

BREVARD COUNTY REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

Committee members present were: Kendall Moore, Chair, District I; Maureen Rupe, District I; Robert Williams, District I; Roger Dobson, District II; Henry Minneboo, District II; Peter Fuscas, District III; James Rosasco, District III; Dave Pasley, District III; Sue Schmitt, District IV; Franck Kaiser, District IV; Matt Dupree, District V; Tres Holton, District V; and David Isnardi, District V.

Staff members present were: Mel Scott, Asst. County Manager; Scott Knox, County Attorney; Robin Sobrino, Director, Planning & Development Department; Dave Jordan, GIS Program Manager; and Candy Hanselman, Zoning Support Manager.

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Kendall Moore, at 5:35 p.m.

Kendall Moore asked for comments, concerns or questions regarding the minutes from the meeting held on September 14, 2011. There were none. Motion by Maureen Rupe, seconded by Dave Pasley, to approve the minutes from that meeting. The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes, as submitted.

Kendall Moore – As per our last meeting, we instructed the staff to return today with a map that is a graphical representation of where we ended, as per Mr. Isnardi's motion. You should have received a link, electronically. We do have maps today. I did make a Chairman's privilege call that I hope my conservative brethren in the room will agree. It took the staff ten hours, and lots of time and materials – and after ten hours of printing, we were only at five maps. So we opted that we could hold hands and share five maps, rather than print 15 maps, because we wanted them in the full size. So we have the full-size maps. I will ask Mel to pass those out. You should also have in front of you a memo, dated September 19th, from Mr. Knox's office – the County Attorney's Office. If you recall, there were two questions posed to Ms. Wilson, who was here for Mr. Knox at the last meeting, and they have provided a memo. Mr. Knox, any comments, or anything related to the memo, or just addressing questions?

Scott Knox – I'll address questions.

Kendall Moore – Does anyone have any question related to Mr. Knox's memo on the two issues of the rejection of the redistricting plan by the County Commission – and it had been a long time since I had read the decision from the court relative to Mr. Stone's case in '96, in the City of Cocoa.

There were no questions for Mr. Knox.

The committee took approximately 20 minutes to study the maps that had been produced to depict the district lines included in the motion made by David Isnardi at the last meeting. They were provided with a map of the entire county, and separate maps for each district.

Kendall Moore – Does anyone have any formal questions for staff? (no response) If there are no formal questions for staff, is there a motion, or some other procedural step that you'd like to take relative to the map, or maps, you have in front of you?

Robert Williams – Question, Mr. Chairman. At this point, are we looking at any possible changes?

Kendall Moore – The committee can make any requests, or suggestions, you (unintelligible).

Robert Williams – In District I, looking at the Exploration Park area, which is (unintelligible) part of District I, as opposed to being in District II.

James Rosasco – I would be very, very reluctant to give any more geographical area to District I. I have no idea what's coming down the pipe, and we're all sitting here making judgment calls of what's coming down the pipe. But I notice that Patrick Air Force Base, the housing they had down there in Satellite Beach, that went

from government to private, at one point. I don't think we want to start adding more land mass to District I. I'm quite comfortable with what we've done to that, as far as (unintelligible) and Cape Canaveral. I don't think we should deal with that, at all.

Sue Schmitt – At the last meeting, we kind of discussed that. And we said that we were going to leave the Federal property, right now, alone, and if the Commission itself wanted to look at something, as far as economic zones, or whatever the case may be, the County Commission can deal with that themselves, if they want to include, or amend, or something like that. And I think we need to just leave it as it is right now.

Roger Dobson – I like it the way it is. It's only about ten minutes from the Commissioner's Office. And I am opposed to redoing it.

Maureen Rupe – Let's be honest. The only thing I can see there is an opportunity to bring jobs to Brevard County, and that's one of our top priorities. Because if D-I, being CRA (unintelligible) economic zone, that would have the money for incentives for firms to come to Exploration Park.

Sue Schmitt - The only problem with that, Maureen, they would have to go back and amend the ordinance to include that into that area.

Maureen Rupe - Wouldn't it automatically...

Sue Schmitt – No, I don't think so. Mr. Knox...

Scott Knox – I think the ordinance says that the economic development district is coextensive with the boundaries of District I, up to a point. I think there's a cutoff (unintelligible).

Scott Knox – He says that the boundaries of the zone are coextensive with the boundaries of District I.

Maureen Rupe – What does that mean?

