FINAL REPORT OF THE CITIZENS REDISTRICTING ADVISORY BOARD

NOVEMBER 10, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices:

I. Role of the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board

The role of the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board ("Advisory Board"), as outlined in Section 2-2414 of the County Code, is to assist the Board of County Commissioners in drafting a redistricting plan that meets the redistricting criteria and factors outlined in Resolution No. R-511-04 (Appendix 1) and any other criteria required by law. The Advisory Board is charged with participating in the public outreach process and providing a written report to the Board of County Commissioners containing its recommendation and comments on each draft plan and/or report. The Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board is comprised of the following appointees:

Member Name	Commission District Represented:
Kenasha Paul	District 1: Oliver Gilbert
Vanessa Joseph	District 2: Jean Monestime
William R. Perry, III	District 3: Keon Hardemon
Phyllis S. Smith	District 4: Sally A. Heyman
Justin A. Klecha	District 5: Eileen Higgins
Natalie Milian	District 6: Rebeca Sosa
Roland Sanchez-Medina	District 7: Raquel Regalado
Juan-Carlos Planas	District 8: Danielle Cohen Higgins
Dennis C. Moss	District 9: Kionne McGhee
Vacant	District 10: Javier D. Souto
Vacant	District 11: Joe A. Martinez
Max Losner	District 12: Jose "Pepe" Diaz
Joshua Dieguez	District 13: Rene Garcia

II. Recommendations of the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board

As required by Article CLXIII of the County Code, the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board hereby submits this written report containing its recommendations and comments on each plan. These recommendations are made following consideration of input received at the community outreach meetings (as summarized in Section IV of this report), the Bloc Voting Analysis provided by the Consultant (Appendix 2), data and analysis provided by the Consultant for each draft map, the redistricting criteria contained in Resolution No. R-511-04, and applicable federal, state and local laws. Following are the final recommendations of the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board:

Proposed Redistricting Map:

The Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board recommends the following amendments to Map 3 dated November 9, 2021 which are described below and depicted on Map 3A in Appendix 3 of this report:

Motion #1 - Motion to follow the current District 1 and District 2 boundaries in the following areas: 1) areas within the City of Opa-locka; and 2) the area east of NW 2nd Avenue and west of I-95.

It was offered by Board Member Paul, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Dieguez and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Motion #2 - Motion to move the area bounded on the east by Biscayne Boulevard, on the north by NE 9th Street, on the south by NE 5th Street, and on the west by NE 2nd Avenue from District 3 to District 5.

It was offered by Board Member Klecha, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Planas and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Nay

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Nay	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Nay	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Motion #3 - Motion to move 1) the Hialeah Racetrack and area extending north to West 34th Street to District 13; 2) the area bounded on the west by West 4th Avenue, on the east by Palm Avenue, and on the north by West 34th Street to District 6; and 3) the area bounded on the west by East 4th Avenue, on the east by the current District 2 Commission District boundary, and on the north by East 25th Street to District 6.

It was offered by Board Member Milian, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Dieguez and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Motion #4 - Motion to move the area bounded on the west by East 4th Avenue, on the east by East 11th Avenue, and on the north by East 32nd Street from District 13 to District 6.

It was offered by Board Member Milian, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Smith and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Motion #5 - Motion to move the area located south of SW 152nd Street between SW 147th Avenue and SW 157th Avenue from District 11 to District 9 and move the "Las Palmas" residential area and surrounding area generally bounded on the north by SW 104th Street, on the west by SW 221st Avenue, on the south by SW 168th Street and extending east to Krome Avenue from District 9 to District 11.

It was offered by Chairman Moss, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Smith and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Motion #6 - Motion to modify Motion #1 to move the area between the current District 1 boundary and Burlington Street, north of the Opa Locka canal, as well as the area extending south of Burlington Street to Wilmington Street, west by Ahmed Street from District 2 to District 1.

It was offered by Board Member Joseph, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Paul and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Motion #7 - The Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board moves to adopt Map 3 with the aforementioned amendments which shall be identified as Map 3A and attached to this report as Appendix 3.

It was offered by Vice-Chairman Planas, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Losner and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

Other Recommendations:

Section III of this report details demographic changes experienced within Miami-Dade County between the 2010 and 2020 Census. Notable among the changes is the sharp decline of Non-Hispanic Black population. While District 3 experienced the steepest decline in Black population, Districts 1, 2 and 9 also lost Black population. In fact, this decline has reduced the number of districts with a Black majority from two to one, with District 2 only maintaining a majority by a slim margin. Diversity in the County's population is important for its overall economic vitality and for maintaining its image as a multi-cultural community. As the County strives to maintain diversity, it is important to understand the underlying causes of these demographic shifts and whether interventions should be considered to stem the loss of diversity in the County. To that end, it is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners work with communities that have experienced a significant loss of minority population to understand the reasons for the loss and consider whether policy interventions should be considered to prevent the further loss of minority population, with particular focus on ensuring that minority populations are maintained in significant enough concentrations to effect desired changes in their community.

Motion #8 - The Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board moves to adopt this final report with the aforementioned recommendations.

It was offered by Vice-Chairman Planas, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Board Member Smith and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman Aye

Juan-Carlos Planas, Vice-Chairman Aye

Joshua Dieguez	Aye	Vanessa Joseph	Aye
Justin A. Klecha	Aye	Max Losner	Aye
Natalie Milian	Aye	Kenasha Paul	Aye
William R. Perry, III	Aye	Roland Sanchez-Medina	Aye

Phyllis S. Smith Aye

III. Population and Demographic Changes

The population in Miami-Dade County grew by 205,332 people between the 2010 and 2020 Census. As depicted in Table 1 below, all Districts had positive population growth except for District 13 which experienced a decline in population. The most significant growth occurred in Districts 8, 9 and 12. As depicted on Table 2, Miami-Dade County has seen overall growth in Hispanic population and a decline in Non-Hispanic Black and Non-Hispanic White population from 2010 to 2020. The decline in Black population has been most significant in District 3 where the population declined by 17,207 persons.

Table 1: Population Change by District

District	Change in Population (2010 to 2020)
District 1	13,184
District 2	718
District 3	18,369
District 4	13,395
District 5	18,893
District 6	183
District 7	16,223
District 8	43,370
District 9	31,826
District 10	3,739
District 11	15,503
District 12	34,090
District 13	-4,161
Total Change	**205,332**

Table 2: Population and Demographic Changes by District (2010 to 2020)

District 1	Oliver Gilbert				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	196,915		183,731		13,184
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-10,913	-5.25%	-8,302	-4.32%	
Hispanic	87,524	44.45%	65,088	35.43%	22,436
NHWhite	9,508	4.83%	10,328	5.62%	-820
NHBlack	93,251	47.36%	103,838	56.52%	-10,587
NHAIAN	159	0.08%	238	0.12%	-79
NHAsian	2,109	1.07%	1,810	0.99%	299
NHOPI	26	0.01%	36	0.02%	-10
NHOther	1,215	0.62%	397	0.22%	818
NH2+Race	3,123	1.59%	1,996	1.92%	1,127
	196,915		183,731		13,184

District 2	Jean Monestime				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	183,911		183,193		718
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-23,917	-11.51%	-8,840	-4.60%	
Hispanic	71,622	38.94%	60,646	33.10%	10,976
NHWhite	8,102	4.41%	9,316	5.09%	-1,214
NHBlack	98,320	53.46%	107,999	58.95%	-9,679
NHAIAN	153	0.07%	266	0.14%	-113
NHAsian	1,797	0.98%	1,859	1.01%	-62
NHOPI	26	0.01%	60	0.03%	-34
NHOther	1,043	0.57%	380	0.21%	663
NH2+Race	2,848	2.90%	2,667	2.47%	181
	183,911		183,193		718

District 3	Keon Hardemon				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	202,030		183,661		18,369
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-5,798	-2.79%	-8,372	-4.36%	
Hispanic	98,201	48.61%	71,533	38.95%	26,668
NHWhite	24,815	12.28%	19,686	10.72%	5,129
NHBlack	70,510	34.90%	87,717	47.76%	-17,207
NHAIAN	172	0.08%	303	0.16%	-131
NHAsian	2,475	1.23%	1,667	0.91%	808
NHOPI	29	0.01%	37	0.02%	-8
NHOther	1,299	0.64%	395	0.22%	904
NH2+Race	4,529	6.42%	2,323	2.65%	2,206
	202,030		183,661		18,369

District 4	Sally Heyman				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	198,409		185,014		13,395
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-9,419	-4.53%	-7,019	-3.66%	
Hispanic	91,549	46.14%	81,343	43.97%	10,206
NHWhite	79,204	39.92%	80,378	43.44%	-1,174
NHBlack	13,862	6.99%	16,478	8.91%	-2,616
NHAIAN	158	0.08%	173	0.09%	-15
NHAsian	4,330	2.18%	3,898	2.11%	432
NHOPI	31	0.02%	51	0.03%	-20
NHOther	1,813	0.91%	605	0.33%	1,208
NH2+Race	7,462	3.76%	2,088	12.67%	5,374
	198,409		185,014		13,395

Table 2: Population and Demographic Changes by District (2010 to 2020)

District 5	Eileen Higgins				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population+A2A23:A35	220,370		201,477		18,893
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	12,542	6.03%	9,444	4.92%	
Hispanic	159,562	72.41%	155,734	77.30%	3,828
NHWhite	45,276	20.55%	37,676	18.70%	7,600
NHBlack	4,624	2.10%	3,690	1.83%	934
NHAIAN	124	0.06%	166	0.09%	-42
NHAsian	3,733	1.69%	2,536	1.26%	1,197
NHOPI	21	0.01%	30	0.01%	-9
NHOther	1,606	0.73%	460	0.23%	1,146
NH2+Race	5,424	2.46%	1,185	32.11%	4,239
	220,370		201,477		18,893

District 6	Rebecca Sosa				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	188,314		188,131		183
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-19,514	-9.39%	-3,902	-2.03%	
Hispanic	167,306	88.84%	167,101	88.82%	205
NHWhite	16,377	8.70%	18,150	9.65%	-1,773
NHBlack	1,188	0.63%	1,013	0.54%	175
NHAIAN	63	0.03%	64	0.03%	-1
NHAsian	1,523	0.81%	1,266	0.67%	257
NHOPI	16	0.01%	3	0.00%	13
NHOther	494	0.26%	135	0.07%	359
NH2+Race	1,347	0.72%	399	0.21%	948
	188,314		188,131		183

District 7	Raquel A. Regalado				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	217,331		201,108		16,223
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	9,503	4.57%	9,075	4.73%	
Hispanic	140,289	64.55%	119,104	59.22%	21,185
NHWhite	55,688	25.62%	65,467	32.55%	-9,779
NHBlack	8,508	3.91%	8,856	4.40%	-348
NHAIAN	107	0.05%	98	0.05%	9
NHAsian	5,740	2.64%	5,286	2.63%	454
NHOPI	56	0.03%	38	0.02%	18
NHOther	1,381	0.64%	469	0.23%	912
NH2+Race	5,562	2.56%	1,790	20.21%	3,772
	217,331		201,108		16,223

