

Single Board Member Redistricting Steering Public Hearing District 5

Monday, June 21, 2012

Start Time: 6:00 p.m.

**Location: City of Lauderdale Lakes Educational Center 2nd Floor
3580 West Oakland Park Boulevard, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33311**

Michael Rajner, Chair

Marsha Ellison, Vice Chair

Agenda Items

1. Call to order

Chair Rajner called the meeting to order at 6:10 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Levoyd L. Williams, Commissioner, City of Lauderdale Lakes led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

District 1 – Russell Chard

District 2 – Barbara Jones

District 2 – Marilyn Soltanipour

District 3 – Paul Eichner

District 3 – Heather Cunniff

District 4 – Mandy Wells

District 5 – Roland Foulkes

District 5 – Roosevelt Walters

District 6 – Philip Busey

District 7 – Sheila Rose

District 7 – Ron Aronson

County Wide, At-Large 8 - Marsha Ellison – Vice Chair

County Wide, At-Large 8 - Alan Ehrlich

County Wide, At-Large 9 – Michael De Gruccio

County Wide, At-Large 9 – Mary C. Fertig

Superintendent – Michael Rajner- Chair

The following committee members were absent from the meeting:

District 1 – Kristine Judeikis

District 4 –Latha Krishnaiyer

4. Approval of June 21, 2012 Public Hearing District 5 Agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented by unanimous consent.

5. Approval of June 4, 2012 Draft Public Hearing District 4 Minutes

Chair Rajner asked the committee if they had any corrections to the minutes submitted by the committee members. They did not have any corrections. The June 4th meeting minutes were approved by the committee.

6. Public Hearing

6.1 Overview of Redistricting Process and Guiding Principles

Mr. Foulkes presented an overview of the Redistricting Process and Guiding Principles.

6.2 Presentation of Newly Submitted Map Alternatives

Rose Waters presented Map Alternative 4.

- *“Roosevelt Walters and I are the creators of Alternative Map 4. We looked at communities of interests, compactness, and Innovation Zones.”*
- *Alternative 4 districts are more compact than Map Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and the current map.*
- *Map Alternative 4 doesn’t reach out to grab a group of people in order to exclude or include a group of people.*
- *Map Alternative 4 has very few jagged edges, and creates a more compact District 7 than what is found in Map Alternative 1.*
- *Map Alternative 4 follows areas of community interest better than Map Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.*
- *District 5 was made more compact than what is found on Map Alternative 1.*
- *District 3 was made more compact than what is found on the current map.*
- *“Just because a map alternative was drawn within the above/below 5% does not mean the map was drawn with regards to communities of interest. It is not a consideration, but actually a law. Maps 2 and 3 completely disregard civil rights requirements.”*
- *“Map Alternative 4 adheres to civil rights requirements by being compact.”*
- *“It was almost impossible to place I-Zones into nice neat blocks. We did consider them and tried to include them entirely into one district when possible. When we did have to split them between zones, we kept in mind fairness of representation.”*
- *Map Alternative 4 has 17 municipalities in one district, 11 in two districts, and 3 municipalities in three districts. The three municipalities are Fort Lauderdale, Plantation and North Lauderdale.*
- *“We did not simply move numbers around in Map Alternative 4. Rather, we sought to create equal opportunity and fair representation for each district.”*
- *Map Alternative 4 distributes the number of schools between each district more evenly than on the previous map alternatives.*
- *Map Alternative 4 is fair for all potential candidates.*

6.3 Public Comment on Newly Submitted Map Alternatives

Levyoyd Williams, Commissioner, City of Lauderdale Lakes – Map Alternative 4 cuts out both Ely High School and Dillard High School and their zones. The racial ratios are lowered with 47% black, 29% white – what is the rationale? The best compromise is Map Alternative 5. Despite losing Ely High School, the racial ratios are better.

Jerry Graziose, Commissioner, City of North Lauderdale – Map Alternative 4 presents us with the same situation for our small city. We will be faced with people in our city voting for Board members that do not represent our schools. One objective in Map Alternative 1 is we ensured that people voted for Board members that represented their schools. Another point is the

Attachment 5

population difference is 4.92%, almost 5%. Map Alternative 4 does not meet all the requirements according to the Redistricting Guidelines. We will not approve this map submission because it splits our city again.

Mr. DeGruccio – Pointed out that there are at least 13 municipalities and 11 I-Zones with at least 2 or more School Board member splits.

Ms. Rose – What is the listed Board member’s responsibility as related to charter school representation?

Chair Rajner – None, we are not looking at charter schools as an aspect of the Redistricting process.

Ms. Rose – Is there an advocacy role?

Chair Rajner – We will have a previous Board member to properly answer this question.

Commissioner Graziose – When charter schools are approved, the item, location, and type go before the Board as a body. The Board collectively votes, but the individual Board member in that district has no responsibility.

Patrick Sipple – The table counts the charter schools which are physically located in that district. Please keep in mind that charter schools will open and close between now and the time redistricting process is due. These numbers will fluctuate.

Mr. Chard – I am big advocate of compactness and like the approach of Map Alternative 4. I am concerned with the couple of zones that are split between 2 and 3 districts. I’ve toyed around with this and realize how impossible this feat is to do. I am not 100% sure, but I acknowledge the effort put forth.

Vice-Chair Ellison – I also commend the effort. I know from experience as well, as this being my area of my residence, that this could be good and/or bad.

