152	3.64%
WDS-4-1	Springfield(1226)*, Weathersfield	4051	-121	-2.90%
WDS-4-2	Springfield^	3915	-257	-6.16%
WDS-4-3	Springfield^	4232	60	1.44%
WDS-5	Cavendish, Ludlow, Plymouth	3949	-223	-5.35%
WDS-ADD-1	Bethel, Granville, Hancock, Rochester	3790	-382	-9.16%
WDS-ORG-1	Royalton, Tunbridge	4057	-115	-2.76%
WDS-WDH-1	Andover, Baltimore, Chester, Grafton	4544	372	8.92%
	*Town subdivided, subdivision shared in district (Number in parentheses is population shared in district)			
	^Town subdivided, subdivision as entire district			

Individual maps of these initially proposed districts may be found online at:
<http://vermont-elections.org/2011LABProposals.html>

**Report of the Legislative Apportionment Board On the Proposed House Reapportionment
APPENDIX 5 - Existing House Districts (2002 Plan)**

DISTRICT (108 Districts)	No. of Reps in District	TOWNS IN DISTRICT
ADDISON-1	2	Middlebury
ADDISON-2	1	Cornwall, Goshen, Hancock, Leicester, Ripton and Salisbury
ADDISON-3	2	Addison, Ferrisburgh, Panton, Vergennes and Waltham
ADDISON-4	2	Bristol, Lincoln, Monkton, and Starksboro
ADDISON-5	1	Bridport, New Haven and Weybridge
ADDISON-RUTLAND-1	1	Benson, Orwell, Shoreham and Whiting
BENNINGTON-1	1	Pownal and Woodford
BENNINGTON-2-1	2	That portion of the town of Bennington not included in BENNINGTON 2-2
BENNINGTON-2-2	2	That portion of the town of Bennington encompassed by a border beginning at the intersection of VT 7 and the Pownal town line; then northerly on the easterly side of VT 7 to the intersection with Monument Avenue; then north along the easterly side of Monument Avenue to the intersection with Dewey Street; then northerly along the easterly side of Dewey Street to the intersection with West Main Street; then southeasterly on the southerly side of West Main Street to the intersection with North Street; then northerly along the easterly side of North Street to the intersection with County Street; then easterly along the southerly side of County Street to the intersection with Park Street; then northerly along the easterly side of Park Street to the intersection with Roaring Branch River; then easterly along the southerly side of the river to the intersection with VT 9; then easterly along VT 9, encompassing both sides of the road, to the intersection with the Bennington-Woodford town line; then southerly along the westerly side of the Bennington-Woodford town line to the intersection with the Bennington-Pownal town line; then westerly along the northerly side of the Bennington-Pownal town line to the point of beginning.
BENNINGTON-3	1	Glastenbury and Shaftsbury
BENNINGTON-4	1	Manchester
BENNINGTON-5	1	Arlington, Sandgate, Sunderland, and, that part of Rupert encompassed within a boundary beginning at the intersection of the New York state line with VT 153, then northeasterly along the centerline of VT 153 to the intersection with East Street, thence easterly along the centerline of East Street to the intersection with Kent Hollow Road, then southerly along the centerline of Kent Hollow Road to the Sandgate town line.
BENNINGTON-RUTLAND-1	1	Danby, Dorset, Landgrove, Mount Tabor and Peru

