

REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, October 4, 2021

5:30 p.m.

Brevard County Government Center

2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way

Viera, Florida 32940

Building C, Florida Room

A. Call to Order

- a. Steve Crisafulli, Chair: called the meeting to order at 5:31pm
If you will notice, you don't hear me through the speaker, we have a hiccup with that so those of y'all can't hear us maybe move forward. We are being picked up on tv so that's important so those at home can hear us, but in the room the speakers aren't working. With that I will call the meeting to order and do the roll call. Teresa if you will call the roll?

B. Roll Call – Teresa Rivera:

- a. District 1 – Robin Fisher, Robert Jordan, Kendall Moore
- b. District 2 – Josiah Gattle, Susan Hodgers, John Weiler
- c. District 3 – James Minus, Yvonne Minus
- d. District 4 – Henry Minneboo, Todd Pokrywa, Sue Schmitt
- e. District 5 – Steve Crisafulli, Jason Steele
- f. Absent – Alberta Wilson, David Workman
- g. Staff – Jim Liesenfelt, Abigail Jorandby, James Shives, Teresa Rivera

Teresa Rivera: Let the record show that we do have a quorum however, Susan Hodgers, Alberta Wilson and David Workman are not in attendance at this time. (Susan Hodgers arrived after the meeting was called to order)

Steve Crisafulli: We have a quorum. At this time, we are not going to approve minutes, we don't have them yet. These minutes have to be dictated word for word, so we will push that to the next meeting.

C. Approval of Minutes, September 27, 2021

- a. Tabled by the Chair to next meeting
- b. Minutes not available

D. Mapping Discussion

Steve Crisafulli: With that before we get started I'd like James to talk through what's different with the maps sitting on your desk versus the maps you took home last week.

James Shives: There's a couple changes with the data sheet, the top table has percentages with the demographic information and the second table is by District the changes in total population and demographics from the existing Districts with the 2020 data and the proposed changes. You can see in the proposed change area we included the demographics for each area. Number 1 would have a total population changes of 8834 with 632 Hispanics, 7000 white people etc. Specifically, from pertaining to those change areas one District 2 another. As far as the maps go we added a city boundary display allowing you to see the municipalities boundaries in that window to see if a change area is involved with a city boundary or not. We changed the symbology on the main map, instead of light green that seemed hard to see in some areas, we changed that to a solid black line. We still have the County location display up in the right-hand corner of the main view, so you can see where the main window is. One thing we also as far as GIS material, we created this redistricting interacting map, so you can change or be able to view everybody's proposed plans and be able to zoom into particular areas and neighborhoods like Google, in a little more detail than the paper maps can provide. So that's another thing we will keep updated after each meeting, we have more plans coming in I will load them in and send a new link after each meeting so you can have the GIS material at your fingertips outside of the meeting.

Steve Crisafulli: Very good, any questions for James on the remake of the maps as far as defining the lines and what you see? I think you changed the colors on things too.

James Shives: The voting, the voting precincts would've changed to a green color.

Steve Crisafulli: That's very helpful. Also, the last meeting there is some questions on the history of majority and minority Districts and case law and different things like that. And Abby did a little bit of research on that. And I want to give her an opportunity to address the committee prior to us getting into a discussion. Let us know what her findings were.

Abigail Jorandby: Yes, and good evening everybody. Since our last meeting last week, we did look into just looking at some of the local cases. If there were any cases involving County specifically. We did find a few County cases in Florida that were looking at redistricting plans as far as creating a majority minority District or a District that's really a minority District. There are not too many cases. However, the cases really are addressing County specific issues. Just to give you the County justice including Washington County, Desoto, and Osceola County. These cases largely were addressing issues that the theater had identified themselves or constituents for contesting an already adopted plan. And really what they took away from the three cases regarding this issue is that there was also still looking at the seminal cases that we talked about before that the Supreme Court has come down in regarding majority minority Districts as a proposal. And that really comes down to the fact that we're looking at the Voting Rights Act, racial neutrality and government decision-making. We last spoke about that. We talked about how you cannot subordinate the traditional Districting principles on compactness continuity and the other issues that we are supposed to look at. Keeping the municipalities together. The natural man-made boundaries and roadways cohesive racial and ethnic communities. Keeping those as our target. Redistricting tools if you would say out of the toolbox. You cannot really subordinate those using race as your only tool in redistricting. Really the proposal of the majority and minority District has been tested by the United States Supreme Court and in these local cases going back to these main several cases. And I just wanted to read for you one particular United States Supreme Court case. I thought really synthesize the issue down to tell us what they're looking for. This is an older case from 1993. It did involve in the majority and minority District 4 the court looking at it and they basically said and this is a quote. Reapportionment Plan A redistricting plan that includes in one District individuals who belong to the same race, who are otherwise widely separated by geographical and political boundaries. And have, who may have little in common with one another, but the color of their skin bears an uncomfortable resemblance to political apartheid. It says it goes into reinforce the perception that members of the same racial group regardless of their age, education, economic status, or community in which they live. Think alike, share the same political interest, and look for the same candidates at the polls. And the court basically says we have rejected that principle. It goes back to what we talked about earlier that if you're gonna do majority and minority District, it really needs to be

identified similar communities of interest. Communities that have similar issues confronting them. You cannot just say this one race, we put them in one District. That they all have the same issues. You need to look at it as if you had the same issues confronting them. That way they elect one District Commissioner that can address the issues there confronting that particular group. The court went on to say that rate rejected that concept unless you can show that you're making a District that really addresses that particular racial groups issues. So, we go back to you can use race as a tool, but you also look at compactness, continuity, the municipal boundaries, you have your natural man-made boundaries as well. Roadways, and then cohesive racial and ethnic communities. This is right out of our charter. And really try and preserve those communities and not subordinate those traditional redistricting tools to just the race. So, keep that in mind when you're looking at the boundaries and looking at what you might want to do with your maps. Keep in mind that you have to eventually show that you have that similar community interests. Those issues that are confronting that one particular community if you're looking to do a majority and minority District. Obviously, if there is one that's created, there is strict scrutiny because they're supposed to use racial neutrality in our government decision-making. So, there is a situation where race is used, that point in time, there's a higher standard that will be held to the courts and evaluated. If it's ever called in the question.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, any questions?

Jason Steele: I make a motion to take the option of minority majority district, based on the position of the County Attorney and based on the opinion they just gave, I believe that I move that we eliminate the Minus Plan A map from the group.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, I have a motion on the table. Do we have a second?

Todd Pokrywa: Second

Steve Crisafulli: I have a second, discussion?

Kendall Moore: Just for clarity, based on Mr. Steele, I don't think your passing an opinion on an existing map or proposal that's before this committee. So, unless you're telling me that it's your legal conclusion is such work they arrived at the ultimately this falls outside of some established medieval barons. The intent to convey? Or to some amazingly quick from the podium.

Abigail Jorandby: You saw me sneak away. I tried, I really did. [laughter] you know, essentially my advice is to just give you the tools to

work with. So, no, not necessarily passing an opinion on a particular plan. I just want to give you the tools to make that determination. Majority District, few recall that memo I've previously given the committee back cases where they were appealed and some cases they were not upheld. Once again, just the guidepost is what the courts are looking for. Risk can be used. It's the strictest scrutiny if it's ever contested, but it cannot be the sole plans that you are redistricting in particular District into. That cannot be the only factor. It should be the traditional concept of contiguity, compactness, and can communities of shared interest. It has to be a plan. He also has the light.

Kendall Moore: Mr. Chairman, is it to the kind gentleman that I work with every day, Mr. Steele. In respect to your point with everything that the Minus proposal has. I also don't believe that the conclusion from what the Attorney just presented is that the map by its nature needs a threshold that she's establishing should be thrown out based upon the interest. A be building on that simple process.

Steve Crisafulli: And to clarify, you said the new map. I think you had mentioned Plan A, which was the one from last week.

Kendall Moore: The Attorney tended to rely on any of the maps a or b. That the difference between them magically had gone above or below.

Steve Crisafulli: You had said, Mr. Steele.

Jason Steele: Mr. Chairman, Thank you very much. And I appreciate your position. There are several reasons for eliminating this map and if you look at the map. It does not really go upon any boundaries and it crosses over. It's a complete gerrymander of the District. And it makes no sense. Even if it wasn't over the minority issue or the minority opinion, this map just doesn't work. And in all respect Councilwoman Minus. It's just a gerrymandered map that I believe would not hold its weight in court.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, and again members, we are on Plan A that was presented last week. It is my understanding that Miss Minus has a new plan that she will act so we have the opportunity to present. Since the motion came forward and we have a second, we are in discussion on you know, whether or not that map you know.

Kendall Moore: Mr. Chair, I agree with you. Just not on [indiscernible] [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: Yes Mr. Fisher.

Robin Fisher: Mr. Chairman, this is the same to me. The board will decision on what maps they want to vote on. So, I'm not sure there's any

value in touring them. They're all getting it to run at the end of the day but one. You know? [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: I would tell you that maybe all of them to get thrown out and we use one as a base map to work from and I think that's what tonight's discussion is going to be about. Whether we come up with want to work from or two to work from three to work from you know, that's obviously the purview of this committee. You know, at some point, we're going to have to narrow it down to remove some maps from discussion. Clearly. As I did last week. I said mine was so close to this prevails that you know, we could use his. I pulled my back and of course there was no motion on that. But certainly, somebody could bring it forward again. It's just I do think we are going to have to have a process of pulling somebody's back and again, that's the pleasure of this committee on how we want to go about that. It's been an all-inclusive committee you know, movement to think through this and talk about it. So, we are in discussion about a motion that was made and maybe you want to rephrase your motion based on why we are pulling that map? Or whatever it is.

Jason Steele: The results of the motion are going to? It's the result of the motion. So, we can go back to it if you want. I think my motion is fine at this point.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Jordan?

Robert Jordan: I got uncomfortable with what you were saying. You heard me last. For sure. To me, I think it was just premature to do it now one we had to have a discussion. Because we have to discuss all these and see very clearly, so, I respectfully request that maybe we just forget about this motion go forward and use the process we have of eliminating. Let's do that. Let's not just pull one out and say okay. Because of this reason, we just need to get rid of it. That would hurt my feelings to be honest with you. Because if you're making a motion appointment, I would have a problem with that. And you would know. I'm saying to me, it's gonna be a moot point anyway once we get through these things and integrate some and subtract some, and you might end up with exactly what you looking for the first place. So, that's where I am.

Steve Crisafulli: Ms. Schmitt?

Sue Schmitt: I would ask the executive person that made the motion to just withdraw those temporarily.

Steve Crisafulli: Ms. Schmitt please speak up because being no speakers in here, the microphone is only working for the tv.

Sue Schmitt: Yes, I happen to agree with what you are saying. But I think anybody has a plan have those plans and wishes to be heard on that plan. At that point, if they are heard on your plan, then we can have the motion.

Jason Steele: Mr. Chairman I'll withdraw my motion.

Steve Crisafulli: Ok that motion is withdrawn. Further questions members? Before we move on, are there any further questions for Abby as to the topic she spoke of regarding the cases she found in the issue in general?

Susan Hodgers: Mr. Chairman, do you hear me?

Steve Crisafulli: It's not working, so speak.

