Single Board Member Redistricting Steering Public Meeting
Wednesday, August 15, 2012
Start Time: 6:00 p.m.
Location: South Plantation High School <u>Media Center</u>
1300 Paladin Way, Plantation, FL 33317
Michael Rajner, Chair
Marsha Ellison, Vice Chair

<u>**Agenda Items**</u>

<u>**1. Call to order**</u>
Chair Rajner called the meeting to order at 6:10 pm.

<u>**2. Pledge of Allegiance**</u>
Vice Chair Marsha Ellison led the Pledge of Allegiance.

<u>**3. Roll Call**</u>

District 1 – Russell Chard
District 1 – Kristine Judeikis
District 2 – Barbara Jones
District 3 – Heather Cunniff
District 3 – Paul Eichner
District 4 – Latha Krishnaiyer
District 4 – Mandy Wells
District 5 – Roland Foulkes
District 5 – Roosevelt Walters
District 6 – Philip Busey
District 6 – Barry Butin
District 7 – Ron Aronson
County Wide, At-Large 8 - Marsha Ellison – Vice Chair
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 2 – Marilyn Soltanipour
District 7 – Sheila Rose
County Wide, At-Large 8 - Alan Ehrlich

<u>**4. Approval of August 15, 2012 Public Redistricting Meeting Agenda**</u>
Chair Rajner requested that item 9.1 under Unfinished Business be moved to 7.7 due to there being no dialogue needed. The Chair also requested addressing Philip Busey's email to the Chair under staff follow up item 7.2. The agenda was adopted as amended.

5. Approval of July 25, 2012 Draft Public Hearing District 7 Minutes
The minutes were approved as amended.

6. Chair's Report
Tabled for discussion when the agenda items are discussed during this meeting.

7. Staff Follow Up
7.1 How Race Classifications Add Up
The Non-Hispanic population footnote was added to the diversity map tables by staff as follows:

"Not-Hispanic population is equal to the total of all race categories. Hispanic plus Not-Hispanic population is equal to the 2010 total population."

7.2 Copy of Census Race Data tables P1 & P2
Pages 18-24 in the packets provide the tables of the US Census summary files we use to provide the total census population for this project.

Philip Busey stated he saw inconsistency with the data available from the US Census Web site and the data the committee is using. Mr. Busey stated that by pulling all races within the category of Hispanic makes it look like Hispanics are all of one race especially putting them all in the same category as White, Black and so forth. Mr. Busey stated he thought it was unequal to consider the race of Hispanics not important if we consider the race of non-Hispanics to be important enough to break it out and believes there is inconsistency between our presentation and data that is available from the US Census Bureau. Mr. Busey stated he found Hispanic and Non-Hispanic cross tabulated by race on the Census.gov Web site.

Chair Rajner asked how did Broward County address the Hispanic population?

Patrick Sipple presented the Broward County redistricting population utilized from the county's redistricting Web site where it showed the percentages of total population. Broward County did not include American Indian and Hawaiian, but the data does break out Hispanic and non-Hispanic. Patrick stated this is not a Broward County or Broward County School District methodology and that this is how the data is actually provided by the US Census Bureau. The way the US Census Bureau presents the summary data file breaks out total population Hispanic, or Latino, and then not Hispanic or Latino, then it breaks down the actual by race population. That is how we have presented the data as provided by the US Census Bureau. There was no data scrubbing of any data fields. Nothing was intentionally left out. These were the data fields they used by the US Census Bureau for the Voter Tabulated District breakdown. The US Census Bureau might have the data broken down by a larger geographical area like the county as a whole, but the Voter Tabulated Districts and the summary file is exactly what was presented by the US Census Bureau.

Latha Krishnaiyer asked how the State Department of Education follows these rules since a lot of what we do is dependent upon grants and funding from the State. How do we report out data and is it consistent with what you are presenting us. What criteria are we required to follow as a school district?

Jill Young stated the Broward County School District follows the Florida Department of Education which follows the US Census. We shared this with the Diversity Committee and all the schools back in 2010. When we collect student data, we collect it in the same way the US Census Bureau collects data so we are all in alignment with the same data sets.

Michael De Gruccio stated this was discussed in depth at the Diversity Committee when this question came up and maybe Roland Foulkes who chairs this committee may have something to add.

Ron Aronson asked where does Black Hispanics come in. Are you double counting that?