District 8	Danielle Cohen Higgins				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	244,849		201,479		43,370
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	37,021	17.81%	9,446	4.92%	
Hispanic	165,936	67.77%	118,160	58.65%	47,776
NHWhite	44,217	18.06%	53,507	26.56%	-9,290
NHBlack	22,917	9.36%	22,283	11.06%	634
NHAIAN	169	0.08%	196	0.10%	-27
NHAsian	4,961	2.03%	4,196	2.08%	765
NHOPI	69	0.03%	128	0.06%	-59
NHOther	1,418	0.58%	595	0.30%	823
NH2+Race	5,162	2.11%	2,414	10.83%	2,748
			201,479		43,370

Table 2: Population and Demographic Changes by District (2010 to 2020)

District 9	Kionne L. McGhee				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	232,225		200,399		31,826
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	24,397	11.74%	8,366	4.36%	
Hispanic	153,792	66.23%	116,068	57.92%	37,724
NHWhite	18,712	8.06%	21,325	10.64%	-2,613
NHBlack	51,363	22.12%	56,470	28.18%	-5,107
NHAIAN	183	0.08%	230	0.12%	-47
NHAsian	3,296	1.42%	3,229	1.61%	67
NHOPI	27	0.01%	51	0.03%	-24
NHOther	1,359	0.59%	614	0.31%	745
NH2+Race	3,493	1.50%	2,412	4.27%	1,081
	232,225		200,399		31,826

District 10	Sen. Javier D. Souto				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	194,496		190,757		3,739
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-13,332	-6.41%	-1,276	-0.66%	
Hispanic	172,587	88.74%	166,999	87.55%	5,588
NHWhite	15,893	8.17%	19,470	10.21%	-3,577
NHBlack	1,378	0.71%	1,463	0.77%	-85
NHAIAN	43	0.02%	47	0.02%	-4
NHAsian	2,595	1.33%	2,060	1.08%	535
NHOPI	22	0.01%	2	0.00%	20
NHOther	514	0.26%	182	0.10%	332
NH2+Race	1,464	0.75%	534	36.50%	930
	194,496		190,757		3,739

District 11	Joe A. Martinez				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	215,785		200,282		15,503
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	7,957	3.83%	8,249	4.30%	
Hispanic	183,518	85.05%	166,216	82.99%	17,302
NHWhite	17,510	8.11%	21,015	10.49%	-3,505
NHBlack	6,713	3.11%	7,217	3.60%	-504
NHAIAN	114	0.05%	121	0.06%	-7
NHAsian	4,535	2.10%	3,994	1.99%	541
NHOPI	34	0.02%	22	0.01%	12
NHOther	990	0.46%	347	0.17%	643
NH2+Race	2,371	1.10%	1,350	18.71%	1,021
	215,785		200,282		15,503

District 12	Jose "Pepe" Diaz				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	224,879		190,789		34,090
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	17,051	8.20%	-1,244	-0.65%	
Hispanic	199,380	88.66%	169,483	88.83%	29,897
NHWhite	15,513	6.90%	14,043	7.36%	1,470
NHBlack	3,019	1.34%	4,024	2.11%	-1,005
NHAIAN	104	0.05%	52	0.03%	52
NHAsian	3,354	1.49%	2,473	1.30%	881
NHOPI	15	0.01%	4	0.00%	11
NHOther	954	0.42%	2,018	1.06%	-1,064
NH2+Race	2,540	1.13%	-1,308	-32.50%	3,848
	224,879		190,789		34,090

Table 2: Population and Demographic Changes by District (2010 to 2020)

District 13	René Garcia				Gain/Loss
	2020		2010		
Population	182,253		186,414		-4,161
Optimum	207,828		192,033		15,795
Deviation	-25,575	-12.31%	-5,619	-2.93%	
Hispanic	165,672	90.90%	166,384	89.26%	-712
NHWhite	10,702	5.87%	13,190	7.08%	-2,488
NHBlack	3,103	1.70%	4,602	2.47%	-1,499
NHAIAN	40	0.02%	60	0.03%	-20
NHAsian	1,224	0.67%	1,567	0.84%	-343
NHOPI	13	0.01%	6	0.00%	7
NHOther	581	0.32%	166	0.09%	415
NH2+Race	918	0.50%	439	9.54%	479
	182,253		186,414		-4,161

IV. Public Input Summary

Seventeen community outreach meetings were held to inform the public about the redistricting effort and elicit input. Comments received through the public outreach meetings are summarized below. In addition, the County established a webpage to keep the public apprised of the process. The website also provided an opportunity for the public to submit comments by email. Public comment submitted by email are included below.

District 1 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/30/2021 at 1:30 p.m.
Location: North Dade Regional Library

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: District 1 Commissioner Oliver Gilbert, Akeem Brutus (District 1), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Phyllis Smith, Justin Klecha, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 1:35 p.m. and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the redistricting effort.

Commissioner Gilbert addressed the community and thanked them for being present. He emphasized that this is a very important activity both politically and for the community as a whole as redistricting can shape a districts economic growth and representation for the next 10 years.

Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 1, as depicted in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked the participants and noted the high attendance at the meeting.

Ms. Brown recognized the Mayor of Opa-locka who was present at the meeting.

The floor was opened for public comments

A member of the public asked who the District 1 representative is on the CRAB. Commissioner Gilbert confirmed that it is Kenasha Paul.

A member of the public asked why the District 1 boundaries are proposed to move west, asserting that it would dilute the Non-Hispanic Black population. He questioned why the boundaries were not instead proposed to move east. This concern was echoed by another member of the public that expressed concerns that the proposed map would increase the Hispanic population within District 1 and dilute the Non-Hispanic Black population. Ms. Mathur said the lines were drawn with a focus on the demographic make-up. She noted that low population in District 4 complicates our ability to move east.

Commissioner Gilbert expressed that all of Opa-locka should be in District 1. He indicated that this is his priority.

In response to a question from the public regarding the Non-Hispanic Black population, Ms. Brown expressed that overall, the Non-Hispanic Black population has reduced in the county. Ms. Mathur provided the Countywide demographic data.

Matthew Pigatt, Mayor of Opa-locka, reiterated the prior question about why the District was not extended to the east, particularly in the area of 183rd Street. Priti responded by saying that there was Jewish community in those areas and they want to stay together in District 4.

Commissioner Gilbert reiterated that he was available to hear the input of the residents and noted that he is the sponsor of the redistricting ordinance.

A member of the public raised concern about the taxable value of the proposed areas that were included in District 1.

Commissioner Gilbert expressed that he does not think the boundaries of District 1 should go west. He further expressed that he understood the limitations about district 2 and 4 and how any changes will affect their districts. He indicated that he is mindful of not diluting Black representation in District 2. He also noted that there has been an increase in Hispanic population in Opa-locka and Miami Gardens.

Phyllis Smith, District 4 appointee to the CRAB, expressed that District 4 residents adjacent to District 1 were primarily orthodox Jews and would like to stay together in District 4

Mr. Moss expressed his strong support to protect minority representation in all districts.

No more comments were received

Ms. Brown explained the outreach process and pointed participants to other community meetings and the redistricting website. She explained that the map adoption will be around December 14th.

The meeting concluded at 2:35 pm

District 2 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/21/2021 at 6 p.m.
Location: North Central Library

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Tracie Auguste (District 2), Samantha Jacob (District 2), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Joshua Dieguez, Justin Klecha, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:

Meeting Called to order by Kim Brown at 6:10 PM

ARCBridge presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to district 2, as presented in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees

Floor Opened for Public Comments

A member of the public asked how splitting Opa-locka will affect the citizens. ARCBridge clarified that Opa-locka is already split between Districts 1 and 2. The member of the public commented that the people in Opa-locka are more familiar with District 1 Commissioner Oliver Gilbert.

Mr. Moss commented that, since District 1 has the lowest population and deviation, it will affect the overall maximum deviation and adjusting this deviation up will help other districts to lower that deviation and population. He also expressed concerns about how removal of a portion of Opa-locka from District 1 will affect the deviation. Priti Mathur responded that, to keep District 1 balanced, a small area from District 13 was moved to District 1. She further explained that the deviation of District 1 currently was -5.07 and District 2 was -4.42. District 13 has a negative growth and cannot give additional area to District 1

A member of the public asked how "ideal population" is calculated. Ms. Mathur responded that ideal population is the total county population divided by the 13 districts.

A member of the public identifying as a journalist asked whether protecting incumbents is a national or county law. Ms. Mathur clarified that it is a Count requirement and Ms. Brown further clarified that it is contained within Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Resolution No. R-511-04. The member of the public asked whether there have been further changes since Map 1 between Districts 2 and 4 in the area of North Miami. Ms. Mathur explained that Map 1 is a proposed plan and subject to changes based on additional input received.

A member of the public suggested that additional community meetings be held with specific focus on the Haitian community. Ms. Brown explained the 17 planned community outreach meetings and outreach efforts specific to the Haitian community. It was recommended that the request be coordinated through the District 2 Commissioner's office.

No more comments were received

Kim Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information

Meeting Adjourned at 7:00pm

District 3 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/28/2021 at 6:00 p.m.
Location: Caleb Center

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: District 3 Commissioner Keon Hardemon, Gordon Bello (District 3), Marcus Barfield (District 3), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Justin Klecha, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 6:35 pm and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the County's Redistricting effort.

Gordon Bello, District 3 Chief of Staff, encouraged citizen participation and offered to answer their questions.

Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting, began a presentation detailing changes to District 03, as depicted in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census.

During the presentation, discussion ensued regarding the accuracy of the Census data and whether there was an undercount in the population data. Ms. Brown replied that we have to work with the numbers that the Census Bureau puts out. Mr. Armada provided detailed information on the Census effort in Miami-Dade County.

There were several questions about participation of minority communities in the Census. Doubts were raised about minority participation in the Census and about low growth in District 3. Additional concerns were expressed about the black community not being fairly represented.

Ms. Mathur continued the presentation

Commissioner Hardemon encouraged residents to not hold back in providing their comments and reiterated that he was listening to their comments. He indicated that he was not happy with the boundaries as depicted in Map 1.

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees. He welcomed the citizens and Commissioner Hardemon to the meeting. He emphasized that Map 1 was a recommendation from the Consultant, that the CRAB would also make a recommendation and the BCC would make a final determination on the plan.

Mr. Perry expressed concerns about whether minority representation was being threatened in District 3. Ms. Brown indicated that Hispanic population was decreasing, and Non-Hispanic Black population was increased in the Map 1 proposal.

The floor was opened for public comment.

James Bush III, State Representative District 109, asked that staff come back and meeting with the community again. Ms. Brown explained the compressed timeframe for completing the redistricting effort and reiterated the opportunities for public participation. He expressed further concerns that the community did not receive notice about the meeting. Ms. Brown detailed the efforts to notice the outreach meetings. A member of the public recommended that the Neighborhood Association for Hadley Park should be notified.

A member of the public asked about consideration of minority representation. Ms. Mathur noted that, among the redistricting criteria, is the goal of maintaining the ethnic and racial characteristics of the districts.