Susan Hodgers: This is a question to Abby to clarify not only to Miss Minus's map. Is there any of the proposals? Anything that would possibly cause a lawsuit or open us up to liability for any of the proposals in addition to Miss Minus's proposal. Including all proposals

Abigail Jorandby: As far as a lawsuit just as we can be contested on any map essentially. That's a really hard evaluation for me to make. Just keep in mind that if race becomes a component of a redistricting plan, that is a challenge. It has to be a challenge. At that point time, there is the higher scrutiny that the court will apply because the insertion of race as well as the components of the redistricting plan. So, this committee want to recommend the majority and minority District, you definitely can. There have been some that have helped. It's just really following the guidance that we do have from Supreme Court as to how we use race as one of the components of drawing that District. As far as all the other plans, there might be something that I have considered that someone might raise as an issue. I've seen redistricting plans where specifically, one of the cases in the little cases that we looked at was Washington County. One of the cases that were local, it was raising the fact that redistricting occurred and the plaintiffs were upset because they did not have a majority in one of the Districts. They raised the issue. The court once again looked at the plans to the lands of redistricting and the group actually followed. The requirements of continuous compactness and determined that it wasn't necessarily necessary to have a District that was a majority minority District. It doesn't cure all the ills. Sometimes that actually can were contrary to what is proposed. If you make the assumption on one race, it's can about one way and then it could be that very different concepts in education status. Different individuals and then that race is actually diluted in regards if they are not maintained the way they are. And this is the way courts look at it. It's very, very detail-

oriented sorrows with the courts look at and truthfully, I wish I could tell you that I had a magic ball. That ability to see what the court would look at and to see what a lawsuit would be filed on these plans. I just don't have that. I can give you the guidance that I have from the Supreme Court, as far as the federal cases that we have. But, I mean, that is really what we're looking at.

Steve Crisafulli: further questions before we move on, Ms. Minus?

Yvonne Minus: Thank you. I'd like to ask our Attorney, strong basis and evidence for the majority and minority District and this could work?

Abigail Jorandby: There have been plans that have been upheld. So, with the courts look at they want to see that you're using still the traditional tools of redistricting that you are looking at keeping them continuous. And then if you insert race that you are not just saying, you are of this ethnicity or race. So, you vote this way. You have to have the community of shared interests where they are looking at you know, where they have the same economic issues in schools and same libraries, the same will that are actually having similar issues that are confronting them. They are trying to see from a perspective that you know, that one could just read especially separate by large geography? Are they in the same area? Not the confronted by the same issues? That's what the courts are looking for. It's kind of this that needs to be fleshed out. That's usually what happens with the courts and they start to look at how the decision was made, the plan came about. And why. What was the element that they were trying to correct as far as proposal? Hope that helps a little bit.

Yvonne Minus: It does. The why is the look at in our County Commissioner now. Okay? There is no representation and I think that's the bottom line on what we're trying to get to. Here our charter, that's what it says. Evidently, we are not following the Charter and we have not followed it in 100 years? Evidently. But, it's troubling. To see that yes, this is targeted first. To be removed. Okay? That's an issue. That's an issue for me. You know, throwing out like you said. You throw mine out. It's an issue for me. But, I'm ok, I will leave it alone.

Steve Crisafulli: Any further questions for Abby, as I mentioned, moving forward before we get into trying to you know, narrow things down. As I mentioned, Miss Minus did come up with another plan since our meeting. And so, I'm getting of her chance to present that just like but he also had an opportunity to present their maps last week. And after she presents that map, obviously we can pass the questions and do the things that we need to do with her on that map. And then we're going to

move forward to a process of trying to narrow things down to come up with a plan for Brevard County for the next 10 years. Keeping in mind that you know, we know where opportunities are for population growth. We know that there are certain opportunities and current Districts that don't exist and other Districts you know, whether it be the beachside or the island door what have you. So, we're going to have to factor that into the decision as we move forward understanding that there's can be continued population growth. You know, static criteria of this committee, but it certainly something we should be considering as we do move forward. And I hope we can have a constructive conversation. Obviously, you know, and an effort without offending anybody's feelings and knowing that at the end of the day we have a job to do. We are not always can agree on everything. At the end of the day, what we want is for our communities to be best represented by the number that represents them and get selected to represent them. I would tell you that think every District without question is going to have a diverse that they are going to represent regardless District wanted District 5. So, it can be up to the committee to decide how we're gonna move forward with that. With that one other change. We had a meeting scheduled again, if we need to get there. For next Monday. The 11th. That is now been moved to Monday the 18th. Make a note of that. Due to challenge with attendance.so, the next meeting would be the 18th. Now, I will told you that puts us on a tight timeframe. So, we need to be, if we don't get out of here tonight with something and we need to come back on the 18th. Will need to come out of here with something that night. Whether we've got to arm wrestle support or whatever it is. We are going to have to come out here for. So, with that and Miss Minus, if you would present your Plan B?

Yvonne Minus: Okay. Plan B. I'm not sure if everyone received the Okay, we've been looking at the compactness and from the compactness, it was 16 and now that is 18. Looking at District 1, took out, did not include Mims on this one. I think it was originally. So, this is District 1. To look at it all the way down to the ledge. Okay. And then just trying to include everyone and everything. Everyone and everything. What happened to Mims? Okay. We're not going to include that on that.

Robin Fisher: Let her present and this is the last request. [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: It's a different map and Plan A. So, I think it's a matter of explaining this map. Not comparing plan, but explain this map on its face. That's it.

Robin Fisher: Yes, so District 1.

Steve Crisafulli: It is District 1.

Robin Fisher: It is.

Yvonne Minus: Okay. District 2, and you look at District 2, that includes the Cape Canaveral area. All way to the coast. District 2. District 3. That is District in which I represent. That has been ordered to the coastline. All the way down to the County line. If you will, District 4. Is intact. It would not be split, touched, separated, divided or anything per the request. On that one. And District 5 will pretty much stay the same. To the coast to the County line. Okay, if you have any questions, let me know. It's like I change that much.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, members. Questions for Mrs. Minus on her Plan B?

Josiah Gattle: Miss Minus. If you had to choose one of your plans for us to consider, which would you prefer us to consider, which is the best plan?

Yvonne Minus: Which plan, A or B?

Josiah Gattle: Yes.

Yvonne Minus: B If you look at the other changes in the model, spreadsheet. We have the white and not Hispanic from 5397point 97 percent. Minority is 46.03. So, that population is 119. 985. So, which has actually dropped. Okay? So, that is consideration and being addressed. They are just asking for consideration.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Weiler?

John Weiler: If I read the map on the page where you have District 2 and Cape Canaveral being eliminated? This problem I have is Cape Canaveral is an island separated. Because there is nothing in that higher part over the County. There's no voting. There's no population there. Okay? So, a Cape Canaveral's with just a little island separated from the rest of District 2 and definitely separated for the rest of District 1. It's always part of District 2. It's a small area as it is. it doesn't seem that that's from a contingent standpoint. That makes any sense at the hall to have it as part of District 1. And not staying as part of District 2. And it appears that from looking at it right, because James is not present on here. Together the other maps. So, I cannot tell. But, it appears that essentially all of Cocoa is now District 1. I am sorry. See if I understand it right. Turn to the big page here.

Steve Crisafulli: It's District 3 now.

John Weiler: District 3, that's what I meant. And that would be a tremendous change from just area there today. And respecting the

boundaries that are currently in place. That one doesn't make me particularly anxious to support.

Steve Crisafulli: Any further questions for Ms. Minus on Plan B?

Jason Steele: Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to reflect that I certainly was not targeting Miss Minus's Plan A. That is absolutely not even close to what I was doing. These boundaries need to be drawn along a line that are cohesive with what the redistricting goals are. Plan A and Plan B make no sense in regards to any of the boundaries and lines. You have cities that are split. The counties that tested the whole thing and when you're looking at this map, District 3 has no oceanfront or beachfront. District 4 has no oceanfront or beachfront. And it completely just throws a monkey wrench in the entire way that I've been working in the County for the last 10 years. So, I am not sure that this is a cohesive map. I understand why Miss Minus is doing this. And I have no problem with what Miss Minus is doing. What I have a problem with is that it doesn't meet the regulations of what the redistricting is all about. Doesn't go along boundary lines and it doesn't go to road lines. And as an issue that is in my opinion going to be upheld by the courts, so, I cannot support either Plan A or Plan B. Thank you.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Chairman, I just want to jump off where Mr. Steele left off. In terms of what we're looking at, Abby outlined what we should be focusing on respect to compactness. Existing municipalities and natural boundaries, major roadways. And that would be my concern as well. Plan A and Plan B. Councilwoman Minus had presented. Rewinding to our last meeting. We had a number of different proposals that are here today along with a couple of other revisions. And there was recognition by you Mr. Chairman and myself, as it related to Mr. Weiler's proposal. That they were very similar and they also incorporated a lot of other committee members and comments from our meeting second to last. So, that's just I did not need to review my Plan A because it mirrored Mr. Weiler's because we took into consideration at this committee feedback during that discussion in the meeting before last Chairman, he said something similar as to my plan. I believe that Mr. Weiler explained that he presented as taking into account the feedback on many of the committee members. Mr. Jordan's plan during our last meeting. You had my concern about the era breaking it up but the proposal before us from you still shows that being broken up.

Robert Jordan: I didn't modify. I was in agreement with it and in fact, I actually was in agreement with the Chairman's inclusive request. So that's where I was going to go tonight.

Todd Pokrywa: Thank you Mr. Jordan. A few things I want to note – District 4 is going to see substantial growth. Based on the Viera Company's projections being conservative, we are looking at 1000 people being added to the District per year. And that's being conservative based upon the company's current projections. So, it makes sense. Even if it's done modestly to somewhat underpopulated District 4. It'll probably be a bigger issue during redistricting in 10 years. And I said this before, I believe that at that point, with District 4 becomes is really Century, Viera and Suntree proper. The numbers do not dictate the larger area than not. And I think over time it just wouldn't make sense. If we are looking at this from compactness perspective, to break up those communities in order to include some of the areas that are further east and beachside within District 4. But, I believe we can get there incrementally. Trying to stay as true to the current boundary as possible. Mr. Weiler's plan only moved Patrick Shores from District 4 to District 2. And Indian Harbour Beach, they remained District 4 proposal. Again, is very similar my proposal, if not the same. Doesn't make wholesale changes. Focuses on population. So, from a compactness perspective, it achieves that goal, but also underpopulated District court. Again, some modestly and in 10 years, I think that needs to be addressed again. So, I would make a motion that we accept Mr. Weiler's map, his proposal as our base map.

Susan Hodgers: Seconded

Steve Crisafulli: Ms. Hodgers had a second so let's have a discussion. Ms. Schmitt?

Sue Schmitt: I want to know if I can beachside, in your plan just as you've eliminated the beach from District 2. That's correct, right?

John Weiler: No, but what we would do is then add the unincorporated.

Sue Schmitt: I brought up at the last meeting is the unincorporated. And on the mainland, I had the last meeting about the Springs of Century, which are not part of the community. Also, Suntree, which is to the west of the Springs of Century. I'm sorry.

John Weiler: That's ok, I don't hear well either, we are all putting up with it.

Sue Schmitt: To pick up a little bit of population at that point. But, it doesn't overload District 4 at that point. Are you amenable to that?