CALEDONIA-1	1	Barnet, Ryegate and Waterford
CALEDONIA-2	1	Hardwick, Stannard and Walden
CALEDONIA-3	2	St. Johnsbury
CALEDONIA-4	2	Burke, Lyndon and Sutton
CALEDONIA-WASHINGTON-1	1	Cabot, Danville and Peacham
CHITTENDEN-1-1	1	The town of Hinesburg, except two portions: the first being that portion of the town of Hinesburg in the southwest corner of the town bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Monkton town line and Baldwin Road, then northerly along Baldwin Road to its intersection with Drinkwater Road, then westerly along the center line of Drinkwater Road to the Charlotte town line; and the second being that portion of the town of Hinesburg in the northwest corner of the town bounded by a line beginning at the junction of VT 116 and the St. George town line; then southerly along the centerline of VT 116 to its intersection with Falls Road; then westerly along the centerline of Falls Road to its intersection with O'Neill Road; then westerly along the centerline of O'Neill Road to the Charlotte town border.
CHITTENDEN-1-2	1	The town of Charlotte, plus the two portions of the town of Hinesburg not included in CHITTENDEN-1-1.
CHITTENDEN-2	2	Williston
CHITTENDEN-3-1	2	Consisting of all that portion of the City of Burlington encompassed within a boundary beginning where the northerly property line of Leddy Park intersects the shore of Lake Champlain, thence northeasterly along said property line and said property line extended to North Avenue, thence southeasterly along North Avenue to the southerly boundary of Farrington's Trailer Park, thence northeasterly and northwesterly along the boundary of Farrington's Trailer Park and said boundary extended to the northwest boundary of the corner lot at the intersection of Lopes Avenue and Roseade Parkway including all the residences in Farrington's Trailer Park and on Poirier Place, thence northeasterly along the back property lines between property fronting on Roseade Parkway and Arlington Court including all the residences on Arlington Court and continuing to the intersection of Farrington Parkway and Ethan Allen Parkway, thence northerly along Ethan Allen Parkway to a point where the back property
CHITTENDEN-3-1 description continued		lines of property fronting on Farrington Parkway intersect Ethan Allen Parkway including the residences on Farrington Parkway, thence northwesterly in a straight line to the northeast corner of the Lyman C. Hunt school property, thence northeasterly along the back property lines of property fronting on Janet Circle to a point where said back property lines intersect the back property lines of property fronting on James Avenue, thence northwesterly along the back property lines of property fronting on James Avenue and Sandra Circle and continuing northeasterly along the back property lines of property fronting on Sandra Circle to the intersection of the right-of-way of the Winooski Valley Park Way, thence northerly in a straight line to the Winooski River, thence northerly along the Winooski River to its intersection with Lake Champlain, thence southerly along the shore of Lake Champlain back to the point of beginning.

CHITTENDEN 3-2	1	<p>Consisting of all that portion of the City of Burlington encompassed within a boundary beginning where the northerly property line of Leddy Park intersects the shore of Lake Champlain, thence northeasterly along said property line and said property line extended to North Avenue, thence southeasterly along North Avenue to the southerly boundary of Farrington's Trailer Park, thence northeasterly and northwesterly along the boundary of Farrington's Trailer Park and said boundary extended to the northwest boundary of the corner lot at the intersection of Lopes Avenue and Roseade Parkway including all the residences on the west side of Lopes Avenue and Blondin Circle, thence northeasterly along the back property lines between property fronting on Roseade Parkway and Arlington Court including all the residences on Roseade Parkway, and continuing to the intersection of Farrington Parkway and Ethan Allen Parkway including all units at 282 Ethan Allen Parkway, thence northerly along Ethan</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-2 description continued		<p>Allen Parkway to a point where the back property lines of property fronting on Farrington Parkway intersect Ethan Allen Parkway, thence northwesterly in a straight line to the northeast corner of the Lyman C. Hunt school property, thence northeasterly along the back property lines of property fronting on Janet Circle to a point where said back property lines intersect the back property lines of property fronting on James Avenue including all residences on Janet Circle, thence northwesterly along the back property lines of property fronting on James Avenue and Sandra Circle and continuing northeasterly along the back property lines of property fronting on Sandra Circle to the intersection of the right-of-way of the Winooski Valley Park Way including all residences on Sandra Circle, thence northerly in a straight line to the Winooski River, thence following the Winooski River easterly to the railroad bridge, thence westerly along the railroad bridge and continuing along the railroad tracks until it intersects at a point</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-2 description continued		<p>with North Winooski Avenue extended, thence southeasterly along North Winooski Avenue extended to the intersection of Riverside Avenue, thence westerly along Riverside Avenue to the intersection of Intervale Avenue, thence southwesterly along Intervale Avenue to the intersection of Archibald Street, thence westerly along Archibald Street to the intersection of Spring Street; thence northwesterly along Spring Street to the intersection of Washington Street, thence westerly along Manhattan Drive to the intersection of Pitkin Street, thence southerly along Pitkin Street to the intersection of Strong Street, thence westerly along Strong Street to the intersection of North Avenue, thence northwesterly along North Avenue to the intersection of the railroad tracks, thence southerly along the railroad tracks to the intersection of the northern boundary line of the property north of the Moran Plant,</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-2 description continued		<p>thence westerly along the boundary line to the intersection of the shore of Lake Champlain, thence northerly along the shore of Lake Champlain to the point of beginning.</p>