A member of the public pointed out that the percentage of Non-Hispanic Black population in District 3 dropped significantly from 2010 to 2020 (as summarized on Page 6 of the presentation) and speculated that the redrawing of the District boundaries in 2011 may have decreased the percentage of black population in the district. Ms. Brown indicated that she would provide information on the effects of the 2011 redistricting effort on the Non-Hispanic Black population at the next CRAB meeting.

A member of the public encouraged the County to be mindful of the reason that single member districts were created and to be mindful of minority participation.

Commissioner Hardemon emphasized the importance of assets such as the American Airlines Arena and the Miami Dade College Wolfson Campus remaining in District 3. He pointed out that, countywide, the Hispanic population is increasing, and the Non-Hispanic Black population is decreasing. He posed the question of whether a map should be drawn that protects the minority representation based on what it was in the past to ensure that District 3 continues to be represented by an African American. He indicated that District 3 is the heart of Black representation in Miami-Dade County. He thanked the public for their comments and offered his office's support to any citizens who needed more information.

Commissioner Hardemon reiterated the importance of maintaining economic engines within Districts. He further noted the importance of college campuses and areas along the waterfront. Mr. Moss indicated that there is a similar economic engine in District 9 that was proposed to be removed in Map 1.

A member of the public asked whether the Commissioners had met to discuss the proposed map. Commissioner Hardemon noted that the Consultants have only met with the Commissioners

individually. The member of the public indicated that he would like to see more community input in the process.

The meeting concluded at 8 pm

District 04 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/27/2021 at 4:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: District 4 Commissioner Sally Heyman, Bonnie Michaels (District 4), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Natalie Milian, Joshua Dieguez, Phyllis Smith, Justin Klecha, Max Losner.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 4:05 p.m. and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the County's redistricting effort.

Commissioner Sally Heyman voiced her concerns about the Map 1 configuration and commented that it was splitting the Jewish community.

Priti Mathur presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 4, as depicted in Map1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census.

Phyllis Smith, District 4 appointee to the CRAB, reiterated commissioner Heyman's concerns and wanted the citizens to chime in. She wanted to see the changes that were discussed with the commissioner and receive an update on when the next iteration of the maps will be published. Ms. Brown responded that the next iteration is expected to be presented at the Citizen's Redistricting Board meeting on November 5, 2021.

Commissioner Heyman asked that the potential changes to District 4 on the next iteration of the map be presented during the meeting. Ms. Mathur discussed the possible changes to District 4 that are expected on the modified map that will be released on November 5th for which Commissioner Heyman had given her consent.

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked Commissioner Heyman for her good work and joining the community meeting. He thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process specifically the residents.

The floor was opened for public comments. No public comments were received.

Commissioner Heyman reiterated the importance of keeping the Jewish community together and thanked everyone.

No other comments were received

Ms. Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She emphasized that the district boundaries are expected to be adopted in December. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information

The meeting concluded at 4:37 pm

District 5 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/18/2021 at 6 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: District 5 Commissioner Eileen Higgins, Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Natalie Milian, Joshua Dieguez, Justin Klecha, Max Losner, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:

Meeting Called to order by Kim Brown at 6:04PM

Opening remarks by Commissioner Higgins: She emphasized the importance of the redistricting process and community involvement in the process

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and iterated that the plans presented today were proposed plans and will be further analyzed before finalization

ARCBridge presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to district 5, as proposed in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Commissioner Higgins emphasized that the changes to District 5 are part of the whole redistricting process and that changes in one district affects other districts. She was happy about the split in Brickell being fixed.

Juan Carlos Planas, Vice Chair of the CRAB, wanted maps to be displayed for the community to review during the public comment process

Floor open for Public Comments: None received

Kim Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She emphasized that the district boundaries are anticipated to be adopted by mid-December. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:28pm

District 6 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/19/2021 at 6 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Manuel Orbis (District 6), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Natalie Milian, Justin Klecha, Max Losner, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:
Meeting Called to order by Kim Brown at 6:05 PM

Manuel Orbis, District 6 Commission Aide, thanked everyone for attending

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees

Priti Mathur presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to district 6 based on Map 1 and census data from the 2020 Census

The floor was opened for public comments.

Juan Carlos Planas, Vice Chair of CRAB, wanted maps to be displayed for the community to review during the public comment process

Mayor of South Miami Sally Phillips expressed her frustration about some parts of South Miami being split and being represented by two commissioners. Mr. Planas replied to the Mayor's comments that splitting some cities is inevitable and being represented by two commissions has merits. Justin Klecha, District 5 CRAB member, addressed the mayor's comments stating that some of the areas split were unincorporated areas

Mayor Phillips expressed concern that the split areas were so small and may not get the commissioner's attention

No more comments were received

Kim Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm, she encouraged everyone to attend. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information.

The meeting concluded at 6:30pm

District 07 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/26/2021 at 6 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: District 7 Commissioner Raquel Regalado, Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Natalie Milian, Joshua Dieguez, Phyllis Smith, Justin Klecha, Max Losner, William Perry

Meeting Summary:

Meeting commenced at 6:05 pm

Commissioner Regalado welcomed everyone to the meeting

Priti Mathur, ArcBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 7, as depicted in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked Commissioner Regalado for her good work and joining the community meeting. He thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process, specifically the residents

The floor was opened for public comments

City of South Miami Mayor Sally Phillips expressed concerns about a small part of South Miami being split specifically the area between 40th and 48th street and 61st and 67th Avenue. City of South Miami Commissioner Brian Corey reiterated the same concern. Commissioner Regalado agreed and also requested the South Miami split be rectified. She expressed support for the change that moved Brickell to Commissioner Higgins' district. Mayor Phillips and a member of the public again reiterated the importance of keeping the City of South Miami together because it is such a small area.

Mr. Moss referred to District 9 changes and areas allocated to District 7 that were predominantly commercial and had very low population. He wanted to discuss those areas in a later meeting.

No other comments were received

Ms. Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm, she encouraged everyone to attend. She also requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information

The meeting ended at 6:37pm

District 8 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/23/2021 at 2:30 p.m.
Location: South Dade Regional Library

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Jeve Clayton (District 8), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Joshua Dieguez, Justin Klecha, Max Losner.

Meeting Summary:

Kim Brown started the meeting at 2:40 p.m. and explained the redistricting process

Mr. Clayton thanked everyone for attending.

Priti Mathur, ArcBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 8, as reflected on Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees. He welcomed the 2 members of the community who attended.

The floor was opened for public comments.

A member of the public asked about the timeframe for providing comments. Ms. Brown explained the outreach process and noted the upcoming community meetings and opportunity to provide input through the redistricting website.

Mr. Moss wanted to know how the citizen heard about the meeting and what else can be done to reach out to the public. A member of the public indicated that they had heard about the District 13 meeting on Facebook but did not have specific information about this meeting or other commissioner's meetings. Another member of the public indicated that she had seen the ad in the Miami Herald and noted that the District 8 Commissioner had posted information about redistricting back in August. She recommended using social media and Next Door to promote future meetings. Jeve Clayton, District 8 Chief of Staff, confirmed that they posted the meeting two days prior on social media. A member of the public recommended sending mailers similar to what is done when precincts are changed.

A member of the public asked why the District 8 boundaries are the way they are. Juan Carlos Planas, Vice Chair of the CRAB, explained the history of the formation of Miami Dade districts and how District 8, which was predominantly rural, took on the shape it has today.

Mr. Moss explained that the consultants and the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board will recommend the best plan to the commissioners and it will be up to them to adopt.

No more comments were received

Kim Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:15pm

District 9 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/29/2021 at 6 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Natalie Milian, Phyllis Smith, Justin Klecha, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 6:05 p.m. and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the redistricting effort.

Dennis Moss, Chairman and District 9 appointee to the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process specifically the residents who joined on a Friday afternoon. He emphasized the importance of keeping the industrial area in north District 9 within the district as it was an economic growth engine for the district.

Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 9, as depicted on Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Mr. Moss reiterated the importance of the redistricting process and informed the participants that the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board was tasked with making a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

The floor was opened for public comments.

A member of the public asked where the population growth has been in the district. He emphasized that the industrial area in the north had little or no population and taking it away will take away the economic growth of the district and it was not right to do so. Mr. Armada clarified that much of the growth has been along the US-1 corridor and in the City of Homestead that grew 33%.

Mr. Moss responded by informing the community about several ways to get more information and to participate in the redistricting process. He offered to be a conduit to pass along information to County staff.

A member of the public wanted to know what the economic impact would be of changing district boundaries, specifically as it relates to the future potential of the area to incorporate. Mr. Moss explained that moving out an industrial area away from the district would mean loss of jobs and tax base for the district and will have a negative economic impact.

A member of the public that identified as a member of the South Dade MAC had the same concerns and said that incorporation of those areas will have a good effect on the district and was opposed to the current redistricting plan.

A member of the public asked to see a population density comparison between the two plans. Ms. Mathur opened the district map and showed the population density of the district. She explained that the reason for removing the industrial area out of the district was to also move the densely populated area south of it to equalize the population.

No further comments were received

Ms. Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She emphasized that the district boundaries are anticipated to be adopted in December. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information

Meeting Adjourned at 6:40pm

District 10 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/30/2021 at 10 a.m.
Location: Westchester Regional Library

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Justin Klecha, William R. Perry, III.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 10:05 a.m. and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the redistricting effort.

Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 10, as depicted on Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census.

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB), thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees. He welcomed the citizens to the meeting.

Justin Klecha, District 5 appointee to the CRAB, inquired about a small piece of the City of Sweetwater that is in District 10. Ms. Mathur indicated that they would look into following the municipal boundary in the next iteration of the map.

The floor was opened for public comment.

A member of the public representing the League of Women Voters asked whether there has been negative feedback related to the proposed boundaries for District 10. Ms. Mathur indicated that she has not received negative feedback but has received comments.

A member of the public that self-identified as a prospective candidate for District 10 Commission seat indicated that she was concerned about communities being split. She identified a specific area west of 826 and down to Kendall as one community that should not be split. She also suggested that portions of Fontainebleau be moved to District 6. Ms. Mathur assured her that they will look into her recommended changes but it is greatly constrained by the requirement to maintain maximum deviation under 10%. The member of the public asked whether the State of Florida considers the County Commission District boundaries in their redistricting effort. Michael Valdez, Assistant County Attorney, responded that it is not a requirement but is a factor that may be considered.

No more comments were received

Ms. Brown explained the outreach process and directed participants to the redistricting website.

The meeting concluded at 10:35 am

District 11 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/25/2021 at 6:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Christina Cicilia (District 11), Ana Bustamante (District 11), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Joshua Dieguez, Phyllis Smith, Justin Klecha, Max Losner, William Perry.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 6:05 p.m. and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the redistricting effort.

Priti Mathur, ArcBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 11, as depicted in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chair of the Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board, thanked Commissioner Martinez and everyone involved in the redistricting process and the residents

The floor was opened for public comments. No public comments were received.

