School Board of Broward County, FL Redistricting Committee Meeting Attendance 2011-2012

| Redistricting Committee Members, Staff, and Community Guests | 1/4/2012 kickoff #1 North Area Office 2:00 pm | 1/11/2012 kickoff #2 North Area Office 6:00 pm | 2/9/2012 kickoff #3 KCW Bldg 6:00 pm | 2/22/2012 Public Orientation #1 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 3/29/2012 Public Orientation #2 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 4/19/2012 District 1 McArthur HS 6:00 pm | 5/9/2012 District 2 Pembroke Pines Senior Center 6:00 pm | 5/17/2012 District 3 City of Ft. Lauderdale Comm. Chambers 6:00 pm | 5/22/2012 SBW #2 10:00 am Not Required to Attend | 6/4/2012 District 4 Coral Springs HS 6:00 pm | 6/21/2012 District 5 City of Lauderdale Lakes Ed. Center 6:00 pm | 7/11/2012 District 6 Western HS 6:00 pm | 7/25/2012 District 7 City of Deerfield Beach HS Auditorium 6:00 pm | 8/15/2012 Public Meeting #8 South Plantation HS 6:00 pm | 8/30/2012 Public Meeting #9 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 9/27/2012 Public Hearing #10 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 10/11/2012 Public Hearing #11 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 10/24/2012 Public Hearing #12 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | SBW #3 1/2013 Not Required to Attend |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | Anı | n Murray - Di | strict 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kristine Judeikis | Ab | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | Ab | Ab | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| Russell Chard | х | х | х | х | Ab | х | Ab | х | | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| | | | | | | | Patr | icia Good - D | istrict 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marilyn Soltanipour | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | Ab | | х | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | | | |
| Barbara Jones | Ab | х | х | х | x | х | х | Ab | | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| | | | | | | | Maure | en S. Dinnen | - District 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paul Eichner | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | х | х | Ab | х | х | Ab | х | | | |
| Heather Cunniff | х | х | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| | | | | | | | Don | na P. Korn - E | District 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latha Krishnaiyer | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | х | х | Present | х | Ab | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| Mandy Wells | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | х | Ab | х | х | Ab | Ab | | | |
| | | | | | | | Benjam | in J. Williams | - District 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roland Foulkes | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | х | х | Ab | х | х | х | Ab | | | |
| Roosevelt Walters | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| | | | | | | | Laurie F | Rich-Levinson | - District 6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Philip Busey | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| Barry Butin | - | - | - | - | - | - | • | - | | - | - | х | х | х | х | Ab | | | |
| | | | | | | | Noi | ra Rupert - Di | strict 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sheila Rose | х | х | х | х | Ab | х | Ab | х | | - | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | | | |
| Ron Aronson | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | Ab | | | |
| | | | | | | Kathe | erine M. Leac | h, At-Large, (| County Wide | District 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mary C. Fertig | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | Ab | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |
| Michael De Gruccio | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | х | х | х | х | х | Ab | Ab | | | |
| | | | | | | R | Robin Bartlema | n, At-Large, Co | unty Wide Di | trict 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| Alan Ehrlich | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | Ab | х | | х | х | х | х | Ab* | х | х | | | |
| Marsha Ellison | х | х | х | Ab | х | х | х | х | | х | х | х | х | х | х | Ab | | | |
| | • | | • | • | • | | Superin | tendent Rober | t W. Runcie | | | | | | | | | | |
| Michael Rajner, Chair | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | Present | х | х | х | х | х | х | х | | | |

Any appointee who has three consecutive absences or misses four meetings in one calendar year shall be automatically removed by the appointed School Board Member. The automatic removal shall cause a vacancy to exist. In the event an appointee is automatically removed, the appointing School Board Member may reappoint the appointee when extenuating circumstances exist as determined by the appointing School Board Member.

School Board of Broward County, FL Redistricting Committee Meeting Attendance 2011-2012

| Redistricting Committee Members, Staff, and Community Guests | 1/4/2012 kickoff #1 North Area Office 2:00 pm | 1/11/2012 kickoff #2 North Area Office 6:00 pm | 2/9/2012 kickoff #3 KCW Bldg 6:00 pm | 2/22/2012 Public Orientation #1 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 3/29/2012 Public Orientation #2 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 4/19/2012 District 1 McArthur HS 6:00 pm | 5/9/2012 District 2 Pembroke Pines Senior Center 6:00 pm | 5/17/2012 District 3 City of Ft. Lauderdale Comm. Chambers 6:00 pm | 5/22/2012 SBW #2 10:00 am Not Required to Attend | 6/4/2012 District 4 Coral Springs HS 6:00 pm | 6/21/2012 District 5 City of Lauderdale Lakes Ed. Center 6:00 pm | 7/11/2012 District 6 Western HS 6:00 pm | 7/25/2012 District 7 City of Deerfield Beach HS Auditorium 6:00 pm | 8/15/2012 Public Meeting #8 South Plantation HS 6:00 pm | 8/30/2012 Public Meeting #9 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 9/27/2012 Public Hearing #10 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 10/11/2012 Public Hearing #11 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | 10/24/2012 Public Hearing #12 KCW Bldg. 6:00 pm | SBW #3 1/2013 Not Required to Attend |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | District Staff & | Guests - Atten | dance Not Re | quired | | | | | | | | | |
| Dr. Joanne Harrison Chief Officer, Office of Portfolio Services | | | | х | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Leslie Brown Executive Director, Portfolio Services | x | × | x | x | | х | | | | | | | x | x | × | | | | |
| Jill Young Director, Demographics & Student | | | | × | | | ., | | Drocent | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assignments Patrick Sipple | Х | Х | Х | X | Х | Х | Х | Х | Present | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | |
| Demographer Specialist, Demographics & | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Student Assignments | Х | | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Present | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х | х | | | |
| Charles Webster or Nadine Drew Coordinator, Public Relations & Govt. Affairs | x | x | x | х | х | | x | x | Present | x | х | | | x | | | | | |
| J. Paul Carland General Cousel | | х | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | | | | |
| | | | | | | S | School Board M | embers - Atter | ndance Not Re | quired | | | | | | | | | |
| Katherine M. Leach | | | | х | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Robin Bartleman | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ann Murray | | | | | _ | | _ | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| Patricia Good | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maureen Dinnen | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Donna P. Korn | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Benjamin J. Williams | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laurie Rich-Levinson | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nora Rupert | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | | | | | | |

Single Board Member Redistricting Steering Public Hearing

Thursday, October 11, 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
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance
- 3. Roll Call (attachment 3) Pages 1-2
- **4.** Approval of October 11, 2012 Public Hearing Agenda *Page 3*
- 5. Approval of September 27, 2012 Draft Public Redistricting Meeting Minutes (attachment 5) Pages 5-8
- **6.** Chair/Vice Chair's Report
- 7. Staff Follow Up
- 8. Unfinished Business
 - 8.1 Redistricting Map Alternatives Legal Review by J. Paul Carland and Suzanne D'Agresta (attachment 8.1) *Pages* 9-10
- 9. New Business
 - 9.1 Community Comment by City of Plantation Mayor Diane Bendekovic (attachment 9.1) Page 11
 - 9.2 Members Submit Initial Map Alternatives Rankings in Order of Preference

Note: 1 being preferable and 12 being least preferable

- 9.3 Discussion of Individual Committee Member Map Alternative Rankings Utilizing Guiding Principles Note: As part of 9.2, the committee will identify strengths and weaknesses in the Map Alternatives
- 9.4 Committee Selects Map Alternatives to Move Forward
- 9.5 Discussion and Review of Map Making Process
 - Identify Goals, Objectives, and Specific Considerations
 - Begin Mapping Process based on identified Goals, Objectives, and Specific Considerations