CHITTENDEN 3-3	2	<p>Consisting of that portion of the City of Burlington encompassed within a boundary beginning at the intersection of Maple and Willard Street, thence westerly along Maple Street to the intersection of St. Paul Street, thence southerly along St. Paul Street to the intersection of Kilburn Street, thence westerly along Kilburn Street to the intersection of Pine Street, thence southerly along Pine Street to the intersection of the railroad track, thence northwesterly along the railroad track to the intersection of Maple Street, thence westerly along Maple Street to the shore of Lake Champlain, thence northerly along the shore of Lake Champlain to the intersection of the northern boundary line of the property to the north of the Moran Plant, thence easterly along the boundary line to the intersection of the railroad tracks, thence northerly along the railroad tracks to the intersection of North Avenue, thence southeasterly</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-3 description continued		<p>along North Avenue to the intersection of Strong Street, thence easterly along Strong Street to the intersection of Pitkin Street, thence northerly along Pitkin Street to the intersection of Manhattan Drive, thence easterly along Manhattan Drive to the intersection of Spring Street, thence southeasterly along Spring Street to the intersection of Archibald Street, thence easterly along Archibald Street to the intersection of North Union Street, thence southwesterly and southerly along North Union Street to the intersection of Pearl Street, thence easterly along Pearl Street to the intersection of Willard Street, thence southerly along Willard Street to the point of beginning.</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-4	2	<p>Consisting of that portion of the City of Burlington encompassed within a boundary beginning at the intersection of Davis Roadway and the boundary between the City of Burlington and the City of South Burlington, thence southwesterly along Davis Roadway to the intersection of South Prospect Street, thence northerly along South Prospect Street to the intersection of Main Street; thence westerly along Main Street to the intersection of Willard Street; thence northerly along Willard Street to the intersection of Pearl Street, thence westerly along Pearl Street to the intersection of North Union Street, thence northerly along North Union Street to the intersection of North Winooski Avenue, thence northeasterly along North Winooski Avenue to the intersection of Archibald Street, thence westerly along Archibald Street to the intersection of Intervale Avenue, thence northeasterly along Intervale Avenue to the intersection of Riverside Avenue, thence easterly along Riverside Avenue to the intersection of North</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-4 description continued		<p>Winooski Avenue, thence northeasterly along a line extending from the endpoint of North Winooski Avenue to the intersection of the railroad tracks, thence easterly along the railroad tracks to the intersection of North Prospect Street , thence southerly along North Prospect Street to the intersection of North Street, thence easterly along North Street to the intersection of Mansfield Avenue, thence southerly along Mansfield Avenue to the intersection of Colchester Avenue, thence northeasterly along Colchester Avenue to the intersection of Chase Street, thence northeasterly along Chase Street to the intersection of Grove Street, thence southeasterly along Grove Street to the intersection of the boundary line between the City of Burlington and the City of South Burlington, thence southwesterly along the boundary line to the intersection of Main Street, thence northwesterly along Main Street to the intersection with the boundary line, thence southerly along the boundary line to the point of beginning.</p>

CHITTENDEN 3-5	2	<p>Consisting of that portion of the City of Burlington encompassed within a boundary beginning from the shore of Lake Champlain, and the boundary line with the City of South Burlington, thence easterly along the boundary line between the City of Burlington and South Burlington (Queen City Parkway) to the intersection with Shelburne Road, thence northerly along the boundary line (Shelburne Road) to the point where the boundary line intersects a line extending westerly from Holt Street, thence proceeding easterly along the boundary line to its easternmost point, thence northerly along the boundary line to the intersection of Davis Roadway, thence southwesterly along Davis Roadway to the intersection of South Prospect Street, thence northerly along South Prospect Street to the intersection of Main Street, thence westerly along Main Street to the intersection of Willard Street, thence southerly</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-5 description continued		<p>along Willard Street to the intersection of Maple Street, thence westerly along Maple Street to the intersection of St. Paul Street, thence southerly along St. Paul Street to the intersection of Kilburn Street, thence westerly along Kilburn Street to the intersection of Pine Street, thence southerly along Pine Street to the intersection of the railroad track, thence northwesterly along the railroad track to the intersection of Maple Street, thence westerly along Maple Street to the intersection of the shore of Lake Champlain, thence southerly along the shore of Lake Champlain to the point of beginning.</p>
CHITTENDEN 3-6	2	<p>Consisting of all the City of Winooski and that portion of the city of Burlington encompassed within a boundary beginning at the northern terminus of the boundary line between the cities of Burlington and South Burlington located at a point adjacent to the Winooski River west of I-89, thence southwesterly along the boundary line to the intersection of the boundary line and Grove Street, thence northwesterly along Grove Street to the intersection of Chase Street, thence southwesterly along Chase Street to the intersection of Colchester Avenue, thence southwesterly along Colchester Avenue to the intersection of Mansfield Avenue, thence northerly along Mansfield Avenue to the intersection of North Street, thence westerly on North Street to the intersection of North Prospect Street, thence northerly along North Prospect Street to the intersection of the railroad tracks, thence easterly along the railroad tracks to the Winooski River and the boundary of the City of Burlington and the City of Winooski.</p>