Kim Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She emphasized that the district boundaries are anticipated to be adopted in December. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information

Meeting Adjourned at 6:20pm

District 12 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/27/2021 at 6:00 p.m.
Location: Sweetwater City Hall

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Olga Hernandez (District 12), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Max Losner.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 6:05 p.m. and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the redistricting process.

Priti Mathur, ArcBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 12, as depicted in Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees. He welcomed the District 12 staff to the meeting.

Olga Hernandez, District 12 Director of Community Affairs, welcomed everyone to the meeting

The floor was opened for public comment. A member of the public asked about the timeline for finalizing the maps. Ms. Brown explained the public outreach process and pointed her to other community meetings and the redistricting website. She explained that adoption of the final map is expected in December.

No further comments were received

The meeting concluded at 6:22 pm

District 13 Redistricting Outreach Meeting Summary

Date: 10/22/2021 at 6:00 p.m.
Location: Miami Dade College – Hialeah Campus

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Joshua Dieguez, Justin Klecha, Max Losner.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 6:12 p.m and Ms. Brown provided an overview of the redistricting effort.

Priti Mathur, ArcBridge Consulting, presented a PowerPoint detailing changes to District 13, as depicted on Map 1, based on the census data from the 2020 Census

Dennis Moss, Chairman of the CRAB, thanked everyone involved in the redistricting process and the attendees.

Josh Dieguez, District 13 CRAB member, inquired about a possible change to add a small sliver from District 1 to District 13 noting that the area is predominantly commercial and has low population. Ms. Mathur noted that they could look into it.

Mr. Dieguez asked about Change #2 from the presentation and whether the areas that are being moved from District 12 to District 13 include parts of City of Hialeah. Ms. Mathur pointed out the proposed change in relation to the City of Hialeah boundary. A member of the public asked how many people are within the area of Change #2. Ms. Mathur directed her to the portion of the handout that included the population and demographic information.

Mr. Moss asked whether more people can be assigned to District 6 to help District 7 and, in turn, help other districts like 8 and 9. Ms. Mathur replied that it is not about one district but the overall maximum deviation and the need to help districts 1, 2 3 4 and 13 which are low in population.

The floor was opened for public comments. No further public comments were received.

Kim Brown followed up with next steps and provided details about the CRAB meeting on November 5th at 1:30 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend. She requested people to go to the Miami-Dade redistricting website for more information.

The meeting concluded at 6:30 pm

Regional Community Meeting – North Districts Meeting Summary

Date: 11/06/2021 at 11:00 a.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Elizabeth Owens (District 2), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office) Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Justin Klecha, Phyllis Smith, Max Losner

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 11:05 a.m. and Ms. Brown explained the redistricting process. She introduced the Citizens Advisory Board members and other attendees.

Dennis Moss, Chairman and District 9 appointee to the CRAB, thanked all attendees and encouraged citizens to participate in this important process.

Ms. Priti Mathur presented changes detailed in Proposed Map 2 in Districts 1, 2 and 3 and noted that the changes considered input received at the meetings with the community and the commissioners over the last two weeks. Also discussed were changes that were recommended at the Citizens Advisory Board meeting on November 5th 2021.

The floor was opened for public comments.

A member of the public expressed noted the decrease in Non-Hispanic Black population in District 3 and expressed deep concern about the impacts to Black representation. He indicated that we must be more proactive in ensuring that Districts 1, 2, 3 and 9 remain areas where Blacks are represented. He also expressed that more must be done to involve the community in the redistricting process.

A member of the public wanted to ensure that the changes recommended at the District 3 outreach meeting were incorporated. Ms. Mathur identified how the input from the meeting was incorporated into the plans.

Dennis Moss, Chairman and District 9 appointee to the CRAB, expressed his concern about the decline in the Black community and expressed his interest in advancing a recommendation for the Board of County Commissioners to further study the reasons for the decline and what can be done

about it. County Attorney Oren Rosenthal suggested that this issue can be advanced as a recommendation from the advisory board.

A member of the public expressed concern about the accuracy of the Census and wanted to know if it was affected by Covid-19. Mr. Armada explained that the County has not identified specific inaccuracies in the population count and the numbers presented by the Census Bureau were the best numbers to work with. Juan Carlos Planas, Vice Chair and District 8 appointee to the CRAB, echoed Mr. Armada's comments that the Census data is the data we have to use.

Phyllis Smith, District 4 appointee to the CRAB, expressed that the citizens are moving out because they cannot afford to live in the county anymore and that the County needs to find a way to make it affordable.

A member of the public echoed concerns about protecting minority representation and suggested not to rush with the redistricting process and to instead consider adopting the maps after the 2022 election.

Ms. Brown explained that the county did the most extensive outreach program with 13 district and 4 regional meetings giving the community a lot of opportunity to voice their concerns. Vice Chair Planas expressed that the State of Florida has not done any outreach like Miami-Dade County has done.

Elizabeth Owens, District 2 Chief of Staff, wanted future trends to be considered in the recommendation to look at the loss of minority population.

A member of the public wanted to know if the Citizens Advisory Board can make a recommendation even when the full board had vacancies. County Attorney Rosenthal responded that no quorum is needed for the community meetings because the board will not make any decisions but full quorum is needed when the board makes a recommendation to the county board of commissioners. Ms. Brown informed that William Perry was recently appointed as the representative for District 3 and District 12 is in the process of confirming their representative. Districts 10 and 11 had vacancy as of now.

A member of the public reiterated that all citizens voices were heard and will be heard and that the consultants and county staff were very responsive to any questions from the community.

A member of the public echoed the concern about the demographic shifts and said it was hard for citizens to understand the redistricting process as it was going so fast and wanted to know how to involve the citizens in future meetings. Chairman Moss explained the future community meetings and encouraged citizens involvement in the process.

A member of the public asked whether the redistricting dates can be extended or if the recommendations were not adopted by the board will the current districts stay in place for the future elections. County Attorney Rosenthal explained that there was no requirement to complete

the redistricting this year but noted that population within the 13 districts is currently malapportioned.

A member of the public expressed concern over the loss of Black population and wanted to know if this dialog could continue even outside of the redistricting project. Chairman Moss expressed that it would be part of his recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

No more comments were received

Ms. brown explained the next steps and other regional meetings schedule and pointed to the redistricting website for additional information and copies of the maps and presentation. She explained that the map is anticipated to be adopted in December.

The meeting concluded at 12:17 pm

Regional Community Meeting – South Districts Meeting Summary

Date: 11/06/2021 at 1:30 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office) Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Justin Klecha, Phyllis Smith

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 1:35 PM and Ms. Brown explained the redistricting process. She introduced the Citizens advisory board members and other attendees.

Dennis Moss, Chairman and District 9 appointee to the CRAB, thanked all attendees and encouraged citizens to participate in this important process.

Juan Carlos Planas, Vice Chair and District 8 appointee to the CRAB, made a statement that the State of Florida has not made any efforts for community outreach which may lead to gerrymandering and suppressing the voice of the public. He advised citizens to talk to their representatives about this.

Ms. Priti Mathur, ARCBridge Consulting, presented changes detailed in Proposed Map 2 for Districts 7, 8 and 9 and indicated that they incorporated input received at meetings with the community and the commissioners over the last two weeks. She also presented were changes that were recommended at the Citizens Advisory Board meeting on November 5, 2021.

Vice Chair Planas commented that he was not fully in favor of the idea of splitting Palmetto Bay and noted that some cities do not want split representation.

Chairman Moss wanted to move the little area south of 152 street with about 1,240 people back to District 9 from District 11.

The floor was opened for public comments

A member of the public inquired about vacancies on the Citizens advisory board and the process for applying. He commented that it was a good idea not to split cities.

Ms. Brown explained that the CRAB was almost in the last stages of its effort and will be wrapping up soon with a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

Chairman Moss explained that redistricting was a very involved process and expressed concern about the diminishing Black and Anglo population in the County and that he would make recommendations to the County Commissioners to look into this.

Steve Losner, Mayor of the City of Homestead, expressed his desire to keep Homestead divided between two commission districts so they can get the support of two commissioners rather than one. He indicated that, in his view, Homestead benefits by having representation from two commissioners. Chairman Moss agreed.

A member of the public expressed his support for moving the boundary of District 7 south into Palmetto Bay and suggested that the city would benefit from split representation. Another member of the public supported this idea. Ms. Mathur responded by pointing out that the split would lead to a tunnel like area which will fail the compactness test as well as too much population shift will throw the maximum deviation over 10%.

A member of the public suggested that areas between SR 878 and SR 826 should be moved from District 6 to District 10.

A member of the public wanted to know if the meeting recordings will be available to the public. Ms. Brown indicated that they will be available following the meeting.

A member of the public wanted to know how the decision was reached to carve out areas from District 9 to move to District 11. Chairman Moss explained that District 9 had to lose population and only adjacent districts were Districts 7, 8 and 11. Population was shifted to all of these districts.

No more comments were received

Chairman Moss thanked everyone for being part of the process.

Ms. Brown explained the next steps and other regional meetings scheduled and pointed to the redistricting website for additional information and copies of the maps and presentation. She explained that the map is expected to be adopted around December.

The meeting concluded at 2:34 pm

Regional Community Meeting – East Districts Meeting Summary

Date: 11/06/2021 at 3:30 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office) Michael Valdez (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Justin Klecha, Phyllis Smith

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 3:35 p.m. and Ms. Brown explained the redistricting process. She introduced the Citizens Advisory Board members and other attendees.

Dennis Moss, Chairman and District 9 appointee to the CRAB, thanked all attendees and encouraged citizens to participate in this important process.

Phyllis Smith, District 4 appointee to the CRAB, and Justin Klecha, District 5 appointee to the CRAB, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Ms. Priti Mathur presented changes detailed in Proposed Map 2 in Districts 4, 5 and 6 and noted that the changes considered input received at the meetings with the community and the commissioners over the last two weeks. Also discussed were changes that were recommended at the Citizens Advisory Board meeting on November 5th 2021.

Ms. Smith thanked everyone for their hard work and was pleased that the Jewish community was not split and stayed in District 4.

Mr. Klecha inquired about a possible additional change to include the on-ramp to the MacArthur Causeway to District 5. Ms. Mathur explained that the change will make the population of District 3 out of balance as the change required the addition of the 2 blocks south of the highway which includes 2,000 people.

The floor was opened for public comments.

A member of the public congratulated everyone for a great job and wanted hard copies of the maps and presentations.

A member of the public wanted to know about the redistricting timeline and if there would be another CRAB meeting after November 10. Ms. Brown explained that the advisory board is expected to consider final recommendations at the meeting on November 10th. Ms. Brown explained the next steps and other regional meetings scheduled and pointed to the redistricting website for additional information and copies of the maps and presentation. She explained that the map adoption is expected in December.

Ms. Smith noted that the Board of County Commissioners may further amend the maps.

No more comments were received

Chairman Moss thanked everyone.