Mr. Foulkes feels that the Board member should represent a cross section of the community.

Ms. Wells asked what their thought process was. **Mr. Walters** replied, “1. Having each city represented by one Board member was impossible; 2. Aligning with I-Zones is simply a wish list; and 3. We went by the Law.” He further stated that although it would be nice to have Dillard High School and Ely High School in one district, it was not possible.

Mr. Eichner – You won’t match everything. People have to recognize that the School District is countywide. I-Zones are for people with kids. Parents should vote for/within a zone and not be split. Board member districts are for voting and the kids. Redistricting should focus more on the I-Zones and not the cities.

Ms. Fertig – I would like to see a column or table that illustrates the number of I-Zones split by a Board member district.

Ms. Rose asked staff if the I-Zones can change. **Jill Young** replied that they can change as they are the same as the high school boundaries.

Mr. Busey presented Map Alternative 5.

- *“I started by trying to make very compact districts. Then I realized that the school count was way off. So, I looked at the cities and found that this too was very difficult when trying to maintain compactness. It was hard to try and not split the larger cities.”*
- *Map Alternative 5 places a lot of emphasis on trying to align with Innovation Zones.*
- *“Map Alternative 5 also protects minority rights. I tried not to diminish minority representation. To me, any fair plan would have at least one 50% plus one African-American population district as we have now.”*
- *“As much as I tried, I couldn’t come up with two majority minority districts.”*
- *The black population in district 5 is over 50%.*
- *“My goal was to have a maximum population deviation of around 1.5%.”*
- *He stated that he was able to balance the number of high schools, I-Zones, between the districts, however, there were three bad splits. The bad I-Zone splits were Miramar, Stranahan, and Coconut Creek.*
- *“Despite my efforts to keep the City of North Lauderdale together, I feel that this is my best effort in taking account compactness and Innovation Zones.”*

Levoyd Williams, Commissioner, City of Lauderdale Lakes stated that he liked Map Alternative 5 and not Map Alternatives 2 and 3. He felt that the best maps to preserve communities of interest are Map Alternatives 1, 4, and 5 with Map Alternative 5 being the best.

Patricia Williams, Commissioner, City of Lauderdale Lakes stated that their elementary schools feed into Dillard High School and that the I-Zone should be in one district. She felt that Map Alternative 5 was a good map.

Jerry Graiose, Commissioner, City of North Lauderdale felt that Map Alternatives 4 and 5 are unacceptable because they split the City of North Lauderdale.

Gloria Lewis, Commissioner, City of Lauderdale Lakes Why are you having the meeting, if you don’t want the communities to have input? It says in the Guidelines “communities of interest whenever possible.” If a commissioner has a problem, they should be able to comment.

Vice-Chair Ellison – We have done everything possible to get the word out and people involved. I would not be a part of this otherwise. The person was merely stating what needs to be done as required by Law versus what is a suggestion to be done.

Gwen Denton, Chair of the City of Lauderdale Lakes School Advisory Board, liked Map Alternative 5.

Ms. Fertig liked the way Map Alternative 5 kept the I-Zones together. She stated that she would like to see a version of Map Alternative 5 attempt to place all of the City of North Lauderdale into one district.

Mr. Eichner made the comment that if a city is represented by more than one School Board member, then they would have more of an opportunity to get what they wanted.

Mr. Foulkes felt that Map Alternatives 4 and 5 had gerrymandered districts and that the districts should cover an area of the county from east to west.

Mr. Chard didn't like the shapes of Districts 3, 5, and 6 in Map Alternative 5, but did like that it tried to follow I-Zones.

Ms. Rose liked Map Alternative 5. She also stated that the map alternatives should try and incorporate small cities into one district.

Chair Rajner stated that there is a need to protect minority rights and that the committee should look at what percent would preserve that. He suggested that this may be a question to ask District Legal Counsel.

Mr. Walters asked the question, "What determines a minority?" **Mr. Busey** stated that the Voting Rights Act protect voting rights for races, ethnicities, and language minorities.

Mr. Ehrlich stated that he liked the map.

6.4 Public Comment on Previously Presented Maps

There was no public comment on previously presented map alternatives.

6.5 General Public Comment on the Redistricting Process

There was no public comment on the Redistricting Process.

7. Chair's Report

Chair Rajner had nothing to report.

8. Staff Follow Up

There were no staff follow up items.

9. Unfinished Business

There were no unfinished business items and none added to the agenda.

10. New Business

Jill Young presented a calendar with available dates in August, September, and October for future committee meetings. The following dates were approved by the committee:

Attachment 5

- **Motion: Ms. Fertig** made the motion to have the August meetings on August 15th and 30th. **Mr. Busey** seconded. The dates were approved by the committee.
- **Motion: Mr. Ehrich** made the motion to have the September meetings on September 12th and 20th. **Mr. Eichner** seconded. The dates were approved by the committee.
- **Motion: Chair Rajner** made the motion to have the October meetings on October 11th and 24th. **Mr. Foulkes** seconded. The dates were approved by the committee.

Staff will try and schedule all future meetings to be held in the Kathleen C. Wright Administration Building.

Chair Rajner asked staff to extend the mapping assistance due date to July 11th. Staff agreed.

Motion: Mr. Busey made the motion to have staff extend the mapping assistance due date to July 11th. **Mr. Foulkes** seconded. The motion was approved by the committee.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 pm.