

Attachment 5

Single Board Member Redistricting Steering Public Hearing

Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Start Time: 6:00 p.m.

Location: Kathleen C. Wright Board Room

600 SE Third Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

Michael Rajner, Chair

Marsha Ellison, Vice Chair

Agenda

1. Call to order

Chair Michael Rajner called the meeting to order at 6:13 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Marsha Ellison, Vice Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

District 1 – Russell Chard

District 1 – Kristine Judeikis

District 2 – Barbara Jones

District 2 – Marilyn Soltanipour

District 3 – Paul Eichner

District 3 – Heather Cunniff

District 4 – Latha Krishnaiyer

District 5 – Roosevelt Walters

District 5 – Roland Foulkes

District 6 – Philip Busey

District 7 – Sheila Rose

District 7 – Ron Aronson

County Wide, At-Large 8 - Alan Ehrlich

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

County Wide, At-Large 9 – Ernestine Price

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

Superintendent – Michael Rajner- Chair

The following committee members were absent from the meeting:

District 4 – Mandy Wells

District 6 – Vacant

Jill Young announced the District 6 committee member vacancy resulting from Barry Butin's resignation and the inclusion of new committee member Ernestine Price.

4. Approval of October 24, 2012 Public Hearing Agenda

Mr. Walters asked Chair Rajner to move public comment to after section 9.1 on the agenda. The agenda was adopted as amended.

Attachment 5

5. Approval of October 11, 2012 Draft Public Redistricting Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were amended to include corrections to scrivener's errors as provided by Patricia McDougale and Chair Rajner. Mr. Busey requested that his comment regarding the fact that none of the top four ranked maps have three minority access districts be added on page 11 of 40 in the meeting packet (section 9.5). Ms. Judeikis requested that the date on page 6 of 40 in paragraph two be changed to December 11, 2012. After a request by Mr. Ehrlich, and research by Jill Young, Mr. Ehrlich's original motion to accept the tallies and the top four maps of 5, 7, 9, and 10 to move forward was included into the minutes on page 8 of 40. The October 11th meeting minutes were adopted as amended.

6. Chair/Vice Chair's Report

Chair Rajner asked that the map handed out by Dan Lewis be entered into the September 27th minutes.

7. Staff Follow Up

There was no staff follow up.

8. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business

9. New Business

9.1 Committee Reviews and Discusses committee directed modifications to Map Alternatives 5, 7, 9, and 10

Mr. Walters asked Chair Rajner if he had received any clarification on the term of members. Chair Rajner stated that the members will serve until November 20th. November 15th will be the last meeting date for the committee. The committee will then be in suspension unless further work is requested by the School Board.

Ms. Price expressed concern over the maps moving forward, particularly the fact that Map Alternative 12 was not on the list for discussion. Chair Rajner stated that at the October 11th public hearing prior to Ms. Price's appointment to the committee, the committee ranked all twelve maps in order of preference from highest to lowest. The map makers of the top four maps were then allowed to modify the maps to accommodate changes requested by the committee and the public. He went on to state that the evenings discussions will only be on Map Alternatives 5, 7, 9, and 10.

Map Alternative 5 presentation by Mr. Busey

The following are comments made by Mr. Busey on Map Alternative 5:

- a. The map creates 3 minority access districts (either Blacks or Hispanics a plurality or majority of voting age population).
- b. 20 innovation zones remain within a district (ignoring unpopulated Executive Airport census block, which is indivisible).
- c. There are only 5 bad splits of innovation zones, Coconut Creek, Hallandale, Hollywood Hills, Piper, and Plantation.

Attachment 5

- d. There is less than 3% deviation of population from the average of districts.
- e. It preserves communities of interest in Lauderdale Lakes, unincorporated Fort Lauderdale, and Lauderdale Hill.
- f. It keeps the majority area of almost all cities in a district largely representing the innovation zones of that city.
- g. Most district lines follow large roadways Griffin Rd., US 441, University Drive, Federal Highway, I-595, I-95, and the Florida's Turnpike.

Public Comment

Mayor Moseley, from the City of Miramar, stated that Map 5 makes Miramar less diverse. She felt that by keeping Miramar whole as in Map 10, diversity would be maintained.