The meeting concluded at 4:20 pm

Regional Community Meeting – West Districts Meeting Summary

Date: 11/08/2021 at 6 p.m.
Location: Virtual

Attendance:

Miami-Dade County: Elizabeth Owens (District 2), Samantha Jacob (District 2), Kimberly Brown (MDC-Planning), Manuel Armada (MDC-Planning), Oren Rosenthal (County Attorney's Office), Priti Mathur (Consultant - ArcBridge)

Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board (CRAB): Dennis C. Moss (Chair), Juan-Carlos Planas (Vice-Chair), Justin Klecha, Max Losner, Phyllis Smith

Meeting Summary:

The meeting commenced at 6:05 pm and Ms. Brown explained the redistricting process. She introduced the Citizens advisory board members and other attendees.

Commissioner Moss thanked all attendees and encouraged citizens to participate in this important process.

Juan Carlos Planas, Vice Chair and District 8 appointee to the CRAB, questioned if any representatives from District 10 and 11 were present today. Ms. Brown indicated that no representatives were identified from the list of attendees. In response to a question from Phyllis Smith, District 4 appointee to the CRAB, Ms. Mathur confirmed that the Commissioners and their staff were consulted in the process of developing the draft maps.

Ms. Mathur presented changes detailed in Map 2 in Districts 10, 11,12 and 13 that considered input received at the meetings with the community and the commissioners over the last two weeks. Also presented were changes that were recommended at the Citizens Advisory Board meeting on November 5, 2021.

The floor was opened for public comments.

Samantha Jacob, District 2 Policy Advisor, put comments on the record regarding areas of importance to the District. She expressed the importance of replacing any areas that are removed from District 2 with area of similar demographics, to the extent feasible. She also noted that Vice Chair Gilbert has publicly expressed an interest in moving the entirety of Opa-locka into District 1. She emphasized the importance of finding other areas of District 1 that could be added to District 2 to compensate for the loss in the event that were to happen. She identified assets that are

important to retain within the District including Poinciana Industrial Park, 79th Street Corridor, 7th Ave Transit Corridor, Green Tech Corridor, Golden Glades Interchange, State Road 9 Corridor (up to 17th Avenue), parks, the county owned parcel located at 6600 NW 27th Avenue, and portions of the Cities of North Miami and North Miami Beach that are currently within the District 2 boundary.

A member of the public asked why voting age population is depicted on the consultant's presentation and asked how the data was considered in the process. Ms. Mathur responded that it is provided for informational purposes and does not factor into their analysis. The member of the public asked how incumbency was considered in the process. Ms. Brown read from the redistricting criteria contained in Board Resolution No. R-511-04 as it relates to protection of incumbency. County Attorney Rosenthal indicated that the plans created by the consultant were consistent with the requirements of the resolution. A member of the public expressed concerns about protecting commissioners who are term-limited and will not be eligible to run for re-election in their districts.

A member of the public expressed a desire to wait on amending the commission district boundaries until after the 2022 elections. County Attorney Rosenthal noted that population within the commission districts is malapportioned.

Board member Smith made a statement that all commissioners have met with the consultant so they were represented in drawing the current lines. She also reiterated concerns about maintaining the orthodox Jewish community in District 4 and asked how many people from District 4 were being assigned to district 2. Ms. Mathur replied that the number is 8,860 people.

Max Losner, District 12 appointee to the CRAB, wanted to move Virginia Garden and area east of the Palmetto Expressway from District 12 to District 6. Ms. Mathur noted that the proposed change appears to be feasible.

No more comments were received

Kim brown explained the next steps and pointed to the redistricting website for additional information. She explained that the map adoption is expected to occur in December.

The meeting concluded at 6:50 pm

Comments Received by Email

Brown, Kimberly (RER)

From: susan khoury <s56k12@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Brown, Kimberly (RER)
Subject: RE: Redistricting Website

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SOURCE

Kimberly:

Based on our telephonic conversation. I just wanted to make sure I sent you my suggestions for District 10.

First, I think its important to maintain communities as a whole and not separate them. Second, issues in one district might be very different in another district. Third, you want to maintain the ability for neighbors to address issues with the same commissioner.

The sections that runs west of 826 and just north of Kendall drive which was in Commissioner Regalado's district was moved into Commissioner Soto's district.

That will move that portion of a community in a totally different district which doesn't have the same issues or concerns. Since Commissioner Regalado's need lose some of the population, the most logical and community beneficial must be at the forefront.

Therefore, since District 10 needs to gain, I believe that portion should be move into District 10, keeping communities' whole as much as possible and maintaining continuation of similar community issues and concerns.

Additionally, the top portion of district 10 is totally cut into another community and I believe that portion should go to either Commissioner Soso's District since it reflects more of het district issues.

Since commissioners Souto and Sosa and other commissioners are terming out in 2022, the new map districts should be made based on keeping communities whole as much as possible.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to provide my input in the process.

Sincerely,
Susan Khoury

South Miami
THE CITY OF PLEASANT LIVING

Sally B. Philips, EdD
Mayor

6130 Sunset Drive
South Miami, Florida 33143-5093
Tel: 305-668-2484 • Cell: 305-608-2973 • Fax: 305-663-6348
E-Mail: sphilips@southmiamifl.gov

21 October 2021

Miami-Dade Citizens Redistricting Advisory Board
Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners
ARCBridge Counsulting and Training

To All Concerned with Miami-Dade County Redistricting:

The current proposed redistricting map cuts the City of South Miami into two very unequal pieces. Most of the City remains in District 7. However, a small area has been proposed to be annexed to District 6. This small area is bounded by 44th and 40th Streets and 67th and 57th Avenues. Within those boundaries only a small number of voters live in unincorportated Miami-Dade County.

I was very impressed with the arithmetic accuracy and careful statistics done by ARCBridge Consulting. However, I doubt that keeping the City of South Miami united in one district will disrupt the diversity balance that is required by law. As best I could discover the requirement is: "In no event shall the population deviation between districts exceed ten percent."

Another guideline is that: "To the extent practical, the districts also should be reasonably compact, contiguous, respect political and administrative boundaries, minimize voter disruption . . ..." If it is practical to carve in Virginia Gardens, then it would seem reasonable to keep the City of South Miami whole. Currently the Supervisor of Elections is able to distinguish the difference between unincorporated Miami-Dade County and the City of South Miami. I suspect that she will continue to be able to distinguish which voters are in unincorporated Miami-Dade County whether they are in District 6 or in District 7.



Attached to this letter is a copy of the Resolution passed by the City of South Miami Commission on October 19, 2021. The Resolution requests that the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners keep the complete City of South Miami in District 7. You will note that this resolution was passed unanimously by the officials elected by South Miami voters.

Sincerely,

Sally B. Philips

RESOLUTION NO. 131-21-15751

A Resolution of the Mayor and City Commissioners of the City of South Miami, Florida, urging the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners to redraw the recommended redistricting map so that the City of South Miami remains in District 7.

WHEREAS, the 2020 Census prompted a remapping of Miami-Dade's 13 commission districts, and Miami-Dade County ("County") is now seeking guidance for how to proceed in that undertaking[1]; and

WHEREAS, the County's hired consultant, ARCBridge, has made a recommendation for new boundaries and a proposed redistricting map for how to redraw the 13 districts to compensate for faster population growth in South Miami-Dade than in other parts of the County, along with smaller shifts in voting-age residents, which has recently become public. A copy of the proposed map is attached; and

WHEREAS, the proposed redistricting will come during unprecedented County turnover - six of the 13 commissioners must leave office in 2022 or 2024 due to term limits, while the rest will be voting on boundaries on districts for their reelections if they seek to stay on the board[2]; and

WHEREAS, the new districts would be in place for the 2022 elections and commissioners could vote on the final boundaries by the end of 2021;

WHEREAS, the City of South Miami ("City") currently lies fully within District 7 but the proposed map has part of the city moving into a new southern leg of District 6, represented by Rebeca Sosa; and

WHEREAS, District 7's Commissioner Raquel A. Regalado said she objects to the change, further stating that, "[i]If we have the opportunity to retain a municipality in one district, we should do that,"[3]; and

WHEREAS, a series of public meetings will be held in October for feedback on the boundary proposals with the Commission Redistricting Public Meeting for District 7 (which includes South Miami) to be held on October 26, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Commissioners wish for the City of South Miami to remain fully in District 7.

---

[1] https://www.miamitodaynews.com/2020/03/17/redistricting-aid-to-usher-in-miami-dade-county-sea-change/
[2] https://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/article254682422.html#storylink=cpy
[3] *Ibid.*

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The City of South Miami respectfully requests that the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners redraw the redistricting map that has been proposed by the County consultants so that the City of South Miami remains in District 7.

Section 2. The City Clerk shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners ahead of their Commission Redistricting Public Meeting for District 7 on October 26, 2021.

Section 3. Corrections. Conforming language or technical scrivener-type corrections may be made by the City Attorney for any conforming amendments to be incorporated into the final resolution for signature.

Section 4. Severability. If any section clause, sentence, or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, the holding will not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this resolution.

Section 5. Effective Date. This resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of October, 2021.

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

APPROVED:

MAYOR

READ AND APPROVED AS TO FORM, LANGUAGE, LEGALITY, AND EXECUTION THEREOF

CITY ATTORNEY

COMMISSION VOTE:	5-0
Mayor Philips:	Yea
Commissioner Harris:	Yea
Commissioner Gil:	Yea
Commissioner Liebman:	Yea
Commissioner Corey:	Yea

Appendix 1: BCC Resolution No. R-511-04

Approved _____ Mayor
Veto _____
Override _____

Agenda Item No. 10(A)(1)
4-27-04

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION SETTING FORTH CRITERIA AND FACTORS TO BE USED IN THE REDISTRICTING PROCESS; PROVIDING FOR A REDISTRICTING ADVISORY BOARD AND A PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

WHEREAS, Section 1.03(B) of the Home Rule Charter authorizes the Board of County Commissioners to redraw the County Commission election districts from time to time; and

WHEREAS, there are established legal criteria and traditional redistricting factors to be considered when redrawing election districts; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that the public be fully informed as to the criteria and factors to be considered by the Board in the redistricting process; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to elicit public comments through a series of public workshops and a citizens advisory board,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. **Redistricting Criteria and Factors.** The following criteria and factors shall be considered when redrawing County Commission election districts during the decennial redistricting process:

a) *One-Person, One-Vote Rule.* Primary consideration shall be given to compliance with the one-person, one-vote requirement of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, as construed by United States Supreme Court decisions. The population deviation between districts shall be minimized to the extent consistent with compliance with §2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended in 1982, 42 U.S.C.A.

§1973, and the accommodation of traditional districting principles. In no event shall the population deviation between districts exceed ten percent, unless the Board of County Commissioners fully explains the necessity for doing so.

b) *§2 of Voting Rights Act.* The redistricting plan shall afford minority groups protected under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended in 1982, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1973, with an equal opportunity to participate in the electoral process and to elect their preferred candidates.

c) *Traditional Districting Principles.* While observing the one-person, one-vote rule and compliance with §2 of the Voting Rights Act, the district boundaries shall be drawn on the basis of geography and with respect for communities of interest, in accordance with the requirements of Section 1.03(B) of the Home Rule Charter. To the extent practical, the districts also should be reasonably compact, contiguous, respect political and administrative boundaries, minimize voter disruption and protect incumbent commissioners from running for election against another sitting commissioner.

