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INTRODUCTION

Every four years, in the year preceding the City of Tampa elections, Florida Law and the City of Tampa Charter require the Planning Commission to hold a Public Hearing to recommend and approve a set of single-member districts to the Supervisor of Elections. Due to residency requirements for mayoral candidates, the law requires this process to be completed by April 1 in the year prior to the next election. The next City Council election is scheduled for March 2019, and therefore the Planning Commission must complete their recommendation by April 1, 2018.

Four alternatives are under consideration. These alternatives have been prepared by staff and reviewed by the Supervisor of Elections. The purpose of this report is to: 1) Summarize the Tampa City Council redistricting process; 2) Summarize the public input received at the outreach meetings; and 3) Provide information in support of the alternatives. One of the four alternatives will be the staff recommendation and, upon Planning Commission approval, will remain in effect for the next four years. The City of Tampa redistricting is unique in following a four-year process and is not triggered by the Decennial Census by which most other entities are redistricted (e.g. Congressional redistricting). The final decision for redistricting resides with the Planning Commission. Therefore, the Planning Commission is not making a recommendation to the City of Tampa but rendering a decision.

WHAT ARE THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS?

Tampa City Council redistricting is governed by Chapter 79-573, Laws of Florida, as amended by Chapter 84-535 and Chapter 86-404 (codified in part of Section 8 of the Related Laws of the City of Tampa, as amended). The relevant Tampa ordinance is Ordinance No. 2000-212. Appendix A contains a copy of the applicable Florida Law.

The highlights of the legal requirements are summarized below:

- The Supervisor of Elections is responsible for redividing the City of Tampa based upon the recommendation and approval of the Planning Commission.

- When dividing the population, precinct boundaries cannot be split to arrive at the “equal population” requirement.

- The Supervisor of Elections cannot proclaim the Districts until the Planning Commission has held a public hearing to discuss the boundaries and solicit comments by the public.

- Districts should not be “contorted” geographically into irregular or non-compact forms to arrive at either the “equal population” or the “minority district” criteria.
• The data used to determine the population of the single-member council districts shall be the latest published Census tables or the Population and Housing Estimates published by the Planning Commission, whichever is the most current [The April 1, 2017 Population and Housing Estimates produced by the Planning Commission is the most recent data and was used to determine the population of the districts].

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

Section 8.03 of the City Charter (as stipulated by Florida Law Ord. No. 2000-212, § 1, 8-17-00) requires only one (1) Public Hearing to receive public comment prior to the Planning Commission’s decision. Staff scheduled six (6) outreach events to maximize public awareness and input. The Supervisor of Elections and his staff were active participants in the outreach events. These events were scheduled in or near precincts under consideration to be moved during the redistricting process. Of the six events, one was cancelled due to Hurricane Irma. Staff scheduled a replacement, but it too was cancelled due to damage from Hurricane Irma. There was a separate presentation to the NAACP’s general meeting concerning changes in District 5.

These outreach events were advertised in La Gaceta, The Florida Sentinel and The Tampa Bay Times. Public notification signs were posted at each location one week in advance of the meetings and were publicized through social media. WTSP requested an interview regarding the redistricting process. The interview was provided and also placed on our website. All outreach material was loaded on our website.

Outreach events were scheduled from 5:00 – 8:00 PM. Staff provided approximately 15 hours of availability to the public. Staff met with six of seven City Council members, including the four single-member district members prior to conducting the outreach.

The outreach events were uniform in their presentation, organization and materials distributed. Maps of each alternative were on site along with demographic data. Each participant was provided a comment form and strongly encouraged to rank the alternatives or provide feedback. Although the turnout was larger than prior redistricting outreach events, few comments were provided on the handouts.

After all outreach events, staff found a tabulation mistake for one of the alternatives. This alternative undercounted the number of African-American voters by 98 people or 1.4%. Once this error was discovered, the Supervisor of Elections and the NAACP were notified.

PUBLIC OUTREACH MAP (OPPOSITE PAGE)
The outreach events were scheduled in or adjacent to precincts under consideration in the alternatives. Additionally, the outreach events were held within a 2.5 mile radius between each other to facilitate ease of access and participation. Due to Hurricane Irma, the event scheduled at the Seminole Heights Library for September 7, 2017 was cancelled as was a follow-up meeting intended for September 18th at the West Tampa Public Library.
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OUTREACH 1
August 30, 2017
821 South Rome Avenue, Tampa
OUTREACH 2
August 31, 2017
7 Miles from the Site
OUTREACH 3
September 5, 2017
Robert Saunders Library
1550 North Nebraska Avenue, Tampa
OUTREACH 4
September 7, 2017
Sunnyside Heights Library
6711 North Central Avenue, Tampa

ALL TIMES FROM 5:00-8:00 PM
What is Redistricting and Why Is It Necessary?

Tampa City Council is composed of three at-large members representing all City residents and four members representing single-districts or a portion of the City. In order to ensure the residents of Tampa’s four single-member districts have equal representation, state and local election laws require the districts be as equal as possible in population size. The standard is total population, not voting age population nor the population of a race or ethnicity.

Redistricting is the redefinition of single-member election districts as a result of differing population growth over time. Redistricting typically occurs in the year immediately following the Decennial Census of Population and Housing. The City of Tampa’s redistricting cycle is atypical in that it occurs every four years, prior to Citywide elections and is an off-cycle election. That is, City elections are scheduled on years where there are neither presidential or mid-term congressional elections. Due to residency requirements for mayoral candidates, redistricting must be completed one year before the election.

Although redistricting redistributes population among the single-member districts, the law contains explicit instructions on how this is to be carried out. First, only whole Precincts may be moved from one District into another. Planning Commission staff must respect the integrity of the Precinct boundaries, as provided by the Supervisor of Elections, and are unable to split or otherwise alter their boundaries. Second, Districts must remain compact and contiguous. The law prohibits the creation of misshapen or non-compact Districts to arrive at the equal population requirement. Third, staff are prohibited from redistricting incumbents out of office. These three constraints limit the number of alternatives and prohibit ill-conceived maps. At the same time, these requirements ensure redistricting meets the legal requirements while minimizing negative impacts to any one District or community.

The range as a percentage of the mean is the tool used to evaluate potential alternatives and arrive at the “equal as possible” criteria. The range is derived by calculating the population average from all four districts. The district with the lowest population is subtracted from the district with the highest population and the result is divided by the average. Presently, the range is 3.1%. Planning Commission staff has held an informal standard that a range over 5% was unacceptable, at 2.5% being acceptable and alternatives under 2.0% being optimal. These standards are derived from Supreme Court ruling in Brown v Thomson which allowed a range for state legislative districts up to 10%. The City of Tampa being a much smaller jurisdiction than a legislative district, has a lower range of acceptability.
The population estimates for the four single member districts, the average and range are included in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>353,560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean (average) 88,930
Population Range 88,390
Range as percent of the mean 3.1%

The range between the District 5 (largest population) and District 4 (lowest population) is only 2,720 people. Equal population should be as close to 88,390 people as possible and so Planning Commission staff sought Precincts at or near the population of 2,720. In order to ensure redistricting did not impede the ability of any group or party to elect a candidate of their choice, additional data was examined. All possible redistricting scenarios were examined against the voting rolls (number of registered voters) and cross tabulated by race and ethnicity as of April 1, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61,469</td>
<td>48,351</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54,815</td>
<td>14,044</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
<td>29,469</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>54,496</td>
<td>30,788</td>
<td>56.50%</td>
<td>6,049</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>13,459</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>25,087</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>10,513</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>8,145</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>221,417</td>
<td>118,270</td>
<td>53.40%</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
<td>33,743</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, District 5 has been the majority African-American district and District 6 the majority Hispanic District. Until 2013, City of Tampa redistricting was subject to Federal oversight by the Justice Department in a process known as preclearance. This required special care creating District 5 to minimize retrogression: the dilution of the minority vote. Redistricting in the City of Tampa no longer requires Federal oversight due to a Supreme Court decision.