Bob Hartman, Southwest Ranches, thanked the committee for reducing the decision down to four maps. He stated that Map Alternative 5 meets their needs but is not preferred.

Nick Sakhnovsky felt that Map 5 was an improvement and that he is looking for diversity on the School Board, not in the district's population.

Steve Breitreuz, Southwest Ranches Councilman, stated that Map 5 is an improvement as it puts Southwest Ranches into District 2, however, it is not the preferred map. He is also against Map 10.

Ms. Degresta, legal counsel on redistricting, stated that Florida State Statutes state that School Board members represent the District as a whole and not just the area from which they are elected.

Kathy Sullivan, a Southwest Ranches parent, stated that she can live with Map 5, but prefers Map 9.

Committee Comment

Mr. Walters asked, "What are the 3 minority access districts?"

Mr. Busey stated that the minority access districts on Map Alternative 5 are Districts 1, 2, and 5, with District 5 also being a majority minority district.

Ms. D'Agresta clarified for the committee that a minority access district is when two racial minorities in a district combine to have a population of 50% plus 1. A majority minority district is when one racial minority has a district population of 50% plus 1.

Mr. Busey stated that he thought plurality was only found with one population group and asked Ms. D'Agresta if minority access would constitute a plurality. Ms. D'Agresta replied that only if the population was equal to 50% plus 1.

Mr. Walters stated that in Broward County whites and Hispanics vote along the same lines and therefore there wouldn't be a minority access district.

Mr. Ehrlich felt Mr. Busey did a good job with the map modifications.

Attachment 5

Mr. Chard felt that the southern area of the map was no longer compact.

Mr. Aronson felt that it is not the committees place to try and decide coalitions or if groups of people will vote together.

Ms. Soltanipour asked legal counsel if creating a minority access district justifies going against compactness.

Ms. D'Agresta stated that there are other considerations to look at, but the first and foremost is equal populations in each district.

Ms. Soltanipour asked, "If the School Board members represent the entire District, then why would minorities feel that they are not being represented?"

Ms. D'Agresta stated that the law states that you cannot dilute a minority vote.

Ms. Soltanipour commented on the fact that despite District 2 not being a majority minority, and have elected a Hispanic School Board member shows that they have coalesced.

Ms. Jones agreed.

Ms. Fertig felt that the map changed too much and that she would probably not have selected the map if it was in its current form. She also felt that there were problems with city divisions and compactness.

Ms. Ellison was concerned about the coalition assumption as it is the opposite in Broward County.

Rose Waters, like Ms. Fertig, felt that the map had changed too much and that the modifications made it an entirely new map.

Mr. Busey stated that in order to achieve three minority access districts, the modifications had to be larger. He suggested letting the School Board choose between the two Map 5 Alternatives.

Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh agreed with Rose Waters.

Mr. Busey commented that there is a constant collision between IZones and the cities and that the committee should decide which is more important to adhere to. North Lauderdale will continue to be split multiple times if IZone boundaries are followed.

Map Alternative 7 presentation by Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh

The following are comments made by Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh on Map Alternative 7:

- a. It started with the original Map Alternative 5 with input by the Plantation residents.
- b. A lot of time was spent trying to get North Lauderdale into one district, but it was not possible. I tried but, it placed District 7 at 9% total population and District 4 at a -8% population.
- c. Total population for each district is within 5%.
- d. Voting age population for District 7 is close to 5%. It is around 7%.
- e. District 2 has a younger population and more children, therefore the voting age population is lower.

Attachment 5

- f. Referring to her attached handout, the City of North Lauderdale has fewer, but better IZone splits.
- g. 17 IZones are in one district, but it could be more if areas around McArthur High School and Dillard High School were cleaned up.
- h. The area of Boyd Anderson High School split in North Lauderdale could be addressed through the boundary process.
- i. North Lauderdale has a large number of students in Coconut Creek High School. They want and should be in District 7.
- j. Regarding the Blanche Ely IZone split, there are only 14 students living in the area that attend Blanche Ely High School.
- k. Maybe a slight modification from District 6 to Davie to smooth out the Hollywood Hills IZone area could be done.
- l. Piper was split due to proposed boundary changes I have.
- m. The east end of the South Plantation IZone could be moved out of District 3, but the numbers may not work.
- n. Maybe not all of Croissant Park Elementary School in District 3, but they should be in District 3.
- o. The map falls within the guidelines and I tried not to exclude IZones or cities. I tried to maintain a balance. As for the City of Miramar, I hadn't heard any comments previous to this evening to try and maintain all of the city in District 2.