Section 2. Citizens Advisory Board and Public Workshops. In the year preceding the release of the federal decennial census the County Commission shall empanel a 13-member citizens redistricting advisory board. Each Commissioner shall appoint one member to the board, who may not be a member of the County Commission. The advisory board will be advised by the redistricting expert(s) designated by the County Commission to assist the Commission in the drafting of a redistricting plan, the County Attorney's Office and such other staff as may be appointed by the County Manager.

After the initial release of the federal census data public redistricting workshops shall be commenced at various locations throughout the county to inform and elicit comments from the public concerning the redistricting process. The members of the advisory board shall be timely

informed of and invited to attend all such public workshops. As appropriate to the location of the workshop, explanatory materials shall be provided in English, Spanish and/or Creole. Spanish and/or Creole interpreters also shall be available to assist members of the public.

Within twenty (20) days from the last public workshop the redistricting expert(s) shall provide the advisory board with any redistricting plan(s) (not to exceed three) and/or report(s) proposed by the expert(s) to the Commission. Within twenty (20) days from the receipt of any such plan(s) and/or report(s) the advisory board shall submit to the Commission a written report containing its recommendations and comments on each plan and/or report proposed by the expert(s). The recommendations and comments of the advisory board must be based upon the redistricting criteria and factors contained in section 1 of this resolution and must receive at least a majority vote of approval from the members of the advisory board. The written report of the advisory board should endeavor to explain the extent to which the proposed plan(s) and/or report(s) comport with the criteria and factors contained in Section 1 of this resolution.

Section 3. Adoption of Redistricting Plan by County Commission. The County Commission shall perform its political and legislative redistricting responsibilities under Section 1.03(B) of the Home Rule Charter in accordance with the criteria and factors contained in Section 1, and after giving due consideration to any proposed plans and recommendations made by the citizens advisory board pursuant to section 2 of this resolution. The County Commission shall adopt a final redistricting plan only after conducting a public hearing upon reasonable notice, including public notice advertisements in newspapers serving Hispanic and Haitian communities.

Section 4. Nothing contained herein is intended to nor shall be construed as detracting from the legislative powers and political prerogatives of the County Commission in its performance of the redistricting process.

The foregoing resolution was sponsored by Chairperson Barbara Carey-Shuler, Ed.D. and offered by Commissioner , who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Dr. Barbara Carey-Shuler, Chairperson
Katy Sorenson, Vice-Chairperson

Bruno A. Barreiro	Jose "Pepe" Diaz
Betty T. Ferguson	Sally A. Heyman
Joe A. Martinez	Jimmy L. Morales
Dennis C. Moss	Dorrin D. Rolle
Natacha Seijas	Rebeca Sosa
Sen. Javier D. Souto	

The Chairperson thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this 27th day of April, 2004. This resolution shall become effective ten (10) days after the date of its adoption unless vetoed by the Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
BY ITS BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

HARVEY RUVIN, CLERK

By:_____
Deputy Clerk

Approved by County Attorney as
to form and legal sufficiency.

Robert A. Duvall

Appendix 2: Bloc Voting Analysis

The Bloc Voting Analysis contained in Appendix 2 was revised and replaced on November 17, 2021 to incorporate additional data related to the 2018 and 2020 primary elections and to update the associated analysis.

ARCBRIDGE CONSULTING & TRAINING INC.

Bloc Voting/Racially Polarized Voting Analysis Report

Miami Dade County FL

11/17/2021

Contents

Executive Summary

ARCBridge obtained the election data sets for the County Commissioners primary elections for the years 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020 and the 2020 general election for Mayor. The data sets included information by each precinct by County Commission District, Total Registered Voters, White, Black and Hispanic voters and total votes cast in each election.

ARCBridge used statistical methodologies that are widely used for such analysis and have been accepted by the US Supreme court in several instances including the 1986 Thornburg Vs Gingles. The statistical methods used were Homogenous Precinct Analysis and Bivariate Regression Analysis.

Here is a summary of the analysis.

2014 Election Results - The 2014 primary elections show a racial bias or polarization in two of the 4 districts holding elections a 50% racial bias was present in this election.

2016 Election Results – 2 out of 3 districts show racial polarization in the 2016 primary elections. The election of 2016 can be characterized as racially polarized.

2018 Election Results - 3 of the 5 Districts exhibit some level of racial bias or polarization. The election of 2018 was racially polarized based on the analysis.

2020 Election Results – 5 out of 7 districts in this election exhibit levels of racial bias thus providing evidence that the voting was racially polarized in the 2020 primary elections.

2020 General Elections - Evidence of racial polarization is present in 11 of the 13 districts for this 2020 General Mayors Election

Analyzing the voting patterns using the Bivariate Ecological Regression analysis shows racial bias or polarization in 23 of the 32 district elections from 2014 to 2020 using 6 election results. This means that there is a 72% bias towards block voting.

Racial Bloc Voting/Racially Polarized Voting Analysis

Introduction

Bloc Voting or racially polarized voting (RPV) means that during an election cycle people of different ethnicity may choose different candidate and thus influence the outcome of the election results. Since information about how the individual voters voted in a given election is not available various statistical methods are used to make estimations about the voting patterns.

ARCBridge used statistical methodologies that are widely used for such analysis and have been accepted by the US Supreme court in several instances including the 1986 Thornburg Vs Gingles.

The first analysis used is the **Homogeneous Precinct Analysis**. A homogeneous precinct can be defined as a precinct where more than 90% of the population is of one predominant race or ethnicity. In an ethnically mixed society such precincts may not be too many in number. Some analysts lower the threshold from 90% to 85% or lower but in that case the analysis may not be statistically significant due to the lower percentage.

In order to account for the shortcomings of the homogeneous precinct analysis a second analysis technique called the **Bivariate Ecological Regression (BER)** is used. In BER information about voting patterns of all precincts are evaluated. Two variables race/ethnicity and votes cast are used in the analysis and aggregate data rather than precinct level data is used. The analysis assumes a linear relationship between the two variables and inference is drawn from the regression line that best fits the data. One drawback with this analysis is that this statistical technique can produce estimates that fall outside the bounds of possibility – negative estimates or estimates of over 100% of a group voting for some candidates in some instances.

Data Sets

ARCBridge obtained the election data sets for the County Commissioners primary elections for the years 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020 and the 2020 general election for Mayor. The data sets included information by each precinct as follows:

Precinct ID	County Commission District	Total Registered Voters	White	Black	Hispanic	Others	Total Valid Votes Cast

Total Votes received by each candidate by precinct was also available. Population in the context of this study means population of Registered Voters

The Analysis results

ARCBridge conducted the Homogeneous Precinct Analysis for all of the above elections. As stated earlier there were very few precincts that were above the threshold of 90% percent single race composition. We lowered the threshold to 89% to get a greater number of precincts. The results obtained were statistically not significant due to the low number of precincts with greater that 89% population of a single race. We found that almost all of the precincts having greater than 89% population of one ethnicity had only Hispanic population significantly dominant. No other ethnicity had precincts with population and voting information that was greater than 89% of total population. Comparison with other ethnic/racial groups could not be made. As such the Homogeneous precinct analysis did not produce any conclusive results.

Here are tables detailing primary election from 2014 to 2020 and number of precincts and registered voters greater than 89% and having a voting record.

Election Year 2014

Homogeneous Precinct Data Analysis						Voting Patterns		
Election Year	District	Number of Homogeneous Precincts	Race/Ethnicity	% of Total Population		Meadows	Souto	
2014	10	1	Hispanic	89.15%		18.50%	73.16%	
						Pepe	Figuera	
	12	14	Hispanic	91.30%		66.91%	20.52%	

Election Year 2016

Election Year	District	Number of Homogeneous Precincts	Race/Ethnicity	% of Total Population		Lorenzo	Martinez	Zapta
2016	11	5	Hispanic	89.60%		18.88%	47.49%	23.75%

Election Year 2018

Election Year	District	Number of Homogeneous Precincts	Race/Ethnicity	% of Total Population		Monestime	Rolle	
2018	2	1	Hispanic	90.23		66.67%	33.33%	
						Sosa	Vargas	
	6	4	Hispanic	93.42		80.71%	19.29%	
						Diaz	Moreno	Alberto
	12	4	Hispanic	89.60%		64.75%	10.78%	24.47%

Election Year 2020

Election Year	District	Number of Homogeneous Precincts	Race/Ethnicity	% of Total Population		Portillla	Higgins	Soliman
2020	5	1	Hispanic	89.41		53.18%	29.22%	17.60%
						Asencio	Mancera	Martinez
	11	1	Hispanic	89.04		25.86%	15.54%	58.60%

Bivariate Ecological Regression (BER)

BER was conducted for each district in the primary elections for the years 2014, 2016, 2018 2020 and the general election 2020 for mayor.

2014 Primary Elections:

DISTRICT 2		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	6.20%	62.40%	24.10%	
Candidate Name	% Votes Received	White	Black	Hispanic	
Lenoir	5.60%	31%	0%	18%	N
Monestime	60.45%	67%	61%	50%	N
Rolle	27.32	0%	36%	17%	N

District 2 had over 62% black population and 24 % Hispanic. The voting data shows no particular racial bias towards any candidate as Whites Blacks and Hispanics all supported Monestime.

DISTRICT 8		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	35.70%	11.20%	45.70%	
Candidate Name	% Votes Received	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bell	46.32%	53%	35%	47%	N
Cava	50.37%	45%	60%	48%	N

District 8 has a mix of White 36% and Hispanic 45% population. The voting pattern shows no significant bias for any candidate by any ethnic group

DISTRICT 10		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	14.00%	1.00%	80.00%	
Candidate Name	% Votes Received	White	Black	Hispanic	
Meadows	20.00%	59%	100%	12%	Y
Souto	71.00%	26%	0%	82%	Y

District 10 has 80% Hispanic population and the only other significant ethnicity is the white population which is 14% of the total population. We see a significant bias of the Hispanic population towards Souto while the white population favored Meadows. This result shows a racial bias or polarization.

DISTRICT 12		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	9.30%	1.20%	84.00%	
Candidate Name	% Votes Received	White	Black	Hispanic	
Diaz	66%	0%	0%	78%	Yes
Figuera	25%	100%	100%	17%	Yes

District 12 shows predominantly Hispanic population at 84% and whites being under 10%. The voting pattern suggests once again a racial bias as Hispanics overwhelmingly supported Diaz while the Black and 10% white population supported Figuera. A racial bias is significant in the district.

Conclusion: The 2014 primary elections show a racial bias or polarization in two of the 4 districts holding elections a 50% racial bias was present in this election.

2016 Primary Elections:

2016 elections took place for Districts 7, 9 and 11

DISTRICT 7		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %--->	37.00%	4.40%	51.80%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Castro	24%	23%	30%	22%	N
Suaez	62%	57%	63%	66%	N

District 7 has a majority Hispanic population at 51% and a significant white population at 37%. The election results show no racial bias as there was overwhelming support by all for Suaez over Castro. No racial Polarization is evident from the results.