Patrick Sipple requested the committee look at page 18 to see the actual Census total population in the first field, then the Hispanic or Latino population and then non-Hispanic population, then the population of one race. The data shows the population of all the races: the total Black population, the total White population, Asian, Native Hawaiian, Native American, and other multiple races. It does not break the population down by whether or not a person is a White Hispanic or Black Hispanic, it just lumps them into a Hispanic category, and it lumps everyone else that is not of Hispanic origin, based on what they filled out on their Census form into one of the other races or multiple races. This is exactly how the Census Bureau presented it and provides it on their Web site for download and it is exactly what we used. This is the data set that allows it to be broken out by Census block, tracts, or voter precinct for the entire United States.

Philip Busey stated he was able to download from Census.gov a breakout of races and Hispanic and non-Hispanic origin. The categories provided on page 18 does not prove they do not allow a cross tabulation of Hispanic and non-Hispanic by race. If we are going to say that all Hispanics are all of one race, or we are not going to pay attention to that, then I think we should ask the attorney if the School Board is allowed to ignore the race of Hispanics. Personally I think that is an unequal treatment to consider the race of non-Hispanics. Why don't we take all non-Hispanics and put them in all one race and then we only break out the race for Hispanics?

Roland Foulkes stated several years ago this district and districts across the country were required by the US Department of Education to ask parents of students their ethnicity and which racial category they chose to belong to. Those racial categories come from Federal Directive 15. In 2011-2012 we went from a majority Black district to a majority White district. According to the 2000 Census, 95-96% of the Hispanics nationwide identified themselves as White, identifying with the people in power. Immigrants come for a better life and the thinking is to

identify with the majority group so their life is better. That is the anthropological explanation for what we think is going on. In Broward County that is what happened.

Chair Rajner stated that by looking at what Mr. Busey provided from the US Census Bureau, White alone Hispanic is 341,000, Black is 17,000 which would make some logical reason as to why it might default to White for programming reasons to minimize steps, but this doesn't make it right or wrong.

Chair Rajner asked if staff had a comparison of ten years ago to see the Hispanic breakdown to see how drastically it changed?

Patrick Sipple stated we do not have it readily available at this meeting.

Patrick Sipple read Broward School District Frequently Asked Questions on the change of student diversity figures to align with the Florida Department of Education's alignment with the US Census.

Philip Busey stated there are two solutions as I see it. One would be to report Hispanic and non-Hispanic as two categories and then to report races as categories inclusive of language or Hispanic or non-Hispanic origin and that can be done because the Census data is available to do that, or two, to do the cross tabulation in which all categories of Hispanic or non-Hispanic race are included. Obviously one is going to be easier to present. I think a Black Hispanic person should be reported as Hispanic and as Black because they are both.

Philip Busey repeats, the first solution that I would propose which would be easier on the eye would be to keep it the way it is accept make sure any Hispanics are redistributed in the race category so when you see a Hispanic person they appear in both the Hispanic column and if they are Black Hispanic they appear in the Black column where the numbers of the races add up to the total.

Patrick Sipple clarifies what Mr. Busey is asking for is then to make sure that the population that is Hispanic, be distributed in each of the race categories. The Census may have this data, but it may only be broken down by the county as a whole, and not by precinct. When we received the Census data it was the summary files that everyone uses for racial and Hispanic breakdowns.

Russell Chard stated we have all been looking at this data for eight months and had this question came up in January and are still not sure this is something this committee could solve. We have come way too far to re-address this at this part. We have had seven public meetings, we have asked for input from the public. We told them to go to My Map Builder and use the data to construct maps and if we are now going to break the data into minute subsets all of that is wiped out and we have wasted eight months of a very narrow window to accomplish something. Any one of us could have restructured our map submissions based on a more detailed data set. I

would recommend that if what we have done is the legal standard used by the Broward County Government, the State of Florida and all the other entities, if we have followed a legally fair and defensible process, then I think it would be insanity to undo eight months of work.

Patrick Sipple stated the same data is what is used in the MyDistrictBuilder software. They use the same racial breakdown summary data files as provided by the US Census Bureau.

Chair Rajner stated there will be a discussion of maybe needing to offer map makers a quick turnaround time to modify their maps based the legal memo dealing with the population with a new set of data that we should have instructed the public on.

Ron Aronson asked, did you say we are counting people twice?