Public Comment

Andrew Disbury, City of North Lauderdale planner and co-author of Map Alternative 1, stated that the City of North Lauderdale cannot support any of these maps even though Map Alternative 7 tried to group the population by communities of interest. "Getting North Lauderdale into District 7 would help us."

Bob Hartman, Southwest Ranches, does not support the map.

Mayor Moseley, from the City of Miramar, stated that Douglas Road is not a natural boundary. She did not like the splitting of the Miramar IZone, but could compromise for the sake of Southwest Ranches on Map Alternative 9.

Kristina Braziel, Vice Chair of the Middle School Advisory, supported Map Alternative 7. She felt that IZones were very important and stated that the map would be better if the Miramar IZone could be accommodated.

Nick Sakhnovsky felt that maybe there could be new modifications based on all of the public comments.

Allana Mersinger of Miramar likes Map Alternative 9 more. She asked legal counsel if having only one Black access district and no Hispanic district is a problem.

Ms. D'Agresta stated that there is always a possibility, but if you can't make them the Court will not hold you accountable.

Attachment 5

Ernestine Tai asked, “Why can’t the Dillard and Ely IZones be in one district?”

Chair Rajner replied that the committee had received various input on whether or not historical black schools should be in one or multiple districts. After ranking the map alternatives at the October 11th meeting, all of the top four maps, 5, 7, 9, and 10, placed the Ely Izone into District 7, and not in the same district as the Dillard Izone.

Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh stated that she placed all of the City of Plantation into District 6 allowing people to vote for the School Board member in the area where their children attend school.

Committee Comment

Ms. Fertig was concerned with the span of total population feeling that the numbers were not close enough together. She also did not like that the Stranahan IZone was split.

Ms. Price commented that she would like to see Dillard and Blanche Ely, two historically Black schools, in the same district. She asked if it could be looked at prior to going to the School Board.

Mr. Busey felt that the map was an improvement. He was concerned that there may need to be additional modifications due to three districts having larger spans in total population.

Mr. Ehrlich stated that this was his preferred map. It keeps Plantation and Southwest Ranches whole and would be ideal if the same could be done for the City of Miramar.

Ms. Judeikis stated that where children go to school should be left up to the boundary process and commented on that school boundaries can change annually.

Mr. Chard felt that District 3 was stretched too far out and that communities in Pompano and Hollywood are not similar.

Ms. Ellison agreed with Ms. Fertig.

Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh commented on the fact that the Stranahan IZone is split on all of the maps.

Ernestine Tai asked to know the difference between districts and IZones. Patrick Sipple explained that IZones are an administrative group inclusive of feeding elementary, middle and center schools based on the high school boundary. The boundary of the IZone can change annually based on the school boundary process. Districts are based on the U.S. Census and are looked at every ten years. They represent the areas from which single seat School Board members are elected.

Map Alternative 9 presentation by Rose Waters

The following are comments made by Rose Waters on Map Alternative 9:

- a. Southwest Ranches is now completely included into District 2.
- b. Coral Springs IZone is now together and not split.

Attachment 5

- c. There was a small change to District 5 in the west.
- d. There are now 17 IZones in one district. This is an improvement over the last version of the map, which only had 11 IZones in one district.
- e. District 2 has a strong possibility for minorities to get a candidate of their choice.
- f. District 5 is a minority majority.

Public Comment

Steve Breitreuz, Southwest Ranches Councilman, stated that the Town is excited about Map Alternative 9.

Bob Hartman appreciated the change to include all of Southwest Ranches. He felt that maybe the map could be modified more to include all of Miramar.

Kathy Sullivan of Southwest Ranches supported the map.