10. Public Comment

11. Committee Input

- a. Confirm November Meeting Dates
- b. Future Agenda Items

Adjourn

Attachments for discussion:

- 3_Attendance Roster
- 5_ September 27, 2012 Draft Public Redistricting Minutes
- 8.1_ Redistricting Map Alternatives Legal Review by J. Paul Carland and Suzanne D'Agresta
- 9.1 Community Comment by City of Plantation Mayor Diane Bendekovic

| Page 4 of 11 |
|--------------|

Single Board Member Redistricting Steering Public Hearing
Thursday, September 27, 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 6:09 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Alan Ehrlich 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 – Heather Cunniff

District 3 – Paul Eichner

District 4 – Latha Krishnaiyer

District 5 – Roosevelt Walters

District 6 – Philip Busey

District 7 – Sheila Rose

County Wide, At-Large 8 - Alan Ehrlich

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 5 – Roland Foulkes

District 6 – Barry Butin

District 7 – Ron Aronson

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

County Wide, At-Large 9 – Michael De Grucci

4. Approval of September 27, 2012 Public Hearing Agenda

The agenda was adopted with revised maps 5 and 6 placed first for discussion under agenda item 8.

5. Approval of August 30, 2012 Draft Public Redistricting Meeting Minutes

The August 30th meeting minutes were approved as amended.

6. Chair/Vice Chair's Report

During the Committee reports section of the September 5, 2012 Regular School Board Meeting, Chair Rajner shared with the School Board his request for Board Members to reappoint committee members who exceed the maximum number of absences so the committee can complete its work with the same individuals who heard from the public. Chair Rajner referenced the October 18, 2011 School Board redistricting resolution and timeline which states that committee member responsibilities will dissolve when the School Board selects a map which may be decided upon at the January 2013 School Board Workshop.

Chair Rajner shared that in accordance with the redistricting timeline, staff, or he will accompany staff (Sunshine law permitting) in gathering all School Board member input on redistricting guidelines in November following the swearing in of new School Board members.

Chair Rajner clarified that all the redistricting meetings are public hearings when public comments are sought, and should be called redistricting public hearings, rather than meetings.

6.1 Patricia McDougle Memo

Parliamentarian Patricia McDougle shared a memo in response to Chair Rajner's inquiry on how the committee may provide their recommendation to the School Board.

Discussion followed on how the School Board would be provided public comments. The committee confirmed all committee materials including public input would be available at any time as a public record.

Additional committee discussion followed on the committee's process for adopting a rule to vote on map recommendations.

7. Staff Follow Up

7.1 Redistricting Map Alternatives Legal Review by J. Paul Carland and Suzanne D'Agresta

Jill Young shared the memorandum provided to the Committee on September 25, 2012 by General Counsel and stated that the legal team has provided some general comments of inquiry for the committee to perform their own self-evaluation of the map alternatives.

Committee members felt the memorandum was vague and requested further clarification from legal counsel at this hearing; however, legal counsel had not intended to attend this hearing and was not available for comment beyond the memorandum provided. The committee requested staff ensure legal assistance was available for the October 11, 2012 hearing.

Further committee discussion ensued on the existing odd shape of Broward County, compactness, minority representation, and the size of single member districts. Chair Rajner reminded the committee that the process has allowed to committee to gather public input which is the rationale that reflects the data and geography for the committee's review as it moves forward.

8. Presentation/discussion

8.1 Discussion of map alternatives 1-12 using Map Evaluation Comparison Form

Revised Map Alternative 5 was presented by Philip Busey. Mr. Busey stated he was able to align many school innovation zones to fit into one district without bad splits except for the Coconut Creek, Blanche Ely, Plantation, Piper, Miramar and Stranahan High School zones. Mr. Busey felt that if he could use Census blocks to draw his map, he could correct this. He stated that the odd shape of District 5 was the result of following the South Plantation Innovation Zone. Mr. Busey shared that the revised map alternative 5 total population and voting age population are nearly equal.

Community member Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh commented on revised map alternative 5 stating that she used original map alternative 5 as a starting point to draw map alternative 7 which keeps all of the City of Plantation in District 6. She stated she would have liked to have been able to not split the Piper High School Innovation Zone by moving the District 5 line north.

Chair Rajner thanked Dr. Lynch-Walsh for her mapping efforts and requested members of the City of Plantation provide comments on the School District's redistricting Web site prior to the next hearing on October 11, 2012.

Community member Rose Waters stated she believed that just looking at the voting age population was not justifiable stating that people will change age and the data that was collected will change by the time of the next election.

Additional committee discussion followed on Philip Busey's revised map alternative 5 on whether balancing voting age population was important or not.

In committee member Ron Aronson's absence, Patrick Sipple presented the revisions to map alternative 6.

Chair Rajner opened up the floor for comments on the remaining non-revised map alternatives where Daniel Lewis spoke on map alternative 12.

Mr. Lewis stated he had worked with committee member Roosevelt Walters on map alternative 12 using Census blocks geography rather than voter tabulated districts. He stated that using block allowed him to create a map that reflected the demographics of the county and allowed for Black and Hispanic access districts.

Chair Rajner clarified that the map alternative submitted by Mr. Lewis would be considered as public comment on map alternative 12, but not as a new map alternative given the deadline for map submission had pasted.

Having heard the input from Mr. Lewis regarding the making of maps utilizing Census blocks, committee members expressed their frustration that new factors or mapping techniques were

being introduced so late in the process. The general consensus was that it was too late to restart the process or to allow new or revised maps to be submitted.

The committee considered the process of evaluating the twelve maps submitted and selecting the maps which best met the criteria to be met as outlined. Should the prepared form for evaluating the maps be used and submitted, or should each member submit his/her ranking of the top four maps. In the end, the committee adopted the following two motions:

Mary Fertig motioned to rank the 12 maps and vote up to four alternatives which will serve as models for the generation of a new map(s). The motion was adopted.

Heather introduced a motion, seconded by Latha, which after debate and amendment was adopted as follows: that all members use the form as a guide for ranking the twelve maps 1 being highest and 12 being lowest and get it to Jill by email on October 3rd.

9. Public Comment

Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh spoke on the subject saying that the forms were quantifiable and transparent and should be utilized.

Rose Waters stated she believed all forms should be filled out for all 12 maps to be transparent.

9.1 New online comments received

Comments received from Redistricting Web site were provided to the committee members.

10. New Business

There was no new business discussed.

11. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

12. Committee Input on Future Agenda Items

No input was provided.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

K.C. WRIGHT ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 600 SOUTHEAST THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301

Telephone: (754) 321-2050 Facsimile: (754) 321-2705

J. PAUL CARLAND, II GENERAL COUNSEL

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Michael Rajner, Chair - School Board Member Redistricting Steering Committee

FROM:

J. Paul Carland, II, General Counsel

DATE:

September 25, 2012

SUBJECT: MAP Alternatives – Redistricting Committee

Below are the initial comments of the General Counsel's Office on the map alternatives. They highlight the most significant questions that should be addressed when reviewing them. The list, however, is not exhaustive and all guidelines should be considered when assessing any map for consideration.

I. Total population equal, as nearly as practicable.

This requirement is set out in section 1001.36(1), Florida Statutes.

- o Map 2 district 2 looks a little small compared to the other districts on the map consider the reason for the smaller size
- o Map 4 district 2 looks a little small compared to the other districts on the map consider the reason for the smaller size
- o Map 8 district 1 looks a little large and district 6 looks a little small compared to the other districts on the map consider the reason for the size
- o Map 9 district 2 looks a little small and district 5 looks a little large compared to the other districts on the map consider the reason for the size
- o Map 12 district 1 looks a little large and district 6 looks a little small compared to the other districts on the map consider the reason for the size

II. Compactness.

This consideration, in practice, it tends to be in the eye of the beholder. Compactness refers to the shape of the district. If an oddly shaped district is a result of irregular geography or the need to keep municipalities whole, such explanations may serve to justify the shape of a district.