Patrick Sipple stated no we are not counting people twice. The way the Census Bureau breaks down the ethnicity and race inside the summary data files, they have a Hispanic category for people who identify themselves as Hispanic, then the not-Hispanic category of everybody else. Those two totals equal the total population. When you look at the table you try to figure out what all of the other races add up to be. All of the non-Hispanic races are those individual races of White, Black, Asian, Hawaiian, American Indian, Other and Multiracial. All of those races add up to be the total number of non-Hispanic population, so there is no double counting at all.

Chair Rajner stated we will defer this question to legal counsel on August 30th to respond. The Chair then requested staff to confirm legal counsel's attendance at this meeting and forward this to him to get final clarification on the issue.

Philip Busey requested confirmation on the unavailability of race data at the precinct level. He stated he brought this up in June at one of the mapping workshops and realizes it is late in the process, but thinks if it is wrong then it doesn't matter whether it was brought up early or late and if we are going to do this in a way that it ignores the race of Hispanic people we ought to be really clear there is a reason for doing that, if there is.

Chair Rajner stated he was fine with taking that extra effort of precaution in getting to this and stated he wanted to make sure that whatever the committee's recommendation, it was meaningful and considered by the Board.

Chair Rajner requested staff forward this memo to legal counsel on his behalf requesting clarification at the August 30th meeting and to request his participation and Suzanne D'Agresta's input on Philip Busey's memo.

Patrick Sipple goes over staff follow up item 7.3 to review the bullets of the memo submitted to Chair Rajner on the summary of community suggested interests on the single School Board redistricting process.

Chair Rajner stated these suggestions were shared item for item at the last Board report.

Chair Rajner moved to item 7.4 providing a list of questions identified over several committee meetings sent to Mr. Carland. He stated he did search the Internet this weekend to review the ability of minority communities to elect a representative of their choice and what he discovered was confirmed by Mr. Carland and the consulting attorney. He also stated he found this by going to the Orange County School Board's Web site which he found to be very helpful with some of the Powerpoint slides they had. He stated he watched some of their videos and it looked like they did not have a huge turnout either.

Chair Rajner asked the committee to review legal counsel's memo in depth over the week and ask questions of Mr. Carlin on the 30th. I think it is reasonable to offer a period of time like 10 days for map makers to modify their maps to include voting age population and resubmit them to us so we can look at them with both the population data sets.

Patrick Sipple stated that after speaking with Ed Solomon, Director of Development Planning with the Supervisor of Elections, there was no requirement for Broward County to use total population or the voting age population. They chose to use total population because their commissioners represent the total population and not just the voter or people who are eligible to voter. There was also a question on whether or not precincts can be split. Mr. Solomon stated it is frowned upon as it would change where the polling places are located and would change the Supervisor of Election's voting precincts and may or may not reflect where people live within the neighborhood of that precinct.

Staff's recommendation is to rerun the data on the existing maps first rather than opening up the mapping process again to begin at square one. This will make the percentages go down since this is a subset of the total population.

Russell Chard asked how we are bound by that when Broward County is not bound by this.

Patrick Sipple suggested that the question posed to legal counsel was more of a leading question.

Chair Rajner stated that legal counsel inserted a summary of a 3 to 4 paragraph email so they extracted out of that one question rather than a specific question.

Patrick Sipple stated the only question posed was should the committee use voting age population and there was never the question asked of whether you could use total population. It was only asked if voting age population and eligible voters as opposed to total population. So when the question was answered by legal counsel, given the choice of eligible population and voting age population they provided the answer of 18 years or over population as opposed to total population.

Chair Rajner stated there is a section under question 1 that reinforces this issue. It was in the Orange County Powerpoint slide that it was the data set to be used. The chair would like clear direction so the committee can move forward.

Paul Eichner stated this is a game changer because you are changing the rules significantly and the train left the station months ago. Let's ask staff to use the boundaries that were created but with the data we should use. We would be treating everybody's recommendation in the same fashion. We already heard the peoples input on what their intent was and what they were trying to accomplish. We can make the tweaks according to what makes the numbers work and uphold what the intention of the people's views were when they presented.

Patrick Sipple showed on the screen what Broward County used. Broward presented both data sets. There won't be a case where someone would have to redraw their map because they all met the initial criteria of plus or minus 5% of the district average population. We would just be showing that separate data set for the 18 year older population.

