



CITY OF COCONUT CREEK RE-DISTRICTING BOARD MINUTES

**Government Center
4800 West Copans Road
Coconut Creek, FL 33063**

**Date: August 21, 2018
Time: 4:00 p.m.**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Haring at 4:00 p.m.

2. PRESENT UPON ROLL CALL

Alfred Delgado
Kevin Haring
Gaynell Heastie
Colleen LaPlant
F. Beale Tilton

ALSO PRESENT: Assistant City Attorney Eve Lewis; Deputy Director of Sustainable Development Scott Stoudenmire; Senior Permit Technician-Building Janet Reisinger; City Clerk Leslie Wallace May; James Gammack-Clark, Instructor at Florida Atlantic University (FAU) Geosciences Department; and Ronald R. Schultz, PhD, Professor Emeritus at FAU Geosciences Department.

3. OATHS OF OFFICE

City Clerk May administered the Oath of Office to all five board members.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: LaPlant/Delgado – To approve the Minutes of the August 7, 2018, Re-Districting Board meeting.

The Motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

5. POPULATION ESTIMATES AND PROJECTION METHODOLOGY

Mr. Gammack-Clark distributed copies of the Consultant Report: Second Meeting of the City of Coconut Creek Redistricting Board dated August 21, 2018, (Consultant Report) to each of the board members and to staff; a copy of same is attached to as Exhibit A and

made a part of these minutes.

Dr. Schultz presented the item and stated that there are four goals that the City is seeking with the voting districts, and the number one goal is reasonable population balance. He noted that the research is restrained by three other goals; geographic contiguity and appropriate compactness, respect for the integrity of communities of interest, and consideration of the interests of the sitting commissioners.

Dr. Schultz stated that the data used for the Consultant Report is from the American Community Survey (ACS), which is an annual survey with high reliability. He further explained that the survey uses block group estimates, which are the smallest geographic unit for which to obtain government data. He said the next step taken was to add to the ACS block group data, information provided by the Department of Sustainable Development regarding new developments from 2017 through the earliest part of 2019, using reasonable estimates of when Certificates of Occupancy will be issued (Referenced in Table 1 of the Consultant Report). Next, the block group data was broken into blocks that were used to proportion the districts. He explained that this is done by looking at the 2010 Census and proportions of populations. The final step was to analyze the block population estimates for 2019, which become the building blocks for the maps included in the Consultant Report for each of the four alternatives being presented to the Board for consideration.

Dr. Schultz and Mr. Gammack-Clark noted that they did find the current districts to be geographically, slightly out of population balance. The practice they have always taken is to keep the population balance within five percent above or below the population average of all the districts. Discussion ensued with questions from the Board regarding the current population estimates and the data noted on the maps. Chair Haring asked if any of the alternatives affected the addresses of the currently seated commissioners, and Dr. Schultz assured that none of the current commissioners would be displaced by any of the alternatives presented.

Dr. Schultz and Mr. Gammack-Clark summarized each of the alternatives as follows:

- **Alternative 1** (Maps 3 and 4) is the simplest geographic change to the districts and is a minimalist approach to population balance with the least amount of changes. (Primary goal = minimal change.);
- **Alternative 2** (Maps 5 and 6) brings the districts into the best balance that could possibly be achieved. It is a much more aggressive approach to minimize the population differences among all of the districts, thus, it brings the closest population balance. (Primary goal = population balance.);
- **Alternative 3** (Maps 7 and 8) focused on creating districts that are the most geographically compact. (Primary goal = geographical compactness.); and
- **Alternative 4** (Maps 9 and 10) tweaks Alternative 1 with a slightly more aggressive approach to bring more balance to the population amongst the districts. (Primary goal = minimal change and population balance.).

Dr. Schultz noted that since the last re-districting, fundamentally the city has grown and the growth has been relatively balanced across the districts except for District E, which is where they began their work to minimize the population deviation as much as possible.

Ms. LaPlant inquired when the changes to the districts would come into effect, and the response was that they need to be in effect by January 2019 when the candidates qualify for the March 2019 election.

Discussion ensued regarding the five percent variation, effects of industrial complexes on the population balance, possible causes for population changes by region, completion of MainStreet, and residences possibly being built on the Broward College campus.

Mr. Haring inquired about another alternative taking Alternative 3 and adjusting the Crown Point community into District A. Dr. Schultz and Mr. Gammack-Clark explained how they tried that alternative, and it did not work.

Dr. Schultz concluded the report by stating that it was now recommended for the Board to discuss alternatives in order to move towards a conclusion on the direction of which alternative to choose.

6. REVIEW ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS

Discussion ensued among the Board on their preferred alternatives.

Chair Haring stated that his preference was Alternative 1 as it has minimal change. Ms. LaPlant said she preferred Alternative 4 as it is minimal but provides a little more population balance. Mr. Haring agreed that he was also okay with Alternative 4. Mr. Tilton expressed his concern with Alternative 2, and Ms. Heastie wanted to take more time to review the Alternatives. Mr. Delgado said he initially liked Alternative 2 because it was more balanced, but was concerned about the district lines being moved significantly within the Township. He asked if this Alternative was the only way to achieve the population balance, and Mr. Gammack-Clark noted that the next closest option to Alternative 2 was Alternative 3.

Further discussion ensued amongst the board members on preferred alternatives, including not making any changes to the current districts. Discussion ensued regarding voting districts and how it is done in other cities. Dr. Schultz explained that the initial goal of the electors of the City in having districts was to ensure an even balance of the representation of the commission throughout the city and to avoid having more than one commissioner residing in one area of the City. He reiterated that any further shifts from the four alternatives presented skews to the population balances. Mr. Stoudenmire recommended providing the board members with background as to the Alternatives that were presented to the 2013 Re-Districting Board, and City Clerk May indicated that this would be done.

The Board agreed to further review the materials independently and wait on making their decision until the next meeting.

7. CONFIRM DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Chair Haring confirmed the date of the next meeting as August 28, 2018, at 4 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Transcribed by: Leslie Wallace May

Leslie Wallace May, MMC, City Clerk

Date