- o Map 1 district 5 is oddly shaped consider the reason
- o Map 2 none of the districts are compact
- o Map 3 none of the districts are compact
- o Map 5 district 5 is oddly shaped consider the reason
- o Map 6 districts 3, 5, and 6 are oddly shaped consider the reason
- o Map 7 district 5 is oddly shaped consider the reason
- o Map 8 district 5 is oddly shaped (similar to Map 1) consider the reason
- o Map 11 districts 4 and 5 are oddly shaped consider the reason
- o Map 12 districts 1, 3, and 7 are oddly shaped consider the reason

III. Ability of voting age population to elect representative of choice.

This consideration is essentially an attempt to foreclose a legal claim that a single member district plan was adopted to intentionally or purposefully discriminate against covered minority voting rights or has a discriminatory effect on covered minority voting rights. To establish such a claim, a plan must unacceptably impair a minority group's ability to elect candidates its members prefer. It is important to remember that race should not be the predominant factor in a redistricting plan, but may be considered along with all the traditional redistricting principles in drawing district boundaries.

- o Map 2 district 5 is no longer a minority/majority district consider the reason
- o Map 3 district 5 is no longer a minority/majority district consider the reason
- o Map 4 district 5 is no longer a minority/majority district consider the reason
- o Map 10 district 5 is no longer a minority/majority district consider the reason
- o Map 12 district 5 is no longer a minority/majority district consider the reason

All of the above comments should not be considered a specific recommendation to reject a map alternative. A final decision on any alternative is dependent upon consideration of all the guidelines and any adjustments to an alternative in light of same should the Committee desire to work with a particular map as a concept.

C: Joanne W. Harrison, Ed.D., Chief Officer - Office of Portfolio Services School Board Member Redistricting Steering Committee Leslie M. Brown, Executive Director – Portfolio Management Jill Young, Director – Demographics & Student Assignment Patrick J. Sipple, GISP, Demographer Specialist - Demographics & Student Assignments Suzanne D'Agresta, Esq., Special Counsel

fritz/allwork/redistricting 2011/ Memo _ Redistricting Committee 09-25-12

Copies fo 10Jill L Young Title: Fw: MAP 7 : CAB

From: Nathalie Lynch-Walsh <nlynch-walsh@att.net>

Fri, Oct 05, 2012 3:53:52 PM

Friday, October 05, 2012 3:56:44 PM

Page 1 of 2

Fw: MAP 7 Subject:

redistricting@browardschools.com To:

Jill L. Young 🎆 Tanis Bell <TanisMBell@gmail.com> Cc:

Debbie Mullaney <kuzlaney@aol.com>

Attachments: Attach0.html / Uploaded File 7K

---- Forwarded Message ----

From: "Tingom, Pete" < PTingom@plantation.org> To: Nathalie Lynch-Walsh <nlynch-walsh@att.net>

Sent: Fri, October 5, 2012 3:30:06 PM

Subject: RE: MAP 7

I concur with Mayor Bendekovic and support Redistricting Map 7. This map best represents the City of Plantation. Pete Tingom, Plantation City Council President

From: Nathalie Lynch-Walsh [nlynch-walsh@att.net]

Sent: Friday, October 05, 2012 10:57 AM **To:** redistricting@browardschools.com

Cc: Jill Young; Tanis Bell; Debbie Mullaney; Tingom, Pete

Subject: Fw: MAP 7

---- Forwarded Message ----

From: Mayor Diane Bendekovic < <u>DBendekovic@plantation.orq</u>>

To: Nathalie Lynch-Walsh <nlynch-walsh@att.net>

Sent: Fri, October 5, 2012 10:51:07 AM

Subject: MAP 7

Nathalie,

Plantation would have three School Board members instead of four members, presently, representing our community if Alternative 7 is selected; two at large and one district member. Maureen Dinnen, Ben Williams, Robin Bartleman, and Jennifer Gottlieb(now Donna Korn) were always accessible to Plantation and willing to work with us. However, I will support Map 7. In my opinion, it isn't the districting or School Board Member representation that have been problematic to Plantation it has been the disparity of the Nova enrollment, the individual school boundaries, traffic control/conditions at specific schools, and a total disregard for the completion of capital projects at Plantation High School.

Diane Veltri Bendekovic

| Source | Timestamp | Name | City, State, Zip | Commenting On | Comment |
|----------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|---|
| email | 2/23/2012 11:49:27 | Jeanne Jusevic | | General | Dear Jill, Michael Rajner asked me to take a look at the web site and video of the redistricting committee. While I found the graphics a little hard to read in the video, overall I found it helpful and informative. I also found the web site easy to navigate and I understood the material posted to the web site. The only thing I would add is either a tutorial on using the map maker or doing a live tutorial on the map maker in each of the three areas. Again, thank you for making this easy for the public to access and easy for the public to understand. Well done! Sincerely, Jeanne Jusevic |
| | | | | | |
| Web form | 3/2/2012 18:16:38 | William Vayens | Ft Lauderdale FL 33304 | General | There appears to be a problem with your KMZ file of the current school board districts. WHen imported into DistrictBuilder (or Google Maps), it only shows 4 districts, 3 of which are outside Broward County. Good Morning: I have checked the School Board Members District Boundaries for my neighborhood and I find that our community is split between two School Board Member District Boundaries. If you reside south of McNab Road and west of State Road 7 within the City of North Lauderdale, you are in District #4 which is School Board Member Donna Kom's District. If you reside north of McNab Road along with the areas east of State Road 7 within the City of North Lauderdale, you are in District #5 which is School Board Member Benjamin William's District. Therefore, I would like to recommend that the entire City of North Lauderdale be placed within District #4. This would only impact Morrow Elementary School, Pinewood Elementary School, and Silver Lakes Middle School, all of which are in the North Area along with the other schools in District #4, while all of the other schools listed in District 5 are in the Central Area. It is a natural fit for these three schools. I will be bringing this issue up at the next North Lauderdale City Commission Meeting, which is scheduled for Wednesday, March 28, for their review and support. Please provide this to the Redistricting Steering Committee. Thanks. |
| email | 3/19/2012 11:32:00 | Jerry Graziose | | General | Jerry |