Concern among constituents of District 5 that they may no longer have representation in District 5 required additional scrutiny of the data by staff. Staff has been aware of concerns in the African-American community that the racial composition is changing due to gentrification. The areas of concern include ChannelSide area (Precincts 160 and 161) and West Tampa (Precinct 207) where North Boulevard Homes and Presbyterian Village once stood.
These concerns were taken seriously. Staff spent time identifying changes in these precincts and observed downtown Tampa and ChannelSide continuing to redevelop but larger developments, for example Water Street, will not be built until after 2019. Permit data, published reports on occupancy trends, as well as our own data were scrutinized. Since our estimates are based on Certificates of Occupancy (CO) issued, we reviewed our COs to ensure they were complete up to March 31, 2017 to prepare April 1, 2017 estimates. Through extensive conversations with the City of Tampa’s permitting department, we procured several COs not originally reported to us. This quality control process assured all records were complete and included.

The most crucial component of the quality control process was working with the Tampa Bay Housing Authority (TBHA) and the local Florida Department of Transportation office (FDOT 7). TBHA relocated residents from North Boulevard Homes and FDOT relocated residents from Presbyterian Village. They maintained records on where these residents now reside. The Tampa Housing Authority provided information on 1700 residents. Of these 1700, approximately 100 were deceased or evicted during the relocation process.

Through TBHA's assistance, staff located 1,140 residents and geocoded their addresses into their new Precincts. We could locate 115 residents from Presbyterian Village using FDOT’s data. Most of the relocations out of North Boulevard Homes were into other Precincts in District 5.

Although Precinct 207 lost approximately 1,700 people (including children – not just adults), approximately 800 residents relocated in other precincts in District 5. The map on the opposite page illustrates the relocation of these residents. The remaining residents ended up in District 4 (85), District 6 (144), and District 7 (112). Based on these results and other research, staff has reached a tentative conclusion that the African American population is shifting north into precincts 338 and 342.

None of the alternatives diminished or caused retrogression within Districts 6 or 5. The existing percentage of registered black voters in District 5 is 53.8% and all alternatives raise this percentage modestly up to or near 55%. In 2013, during the last redistricting, the percentage of Black voters was 61% and has declined by 8%. It is staff’s opinion that now, all districts can elect a candidate of their choice without any impediment.

Redistricting is intended to be a color-blind process and independent of race and/or ethnic considerations. The Voting Rights act requires there be no discrimination on account of race or ethnicity. These two conflicting requirements require staff to focus solely on population change, while attending to questions of race, without allowing questions of race to dominate the process. This process requires time, outreach and participation to ensure the alternatives meet the legislative intent.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

As stated earlier, due to population growth, the four City Council, Single-member Districts must be redistricted. The map entitled, Reference Map, on pp. 10 displays the current existing Districts. Below is a summary of development activity for each District. The summary of growth explains the different growth patterns characteristic of each District. Each has seen changes in population but for differing reasons.

1. DISTRICT 4: District 4 has the lowest population of the four districts (by 2,720 people). Development in this area is characterized by the demolition of older, smaller dwelling units and their replacement by larger units. Of the 2,012 demolitions permitted from April 1, 2010 – March 31, 2017, 985 occurred in District 4. Staff checked the physical location of these demolitions against the location of new residential units. There were 605 new units built at the locations of demolitions. That is around 60% of new residential units replacing existing units and consistent with media reports. The Tampa Bay Times published an article in 2016, As Florida McMansions Multiply, Neighbors Cope in the Shadows. The author states: If there’s one trend that has characterized Tampa Bay’s new-home market in recent years, it’s the proliferation of huge new houses replacing or overwhelming smaller ones in established neighborhoods like Davis Islands and St. Petersburg’s Snell Isle. Many Realtors and property owners welcome the new construction, which is boosting sales and driving up value.

While anecdotal accounts would indicate greater growth in this District, the data reflects a trend towards infill and the replacement of existing, older housing stock.

2. DISTRICT 5: District 5 has the largest population. The District would have an even larger population if not for the large number of demolitions. There were approximately 500 residential units (single family and duplexes) demolished over the past seven years. Almost the entirety of these demolitions were not accompanied with new construction. In general, the area between Central Avenue and 22nd streets had the largest number of demolitions without accompanying redevelopment.

3. DISTRICT 6: District 6 bears some resemblance to District 4 in having many demolitions accompanied by new construction. Staff identified 257 demolitions/rebuilds out of a total of 647 demolitions in this District. Development in District 6 is almost entirely multi-family housing units with 989 units permitted for apartments. While there has been a large amount of attention on Downtown redevelopment, Westshore has had tremendous growth.

4. DISTRICT 7: Throughout the aughts, District 7 (North Tampa) was the fastest growing area. Between 2000 and 2010, over 11,000 units received a CO. The number of COs in that District has dramatically slowed as Downtown and Westshore have become redevelopment areas. Since 2010, approximately 3,300 units have received a CO.


New dwelling units in District 7 are essentially split between multi-family housing (893 apartments, 472 townhomes) and single-family detached (1345 units). To put it in a different perspective, 33% of new housing stock are apartments. The majority of housing in District 7 was constructed within the last 20-25 years and so the number of demolitions is negligible.

**Alternatives**

Since the existing range was at 3.1% and already in a *good range*, staff prepared four alternatives. Each alternative improved on the existing range and mostly focused on the same Precincts (small ranges reduce the number of available Precincts). While possible to move many Precincts, there is a high risk of unintended consequences: neighborhoods may be split, and residents negatively affected, with little improvement in the range.

There were two approaches used. First, staff modeled a move of a Precinct directly out of District 5 and into District 4. This attempt focuses on downtown Tampa and the ChannelSide area. In ideal redistricting scenarios, Precincts are moved directly out of the highly populated District and into the lower populated District. This scenario didn’t work because Districts 4 and 5 are separated by the Hillsborough River and are barely contiguous. District 4 shares a border with only two Precincts in District 5.

The second approach relies on moving Precincts out of District 5 into District 6 and then moving Precincts out of District 6 into District 4. This is a roundabout approach, requiring scrutiny, as it can result in a domino effect of Precincts rapidly moving to offset changes in the range. One goal of this redistricting was to leave District 7 untouched. Since District 7 was already in range and met the compactness and contiguous criteria, it was thought best to focus on the three remaining Districts.

The Map on pp 11 illustrates the eligible Precincts that could be considered in the redistricting process. An eligible Precinct is one that shares a border with another District and its movement doesn’t violate the compactness or contiguousness requirements. Ineligible Precincts are constrained by political boundaries (e.g. boundaries between the City of Tampa and Unincorporated Hillsborough County) or physical boundaries (e.g. Tampa Bay).
Alternative 1

Map: Alternative 1

Alternative 1 has a range of 2.1%. The range is under 5% and 2.5% and is in an acceptable range. In Alternative 1, two precincts are moved. First, Precinct 151 is moved out of District 6 and into District 4. Precinct 151 is an irregularly shaped precinct that juts out of District 6 and is almost surrounded by District 4. The northern boundary of Precinct 151 is Platt Street, its southern boundary is Swann Avenue, its eastern boundary is Willow Avenue and its western boundary is Armenia Avenue.

Second, Precinct 333 is moved out of District 5 and into District 6. Precinct 333 is an irregularly shaped Precinct with a northern boundary of Sligh Avenue, a southern boundary of Hillsborough Avenue, an eastern boundary just past 115th Avenue and a western boundary of Interstate-275. Precinct 333 was moved into District 5 during the last redistricting. Its demographic profile is dissimilar to other Precincts in District 5. As of April 1, 2017, there were 1,427 registered voters in this Precinct. There were 235 Black voters or 16% of the population and 896 white voters or 63% of the population. Therefore, moving this Precinct would not result in retrogression.
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RANGE = 2.1%
ALTERNATIVE 2

Map: Alternative 2

Alternative 2 has a range of 2.5% and is at the high end of the acceptable range. Alternative 2 was premised on moving much of Downtown Tampa out of District 5 and into District 4. This alternative was created out of concern over District 5’s changing demographic profile. As it is presently constituted, Downtown Tampa consists of four (4) Precincts with the largest being Precinct 161 (Precincts in downtown consist of 163, 161, 160, 304). For this reason, Precinct 161 was selected to be moved out of District 5 and into District 4. Precinct 161 is bordered on the south and the east by Tampa Bay. Its northern boundary is Kennedy Boulevard and its western boundary is the Hillsborough River. Precinct 161 is the only Precinct eligible to be moved based on the contiguity requirement. None of the other Precincts are eligible for movement without taking 161 with them.