Andrew Burns, Town Administrator for Southwest Ranches supported Map 9.

Mayor Moseley, from the City of Miramar, stated that she liked Map 9, however, it would be better if all of Miramar was included into District 2.

Alanna Mersinger agreed with Mayor Moseley.

Rose Waters stated that she would also like to look at placing all of Pompano into District 7.

Dr. Nathalie Lynch Walsh commented on that people from the City of Plantation would not like the map.

Committee Comment

Ms. Judeikis stated that she would support the map if Miramar could be accommodated.

Mr. Walters commented on the fact that he was a co-author of the map. He supported Map 9 and stated that it is going to be impossible to give everyone everything that they want on a map. The committee should strive for a compromise by achieving the best results for the most people.

Mr. Busey stated that the map is an improvement over the previous version, however, it should be cautioned that not all requested modifications would be possible as it may throw the numbers off. He also stated that District 5 in the map keeps out a potential candidate for that district.

Chair Rajner stated that the committee was instructed by the School Board not to look at current or potential School Board members when creating the maps and that is why the data was never presented.

Mr. Aronson stated that the map was an improvement and asked legal counsel what would happen if a School Board member was boundered out of their current district.

Attachment 5

Mr. Carland stated that Florida Statutes state that a School Board member would serve out their term of office and represent the district that they were elected in even though they may reside in a new district. If they wanted to run for office again, they would run for the district in which they now reside.

Ms. Soltanipour thanked Rose Waters for including all of Southwest Ranches into District 2.

Ms. Ellison supported Map Alternative 9.

Ms. Fertig liked the changes and would like to see if the City of Miramar could be accommodated.

Chair Rajner asked for a legal opinion on potential changes in School Board member residences.

Ms. D'Agresta stated that it happens quite often. The School Board member would serve out their term and upon the new election, they would run in the new district.

Mr. Foulkes supported what Ms. D'Agresta stated.

Mr. Walters asked, "Would they serve out the term for which they were elected?"

Chair Rajner replied, "Yes."

Map Alternative 10 presentation by Russell Chard

The following are comments made by Russell Chard on Map Alternative 10:

- a. Tried to get a majority minority district.
- b. He felt that the districts were different than what he submitted. *This was verified by Patrick Sipple and was not the case. Mr. Chard's map supplied via MyDistrictBuilder is as drawn in the redistricting materials. There were some areas of miscoded and uncoded districts from MyDistrictBuilder which may account for the differences in numbers.*
- c. District 1 was squared out.
- d. District 2 there was no change.
- e. District 3 wraps around District 5, but has to.
- f. District 6 was squared off.

Public Comment

Bob Hartman of Southwest Ranches did not support the map.

Kathy Sullivan did not support the map.

Steve Breitzkreuz did not support the map.

Kristina Braziel did not support the map.

Committee Comment

Attachment 5

Ms. Fertig concerned about Mr. Chard's belief that the data was different in MyDistrictBuilder.

Mr. Foulkes thanked all of the map makers for their hard work.

Mr. Busey feels that the discrepancies in MyDistrictBuilder were possibly due to the racial breakdowns of the data. He liked the compactness, but the map would be his second choice if slight modifications could be accomplished.

Rose Waters commented on the fact that the map has 7 Izones split by 3 districts.

Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh agreed.

9.2 Committee Vote on Map Alternatives 5, 7, 9, and 10

Ms. Fertig felt that minority access was not accomplished on the maps.

Mr. Ehrlich felt the maps should be ranked.

Chair Rajner stated that he would like to see the best products move forward and asked the committee if they would like to see all of the modified maps submitted.

Mr. Busey stated that the committee should decide on whether or not to accept the modifications.

Mr. Walters commented on the fact that the community asked for possible modifications to the maps. He asked the committee if there was going to be any incorporation of further modifications prior to the maps being sent to the School Board.

Chair Rajner stated that input has been incorporated into the process over the last 8 months. He asked the committee if quick modifications by the committee were going to be done.

Mr. Ehrlich stated that the modified maps should be accepted prior to further modifications being made.

Ms. Judeikis commented that modifying the maps again may throw the numbers off and may not be quick or easy.