John Weiler: I think the Plan as proposed leaves all of Century as you had stated last time. Century and Suntree all part of this report. We'll use a little strip that little strip from US1 east of the river, it's a small strip to continues District 2 Rockledge and lay down to does not pass by

Pineda. The small strip and that was to make the population just about 5. So keeping easily within the barrier.

Sue Schmitt: Ok thank you.

John Weiler: You are welcome.

Steve Crisafulli: Any further discussion, Fisher?

Robin Fisher: I think everything starts in District 1 you know?

Steve Crisafulli: You gotta move what?

Robin Fisher: I think the real question is District 1, disregard break it up? Because that seems to be the big factors whether you carry this map all the way across and take the northern part of the island? To me seems like is one of the issues that we as a board have to decide. I know you have some concern from Merritt Island and residents have. And so, Me, I think once that's established as that's wherever this board decides to go there, the rest of it kind of starts falling in line you know? With lines.

Steve Crisafulli: I think Mr. Fisher, I think it was pretty clearly stated by several people of what their wishes were, keeping Merritt Island in District 2 and not moving it. I am saying there speaking for the group because they were present homeowner association and I would assume that there speaking from that position of Merritt Island in District 2 not moving it. So, to your point, moves down on the mainland. It's where you break it up there is the question. The irony of this is when you look at four or five different maps of unit comes moving down the mainland, we can't use the same general lines to work from, so granted this could be moved here and there and changed a little bit. Obviously, what we've got to be cognizant of precincts and things like that. And obviously communities of interest contribute keep in mind that together. I think it is contemplated and everybody's decision is needed. Also falls in line with Mr. Weiler. Looking at his. So, I think from a standpoint of north Merritt Island, I think that people spoke last weekend want to see that stay as it is and move south on the mainland for District 1

Susan Hodgers: Losing that Mr. Weiler's. Yes sir. I don't have a loud voice. I think Mr. Weiler's proposal is, decide to be a perfect map. And I think anything you do in life you have to compromise, so, I think with a combination, there's like 30,000 people in Viera? About and then we heard from Mr. Foley last week. This about 5000 people Century HOA. This week, I heard from Satellite Beach. With the high schooler and I'm very familiar with that. I think it's a good idea to keep it Indian Harbour Beach together in District 4. So, try to make very happen everybody happy. North Merritt Island, Satellite Beach also represented here. Try to

make everyone happy and again, some perfect but we heard from homeowner associations I heard 9000 people from northern Merritt Island HOA and the Century.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Weiler?

John Weiler: One of the reasons I kept away from Merritt Island and the plan is because I like looked at the whole map and looked at well, where's the development going to occur probably over the next 10 years? Everybody knows it. Viera and District 4. That development is moving west. And we will probably grow. Well, for District 2, we are surrounded and the only growth area left for us is north Merritt Island. There is growth there, development to be done. And then when I looked in District 1, I am seeing well, wait a minute. You have a lot of territory to move north from development. All the new jobs coming in supposedly these new companies coming in the space center, those people are going to be looking to be closer to the space center, so, I can see areas north of Titusville developing quite a bit. So, you'll make that up over the next 10 years. I see District 1 probably one of a population problem. This report definitely will not have a population problem. Go over it again. We might be Okay. In District 2, because of having north Merritt Island for development so, in my mind, just looking at the whole big picture of the County development population of the next 10 years that sort of would make sense. And I would also imagine is minorities and so forth. One of the big things of the companies that moving in in the space center and by people moving in my neighborhood. On Merritt Island, it's a diverse community moving in. While people are coming in from Colorado, California, Texas, and so, there is, it's not all of one racial makeup. It is a diverse racial makeup. I think we will all be in relatively decent shape there the next 10 years. That's my crystal ball for the future. Thank you.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Gattle

Josiah Gattle: I literally only have these four that are viable to move forward if you want to look at the general structure of maps going forward. The Jordan plan for us to break up Merritt Island across 95 is the difference from Weiler. We have the Weiler plan, which is identical. And I believe every respect to the data. We have the Plan B by Mr. Pokrywa, with your setting aside for the Weiler plan. The Tobia / Minus plan. As kind of the third plan. My understanding is that for purposes of today our goal is to narrow down to kind of three maps. There are kind of maps the bible wants to look forward.

Steve Crisafulli: Those are certainly the guardrails that are out there., to your point, yes. You look at them all, they start looking the same with a

few minor changes here and there. I think the [unintelligible]. And said his own. Because you know, it makes sense. We do have a first and a second on Mr. Weiler's map forward and we are in discussion and will vote on whether or not want to do that. Any other questions or comments on Mr. Weiler's map as we.

Kendall Moore: You limited yours in part because it is subsumed by what Mr. Weiler has proposed amending from the thoughts and ideas that you had originally?

Josiah Gattle: As I said, not on the Cape Canaveral map, I think there are important discussions to have there that we want to go on the direction their victim public feedback. Aaron from Mr. Fisher and representatives of District women they considered their tourism business to be beachside community that they wanted to maintain. So, I think it was important for discussion as well as beachside community being isolated. Don't think it's wise from a me to you perspective, from a population perspective, from a representation perspective. Think anyone fully supported that at this committee and then the other one was to reflect kind of the thoughts and ideas by the Minneboo Plan and the Jordan plan, better stated in their plans.

Kendall Moore: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Steve Crisafulli: Further questions, comments?

Robert Jordan: I think I agree with Josiah. Made sense grouping them three together. I am really open. I want everyone to be happy, but the second happen for sure.

Steve Crisafulli: What we have heard from Satellite Beach for.

Robert Jordan: I certainly heard from Mrs. Minus, I can't say Todd I think is a foregone conclusion that we certainly want to make sure that the area stays intact for sure. Of course, have heard that I have heard and cannot speak for others. I think others have heard the is some horror going back and forth the Satellite Beach area. I have heard that so, that's kind of up in the air. The Mayor Allen thing. Matt Valentine? I am pretty strong with where I am as far as lines. I was only doing lines doing across using roots and just so happened that north Merritt Island had some area. But I am pretty pliable. Just want us to do the best job that we possibly can. So, after some compromise be made there, I'm really ready to do that.

Henry Minneboo: Mr. Chairman I'm on the same train, if he jumps, I'm going.

Robin Fisher: Mr. Chair?

Steve Crisafulli: Yes sir, Mr. Fisher.

Robin Fisher: From this standpoint and Merritt Island phone this rope justice we have several big large developers and Mr. Jordan would know better than I that are developing concurrently breaking ground, one of them is a 2200-unit subdivision for the other one is a 1200-unit subdivision. Some talk about men. Just staff more. I have not drawn a map. Because I am still under the proposal that there's a floor plan. And that's doing nothing. And I'm serious about that because I don't believe that there is enough, I think South Brevard is going to grow. What he wants to be taught. But, if you lose at a faster pace than the rest of us. And from my standpoint, this meeting 5 to 7000 people behind total population doesn't bother me I think the next 10 years. North Brevard is positioning itself have some growth these numbers would be closer? So, I don't know if we have to move it just to move it, but it's based on population the percentages are not great enough to make me worry about it. So, that would be the fourth option.

Steve Crisafulli: Listen, that could be the second option. We get done with this one justice and we make about, is an open discussion we had this committee wants to do. I would tell you I think we do that, we should make sure that the justice system at the time everyone seizes the moment, we know what it looks like it's been compared. We have to see the deviations so that we know what we are voting a picture point, I would love to tell you that north Merritt Island may contribute to some of the District 2 areas where I guess the growth opportunities are for District 2 as well as mainland to some degree. I think that the District what does have a lot of potential for growth is we know what District 4 was doing before it was the D2. There, South Brevard has opportunities as well is going to continue to see growth and across the board in these Districts. Mr. Jordan, yes?

Robert Jordan: I just need clarity because Mr. Fisher, Robin is a pretty smart guy, but is not the smartest as me. [laughter] so, I just need to understand, ask my wife, I just need to understand.

Steve Crisafulli: We're on Mr. Weiler's map let's have that discussion, it's finished because we are on Mr. Weiler's map first.

Robert Jordan: I just need to understand percentage because he.

Steve Crisafulli: Let's do that and then if he brings that up as a motion and second, we can bring up for this discussion. There's no reason to have a discussion of Mr. Weiler's map is there?

Robert Jordan: I just need clarification.

Steve Crisafulli: I just want us to finish the discussion on Mr. Weiler's map the best that we will absolutely have a discussion. You can second

his motion to do that. Mr. Weiler explained to me. Merritt Island District 1 map.

John Weiler: North Merritt Island is on District 1 or off of District 1. Your map.

Kendall Moore: Point of clarification from the King of Viera, motion Mr. Pokrywa.

Todd Pokrywa: My motion was to make it the base map that we were working from.

Kendall Moore: That would be the choice.

Steve Crisafulli: It's a map to work from if we choose to work from that map. We have an option, correct me if I'm wrong. With your motion test, we have an option to move another map forward to have a discussion to work from.

Kendall Moore: Ok

Steve Crisafulli: Any further questions and comments? Ms. Minus, did you have something? No? Okay. On paper of previous motion, say aye. Opposed?

All in favor, motion passed

Steve Crisafulli: None. So, unanimous vote to move and store this map forward as a map for us to look seriously at. Obviously, there can be changes forward on that. For the discussion of other options. Mr. Fisher?

Robin Fisher: I make a motion that we use current District boundaries as a basis.

John Weiler: I'll second that

Jason Steele: I have no problem that

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Weiler second. Okay. Discussion?

Susan Hodgers: Mr. Chairman.

Steve Crisafulli: And no problem with that whatsoever. And I think it's probably because was in the best interest of this County.

Susan Hodgers: Mr. Chair, going back to Abby, if we did stay with a current status quo, there be anything and challenges legality wise? If we did that?

Abigail Jorandby: There is. Using the percentage deviation in looking at the numbers that we were looking at. There is a concern. You do have two Districts that are getting them together, getting close to that 10 percent deviation.

Steve Crisafulli: Can you come up?

Abigail Jorandby: These deviations here Justice will start to look at them the concern is that we might be triggering that 10 percent that you're not

supposed to go over and start looking at two Districts, you have the potential to get over the deviation.

Robin Fisher: How do you get that 10%? 4.7 and 5.7? So, the weight?

Abigail Jorandby: The way they did the deviation is plus or minus. So, to calculate, I guess the software does the calculation.

Jim Liesenfelt: Yes so, District 4 and District 2 show the deviation over time.

Abigail Jorandby: We are looking at the yes. I think that's would be the highest and the lowest population. So, you have highest being actually

Jim Liesenfelt: Yes, committee test is what you have is under existing Districts. This return of the arrow published for District 4 5700 and change. Over the target of 121 and 322. This gives you a deviation of 4.7 and in District 2 is 6900 under the target of 122 120. Like if you deviation of -5.7 and a you don't at a post that minus to get over time, but looking at the spread.

Steve Crisafulli: It's not the actual deviation above or below. Deviation between that and is the highest and lowest.

Robin Fisher: You to that particular rule having a two percent spread from one District 2 another. I don't think you have the in the numbers.

Jim Liesenfelt: You are correct. They are all fortified except District 5.

Steve Crisafulli: Ms. Schmitt.

Sue Schmitt: I think before, we did 5% there's also nothing stopping the County Commissioners in 5 years to do something that we would like to have a look at redistricting, take a look at it.

