


EXHIBIT 2

via electronic mail

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Chairman and Members, Board of County Commissioners
Jefferson County

FROM: Kurt Spitzer 

DATE: August 16, 2013

RE: Redistricting of the Board of County Commissioners

The purpose of this memorandum is to discuss the process that has been used by the consultants in the redistricting effort and the draft proposals for new districts. You have previously been provided with copies of maps illustrating two proposed plans to redistrict the boundaries of the Jefferson County Commission. Further comments and suggestions from the County Commission, members of the public and other interested parties will be obtained next week and thereafter.

At a minimum, all county governments are required to consider the necessity to realign the district boundaries of its legislative body (the County Commission) after each decennial census. The primary purpose of such redistricting exercises is to determine if the population of each district is as close to being equal to one another as is possible, thus furthering the goal of "one person, one vote" and other policy objectives.

General Guidelines for Redistricting

Population is the dominant criteria to be considered in all districting plans. Districts should be as nearly equal in population as is possible and in most cases may not be greater than 5% over (or under) the average district size.

Other criteria are considered when redistricting commission boundaries. They are intended to preserve communities of interest and create districts and district boundaries that are easily understood by voters. All criteria are considered in total - none are absolute. A variety of factors are "balanced" with each other. In addition to equal population, other criteria include:

1. No Discriminatory Effect – Where it is clear that a minority community votes in a cohesive manner, districts should not be drawn in a way that has a discriminatory effect toward that community. District boundaries that have the effect of diluting minority voting strength should be avoided. However, districts that have highly illogical or "bizarre" shapes, that are

drawn exclusively to create minority-influence or minority-majority districts, should likewise be avoided.

2. Census Blocks – Data from census blocks is presumed to be correct and is an efficient source of population information. Generally, district boundary lines should follow census block boundaries, although splitting one or more census blocks is acceptable when necessary to further a valid policy objective.
3. Logical Boundaries – District boundaries should generally follow significant, existing natural or man-made boundaries when possible and practical to do so, such as major highways, railroads, water-bodies, etc., as those types of boundaries are more easily understood by the electorate.
4. Municipal and Neighborhood Boundaries – District boundaries should attempt to avoid splitting neighborhood and municipal boundaries.
5. Compact District Shape – While district shapes will never be perfect circles or squares, they should have a shape that is relatively compact. “Bizarre” or “serpentine” shapes should be avoided.
6. Recognition of Existing District Boundaries – Plans to redistrict county commissions should follow existing boundaries to the extent possible, as such plans recognize the preferences of the voters that elected the incumbents.

Data Sources and Software

The consulting team used several sources of data during the course of the project. Population information for 2010 was obtained from the US Bureau of the Census in units known as “census blocks.” Such blocks are of widely varying shapes and population sizes but generally follow logical boundaries such as city blocks, streets, roads or highways, creek beds, lakes, railroad tracks, etc.

Block data includes the total number of persons identified as being residents of the census block. It also includes a wide variety of information concerning the background of each person, such as race and ethnicity.

Data concerning the existing district boundary lines was provided to the consultant by the staff of Jefferson County. Additionally, a wide variety of other readily available geographic features (roads, water bodies, etc.) was added into the mapping database.

The primary software used for data analysis and mapping purposes was ESRI Corporation’s ArcGIS 10.1.

Adding ("Layering") County Data

Current commission district boundaries were added as a data field. Layering existing districts over the 2010 population data allowed the consultant to determine the current population of each district and whether one or more districts were significantly over or under the population of the average district size, and the racial composition of the population of each district.

Generally, districts should be less than 5% over or under the average size of a commission district. After adding the current district boundaries to the new population data, it was determined that the populations of the current commission districts were not "as nearly equal in population as possible" as required by the Florida constitution and statutes.

Using the 2010 data, the average or "ideal" population size of the commission districts in Jefferson County is 2,952. Current populations of the existing commission districts (prior to redistricting) are as follows:

District	Average Population	Actual Population	Deviation	Percent Deviation
1	2,952	3,108	156	5.28%
2	2,952	2,741	(211)	-7.15%
3	2,952	3,066	114	3.85%
4	2,952	3,113	161	5.45%
5	2,952	2,733	(219)	-7.42%

Thus, four of five districts are not within the generally-accepted thresholds for population; two of the five districts deviate significantly from the average district size.

Districts 1 and 4 should lose at least a small amount of population. District 3's population is acceptable without changing boundaries. The Districts requiring the most significant revisions are District 2 and District 5, which must gain population.

Proposed Districting Plans

While redistricting of the County Commission's district boundaries is necessary, major realignment of the existing district boundaries was not necessary in order to bring Jefferson's Commission Districts into compliance.

Two plans for new district boundaries that meet acceptable criteria are proposed for discussion and consideration. Both use the boundaries of the existing districting plan to the greatest extent possible. Demographic and statistical information concerning each plan is included in a table located at the bottom of the maps previously provided to the County Commission.

There are over 530 census blocks in Jefferson County that contain population. By moving only seven populated blocks (Plan A) or only eight populated blocks (Plan B), either of the proposed plans is consistent with generally accepted districting principals.

Features Common to both Proposed Plans

1. To add population to District 2 and to reduce population in District 1, both Plan A and Plan B move the following populated blocks from District 1 into District 2. An illustration of the area is attached.
 - Census Block 4015 – 69 people
 - Census Block 4049 – 12 people

2. To add population to District 5 and to reduce population in District 4, both Plan A and Plan B move the following populated blocks from District 4 into District 5. An illustration of the area is attached.
 - Census Block 2057 - 14 people
 - Census Block 2121 - 26 people

Proposed Districting Plan A

In addition to the revisions noted above, Plan A makes the following changes:

1. To add population to District 5 and reduce population in District 3, Plan A moves Census Block 2056 (15 people) from District 3 to District 5. An illustration of the area is attached.

2. To add population to District 5 and reduce population in District 1, Plan A moves Census Blocks 1024 (19 people) and 1025 (10 people) from District 1 to District 5. An illustration of the area is attached.

Proposed Districting Plan B

In addition to the revisions noted above ("*Features Common to both Proposed Plans*"), to add population to District 5 and reduce population in District 1, Plan B moves Census Blocks 3055 (nine people), 3056 (19 people), 3057 (three people) and 3060 (13 people) from District 1 to District 5. An illustration of the area is attached.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.