

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
FINAL BILL ANALYSIS**

BILL #:	SJR 1176 (HJR 6001, HJR 6011)	FINAL HOUSE FLOOR ACTION:	
SPONSOR(S):	Senate Committee on Reapportionment	80 Y's	37 N's
COMPANION BILLS:	HJR 6001, HJR 6011	GOVERNOR'S ACTION: N/A	

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Senate Joint Resolution 1176 initially passed the Senate on January 17, 2012. As initially passed by the Senate, this joint resolution contained the State Senate redistricting map and a placeholder for the House redistricting plan. In the amendatory process, the House added the substance of House Joint Resolution 6011 (the State House redistricting map) and passed Senate Joint Resolution 1176 on February 3, 2012, and the Senate subsequently passed it on February 9, 2012.

The Florida Constitution requires the Legislature, by joint resolution at its regular session in the second year after the United States Census, to apportion state legislative districts. The United States Constitution requires the reapportionment of the United States House of Representatives every ten years, which includes the distribution of the House's 435 seats between the states and the equalization of population between districts within each state.

The 2010 Census revealed an unequal distribution of population growth amongst the State's legislative and congressional districts. Therefore districts must be adjusted to correct population differences.

Redistricting Plan H000H9049: This joint resolution reapportions the resident population of Florida into 120 State House districts, as required by state and federal law.

This proposed committee bill would substantially amend Chapter 10 of the Florida Statutes.

When compared to the existing 120 State House districts, this proposed committee bill would:

- Reduce the number of counties split from 46 to 30;
- Reduce the number of cities split from 170 to 75;
- Reduce the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Reduce the distance and drive time to travel the average district;
- Reduce the total population deviation from 81.58% to 3.97%; and
- Maintain and possibly increase numbers of elected representation for African-American and Hispanic Floridians.

Redistricting Plan S000S9008: This joint resolution reapportions the resident population of Florida into 40 State Senate districts, as required by state and federal law.

This proposed committee bill would substantially amend Chapter 10 of the Florida Statutes.

When compared to the existing 40 State Senate districts, this proposed committee bill would:

- Reduce the number of counties split from 45 to 31;

- Reduce the number of cities split from 126 to 54;
- Reduce the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Reduce the distance and drive time to travel the average district;
- Reduce the total population deviation from 38.60% to 1.98%; and
- Maintains elected representation for African-American and Hispanic Floridians.

Upon approval by the Legislature, within 15 days the Attorney General must petition the Florida Supreme Court to review this joint resolution. The Attorney General filed the petition on February 10, 2012. The Florida Supreme Court must enter its judgment within thirty days from the filing of the petition.

Prior to the implementation, pursuant to Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act (VRA), this apportionment must also be approved (“precleared”) by either the District Court for the District of Columbia or the United States Department of Justice.

I. SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION

A. EFFECT OF CHANGES:

Current Situation

The 2010 Census

According to the 2010 Census, 18,801,310 people resided in Florida on April 1, 2010. That represents a population growth of 2,818,932 Florida residents between the 2000 to 2010 censuses.

After the 2000 Census, the ideal populations for each district in Florida were:

- Congressional: 639,295
- State Senate: 399,559
- State House 133,186

After the 2010 Census, the ideal populations for each district in Florida are:

- Congressional: 696,345
- State Senate: 470,033
- State House: 156,678

The 2010 Census revealed an unequal distribution of population growth amongst the State’s legislative and congressional districts. Therefore districts must be adjusted to comply with “one-person, one vote,” such that each district must be substantially equal in total population.

Table 1 below shows the changes in population for each of Florida’s current State House districts and their subsequent deviation from the new ideal population of 156,678 residents.

Table 1. Florida House Districts 2002-2011

Florida House Districts 2002-2011	2000	2010
Total State Population, Decennial Census	15,982,378	18,801,310
Maximum Number of Districts	120	120
Ideal District Population (Total State Population / 120)	133,186	156,678