Scott Knox – It's the same. So, the same, except I think there's a cutoff where it stops. I'm thinking it's 528, I think, is where it is.

Maureen Rupe – So do you mean some of it's in District I? Is that what you meant?

Scott Knox – I mean anything north of 528 that's in District I is part of that...

Maureen Rupe – Does it end north of...

Scott Knox – I think it's 528.

Kendall Moore – So it's north of 528, and in District I?

Scott Knox – Right.

Sue Schmitt – In this case, it's (unintelligible), but it doesn't go (unintelligible), or they could not do an economic...

Maureen Rupe – Oh, I'm sorry, I get you. What you're trying to say is they could use their development in D-I for Exploration Park. Is that what you're saying? No.

David Isnardi – They could extend, through a change in the ordinance, to that portion of District...

Maureen Rupe – If we put it in District I, you mean?

David Isnardi – No. That's how I understand it.

Scott Knox – If it's north of 528, and in District I, then it's part of the economic development zone.

Kendall Moore – Could the boundaries of the zone be changed at a later date?

Scott Knox – Yes.

Kendall Moore – With significant difficulty, or is that done by a majority vote of the Commission?

Scott Knox – It's majority vote.

Robert Williams – Clarification, again. In terms of north of 528, and being part of District I, it qualifies for the economic zone. If we choose, as a committee, not to put that piece of land into District I - the option of the Commission, when we send them the maps, is to accept or reject. It would not be an opportunity for that Exploration Park to then go into the economic development zone. So it removes what opportunities may have been possible. That's my understanding (unintelligible).

Matt Dupree – You're right, except for the Commission can change the boundaries of that zone with a majority vote. They don't have to ride on district lines. They can incorporate that...

Several committee members spoke at once.

Kendall Moore – Wait a minute. Mr. Knox.

Scott Knox – I would not jump to that conclusion. That was a District I zone, created for District I. It did not include District II.

Kendall Moore – I'm not speaking as the Chair. I'm speaking as myself. I think Mr. Rosasco has said it. There's some things that shouldn't creep into the process. But I think we do miss out on a grand opportunity that there are dollars available through that particular zone that can be used for that specific parcel, with no population being associated with it. I know we've had that debate, and that's why I said, in agreement with Mr. Rosasco, (unintelligible) Scott, I was feeling okay, until you said you said you wouldn't – is it just subject to the vote, or are there more procedural hurdles to accomplish that?

Scott Knox – I think it was just the way it was created, initially. It was designed to be a District I phenomenon. The other Commissioners went along with it because of that. Whether they would change that, or not, I don't know.

Peter Fusscas – It would seem to me that the possibility of moving it is not germane to our charge. You're talking about economic development, and we're talking about - we're drawing districts on a basis of population. Since it's Federal land, there's no population to move. So it's just not germane.

Maureen Rupe – That's right. I guess I was just thinking of our County, something we could do. We're in a terrible situation.

Matt Dupree - Is there a reason that the District II Commissioner couldn't apply for the same monies?

Kendall Moore – I would think, when you look at the structure of the district, and the gross increment that will come with the planned new construction in D-I, that becomes the fundamental funder for the zone. I don't know that that could be created in D-II.

Franck Kaiser – We're complying with our directives with the straight line we have here at NASA Causeway, number one. Number two, that could be confused, even though there's no population, as kind of a gerrymandering issue.

Kendall Moore – Whoa, don't use that word.

Franck Kaiser – All right, strike that. O.K., it's not gerrymandering. There's no population involved, is what I'm saying. But I'm saying that you're manipulating for another purpose, whether it's economic, or whatever, and that's not what our charge is.

Sue Schmitt – Like Franck just said, we're not supposed to do it for economic reasons, just population.

Maureen Rupe – I've heard things here that strike me the same way. So you're absolutely right.

Kendall Moore – Mr. Rosasco, and then Mr. Williams.

James Rosasco – I'll let Mr. Williams go first.

Robert Williams – No, no, go ahead.

James Rosasco – Well, I'm going to move that we approve this thing we have on the drawing board now.

Kendall Moore – Mr. Williams, he deferred to you because he was going to make a motion on the existing map. So I think that's why he was deferring to you.