Marsha Ellison stated we can't be serious without using Voting Age Population (VAP) and we have known this for some time. Roosevelt and I have been a part of a lot of legal challenges and it has always stood the test of time because of special interest groups who may have put in a bunch of people who were ineligible to vote because they may have been in jail or prison. If this committee is going to the School Board to present this and VAP is not a consideration I don't think anyone would take us seriously. That is the essence of what we are talking about. Ms. Ellison then went on to say she knew for a fact that it was all about the VAP in the county discussions. How we get there, if the VAP created a different look that what you wanted it to be then the map maker would have to have the ability to see that. VAP would be the top data set and the total population would be below as an auxiliary table.

Latha Krishnaiyer stated she agreed with Mr. Eichner and asked in redrawing maps, would any of that get disturbed (Innovation Zones, the ethnicity and race, etc)?

Patrick Sipple stated it would be exactly as we have it just another diversity table breakdown and will not change the plus or minus 5% criteria of the population. You are taking away a population in a subgroup in each group.

Roland Foulkes agreed with Paul Eichner and Marsha Ellison and others about the need for voting age population and believes that the more information we have the better our recommendation we will have to make to the School Board.

Philip Busey concurs with rerunning the maps based on voting age population. He stated he would amend the motion to include race as Latino or not Latino.

Ron Aronson agrees with colleges. I want to make a motion to let staff take all maps and data and let them put together a couple of choices for us to go over and tweak.

Mary Fertig stated that it is an extremely critical data point and we need to go back to revisit the criteria given to us by the attorney in the beginning, or to take the 12 maps we have and make sure someone looks at them to say we are not going to go forward with something that is not going to be viable in the end. Ms. Fertig requested to make sure this data is included, as well as any other data used by Orange County before we have conversations.

Michael De Gruccio stated he thought the Voting Age Populations are extremely important.

Chair Rajner wanted to make certain the committee's recommendations are taken seriously with the best advice and input to the School Board so that it will withstand any challenge.

Motion : **Roland Foulkes** made the motion to recommend staff provide Voting Age Population presentation data for each of the 12 maps presented. Motion was moved and seconded by **Heather Cunniff**.

Discussion on the motion continues.

Philip Busey wanted to amend the recommendation to include both Hispanic and non-Hispanic into the data. After collecting the Census in 2010 Hispanic or Latino was not a race and if they had known that by answering, "Yes, I am Hispanic" that would have wiped out any report of their race then they should have been advised but they were not.

Parliamentarian Patricia McDougle advised the committee as to when a friendly amendment is being proposed to a motion. "Friendly amendments should really be ignored. Once an amendment has been stated by the chair, then you have to formally vote on the amendment by the committee."

Ms. McDougle advised that **Mr. Busey** should move to amend the motion made by **Mr. Foulkes** by adding the words or adding the categories to include whatever he said.

Motion : **Philip Busey** made the motion to recommend race be inclusive of Hispanic if technically feasible. The amendment was seconded by ?

Discussion on the motion continued.

Russell Chard questioned if the amendment was germane to the main motion.

Chair Rajner found the amendment germane.

Mary Fertig clarified you would be adding and not removing?

Paul Eichner questioned if the committee should leave it to staff to determine if it is technically feasible.

Patrick Sipple clarified that whether that data can or cannot be provided would be solely upon whether that data is available by the US Census Bureau for the voter tabulated districts and not whether it requires more work.

Barbara Jones asked when this would be provided if it was available by August 30th?

Patrick Sipple stated he would look for the data and work to make it happen.

Roland Foulkes asked if the county's data included what is being offered here.

Patrick Sipple stated the county strictly went by the data we are using here which are the summary data files by the US Census Bureau by voter tabulated districts and how the Census Bureau provides the data by Hispanic, non-Hispanic and the other racial categories that make up the not-Hispanic.

Roland Foulkes asked if their legal team, demographers and planners had no problem with it.

Patrick Sipple stated they, and the Supervisor of Elections had no problem with it as that is what they used.

Chair Rajner called for a vote on the amendment, but first asked if there was any objection to adopting the amendment.

Hearing no committee opposition, the chair requested a show of hands.

Heather Cunniff asked for the motion to be read in full.

Jill Young read the motion as follows:

Motion : **Roland Foulkes** made the motion to recommend staff provide Voting Age Population presentation data for each of the 12 maps presented. **Jill Young** stated there was also an amendment to this motion by **Philip Busey** that race be inclusive of Hispanics if technically feasible.

Mr. Busey confirmed that was the amendment as he had stated it.

Chair Rajner asked all in favor of the motion to raise their hand.

Jill Young counts the show of hands in favor of the motion 10, and 5 opposed.