Last updated: 10/15/2012 Page 1 of 5

| | | | au au - | Commenting | |
|--------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| Source | Timestamp | Name | City, State, Zip | On | Comment |
| | | | | | Jill, Good Afternoon: I went on the School Districts Redistricting Web Site and the Broward County Map that is on the left side of the page, is old. The map does not show the current city boundaries, that have been changed over the last 6 years due to annexations. Thanks, Jerry Graziose, Director, Safety & Chief Fire Official Safety Department The School Board of Broward County, Florida 754-321-4200 754-321-4287 Fax |
| | 0/00/0040 45 00 00 1 | 0 | | 0 | 154 521 4251 143 |
| email | 3/28/2012 15:00:00 Jerr | y Graziose | | General | Worked with commissioner Jerry Graziose on completing new districting map, was honored to be part of the process. I believe the meeting |
| Web form | 4/9/2012 13:12:56 And | Irew | Davie, Fl.33314 | General | was a learning process for all. |
| | , | ·· - · · | | Two hour map | I found the mapping workshop to be helpful and easy to understand. I also found the assistance provided by the staff to be very |
| Comment card | 4/16/2012 0:00:00 Jerr | y Graziose | North Lauderdale | meeting | knowledgable and friendly. |
| | | | | | When attempting to review the current map and the "Innovative" map option, I found it strange that the new "innovative" map did not have the dots showing the locations of each school. It would be helpful to show the before/after maps on a an 'apples to apples' basis so that you can understand why people are up in arms about living within walking distance of a school, yet are innovatively being redistricted to another school. I also do not see information around the reasoning behind the redistricting changes. It would be helpful to have this information listed on the website for the public to be better informed. |
| Web form | 5/25/2012 6:39:51 Car | olyn | Weston, FL 33331 | Alternative 1 | Thank you. |
| Wah farra | E/00/0040 40.40.00 L V | | Course City El 2020 | Consti | I do not understand why we do not remove the children attending Cooper City Schools who do not live in the area. I have a neighor whos granddaughter attends Cooper City Elem for 2 0r 3 years now but lives with her mother in Hollywood. I have spoken to the school about it. They know the situation but because the grandmother claims the child lives there, it is allowed. This is not a hardship case. The grandparents house is only 1 bock from the school. If they do not care about this child how many more are their. The representative for the school told me there were lots and asked me why I care. |
| Web form | 5/26/2012 10:12:22 Julia | ann Anderson | Cooper City, FL 33328 | General | Why waste the time to make the laws if you are not going to enforce them? The Riverside Park Neighborhood in Fort Lauderdale is currently split into two districts. We as a neighborhood would prefer having the entire neighborhood in one district. Stranahan HS is an important part of our neighborhood. The Board of the Riverside Park Residents Association has asked me to make this request. |
| google form | 6/16/2012 13:59:26 Day | rid L Sloan, 3rd | Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312 | General | Thank you for your consideration. |

Last updated: 10/15/2012 Page 2 of 5

| | | | | Commenting | |
|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---|
| Source | Timestamp | Name | City, State, Zip | On | Comment |
| Jource | Timestamp | IVAILLE | City, State, Zip | Oil | THIS IS A LETTER I PUBLISHED AND I THOUGHT IT BEST DESCRIBED SOUTHWEST RANCHES FEELINGS |
| | | | | | Here we go again! I am referring to the school board redistricting that is occurring as we speak. Don't stop reading if you don't have school age kids because this fight belongs to all of us. We cannot sit back and continually allow the children of Southwest Ranches to pay the price of elected officials playing to the voting masses, rather than doing what is right for all of the students. As if it were not bad enough that students my son's age were re-boundaried in elementary school, middle school and then again in high school the county is now taking away our voice. Apparently school board members are bogged down by the sheer number of people in their districts and in an effort to redistribute the population more fairly between representatives, they have placed half of Southwest Ranches with the Weston representative. It can be argued that each of the members represents all of our children, but if you live in SWR, you know this is not true. It was a mere six years ago that our high schoolers were boundaried out of the school across the street, Cypress Bay. As I personally took school board members and the superintendent on tours to show them how ludacris this move was, they all stated that sometimes they have to make decisions based on the discomfort of the fewest amount of people and the benefit of the largest number of voters. Well obviously we have the smallest number of children and Weston has the largest number of voters, their message was loud and clear, the only one that sided with our town was our representative, our sole vote, our only voice. It has been a Weston area school that our children have been |
| | | | | | boundraried out of each time, so I suppose if they give us a Weston representative they will not even have to hear that sole voice or be |
| | | | | | bothered by that single vote! If you compare the number of Weston voters to the number of Southwest Ranches vote it is apparent which |
| | | | | | way our new representative will swing if she hopes to be reelected. We may be small and we may not have a ton of kids in our town but we |
| | | | | | have the right to fair representation, our students deserve to have someone with their best interest at heart, regardless of voter opinions. If you have it in you to buck the system, fight the fight, do what is right, it is not too late, call or email the school board today because our time |
| google form | 6/22/2012 17:44:32 | kathy sullivan | Southwest Ranches, fl 33331 | General | is running out. Tell them that we want; no we demand to have our entire town represented by Patti Good, the representative that has our |
| | | 1 | , | | It seems like Southwest Ranches should be represented by someone in their district who covers the public schools that the children in SW |
| | 0/00/00/00 50 50 00 | D: " D 1 0: | SW 5 1 51 5000 1 | | Ranches attend, as opposed to having them be represented by someone from Weston, since the children from Southwest Ranches do not |
| google form | 6/22/2012 20:56:03 | Priscilla Prado Stroze | SW Ranches, FL 33331 | General | attend their schools. We want to modify alternative 1 to include all of SWR in the West Broward innovation zone, that keeps every innovation zone in district 2 |
| google form | 6/23/2012 12:49:05 | Kathy Sullivan | Southwest Ranches, fl 33331 | General | intact, The map would be altered slightly. The line would go down Griffin to Flamingo. This would keep the West Broward ZONE together. I am trying to get the map included at the Western High School meeting on July 12 at 6pm. our alternative speaks to the needs of the smaller areas that do not have a school in their city but is impacted hugely by these changes. It is also important to realize that the change I am proposing does not negatively impact any other districts. This is a community driven process and we need to make our voices heard. If we are separated in this process it will serve to dilute our already small voice in issues. Please tell me what we do next and if we can have this submitted for the July 12 meeting at Western High School,, as it is the closest meeting place for our district. |
| | | | | | I am on the Town Council of Southwest Ranches. It is important that we keep our town in one district, rather than splitting it between |
| | | | | | districts. As we are a small town, our voice is already diminished. Splitting our town reduces our voice even more. I wish to see all of |
| google form | 6/23/2012 16:24:35 | Stove Breitkreuz | Southwest Ranches, FL 33332 | General | West Broward zone kept together. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| | | | | Conordi | We want to modify Alternative Map 1 slightly by moving the northern-most line (Griffin Road) east to Flamingo Road and then south to Sheridan Street. This would serve to include all of the Hawkes Bluff boundary and keep the West Broward innovation zone intact, thereby insuring that District 2 zones are not split. I do not believe this minor change will have a negative impact to any other district but I would appreciate your help in determining how the demographics play out and its impact to both Districts 2 and 6. I would like to present this at the next redistricting meeting which I believe is to be held at Western High School. Please advise what steps I need to take to insure this |
| google form | 6/23/2012 16:58:09 | Michael Tromans | Southwest Ranches, fl 33331 | General | can be accomplished. |
| google form | 6/25/2012 15:38:12 | marie berry | SW Ranches, fl 33331 | General | Since the students of Southwest Ranches are not able to attend the Weston area schools, it make better sence to be represented by patti Good, who actually has school boundaries in her area. |
| google form | 6/26/2012 15:30:23 | Debbie Green | Southwest Ranches, FL 33332 | Alternative 1 | I wish to see ALL of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. Be redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flamingo is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| google form | 6/26/2012 19:16:46 | | | General | Please keep all of Southwest Ranches together as we are small and need the entire town to be together and have a little voice. |
| google form | 6/27/2012 8:13:46 | Manny Hagen | Southwest Ranches, 33331 | General | I would like to keep all of Southwest Ranches in the same district and not have it split up. |
| and a state of | 0/07/00 : 0 0 07 | Kathara Asa | O.W. Barriera El 2000 | A11 | wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest RAnches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would |
| google form | 6/27/2012 8:27:39 | Kathryn Aaron | S.W. Ranches, FL 33331 | Alternative 1 | dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines to that Griffin to Flamingo is included in D2, we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. Please adopt Alternative 5. We want to keep Southwest Ranches together, incl. Cooper city, to be a sguared off zone represented by Patricia Good. It makes common sense. When the other alternatives divide across illogical lines, the public wonders if politics trumps |
| google form | 6/27/2012 19:53:01 | CHARLES POPE | SOUTHWEST RANCHES, FL 3333 | Alternative 5 | common sense. |