Robert Williams – I think I understand the reason, et cetera and so forth, to draw districts based on the population. I think we would be very myopic if we did not look at the implications of our work. What we do here tonight is going to be with us for the next ten years. The County is at a point, particularly the north part of the County, is at a point where we need to take advantage of every opportunity to increase jobs in this County. And for us to be myopic as to say our charge is just this, and I can't look (unintelligible), I think we kind of defeat our purpose. I think you have to broaden your scope and look at the big picture, as they say, and not at just the small picture.

David Isnardi – Real quick comment on that. In theory, I agree with what you said. In theory, I absolute agree. I do not particularly care for these economic development areas. I personally don't agree with those. But if it's there, I think you're right. It's a shame not to incorporate that part of the Cape, because that puts 100 percent of the Cape under one thing, and one representative. (noise interference on the sound system). You understand what I'm saying. Like I said, I don't agree, necessarily, with these economic developments. I don't. I think it's dog eat dog. And what money they raise for their community, they (unintelligible). But I think we need to put the Cape under one Commissioner, and I've always thought that. I thought it was wrong to have two and three Commissioners (unintelligible). We need one face to represent the (unintelligible).

Dave Pasley – Can anyone in this room show me one economic development zone, anywhere in the United States, that works?

Several committee members spoke at once.

Sue Schmitt – I'd like to ask either Mr. Knox or Mr. Scott a question. When the District II CRA, the North Merritt Island, was extended, do you by any chance know how far north that was extended?

Robin Sobrino – I believe that it only goes up to 528, the Beach Line.

Sue Schmitt – So that's already been extended once, but it doesn't have the possibility of being extended north of that point. Is that correct? Somebody? Or it could just be...

Several committee members, and staff, spoke at once.

Mel Scott – In any regard, MIRA is still squarely within the confines of the revised District II. Is that one of your questions, Sue, the implications of MIRA extending, expanded, out of District II?

Sue Schmitt – No. I mean, (unintelligible) extended on the south and on the north. And I guess you're saying it went up to 528. But if MIRA wanted to expand again, they could expand, just along North Courtenay, up to that area. Correct?

Mel Scott – That's correct.

Sue Schmitt – So you have an avenue to bring that (unintelligible), and things with it, if you want to. If you don't want to, then that's up to you.

James Rosasco – I'm not going to be nice anymore. I want to talk, make a motion. Let's get on with the program. I make a motion we approve the drawing presented to us.

Kendall Moore – We have a motion by Mr. Rosasco. I saw Mr. Dobson raise his hand. Was that a second?

Roger Dobson – Second.

Kendall Moore - Second by Mr. Dobson. Discussion? Mr. Fuscas.

Peter Fuscas – Parliamentary inquiry. We're voting to approve this as the plan. Is that correct?

Kendall Moore – Was that the intent of your motion, Mr. Rosasco?

James Rosasco - Yes, it is. I am making a motion this is the plan we forward to the County Commissioners for approval.

Peter Fuscas – I'd like to comment. It seems that the only criteria for redistricting a district is population. Amendments Five and Six to the Florida Constitution, approved by Florida voters by referendum, stipulated other considerations for Federal and State districts. I believe that separation of Indialantic from Melbourne Beach is a violation of those amendments. Further, the issue of continuity, notwithstanding a Supreme Court opinion that you can always swim or boat across the body of water, is fairly unrealistic in modern times. It also begs the issue. It may not be possible, or practical, for a Commissioner to swim or boat across the water. But, be that as it may, the issue is 3,000 in population. It's fairly insignificant in terms of the entire district with 43,000 people, but it's the principle of the thing. And for that reason, I will oppose this plan.

David Isnardi – I totally appreciate where you're coming from on that. I totally do. But for the criteria we agreed to when we first came on board here was to ensure that we maintained the integrity of some of our city lines... (some of Mr. Isnardi's remarks are unintelligible due to noise interference on the south system). These

