

Analysis of Five Proposed Maps

The Collier County Commission Redistricting mapping criteria below is listed verbatim from the June 22, 2021 Executive Summary. **Bold** and *italics* added for emphasis, re-numbering (from 1-4 and 1-4 to 1-8) is for convenience of reference.

PRIMARY CRITERIA (numbered 1-4 in Executive Summary)

1. The **population** of each district should be **as similar as possible**.
2. All districts should be **as compact and regularly shaped as feasible**.
3. The **incumbent Commissioner's residence (and the same for School Board members) must remain in his or her current district**.
4. Consider racial and ethnic populations in accordance with the law.

SUPPLEMENTAL CRITERIA (also numbered 1-4 in Executive Summary)

5. *Any plan that has a retrogressive effect on minority voting strength would be eliminated from further consideration.*
6. **Well-defined, easily recognizable, and major boundaries**, such as rivers, arterials and major roads, **should be utilized** *when not in conflict with other criteria.*
7. **Former district boundaries should generally be maintained** *when not in conflict with other criteria.*
8. **Communities of interest**, such as Golden Gate Estates, **and neighborhood integrity should be preserved** *when not in conflict with other criteria.*

Below is an analysis for each of the five proposed map alternatives with responses correlating to the above eight criteria.

MAP 1

1. Similar population: The deviation from the ideal population (75,150) is 5.2%, second lowest deviation of the five maps, behind only Map 4.
2. Compact and regularly shaped: This map is 54% compact, 2nd highest/greatest compactness of the five maps. District 4 is the most compact and District 5 is the least compact.
3. Incumbency protection: Yes.
4. Racial & ethnic populations per law: Yes.
5. Retrogression: No retrogression of Hispanic minority in District 5, rather an increase in both voting age population and total population of Hispanic minority.
6. Well-defined, recognizable, major boundaries: Most boundaries follow major features, more so than the other 4 maps, and the stair-step between Districts 1 and 3 is eliminated. Only one new boundary is not easily recognizable, that being the north boundary of District 3 shared with District 5 extending east from the Collier/Lee County line.
7. Former (existing) district boundaries: Potentially, Districts 1, 2 and 4 could be retained completely as both Districts 2 and 4 must gain population and District 1 is within the acceptable population range of deviation. Existing Districts 2 and 4 are maintained completely while being expanded; District 1 both gains and loses a small area at the northwest boundary with Districts 3 and 4; District 3 loses the second most land area and gains the largest land area, out of necessity to lose population and shift eastward; District

- 5, encompassing by far the largest land area and must lose population out of necessity, loses the most area but it is a small reduction in size compared to the size of the District.
8. Communities of interest: This map divides Golden Gate Estates east of Collier Blvd. between Districts 3 and 5; retains the Lely outfall canal as a boundary thus continues to divide the now developing Isles of Collier Preserve community (Sabal Bay PUD/DRI, Planned Unit Development/Development of Regional Impact) between Districts 1 and 4; and, retains I-75 and Santa Barbara Blvd. as boundaries thus continues to divide Berkshire Lakes PUD/DRI between Districts 3 and 4 and now 1 and 4, respectively. This map eliminates the stair-step near the northwest corner of District 1 thus no longer divides the low-density neighborhood along Cope Lane and along Sunset Blvd./Polly Avenue.

MAP 2

1. Similar population: The deviation from the ideal population (75,150) is 9.5%, the greatest deviation of the five maps.
2. Compact and regularly shaped: This map is 54.7% compact, the highest/greatest compactness of the five maps. District 4 is the most compact and District 5 is the least compact.
3. Incumbency protection: Yes.
4. Racial & ethnic populations per law: Yes.
5. Retrogression: No retrogression of Hispanic minority in District 5, rather an increase in both voting age population and total population of Hispanic minority.
6. Well-defined, recognizable, major boundaries: Most boundaries follow major features and the stair-step between Districts 1 and 3 is eliminated. However, two new boundaries are not easily recognizable: the north boundary of District 3 shared with District 5 extending east from the Collier/Lee County line; and two portions the east boundary of District 3 shared with District 5 that runs south of Golden Gate Blvd. to I-75 – the first following a canal that connects to the Golden Gate main canal, and the second following an imaginary southerly extension of the Golden Gate main canal and on the east side of White Lake Industrial Park PUD.
7. Former (existing) district boundaries: Potentially, Districts 1, 2 and 4 could be retained completely as both Districts 2 and 4 must gain population and District 1 is within the acceptable population range of deviation. Existing Districts 2 and 4 are maintained completely while being expanded; District 1 both gains and loses a small area at the northwest boundary with Districts 3 and 4; District 3 loses the second most land area and gains the largest land area, out of necessity to lose population and shift eastward; District 5, encompassing by far the largest land area and must lose population out of necessity, loses the most area but it is a small reduction in size compared to the size of the District.
8. Communities of interest: This map divides Golden Gate Estates east of Collier Blvd. between Districts 3 and 5; retains the Lely outfall canal as a boundary thus continues to divide the now developing Isles of Collier Preserve community (Sabal Bay PUD/DRI) between Districts 1 and 4; and retains I-75 and Santa Barbara Blvd. as boundaries thus continues to divide Berkshire Lakes PUD/DRI between Districts 3 and 4 and now 1 and 4, respectively. This map eliminates the stair-step near the northwest corner of District 1 thus no longer divides the low-density neighborhood along Cope Lane and along Sunset Blvd./Polly Avenue.