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
1	134,020	834	0.6%	159,402	2,724	1.7%
2	132,612	-574	-0.4%	139,453	-17,225	-11.0%
3	132,921	-265	-0.2%	126,253	-30,425	-19.4%
4	133,438	252	0.2%	144,198	-12,480	-8.0%
5	132,940	-246	-0.2%	154,014	-2,664	-1.7%
6	133,583	397	0.3%	147,936	-8,742	-5.6%
7	133,222	36	0.0%	169,309	12,631	8.1%
8	133,335	149	0.1%	152,934	-3,744	-2.4%
9	133,815	629	0.5%	147,197	-9,481	-6.1%
10	133,367	181	0.1%	151,214	-5,464	-3.5%
11	134,465	1,279	1.0%	163,223	6,545	4.2%
12	132,062	-1,124	-0.8%	159,354	2,676	1.7%
13	132,396	-790	-0.6%	195,431	38,753	24.7%
14	131,893	-1,293	-1.0%	134,417	-22,261	-14.2%
15	131,954	-1,232	-0.9%	124,511	-32,167	-20.5%
16	131,880	-1,306	-1.0%	140,428	-16,250	-10.4%
17	131,971	-1,215	-0.9%	161,943	5,265	3.4%
18	131,882	-1,304	-1.0%	161,190	4,512	2.9%
19	134,499	1,313	1.0%	175,628	18,950	12.1%
20	132,090	-1,096	-0.8%	201,953	45,275	28.9%
21	134,384	1,198	0.9%	145,063	-11,615	-7.4%
22	133,859	673	0.5%	176,739	20,061	12.8%
23	134,120	934	0.7%	142,648	-14,030	-9.0%
24	134,662	1,476	1.1%	166,317	9,639	6.2%
25	134,252	1,066	0.8%	179,031	22,353	14.3%
26	134,314	1,128	0.8%	165,010	8,332	5.3%
27	132,503	-683	-0.5%	131,755	-24,923	-15.9%
28	133,183	-3	0.0%	154,175	-2,503	-1.6%
29	133,692	506	0.4%	160,290	3,612	2.3%
30	132,532	-654	-0.5%	180,594	23,916	15.3%
31	133,546	360	0.3%	138,215	-18,463	-11.8%
32	131,310	-1,876	-1.4%	177,523	20,845	13.3%
33	132,100	-1,086	-0.8%	196,662	39,984	25.5%
34	133,372	186	0.1%	144,119	-12,559	-8.0%
35	134,235	1,049	0.8%	154,735	-1,943	-1.2%
36	134,498	1,312	1.0%	157,126	448	0.3%
37	133,762	576	0.4%	135,554	-21,124	-13.5%
38	133,604	418	0.3%	162,248	5,570	3.6%
39	132,057	-1,129	-0.8%	132,191	-24,487	-15.6%
40	131,857	-1,329	-1.0%	149,664	-7,014	-4.5%
41	132,515	-671	-0.5%	252,332	95,654	61.1%
42	133,934	748	0.6%	214,866	58,188	37.1%
43	133,261	75	0.1%	162,052	5,374	3.4%
44	133,585	399	0.3%	171,652	14,974	9.6%
45	132,702	-484	-0.4%	146,618	-10,060	-6.4%
46	133,040	-146	-0.1%	142,772	-13,906	-8.9%
47	133,784	598	0.4%	157,056	378	0.2%
48	133,784	598	0.4%	136,924	-19,754	-12.6%
49	134,665	1,479	1.1%	172,598	15,920	10.2%
50	133,105	-81	-0.1%	131,026	-25,652	-16.4%
51	133,050	-136	-0.1%	129,144	-27,534	-17.6%

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
61	132,901	-285	-0.2%	242,396	85,718	54.7%
62	132,243	-943	-0.7%	162,165	5,487	3.5%
63	134,713	1,527	1.1%	156,183	-495	-0.3%
64	133,177	-9	0.0%	165,492	8,814	5.6%
65	133,436	250	0.2%	179,502	22,824	14.6%
66	134,437	1,251	0.9%	162,026	5,348	3.4%
67	133,046	-140	-0.1%	241,034	84,356	53.8%
68	131,868	-1,318	-1.0%	128,684	-27,994	-17.9%
69	134,830	1,644	1.2%	132,224	-24,454	-15.6%
70	132,331	-855	-0.6%	150,125	-6,553	-4.2%
71	133,334	148	0.1%	183,147	26,469	16.9%
72	133,199	13	0.0%	167,184	10,506	6.7%
73	133,440	254	0.2%	189,406	32,728	20.9%
74	133,276	90	0.1%	182,460	25,782	16.5%
75	133,374	188	0.1%	174,874	18,196	11.6%
76	132,709	-477	-0.4%	149,992	-6,686	-4.3%
77	131,816	-1,370	-1.0%	147,455	-9,223	-5.9%
78	132,858	-328	-0.2%	156,153	-525	-0.3%
79	133,830	644	0.5%	187,203	30,525	19.5%
80	134,325	1,139	0.9%	148,503	-8,175	-5.2%
81	132,970	-216	-0.2%	201,633	44,955	28.7%
82	133,132	-54	0.0%	172,265	15,587	9.9%
83	133,850	664	0.5%	168,377	11,699	7.5%
84	132,198	-988	-0.7%	144,934	-11,744	-7.5%
85	132,080	-1,106	-0.8%	193,827	37,149	23.7%
86	133,526	340	0.3%	142,110	-14,568	-9.3%
87	133,861	675	0.5%	137,131	-19,547	-12.5%
88	134,078	892	0.7%	164,967	8,289	5.3%
89	133,810	624	0.5%	140,077	-16,601	-10.6%
90	134,668	1,482	1.1%	142,553	-14,125	-9.0%
91	132,744	-442	-0.3%	129,999	-26,679	-17.0%
92	134,594	1,408	1.1%	133,187	-23,491	-15.0%
93	131,438	-1,748	-1.3%	131,283	-25,395	-16.2%
94	132,783	-403	-0.3%	135,245	-21,433	-13.7%
95	134,393	1,207	0.9%	134,355	-22,323	-14.2%
96	132,697	-489	-0.4%	140,377	-16,301	-10.4%
97	132,239	-947	-0.7%	169,848	13,170	8.4%
98	135,043	1,857	1.4%	134,942	-21,736	-13.9%
99	134,167	981	0.7%	137,645	-19,033	-12.1%
100	132,197	-989	-0.7%	137,630	-19,048	-12.2%
101	133,642	456	0.3%	189,600	32,922	21.0%
102	133,470	284	0.2%	160,952	4,274	2.7%
103	133,827	641	0.5%	138,339	-18,339	-11.7%
104	132,832	-354	-0.3%	137,432	-19,246	-12.3%
105	133,173	-13	0.0%	151,273	-5,405	-3.4%
106	133,343	157	0.1%	150,952	-5,726	-3.7%
107	132,275	-911	-0.7%	156,177	-501	-0.3%
108	132,309	-877	-0.7%	132,251	-24,427	-15.6%
109	132,383	-803	-0.6%	135,230	-21,448	-13.7%
110	132,082	-1,104	-0.8%	132,138	-24,540	-15.7%
111	132,608	-578	-0.4%	139,430	-17,248	-11.0%