are some of the other criteria that were there. So, keeping that in mind, I feel very, very comfortable with what happened. The body of water shouldn't be a determining factor as to whether or not you have access to your district or not. It clearly says it. The majority said it several times. I have to drive – Andy has to drive out of his district into District III to get to his office. And we have no choice but to do it. There's no other way to do it, not yet, until we get Parkway. That's a whole different argument. But the point I'm trying to make is, it's not the end of the world that Commissioner Infantini has to drive through that much (showed a small space between his fingers) of District V to get to her office. And my office is right across the street from our line. So I think, with that in mind, I think District III was moved the least of all the other Commissioners. She was actually moved the least amount of variation. I was looking at all the precincts that we moved today from District V, and it was all over the map. District IV, all over the map. District II, all over the map. District I, the same way. District III was the least one affected. Now, I don't begrudge you guys because of that. I'm just saying it's a give and take. Believe me, I didn't want any more of Palm Bay. I'll be the first to tell you guys I did not want any more of Palm Bay. I thought it was well represented. And I fought you guys on it, but I lost. I lost that little bit. But that's okay. We'll just have to work (unintelligible) to our new constituents down there, if this gets approved, just as we will with our new constituents in Indialantic. But the point is, is I think, through this whole thing, we did a good job. We argued. We were passionate about our stances. But I think, at the end of the day, we can step back and look at it and say, "You know what, I lost some, and I've won some." And, to me, the winner here is Brevard County. It's not one district over another. It's all the people of Brevard County. So my respect to all of you guys, especially Jim over there who is as impassioned as I am about the stances that we take, things like that. Pete, same thing. That's all I had to say.

Maureen Rupe – Well, you know, after I learned about the Five and Six, I don't think, Scott, anything's changed in these ten years to the criteria for redistricting in the counties, has it?

Scott Knox – Not that I know of.

Mel Scott – This board adopted six criteria to follow for redistricting, not one. There were six guidelines adopted by this body.

Maureen Rupe – O.K. So it means that the County Commissioners can adopt what criteria they would like, and leave some out. I was going through – I got out all the old papers from ten years ago, and our consultant at that time, in a presentation, said, "Is there enough (unintelligible,") - things we were to look out for to avoid a lawsuit - "(unintelligible) in population to create a minority community, or communities of interest. And when identifying other communities of interest, the committee should take into consideration preserving neighborhoods, avoid splitting cities, recognizing significant natural and manmade boundaries like I-95, and be compact, as well as avoiding splitting precincts." Have we done that? Have we done everything that was down there? We have? We've looked at the minorities, have we, in the different precincts?

Kendall Moore – I won't go on the record as being the arbiter for that, although I've got an opinion.

Maureen Rupe – Well, I don't know where we've done all that. I honestly don't.

Sue Schmitt – Did that not come out on the whole information that you gave us, with the population of the African-American, Hispanic, and other percentages for each district? Wasn't that on there?

Mel Scott – We had an initial presentation that we went over, generally speaking, the new Census data. And we discussed whether or not we were able to, in the following ten years of growth and diversity, if a neighborhood had grown to the point where it could, in and of itself, be a district close to 108,000 people, that would give it a minority/majority. And what I read into the record was an analysis, that was in the Florida Today, that did not identify an appreciable increase in minority populations such that a minority/majority could be accomplished.

Maureen Rupe – I just still feel that enough information has not gone out to the public about these meetings for people to have that input. I really don't. Because this is a very important committee. And the only way I've seen it advertised has been on the County website, nothing else. And, last time, we had bunches of people.

Sue Schmitt – Maybe they have other things to do (unintelligible).

Maureen Rupe – Well, maybe. That's okay. But it was just a concern of mine as to whether we...

Franck Kaiser – And I appreciate your concern. And based on what we had reported at the beginning, I don't think there was a reason for concern in that area. But as far as the advertising is concerned, I know we've met the legal requirements. And I think that the review by the County Commission is part of the process with the public input. If they chose not to come here, they can come there. So I don't know that we could (unintelligible) any more than we have, because it wasn't – I think the administration did what they were supposed to do. It wasn't up to us.

Mel Scott – I'll give you an example. The African-American population in Brevard County went from 8.4 percent to 10 percent in the last ten years.

Sue Schmitt – That's scattered over 72 miles. Is that correct?

Mel Scott – The highest concentration points are Palm Bay and Cocoa. The Hispanic population doubled in the past decade, reached 43,900 people, but in the same general area of the current district. So if we're to take the entire doubling of the Hispanic population that occurred primarily in the Palm Bay area. and if you were to seek to have that be a district, it would be 50 percent below the total population that a district would need to be nearly equal in population to the other four.

Maureen Rupe – I can just see – and I know it's been ten years – a vast difference on how that was run and how we conducted this one. That's all, you know. And it is a big difference. You were there, Mel, and I'm sure you can see it.

Mel Scott – There were three or four more people that attended ten years ago.

Maureen Rupe – What, Mel?

Mel Scott – A little bit more people attended, as far as ten years ago.

Maureen Rupe – A little bit more? Well, there was a difference without any consultants, too, a great deal of difference.