Steve Crisafulli: I'm not complaining. Trust me. But, just for the record, I think the three percent came from an association of counties. I don't know that it was something that you know, yes.

Sue Schmitt: We can go up 10 percent obviously, but what you're saying is that if we just elected and left it the way it is, it's the within the legal boundaries of percentages.

Robert Jordan: Mr. Chair

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Jordan

Robert Jordan: That was actually the discussion I want to have one to talk about it. Because I thought we had an understanding of how far we can go in there and overpopulation in some areas and under population in other areas. But now I'm hearing that's not really true. Right?

Abigail Jorandby: We mean as far as to balance the Districts.

Robert Jordan: Right? What if we leave things the way they are, it won't be golf because there's going to be populations that's going to be under.

And there's going to be some that are over the 121 that we. So, trying to understand what the rules are.

Abigail Jorandby: Typically, exposed the bonds of the population will that there is a deviation that your above. Up to 10 percent. They are usually looking for three or five percent, no more than 10. There is no hard and fast rule as if the balance them out to a perfect number. We're all equal. Because you're trying to box up because you're supposed to have one person one vote and is recognized that if you have one District that's very, very high population. Some of the representation that you're supposed to achieve. Supposed of the five Districts in its best as possible, to even the mountainous recognition outside was perfect there are man-made boundaries or city boundaries or that may be an impediment so, when District has a little bit of higher population in the other. There is a flexibility there. But it's really the case law and the courts that are looking for that three percent or five percent. Not exceeding the 10. My understanding is when it hits the 10 percent or above, that's from the court really starts to look at whether or not you have you know, have we done something mutual or really trying to at that point cause an adverse impact to one District over another? Is there favoritism for one District or another?

Robert Jordan: So, if I understand correctly, since we are not even close to 10 percent on any of these, you are doing the accumulative of two Districts to get to the almost 10 percent, correct?

Abigail Jorandby: We're looking at what we call the spread at that point.

Robert Jordan: The law and the rules is to have only a maximum of 10 percent in one.

Abigail Jorandby: It's the spread, yes. The spread is for District by District.

Robert Jordan: Not two districts like you are trying to do.

Abigail Jorandby: It's between the two Districts. I think thank you. Thing shown what we have provided previously, but describes how you do the deviation. And as a presented deviation from the mean and it is between the different you know, you do use a different Districts together. It's not just one District.

Robert Jordan: So, we cannot do that since we cannot stay the same as what you're saying.

Abigail Jorandby: Essentially, because at that point would be triggering that 10 percent not the numbers right from mean. I believe if we had, overlooking what Districts were they?

Robert Jordan: Two and four.

Abigail Jorandby: If there was a challenge the court would look at that with a little bit more of an eye. Because you're hitting that 10 percent mark. And they are questioning why there wasn't a redistribution of the population to even out the Districts a little bit more.

Robert Jordan: Okay.

Abigail Jorandby: It isn't a hard and fast rule. There is no real hard and fast rule. As a percentage, with recommended what really catches the court's eye if there is a challenge.

Robert Jordan: Thank you Abby.

Abigail Jorandby: Thank you.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Gattle.

Josiah Gattle: Appointed to the community that deviation was 10.46 which is on the high-end. Mr. Fisher just wanted to make modifications along the D2 and D4 line, you could theoretically do it. But I think that would draw stricter scrutiny because you didn't go through the entire make changes. Thanks.

Robin Fisher: Mr. Chairman, my map is different, the number is 121 that's not the number we try to get?

Steve Crisafulli: I believe what she's saying is that it's based off the spread, it's based off the spread. The difference between District 1 District and 121 number. Let's correct me if I'm wrong, it's the difference between two Districts, the high and the low. We have checked that threshold on the redistricting is 10.46.

John Weiler: It's 2 and 4.

Robin Fisher: I guess my thought process, whether or not it was if it stays the same. In representation and power. If that's what the court is looking at. I've got one vote and Todd has one vote. And so, at the end of the day, you know, if I count to three and so, my vote is just as powerful as someone who's got more population than that

Steve Crisafulli: At the end of the day, you are still only five Commissioners. And each have one vote.

Robin Fisher: He's got six or 7000 more people than me. So that one vote. I got one vote. You've got one vote. So, I'm not sure there's that much of an issue in the power struggle

Abigail Jorandby: I'm sorry.

Abigail Jorandby: Jim can explain ethical but better about the spread, but as far as the Charter, it does direct us that the Board of County Commissioners shall cause the County to be divided into County Commission Districts. Contiguous territory is nearly equal population as practical. So, we are supposed to try and even out the population. That's

what this committee was you know, conceived consist that border. It's just that. Have we actually divided the five Districts into populations nearly equal in population as practical? And that is really from our Charter.

Robin Fisher: So, everybody answer this question, what happens if we do nothing.

Abigail Jorandby: If we take no actions at that point the courts actually look at what the determination of Board of County Commissioners does is ultimately they're the ones that determine what happens. Some contests that, that is something that can happen. I mean again, it's not a hard and fast rule for the 10 percent is really just triggering the court's attention and if for some reason there is that deviation.

Robin Fisher: So, you cannot get sued and we can always defend the lawsuit.

Jason Steele: I can't agree with Commissioner Fisher more – who's going to sue us? Really, this is a small amount. Just think logically. I know it's difficult for people in public office to think logically. If we kept the lines exactly where they were? This really be at the head of the Supervisor of Elections office. We alleviate the millions of dollars of expenses that we are talking about in order to redistrict this stuff and we, in my opinion, these deviations are so small that the likelihood of having someone come after us is minimal. So, if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

[laughter] [applause]

John Weiler: Mr. Chair.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Weiler

John Weiler: Back to the math again. So, we have 121 and 332 as our target. So, 10 percent of that? That's 12,001 32. And the spread between the lowest and the highest is 12,006 99. Population. So, Mr. Gattle is correct. Delete outside the 10 percent in that gap and that's liable in causing someone to question it. Because it's over that magical 10 percent. Even though it's .4 even out either group and I agree with Mr. Steele. I think would save everybody a lot of trouble and I agree with you. Kept it like it is prettify seconded the motion. Just a discussion.

Steve Crisafulli: Did you have a comment?

Robert Jordan: Yes.

Robert Jordan: Even though Mr. Fisher sounds logical, I think one of the challenges that we have is he loves me. The challenges that we do have is we have the edict that says let's look at this, try and bounce it out as much as we can and for the committee to say that when I can do anything? This we are worried about suing and I think that. When I can

do that because we think the population is gonna take care of itself and five years, not think that is something that were supposed be doing here. We are supposed to be proactive try to bounce it out as much as we can. Come up with something and by the way, whatever we come up with the Commission doesn't have to agree with it. Right? So, I think we should try to the best job we can with what information we have. We do have 10.46 percent or whatever. I don't agree with you, people love to sue all the time. It is not my fear of that. And yes, we could save a lot of money. But in the long run we could find ourselves or someone else could be around the stable doing exactly what we are supposed be doing. Right now. And I certainly don't want that to happen for sure

Steve Crisafulli: Further comments.

Yvonne Minus: Yes Mr. Chairman. I want to go back to what Abby was saying about what is in our Charter. I'm gonna beat this again. In our Charter it says that we must preserve the disavowals geographically cohesive racial or minority community from fragmentation. That is in our Charter. We chose that. That is in our Charter so, I hope that we are not choosing part and recognizing the other. It's very unpopular. I understand that. And if it doesn't gain any ground, it is what it is. But, it needs to be recognized that's our Charter.

Steve Crisafulli: Are you saying that the current maps don't satisfy that. Whether that's drawn right now as we exist today?

Yvonne Minus: If that doesn't work then, whatever is the next best or whatever the majority that I am in support of what it is. My point is that this is not in our Charter. She just quoted another part of our Charter. But, we don't want to recognize as part of the Charter. That's an issue for me.

Steve Crisafulli: Ms. Hodgers.

Susan Hodgers: Going on to comparing to contrast Mr. Fisher's proposal and Ms. Minus's proposal, certainly this and that. Yes or no. If you're in a court of law you are the judge and he had Ms. Minus's proposal for Mr. Fisher, less likely is to be sued. [laughter] sustained.

Abigail Jorandby: So, I'll answer like a true Attorney. It really depends on what the lawsuit was challenging. Have a challenger. For some reason, at this point, it just depends if the court sees a majority minority District as something that is not just subordinating the traditional redistricting tools, just to raise the point, for can show that there's other considerations that were given in addition to race, in order to create the District, that is something we would have to bring forward in the case. As far as the 10 percent, at that point, would be an evaluation by the

corporate so it's kind of hard to say which one would you know, if we had the choice, which case to go on, which one, that point, I would hope we would ever have to be in a contest over redistricting. But I mean, obviously and can raise a lawsuit and raise an issue. It's really evaluation by the court and I can tell you that looking at all the case that looked at on these issues, the courts are very, are different. The evaluated. There are key core issues. Because some cases that's just the kind in favor of the majority minority. Some they did not, it is very dependent on who your judge will be and what the issues are. As presented by the defendant and by the plaintiff. So it's hard for me to say. I wish I could. But it's hard.

Steve Crisafulli: They should sue us on the way we number them. Bottom line. Ms. Schmitt.

Sue Schmitt: I would ask that we vote on Mr. Fisher's motion and then.

Steve Crisafulli: We have a motion on the floor right now, of Mr. Fisher's motion of the test as we are noted on his.

Sue Schmitt: Okay.

Steve Crisafulli: We have Mr. Fisher's motion to keep things as they are and Mr. Weiler seconded. Centered on the discussion, we will take about, yes, Mr. Moore?

Kendall Moore: Mr. Fisher's point. I agree with the map exactly how desperate I agree with the thought process that the current line should be a strong consideration in the thought process. And so, to the degree that it's another map that's part of the consideration, I do think that the trendlines are worthy of ending up at the table as a part of the discussion. Although, I may or may not agree with Ms. Minus's proposal. I think the access, I'm sorry, the impact on demographics should be part of this discussion echoes regardless please Mr. Weiler this map or whatever. So, I would support Mr. Fisher's proposition. Because I think the current map should be on the table as a part of this discussion now. Now to Mr. Jordan's point, I think what Mr. Pokrywa brought up, the growth is going to push us so far so quickly beyond the 10.46. Because the spreads between two and four. So, if it's time for six today, Todd's success is gonna make it 11, 12, 13, 14. It's going to continue to grow and that the bite is gonna get a lot bigger. What we would like to see the current map on the table for the discussion

Steve Crisafulli: You can increase density in north Merritt Island and probably bounce all that out.

Kendall Moore: Yes.

Steve Crisafulli: Glad it works out for you, [laughter] yes.

Josiah Gattle: So, I'm understanding it from all this discussion is the issue with Mr. Fisher's proposal is the spread as it relates to Districts 2 and 4, correct? That's really the issue with his proposal. Not any of the other Districts necessarily. So.