A number of concerns (economic, demographic, political) were brought to staff’s attention regarding this alternative. At this time, the population of any one Precinct is too low to move into District 5 with the overall population too large to move the entirety of Downtown out of District 5 and into another District. It is staff’s opinion that in a future redistricting, the Downtown Precincts will likely be moved out of District 5. Furthermore, it is staff’s opinion that all Precincts should be moved at once and not in a piece-meal fashion over four to eight years. A piece-meal approach would violate the compactness and contiguous approach and created a fractured downtown.

3 Precinct 999 is also in Downtown Tampa. It is, in fact, the County Center with registered voters assigned to it but it obviously lacks any population. Precinct 999 would also be moved should Downtown Tampa transition to another District but its demographic impacts are negligible.
ALTERNATIVE 3

Map: Alternative 3

Alternative 3 has a range of 1.7% and is in the optimal range (below the 2% threshold) and it closely resembles Alternative 1 because only two precincts are moved. First, Precinct 145 is moved out of District 6 and into District 4. Precinct 145 is a relatively compact, rectangular shaped precinct. The northern boundary of Precinct 145 is Kennedy Boulevard, its southern boundary is Swann Avenue, its eastern boundary varies between Armenia Avenue and Howard Avenue (the eastern boundary is irregularly shaped). The western boundary is entirely MacDill Avenue.

Second, Precinct 333 is moved out of District 5 and into District 6. Precinct 333 is an irregularly shaped precinct with a northern boundary of Sligh Avenue, a southern boundary of Hillsborough Avenue, an eastern boundary just past 115th Avenue and a western boundary of Interstate-275. This is the same Precinct that was moved in Alternative 1.
RANGE = 1.7%
ALTERNATIVE 4

Map: Alternative 4

Alternative 4 has the lowest range of all four alternatives at 1.5%. It resembles Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 in that both Precincts 145 and 151 are moved out of District 6 and into District 4. Likewise, Precinct 333 is moved from District 5 into District 6. To compensate for moving multiple Precincts from District 6 into District 4, District 4 donates 133 to District 6.

The rationale for this map was to clean up the Precincts along Kennedy Boulevard. Precinct 131 is a split Precinct with a small portion isolated between Precincts 145 and 151. Staff felt that moving both Precincts out of District 6 into District 4 would make that area more compact. These two precincts all reside in part or in whole between Cleveland Street and Swann Avenue. Staff moved Precinct 133 out of District 4 into District 6 to compensate for the population change.
**Findings and Recommendations**

It should come as no surprise that participants at outreach events were most interested in their respective neighborhoods, Precincts and then their Districts. For example, no attendee at the Copeland Park outreach event (District 7) provided feedback. Seeing that none of the alternatives affected them, many returned the forms and left the event. The five outreach events received an average number of five participants. Staff received only two feedback forms, two phone-calls, two-emails and an interview request from WTSP. The NAACP meeting generated the greatest number of participants and responses.

Some participants questioned the selection of certain Precincts for inclusion in the Alternatives and the exclusion of others. The process was explained and most attendees were satisfied. The number of attendees was larger than the number of responses. In a separate section of this report, you will find the submitted feedback sheets but the general tenor of feedback can be summarized below:

**Alternative 1** – Alternative 1 has the benefit of moving the fewest number of people. Citizens who preferred no change as an option would indicate this to be their second-best choice. Alternative 1 has the third lowest range and at 2.1% is in the acceptable range.

**Alternative 2** – Alternative 2 has the benefit of eliminating a Precinct from downtown Tampa. Residents who perceive that District 5 is changing to the detriment of current residents may lean towards this alternative. Alternative 2 is at the upper limit of acceptability at the 2.5% range.

**Alternative 3** – In our original outreach, staff made a mistake on one of our handouts indicating this Precinct had the highest percentage of African American voters. This made it the most popular alternative. Once the error was detected, both the NAACP and the Supervisor of Elections were notified. The population numbers ARE correct for this alternative and it has a range in the optimal region.

**Alternative 4** – Alternative 4 has the lowest possible range but also received the most criticism. Alternative 4 was perceived as splitting neighborhoods in South Tampa and creating a District where residents with common interests would be represented by different Council members. The range between Alternative 3 and Alternative 4 is negligible at .2% but the dislike of Alternative 4 expressed by attendees was quite pronounced.

After the outreach process, and accounting for the tabulation error, staff is satisfied that Alternative 3 is the preferred option with Alternative 1 being the second choice. However, the number of persons participating or commenting on the process was very low. The overall registered number of voters is 221,417 and the overall participation was 32 people or 0.014% of the number of registered voters.
**ALTERNATIVE 3 IN DETAIL**

Alternative 3, as the preferred option, minimizes retrogression on the part of the Hispanic and African American communities and is in the optimal range. Unlike Alternative 4, it was both favorably received and is more compact. This alternative only moves two Precincts as opposed to the four Precincts moved in Alternative 4. Since the range separating these two alternatives is only .2%, or 100 people, Alternative 3 satisfies the legal requirements.

Alternative 3 affects two Precincts. The alternative lowers the population of District 5 by 1,900 people by moving Precinct 333 into District 6 and 145 out of District 6 into District 4. This is a total of 1,700 people.

The number of registered voters in Precinct 333 who voted in the 2015 Municipal election was 159 out of 1,389 voters or 11% of the registered voters. The number of registered voters in Precinct 145 who voted in the 2015 municipal election was 102 out of 1,152 voters or 9% of the registered voters. The demographic profile of the two districts is as follows:

| 333 Polling Location: Northeast Methodist Church |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL | DEMS | REPS | NPA | OTHER | LPF |
| WHITE | 886 | 387 | 249 | 234 | 2 | 14 |
| BLACK | 221 | 173 | 5 | 43 | 0 | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 178 | 90 | 18 | 69 | 0 | 1 |
| OTHER | 104 | 47 | 14 | 43 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 1389 | 697 | 286 | 389 | 2 | 15 |

| 145 Polling Location: Jewish Town Centers |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL | DEMS | REPS | NPA | OTHER | LPF |
| WHITE | 870 | 220 | 361 | 285 | 1 | 3 |
| BLACK | 44 | 30 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 2 |
| HISPANIC | 173 | 84 | 39 | 49 | 0 | 1 |
| OTHER | 68 | 20 | 17 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 1155 | 354 | 418 | 376 | 1 | 6 |

Based on the best available data, staff concludes and recommends the selection of Alternative 3 as the new boundaries for the four, single-member City Council Districts. Staff’s conclusion rests on population estimates and feedback from various neighborhood groups. The conclusion was clarified by comparing registered voter data and historical voter turnout. Although not required, this further analysis demonstrates Alternative 3 has neither the intent nor effect of diluting or causing retrogression.

Staff balanced the legal requirements with the concerns of the citizens, namely, their preference in preserving neighborhood integrity with the least intrusive changes. Alternative 3 achieves both of these goals.
APPENDIX A

CITY OF TAMPA
ORDINANCE
City of Tampa Ordinance

Article VIII. Elections*

*State law references: Florida Election Code, F.S. Ch. 97 et seq.

Sec. 8.03. [Redivision of election districts.]

In the year immediately preceding the year in which regular elections shall be held for electing the various officers to serve as city officials, but no later than April 1 of that preceding year, all of the territory then included within the corporate limits of said city shall be redivided by the elections officer, upon the recommendation and with the approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, into seven council districts, three of those districts being identical with the territorial boundaries of the city, and four districts being divisions of the entire city, each containing as nearly as possible equal population, while maintaining the integrity of precinct boundaries. Said districts and their boundaries shall not be numbered and proclaimed by said officer until the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has held at least one public hearing to discuss the said boundaries and to solicit comments by the public. The public hearing shall be noticed in a newspaper of general circulation in the city, once a week for 2 consecutive weeks, and shall be placed in an area of the newspaper other than the classified section. Such notice shall be no smaller than 4 inches by 6 inches and shall contain the time and location of such public hearing and the purpose thereof. The public hearing(s) shall be held after 7:30 p.m. Any time after the public hearing(s) the districts and their boundaries shall thereupon be numbered and proclaimed by the elections officer and notices of the same shall be published once a week for 2 consecutive weeks in a daily newspaper of general circulation in the city and shall be placed in an area of the newspaper other than the classified section. In determining the population in the council districts and the precincts, the elections officer shall base the determination according to the latest published official census figures, federal or state, or the "Population and Housing Estimates" as promulgated yearly by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, whichever shall be the most current.