Mel Scott – I think you got great service here, from what I can tell, as far as an administrative support function.

Sue Schmitt – Yes. Hear, hear, Dave and Robin.

Maureen Rupe – Well, I've worked with you long enough to know when you're kind of being told (unintelligible) questions (unintelligible). I've been on your boards and committees.

Peter Fuscas – Reasonable people can differ. And I fully appreciate where you're all coming from. But as Ms. Rupe said, there are other criteria. And splitting up a neighborhood that's been together for so long, and it's only 3,000 population – I mean, we should have – as a body, we should have been able to take care of

that. But we didn't. So, again, it's not big in terms of the entire thing. It's just a matter of principle, and I'm a man of principle.

Kendall Moore – Other discussion? Seeing none – and for the matter of the record, we've been asked to – when you raise your right hand, we're going to go through and call the names, so that on the final vote, who voted yea and nay can be appropriately recorded. There was a question relative to our minutes. As we have gone through the process, you have the votes in terms of numbers, but not names as to record who voted how. And that was a request relative to this vote.

A roll call vote was taken. The motion was passed with a vote of 10:3. Those members voting in favor of the motion were Kendall Moore, Maureen Rupe, Henry Minneboo, Dave Pasley, Sue Schmitt, Franck Kaiser, Tres Holton, Dave Isnardi, Matt Dupree, and Roger Dobson. Those voting against the motion were Robert Williams, Peter Fusscas, James Rosasco.

Kendall Moore – The motion passed by a vote of 10:3. We now have what we can deem as the final map, but there are a couple of procedural issues that we need to deal with to give staff appropriate direction to move forward. I was going to try to list them for you, but I'm going to turn it over to you, Mr. Scott.

Mel Scott – The last time we got together, we highlighted a stretch of Eau Gallie on the beachside. And the committee was looking at the data and arriving at a point of satisfaction, from its perspective, as it related to those numbers. But the fine detail of the lines there, as they were drawn, that gave you the numbers that you were pleased with, actually has this jag, and I'm going to refer to it as an alligator tooth breakup of the Eau Gallie Boulevard. So what we have on the record is a clear intent from this committee to snap the line to Eau Gallie. But when you were considering the numbers, there were data sets that were included in the numbers that you were happy with, that were north of Eau Gallie. Is everybody clear what the problem is that I've identified? So, if it's the pleasure of this committee, we would like you to ratify the uniform shifting of that district boundary along Eau Gallie, bringing the pink highlighted parcels that are north into the north district, and the pink highlighted – and that's all I needed to say.

Kendall Moore – Let me see if I can explain it differently, because then I would have to take the (unintelligible), rather than you. We have drawn boundary lines. And the next step for the Commission is that this map has to go to the Public Works Department for them to do a legal description of the vote that we just took. In order for staff to complete that legal description, we have lines that exist, and I think staff has identified – and you may just want to pull out the big map now – but there are a few of them that it is unclear as to whether the line is drawn north, south, or down the middle of the road. And relative to that, there are a few options. You, generally speaking, can leave that to staff, where they are trying to decide, generally, what we meant, which I think not many of us will have a desire to do, because it is then staff decision, and not this board's direction, relative to what that line actually means. There are how many of those, Mel, that Public Works has identified, where you have a concern of clarity?

Mel Scott – About ten. There are about ten roads.

Kendall Moore – So does everybody understand what it means? So, if we use Eau Gallie as an example, is that line drawn on the north side of Eau Gallie, that both sides are included? Is it drawn down the middle of the road? Or is it on the south side of Eau Gallie?

Mel Scott – I will share with you, as it relates to Eau Gallie, it's not a concern whether it's down the middle, on one side or the other. We just need to not have that district breaking into the north side of Eau Gallie. That would be counter to the direction that you gave.

Sue Schmitt - I make a motion that we authorize the line to be straight across Eau Gallie Boulevard.

David Isnardi – I second.

Robert Williams – Point of order.

Kendall Moore – We've got a point of order by Mr. Williams.

Robert Williams – In terms of procedure, if there are nine or ten of these that we have to consider, shouldn't this have come before we voted on the thing?

Maureen Rupe – Yes, I think so, too.

Henry Minneboo – No.

Kendall Moore – Do you have a professional opinion on that, Mr. Scott, relative to that question?