Steve Crisafulli: I think that's the consistent issue. This committee and conversation that we are having, that's the one that comes up as now, and it's not I think sums it down the road, that's today. It's as we vote on it with the Census numbers as it is today. The courts are, look at the possibilities. Because you know, you could have a gopher out there the shut you down tomorrow. You know? You know, he knows. [laughter] so, the fact of the matter is that we have to go off of what all we have for today and the spread is going to get greater. But this project greater from in the past the last map to where we are today. So, I think this is purely based on recent today with the data as it is in front of us.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Chairman, understanding not. Is a solution where we are not making many changes we are staying true to the existing boundaries. But recognizing that that spread needs to be reduced, we look at Mr. Weiler's plane change area? Regarding District 4 and District 2. Within population from District 4 and District 2. In the same areas already identified. And then in all other respects, just they stay true to the current strict boundary. And that spread is addressed to look at Mr. Weiler's proposal. Their plan changed areas. Plane change area number six D2, that is almost 6700 in population. Plane change area seven is 14 and 18 and population. And plane change area eight is 6500 projected growth in D4, you want to under populate District 4. So, is that perhaps a method of marrying the two concepts? Not making many changes at all to the District boundaries except for reducing that spread in using Mr. Weiler's proposed changed areas. As they relate to District 4 and District 2.

Steve Crisafulli: I mean I would say that would be obviously that could be a proposal that we bring forward. Mr. Fisher wants to continue on with what he's put on the table, certainly we can take a vote on it and you can propose that as the compromise of all compromises. To get your point with the math. Two were trying to get. So yes. I would say with Mr. Fisher, is the one that the question is pointing to. So, does that help? Yes, Mr. Fisher.

Robin Fisher: I think mine would stay the same.

Steve Crisafulli: And to your point, that is a third option, that's a third option because it's roasting. It might take some marrying these maps together. Whether to existing maps with three proposed changes of Mr.

Weiler's map laid on top of it? You get to where you're trying to get. It's a decision this committee needs to make.

Jason Steele: Mr. Chairman, would you consider taking public comment before we take this vote? I think we really are kind of at a point where maybe we oughta hear from the general public.

Steve Crisafulli: We would take public comment before we take a final vote. Right now, we're putting proposals forward.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Chairman is there a possibility that we could take a final vote on a final map before the end of this meeting?

Steve Crisafulli: Absolutely. Listen that would be great if we could get there.

Robert Jordan: That would be wonderful.

Steve Crisafulli: Certainly. Further comments or questions on Mr. Fisher's proposal to keep things as they are today?

Robert Jordan: I just want to make sure we understand, his proposal is just like Todd's proposal, we're going to use those as a basis for doing some modifications and all that stuff.

Steve Crisafulli: It's just another option.

Robert Jordan: I'm good with that, call for the question.

Steve Crisafulli: Alright, all in favor of Mr. Fisher's motion say aye. Opposed? Seeing none. Passed unanimous. Alright, further conversations.

Robert Jordan: Mr. Chairman, certainly want to bring mine forward because of the fact that I was just going across lines but I'm certainly amenable to doing some modification, I understand the north Merritt Island thing and that's the reason why I asked that question because I've heard loud and clear from north Merritt Island that they want to stay within their District and I don't have a problem with Todd's either, but I think that one of the maps, we didn't have a straight line for Rockledge. And that was the only concern that I had. It isn't a straight line because it seemed like it kind of bumped up if I remember right. So, John, yours don't you bump up Rockledge, break up Rockledge some, you don't go across.

John Weiler: Did you want me to respond to that?

Steve Crisafulli: Yes.

John Weiler: We did have a straight line across where the Viera DRI was. We made that and that gave us by population that was in Rockledge that was currently in District 4. It looks like we took over 428 and miscellaneous 433 and so forth, so most of Rockledge as a city then becomes District 2, right now it's pretty split between District 4 and

District 2. That's in the Viera area going from 95 almost over to US 1, it leaves the DRI in place. Then if you go to the second District 2 and 4 to District 1, we're giving a little bit of District 4 and a little bit of District 2 to District 1 to allow them to come over 95 and some of that is into Rockledge over the Timber west area but we needed that to give population to District 1 so that we even out that population, it's a contiguous area, it comes over 95, that's about everything you can say about that. A moment ago, I was looking back at the percentages, the more I look at it, the more I like what I did (laughter) because if you look at the percentages over here for all the Districts, the target deviations, we're no more than 2% on the spread between the lowest and the highest District, that's pretty doggone close. And the lowest is .43 and the highest is 1.51 and that's District 1. The spread just worked out that way. I didn't deliberately decide those numbers, but it worked out pretty good.

Robert Jordan: Ok John, you've proven that you're brilliant. [laughter] What I'm gonna suggest because I think that we are inclusive of the things that I was concerned with, so I would ask that we eliminate my map there. Just so we can reduce some of the paperwork that we have here. So, we can negotiate after that.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Chairman I just want to make a motion that there be an option incorporating the suggestion that I made relative to Mr. Fisher's proposal. Retaining the current District boundaries. And incorporating one or more of the plan change areas. Six, seven and/or eight. From D4 to D2 from Mr. Weiler's proposal in order to reduce that spread between District 2 and District 4.

John Weiler: I don't understand

Jason Steele: Beach, not beach, where are you going with that?

Todd Pokrywa: So, it's plan change area 6 in Mr. Weiler's.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Steele, if you would, pull up Mr. Weiler's, document and you will see on the front. The front page of that. It will show PCA 6, 7 and 8. And that's what he is referencing.

Todd Pokrywa: So, the 6 would move the.

Jason Steele: It's very self-explanatory here, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Josiah Gattle: Mr. Chair.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Gattle.

Josiah Gattle: To clarify just based on the comments that we've had from the public, I might suggest that we make the motion 6 and 7, as the ones that we focus on and leaving the Island alone based on the

comments that we received from the public for solidifying the motions instead of having an “or” and just making it six and seven.

Steve Crisafulli: We would need definite clarity I think.

Todd Pokrywa: I’ll amend my motion and just include plan change area 6 and plan change area 7 from Mr. Weiler’s proposal.

John Weiler: Say that again, include or exclude?

Todd Pokrywa: Include change area 6 and 7.

Steve Crisafulli: The motion is to use the existing map as it sits. Taking Mr. Weiler’s PCA six and PCA seven and incorporating it into the existing map as it sits today.

Robert Jordan: We’d just have to spread it.

Steve Crisafulli: Yes ma’am.

Sue Schmitt: Mr. Chairman, did you include PCA 8?

Todd Pokrywa: No, that’s what I just ended up excluding.

Jason Steele: Basically, that’s South Patrick Shores.

Todd Pokrywa: Correct.

Sue Schmitt: So, you were talking about not including any of that beach side as it exists now.

Todd Pokrywa: That’s what I was suggesting for this proposal.

John Weiler: So then where would District 2 pick up the population?

Todd Pokrywa: District 2 would be picking up the 6698 in plan change area 6 and 6418 in plan change area 7.

Steve Crisafulli: From your map.

Todd Pokrywa: I don’t know if James is able to tell us the result.

Sue Schmitt: It’s the unincorporated area north of Satellite Beach, ok so that’s what I was asking.

Todd Pokrywa: Right, I was not including that in this proposal. Part two stays as it is today.

Steve Crisafulli: It stays as it is today.

Sue Schmitt: Okay, got it.

Steve Crisafulli: We have a motion on the table.

Josiah Gattle: Second.

Steve Crisafulli: We have a second Mr. Gattle.

Sue Schmitt: Second.

Robert Jordan: Got a lot of seconds. [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Weiler? Yes, discussion.

John Weiler: If I understood, if we leave that as it is, we would have to go where we were in Cocoa and leave that with no changes there.

Steve Crisafulli: It stays the same.

John Weiler: I got it.

Steve Crisafulli: The only thing changing is your PCA 6 and PCA 7.

John Weiler: And those would be added to District 2.

Steve Crisafulli: From 4 to 2.

John Weiler: And PCA 8 would be excluded. Ok, got it

Todd Pokrywa: James, are you able to share?

James Shives: Basically, you'd be adding 8,000 people to District 2 which would put us at 122,000 thereabouts for District 2. And then that would drop District 4 to around 119,000. Give or take.

Robert Jordan: I can live with that.

Steve Crisafulli: Further discussion or comments on that?

Kendall Moore: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go back to Todd's original thing with Mr. Weiler, if we're going to open it up, I don't want to limit myself in this vote today without looking at the other, the other six PCAs plus whatever else we intended to come back with in terms of that. Not that I disagree with those two, but limiting it to those two today. Not in favor of doing that quite yet.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Moore, as long as we can vote on the final map before the end of this meeting.

Kendall Moore: I'm still not quite there yet

Steve Crisafulli: That will be a majority vote.

Kendall Moore: I've only got one so you can still get there.

Steve Crisafulli: So, we're back to that [laughter]. Further comments on this proposal? Mr. Gattle?

Josiah Gattle: Question for James, what is the total variance on this new proposal from Mr. Pokrywa?

James Shives: It was small.

Jim Liesenfelt: I can't tell you for District 2 but for District 4 the variance would be -1.9%.

Josiah Gattle: The spread, the highest spread. I just can't read the.

Jim Liesenfelt: Your spread is 1.9 I got it right here. Spread? District 1 would be 4.7 under the target. There you go, thank you. And your District 2. So, your spread is going to be 6.7ish somewhere in that neighborhood. Please forgive me, it's public math [laughter].

James Shives: Actually, it would be around there, because you'd still have District 1 and District 3, it would be -4.7 and then District 4.

Steve Crisafulli: Because they haven't changed. It's under 10, it's at 8 or so.

Steve Crisafulli: Further comments, questions? All in favor of the current proposal signify by saying yay, opposed, Mr. Moore is the one nay.

Steve Crisafulli: Alright, further discussions or ideas to bring forward to the committee for further discussion? Otherwise, we take the slate and move forward.

Jason Steele: I move we take the slate and move forward.

Steve Crisafulli: We have a motion.

Robert Jordan: Ok, I will second.

Steve Crisafulli: We have a second.

Robin Fisher: Discussion, that would be the Weiler plan, my map, and the hybrid. I'm good with that.

Robert Jordan: I'm sure you are. [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: Any further discussion? All in favor, signify by saying yay, opposed, nay. Unanimous – to bring those 3 maps forward.

Steve Crisafulli: So, let's start with Mr. Fisher's map. Because I think there is no further discussion to have if that's the map we're going to go with otherwise, we have maps that have been changed. So, from the standpoint of this committee, what's the best? Obviously, the biggest issue that we all have is the spread. That is the number one conversation that keeps being brought up on that map. The question is, are we willing as a committee to stand behind that. Is Abby willing to stand up in court and defend that? And are you all prepared to be deposed for that?

Steve Crisafulli: To say that she didn't warn us, she did warn us. She did. So that's the discussion this committee has to have, is that what we want to go with? Or do we want to make the changes that we feel we need to make? Obviously, we have a hybrid of all three of these maps have been brought forward. You brought the existing map. He brought a new map and you took pieces of his map and put it on your map. So, I think that's what this process is about. Narrowing it down and I think we've done that in a way that made it to where we're using parts and pieces of the overall discussion it's just a matter of how we want to marry it all up.

Robert Jordan: Mr. Chairman?

Steve Crisafulli: Yes, sir.

Robert Jordan: My thought is actually I like all three of them, in some way or the other. Mr. Fisher, since you're driving me, I've gotta say that, I want a ride back home, I don't hitchhike. Anyway, I guess the only concern that I have, because I think Mr. Fisher along with what Todd said to me is that it makes a lot of sense. My concern is how the public sees what we would, if we vote for this, what they would believe about

this Commission. Did we actually work hard to balance everything or did we take the easy way out? I don't know what the answer is.

