**HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF JACKSONVILLE REDISTRICTINGS**

**1980-81**

* 1980 Census data applied to 1970 districts showed population variation from 65,204 in the most populous district to 32,056 in the least populous district – a 103% spread between the most and least populated districts; ideal target – 40,785.
* The Planning Department was tasked to draw the new districts and did so, but the results were severely criticized by the City Council, the Mayor and the newspapers at the time.
* John Libby of Market Research and Analysis, Inc., a former U.S. Census Bureau employee and political pollster, voluntarily drafted a plan and presented it to the City Council as an alternative to the Planning Department’s proposal. A version of the Libby plan was adopted.
* The Rules Committee served as the reapportionment committee of the Council.
* The final plan produced districts ranging in population from 42,133 to 39,761 – a 5.9% range of deviation from the target population.
* 4 districts had majority African-American population: 56.7%, 80.1%, 65.5% and 66.1%; total African-American population citywide was 24.6%.
* Because of population growth in the 1970s, one district was moved from the north/west the south/east side of the river to create 8 north/west districts and 6 south/east districts.
* Districts were drawn such that City Council incumbents Harold Gibson and Sallye Mathis were placed in the same district, but Ms. Mathis was in poor health and not planning to run for reelection; 2 School Board members were drawn into 1 new district.
* City Council districts were re-numbered so that 2 pairs of majority African-American council districts would produce 2 majority African-American School Board districts.

**1990-91**

* 1990 Census data applied to the 1980 districts showed population variation from 95,304 in the most populous district to 30,661 in the least populous district – 214% spread between the most and least populated districts; ideal target – 48,069.
* A Special Committee on Reapportionment was appointed to produce a proposal for City Council consideration.
* The Special Committee recommended and the Council hired Strategic Demographics Research Inc. of Gainesville (former Florida Speaker of the House Jon Mills and University of Florida professor Richard Scher) to produce the redistricting plan.
* Total African-American population citywide – 24.4%. Compared to 1980 when 80% of Jacksonville’s minority population lived in the Northwest Quadrant, by 1990 only 63% lived in the same area, although the citywide minority population had increased by 24,000 since 1980.
* The consultant used 6 criteria in devising its proposals: 1) population equality among districts (no more than 10% total deviation from most to least populous); 2) racial fairness (4 “impact” districts); 3) contiguity; 4) communities of interest; 5) compactness; and 6) preservation of the core of existing districts.
* The consultant submitted several different plans for consideration: one with 4 “impact” districts with at least 63% minority population; one with 4 “impact” districts with at least 65% minority population; one with 4 “impact” districts ranging from 56% to 80% minority population; one with 3 “impact” districts; and one with 7 council districts south/east of the river.
* John Libby’s firm, ATS Research, submitted several proposals including a 14-district plan with 4 minority access districts, a 19-district/no at-large plan with 5 minority access districts, and a plan with 12 “neighborhood” single-member districts and 7 single-member “superdistricts”.
* Midway through the process the Special Committee considered whether the redistricting should be delayed and a referendum held on changing the form of the Council to eliminate the at-large seats. When the committee did not resume work, the Council President turned the task of redistricting over to the Rules Committee.
* When the redistricting process was not completed by the 6-month deadline established in the Ordinance Code, the Council waived the Code and extended the deadline to November 5, 1991.
* The plan finally adopted kept 6 complete districts on the south/east side of the river but included small portions of north/west districts 9 and 11 which crossed the river to the south/east and a small portion of south/east district 6 crossed the river to the north to incorporate the core of downtown (a holdover from the 1980 plan). Districts 7 and 8 crossed the Trout River to the north.
* Several months after passage of the redistricting plan the Council amended it to shift a council district line slightly to return an incumbent School Board member to his district, from which he had been removed by the original plan.

**2000-01**

* 2000 Census data applied to the 1990 districts showed population variations from 73,573 in the most populous district to 42,235 in the least populous district – a 74% spread between the most and least populated districts; ideal target – 55,634 if using total population, 40,992 if using voting age population.
* A Special Committee on Reapportionment was appointed to produce a proposal for Ctiy Council consideration.
* The Special Committee recommended and the Council hired Applied Mapping, Inc. (AMI) of Jacksonville to produce a redistricting plan.
* AMI used the following criteria to produce its various plans: 1) City Charter requirements – equal district populations and logical and compact geographic patterns; 2) topography; 3) geography; 4) cohesiveness; 5) contiguity; 6) integrity; 7) compactness of territory 8) communities of interest; 9) legal considerations (Voting Rights Act, US Supreme Court decisions on redistricting; 10) Census data, including total and voting age population and racial characteristics of the city.
* The Census was certified on March 25 and AMI produced 4 initial plans for consideration – Plans A-D – in April. After another meeting in which the use of race as a redistricting factor was discussed by General Counsel Cindy Laquidara, AMI produced Plan E.
* City Council extended the 30 day deadline for the Reapportionment Committee to make its report for an additional 30 days to May 25th, then another 60 days to July 26th.
* The committee met throughout June and individual council members visited AMI’s offices to work on refinements to the plan; AMI produced Plans F-W. The Reapportionment Committee reported Plan W to the full Council on July 11.
* After numerous individual council member town hall meetings and the 3 official Rules Committee public hearings, the Rules Committee held a workshop meeting on September 27 and refined and referred Plan X to Council.
* The plan finally adopted moved a district from the north/west to the south/east side of the river for a 7/7 division; portions of north/west districts 7, 9 and 11 crossed the river to the south/east while a portion of south/east district 6 crossed the river to the north/west to encompass a portion of downtown; districts 7 and 8 crossed the Trout River.
* The 4 traditionally minority districts had minority populations of 68.8%, 66.4%, 58.4% and 58.3%.

**2010-11**

* 2010 Census data applied to the 2000 districts showed population variations from 76,458 in the most populous district to 49,560 in the least populous district – a 54% spread between the most and least populated districts; ideal target – 61,733 if using total population, 47,196 if using voting age population.
* The districts north/west of the river were short of the target population by 7,000 – 10,000, so all needed to grow geographically to achieve the target.
* The Rules Committee was designated as the Council’s Committee on Reapportionment.
* The committee determined to utilize the Planning and Development Department and the Supervisor of Elections’ Office to produce a redistricting plan.
* The Rules Reapportionment Committee ranked the various criteria affecting redistricting as follows:
* Most important/legally required: population equality
* Next most important: compactness, contiguity, represent communities of interest, minimize river crossings
* Somewhat lesser importance – elected official incumbency, preservation of existing districts
* The initial plan developed created a stand-alone Beaches district (which required a crossing of the Intracoastal Waterway to the west to pick up additional population to meet the target size), moving a complete district from the north/west to the south/east side of the river, and crossing the St. Johns River one time to form a district encompassing San Jose, San Marco, Downtown, Springfield, Brooklyn and Riverside (connecting the historic first-ring suburbs around downtown as a community of interest). A School Board representative said a district spanning from San Jose to Springfield would be extremely difficult to represent from a schools perspective.
* City Council elections were held in 2011 and a new Rules Committee was seated to continue the task.
* The final adopted plan maintained the 7/7 division of districts on the north/west and south/east sides of the river. The downtown/first ring suburbs river crossing concept was abandoned and the sole river crossing district was moved to the northeast area, encompassing the Hidden Hills/Monument Road area connecting to the Northside via the Dames Point Bridge.
* The 4 traditionally minority districts had minority populations of 63.94%, 68.25%, 58.36% and 57.43%.