(Laws of Fla., Ch. 79-573, § 3; Ord. No. 8148-A, § 7, 1-6-83; Laws of Fla., Ch. 84-535, § 1; Laws of Fla., Ch. 86-404, § 1; Ord. No. 2000-212, § 1, 8-17-00)

District boundaries are set based on Chapter 79-573 Laws of Florida, as amended by Chapter 84-535 and Chapter 86-404 (codified in part of Section 8 of the Related Laws of the City of Tampa, as amended).
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO CITY COUNCIL, LEGAL ADVERTISEMENTS, NEWS ARTICLES AND MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCES
May 1, 2017

Mr. Craig Latimer, Supervisor of Elections
Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections Office
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 16th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

Supervisor Latimer:

RE: City of Tampa Redistricting

Planning Commission staff wishes to discuss with your office the upcoming redistricting for the City of Tampa. The Tampa City Charter, Article VIII, Section 8.03, states the incorporated city shall be redistricted by the Supervisor of Elections, "...upon the recommendation and with the approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission into seven council districts, three of those districts being identical with the territorial boundaries of the city and four districts being divisions of the entire city, each containing as nearly as possible as equal population, while maintaining the integrity of precinct boundaries." In addition, this project, including all required legal advertisements and public hearings must be completed, "no later than April 1..." of 2018.

Planning Commission staff is currently preparing population estimates, benchmarked as of April 1, 2017, and allocating them to City of Tampa voting precincts. The tabulation of registered voters by precincts has been completed.

We respectfully request the assistance of a designated employee of the Supervisor of Elections Office to coordinate with our staff. The project manager for the redistricting effort will be Terry Eagan, available at 272-5940, ext. 349. Please have your liaison contact Mr. Eagan to initiate planning for this project.

We hope to have an initial kick-off meeting between Planning Commission staff, Supervisor of Elections staff and a representative from the City of Tampa Legal Department as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Melissa E. Zornitta, AICP
Executive Director

MEZ/te
Hillsborough County
City-County
Planning Commission

July 11, 2017

The Honorable Yvonne Yolie Capin, Chair and members of City Council
Tampa City Council
315 East Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33602

The Honorable Yvonne Capin, Chair, and City Council:

The Planning Commission staff has formally begun the process of redistricting the City of Tampa’s four single-member districts. The Tampa City Charter, Article VIII, Section 8.03, states that the incorporated city shall be redivided by the Supervisor of Elections, “…upon the recommendation and with the approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, into seven council districts, three of those districts being identical with the territorial boundaries of the city, and four districts being divisions of the entire city, each containing as nearly as possible as equal population, while maintaining the integrity of precinct boundaries.” In addition, this project, including all the advertisements and public hearings, must be completed “…no later than April 1…” of 2018.

Planning Commission staff prepared Population Estimates as of April 1, 2017. Four alternative scenarios for redistricting were prepared based on those estimates. Planning Commission staff met with the Supervisor of Elections staff, and the City’s legal counsel, to prepare and complete the project in an expeditious manner as possible. Public outreach will occur in September and October with Planning Commission action scheduled in either late 2017 or early 2018. The project manager for the redistricting effort is Terry Eagan, available at 272-6940, Ext. 349.

As part of this process, we will brief the Planning Commission at its August 14th Regular Meeting on redistricting of the City of Tampa’s four single-member districts. We would welcome the opportunity to brief you all on the process and alternatives.

We look forward to having the redistricting completed by the required date of April 1, 2018. We intend to minimize any disruption to the existing districts while still meeting the letter and spirit of the law. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or Mr. Eagan.

Sincerely,

Melissa Zornitta, AICP
Executive Director

Attachment: Sec. 8.03 [Redivision of election districts.]
Hillsborough County
City-County
Planning Commission

July 19, 2017

Ms. Yvette Lewis, President
Hillsborough County Branch, NAACP
308 East Martin Luther King Blvd, Suite C
Tampa, FL 33602

Ms. Lewis

The Planning Commission staff has formally begun the process of redistricting the City of Tampa’s four single-member districts. The Tampa City Charter, Article VIII, Section 8.03, states the incorporated city shall be redivided by the Supervisor of Elections, “...upon the recommendation and with the approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, into seven council districts, three of those districts being identical with the territorial boundaries of the city, and four districts being divisions of the entire city, each containing as nearly as possible as equal population, while maintaining the integrity of precinct boundaries.” In addition, this project, including all the advertisements and public hearings, must be completed “...no later than April 1...” of 2018.

Planning Commission staff prepared Population Estimates as of April 1, 2017. Four alternative scenarios for redistricting were prepared based on these estimates. Planning Commission staff met with the Supervisor of Elections staff, and the City’s legal counsel, to prepare and complete the project in as expeditious a manner as possible. Public outreach will occur in August and September with Planning Commission action scheduled in either late 2017 or early 2018. The project manager for the redistricting effort is Terry Eagan, available at 272-5940, Ext. 349.

As part of this process, we will brief the Planning Commission at its August 14th Regular Meeting on the redistricting of the City of Tampa’s four single-member districts. We would welcome the opportunity to brief you all on this process and alternatives.

We look forward to having the redistricting completed by the required date of April 1, 2018. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact myself or Mr. Eagan.

Sincerely,

Melissa Zomitta, AICP
Executive Director

Attachment: Sec. 8.03 [Redivision of election districts.]
Ms. Pinzón:

The Planning Commission staff has formally begun the process of redistricting the City of Tampa’s four single member districts. The Tampa City Charter, Article VIII, Section 8.03 states the incorporated city shall be redivided by the Supervisor of Elections, “…upon the recommendations and with the approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, into seven council districts, three of those districts being identical with the territorial boundaries of the city, and four districts being divisions of the entire city, each containing as nearly as possible as equal population, while maintaining the integrity of precinct boundaries.” In addition, this project, including all advertisements and public hearings, must be completed “…no later than April…” of 2018.

Planning Commission staff prepared Population Estimates as of April 1, 2007. Four alternative scenarios for redistricting were prepared based on these estimates. Planning Commission staff met with the Supervisor of Elections staff, and the City’s legal counsel, to prepare and complete the project in as expeditious a manner as possible. Public outreach will occur in August and September with Planning Commission action scheduled in either late 2017 or early 2018. The project manager for the redistricting effort is Terry Eagan, available at 272-5940, Ext. 349.

As part of this process, we will brief the Planning Commission at its August 14th Regular Meeting on the redistricting of the City of Tampa’s four single-member districts. We would welcome the opportunity to brief you all on this process and alternatives.

We look forward to having the redistricting completed by the required date of April 1, 2018. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact myself or Mr. Eagan.

Sincerely,

Melissa Zornitta, AICP
Executive Director

Attachments: Sec. 8.03 [Redivision of election districts.]
November 15, 2017

Ms. Yvette Lewis, President
Hillsborough County Branch, NAACP
338 East Martin Luther King Blvd, Suite C
Tampa, FL 33602

Ms. Lewis

I am writing to apologize for an error I made on a handout I provided at the General Meeting on October 19th. In tabulating the number of registered voters for Alternative 3, I made a mistake. In that alternative I undercounted the number of Black voters by 93 people. For that alternative, the true number of Black voters in District 5 is 29,248 and not 29,150. This lowers the percentage of Black voters from 56.1% to 54.7%.

The total population for all alternatives is calculated independently of the registered voter tabulation and those population numbers are correct. The range of population is also correct for all four alternatives.

If you or your general members have questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me directly. I am available at (813) 273-3774 ext. 349. I encourage any member who wishes to revise the selection of their alternative to email me at eagant@plancom.org

The last item, we have scheduled the public hearing for redistricting on January 22, 2018 at 7:30 pm. I hope to see you at the meeting.