CHITTENDEN 3-7	1	That portion of the City of South Burlington starting at a point on Lake Champlain at the Shelburne-South Burlington boundary and following the Shelburne-South Burlington boundary easterly to Shelburne Road, then northerly following Shelburne Road to Allen Road, then easterly following Allen Road to Spear Street, then northerly on Spear Street to Pheasant Way, then westerly on Pheasant Way to Deerfield Drive, then northerly on Deerfield Drive, then easterly on Deerfield Drive to the intersection with Spear Street, then across Spear Street to Nowland Farm Road to the intersection with Pinnacle Drive, then northerly on Pinnacle Drive, then easterly on Pinnacle Drive, then northerly on Pinnacle Drive, then westerly on Pinnacle Drive, then southerly on Pinnacle Drive to the intersection with Olivia Drive, then westerly along Olivia Drive to Spear Street, then northerly on Spear Street to Swift Street, then westerly on Swift Street, to Shelburne Road, then westerly along the Burlington-South Burlington boundary to Lake Champlain, then following the shore of Lake Champlain southerly to the point of beginning.
CHITTENDEN 3-8	1	That portion of the City of South Burlington starting at the junction of Dorset Street and the Shelburne-South Burlington boundary and proceeding easterly to the junction of the Shelburne-South Burlington-Williston boundaries, then northerly following the Williston-South Burlington boundary to Williston Road, then continuing westerly to the intersection of Hinesburg Road/ Patchen Road, then southerly following Hinesburg Road to Woodcrest Street, then westerly on Woodcrest Street, then northerly on Woodcrest Street, then westerly on Woodcrest Street, then southerly on Woodcrest Street to Dean Street, then easterly on Dean Street to Hinesburg Road, then southerly along Hinesburg Road to Interstate 89, then westerly along Interstate 89 to its intersection with Dorset Street, then southerly to Swift Street, then westerly following Swift Street to Spear Street, then southerly along Spear Street to Olivia Drive, then easterly on Olivia Drive to Pinnacle Drive, then northerly on Pinnacle Drive, then easterly on Pinnacle Drive, then southerly on Pinnacle Drive, then westerly on Pinnacle Drive, then southerly on Pinnacle Drive to Nowland Farm Road, then westerly to Spear Street, then across Spear Street to
CHITTENDEN-3-8 Description Continued		Deerfield Drive, then westerly on Deerfield Drive, then southerly on Deerfield Drive to Pheasant Way, then easterly on Pheasant Way to Spear Street, then southerly along Spear Street to Allen Road, then westerly following Allen Road to the intersection of Shelburne Road, then southerly on Shelburne Road to the Shelburne-South Burlington boundary, then easterly on the Shelburne-South Burlington boundary to the point of beginning at Dorset Street and the Shelburne-South Burlington boundary.