Mel Scott – Yes, I do, because with the exception of this Eau Gallie line, every other decision that you would make would have zero population at that location. It would not impact population distribution. It's just whether or not – for instance, Parkway, whether or not that district boundary is the double yellow line in the middle of the asphalt, or snaps to one boundary on one side of the road, or the other side of the road.

Kendall Moore – And maybe I was under the impression that – that'll be my thought – that they were all zero, and so I would have been incorrect.

Mel Scott – Except for this one. They're all zero, except for this one.

David Isnardi – What are the numbers on here?

Dave Jordan – As best I can tell, there's about ten.

Mel Scott – We (unintelligible) on our own. We just needed this committee to do it. These are businesses, primarily, but you wanted the Eau Gallie Boulevard to...

Dave Jordan – I would say there's less than 50.

Kendall Moore – Other than the point of order, I need to recognize Ms. Schmitt for the motion, first. And then if there's discussion points on that, we'll go back to that. Ms. Schmitt.

Sue Schmitt – I made a motion that we draw a line straight across Eau Gallie Boulevard. And I think Dave seconded it.

David Isnardi – I did.

Kendall Moore – Second by Mr. Isnardi. Discussion? Mr. Rosasco.

James Rosasco – My only question is, is this going to split up precincts?

Dave Jordan – It appears there's going to be a split in precincts in a couple areas that, to the best of my knowledge here, there's zero population affected by the change in the precinct lines. For example, up here on the screen, I'm looking at 66.02 Precinct, and it crossed Eau Gallie Boulevard. On the north side of Eau Gallie

Boulevard, I'm seeing zero population. And the same extends over here, where Precinct 104.01 extends north of Eau Gallie into this pocket, for some reason. But my numbers are showing zero population affected.

James Rosasco – A follow-up question then. Who determines the precincts? Is that something the Supervisor of Elections would move that around? Or who actually does that? Because that seems like a fairly simple fix.

Scott Knox – It's the County Commission and the Supervisor together.

James Rosasco – Together? Well, if they want to, they can clean it up.

Franck Kaiser – Speaking to the motion, seeing as I don't see population involved there, I don't have any opposition to snapping it to the line, which was one of our criteria.

Henry Minneboo – I'm extremely adamant to allow the staff to make these adjustments. I made them for 30 years. And let me tell you something. It gives them some flexibility. And, to you all, it sounds maybe of major magnitude, but when you're defining and describing a piece of property on that line, it's so essential if you're on the north side of that property, or the south side of that property.

James Rosasco – If there's a sewer line running down the middle of the street, you've got to know which district it's in.

Henry Minneboo – Something as miniscule as a stop sign or a speed limit sign can cause you two hours worth of work.

Robert Williams – Are you amending the motion?

Henry Minneboo – I didn't get in on the motion. I just...

Several committee members spoke at once.

Sue Schmitt – I think you can do another one for the rest of them.

Henry Minneboo – If staff can clean this thing up - there's no adjustments in bodies. They need some flexibility and latitude to accomplish a goal to make them perfect.

Kendall Moore – Further discussion? Seeing none, do we need to call the roll, Mr. Rosasco?

James Rosasco – I think we should.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

Kendall Moore – That just deals with Eau Gallie. You have the remainder. That was only related to that one.

David Isnardi – I thought the motion also included to adjust all the other...

Several committee members responded that the motion had been for only the Eau Gallie Causeway.

David Isnardi – I will make motion so that staff has the ability to go in and clean up all these little messes.

Robert Williams – Make the technical adjustments.

David Isnardi – Make the technical adjustments.

Henry Minneboo – I'll second that.

Kendall Moore – Motion by Mr. Isnardi to give staff the power to go in to make the necessary – can we denote how many? Or do you want to leave it open for them? Mel, is there a number, or just say...

Several committee members spoke at once.

Kendall Moore – Motion by Mr. Isnardi. Second by Mr. Minneboo. Discussion? (There was no discussion)

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

Kendall Moore – Mr. Scott, is there anything else, technically, from the staff that needs to be addressed?

Mel Scott – No, thank you.

Sue Schmitt – Can I ask if staff the staff could put together something that we (unintelligible due to noise in the room) new proposed districts?

Kendall Moore – Robin, did you get that?

Robin Sobrino – No. Are you asking for another electronic copy of the map of the whole County?

Sue Schmitt – Just the new proposed districts, with colors for each district.

Robin Moore – And he (Dave Jordan) said O.K.?

Sue Schmitt – Yes.

Robin Sobrino – He knows.

Dave Jordan – Simple enough.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 p.m.