Chair Rajner asked if there was any discussion on the motion as amended.

Michael De Gruccio asked if we tweak these maps, will the Voting Age Population information be included in these maps as well.

Patrick Sipple stated if he can get the data, the committee will have the data for any future map tweaks the committee might have.

Chair Rajner recognizing there was no further discussion asked for a vote on the motion as amended and asked all those in favor to signify with their hand. **Jill Young** counts 14 hands in favor and 1 opposed to the motion as amended.

Ron Aronson requested to table this motion to see what the data looks like.

Motion: Mary Fertig suggested the legal department review the criteria they have previously given us with the inclusion of what they have now given us tonight and make sure they have a complete picture inclusive of all the criteria that we are supposed to be considering when drafting these maps and making recommendations to the School Board. The motion was seconded by **Marsha Ellison**.

Chair Rajner asked if there was any discussion on the motion, then asked if there was any objection to the motion. Seeing no objection the motion was adopted.

Item 7.5 Web Tools to Compare Map Alternatives

Patrick Sipple explained the web based map tool, created by Janis Wint in the District's Demographics Department, allows users to visually compare maps side-by-side making it easier on the committee and the public. From the Redistricting Map Alternatives web page it allow you to go to this application to view each map and see the demographics for each district by left mouse clicking while viewing the maps side by side. Also added are the school locations if you zoom in. Both sides zoom in and out at the same level. This tool was made accessible to the public to show the map data. We will work with the new data set to allow uses to look at the voter age population in this tool.

Roland Foulkes thanked staff and Janis Wint and stated this is a wonderful comparison and looks forward to using it.

Leslie Brown stated she appreciated Mr. Foulkes's comment as sometimes people will think staff is not sharing things but as soon as we saw the struggle community members were having, this is not a program that is ready to use as is, but was programmed to get this ready for you all. It was something hand created for your work.

Patrick Sipple stated we kept the application simple so people didn't have to turn on and off layers and may have become confused with what data they were looking at. The Innovation Zones and municipalities can be viewed from the hard copy maps.

Chair Rajner mentioned that we just covered 7.6 (providing school locations on the maps).

Item 7.7 includes the transcribed letters and flyers in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Haitian-Creole. These were provided to all principals, all elected officials, and all educational advisory groups.

Chair Rajner did speak during public comment portion at the Wilton Manors City Commission meeting to make sure the city of Wilton Manors knew that this process was going on and recommended they weighed in on this process especially since they are a small municipality with school district 3 and 5 running through it. He said that the committee was hearing from the public that smaller cities should be within one School Board member's district. Rajner asked them to weigh in since, as a resident of the city hadn't heard from the city on this. Rajner urged the committee members to please take the opportunity to highlight the process and bring the letters and the flyers with them to meetings.

Kristine Judeikis stated she did share this process with her city and they asked her to keep them informed. Based on what we are seeing so far, our city is not going to be affected by redistricting and thinks that is one of the reasons why the city of West Park residents may not be as excited to participate.

Chair Rajner moves to item 8.1, Committee Discussion on How to Evaluate Map Alternatives.

Ron Aronson motions to table item 8.1 until staff can come back with the additional data.

Chair Rajner states the motion to table is not in order.

Chair Rajner explains to the committee the map evaluation form would allow the committee to have a document to evaluate and score each map so the map makers would know how each of their maps were looked at and considered. This is similar to how the School Board rates applicants and will allow us to see which maps really stand out. Staff revised the format our parliamentarian had suggested to help facilitate the meetings to include only the categories found in the School Board's Redistricting Guiding Principles. The form will allow everyone to know that we evaluated their map based on objective categories rather than being subjective.

Mary Fertig thinks this is good.

Roland Foulkes motions to adopt the form.

Chair Rajner asks to hold off on motions at this time to get committee discussion and input on the form.

Ron Aronson has no problem approving the form, but does not want to evaluate the maps at this meeting.

Mary Fertig suggests adding the voting age population as another category.

Paul Eichner asked if voting precincts was another category we might want to add if we are considering splitting precincts.

Jill Young explains the categories in the draft form are from the Guiding Principles.

No one has requested to split a voter tabulated precinct at this point.

Russell Chard suggests splitting category B into two categories as a map can be compact and contiguous and not necessarily follow geographic borders, and one that precisely follows geographic borders is not going to be compact and contiguous.