Sincerely,

Terry Eagan
Project Manager

Attachment: Corrected Alternatives
All Public Outreach ads were published on August 18th in *La Gaceta*, *The Florida Sentinel* and *The Tampa Bay Times*. 
The following legal ad was placed in La Gaceta, The Florida Sentinel and The Tampa Bay Times. This outreach event was cancelled due to Hurricane Irma.
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**AS WE HEARD IT**

(Continued from page 2)

Tampa City Council Redistricting | Staff Report

1. **The story of the Tampa City Council Redistricting**

Councillors are looking to run for judge in Hillsborough County. She is a legal assistant for the St. Petersburg Police Department.

2. **Executive Director of the Hillsborough County Soil and Water Conservation District Betty Tompkins received a great honor recently. She was the Florida Governor’s Award winner for the recent Southeastern Regional Meeting of the National Assocation of Conservation Districts.**

3. **She was honored for more than 40 years of involvement in conservation movement through conservation district activities, and organizations such as E.P.**

4. **It’s not the first time the amazing lady has been recognized for her work in the community. She’s also been inducted into the Florida Hall of Fame.**

5. **A fundraiser kickoff for Republican candidate for Tampa City Council District 5, Mike Wells, will be held on Tuesday, Aug. 22, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Crowne Plaza at 1401 Pebble Beach Dr.**

6. **A part of the event includes House Speaker Richard Corcoran, State Senator Wilton Simpson, State Representative Randy Fine, and Tampa Mayor Bob Buckhorn.**

7. **The event will include a live auction to raise money and support the campaign.**

8. **The Tampa Bay Club and the League of Women Voters will co-host an event on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

9. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

10. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

11. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

12. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

13. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

14. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

15. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

16. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

17. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

18. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

19. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

20. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

21. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

22. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

23. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

24. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

25. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

26. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

27. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

28. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

29. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

30. **The event will include a panel discussion on the importance of voting and the need for citizens to get out and vote.**

The Planning Commission will hold public meetings to get feedback on four maps to redraw the Tampa City Council districts. The changes are to even out the populations of the 14 district council seats.

We are happy with maps that make significant changes as long as possible. The quorum created good diversity on Tampa City Council. We feel that maps 1 and 3 keep things pretty close to the way they are and could support either one.

Map 2 is a little wartsome, as we believe could make Design 6, which is commonly known as the "West Tampa" District, susceptible to being controlled by voters south of 10th Street. This map (Precinct 133 from District 4 South Tampa) to Design 6 (West Tampa). This precinct has one of the highest voter percentages in the city. Add this to the other six precincts to make the council for West Tampa important. Only the South Tampa District has too much power in the city. Every mayor in recent history with the exception of a few years has lived in the city. So this change, added to the Union area, would mean that a city council in the future could have five members living in the city of the land mass and money and occasional flooding.

Map 2 also has some interesting ramifications. It does not. Currently, Downtown is completely in the East Tampa Black-majority District 5. This frustrates some of the up-and-coming politically active non-black homeowners who might want to run for the Tampa City Council in the future. Running in District 5 is an non-starter for them, as the seat for many years to come will be dominated by black candidates.

Some black wannabes might want to run outside of the city, believing the flood of Downtown residents, who are mostly white, will threaten their power. These worries are unfounded. Currently, District 5 is 58.8 percent black. All of the proposed maps increase that percentage from 44.7 to being the lowest and 56.1 being the highest.

Some concern in the black community worry that if the percentages falls below 50, they lose the seat. It’s just not true. It could go down to 45 percent or even 40 percent and still deliver black candidates as election winners.

Predominant minority districts are overall better than overstaffed majority minority districts, as the last set of State House, State Senate and Congressional races in Florida prove.

Just remember, any no to 4. These maps will be available for public viewing and comments at different dates and locations.

The last map, by Katz, Jackson Center for Policy, 81 S. Roma Ave.

Aug. 28, Sulphur Springs Library

Aug. 30, Charles Lindbergh Library

Sept. 4, Copperhead Park community center, 11001 N. 16th St.

Sept. 5, Robert Saunders Library

Sept. 5, Seminole Heights Library

The staff at the Planning Commission is opposed to the land change that is important to the future of Ybor City and the Adama community.

Two parcels around the very successful Corlett's Bakery at 26th Street and Adams Drive are targeted by local developers who would like to build a five-story, multi-family building with mostly parking. Current zoning is industrial and would allow commercial and residential use one or two stories. The future of Adama’s north side was determined by multi-use buildings. On the end closest to Downtown, that could change, but the end of the strip, four or five stories will be appropriate.

Staff at the Planning Commission is hamstrung by the fact that this parcel is a few blocks from parcels that are zoned for higher density. The rules typically discourage five-story buildings in our city to maintain historic buildings and changing industrial to residential in the suburbs, that change is needed. But north of Adama is not a sleepy suburb. Its destiny is already cast and this project will help it reach its potential quicker.

Fel with its present low density use, the site is more likely to be a one-story commercial strip surrounded by large, flat, ugly parking lots. The change will bring new buildings with interior parking garages and building sets that will change the border of the property boundaries.

That’s the way it should be done on this north side of Downtown. The Planning Commission will hear this land use change at its Aug. 16 meeting, at 5:30 p.m. The Board supports Ybor’s future.

“George and Ruth: Songs and Letters of the Spanish Civil War” is a play being presented by the Silver Meteor Gallery Aug. 17-27.

The play is based on excerpts of letters between George Weiss and his new bride Ruth, as he serves as a volunteer in the Spanish Civil War along the side of thepoor.

It is especially meaningful that this play will be performed in Ybor City because the Latin community was a main source of support for the Republic. Our Latin community raised money to support the war effort and many volunteers volunteered to fight the fascists under the banner of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Show times are Thursday-Saturday 7:30 p.m. and Sunday 2:30 p.m. The gallery is at 2213 8th St. Ave. in Ybor City. Cost is $15 per person and can be purchased at www.veBright.com.

Marilyn Alvarez is this year’s Hispanic Woman of the Year. Read about her in this week’s Silhouettes, on page 14.
Local

Councilman Urges Community Leaders To Get Involved In Election District Changes

BY IRIS B. HOLTON
Sentinel City Editor

The Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections Office and the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission will host several meetings to discuss redistricting. Two of the four community meetings are planned for next week.

The meetings will be held on: Tuesday, September 5th, at the Robert Saunders Library, 1505 N. Nebraska Avenue; and Thursday, September 7th, at the Seminole Heights Library, 4711 N. Central Avenue.

They have been set for residents to review maps and seek answers to their questions.

Redistricting is required by law each year before regular elections are held. All property within the city limits must be re-divided by the elections officers in accordance with population changes.

The population changes must be based on recommendations and approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, into seven Council districts. Three of those districts must be identical with territorial boundaries of the city. The other four districts must be divisions of the entire city, with each containing as nearly as possible, equal population.

Before the new districts can be instituted, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission is required by law to host at least one public hearing to discuss the boundaries and allow the public to comment.

According to the Planning Commission and based on the U. S. Census Report, there are 353,560 residents within the city limits of Tampa.

District 4, represented by Councilman Harry Cohen, which has 87,470 residents, is below the average population of 88,390 residents.

District 5, represented by Councilman Frank Reddick, has 90,190 residents, is above the average population of 88,390 residents. Since the law requires that the districts be as equal as possible, some boundaries must be reconfigured to reflect the population.

Councilman Reddick said, “I believe it is critical that all of our community leaders become active and engaged in this discussion. The Hillsborough County Planning Commission and Supervisor of Elections Office are holding meetings in various areas of the city over the next couple weeks.

“They are discussing the possible changes to the City Council boundaries in the future. We really need to hear from the residents within the City of Tampa and more specifically District 5. With the various population changes taking place within the City of Tampa, it may become more difficult to elect an African American to the Tampa City Council District 5 Seat.”

The Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections Office cannot proclaim the new districts until the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has held the public meetings and solicited comments about the changes.
A turtle hatchery in Cayo Largo, Cuba, needs work, researchers say, because it's too small and too hot for the creatures it aims to help.

A decline in the percentage of black voters in Tampa's only majority-black City Council district, District 5, has council member Frank Reddick worried.

"If we can't maintain the African-American voter numbers, I could be the last African-American representative," Reddick, the only black council member, said this week.

Gentrification near downtown is part of the reason.

"The shift from the 70s on has been from downtowns having large minority populations to the minorities moving away from the city center," said Terry Eagan of Plan Hillsborough.