DISTRICT 9		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	12.20%	30.90%	49.30%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Beaver	24%	58%	2%	40%	Y
Moss	67%	36%	98%	35%	Y

District 9 has a Hispanic plurality at 49% and significant Black population at 30%. While the Black population showed a strong bias for Moss the other ethnic groups also showed support for Moss but the white population supported Beaver. This race can be classified as racially polarized.

DISTRICT 11		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %--->	10.90%	3.20%	79.10%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Lorenzo	19.95%	53%	100%	18%	Y
Martinez	45.40%	0%	0%	47%	Y
Zapata	24.44%	26%	0%	25%	Y

District 11 has a 79% Hispanic population and 11% White. Black population is significantly low at 3%.

The voting patterns suggest Hispanic support for Martinez while the white voters supported Lorenzo.

This race is racially polarized.

Conclusion: 2 out of 3 districts show racial polarization in the 2016 primary elections. The election of 2016 can be characterized as racially polarized.

2018 Primary Elections:

Elections were conducted in districts 2,6,8,10 and 12

DISTRICT 2		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	5.50%	60.40%	26.40%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Monestime	60%	100%	65%	41%	N
Rolle	30%	0%	34%	44%	N

District 2 has a majority black population over 60% and a large Hispanic population of 26%. Voting patterns suggest that Black & White voters predominantly voted for Monestime while the Hispanic voters were evenly split. There is none or very low evidence of polarized voting.

DISTRICT 6		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	13.80%	1.00%	79.40%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Sosa	71%	58%	2%	40%	N
Vargas	22%	36%	98%	35%	N

District 6 has a predominant Hispanic population of about 80% and 14% white population. Black population is less than 1%. Voting patterns show an even % distribution of votes by the two major ethnic groups with no candidate getting any racial preference. There is no evidence of block voting in this district.

DISTRICT 8		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	30.20%	0.00%	51.30%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Barreiro	21.13%	53%	100%	18%	Y
Burke	15.57%	0%	0%	47%	Y
Cava	56.21%	26%	0%	25%	Y

District 8 has a majority Hispanic population of over 51% and a significant white population of 30%.

Voting patterns show a bias of Hispanic Voters for Burke at 47% votes while the white voters favored Barreiro. There is moderate level of racial Polarization in this district election.

DISTRICT 10		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	12.10%	1.00%	80.90%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Garrido	13%	42%	10%	8%	Y
Sanchez	4%	10%	30%	4%	N
Santamaria	11%	7%	30%	11%	N
Souto	58%	22%	0%	70%	Y
Roberto Suarez	8%	19%	30%	7%	N

District 10 has a predominant Hispanic registered voter population of 81% while other ethnic groups are in low percentages. There is predominant support for Souto from the Hispanic population while the White population supported Garrido. Racial Polarization exists in this district.

DISTRICT 12		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	8.40%	1.20%	83.00%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Diaz	54%	0%	0%	66%	Y
Moreno	12%	26%	36%	11%	Y
Pineyro	23%	73%	63%	17%	Y

District 12 has 83% Hispanic registered voters and only 8.4% white voters. Hispanics supported Diaz overwhelmingly while the White & Black population supported Moreno and Pineyro. Racial Polarization exists in this district

Conclusion: 3 of the 5 Districts exhibit some level of racial bias or polarization. The election of 2018 was racially polarized based on the analysis above.

2020 Primary Elections

In 2020 elections were held in 7 Districts including 1,3,5,7,9,11 and 13. The BER analysis of each election is as follows:

DISTRICT 1		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	5.00%	55.50%	31.60%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Fulton	48%	58%	52%	36%	N
Gilbert	48%	13%	48%	49%	N

In 2020 District 1 had 55.5% Black registered voters and 32% Hispanics. Population of white voters was only 5% and not statistically significant. Voting patterns suggest an even split between the black and Hispanic voters for the two candidates. As such there is no evidence of racial polarization.

DISTRICT 3		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	13.90%	44.80%	33.20%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Dennis	7.70%	9%	3%	24%	N
Hardemon	46.43%	1%	73%	18%	Y
Lewis	1.64%	4%	4%	15%	N
Kinsler	5.23%	3%	1%	6%	N
Tisa McGhee	14.20%	27%	10%	19%	N
Gepsee Metellus	20%	56%	9%	18%	Y

District 3 has a Black voter's plurality of 45% followed by Hispanics at 33% and White voters at 14%.

Voting patterns indicate that the Hispanics were divided but White voters favored Metellus while the black voters overwhelmingly favored Hardemon at 73%. This pattern exhibits racial polarization

DISTRICT 5		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	25.80%	3.10%	62.60%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Portilla	37%	0%	50%	59%	y
Higgins	44%	93%	40%	27%	y
Soliman	13%	7%	10%	13%	N

District 5 is a Hispanic majority district with 63% Hispanic registered voters and 26% white voters. Voting pattern suggest that 60% Hispanics favored Portilla while 93% white voters favored Higgins. There is clear evidence of Polarized voting.

DISTRICT 7		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	34.40%	4.10%	53.40%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Lerner	37%	72%	63%	13%	Y
Regalado	34%	6%	10%	61%	Y
Rosenburg	13%	13%	22%	12%	N
Rafael Suarez	10%	9%	5%	14%	N

District 7 is a majority Hispanic district with 53% Hispanics and 34% white voters. Voting patterns suggest that Black and White voters favored Lerner while the Hispanic voters supported Regalado. This election suggests racially polarized voting.

DISTRICT 9		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	10.20%	27.80%	53.70%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Coats	7%	4%	10%	5%	N
Farias	11%	17%	0%	21%	N
Hill	21%	47%	15%	15%	Y
Maldonado	22%	29%	0%	47%	Y
Kionne McGhee	35%	3%	75%	12%	Y

District 9 has a Hispanic majority with 54% voters. Black population is 28% and white population is 10%

Voting patterns suggests a high level of polarization with 47% Hispanics voted for Maldonado while 75% blacks voted for McGhee and 47% Whites voted for Hill. There was high level of racial polarization in this district election.

DISTRICT 11		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	9.50%	3.10%	79.70%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Asencio	27%	91%	71%	20%	Y
Mancera	15%	4%	29%	13%	N
Martinez	50%	5%	0%	57%	Y

District 11 is 80% Hispanic and they overwhelmingly supported Martinez with 57% votes. White and Black voters voted for Asencio. There is clear evidence of racial polarization in this district.

DISTRICT 13		BER Analysis			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters	Population %-->	8.60%	2.30%	81.90%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Garcia	70%	72%	37%	75%	N
Jimenez	21%	17%	52%	16%	N

District 13 is predominantly a Hispanic majority district with 82% Hispanic voters. White and Black voters together account for 11% of the voters. There is little evidence of racial polarization in this district as majority of White and Hispanic voters voted for Garcia. Black voters however favored Jimenez with 52% votes. Black population is statistically low in this district so the racial polarization if any cannot be stablished.

Conclusion: 5 out of 7 districts in this election exhibit levels of racial bias thus providing evidence that the voting was racially polarized in the 2020 primary elections.

2020 General Mayoral Elections:

WHOLE COUNTY		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		17.90%	16.34%	58.47%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	42.19%	39%	0%	65%	Y
Cava	49.47%	50%	90%	30%	Y
90% Black voters favored Cava while 65% Hispanics favored Bova	Voting is Polarized				

DISTRICT 1		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		5.10%	54.80%	32.40%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	22.00%	89%	2%	58%	Y
Cava	70.00%	10%	93%	21%	Y
93% Black voters favored Cava while 58% Hispanics and 89% white favored Bovo	Voting is Polarized				

DISTRICT 2		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		5.10%	59.00%	28.00%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	20.00%	44%	5%	51%	N
Cava	70.00%	43%	89%	42%	Y
89% black voters voted for Cava while Hispanics and whites were evenly divided between Bovo and Cava	Polarization Exists				

DISTRICT 3		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		14.00%	44.00%	33.70%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	20.00%	23%	50%	15%	N
Cava	68.00%	44%	44%	82%	Y
Hispanic Voters favored Cava 82% while black and white voters were divided	Polarization Exists				

DISTRICT 4		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		45.50%	7.40%	36.90%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	33.00%	42%	2%	29%	N
Cava	56.00%	47%	95%	55%	Y

95% black voters voted for Cava while other voters were split — Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 5		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		25.80%	3.10%	62.10%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	40.00%	19%	0%	49%	Y
Cava	50.00%	64%	100%	35%	Y

White and black voters favored Cava while the 49% Hispanics favored Bovo. — Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 6		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		13.10%	0.80%	79.50%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	55.00%	19%	0%	65%	Y
Cava	38.00%	73%	100%	27%	Y

Hispanic voters favored Bovo while the white voters voted for Cava — Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 7		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		33.90%	4.10%	53.60%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	43.00%	25%	0%	70%	Y
Cava	50.00%	71%	90%	25%	Y

White and Black voters favored Cava while Hispanics overwhelmingly supported Bova — Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 8		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		26.10%	10.30%	55.10%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	43.00%	60%	0%	36%	Y
Cava	50.00%	28%	100%	56%	Y

Hispanics and Black voters favored Cava while White voters voted 60% for Bovo — Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 9		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		9.90%	27.20%	54.50%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	35.00%	60%	2%	51%	Y
Cava	55.00%	35%	85%	39%	Y

85% Black voters favored Cava while white and Hispanics voted over 50% for Bovo — Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 10		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		10.90%	0.90%	81.80%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	59.00%	47%	0%	65%	N
Cava	34.00%	44%	100%	27%	N

Votes are split so polarization cannot be determined in district 10

DISTRICT 11		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		9.20%	2.90%	80.00%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	53.00%	0%	0%	66%	Y
Cava	41.00%	97%	100%	26%	Y

97% white and 100% black voters favored Cava while 66% Hispanics voted for Bova

Polarization Exists

DISTRICT 12		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		8.20%	1.40%	82.30%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	54.00%	70%	0%	58%	N
Cava	39.00%	23%	89%	36%	N

70% White voters favored Bova while 89% black voters voted for Cava Black percentage is very low in this district hence not statistically significant. Hispanics are split but 58% supported Bova Racial bias cannot be determined

DISTRICT 13		Bi-Variate Regression			Significant?
Percent Reg Voters		8.30%	2.30%	82.40%	
Candidate Name	% of Total Votes	White	Black	Hispanic	
Bovo	61.00%	99%	0%	76%	Y
Cava	30.00%	1%	100%	19%	Y
Majority of White and Hispanic voters supported Bova while 100% black voters supported Cava	Polarization Exists				

Conclusion: Evidence of racial polarization is present in 11 of the 13 districts for this 2020 General Mayors Election

Overall Evaluation:

Analyzing the voting patterns using the Bivariate Ecological Regression analysis shows racial bias or polarization in 23 of the 32 district elections from 2014 to 2020 using 6 election results. This means that there is a 72% bias towards block voting.