CHITTENDEN 3-9	1	That portion of the City of South Burlington starting at the junction of the Burlington-South Burlington boundary and Williston Road and following that boundary starting northerly following the city boundary to the Winooski River, then following the South Burlington-Winooski River boundary to Muddy Brook, then following the Muddy Brook - South Burlington boundary to Williston Road, then westerly to Hinesburg Road/Patchen Road, then southerly to Woodcrest Street, then westerly on Woodcrest Street, then northerly on Woodcrest Street, then westerly on Woodcrest Street, then southerly on Woodcrest Street to Dean Street, then easterly on Dean Street to Hinesburg Road, then continuing southerly on Hinesburg Road to Potash Brook, then westerly following the centerline of Potash Brook to the intersection with Kennedy Drive, then westerly on Kennedy Drive to Dorset Street, then northerly on Dorset Street to Williston Road, then westerly to the point beginning at the junction of the Burlington-South Burlington boundary and Williston Road.
CHITTENDEN 3-10	1	That portion of South Burlington not contained in CHITTENDEN 3-7, CHITTENDEN 3-8, OR CHITTENDEN 3-9.
CHITTENDEN-4	1	Richmond
CHITTENDEN-5-1	1	That portion of the town of Shelburne bounded by a line beginning on the southwest corner of the Shelburne-Charlotte town line, then following the shore of Lake Champlain to the mouth of the Munroe Brook, including all of the Lake that is part of the town of Shelburne, then upstream along the center of Munroe Brook to the intersection with Spear Street, then south along the centerline of Spear Street to the Shelburne-Charlotte town line, then west along the Shelburne-Charlotte town line to the place of beginning.
CHITTENDEN-5-2	1	The town of St. George, plus that portion of Shelburne which is not in CHITTENDEN 5-1.
CHITTENDEN-6-1	2	That portion of the Town of Essex not included in CHITTENDEN 6-2, or in CHITTENDEN 6-3.
CHITTENDEN-6-2	2	The Village of Essex Junction.
CHITTENDEN-6-3	1	The Town of Westford, plus that portion of the Town of Essex bounded by the center line of the road from Curve Hill at the Colchester Town line; thence to Lost Nation Road; then northerly on Old Stage Road to Towers Road; then continuing easterly to Brown's River Road to Weed Road; then easterly on Jericho Road to the Jericho town line.
CHITTENDEN 7-1	2	That portion of the town of Colchester north of Mallets Creek and west of Interstate 89 to the Milton town line, plus that portion of the Town of Colchester east of Interstate 89.
CHITTENDEN 7-2	2	That portion of the town of Colchester not included in CHITTENDEN 7-1.
CHITTENDEN-8	2	Bolton, Jericho and Underhill
CHITTENDEN-9	2	That portion of the town of Milton not included in GRAND ISLE-CHITTENDEN-1.
ESSEX-CALEDONIA	1	Bloomfield, Brunswick, Concord, Granby, Guildhall, Kirby, Lunenburg, Maidstone, and Victory
ESSEX-CALEDONIA-ORLEANS	1	Averill, Avery's Gore, Brighton, Canaan, East Haven, Ferdinand, Lemington, Lewis, Newark, Norton, Warner's Grant, Warren's Gore and Westmore(in Orleans County)
FRANKLIN-1	2	Fairfax and Georgia
FRANKLIN-2	2	Fairfield, Fletcher and St. Albans Town

FRANKLIN-3	2	St. Albans City
FRANKLIN-4	1	Bakersfield and Enosburg
FRANKLIN-5	2	Sheldon and Swanton
FRANKLIN-6	2	Berkshire, Franklin, Highgate and Richford
GRAND ISLE-CHITTENDEN-1-1	2	Alburg, Grand Isle, Isle La Motte, North Hero, South Hero, plus that portion of the town of Milton bounded by a line beginning at the mouth of the Lamoille River and Lake Champlain; then along the river upstream to the Interstate 89 bridge crossing the Lamoille River, then northerly along Interstate 89 to the Georgia town line; then along the Georgia town line to Lake Champlain; then southerly along the lakeshore to the place of beginning.
LAMOILLE-1	1	Stowe
LAMOILLE-2	1	Hyde Park and Wolcott
LAMOILLE-3	1	Eden and Johnson
LAMOILLE-4	1	Belvidere, Cambridge and Waterville
LAMOILLE-WASHINGTON-1	2	Elmore, Morrystown, Woodbury and Worcester
ORANGE-1	2	Chelsea, Corinth, Orange, Vershire, Washington, and Williamstown
ORANGE-2	1	Bradford, Fairlee and West Fairlee
ORANGE-ADDISON-1	2	Braintree, Brookfield, Granville and Randolph
ORANGE-CALEDONIA-1	1	Groton, Newbury and Topsham
ORLEANS-1	2	Brownington, Charleston, Derby, Holland and Morgan
ORLEANS-2	2	Coventry, Irasburg, Newport City and Newport Town
ORLEANS-CALEDONIA-1	2	Albany, Barton, Craftsbury, Glover, Greensboro, Sheffield and Wheelock
ORLEANS-FRANKLIN-1	1	Jay, Lowell, Montgomery, Troy and Westfield
RUTLAND-1-1	1	The town of Poultney and that part of the town of Ira encompassed with a boundary beginning in the southwest at the intersection of the town boundaries of Ira, Middletown Springs and Poultney, then northerly along the boundary with Poultney and continuing northerly along the boundary with Castleton, then easterly along the boundary with Castleton to the boundary with West Rutland, then southeasterly along the boundary with West Rutland to the ridge line of the mountain range, then southwesterly along the ridge line of the mountain range to the boundary with Middletown Springs, then westerly along the boundary with Middletown Springs to the point of beginning.
RUTLAND-1-2	2	The towns of Clarendon, Proctor, West Rutland, and that part of the town of Ira not included in Rutland-1-1.
RUTLAND-2	2	Castleton, Fair Haven, Hubbardton and West Haven
RUTLAND-3	1	Shrewsbury, Tinmouth and Wallingford
RUTLAND-4	1	Rutland Town