MAP 3

1. Similar population: The deviation from the ideal population (75,150) is 7.3%, the second greatest deviation of the five maps, ahead of only Map 5.
2. Compact and regularly shaped: This map is 46.9% compact, the lowest/least compact of the five maps. District 1 is the most compact and District 4 is the least compact.
3. Incumbency protection: Yes.
4. Racial & ethnic populations per law: Yes.
5. Retrogression: No retrogression of Hispanic minority in District 5, rather an increase in both voting age population and total population of Hispanic minority.
6. Well-defined, recognizable, major boundaries: Most boundaries follow major features. Nonetheless, there are more boundaries on this map than the other four maps that are less well defined, less recognizable, and minor. The stair-step remains near the northwest corner of District 1, now shared with District 4; the boundary between Districts 1 and 5 in the vicinity of Everglades City follow small canals, creeks and waterways (or Census Blocks within them) that run mostly east and south of Everglades City, Plantation Island and Chokoloskee; a portion of the boundary between Districts 2 and 3 north of Immokalee Road follows minor features - an unnamed canal and a powerline - and another portion follows a zoning district/community boundary rather than major physical features (Quail West PUD); a portion of the boundary between Districts 2 and 4 south of Pine Ridge Road and west of I-75 follows zoning district/community boundaries rather than major physical features (Marbella Lakes subdivision/Livingston Village PUD); and, a portion of the boundary between Districts 3 and 5, north of Immokalee Road, extending east from the north boundary of Heritage Bay PUD/DRI, follows a canal or swale for approximately one mile.
7. Former (existing) district boundaries: Potentially, Districts 1, 2 and 4 could be retained completely as both Districts 2 and 4 must gain population and District 1 is within the acceptable population range of deviation. Existing District 2 is maintained completely while being slightly expanded to the east and south. District 4 is maintained except for about 1 square mile at the NE corner with District 2 and is expanded to the east into District 5. District 1 is maintained completely while being slightly expanded at the SE corner with District 5. District 3 retains most of its land area but, out of necessity to lose population and shift eastward, loses area at the NW corner with District 2 and along the south border with District 1 and expands to the east. District 5, encompassing by far the largest land area and must lose population out of necessity, loses the most area - to Districts 3 and 5 - but it is a small reduction in size compared to the size of the District.
8. Communities of interest: This map retains the Lely outfall canal as a boundary thus continues to divide the now developing Isles of Collier Preserve community (Sabal Bay PUD/DRI) between Districts 1 and 4; retains the stair-step near the northwest corner of District 1 thus continues to divide the low-density neighborhood along Cope Lane and along Sunset Blvd./Polly Avenue, now between Districts 1 and 4; and, retains I-75 as a boundary thus continues to divide Berkshire Lakes PUD/DRI between Districts 3 and 4, though less so than the existing map.