Mr. Chard stated that Map Alternative 9 should be sent to the School Board as the sole map as everyone has almost reached a consensus.

Ms. Krishnaiyer stated that the committee is an advisory group and that all four maps should be sent to the School Board.

Ms. Fertig stated that if the maps could be modified tonight, than the committee should try and do so.

Attachment 5

Ms. Cunniff commented that all four maps should be sent to the School Board as is. Any further modifications will generate new and possibly unwanted changes.

Mr. Eichner felt that the maps should be ranked and sent to the School Board with the caveat of public comments.

Mr. Ehrlich made the **motion** for the committee to accept all four revised maps and then rank them according to preference. Mr. Walters seconded the motion. The motion was adopted after debate and public comment which is reflected in the paragraphs which follow.

Ms. Fertig stated that she could not support the motion.

Mr. Busey supported it and stated that requested modifications can be provided in the report.

Public Comment

Steve Breitreuz felt that the lowest two maps should be excluded.

Dr. Nathalie Lynch Walsh stated that by sending all four maps, the School Board can decide on what to avoid or strive for.

Ernastine Tai felt all four maps should be sent to the School Board and they should be left to make the decision on whether or not to accept a map or modify it.

Andrew Disbury felt the School Board would not consider public input after the four maps had been submitted.

Mr. Foulkes asked if the School Board will get everything.

Chair Rajner replied, "Yes."

Mr. Foulkes felt that a listing of strengths and weaknesses should accompany the four maps.

Ms. Fertig felt that all twelve maps should go to the School Board with the top four as being the recommended maps. She was also concerned that some of the maps did not have minority access districts.

Jill Young took a count of hands in favor of the motion. 12 for the motion, 4 against.

Chair Rajner suggested that the rankings be done at home on the committee member's time as the meeting was now approaching 4 hours in length. He asked if the members could have the rankings with strengths and weaknesses emailed to Jill Young or Patrick Sipple by the end of business on October 31st.

Mr. Busey felt like the committee was close to a consensus.

Mr. Aronson asked if the ranking could be done now.

Attachment 5

Ms. Soltanipour stated that she would need some time.

Ms. Jones asked if there was a format to do the ranking.
Ms. Cunniff felt the rankings should be done at home.

Ms. Fertig asked if the same grid would be used when the initial twelve maps were ranked.

Chair Rajner stated that the committee will not be utilizing the evaluation matrix and to just rank the maps in order of preference with 1 being most preferable and 4 being least preferable. He also requested that the committee members articulate why they ranked the maps the way they did.

Ms. Krishnaiyer agreed.

Ms. Ellison stated that writing down a reason will justify the ranks.

Mr. Chard had no preference on whether to rank now or at home.

Mr. Walters and Mr. Foulkes felt the same.

Steve Breitreuz expressed disappointment on the committee's decision to rank the maps at home instead of during a public hearing and then left the meeting.

9.3 Committee Discussion on Report Generation

Chair Rajner stated that Ms. McDouglles's template would be used as a starting point.

9.4 Committee Discussion on the November 8th and November 15th Meeting Room Needs

Jill Young stated that the School Board room had been reserved along with translators, a telephone link, and BECON for both evenings. She asked the committee what type of minute taker should be present.

Mr. Eichner felt that there will need to be someone available to pull up data for report generation.

Chair Rajner felt that a minute taker and someone who could bring up maps and data would be sufficient.

Bob Hartman asked why is this being done now.

Mr. Carland stated that School Board member redistricting must be completed in an odd year.

Mr. Busey stated that he would like to leave any further modifications left up to the School Board.

Attachment 5

Motion: Mr. Busey made the motion that the comments included in the report be inclusive of modifications requested by the committee and public. Mr. Foulkes seconded the motion.

Ms. Cunniff felt that the committee members should suggest the modifications to their School Board members directly.

Mr. Busey withdrew the motion.

Motion: Mr. Ehrlich made the motion that the committee not make any further modifications to the maps but rank the maps and send them to the School Board with comments. Ms. Judeikis seconded the motion. 8 in favor, 6 opposed. The motion passed.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 pm.