Since the 2015 council redistricting, black voters have dropped from 61.3 percent to 53.8 percent of the district, said Eagan, who's working on the 2018 remapping.

The closing of North Boulevard Homes for West Tampa urban renewal and Presbyterian Village for Interstate 275 expansion uprooted some 2,000 district residents, many black.

Some older residents moved to the Encore project, remaining in District 5, but many moved to the University area, the Brandon area or south Hillsborough, Eagan said.

Eagan's group has come up with four alternative maps that increase the percentage of black voters in District 5 to as much as 56.1 percent. But gentrification isn't over. Oakhurst Square Apartments will be close next year, Reddick said.

Raulerson backs Fry, warns of Tallahassee influence

The tiny island of Cayo Largo in Cuba is home to 10 resort hotels but no permanent residents. Resort workers shuttle in and out by boat each day.

A turtle hatchery in Cayo Largo, Cuba, needs work, researchers say, because it's too small and too hot for the creatures it aims to help.
September 25, 2017

Terry,

Thank you for your time at the public meeting regarding City Council redistricting that was held at Kate Jackson Center a month ago. I have since had an opportunity to discuss the scenarios, that the Planning Commission developed, with the Board of Historic Hyde Park Neighborhood Association, which resides in District 4. I am writing this letter to relay the Board’s position.

The Historic Hyde Park Neighborhood Association Board prefers scenario number four, with scenario number one as its second preference. As we understand it, the staff’s scenario number one moves Precinct 151 into District 4. Scenario number four makes the same move of Precinct 151, but also removes Precinct 133 while adding Precinct 145 to District 4. In coming to the conclusion to favor scenario four, followed by scenario one, the Board weighted the importance of keeping the historic district intact within a precinct, as well as having our district include contiguous neighborhoods that deal with similar issues to ours.

Please let me know if you have any questions about our position.

Sincerely,

Marylou Y. Bailey

Historic Hyde Park Neighborhood Association
Board Member and Regulatory Committee Chair

(transmitted via email)
Hillsborough County Branch

General Membership Meeting

October 19, 2017

At

6:00pm

Location: Seminole Heights Library

(4711 N. Central Ave. Tampa, 33603)

Speaker

Hillsborough County
Planning Commission
(City Re-districting Maps)

The mission of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate race-based discrimination.
APPENDIX C

PUBLIC MEETINGS: SIGN IN SHEETS, WRITTEN COMMENTS.
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of "1" through "4."
Where "1" means the most favorable alternative and "4" means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

On Alternative 3 -
I think District (159) Har Bour Island needs to go into Westchase Avenue + District (141) comes into Countryside
What is the harbor island population? And what is its district number?

What is the population of the Palma Ceia West district that I asked you to keep together, with their other half. And what is that precinct number?

Thank you.

Anneliese Meier

On Aug 22, 2017, at 11:03 AM, Terry Eagan <eagant@plancom.org> wrote:

Anneliese --

Per your request, I checked the population numbers for precincts 159 and 141. Moving 159 from District 4 into District 5 increases that District’s population to 94,120 and decreases the registered number of African American voters to 51% (regression). Adding precinct 141 from 6 into 4 reduces the population in 6 to 85,800 and leaves District 4 at 86,920. This increases the range from 3.1% to 9.4%.

This would not be viable option.

Thank you for your participation and suggestion.

Sincerely,

Terry Eagan

Librarian, planhillsborough.org

eagant@plancom.org  •  813.273.3774 x349

All incoming and outgoing messages are subject to public records inspection.
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

Looking to prove the best amount of areas which is why I chose 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Email address (very important for us to have)</th>
<th>Mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>813-784-3562</td>
<td>&quot;<a href="mailto:Jasmine3201@gmail.com">Jasmine3201@gmail.com</a>&quot;</td>
<td>4968838 3rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-784-3562</td>
<td>&quot;<a href="mailto:Jasmine3201@gmail.com">Jasmine3201@gmail.com</a>&quot;</td>
<td>4968838 3rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-784-3562</td>
<td>&quot;<a href="mailto:Jasmine3201@gmail.com">Jasmine3201@gmail.com</a>&quot;</td>
<td>4968838 3rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-784-3562</td>
<td>&quot;<a href="mailto:Jasmine3201@gmail.com">Jasmine3201@gmail.com</a>&quot;</td>
<td>4968838 3rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-784-3562</td>
<td>&quot;<a href="mailto:Jasmine3201@gmail.com">Jasmine3201@gmail.com</a>&quot;</td>
<td>4968838 3rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-784-3562</td>
<td>&quot;<a href="mailto:Jasmine3201@gmail.com">Jasmine3201@gmail.com</a>&quot;</td>
<td>4968838 3rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sheet is public record and will be incorporated in the final staff report.

Tampa City Council Redistricting
Staff Report

Charles Fendle Library

August 30, 2017
Public Workshop

Tampa City Council Redistricting

Hillsborough County Planning Commission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>813-593-7191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613-397-3100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-877-4830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913-442-4311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997-1624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sign-in sheet is public record and will be incorporated in the final staff report.
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

Alternative 2 - seems best to pull #161 out of District 5 now. New residents will likely be higher income with interests that are better aligned with residents of District 14.
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

3 has the highest minority percentage for both Black & Hispanic populations
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Tampa City Council Redistricting Public Workshop
October 19, 2017

Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of "1" through "4."
Where "1" means the most favorable alternative and "4" means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Tampa City Council Redistricting Public Workshop
October 19, 2017

Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

Alternative 3 appears to be the best as from the stats it shows there will be a better representation of African voters.

Suggestion: Move precinct 338 or 345 into district 5.

...
Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of "1" through "4."
Where "1" means the most favorable alternative and "4" means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4
Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Tampa City Council Redistricting Public Workshop
October 19, 2017

Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4
Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of "1" through "4."
Where "1" means the most favorable alternative and "4" means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Feb 8th, 2018
Tampa City Council Redistricting Public Workshop
October 19, 2017

**Comment Worksheet**

*Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.*

Please rank each alternative on a scale of "1" through "4."
Where "1" means the most favorable alternative and "4" means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Tampa City Council Redistricting Public Workshop
October 19, 2017

Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

Alt #3 is the best for AP District
Tampa City Council Redistricting Public Workshop
October 19, 2017

Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of "1" through "4."
Where "1" means the most favorable alternative and "4" means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

---

Good Job!
Comment Worksheet

Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Comment Worksheet
Your comments are valuable to us! Thank you for your input.

Please rank each alternative on a scale of “1” through “4.”
Where “1” means the most favorable alternative and “4” means the least favorable alternative.
You may only use each number (1-4) one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK (1-4)</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any comments relating to Alternatives 1 through 4

Alternative 4 had the lowest rating.
APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP HANDOUTS
Tampa City Council Redistricting
FACT SHEET

WHAT IS REDISTRICTING AND WHY IS IT NECESSARY?

• “Redistricting” is a process that addresses population change. Redistricting redefines the four single-member districts based on population change.

• The Tampa City Council is composed of four single-member districts and three at-large districts. In order to ensure the residents of Tampa’s four single-member districts have equal representation, Florida law requires the districts to be as equal as possible in population size. The standard is total population, not voting age population or population by race or ethnicity.

• The "range as a percentage of the average" is a key measure examined when determining the "as equal as possible" criteria.

• Due to population change over time, the range as a percentage of the mean is currently 3.1%.

The current population by district is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>353560</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (average)</td>
<td>88390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Range</td>
<td>2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range as percent of the mean</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• As of April 1, 2017, the City of Tampa’s Population Estimate is 353,560. The Average Population per District should be 88,390. However, District 5 has the largest population (90,190) and District 4 has the lowest population (87,470).

• Since Florida Law requires these districts to be as equal as possible in population size, the range should be as small as possible without violating the compact and contiguous requirement.

WHAT ARE THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS?

• The Law of Florida that governs Tampa City Council redistricting is Chapter 79-573, Laws of Florida, as amended by Chapter 84-535 and Chapter 86-404 (codified in part of Section 8 of the Related Laws of the City of Tampa, as amended). The relevant Tampa ordinance is Ordinance No. 2000-212.

• When dividing the population, precinct boundaries cannot be split in order to arrive at the “equal population” requirement.