Steve Crisafulli: I would show them this.

Robert Jordan: We got would you say eight percent? We're not at 10, we're at 8%. There could be some who say well, you should've made sure that the population was more balanced. Which we have the power to do. But, we may not do that, that is really my only concern. I just think that we got something pretty close to being as good as we're gonna get it. It's just a question of what, which you asked can we be deposed? We feel very comfortable that we have done the right thing to do and I don't the answers to that. To be honest with you.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Fisher?

Robin Fisher: I'm quite sure the voter that gets pulled from 4 to 2 or 2 to 4 will say they put me on another District and that's just the way it is. I don't know if tonight's the night that we vote on a map, I thought maybe the way it was going to go Mr. Chairman is we would narrow down to 2 or 3 and then we have public comments and then next time we come back together we vote. Is that how you were looking at it?

Steve Crisafulli: We can have public comment tonight before we were going to go to a vote on anything and if this committee sees that they have a clear picture of what they want to do, we can vote tonight. There's no necessity to come back here and take two weeks to decide what we've probably all kind of started making up in our own minds. If we're going to have a discussion on these three maps. We can halt the discussion now and have public comment just to add that into further discussion. If we can come to agreement tonight, we can come to an agreement tonight.

Mr. Weiler?

John Weiler: I move we go to public comment.

Jason Steele: Second.

Steve Crisafulli: Ok, discussion on that? Go ahead and go to public comment. All in favor say aye. Ok at this time we'll go to public comment.

E. Public Comment

Steve Crisafulli: Alright. So, first up, is it Mike Best? Mike Beasy. Come on up here. Yes sir. Yes, just speak so we can hear you.

Mike Beasy: Ok, I just want to thank everybody for everything that you're going through on this. I'm part of the Suntime Master HOA, we would love to see it stay as District 4 for logistics part of it. Like you said, if it

ain't broke, you don't need to fix anything right there. We oppose any part of 4 being moved away from the Suntree area. Thank you very much.

Steve Crisafulli: Next we have Mindy Gibson. You're recognized.

Mindy Gibson: I'm a little tall. I'm with Satellite Beach. I am a councilwoman for the City of Satellite Beach I know several of you up here and some of you I don't know. I'm here to say that Satellite Beach, as a city specifically, wants to stay in District 4, I do know that there's talk of moving South Patrick Shores into District 2, and I'd like you guys to consider the process of how you're supposed to be doing these Districts to begin with geographically, we have Patrick Air Force Base is a big void, you have the lagoon, we have the main canal that we share with South Patrick Shores along with Indian Harbour Beach, we have the mid-reach beach project that we have to do when we do beach re-nourishments, we do a lot of projects congruently with each other. So, from a city perspective, I know Courtney is probably going to actually come up, so I'll stop there and let her say whatever she wants to say. I'm very happy with anything that keeps Satellite Beach in District 4 and I know the community will be very happy. I do think that South Patrick Shores should also stay with us just to keep things simple when you're doing budgets and projects. And having to deal with two Commissioners as opposed to want to make it a lot more difficult so, thank you. Thank you for everything you guys are doing.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Ratterman?

Jack Ratterman: I'd like to start out by saying that anybody that doesn't think this group worked hard, send them over to my house. I will tell them how it is. I think everybody in here showed great respect for one another. And Mr. Crisafulli did a great job of handling all the debate and letting everybody have a chance to have their say. You know? With that said, my remarks here it turned out better than I expected. But I would still like to give you this. We need Elvis now more than ever. [laughter] Growing up in Tennessee and Florida in the 60s and 70s I always felt like the bad old days of prejudice and ignorance have passed. That we are entering a new area. A new era. Built on hard won racial equality, charity and a sense that no one was better than anyone else. And this could not be stopped. I am not so sure anymore now. Lately I feel like our moral compass has been broken, spent into intolerance, greed and hypocrisy. And a meanness that is as thick as the humidity in July. In times of trouble, I put my faith in Elvis Presley. Who represents the south, the best angel. He was a hard worker and although lived the high

life, he never forgot that he had been born into poverty. The man expressed gratitude and humility for all that life had given him, he was a self-made talent. He couldn't even read music. Perhaps the greatest entertainer of all time was born to a two-room shack in Tupelo, Mississippi in 1935, just up the road from where I went to college in Mississippi. I've been to that small shack, sorry and reflected on what it says about America. Greatness can be born anywhere. Elvis was famous for his generosity ultimately to a fault, giving cars away and expensive gifts. And a hand out to anyone who needed a leg up. That's how the Presley's survived the depression. His father Vernon was out of work and the Presley's relied on kindness of family and neighbors to get them through the hard times. Vernon and his father built the two-room house themselves. It was tiny and seemed like the best thing that they had. But it ended up being too nice and too expensive for them the family lost the house, the family was on hard times and Elvis, the young boy he was ended up shuttling between Tupelo and families and friends. Living in the black neighborhoods, where Elvis famously developed an ear for black gospel blues, to supplement his love of old-time gospel he got from his church. Elvis knew what it was like to be dirt poor. To struggle for food and shelter. By the time his talent helped him buy a Memphis mansion, he was already using his money to help others, often quietly without fanfare, he did not create a foundation and then have a portrait painted larger than he was with outside donations. He just went down and bought that lady a Cadillac, got that fellow a job.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Ratterman, I would ask you to wrap it up. We are past the three minutes.

Jack Ratterman: Okay. I got you. I still believe in my heart that most people are still more like Elvis and we are likely to pull over and help someone stranded on the side of the road. Most of the people that I know in Merritt Island would give you the shirt off their back. Most of the people agree racism and intolerance is evil. Even a preschooler knows that it's better to tell the truth and take the lumps than to lie and evade. And now, we are here. We know right from wrong. And I'm asking you to vote for what's right for our community and for Brevard County, do not be part of a traumatic amputation of North Merritt Island community. Like Elvis said, truth is like the sun, you can shut it out for a time, but it ain't going to go away.

Steve Crisafulli: Thank you for your comments. Courtney Barker?

Courtney Barker: Good evening. Courtney Barker. City Manager for the City of Satellite Beach, following up with what Mindy was saying, first I

want to thank you all for all of the stuff that you're doing for this. I can't imagine the amount of hours that you are dedicating to this so we really appreciate it. What I wanted to make sure that you all knew and that I can see that you are listening in taking out Satellite Beach from the equation of moving into District 2. We appreciate that. But I did want to make sure that you are aware of how close South Patrick Shores, Indian Harbour Beach and Satellite Beach really are. We all share a zip code. We share a library, we share facilities. A lot of the South Patrick Shores, and I know you might hear from residents that there is no relationship, but there strongly is, I've lived there, graduated high school from Satellite High School, been the City Manager for eight years, and I've worked as a leader in Brevard County for over 20 years. So, there is a huge relationship with those three communities. Satellite Beach? The city often helps the residents of South Patrick Shores, I cannot tell you how many residents of South Patrick Shores call my office thinking they live in Satellite Beach, because their address says Satellite Beach. So, they call us a lot. We just helped a lady right now. We're working with Brevard County to get her through the lagoon plumbing lateral line grant and things like that. So, we do that stuff all the time. The Homeowners Association for South Patrick Shores actually uses our community center to have their meetings. So, we have a very strong relationship. And I do think that it would be a mistake to split that up. I think we will be very hard-pressed logistically to work with two County Commissioners. And I think we do need to all be able to stay in one District. So, thank you.

Steve Crisafulli: Thank you. Miss Mary Hillberg? You're recognized.

Mary Hillberg: Hi I'm Millie Mary Hillberg. Thank you all again for your hard work. The direction and the effort that you've done tonight I think is commendable. As you may know, the odd idea of creating a minority and majority District has been picked up by the mainstream media. NPR discussed it and it was embarrassing to hear. And I'm glad that you are not going to be following that and you're going in the direction that you're going, thank you very much.

Steve Crisafulli: Commissioner Lober?

Bryan Lober: I'm gonna start right where I was. I just wanted to share a few thoughts with you all. First off, Satellite Beach clearly wishes to stay in D4. I know from my perspective and again, you need three Commissioners to pass whatever you send to the Commission to get to win the day. So, from my perspective, I don't have a desire to yank them from where they are happy, if they are happy, let them be. With respect

to South Patrick Shores, I don't have a position. If I get them, fine. If I don't get them, fine. I'm not gonna lose sleep at night either way with respect to that. Mr. Fisher, mentioned earlier in the meeting that he wishes to use the existing boundaries as a starting basis for redistricting, apart from the comments that already have been made with respect to that, I would just point out respectfully that all of the other maps without exception that are currently under consideration have done this. To my understanding, everyone that's met with James including my colleague, who is no longer here, Commissioner Tobia, used the existing boundaries and shifted them from there. So, I think that has already been accomplished and we've seen where the different directions have gone. So, I think if you're looking at reducing the spread, you have options that have done that. Some of them have been excluded some of them have been included. As to the spread, I'll just tell ya and I kind of hinted at this last time, with respect to not throwing Abby under the bus, but trying to explain why she might be somewhat evasive to answering questions that pertain to how potentially meritorious a lawsuit would be. Mainly she doesn't want this, which we heard earlier in the meeting that will be typed verbatim word by word, introduced as the plaintiff's first exhibit. I don't think anyone is looking for that. Speaking for myself, I can tell you I could care less for the most part about a lawsuit. A lawsuit in and of itself does not keep me up at night. The County is sued left and right. I don't care. It's part and parcel of living. We get them at my office, sometimes directed to Space Coast Area Transit, something happens with a bus. Sometimes directed to Parks and Rec, we get them all the time. Generally speaking, they don't bother me. What bothers me is not the fear of being sued. What bothers me is a concern that we open ourselves up unnecessarily to a potentially meritorious claim. Not something where there's an uphill battle for someone, or a very uphill battle. Frivolous lawsuits I could care less about. But we have, and I sent James the direct link to this. So, if you all want afterward, if someone suggested he bring it up, he has the link on his email front and center. It should be the most recent one that he received. The League of Cities redistricting proposal. It was about 10 minutes and 17 seconds into it so, at 10:17 or 11:17. About 60 to 90 seconds the operative portion. The bottom line is that we have an opportunity either to follow best practice by staying well within that three percent spread or alternatively we can choose to push the limits whether it's with a seven percent spread or over 10 percent spread. And see whether or not we get sued. We've heard the numbers three percent thrown out there for a

reason. Not to say that it's a hard and fast rule, but if we can stay within that 3 percent, unless there's a compelling or extenuating reason to do otherwise. For my comfort level when it comes to me later, it's something that I'm going to keep in mind. If it's something you all want to see, I can double check the timestamp and he can pull it up for you.

Steve Crisafulli: Miss Sandra Sullivan?