Last updated: 10/15/2012 Page 3 of 5

| Source | Timestamp | Name | City, State, Zip | Commenting On | Comment |
|--------------|--|-----------------|--|------------------|--|
| google form | 6/27/2012 20:22:28 | Marion Hagen | SW Ranches, FL 33331 | Alternative 2 | TO: Jill Young redistricting@browardschools.com I feel that we must Keep Patricia Good as our representive for our childrens sake. I do not feel that a representive From Weston will help us in anyway. They do NOT ALLOW OUR CHILDREN TO ENTER ANY WESTON SCHOOLS. It would not be fair to them. We must protect our children from people who do not care about them Sincerely, Marion Hagen |
| googie form | 0/21/2012 20.22.20 | Marion Hageri | OV Ranches, 1 E 33331 | Alternative 2 | We are a small town and I realize this does not impact our students but it would impact our representation. Please leave the town with a |
| google form | 6/28/2012 7:19:55 | Bob Macfarlane | Southwest Ranches, FL 33331 | General | single representative. I wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| google form | 6/28/2012 13:38:01 | Salana Hodgars | southwest ranches. fl 33331 | General | |
| google lolli | 0/20/2012 13.30.01 | Selena Hougers | southwest fancties, if 50001 | General | wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| google form | 6/28/2012 13:39:03 | Ben Hodgers | Southwest ranches, FL 33331 | General | |
| google form | 6/28/2012 13:39:10 | Ben Hodgers | Southwest ranches, FL 33331 | General | wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| google form | 6/28/2012 13:39:50 | Jimmie O'Steen | southwest ranches, fl 33331 | General | wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| | | | | | wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| google form | 6/28/2012 13:40:33 | Richard O'Steen | southwest ranches, fl 33331 | General | I wish to see all of West Broward zone kept together. Southwest Ranches is a small town and splitting us between two districts would dilute our voice. By redrawing the lines so that Griffin to Flaming is included in D2 we will be able to keep our innovation zone intact. |
| google form | 7/1/2012 23:16:00 8/29/2012 2:03:52 | | SW Ranches, FL 33330 SW Ranches, FL 33331 | General | After studying all of the maps, the impact of the final decision became all the more clear. I appreciate the time and efforts of the contributors. Each obviously having some local district insight. For my neighborhood (town), it is IMPERATIVE that we are not divided up to multiple districts/representatives. Our students have been moved around and pushed around for years. Dividing our feeder school flows between districts will only create chaos. Let us remain as one district. Maps 5,6,8,8,10, allow our students to remain in one district. Some of the maps have us in district 2, some district 6. Our students were "kicked out" of Weston area schools so I believe our students and parents will be better served to be districted with West Broward H.S. with Griffin rd. as the North divider as in map 8. Nevertheless, whatever happens it will be devastating for our students to be divided using Dykes, I75, Volunteer as an Eastern line!!!! |

Last updated: 10/15/2012

| Source | Timestamp | Name | City, State, Zip | Commenting | Comment |
|-------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| Source | Timestamp | ivanie | city, state, zip | - On | Chair Rajner, I was with this mapping process from the beginning. If you listen to the public meetings you recorded, you will hear that it was said over and over again that "voting population" was not to be considered according to the rules and consideration handed down by the those who appointed the committee and those who drew the guidelines. I cannot understand why the committee is moving away from the set criteria for drawing the Broward County Map. Staying with the set criteria and considerations, it will eliminated chasing a tail as a confuse cat does. There is no confusing when the guideline are honored. Voting age population, according to what is written, is the guidelines, not a "suggestion" that moves away from it. The reason for guidelines is to guide. Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts. |
| google form | 9/10/2012 9:37:25 | Rose Waters | Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311 | General | Rose Waters |
| | | | | | I like plan/map 7 for the re-districting because I like the idea of having a Plantation Community. I like to think that we can a small town feeling within a larger community. For example, having my children, who are both in public Plantation schools, traveling with some of the same group of children that they have seen in Elementary, Middle and then High School. They may see them at sports events or other events in the community and they will feel part of a larger family/community. |
| | | | | | Thank you for your attention to my comment, I appreciate the difficulty of this decision and thank you as a board for your efforts. |
| | | | | | Sincerely, |
| google form | 10/3/2012 21:09:36 | Tanya Reid | Plantation, FL, 33324 | Alternative 7 | Tanya Reid |
| | | | | | I believe that it is in the best interests of Plantation to approve the map 7 submitted in order to have Plantation have it's own school board |
| google form | 10/7/2012 11:15:37 | R. Murphy | Plantation, FL 33322 | General | member district. |

Last updated: 10/15/2012 Page 5 of 5

Printed by: **Jill L Young**Title: **Ranking of Map Alternative : CAB**Thursday, October 04, 2012 12:16:34 PM
Page 1 of 1

From: Thu, Oct 04, 2012 12:09:13 PM

Subject: Ranking of Map Alternative

To: Jill L. Young Patrick Sipple

Attachments: Attach0.html / Uploaded File 12K

| Ranking | Map Alternative |
|---------|-----------------|
| 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 7 |
| 3 | 10 |
| 4 | 6 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 9 |
| 9 | 12 |
| 10 | 8 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 3 |

Michael Emanuel Rajner, BSW Chairman, 2011-2013 Redistricting Steering Committee The School Board of Broward County, Florida

For more information on redistricting, please visit our website: http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/redistricting

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses, and all communications, including e-mail communications, made or received in connection with the transaction of School Board business are public records, which must be retained as required by law and must be disclosed upon receipt of a public records request, except as may be excluded by federal or state laws. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity.

From:

Alan G. Ehrlich"

Wednesday, October 03, 2012 1:37:29 AM 🚃 🗐



Subject:

Re: Reminder! Fwd(2): Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form

To:

🍶 Jill L. Young

Cc:

Attachments:

Attach0.html / Uploaded File

19K

Hi, Jill!

Here are my rankings:

- 1. 7;
- 2. 10;
- 3. 5;
- 4. 1;
- 5. 9;
- 6. 4;
- 7. 6;
- 8. 8;
- 9. 11;
- 10. 12;
- 11. 2;
- 12. 3.

Alan Ehrlich

On 10/2/2012 5:31 PM, Jill L. Young wrote:

Tuesday, October 2, 2012

Good Evening Redistricting Steering Committee Members,

From:

Friday, October 05, 2012 1:45:42 PM (1996)



Subject: Rankings for map

To: Jill L. Young 🚺 Patrick Sipple

Attach0.html / Uploaded File Attachments:

2K

Dear Jill and Patrick,

Please accept my sincere apologies for getting this to you so late.

I have finished reviewing all of the materials and am sending the following ranking:

- 1. Map 12
- Map 10 2
- 3. Map 1
- 4. Map 5
- 5. Map 7 and Map 9
- 6. Map 8 and Map 11
- 7. Map 2
- 8. Map 4
- 9. Map 6
- 10. Map 3

Sorry I had some ties. Actually, within the top four they were very close, and, since Map 7 was drawn from Map 5, it was very close.

I will bring my notes. The worksheets provided a good format for doing a preliminary analysis, but I am looking forward to the conversation next week.

Thank you for all your work on this process.