Philip Busey agreed that this is a working tool for each member but is concerned that some committee members may consider Innovation Zones more important than another category. As committee member add up their totals, we as a group will have to decide if one category is more important than another rather than an overall average.

Chair Rajner stated this form will allow us to see which maps we may want to make some modification to. The form allows you to look at the maps in a very transparent way and to apply the guiding principles to allow us to say this is something we want to see go forward. The chair stated his concern that he did not want the committee to do anything subjectively in the evaluation process.

Philip Busey stated this is all highly subjective. He stated he doesn't understand what communities of interest are. So we cannot say these are entirely objective.

Chair Rajner stated that communities of interest has been somewhat defined as home owner associations or it can vary based on what community you are looking at. Once you define that community, you find out what that community has of interest. So I would assume it has a different meaning in different areas.

Chair Rajner suggests the committee moves forward to make a motion to adopt this as a worksheet after the discussion.

Russell Chard clarified we are not suggesting this is the end all, be all for the committee's recommendation.

Roland Foulkes asks that as individual committee members, we will all fill this out, and then share our comments and scores on each of the maps. Just like how we review applications to the United Way, we will have all the members give their scores and explanations, we review each map hierarchy or priority. **Mr. Foulkes** asks if this is the process we will be using here.

Chair Rajner at the next meeting we will need to discuss the process and ground rules going forward for looking at maps. This will help us as a guide as we move forward. And will help us really pull out what those really good maps may be and why we support them to the School Board.

Roosevelt Walters asked if it is necessary that committee member names be on the score sheet so that no one is intimidated.

Chair Rajner asked staff to follow up with legal counsel on whether names are necessary on the score sheet.

Russell Chard requested an editable version such as Microsoft Word or Excel allowing the form to be typed into it by the committee members.

Chair Rajner reiterates that the form will be edited to add a category for voter age population after category A, then spilt category B into two different categories. Hearing no objection the committee adopted the worksheet.

Chair Rajner asked if there was any member of the public who would like to provide comment. Seeing no comments, item 10 on the agenda was concluded.

Under item 11 on the agenda **Chair Rajner** requested input from the committee on the August 30th agenda. He stated, so far there is a presentation by Mr. Carland, a presentation from staff on the Voter Age Population and the other items Mr. Busey requested. We will go forward with evaluating the map proposals that were presented to us.

Roosevelt Walters asked how may maps the committee was going to present to the School Board.

Chair Rajner stated this would follow the committee's evaluation worksheet to see how many maps really stand out.

Mary Fertig asked if the committee will be bringing the completed worksheet to the next meeting or submit it before or after the meeting.

Patrick Sipple asked would you use the score sheet on any map you tweak?

Chair Rajner stated that right now, the committee is talking about evaluating the public's maps and we haven't talked about committee maps yet.

Barry Butin questioned if there are three maps submitted and the committee does not have to have a unanimous vote on three maps, would it be a majority vote?

Chair Rajner responded, a consensus on a majority vote would be used.

Patrick Sipple questioned if the committee comes forward with four maps, would those be inclusive or non-inclusive of any tweaked maps? The committee might arrive at four maps then come up with two tweaked maps which will then pop out two of the community maps you have moved forward through the evaluation.

Chair Rajner responded by saying we will figure that out at the next meeting. Whether we decide to forward four of the maps, or we decide to modify maps will be something the

committee will decide at the next meeting because it is part of the discussion of how we move forward.

The chair questioned whether Patrick will have the data ready in time for the next meeting for the committee to come with completed forms.

Mary Fertig asked if we are not going to be ready with all the information it is not worth meeting at this next meeting as we don't know how to rank them without all the information.

Chair Rajner asked if the committee would be comfortable evaluating the maps at the next meeting if it was within a two hour time frame.

Mary Fertig stated she would not be comfortable evaluating the maps without all of the data in the online tool. She also stated she would like to know what the deadline is to complete the evaluation form.

Chair Rajner stated evaluations will happen on your own time.

Philip Busey asked what the committee's responsibility is concerning minority language groups as it pertains to the voting right act.

Roland Foulkes commends the committee, staff, and the community for bringing forward the explosion of maps in the last few months to now have 12 maps.

Chair Rajner asked for patience as the committee moves forward with the discussion and expressed his thanks for the wonderful and collegiate experience. The future meetings will all be held in the Board Room at the KC Wright Administration building. The next meeting is Thursday, August 30th at 6:00 PM. Parking is available right outside and the gates remain open after 6:00 PM.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.