Sandra Sullivan: Good evening. So, I am a South Patrick Shores resident and we have a Facebook group called South Patrick Shores families. And I can tell you that is not as portrayed by the city, how close we are. And in fact, I'm the lady who lives on the dump that dug up all that stuff. That determined we got the FUDS eligibility for the former military dump that's under our homes. And I can tell you that in that process the gas lighting I experienced from the city in the battles I went through and tomorrow night I will be on the RAB board for Patrick Space Force Base. And going to those meetings and talking about PFOS coming off the base. And having the city gas lighting in and saying it's not coming off the city, supporting the base's position and then the following week I find the report related to testing. So, I would say from the residents of South Patrick Shores, we do not mind being in a different District than the city. And in fact, as far as I'm concerned, I would encourage it. And then I would also like to say that we share a commonality because we were adjacent to Patrick Air Force Base as Cocoa Beach with the contamination coming off. We are closer to the point source. So, the PFOS is going to Cocoa Beach through their reclaimed water. So, I would also like to suggest that Mr. Jason Steele, who attends meetings for Satellite Beach and he just got a recent raise for being a lobbyist for the city. That he be asked to recuse himself from any decisions that involve Satellite Beach. And in that light, I noticed he was very active as that got debated. I would also, as a side note and obviously, this has nothing to do with redistricting other than making the point of why the city would want to remain in D4. Liz Alward's husband is Curt Smith's legislative aide. Liz Alward is today on the P and Z board meeting for this week is being appointed to that board. Curt tried to release the covenants for the High Tower Beach. There are very controversial changes going there with regard to the FCT grant across the road and he tried to put Jim Barfield on the state FCT governing board at a time when the city is making these very controversial changes. So, they have a lot of support with Curt Smith. Maybe a different Commissioner might bring some balance there and help represent our community with those needs. Those lands used to be in

our community and unincorporated. They were annexed only for the preservation of conservation use and they are being monetized. Thank you.

Steve Crisafulli: Thank you. Members, that is the end of public comment. I guess I should ask this committee if they would like to talk about passing a map tonight. if you've got time. It is 7:25. I don't know how in-depth we will get on this. If you all want to go down that road and see if we can get there. If not, certainly it's up to this committee and what they want to do. You got dinner. [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: Yes Mr. Pokrywa?

Todd Pokrywa: I want to ask James a few questions One of my hybrid proposal that marries Mr. Wyler's with Mr. Fisher's. Are you able to tell me what the deviation is for each of the Districts?

James Shives: Yes.

Todd Pokrywa: Within a .3 differential?

James Shives: I could get that for you tomorrow if that's alright.

Todd Pokrywa: We know what the issue was in terms of the deviation with the existing boundaries. And we have addressed that with the information that you and Jim have provided earlier. I would like to make a motion that we move forward with the hybrid proposal that I presented marrying Mr. Weiler's with Mr. Fisher's. I think it's important that we under populate District 4 based on the projected growth that's anticipated. It stays true to the existing boundaries. To the maximum extent possible. And again, I move that forward.

Jason Steele: I would second

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Steele seconds. Discussion? Let me just say one thing. I think I've got math accurate here. You know, a lot of this discussion on the beach side is whether the unincorporated area goes or stays or however it works. Keep in mind that's 6500 people. That's the difference of PCA six that we just changed. So really, you know, if we try to use that map and change that back and keep it in 4, then we just go back to square one basically. And it would only be a thousand people different. So, we are at a point of having to make a decision on that. And that's really the differential on the map. It's really where the population number is. That's where it's at so keeping that in mind as we move forward. Mr. Gattle?

Josiah Gattle: I would disagree with the proposal as stated. Because I believe that we would still have population variance that's well outside the balance that I would be comfortable with. I would like us to get below that five percent variance. And I don't think that is possible with the

married map of just the D6 and D7 changes. Or PCA six and seven changes. And Mr. Fisher's map of leaving everything else the same. We have over 100,000 empty lots in Palm Bay right now. That could have explosive growth at some point in the near future. They are ready to build. And so from that perspective, having a variance of District 1 and District 3 and 5 ready to explode. I think we would have a similar problem very quickly. I believe James had mentioned that there was an eight percent variance still with those changes.

Susan Hodgers: Mr. Chair? Can we do a refresher. I think James might have access to it. The webinar that Commissioner Lober had sent out a couple weeks ago. I think it was the 10-minute mark or 10 minute and 32nd mark before we take a vote to talk about the spread. The link.

Steve Crisafulli: And this is from the League of Cities?

Abigail Jorandby: It's my understanding that there was this one expert and I believe he did the same presentation to different groups. I think it's pretty much the same groups. With the same presentation.

Steve Crisafulli: Is that Curt Smith? Is that who it is?

Abigail Jorandby: That's my understanding that we're going to see.

Steve Crisafulli: You have the magic mic over there, if James can remember his password, we're going to do this. [laughter] No pressure James, not in the middle of a committee meeting.

Steve Crisafulli: While he's pulling that up. Let's continue on with the discussion. Ms. Schmitt, you have comments?

Sue Schmitt: We have already accepted three different plans here. I think it may be and trust me, I don't want any meetings either. But, I think it would be better off to get those and have them really sent out to us in advance of the next meeting. So that we won't have to wait till we get here and look at them. And I think we pretty much agree. On what needs to be done. I think some or probably I would guess, would like to see what it is.

Steve Crisafulli: You have the existing map as it is today. You have Mr. Weiler's map as it is.

Sue Schmitt: I know that.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay. And then you have the hybrid, which is the existing map with PCA 6 and PCA 7. I just want you to make sure that you know what we are working off of. There's really nothing different that you're gonna see it lying in front of you, but what we have in front of us tonight.

Sue Schmitt: I don't care, if you want to vote tonight I'm ready.

Steve Crisafulli: That's up to the committee obviously. We just want to make sure that you know like, you know, we could reprint them.

Sue Schmitt: I get it, I just don't know if everybody else does, but I'm ready to vote.

Steve Crisafulli: Were you able to pull it up?

(portion of online presentation played from YouTube)

Steve Crisafulli: I think that's good enough, I think we've got good guidance there.

Robin Fisher: The only thing I would say about that chart Mr. Chairman is that you know, 116 people is the difference between, 12% difference, the deviation. I bet Abby could win that one. [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: The question is does she want to win? [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: So, currently we have a proposal on the table am I correct? The hybrid map as it lays today with the changes of PCA 6 and PCA 7. We're in discussion, further comments or discussion on the proposal before us. Mr. Gattle?

Josiah Gattle: Mr. Chairman can we get a reading on what the deviation is currently? I think it is reading as 8.78?

James Shives: Yeah, so this is the population summary report where we get the overall and mean deviations. I was able to quickly do PCA 6 and 7 so this would essentially be the statistics for the hybrid map that Mr. Pokrywa is suggesting.

Josiah Gattle: I would continue to have objections along the lines of District 1 will continue to be under represented overpowered with voting power while Districts 3 and 5 are poised for growth. With development in the Palm Bay area. I don't think that this map will adequately meet the needs of South Brevard.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, further comments? (unintelligible) [laughter]

Robin Fisher: I was wondering, I mean, I'm sorry, I think District 1 it's important have this growth. And I am good, I just don't know because I've seen some reservation with several board members. Should we not have the exact map in front of us with an exact number and that kind of stuff before we make a final vote. You know?

Steve Crisafulli: If we go to the hybrid, if the committee chooses to want that, absolutely. We can do that. And keep in mind, it's going to potentially get changed a little bit by supervisor, just making sure that some things lineup. But, if that's the wish of this committee, then you know, that's the wish of the committee. You know, I'm just looking at the defining of where those areas are and I guess in my head, I understand

what it is. But if everybody is better off seeing a picture of it, then I am certainly open to that as well.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Chairman.

Steve Crisafulli: Yes sir.

Todd Pokrywa: I am of course comfortable with it through the existing District boundaries that we're all used to seeing and there are only two changes and we've seen those before in Mr. Weiler's proposal. James has the numbers up there. He's quickly put together so, I think if there's questions for James, I understand that. But I think this strikes a good balance and again going back to my earlier comments at the outset of the meeting, it's really an incremental change because we're going to see a lot of growth over the next 10 years. Between now and the next redistricting, in Palm Bay and the north part of the County, in Viera, so, certainly there's going to be more growth and I think we're gonna have more substantial changes to deal with when we come back for redistricting. But it really makes sense while we can, remain true to the current boundaries then piecemeal this. I think the appropriate time to make those more sweeping changes after we see additional growth that we are anticipating in various parts of the County.

Jason Steele: Mr. Chairman.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Jordan first.

Robert Jordan: Commissioner Lober said something that struck my ear. Which was really brilliant on his part. Even though Mr. Fisher basically said leave it the same with Todd modifying it. We all started with the base of where we are today. And so, we actually have done exactly what we were supposed to do. I'm feeling very comfortable because of the fact that we started with the same base. And so, there was modifications to the base by you for what Mr. Fisher says. So, there was some pliability on Mr. Fisher's part. As far as where we could go. So, I think we're in pretty good shape. I can defend it. I don't have a problem being deposed if you will. The only question I do have is as Josh would say. I think we're still at 8 percent.

James Shives: Yes. 8.78 percent.

Robert Jordan: And I'm not really sure? It's a lot further away from 10 than we were before. We were at 10.4 something. Now, we are at eight percent. I think the only thing is that we just have to be careful is that it's smarter for us to just get copies of this thing that you're looking at. In the light of day to make sure that this is what we can all live with and then move forward. Not for having another meeting, but I think it might be a smart choice to do that. In my humble opinion.

Steve Crisafulli: And you do know that there is a picture of it in here.

Robin Fisher: I'm not clear right now, is D4 now going to D2 in that picture? D2 would be representing Viera?

Steve Crisafulli: No.

Robin Fisher: This map is a little confusing.

Steve Crisafulli: Which map are you on?

Robin Fisher: I'm on proposed changes by Weiler. It says D4 to D2 by Weiler. This picture here. It says District 4 to District 2 proposed changes by Weiler.

Steve Crisafulli: On PCA, on 7?

Kendall Moore: I think he's only suggesting number 6 and number 7 out of that list. Are you looking at, what number does that one have on it?

Steve Crisafulli: That's number 7.

Robin Fisher: Proposed changes area 7.

Todd Pokrywa: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Fisher. Proposed change area 7. It moves that area east of US 1 that's currently in District 4. Self to Pineda into District 2. Which is consistent with the existing boundary of District 2 on Merritt Island as well as on the beach side, and then the page prior to that is proposed change area 6. And that moves the area north of the Viera DRI from District 4 to District 2. So those are the only two changes to the existing District boundaries.

Steve Crisafulli: So, what you see there is that thicker line above that's the black one. That's the existing line. It's overlaid with a redline for the proposed change. But that's the area there that's going from 4 to 2 on 6. And then on 7, again, using the dark, the blackline, that's the existing line and then the proposed change is the darker red. You know, the thicker red line. So, those are the only two changes being made to existing map as it sits today.

Robert Jordan: Is everybody clear?

Robin Fisher: No.

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Steele?

Jason Steele: If I had a preference, I would go along with Commissioner Fisher's first proposal to leave it alone. Unfortunately, after hearing the deviation would be 10.4 and that we could potentially have somebody come in and litigate against this, which we don't necessarily want is fine. But, the two maps that we have now between Todd and John are a tossup. There are really almost identical except for one big thing. And that's the deviation on Todd's is 8.4, the deviation on John's is 2.4. Significantly lower on John's. So, why would we go with an 8.4 deviation when we can go for a 2.4 deviation? Is it really gonna make a difference

to Todd from what I'm seeing, and I don't know the inner workings of the Viera company, but it's 6 of one and half dozen of the other, so, I think we could easily come to a decision tonight and either one of these proposals would be very good with the County Commission. And unfortunately, as much as I would like to go along with Robin's idea, I think it's probably smarter for us to do deviation that's lower and puts us in a better protective position.