Mary Fertig

THE BOY STATE OF STATES OF

Broward County School Board

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| Comments | | |
|---|-----------------|---|
| Total | to | 0 |
| Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | K | W PASSING PROBLEM |
| Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | CE) | 7 |
| Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | 7 | \$ townseed and the second seco |
| Category E Preservation of communities of interest | 9 | , geometrare |
| Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | 40 | and the second s |
| Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | લ | |
| Category B Districts are as nearly as nearly as practicable, equal in equal in total voting total population Category B as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | 20) | 7 |
| Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total | + | 60 |
| Map Alternative | Alternative # 1 | Alternative # 2 |

Page 1 of 7

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles | 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|--|--|--|

| Comments | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Total | I | 6-6 |
| Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | S | a |
| Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | el | 60 |
| Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | et-mana popularia-1578 | 20. |
| Category E Preservation of communities of interest | | 7 |
| Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | and control of the second control of | + |
| Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | ويستسيع | T |
| Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age age | 66 | |
| Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total | 8) | 6 |
| Map Alternative | Alternative # 3 | Alternative # 4 |

Page 2 of 7

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles | 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|--|--|--|

| Comments | |
|---|-----------------|
| Score Score | 12 |
| Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | S |
| Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | (A) |
| Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | 60 |
| Category E Preservation of communities of interest | 7 |
| Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | 7 |
| Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | 66 |
| Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | S |
| Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | 4 |
| Map Alternative Alternative # 5 | Alternative # 6 |

Page 3 of 7

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles | 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|--|--|--|

| Comments | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Total | 36 | 2 |
| Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | 6 | 0 |
| Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | ditionens | É |
| Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | 60 | 7 |
| Category E Preservation of communities of interest | 7 | 7 |
| Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | 7 | 4 |
| Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | 70 | \prec |
| Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age | -6 | 6 |
| Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total | 7 | ~ |
| Map Alternative | Alternative # 7 | Alternative # 8 |

Page 4 of 7

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| | | | , |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles | 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |

| Comments | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | (b) | 4 |
| Total | 66 | C. J. |
| Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | 4 | 40 |
| Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Ø, | ω |
| Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | (m), | 80 |
| Category E Preservation of communities of interest | 7 | America. |
| Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | 4 | Ą |
| Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | 7 | 4 |
| Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | | 9 |
| Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total | (6) | 7 |
| Map Alternative | Alternative # 9 | Alternative # 10 |

Page 5 of 7

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
| 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |

| Comments | | divavorh numbers |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| Total | 2 | 2 |
| Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | 4 | Comment |
| Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | \prec | **Density;;;;. |
| Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | 7 | |
| Category E Preservation of communities of interest | + | 7 |
| Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | ~ | 2 |
| Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | | 7 |
| Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age age | Z | S |
| Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total | 4 | 4 |
| Map Alternative | Alternative # 11 | Alternative # 12 |



Page 6 of 7

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles

4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

Shall (ROSE Print Name - Redistricting Steering Committee Member

Signature - Redistricting Steering Committee Member

Date

Page 7 of 7

Philip Busey From:

Wednesday, October 03, 2012 2:57:46 PM



Subject: Map ranking

To: 🍶 Jill L. Young

Jill, here are my rankings, where 1=highest or best ranking in conforming to guidelines, and 12=least conforming.

5 Alternative 1= Alternative 2= 11 Alternative 3= 12 Alternative 4= 6 Alternative 5= 1 7 Alternative 6= Alternative 7= 8 Alternative 8= 9 Alternative 9= 3 Alternative 10= 2 Alternative 11= 10 Alternative 12= 4

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | gly Unfavorable to the Guid | ding Principles |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | | Category B | | Category D | | | cCČ | 90 | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| | Category A | Districts are | | Districts shall | | | Category | Category H | | |
| | Districts are | as nearly as | Category C | where feasible, | | Category F | Alignment of single | Alignment of | | |
| | as nearly as | practicable, | Districts | utilize | Category E | Ability for | member | single member | | |
| | practicable, | equal in | shall be | existing | Preservation | populations to | districts with | districts with | | |
| | equal in | total voting | compact | political and | of | elect | equal | | | |
| Мар | <u>total</u> | <u>age</u> | and | geographical | communities | representatives | numbers of | Innovation | Total | |
| Alternative | population | population | contiguous | boundaries | of interest | of their choice | schools | Zones | Score | Comments |
| | | | | | 4 | 97. | | | | Categories "E" and "F" |
| Alternative # 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1)21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 15 | difficult to determine. |
| | | | | | 70, | | | | | |
| Alternative # 2 | | | | A | 191 | | | | | Categories "E" and "F" |
| | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 22 | difficult to determine. |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly | Unfavorable to th | e Guiding Principles |
|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | |

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | | Category B | | Category D | | | Č | 90 | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-------|--|
| | Category A | Districts are | | Districts shall | | | Category | Category H | | |
| | Districts are | as nearly as | Category C | where feasible, | | Category F | Alignment of single | Alignment of | | |
| | as nearly as | practicable, | Districts | utilize | Category E | Ability for | member | single member | | |
| | practicable, | equal in | shall be | existing | Preservation | populations to | districts with | districts with | | |
| | equal in | total voting | compact | political and | of | elect | equal | | | |
| Мар | <u>total</u> | <u>age</u> | and | geographical | communities | representatives | numbers of | Innovation | Total | |
| Alternative | population | population | contiguous | boundaries | of interest | of their choice | schools | Zones | Score | Comments |
| Alternative # 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1201 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 16 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |
| Alternative # 4 | | | | | land | | | | | Categories "E" and "F" |
| | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 19 | difficult to determine. |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
|--|

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | | Category B | | Category D | | | a Č | 900 | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|---|----------------|--|
| | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting | Category C Districts shall be compact | Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and | Category E Preservation of | Category F Ability for populations to elect | Alignment of single member districts with equal | Category H Alignment of single member districts with | | |
| Map Alternative | total population | age population | and contiguous | geographical boundaries | communities of interest | representatives of their choice | numbers of schools | Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| Alternative # 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | dillet | 1 | 4 | 3 | 21 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |
| Alternative # 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 18 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
|--|

- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | | Category B | | Category D | | | Č | 90 | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| | Category A | Districts are | | Districts shall | | | Category | Category H | | |
| | Districts are | as nearly | Category C | where feasible, | | Category F | Alignment of single | Alignment of | | |
| | as nearly as | as practicable, | Districts | utilize | Category E | Ability for | member | single | | |
| | practicable, | equal in | shall be | existing | Preservation | populations to | districts with | member districts with | | |
| | equal in | total voting | compact | political and | of | elect | equal | districts with | | |
| Мар | <u>total</u> | <u>age</u> | and | geographical | communities | representatives | numbers of | Innovation | Total | |
| Alternative | <u>population</u> | population | contiguous | boundaries | of interest | of their choice | schools | Zones | Score | Comments |
| | | | | | Det | | | | | Categories "E" and "F" |
| Alternative # 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | St. | 1 | 3 | 2 | 20 | difficult to determine. |
| | | | | A | 197 | | | | | Categories "E" and "F" |
| Alternative # 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 3 |) | 1 | 3 | 3 | 18 | difficult to determine. |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly | Unfavorable | to the | Guidina | Principles |
|--------------|-------------|--------|---------|------------|
|--------------|-------------|--------|---------|------------|

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| Map Alternative | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Category E Preservation of communities of interest | Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|--|
| Alternative # 9 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1,127 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 19 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |
| Alternative # 10 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 21 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
| 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles |

| | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, | equal in | Category C Districts shall be | Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing | Category E Preservation | Category F Ability for populations to elect | Category Alignment of single member districts with | Category H Alignment of single member districts with | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|---|-------|--|
| Мар | equal in <u>total</u> | total voting age | compact and | political and geographical | of communities | representatives | equal numbers of | Innovation | Total | |
| Alternative | population | population | contiguous | boundaries | of interest | of their choice | schools | Zones | Score | Comments |
| Alternative # 11 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1,387 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 18 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |
| Alternative # 12 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | and | 1 | 3 | 2 | 15 | Categories "E" and "F" difficult to determine. |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
|--|

- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

Roland Alexander FOULKES

Print Name - Redistricting Steering Committee Member

Roland Alexander FOULKES

Signature - Redistricting Steering Committee Member

3 October 2012

Dat

Page **7** of **7**

Printed by: Jill L Young
Title: Re: Fwd: Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form : CAB

Wednesday, October 03, 2012 8:13:04 PM Page 1 of 3

From: Wednesday, October 03, 2012 8:11:20 PM

Subject: Re: Fwd: Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form

To: **Jill L. Young**

Attachments: Attach0.html / Uploaded File 13K

Jill,

My rankings are as follows:

- 1. 5
- 2. 10
- 3. 7
- 4. 4
- 5. 9
- 6. 8
- 7. 1
- 8. 6
- 9. 11
- 10. 2
- 11. 12
- 12. 3

Sincerely,

Heather Cunniff

--- On Fri, 9/28/12, Jill L. Young <i ill.young@browardschools.com> wrote:

From: Jill L. Young < jill.young@browardschools.com > Subject: Fwd: Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form

To:

Cc: "Leslie M. Brown" < leslie.brown@browardschools.com >, "Paul Carland" < paul.carland@browardschools.com >, "Patrick Sipple" < patrick.sipple@browardschools.com >, "Tracy Clark" < tracy.clark@browardschools.com >, "Charles P. Webster" < charles.webster@browardschools.com >, "Nadine Drew" < nadine.drew@browardschools.com >, patmcdougle@att.net, "Elizabeth A. Henderson" < elizabeth.henderson@browardschools.com >, "Theresa M. Silva" < theresa.silva@browardschools.com >, "Christine A. Young" < christine.young@browardschools.com >, "Dorothy McCray" < dorothy.mccray@browardschools.com >, "JoAnn T. DiLallo" < joann.dilallo@browardschools.com >, "Cecilia U. Guerrero" < cecilia.guerrero@browardschools.com >

Date: Friday, September 28, 2012, 3:04 PM

Good Morning Redistricting Steering Committee Members,

Please find attached the Revised Map Evaluation Comparison worksheet emailed to you on Friday, August 17, 2012 at 7:03 PM.

Printed by: Jill L Young Title: Map Evaluation: CAB Thursday, October 04, 2012 8:05:35 AM Page 1 of 4

From: Barbara Jones Barbara Jones

Wednesday, October 03, 2012 9:10:15 PM 🚃 🗐

Subject: Map Evaluation

Jill L. Young To:

Attachments: Attach0.html / Uploaded File

24K Map Evaluation.docx / Uploaded File 20K

Jill:

Following are the rankings for all twelve maps (1 being thehighest ranking and 12 being the lowest ranking) based on the totals as indicated on the attached map evaluation comparison matrix:

- Map Alternative #8
 - 2. Map Alternative #1
- Map Alternative #4 3.
- Map Alternative #9
- Map Alternative #5 5.
- Map Alternative #6
- 7. Map Alternative #7
- 8. Map Alternative #10
- Map Alternative #12
- 10. Map Alternative #11
- 11. Map Alternative #2
- 12. Map Alternative #3

Redistricting Committee Member, Barbara D. Jones

From: Jill L. Young <i ill.young@browardschools.com>

To:

Cc: Leslie M. Brown < leslie.brown@browardschools.com>; Paul Carland

<paul.carland@browardschools.com>; Patrick Sipple <patrick.sipple@browardschools.com>; Tracy Clark <tracy.clark@browardschools.com>; Charles P. Webster

<charles.webster@browardschools.com>; Nadine Drew <nadine.drew@browardschools.com>; patmcdougle@att.net; Elizabeth A. Henderson <elizabeth.henderson@browardschools.com>;

Pompano Bch Jill L Young Title: Redistricting Maps: CAB Wednesday, October 03, 2012 7:02:00 PM Page 1 of 1

From: M SOLTANIPOUR Wed, Oct 03, 2012 4:53:04 PM

Subject: **Redistricting Maps**

To: 🍶 Jill L. Young

Attach0.html / Uploaded File Attachments:

2K

Dear Jill:

Pursuant to the motion passed at the last meeting of the redistricting committee, the following are my top 4 picks:

- 1-Map Alternative 5
- 2-Map Alternative 7
- 3- Map Alternative 8
- 4- Map Alternatives 1 & 10 (they tied)

I hope this is sufficient. However, should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marilyn L. Soltanipour

Paul Eichner From:

Monday, October 01, 2012 7:25:46 PM

Subject: Re: Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form

🏅 Jill L. Young To:

Attach0.html / Uploaded File Attachments:

12K

Good evening Jill and Patrick,

My selection is as follows with my first response being my first choice:

Map 10 is my first choice

Map 4 is my second choice

Map 8 is my third choice and

Map 9 is my fourth and least favorite choice

Thanks go to both you and Patrick for all of your patience.

Regards, Paul Eichner

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 28, 2012, at 11:04 AM, "Jill L. Young" <iill.young@browardschools.com> wrote:

Good Morning Redistricting Steering Committee Members,

Please find attached the Revised Map Evaluation Comparison worksheet emailed to you on Friday, August 17, 2012 at 7:03 PM.

During last night's Redistricting Hearing, the committee requested that <u>each</u> committee member rank all twelve maps, with 1 being the highest ranking and 12 being the lowest ranking, and provide this to Jill. Young@browardschools.com by this Wednesday, October 3, 2012.

The audio recording of the Thursday, September 27th redistricting public hearing can be downloaded by visiting: http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/redistricting/Audio.shtml

The next Redistricting Steering Committee hearing is scheduled for Thursday, October 11th at 6:00 PM at Kathleen C. Wright School Board Room, 600 SE 3rd Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Please contact me or Patrick Sipple if you are physically unable to attend this meeting, and we will provide you a call in number to attend the October 11th hearing.

From:

Kristine Judeikis Kristine Judeikisl

Thursday, October 04, 2012 7:57:22 AM 🔀 🧐



Subject:

Re: Reminder ! Fwd(2): Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form

To:

Jill L. Young

Attachments:

Attach0.html / Uploaded File

20K

Jill,

Sorry I forgot to send this to you earlier in the week. It has been a zoo this week for me.

Choice #1 - Alternative 5

Choice #2 - Alternative 10

Choice #3 - Alternative 2

Choice #4 - Alternative 9

Choice #5 - Alternative 6

Choice #6 - Alternative 8

Choice #7 - Alternative 11

Choice #8 - Alternative 12

Choice #9 - Alternative 4

Choice #10 - Alternative 7

Choice #11 - Alternative 1

Choice #12 - Alternative 3

Kristine

From: Jill L. Young < jill.young@browardschools.com>

To:

Cc: Leslie M. Brown < ! Paul Carland

<paul.carland@browardschools.com>; Patrick Sipple <patrick.sipple@browardschools.com>; Tracy

Clark < tracy.clark@browardschools.com >; Charles P. Webster

<charles.webster@browardschools.com>; Nadine Drew <nadine.drew@browardschools.com>;

patmcdougle@att.net; Elizabeth A. Henderson <elizabeth.henderson@browardschools.com>;

Theresa M. Silva <theresa.silva@browardschools.com>; Christine A. Young

<christine.young@browardschools.com>; Dorothy McCray

<dorothy.mccray@browardschools.com>; JoAnn T. DiLallo <joann.dilallo@browardschools.com>;