Appendix 3: Recommended Redistricting Map(s) and Data

County of Miami Dade, FL
Proposed Commission Districts - 11-10-21



District Summary

Miami-Plan3A-
11-10-21

District Count:	13
Total Population:	2,701,767
Maximum Deviation:	20,607
	9.92%
Average Deviation:	9,035
	4.35%
Minimum Count:	197,334
Maximum Count:	217,941

Name	Count	Optimum	Deviation	Deviation %
Danielle Cohen Higgins	217,378	207,828	9,550	4.60%
Eileen Higgins	212,511	207,828	4,683	2.25%
Javier D. Souto	217,774	207,828	9,946	4.79%
Jean Monestime	197,599	207,828	-10,229	-4.92%
Joe A. Martinez	216,661	207,828	8,833	4.25%
Jose "Pepe" Diaz	198,835	207,828	-8,993	-4.33%
Keon Hardemon	197,589	207,828	-10,239	-4.93%
Kionne McGhee	217,941	207,828	10,113	4.87%
Oliver Gilbert	197,334	207,828	-10,494	-5.05%
Raquel Regalado	214,622	207,828	6,794	3.27%

Rebeca Sosa	216,639	207,828	8,811	4.24%
Rene Garcia	198,882	207,828	-8,946	-4.30%
Sally A. Heyman	198,002	207,828	-9,826	-4.73%

District Summary

District Count:	13
Total Population:	2,701,767
Maximum Deviation:	20,607
	9.92%
Average Deviation:	9,035
	4.35%
Minimum Count:	197,334
Maximum Count:	217,941

Demographic Totals

HISP:	1,856,938	68.73%
NHWHT:	361,517	13.38%
NHBLK:	378,756	14.02%
NHAIAN:	1,589	0.06%
NHASIAN:	41,672	1.54%
NHNHOPI:	385	0.01%
NHOTHER:	14,667	0.54%
NHP2MRCE:	46,243	1.71%

Name		Count	Optimum	Deviation	Dev. %
Danielle Cohen Higgins		217,378	207,828	9,550	4.60%
	HISP:	148,144	68.15%		
	NHWHT:	37,062	17.05%		
	NHBLK:	21,998	10.12%		
	NHAIAN:	157	0.07%		
	NHASIAN:	4,237	1.95%		
	NHNHOPI:	62	0.03%		
	NHOTHER:	1,280	0.59%		
	NHP2MRCE:	4,438	2.04%		
Eileen Higgins		212,511	207,828	4,683	2.25%
	HISP:	153,441	72.20%		
	NHWHT:	43,914	20.66%		
	NHBLK:	4,482	2.11%		

	NHAIAN:	121	0.06%		
	NHASIAN:	3,655	1.72%		
	NHNHOPI:	19	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	1,579	0.74%		
	NHP2MRCE:	5,300	2.49%		
Javier D. Souto		217,774	207,828	9,946	4.79%
	HISP:	191,005	87.71%		
	NHWHT:	19,490	8.95%		
	NHBLK:	1,759	0.81%		
	NHAIAN:	47	0.02%		
	NHASIAN:	3,078	1.41%		
	NHNHOPI:	23	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	616	0.28%		
	NHP2MRCE:	1,756	0.81%		
Jean Monestime		197,599	207,828	-10,229	-4.92%
	HISP:	79,862	40.42%		
	NHWHT:	9,151	4.63%		
	NHBLK:	102,114	51.68%		
	NHAIAN:	165	0.08%		
	NHASIAN:	2,062	1.04%		
	NHNHOPI:	27	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	1,116	0.56%		
	NHP2MRCE:	3,102	1.57%		
Joe A. Martinez		216,661	207,828	8,833	4.25%
	HISP:	183,606	84.74%		
	NHWHT:	17,802	8.22%		
	NHBLK:	6,934	3.20%		
	NHAIAN:	123	0.06%		

	NHASIAN:	4,596	2.12%		
	NHNHOPI:	37	0.02%		
	NHOTHER:	1,019	0.47%		
	NHP2MRCE:	2,544	1.17%		
Jose "Pepe" Diaz		198,835	207,828	-8,993	-4.33%
	HISP:	175,712	88.37%		
	NHWHT:	13,921	7.00%		
	NHBLK:	2,496	1.26%		
	NHAIAN:	94	0.05%		
	NHASIAN:	3,266	1.64%		
	NHNHOPI:	15	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	890	0.45%		
	NHP2MRCE:	2,441	1.23%		
Keon Hardemon		197,589	207,828	-10,239	-4.93%
	HISP:	94,656	47.91%		
	NHWHT:	24,672	12.49%		
	NHBLK:	69,772	35.31%		
	NHAIAN:	170	0.09%		
	NHASIAN:	2,489	1.26%		
	NHNHOPI:	28	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	1,287	0.65%		
	NHP2MRCE:	4,515	2.29%		
Kionne McGhee		217,941	207,828	10,113	4.87%
	HISP:	142,946	65.59%		
	NHWHT:	17,011	7.81%		
	NHBLK:	50,554	23.20%		

	NHAIAN:	169	0.08%		
	NHASIAN:	2,817	1.29%		
	NHNHOPI:	24	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	1,263	0.58%		
	NHP2MRCE:	3,157	1.45%		
Oliver Gilbert		197,334	207,828	-10,494	-5.05%
	HISP:	87,747	44.47%		
	NHWHT:	9,562	4.85%		
	NHBLK:	93,385	47.32%		
	NHAIAN:	160	0.08%		
	NHASIAN:	2,113	1.07%		
	NHNHOPI:	26	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	1,215	0.62%		
	NHP2MRCE:	3,126	1.58%		
Raquel Regalado		214,622	207,828	6,794	3.27%
	HISP:	136,120	63.42%		
	NHWHT:	55,966	26.08%		
	NHBLK:	9,340	4.35%		
	NHAIAN:	102	0.05%		
	NHASIAN:	6,050	2.82%		
	NHNHOPI:	61	0.03%		
	NHOTHER:	1,345	0.63%		
	NHP2MRCE:	5,638	2.63%		
Rebeca Sosa		216,639	207,828	8,811	4.24%
	HISP:	190,371	87.87%		
	NHWHT:	20,037	9.25%		
	NHBLK:	2,020	0.93%		
	NHAIAN:	84	0.04%		

	NHASIAN:	1,801	0.83%		
	NHNHOPI:	17	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	629	0.29%		
	NHP2MRCE:	1,680	0.78%		
Rene Garcia		198,882	207,828	-8,946	-4.30%
	HISP:	181,498	91.26%		
	NHWHT:	11,497	5.78%		
	NHBLK:	2,973	1.49%		
	NHAIAN:	45	0.02%		
	NHASIAN:	1,282	0.64%		
	NHNHOPI:	13	0.01%		
	NHOTHER:	606	0.30%		
	NHP2MRCE:	968	0.49%		
Sally A. Heyman		198,002	207,828	-9,826	-4.73%
	HISP:	91,830	46.38%		
	NHWHT:	81,432	41.13%		
	NHBLK:	10,929	5.52%		
	NHAIAN:	152	0.08%		
	NHASIAN:	4,226	2.13%		
	NHNHOPI:	33	0.02%		
	NHOTHER:	1,822	0.92%		
	NHP2MRCE:	7,578	3.83%		

District Compactness

District	Name
1	Oliver Gilbert
Area:	37.22
Perimeter:	31.49
Width/Length Ratio:	0.481
Population Density:	5,302.16
Reock Test:	0.311
Polsby-Popper Test:	0.472
Convex Hull Ratio:	0.870
Schwarzberg Test:	1.456
Grofman Test:	5.161
2	Jean Monestime
Area:	32.16
Perimeter:	41.74
Width/Length Ratio:	0.813
Population Density:	6,144.30
Reock Test:	0.222
Polsby-Popper Test:	0.232
Convex Hull Ratio:	0.628
Schwarzberg Test:	2.076
Grofman Test:	7.359
3	Keon Hardemon
Area:	29.14
Perimeter:	32.62
Width/Length Ratio:	0.815
Population Density:	6,781.58
Reock Test:	0.387
Polsby-Popper Test:	0.344
Convex Hull Ratio:	0.816
Schwarzberg Test:	1.705
Grofman Test:	6.043

4	Sally A. Heyman
Area:	68.59
Perimeter:	50.86
Width/Length Ratio:	0.668
Population Density:	2,886.59
Reock Test:	0.343
Polsby-Popper Test:	0.333
Convex Hull Ratio:	0.752
Schwarzberg Test:	1.732
Grofman Test:	6.141
5	Eileen Higgins
Area:	55.80
Perimeter:	50.83
Width/Length Ratio:	0.785
Population Density:	3,808.73
Reock Test:	0.247
Polsby-Popper Test:	0.271
Convex Hull Ratio:	0.574
Schwarzberg Test:	1.920
Grofman Test:	6.805
6	Rebeca Sosa
Area:	40.27
Perimeter:	42.54
Width/Length Ratio:	0.653
Population Density:	5,379.42
Reock Test:	0.292
Polsby-Popper Test:	0.280
Convex Hull Ratio:	0.695
Schwarzberg Test:	1.891
Grofman Test:	6.703
7	Raquel Regalado
Area:	127.98
Perimeter:	76.31

	Width/Length Ratio:	0.488
	Population Density:	1,676.96
	Reock Test:	0.261
	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.276
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.751
	Schwarzberg Test:	1.903
	Grofman Test:	6.746
8		Danielle Cohen Higgins
	Area:	208.84
	Perimeter:	115.99
	Width/Length Ratio:	0.443
	Population Density:	1,040.89
	Reock Test:	0.220
	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.195
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.652
	Schwarzberg Test:	2.264
	Grofman Test:	8.026
9		Kionne McGhee
	Area:	1,231.86
	Perimeter:	297.69
	Width/Length Ratio:	0.681
	Population Density:	176.92
	Reock Test:	0.369
	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.175
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.821
	Schwarzberg Test:	2.393
	Grofman Test:	8.482
10		Javier D. Souto
	Area:	33.90
	Perimeter:	33.67
	Width/Length Ratio:	0.846
	Population Density:	6,423.66
	Reock Test:	0.401

	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.376
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.802
	Schwarzberg Test:	1.632
	Grofman Test:	5.784
11		Joe A. Martinez
	Area:	238.84
	Perimeter:	104.39
	Width/Length Ratio:	0.304
	Population Density:	907.16
	Reock Test:	0.228
	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.275
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.767
	Schwarzberg Test:	1.905
	Grofman Test:	6.755
12		Jose "Pepe" Diaz
	Area:	523.20
	Perimeter:	110.02
	Width/Length Ratio:	0.384
	Population Density:	380.04
	Reock Test:	0.375
	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.543
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.947
	Schwarzberg Test:	1.357
	Grofman Test:	4.810
13		Rene Garcia
	Area:	27.09
	Perimeter:	31.08
	Width/Length Ratio:	0.789
	Population Density:	7,341.65
	Reock Test:	0.324
	Polsby-Popper Test:	0.352
	Convex Hull Ratio:	0.799
	Schwarzberg Test:	1.685

Grofman Test:	5.972