MAP 4

1. Similar population: The deviation from the ideal population (75,150) is 3.4%, the least deviation of the five maps.

2. Compact and regularly shaped: This map is 49.9% compact, the second lowest/least compact of the five maps. District 2 is the most compact and District 5 is the least compact.
3. Incumbency protection: Yes.
4. Racial & ethnic populations per law: Yes.
5. Retrogression: No retrogression of Hispanic minority in District 5, rather an increase in both voting age population and total population of Hispanic minority.
6. Well-defined, recognizable, major boundaries: Most boundaries follow major features. However, the stair-step remains near the northwest corner of District 1, now shared with District 4; a portion of the boundary between Districts 2 and 4 south of Pine Ridge Road and between I-75 and Airport-Pulling Road follows zoning district/community boundaries rather than major physical features (Marbella Lakes subdivision/Livingston Village PUD and Grey Oaks PUD/DRI); and, a boundary between Districts 3 and 5 south of Immokalee Road, extending south from the Curry Canal, follows 9th Street SW in Golden Gate Estates until reaching the Golden Gate main canal.
7. Former (existing) district boundaries: Potentially, Districts 1, 2 and 4 could be retained completely as both Districts 2 and 4 must gain population and District 1 is within the acceptable population range of deviation. District 1 is maintained completely – there are no changes. Existing District 2 is maintained completely while being expanded to the south. District 3 loses the second most land area, along the south and SW borders, and gains the largest land area – to the east, out of necessity to lose population and shift eastward. District 4 retains most of its area, losing approximately two square miles at the NE border with District 2 and gains area to the east from District 3. District 5, encompassing by far the largest land area and must lose population out of necessity, loses the most area – to District 3 - but it is a small reduction in size compared to the size of the District.
8. Communities of interest: This map divides Golden Gate Estates east of Collier Blvd. between Districts 3 and 5; retains the Lely outfall canal as a boundary thus continues to divide the now developing Isles of Collier Preserve community (Sabal Bay PUD/DRI) between Districts 1 and 4; and, retains the stair-step near the northwest corner of District 1 thus continues to divide the low-density neighborhood along Cope Lane and along Sunset Blvd./Polly Avenue, now between Districts 1 and 4. This map eliminates the division of Berkshire Lakes PUD/DRI between Districts 3 and 4.

MAP 5

1. Similar population: The deviation from the ideal population (75,150) is 6.6%, the third greatest and third least deviation of the five maps.
2. Compact and regularly shaped: This map is 50.2% compact, the third highest/greatest compactness and third lowest/least compactness of the five maps. District 1 is the most compact and District 4 is the least compact.
3. Incumbency protection: Yes.
4. Racial & ethnic populations per law: Yes.
5. Retrogression: No retrogression of Hispanic minority in District 5, rather an increase in both voting age population and total population of Hispanic minority.
6. Well-defined, recognizable, major boundaries: Most boundaries follow major features and the stair-step between Districts 1 and 3 is eliminated. However, the boundary between Districts 1 and 4 follows remote, obscure features (Census Blocks) south and west of Henderson Creek; a portion of the boundary between Districts 2 and 3 north of Immokalee

Road follows minor features - an unnamed canal and a powerline – and another portion follows a zoning district/community boundary rather than major physical features (Quail West PUD); a portion of the boundary between Districts 2 and 4 south of Pine Ridge Road and between I-75 and Airport-Pulling Road follows zoning district/community boundaries rather than major physical features (Marbella Lakes subdivision/Livingston Village PUD and Grey Oaks PUD/DRI); and, a portion of the boundary between Districts 3 and 5, north of Immokalee Road, extending east from the north boundary of Heritage Bay PUD/DRI, follows a canal or swale for approximately one mile.

7. Former (existing) district boundaries: Potentially, Districts 1, 2 and 4 could be retained completely as both Districts 2 and 4 must gain population and District 1 is within the acceptable population range of deviation. This is the only map that fully retains the existing boundaries just one District out of a possible three. Existing District 2 is maintained completely while being expanded to the south. District 1 maintains most of its area but also loses the second most area – to District 4 to the west and gains the most area by far – near NW corner from District 3, and to the east from District 5 all the way to the Broward and Miami-Dade County lines. District 3 loses a small area at the NW corner with District 2 and a larger area along south border with District 1, and gains area to the east with District 5, all out of necessity to lose population and shift eastward. District 4 retains most of its area, losing approximately two square miles at the NE border with District 2, and gains area to the east from District 3 and to the SE from District 1. District 5, encompassing by far the largest land area and must lose population out of necessity, loses the most area – over one half of the District – to the west with Districts 1 and 3.
8. Communities of interest: This map divides the fewest communities of interest, only one, as it retains I-75 as a boundary thus continues to divide Berkshire Lakes PUD/DRI between Districts 3 and 4 - though less so than the existing map. This map eliminates Lely outfall canal as a boundary thus no longer divides the now developing Isles of Collier Preserve community (Sabal Bay PUD/DRI) between Districts 1 and 4; and eliminates the stair-step near the northwest corner of District 1 thus no longer divides the low-density neighborhood along Cope Lane and along Sunset Blvd./Polly Avenue.