• The Supervisor of Elections cannot proclaim the districts until the Planning Commission has held a public hearing to discuss the boundaries and solicit comments by the public.

• Districts should not be “contorted” geographically into irregular or non-compact forms in order to arrive at either the “equal population” or the “minority district” criteria.

• The deadline for completion of redistricting is April 1 of the year preceding the election.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87,470</td>
<td>61,469</td>
<td>48351</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5019</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4834</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90,190</td>
<td>54,815</td>
<td>14044</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>29469</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>7120</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4182</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87,490</td>
<td>54,496</td>
<td>30788</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>6049</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13459</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>25087</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>10513</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8145</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6892</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353,560</td>
<td>221,417</td>
<td>118,270</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>33,743</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>20,108</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Range:** 3.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89,370</td>
<td>62,615</td>
<td>49253</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5090</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4929</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,290</td>
<td>53,426</td>
<td>13158</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29248</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>6942</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4078</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87,490</td>
<td>54,739</td>
<td>30772</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>6192</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>13566</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>4209</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>25087</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>10513</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8145</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6892</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353,560</td>
<td>221,417</td>
<td>118,270</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>33,743</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>20,108</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Range:** 2.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89,660</td>
<td>62,927</td>
<td>49482</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3363</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5135</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4947</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>53,357</td>
<td>12913</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>29371</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>7004</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>4069</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87,490</td>
<td>54,496</td>
<td>30788</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>6049</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13459</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>25087</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>10513</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8145</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6892</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353,560</td>
<td>221,417</td>
<td>118,270</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>33,627</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>20,108</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Range:** 2.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89,160</td>
<td>62,624</td>
<td>49,221</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5,192</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4,902</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,290</td>
<td>53,426</td>
<td>13,158</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29,248</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>6,826</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87,700</td>
<td>54,730</td>
<td>30,804</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13,464</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>25087</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>10,513</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8,145</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353,560</td>
<td>221,417</td>
<td>118,270</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>33,627</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19,995</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Range:** 1.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White Percent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Black Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic Percent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89,110</td>
<td>62,153</td>
<td>48,653</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4,934</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,290</td>
<td>53,426</td>
<td>13,158</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29,248</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87,750</td>
<td>55,201</td>
<td>31,372</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13,463</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>25087</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>10,513</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8,145</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353,560</td>
<td>221,417</td>
<td>118,270</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>33,743</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>20,108</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Range:** 1.5%
APPENDIX D

HISTORIC VOTER TURNOUT
HISTORIC VOTER TURNOUT

Staff had access to a large amount of voter data in preparing the redistricting plans. One dataset that was of interest was the historical voter turnout for municipal elections. Since the City of Tampa’s municipal elections are off-cycle, meaning that they do not correspond to either mid-term (e.g. Congressional) elections or Presidential elections, historical turnout might be of interest in ensuring votes are not artificially diluted.

Historic voter turnout was not used in the development of the alternatives. It was only examined after all alternatives had been drawn and the outreach process had begun. In analyzing these historic patterns, we used the data provided by the Supervisor of Elections and the turnout data as the Precincts were then defined. We examined the turnout for the 2015 and 2011 Municipal elections for the three Districts under consideration for this redistricting project (Districts 4, 5, and 6).

The votes are cross-tabulated by votes cast, method of voting and race/ethnicity.
## District 4 (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIA</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible to vote</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Absentee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rejected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted at the Polls</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>38,402</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional (Not Tabulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>50,084</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTED</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>11,591</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>38,492</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL VOTER TURNOUT FOR THE ENTIRE DISTRICT** 19.9%

## District 4 (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIA</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible to vote</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Absentee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rejected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted at the Polls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>39,686</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional (Not Tabulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>50,084</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTED</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>39,772</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL VOTER TURNOUT FOR THE ENTIRE DISTRICT** 14.5%
### District 5 (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIA</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible to vote</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Absentee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rejected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted at the Polls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Early</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>27,017</td>
<td>7,137</td>
<td>11,526</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional (Not Tabulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>30,848</td>
<td>7,438</td>
<td>13,312</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTED</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>27,040</td>
<td>7,143</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Voter Turnout for the Entire District**: 10.8%

### District 5 (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIA</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible to vote</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Absentee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rejected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted at the Polls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>26,415</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>10,901</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional (Not Tabulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>30,848</td>
<td>7,438</td>
<td>13,312</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTED</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>26,457</td>
<td>6,435</td>
<td>10,916</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Voter Turnout for the Entire District**: 7.5%
### District 6 (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AIA</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible to vote</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Absentee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rejected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted at the Polls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>13,155</td>
<td>24,393</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional (Not Tabulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>31,672</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTED</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>5605</td>
<td>13,165</td>
<td>24,442</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Voter Turnout for the Entire District:** 16.9%

### District 6 (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AIA</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UNKNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible to vote</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Absentee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rejected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted at the Polls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted Early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>11,881</td>
<td>24,215</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional (Not Tabulated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Provisional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>31,672</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTED</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>5,604</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>24,271</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Voter Turnout for the Entire District:** 13.5%
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Thereupon, the meeting commenced:

MR. DOUGHTY: Good evening and welcome to the January 22nd, 2018, public hearing of the Planning Commission on City of Tampa Single Member Redistricting.

We thank you for attending this meeting. Your comments and participation are encouraged. If you will, please sign the register at the rear of the room and turn off any devices that may be a distraction to the meeting. If you wish to address the Commission on this issue, we ask that you please complete the appropriate public comment sign-in sheet at the rear of the room now.

When addressing the Commission, please begin with your name and address and speak directly into the microphone. The process is to introduce that presentation with a 15-minute time limit. Following staff presentations, members of the public may address the Commission when recognized by the Chair for a time limit of three minutes per person. Planning Commission will then discuss when public comment is closed and upon a motion and a second and discussion a vote will be taken.
Do we have a roll call, please.

MR. YUNK: Good evening.

Buzza?

Dicks?

MR. DICKS: Here.

MR. YUNK: Green?

MR. GREEN: Present.

MR. YUNK: Joseph?

MR. JOSEPH: Here.

MR. YUNK: Kress?

MS. KRESS: Here.

MR. YUNK: Maurino?

Thrower?

MR. THROWER: Here.

MR. YUNK: Wilds?

MS. WILDS: Here.

MR. YUNK: Farkas?

Rodriguez?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Here.

MR. YUNK: Doughty?

MR. DOUGHTY: Here.

MR. YUNK: And Metzger?

MR. METZGER: Here.

MR. YUNK: You have a quorum.

MR. DOUGHTY: Thank you.
So, with that, we are to the City of Tampa Single Member Redistricting team.

Mr. Eagan.

MR. EAGAN: Hi. Good evening, Commissioners. This is Terry Eagan, Project Manager of Planning Commission staff. I'm here to provide the final recommendation on the alternatives for the Tampa City Council Redistricting.

This is going to be a very similar presentation to the original presentation I gave you when we did the overview. It's also going to pick up on some of those things I omitted when I talked about the population estimates and how those are generated.

So, just to kind of refresh everybody, this is required by the laws of Florida, Florida law. It's also incorporated into the City of Tampa Charter and it's required every four years. Not every 10 years like most other jurisdictions.

The legal requirements require it be based on population change, measured as a range as a percent of the mean. We use the Planning Commission population estimates to generate
this range, and then it goes before you all. You will make the recommendation and the Supervisor of Elections will then proclaim the new single member districts.

City of Tampa City Council has been briefed one on one the outset of the process, received the feedback, but there are no manner influencing this process at all.

The requirements are to hold one public hearing, which this is the public hearing. There are noticing requirements for it as well. Maintain all precinct boundaries. If the precinct is split or noncontiguous, we can't do anything to it. We take the precincts' boundaries as we find them and utilize those as building blocks.

The districts have to be compact and contiguous. It can't have an island floating off in some other location and the single member districts must contain a population as nearly equal as possible.

So what we call the three C's, there is the infamous gerrymandering illustration from Eldridge. Gerry, who we get the term from, the three C's, complete precincts, compact
districts and contiguous districts.

So the existing districts we have right now. We have District 5, which is the darker blue, we have District 4, which is the southern peninsula part including MacDill Air Force base, District 6, which is the green and District 7 which is more of the light green.