RUTLAND-5-1	1	That portion of the City of Rutland encompassed within a boundary beginning at the point where the boundary line of Rutland City and Rutland Town intersects with Lincoln Avenue; then southerly along the east side of the centerline of Lincoln Avenue to the intersection of West Street; then easterly along the north side of the centerline of West Street across North Main Street; then easterly along the north side of Terrill Street to the intersection of Lafayette Street; then southerly along the east side of the centerline of Lafayette Street to the intersection of Easterly Avenue; then easterly along the north side of Easterly Avenue to the intersection of Easterly Avenue and Piedmont Drive; then easterly along the north side of the centerline of Piedmont Drive to the intersection of Piedmont Drive and Piedmont Parkway; then easterly along the centerline of Piedmont Parkway to the intersection of Piedmont Parkway and Stratton Road; then southerly along the easterly side of the centerline of Stratton Road to the intersection of Stratton Road and Killington Avenue; then easterly along the north side of the centerline of Killington Avenue, including both sides of Grandview Terrace, to the boundary between Rutland City and Rutland Town;
RUTLAND-5-1 Description Continued		then northerly following the boundary line to its intersection with Gleason Road; then westerly along the south side of the centerline of Gleason Road to Woodstock Avenue; then following the boundary line back to the point of beginning.
RUTLAND-5-2	1	That portion of the City of Rutland encompassed within a boundary beginning at the point where the boundary line of Rutland City and Rutland Town intersects with South Main Street; then northerly along the easterly side of the centerline of South Main Street to the intersection of South Main Street and Strongs Avenue; then northwesterly along the east side of the centerline of Strongs Avenue to the intersection of Strongs Avenue and Prospect Street; then northerly along the east side of the centerline of Prospect Street to the intersection of Prospect Street and Washington Street; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of Washington Street to the intersection of Washington Street and Court Street; then northerly along the east side of the centerline of Court Street to the intersection of Court Street and West Street; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of West Street, to the intersection of West Street and South Main Street; then east across South Main Street to the intersection of South Main Street and Terrill Street; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of Terrill Street to the
RUTLAND-5-2 Description Continued		intersection of Terrill Street and Lafayette Street; then southerly along the west side of the centerline of Lafayette Street to the intersection of Lafayette Street and Easterly Avenue; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of Easterly Avenue to the intersection of Easterly Avenue and Piedmont Drive; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of Piedmont Drive to the intersection of Piedmont Drive and Piedmont Parkway; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of Piedmont Parkway to the intersection of Piedmont Parkway and Stratton Road; then southerly along the west side of the centerline of Stratton Road to the intersection of Stratton Road and Killington Avenue; then easterly along the south side of the centerline of Killington Avenue to the boundary of Rutland City and Rutland Town; then southerly along the city line to the intersection of the city line and South Main Street to the point of beginning.