Todd Pokrywa: Again Mr. Chairman, just to answer Mr. Steele, I don't have a preference between those two options. Mr. Weiler's or my hybrid proposal. I'm trying to strike a balance between the two proposals that were presented, Mr. Weiler's and Mr. Robin Fisher's.

Steve Crisafulli: Understood. Understood. And that's exactly what it was, it was a hybrid between the two and it was understood I think by the committee when you put it forward. Certainly, there is a risk factor. Is anybody gonna say anything about the difference between the deviation of 8 and a deviation of 2 and a half or whatever? Who knows. But, we are certainly below the threshold of 10 point whatever. So, we are in a much better place with the two options in front of us. Again, we have a proposal in front of us that has a motion and a second and we're debating that. Certainly, if we are thinking through this again and want to pull back, and that's the prerogative of this committee. Mr. Gattle?

Josiah Gattle: Can I make a motion to move aside the hybrid proposal for a moment to move over to the Weiler proposal. Without voting down any of these proposals at this point time. Just for purposes of discussion?

Jason Steele: A point of order wouldn't allow you to do that.

Steve Crisafulli: I don't think so. I mean, we've got a proposal on the table. So, I assume that's Robert's Rules. That's what we are operating under.

Jason Steele: Todd would have to withdraw his motion and I would have to withdraw my second.

Robin Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I would go back to Mr. Steele's argument early on. To make the change, because I think Mr. Wyler motion when you start putting all the pieces together you're moving a lot of voters around. Where the hybrid doesn't do that. And I think that if you think of one reason why, that would be one that I would be supportive of the hybrid if I couldn't leave it alone.

Steve Crisafulli: And that's you know, again, if that is something that this committee wants to put into play, it's the conversation to be had.

Kendall Moore: Mr. Chairman, hey, look, I count votes for a living and I can start to count as this process moves its way swiftly through this discussion we are having. My only opposition I think that I voted yes to the two proposals earlier because the thought process and if you remember I asked the question, is this A or is this B? And the question and answer was it's A. As in we were going to consider those and have the opportunity to come back. Mr. Steele, there is a significant number of changes in Mr. Weiler's proposal that affect Rockledge, that affect Cocoa. That affect lots of other areas outside the context of that scenario, so, my yes vote was based upon the fact of going back to look at those PCAs in totality as a group. As opposed to solving the single issue that may be addressed between two and four. So, I can certainly count. But, I voted with the intent of having the opportunity to readdress those and I will remain in that particular juncture.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, further discussions? Yes sir.

Robin Fisher: Yes, I'd like to make a motion that we bring the two proposals back for a meeting and get the exact number and get the map laid out and we vote on it in the next meeting.

Robert Jordan: Second.

Steve Crisafulli: Well we have a motion on the table.

Abigail Jorandby: You have a motion on the table.

Jason Steele: Move to table Mr. Chairman.

Robert Jordan: Move to table what?

Kendall Moore: I'll second that for discussion, but a point of order Mr. Chairman, move to table what?

Jason Steele: Move to table the motion on the floor.

Kendall Moore: As in Mr.

Jason Steele: Correct, and all it takes is a second and it's tabled.

Kendall Moore: Motion to table has no discussion as per Robert's Rules, I'll leave that to Abby.

Jason Steele: Exactly.

Kendall Moore: You gotta just vote.

Abigail Jorandby: Yes, you have a current motion pending. You have to resolve that motion before you can take another. So, it's at that point you're trying to resolve that.

Steve Crisafulli: But if he's moving to table his, and there's a second, there's no debate, correct?

Abigail Jorandby: This motion to table, yes, at that point you would do vote. You would just have your vote.

Steve Crisafulli: So the motion is tabled. What's that?

Kendall Moore: You have to vote.

Steve Crisafulli: So yes, you've seconded it, it's tabled all in favor say aye. Opposed? One nay, Todd Pokrywa.

Steve Crisafulli: All right. The majority says that we table and now the floor is open for.

Robin Fisher: Making a motion that we give James a chance to lay it out exactly as Mr. Weiler's Plan A and in fact, the hybrid, Mr. Pokrywa's and then we will come back at the next meeting and make a decision.

Yvonne Minus: Second.

Steve Crisafulli: We have a motion and a second. Discussion? Mr. Weiler?

John Weiler: My plan isn't changing, so it's mainly Todd's plan would be the only one to come back with the change. With the percentages I think.

Robin Fisher: But it would give us a chance to really see the percentages.

John Weiler: I understand that. I'm saying that it wouldn't be any work for you to do it online. It staying the same. It's just his modifying mind and it would be the only one that we come back to look at. Is that right?

Kendall Moore: Modifying his not yours.

Steve Crisafulli: His well, modifying his with your information, [laughter] and I think the request would be now granted, we don't come back until the 18th. But the request would be as soon as these changes are made. You send those out and we can post them on the website. And have those out there for public consumption. So, that would be the request of a committee. So, we are in discussion on that and any further discussion?

Jason Steele: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to Mr. Moore, I think that this is the best way to do it. If he has concerns about Rockledge and all these other areas, I think we need to pay attention to that. So, I couldn't agree with you more. I did not see those on the map. If you've got something that you feel is important, I think we need to take that into consideration so that we don't hurt any of the cities up there.

Steve Crisafulli: And that's the same map that Mr. Weiler has had in place since last week.

Jason Steele: I understand.

Robert Jordan: Mr. Chairman?

Robert Jordan: The only concern that I have our request that I would have is if we bring these two maps back, then ask the Attorney to look at them for acceptability if you will. For the requirements that we have to

make sure that we are following the letter of the law and all those caveats and that need to be in there for sure. Then you can tell us yes, we are in good shape. With one or the other.

Abigail Jorandby: As far as the percentages and the like. That's one question I just want to make sure. I understand the map would be changed with the deviations of six and seven. What is the other map? Is it Weiler's map as it exists?

Steve Crisafulli: Mr. Weiler's map in its entirety as it stands, yes.

Abigail Jorandby: I just want to be sure that we understood that.

Steve Crisafulli: Is there any other information that the committee would want that we don't see you know, in the data points right now? To be added to the conversation for the next meeting?

Josiah Gattle: Mr. Chair, I would just ask Mr. Moore and Miss Minus as you mentioned, communities of interest that we need to keep together throughout our discussions. If there's any of those that you could lay them on the table tonight or between now and the next meeting. If there's areas that we've overlooked with this map, I want to defer to both of you as you have expressed throughout the discussion, communities of interest that you would like to preserve.

Kendall Moore: One example Mr. Gattle would be, I don't have it in front of me, you've got multiple changes on a piece that goes from D2 to D1, which one is that Mr. Weiler? I should know that off the top of my head.

Steve Crisafulli: PCA1.

Kendall Moore: Actually, it's PCA2 as an example has a significant impact at least from the lens of different demographics from that perspective. And so, what I would really be interested in just seeing is the new breakdown that results from either Todd's proposed change or otherwise to be able to know and understand and make that assessment for several of those were addressed in Mr. Weiler's proposal, but we ended up not looking at all eight, we ended up only looking at two. And so, that was ultimately why I raised the issue. We will certainly comment on those and may be as smart as Commissioner Lober and write a memo before the next meeting. [laughter]

Josiah Gattle: If I may follow-up looking at page 2 of the Weiler proposal. I think we have some of the information that you are requesting this evening. Not pushing for a vote this evening, just looking at the demographic breakdown on PCA one and two, which are the two going from D1 to D2. Was there something that stood out to you on that page that was concerning to you specifically? Trying to understand your concerns and make sure we address them.

Kendall Moore: To me, it is very difficult to make a single change based upon the numerics. We may fix that, but the other implications all need to be measured and I think Mr. Weiler has gone through ad nauseum a variety so if you kind of look at his proposal, one, two, and three are all the same area of the County, those are all Rockledge Cocoa related changes that don't ultimately touch Viera or address any of these issues. Six, seven, and eight are on the other end of the spectrum. They all kind of work and live together as a group of changes and then four or five are kind of isolated in their own categories. And so, I just picked two as an example. But would like to better understand and ultimately as the Chairman said, Mr. Gattle, I am happy to live with the will of the committee. And absent that motion to table what would pass tonight. And so, they can thank me for coming back one more time. Ultimately, those three areas do bring about issues. We heard from Satellite Beach tonight you know, if I had been someone else, I would've been under the assumption that we might have gone forward to start at a base map. And work from the base map to have a progressive discussion. The will wasn't going in that direction. And I just expressed my own personal concern about not having an ability to have that discussion.

Josiah Gattle: Thank you very much.

Kendall Moore: You're welcome.

Steve Crisafulli: So basically, you're going to get additional data that basically addresses PCA 6 and PCA 7 otherwise it's the existing map. You're going to still need to put the information in play James for the existing map for everything else. But, you know, it'll be the changes for PCA 6 and PCA 7. Which that data is already here. But you know, it will all be on one piece of paper with one colorful picture. So, any other comments for the good of the committee before we adjourn? Yes ma'am?

Yvonne Minus: Mr. Mayor [laughter] I just want to say that the comments that were made earlier about my dear friend Mr. Steele and to everyone that I have no ill feelings. I love Jason. And yeah, just wanted to have that for the record. I have no ill feelings about anything. We agree to disagree with all of us. And you know, whatever it is I'm totally supporting the majority. But, you know, I love Jason so, you know, please don't.

Steve Crisafulli: Thank you. Well that's a good note to end on.

Jason Steele: Right back at ya.

Steve Crisafulli: So with that, the committee adjourns.

Abigail Jorandby: Wait a minute, do we have a vote?

John Weiler: On what?

Abigail Jorandby: On bringing it back to the next meeting?

Jason Steele: We don't need to have a vote.

Steve Crisafulli: We have the three proposals are still on the table we're just keeping our meeting schedule. With the three proposals are still on the table. But we gave James direction to bring back more data back.

Abigail Jorandby: I thought there was a motion by Mr. Fisher and Minus seconded it. That's what I have on Teresa, were you able to capture that? To bring back two maps.

Steve Crisafulli: I'm out of order, I resign from this position effective immediately. [laughter]

Abigail Jorandby: I believe Jim has the same notes as well.

Steve Crisafulli: Ok, so we didn't adjourn.

Abigail Jorandby: I wouldn't let you. [laughter]

Steve Crisafulli: So, we have a motion and a second by Miss Minus to bring the two maps back. But, the one map is already coming back, it hasn't changed. The other one is the data of the existing map as it is with the changes that PCA 6 and PCA 7 in a document such as this that James will distribute to the committee via electronic distribution as soon as you have that.

Abigail Jorandby: And I will review it per Ms. Hodgers request as well.

Steve Crisafulli: Okay, that is the motion. All in favor signify by saying yay. Opposed say nay. None.

Sue Schmitt: That is October 18th. Is that correct?

Steve Crisafulli: Yes, that is correct. That motion passes and with that, the committee is adjourned.

Yvonne Minus: Go Buccaneers. [laughter]

F. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned by Steve Crisafulli at 8:00pm
- b. Next meeting – Monday, October 18, 2021
- c. Attachments in separate file – Mapping Proposals