The range is very small. It's about 3 percent. It's just under 3,000 people we're talking about in terms of the discrepancy of population or the disparity.

As I put in the staff report, there is a lot of different types of development that are occurring which is driving how these districts have grown in their own different way. South Tampa has been mostly infill. We see a lot of demolitions and we're seeing a lot of new construction going right back on top of it.

Six, we're seeing some of that. We've seen Westshore blow up, Channelside. We're seeing North Boulevard homes in West Tampa has gone away. We're seeing Channelside going vertical very fast and we've seen District 7, New Tampa, has essentially plateaued at this point in terms of population growth.
This is the alternative map. I don't know if I had this map when I presented last time, but basically I grade out all precincts that could not logically be moved for any number of reasons. Either they were so constrained in a southern position in a peninsula or so far north, New Tampa.

The precincts up in New Tampa are always going to be in New Tampa. Likewise, you can't redistrict anybody out of office. So, wherever the incumbents were, their precincts were kept safe.

So that's really it in terms of how we go about it. We try to be as conservative as possible minimizing all the negative approach, don't redistrict anybody out of office and do the least that we have to do to meet the legal requirements.

So Alternative 1. So alternative 1 and you will see the same precinct appear in two of the other alternatives. Alternative 1 we bring out two precincts to get District 5 and District 4 as close together as population, and that is bringing out Precinct 333, taking it out of 5 and putting it into 6 and then taking
a precinct out of District 6 and putting it into 4, which is 151. So, just by flipping those two precincts, we drop the range from 3.1 to 2.1 percent. Very easy to do. Pretty simple solution. 333 was brought into District 5 the last time we did redistricting, so moving it back out isn't going to cause a major change in the profile of that district.

The second alternative we have -- this is Alternative 2. This was to address a lot of the concern regarding development in Channelside downtown. So there are actually three precincts that make up what you would consider the downtown area, and just by moving one precinct out, the number went in the opposite direction. So it has a range of 2.5 percent. It's not possible at this time population-wise to take all of downtown out, which a lot of people would like, and move it all over into 4 because 4 already has a certain population.

I mean, we're trying to close a narrow gap. Moving all of downtown out and in would cause kind of like a cascading effect which we don't want. If you start putting too many
people out of one district into the next
district, then that district will have to
borrow from the other district and it will go
very quickly circular and then you will have a
non-compact district.

So that was Alternative 2.

This is Alternative 3. This gets the
range down to 1.7 percent which is really in
the optimal area. We keep it below five. If
it's near five we have to do something with it.
If we can get it under three, that's pretty
good. If we can get it under two, that's
really the best place for the numbers to work
out.

So this one is just like Alternative 1.
We move Precinct 333 out of District 5, and in
this alternative we move Precinct 145 out of 6
and put it in 4 and that closes the numbers
down.

And then the last one, Alternative 4,
which has the smallest range. Alternative 4
received most of the negative feedback from
taking it out to the public in terms of the way
it affected the residents in Hyde Park and the
residents in District 4. When we conducted the
outreach, they didn't feel like that was a very viable option. We moved multiple precincts to get to here. It just didn't make its way through. It's not really viable at this point. So those are the four alternatives.

The staff's recommendation is Alternative 3. It's below the 2-percent range and it meets all the other criteria that is required by federal and state law.

Thank you.

MR. DOUGHTY: Thank you, Mr. Eagan.

Are there any members of the public that wish to address the Commission on this redistricting?

Come forward and state your name and address in the mike and you will have three minutes.

MR. BAILEY: Good evening. My name is Neal Bailey. I reside -- I have a P.O. Box, P.O. Box 27405, Tampa, Florida 33623. I'm a resident. Well, my mother-in-law is a resident in District 5, and the way that I look at it district of four alternative would be the best because it would be moving something around for everybody and not just for one district to lose
more than the other district. That's basically all I have to say.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. DEMAYO: Good evening. My name is Victor DeMayo. I'm a resident of West Tampa, 3112 North Rome Avenue. A life-long resident, I should say, of Tampa and Hillsborough County. I'm here just to go over a couple of parameters of why I'm here. I'm also a member of the Hillsborough County Democratic Hispanic Caucus, and one of the things, you know, our group is concerned with is Hispanic representation and minority access districts.

Two of the things that -- there is never a perfect system to do this. You can play a little bit with the numbers to allow for what's called a jingle standard. Jingles is a U.S. Supreme Court decision that was passed on many years ago. It said if you can prove that you can make a 50 plus 1 percent district either black or Hispanic or minority access, you've proven you've met the minimum standard by the Supreme Court to say that that district can be made even if you do play with the numbers and there are less numbers there than in other
districts.

We have historic racial discrimination in Hillsborough County. In the 1960 Voting Rights Act Hillsborough County was named as one of the few counties in the nation that was named within the Voting Rights Act for past racial discrimination.

Now, even though the U.S. Supreme Court struck down many parts of this Voting Rights Act, there are other parts of the legislation that has remained in tact.

In fact, I spoke just recently with the Justice Department in Washington D.C. for several hours a couple of weeks ago. Of course this is a conversation for another day, but Hillsborough County Commission, for example, you have seven commissioners and we have a situation in Hillsborough County, for example, where there are 300,000 Hispanics in Hillsborough County, over 25 percent of the population. One out of every four people in Hillsborough County are Hispanic and, yet, there are no Hispanics on the County Commission. Not one.

There is 70,000 more democrats countywide
than republican and, yet, there are five republicans and only two democrats on the County Commission.

This is where you have to be careful about gerrymandering, and this is why you have to take your job very seriously because -- not just for African Americans, but for Hispanics like myself who traditionally are discriminated against for many years.

Oh, I apologize. I didn't realize there was a time limit here.

Anyway, I wanted to make up those points. We've studied this. My friend Patrick Montega and I have sat down together and looked at it and we prefer the third plan as the least of the plan that we would like the best, and that's my personal recommendation and from our organization and also from other people I've spoken with.

So I appreciate you giving me your time and, if you have any questions, I'll be here. Thank you very much.

MR. DOUGHTY: Any other members of the public wish to address the Commission?

Any questions from Commissioners?
I see none.

I'll entertain a motion or was that --

okay. I'll entertain a motion.

There seems to be somebody from the City.

MS. KRESS: I can make the motion. Am I referring to a number?

I'd like to make a motion that the Planning Commission support Alternative 3 for the redistricting and send that back to the City of Tampa.

MR. GREEN: Second.

Supervisor of elections.


MR. DOUGHTY: The Supervisor of Elections.

Correct.

MR. GREEN: Can I second?

MR. DOUGHTY: You may.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. DOUGHTY: You could have made the motion, too.

MR. GREEN: Oh, okay.

MR. DOUGHTY: I just figured since it was City of Tampa that somebody from the City of Tampa would make the motion.
Okay. So we have a motion by Commissioner Kress and a second by Commissioner Green.

Any discussion?

Mr. Dicks.

MR. DICKS: Mr. Chairman, redistricting was an issue that I was not aware of when I was appointed to this Commission, but was pleased to see that that was the case and that the legislators have the foresight to come up with a plan that would be totally nonpartisan and straightforward as I'm sure all of us are. When the process began, I kind of did my best to follow it carefully to see whether it was really being followed in such a manner.

I just wanted to state on the record, and I know that all of us agree, but when I read through the report that our staff did I couldn't be any more proud. They did just an outstanding job in making certain that all legal ramifications were adhered to, that the districts are not gerrymandered, that there was very little movement or changes from years past, but it still met all the requirements. Frankly, what our staff did is a model for what
should be done by all bodies that are having to come up with legislative districts frankly around our state and around our county.

So, Madam Executive Director, if you could pass our comments on to the staff. We're so very proud of that.

Thanks.

MR. DOUGHTY: I would definitely second those remarks and agree. Yes.

We have a motion and a second. I see no further discussion.

All in favor signify by "aye."

MR. THROWER: Aye.

MR. DICKS: Aye.

MR. GREEN: Aye.

MR. JOSEPH: Aye.

MS. KRESS: Aye.

MS. WILDS: Aye.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Aye.

MR. METZGER: Aye.

Those opposed?

Motion carries unanimously by members present and we are adjourned.

(The meeting concluded at 7:55 p.m.)

* * * * *
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