RUTLAND-5-3	1	That portion of the City of Rutland encompassed within a boundary beginning at the point where the boundary line of Rutland City and Rutland Town intersects with South Main Street; then northerly along the west side of the centerline of South Main Street to the intersection of South Main Street and Strongs Avenue; then northwesterly along the west side of the centerline of Strongs Avenue to the intersection of Strongs Avenue and Prospect Street; then northerly along the west side of the centerline of Prospect Street to the intersection of Prospect Street and Washington Street; then easterly along the north side of the centerline of Washington Street to the intersection of Washington Street and Court Street; then northerly along the west side of the centerline of Court Street to the intersection of Court Street and West Street; then easterly along the north side of the centerline of West Street to the intersection of West Street and Lincoln Avenue; then northerly along the west side of the centerline of Lincoln Avenue to the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Williams Street; then west along the south side of the centerline of Williams Street to the intersection of Williams Street and Grove Street; then north along the west side of the
RUTLAND-5-3 Description Continued		centerline of Grove Street to the intersection of Grove Street and Maple Street; then west along the south side of the centerline of Maple Street to the intersection of Maple Street and Pine Street; then south along the east side of the centerline of Pine Street to the intersection of Pine Street and Robbins Street; then west along the south side of the centerline of Robbins Street to the intersection of Robbins Street and Baxter Street; then south along the east side of the centerline of Baxter Street to the intersection of Baxter Street and State Street; then west along the south side of the centerline of State Street to the intersection of State Street and Cramton Avenue; then south along the east side of the centerline of Cramton Avenue to the intersection of Cramton Avenue and West Street; then westerly along the south side of the centerline of West Street to the intersection of Ripley Road; then southerly along the Rutland City-Rutland Town line to the intersection of the city line and South Main Street, the point of beginning.
RUTLAND-5-4	1	That portion of the City of Rutland not located with the boundaries of RUTLAND-5-1, RUTLAND-5-2, or RUTLAND-5-3.
RUTLAND-6	1	Pittsford and Sudbury
RUTLAND-7	1	Brandon
RUTLAND-8	1	Middletown Springs, Pawlet, Wells and that part of Rupert not in BENNINGTON-5
RUTLAND-WINDSOR-1	1	Bridgewater, Chittenden, Killington and Mendon
WASHINGTON-1	1	Fayston, Waitsfield and Warren
WASHINGTON-2	2	Moretown, Northfield and Roxbury
WASHINGTON-3-1	1	That portion of the City of Barre bounded on the north, east and south by the Barre Town line, and bounded on the west by a line running along the center of Hall Street to the intersection of Elm Street; then along the center of Elm Street to the intersection of North Main Street; then along the center of North Main Street to the intersection of Prospect Street; then along the center of Prospect Street to the intersection of Allen Street; then along the western back lot line of Allen Street to the Barre Town boundary.

WASHINGTON-3-2	1	That portion of the City of Barre bounded on the north and south by the Barre Town line, on the east by the boundary with WASHINGTON-3-1, and on the west by the boundary with WASHINGTON-3-3.
WASHINGTON-3-3	1	The town of Berlin and that portion of the City of Barre bound on the west by the Berlin town line, on the north and south by the Barre Town line, and on the east by a boundary running from the Barre Town northern boundary along the center of Beckley Street; then along the center of Third Street to North Main street; then along the center of North Main Street to the intersection of Berlin Street; then along the center of Berlin Street to Prospect Street; then along the center of Prospect Street to the Barre Town line.
WASHINGTON-4	2	Barre Town
WASHINGTON-5	2	Montpelier
WASHINGTON-6	1	Calais, Marshfield and Plainfield
WASHINGTON-7	1	East Montpelier and Middlesex
WASHINGTON-CHITTENDEN-1	2	Buel's Gore, Duxbury, Huntington and Waterbury
WINDHAM-1	1	Guilford and Vernon
WINDHAM-2	1	Halifax, Whitingham and Wilmington
WINDHAM-3-1	1	That portion of the Town of Brattleboro to the west of a boundary beginning at Upper Dummerston Road at the Dummerston town line; then southeasterly along the centerline of Upper Dummerston Road to Interstate 91; thence southerly along the median of Interstate 91 to Williams Street; then easterly along the centerline of Williams Street to where the Whetstone Brook crosses; then southwestly along the western bank of the Whetstone Brook to Lamson Street and southerly along the centerline of Lamson Street to Chestnut Street; then westerly along the centerline of Chestnut Street to I-91; then southerly along the median of Interstate 91 to the Guilford town line.
WINDHAM-3-2	1	That portion of the Town of Brattleboro to the south of a boundary beginning at the Connecticut River at the Whetstone Brook, westerly along the southern bank of the Whetstone Brook to Elm Street; then northerly along the centerline of Frost Street to Williams Street and following the centerline of Williams Street to West Street; then westerly along the centerline of West Street to Williams Street and westerly along the centerline of Williams Street to where the Whetstone Brook crosses; then southwestly along the eastern bank of the Whetstone Brook to Lamson Street and southerly along the centerline of Lamson Street to Chestnut Street; then westerly along the centerline of Chestnut Street to I-91, and east of I-91 to the Guilford town line.
WINDHAM-3-3	1	That portion of the Town of Brattleboro not located in WINDHAM-3-1 or WINDHAM- 3-2.