Cecilia U. Guerrero < cecilia.guerrero @browardschools.com >

Sent: Tuesday, October 2, 2012 5:31 PM

Subject: Reminder! Fwd(2): Revised Map Evaluation Comparison Form

Tuesday, October 2, 2012

Good Evening Redistricting Steering Committee Members,

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

- 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | Catagony | Category B Districts are | | Category D Districts shall | | | Category | Category H | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Map Alternative | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Category E Preservation of communities of interest | Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| Alternative # 1 | | | | | | | | | 7 | |
| Alternative # 2 | | | | | | | | | 11 | |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| Map Alternative | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Category E Preservation of communities of interest | Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Alternative # 3 Alternative # 4 | | | | | | | | | 12 | |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

- 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | | Category B Districts are | | Category D Districts shall | | | Category | Category H | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Map Alternative | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Category E Preservation of communities of interest | Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| Alternative # 5 | | | | | | | | | 9 | |
| Alternative # 6 | | | | | | | | | 10 | |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

- 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| Map Alternative | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Category E Preservation of communities of interest | Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Alternative # 7 Alternative # 8 | | | | | | | | | 5 | |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guid | ding Principles |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| Map Alternative | Category A Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Category B Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Category C Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Category D Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Category E Preservation of communities of interest | Category F Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Category Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Category H Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Alternative # 9 Alternative # 10 | | | | | | | | | 3 | |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Rate each category from 1 to 4.

| 1 = Strongly | Unfavorable | to the | Guiding | Principles |
|--------------|-------------|--------|---------|-------------------|
| | | | | |

2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles

- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | Category A Districts are | Category B Districts are as nearly as | Category C | Category D Districts shall where feasible, | | Category F | Category Alignment of single | Category H Alignment of | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Mars | as nearly as practicable, equal in | practicable, equal in total voting | Districts shall be compact | utilize existing political and | Category E Preservation of | Ability for populations to elect | member districts with equal | single member districts with | Tatal | |
| Map Alternative | total population | age population | and contiguous | geographical boundaries | communities of interest | representatives of their choice | numbers of schools | Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| Alternative # 11 | | | | | | | | | 8 | |
| Alternative # 12 | | | | | | | | | 1 | |

Redistricting Steering Committee

2011 - 2013

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles | | |
| 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles | | |
| 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles | | |
| Roosevelt Walters | | |
| | | |
| Roosevelt Walters | | |
| Print Name - Redistricting Steering Committee Member | | |
| | | |
| | October 6, 2012 | |
| Signature - Redistricting Steering Committee Member | Date | |

Redistricting Committee Map Evaluation

Latha Krishnaiyer

10/2/2012

| Мар | Score |
|----------|-------|
| 1. 10 | 28 |
| 2. 5 | 26 |
| 3. 4 | 23 |
| 4. 7 | 20 |
| 5. 1,6,9 | 18 |
| 6. 11 | 15 |
| 7. 2 | 12 |
| 8. 8 | 11 |
| 9. 3,12 | 10 |

Russell Chard

Broward County School Board Redistricting Steering Committee 2011 - 2013

- Rate each category from 1 to 4.

 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guidin Strongly Exchange School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Philadeles School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | Category A | Category B | Category C | Category D | Category E | Category F | Category G | Category H | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Map Alternative | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Preservation of communities of interest | Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Rank (1 is best, 12 is worst) | Comments |
| Alternative # 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 6 | Good: Minority access districts. Bad: Bizarre district shapes |
| Alternative # 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 11 | No comments |
| Alternative # 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 12 | No comments |
| Alternative # 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 21 | 5 | Good: Nice, compact district lines, pretty good distribution of schools. Bad: ranked in lower half of submissions for following government and I-Zone boundaries. |
| Alternative # 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 26 | 2 | Good: best balance of district populations, good minority access districts. Bad: In lower half of submissions for governmental boundaries and school distribution. Shapes of D3, D5, and D6 are bizarre and non-compact. |
| Alternative # 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 9 | Good: Follows governmental boundaries. Bad: Districts bizarre and non-compact, in lowest quarter of ranking for distribution of schools and alignment with I-Zones |
| Alternative # 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 25 | 3 | Good: population categories. Bad: D3, D5, and D6 are non- compact with D3 stretching from Pompano Bch to West Hollywood. |
| Alternative # 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 8 | Good: minority access districts. Bad: 5/7 districts are bizarre and irregularly shaped. In lower half of rankings for school distribution and I-Zone alignment. |
| Alternative # 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 4 | Good: In upper half of rankings in most categories. Bad: Comes close to the 5% "limit" in population categories. |

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

- 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles
- 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles
- 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles

| | Category A | Category B | Category C | Category D | Category E | Category F | Category G | Category H | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|----------------|--|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Map Alternative | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Preservation of communities of interest | populations to | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Rank (1 is best, 12 is worst) | Comments |
| Alternative # 10 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 30 | 1 | Good: Offers most compact districts. Best distribution of schools and I-Zones alignment. At top or near top of almost every objective category. Bad: Falls slightly short of a pure "minority-majority" district, but still has two strong minority access districts. |
| Alternative # 11 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 7 | Good: strong in population categories. Bad: non-compact districts, bottom half of rankings in governmental boundaries and school distribution, bottom quarter in I-Zone alignment. |
| Alternative # 12 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 10 | Good: Minority access districts. Bad: D3, D6, and D7 non-compact. D3 stretches from north county line to west Hollywood. In lower quarter for following governmental and I-Zone boundaries and for school distribution. |

| Russell R. And | |
|--|-----------|
| Signature - Redistricting Steering Committee Member Date | 10/2/2012 |



Map ranking order submitted by Mandy Wells

Order Map# 1. 5 2. 10 3. 7 4. б 5. 11 6. 1 7. 4 8. 9 9. 12 10. 8 11. 2 12, 3

RON ARONSON

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
| 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |

| | Category A | Category B | Category C | Category D | Category E | Category F | Category G | Category H | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|----------------|----------|
| Map Alternative | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Preservation of communities of interest | Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 34 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 32 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 3 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 60 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 4 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 62 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 | |

RON ARONSON

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
|--|
| 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 4 = Strongly Favorable to the Guiding Principles |

| Category A Category | Α | ategory A | Category B | Category C | Category D | Category E | Category F | Category G | Category H | | |
|--|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|----------------|----------|
| as nearly as practically equal in total voting a | as e, <u>tal</u> | s nearly as practicable, qual in total | practicable, equal in <u>total</u> | Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Preservation of communities of interest | Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ¢ 6 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 32 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ‡ 7 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 17 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ŧ 8 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 25 | |
| | | | | | | | | 0 | | 0.5 | |
| # 9 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 25 | |
| £10 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 31 | 2 | 9 | 21 | 10 | |
| £ 8 3 4 9 3 E 10 2 | 3 3 | 3 3 | 2 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 25 | |

Single School Board Member Alternative Map Evaluation Comparison Matrix

RON ARONSON

| Rate | each | categor | v from | 1 | to 4. |
|------|-------|---------|-----------|---|-------|
| Nate | cacii | Caleuoi | V 11 OI11 | | IU T. |

| <u> </u> |
|--|
| 1 = Strongly Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 2 = Somewhat Unfavorable to the Guiding Principles |
| 3 = Somewhat Favorable to the Guiding Principles |

| 4 = Strongly Favorable to the | Guiding Principles |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
|-------------------------------|--------------------|

| | Category A | Category B | Category C | Category D | Category E | Category F | Category G | Category H | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|----------------|----------|
| Map Alternative | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total population | Districts are as nearly as practicable, equal in total voting age population | Districts shall be compact and contiguous | Districts shall where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries | Preservation of communities of interest | Ability for populations to elect representatives of their choice | Alignment of single member districts with equal numbers of schools | Alignment of single member districts with Innovation Zones | Total Score | Comments |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 11 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 42 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative # 12 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 51 | |

| RON ARONSON | |
|--|------|
| Print Name - Redistricting Steering Committee Member | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Signature - Redistricting Steering Committee Member | Date |