HB 356 – Setting the Record Straight

A Response to Summit County's Talking Points

Q: Doesn't HB 356 create unintended consequences by forcing already-districted counties to redraw their maps?

A: No. We fully support restoring the **grandfather clause** from earlier versions of HB 356, which would exempt counties that already have **at least 50% of council seats elected by district**. This resolves concerns without changing the core goals of the bill. Governor Cox also indicated support for keeping the bill's main structure intact.

Q: Is assigning current council members to districts by lottery a good idea?

A: We agree that randomly assigning councilmembers isn't ideal.

The **better solution** is to assign each councilmember to the district where they live. Only if two or more members live in the same district should a lot be drawn to determine who represents it, with the remaining councilmembers placed into unassigned districts.

Q: Why should the districting commission—not the council—draw the maps?

A: Allowing seated councilmembers to override or redraw districts **would create an obvious conflict of interest**. HB 356 rightly puts that power in the hands of a **bipartisan districting commission** to protect public trust and ensure fair representation, just as it is done for legislative and congressional districts.

Q: Is the districting commission representative enough?

A: Yes. The commission will represent the entire county:

Mayors are geographically distributed across Summit County.

 The County Council can appoint a member specifically to represent the Snyderville Basin.

Adding more council-appointed members risks tipping the balance and undermining the commission's neutrality.

Q: What about the costs of contested elections under HB 356?

A: The Council's analysis **ignores real election costs** today.

Contested countywide elections already cost **\$50,000 or more**, and candidates struggle to reach voters across the sprawling geography. District elections are more affordable, manageable, and give local residents better access to their candidates.

Q: Doesn't districting undermine the "countywide perspective"?

A: No. In fact, the **current system concentrates power in Park City and Snyderville**. True districting will finally ensure the entire county—including the East Side and rural communities—has representation.

- **Most governing bodies** (school boards, legislatures, Congress) are district-based and still consider broader needs.
- Voters can still **contact any councilmember**, not just their district representative.
- Claims about "gerrymandering" are false. If any imbalance exists, it exists right now, not under HB 356.

Q: Will HB 356 create administrative disruption?

A: No. Councilmembers will continue to **serve out their full terms**. Districting would only take effect for future elections. There is no operational disruption.

Q: Is there real support for a five-district model without at-large seats?

A: Yes.

- All mayors in Summit County unanimously support the 5-district model.
- At least one current councilmember also supports it.

Adding an at-large seat would **guarantee another Park City/Snyderville seat**, further disenfranchising other parts of the county.

Q: Was HB 356 "pulled" or rushed at the end of the session?

A: No.

- HB 356 passed the House in late February and was sent to the Senate.
- It was "circled" (temporarily set aside) in committee but was never pulled.
- It passed the Senate on the last day—not at the "11th hour," but with ample time for the House to ratify Senate changes before the session adjourned.

Bottom Line:

HB 356 is about fair, district-based representation for all Summit County residents—not just Park City and Snyderville.

We support restoring the grandfather clause and fixing minor technical issues, but we must defend the core principles of the bill:

- Fully districted representation
- Neutral, bipartisan districting commission
- Respect for voters in all communities across the county.