WINDHAM-4	2	Athens, Brookline, Grafton, Rockingham, Windham, plus that part of Westminster encompassed within a boundary beginning at the intersection of the Rockingham town line with Interstate 91; then southeasterly along the centerline of Interstate 91 to the intersection with the Saxtons River; then easterly along the centerline of the Saxtons River until the intersection with Saxtons River Road (VT 121); then southeasterly along the centerline of Saxtons River road until the intersection with Church Avenue; then easterly along the center line of Church Avenue until the intersection with Saxtons River Road; then northerly along the centerline of Saxtons River Road until the intersection of Forest Road; then southerly along the centerline of Forest Road to the intersection with the Saxtons River; then northeasterly along the centerline of the Saxtons River to the intersection with the Connecticut River.
WINDHAM-5	2	Dummerston, Putney and that part of Westminster not in WINDHAM-4
WINDHAM-6	1	Marlboro, Newfane and Townshend
WINDHAM-BENNINGTON-1	1	Dover, Readsboro, Searsburg, Somerset, Stamford and Wardsboro
WINDHAM-BENNINGTON-WINDSOR-1	1	Jamaica, Londonderry, Stratton, Weston and Winhall
WINDSOR-1-1	1	The towns of Andover, Baltimore, Chester and that portion of the town of Springfield encompassed within a boundary beginning at the Chester-Springfield town lines at Northfield Drive; then easterly along the centerline of Northfield Drive to the intersection with Fairbanks Road; then northerly along the centerline of Fairbanks Road to the intersection with Main Street, North Springfield; then easterly along the centerline of Main Street, North Springfield to the intersection with the County Road; then northeasterly along the centerline of the County Road to the intersection with VT 106; then northwesterly along the centerline of VT 106 to the intersection with the Baltimore Road; then northwesterly along the centerline of the Baltimore Road to the Chester boundary line; then southerly along the Chester boundary line to the point of the beginning.
WINDSOR-1-2	2	That portion of the town of Springfield not part of WINDSOR 1-1
WINDSOR-2	1	Cavendish and Weathersfield
WINDSOR-3	1	Windsor
WINDSOR-4	1	Hartland and West Windsor
WINDSOR-5	1	Reading and Woodstock

WINDSOR-6-1	1	The towns of Barnard and Pomfret and that portion of the town of Hartford lying westerly and northerly of a boundary beginning on the Norwich-Hartford town line at the centerline of Newton Lane; then southerly along the centerline of Newton Lane to its intersection with Jericho Street; then westerly along the centerline of Jericho Street to its intersection with Dothan Road; then southerly along the centerline of Dothan Road to VT 14; then westerly along the centerline of VT 14 to the intersection of the centerline of Runnels Road and VT 14; then at a right angle to a utility pole marked 137T/6/NET&T/3>/136/GMP Corp/156/40030 on the south edge of VT 14; then southerly in a straight line across the White River to the junction of Old River Road and the beginning of Costello Road; then southerly and easterly along the center of Costello Road to its end on U.S. Route 4; then westerly along the centerline of U.S. Route 4 to the intersection of Waterman Hill Road; then northerly along the centerline of Waterman Hill Road to the northerly low watermark of the Ottauquechee River; then westerly and southerly along the northerly and westerly low watermark of the Ottauquechee River to the Hartford-Hartland town line;
WINDSOR-6-1 Description Continued		then westerly along the town line to the northerly low watermark of the Ottauquechee River; then along the northerly low watermark of the Ottauquechee River to the Hartford-Pomfret town line.
WINDSOR-6-2	2	That portion of the town of Hartford not located in Windsor 6-1
WINDSOR-ORANGE-1	1	Royalton and Tunbridge
WINDSOR-ORANGE-2	2	Norwich, Sharon, Strafford and Thetford
WINDSOR-RUTLAND-1	1	Ludlow, Mount Holly and Plymouth
WINDSOR-RUTLAND-2	1	Bethel, Pittsfield, Rochester, and Stockbridge