52	133,467	281	0.2%	139,789	-16,889	-10.8%
53	133,941	755	0.6%	133,115	-23,563	-15.0%
54	133,208	22	0.0%	130,417	-26,261	-16.8%
55	132,050	-1,136	-0.9%	133,112	-23,566	-15.0%
56	132,935	-251	-0.2%	192,632	35,954	22.9%
57	134,916	1,730	1.3%	148,460	-8,218	-5.2%
58	131,681	-1,505	-1.1%	131,897	-24,781	-15.8%
59	133,579	393	0.3%	141,651	-15,027	-9.6%
60	132,203	-983	-0.7%	162,605	5,927	3.8%

112	131,626	-1,560	-1.2%	210,556	53,878	34.4%
113	132,604	-582	-0.4%	136,597	-20,081	-12.8%
114	133,225	39	0.0%	133,125	-23,553	-15.0%
115	133,225	39	0.0%	135,054	-21,624	-13.8%
116	133,596	410	0.3%	134,681	-21,997	-14.0%
117	132,921	-265	-0.2%	150,960	-5,718	-3.6%
118	133,178	-8	0.0%	162,848	6,170	3.9%
119	133,349	163	0.1%	154,679	-1,999	-1.3%
120	133,507	321	0.2%	170,078	13,400	8.6%

Table 2 below shows the changes in population for each of Florida's current State Senate districts and their subsequent deviation from the new ideal population of 470,033 residents.

Table 2. Florida Senate Districts 2002-2011

Florida Senate Districts 2002-2011	2000	2010
Total State Population, Decennial Census	15,982,378	18,801,310
Maximum Number of Districts	40	40
Ideal District Population (Total State Population / 40)	399,559	470,033

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
1	399,563	4	0.0%	424,456	-45,577	-9.7%
2	399,543	-16	0.0%	449,902	-20,131	-4.3%
3	399,512	-47	0.0%	495,081	25,048	5.3%
4	399,586	27	0.0%	433,628	-36,405	-7.7%
5	399,573	14	0.0%	515,369	45,336	9.6%
6	399,586	27	0.0%	451,464	-18,569	-4.0%
7	399,552	-7	0.0%	432,554	-37,479	-8.0%
8	399,568	9	0.0%	525,674	55,641	11.8%
9	399,552	-7	0.0%	527,435	57,402	12.2%
10	399,547	-12	0.0%	565,921	95,888	20.4%
11	399,543	-16	0.0%	433,661	-36,372	-7.7%
12	399,594	35	0.0%	531,959	61,926	13.2%
13	399,563	4	0.0%	394,766	-75,267	-16.0%
14	399,571	12	0.0%	457,489	-12,544	-2.7%
15	399,559	0	0.0%	560,770	90,737	19.3%
16	399,549	-10	0.0%	431,916	-38,117	-8.1%
17	399,577	18	0.0%	456,960	-13,073	-2.8%
18	399,553	-6	0.0%	404,822	-65,211	-13.9%
19	399,553	-6	0.0%	477,068	7,035	1.5%
20	399,578	19	0.0%	576,207	106,174	22.6%
21	399,556	-3	0.0%	529,870	59,837	12.7%
22	399,568	9	0.0%	419,763	-50,270	-10.7%
23	399,561	2	0.0%	458,330	-11,703	-2.5%
24	399,554	-5	0.0%	524,254	54,221	11.5%
25	399,580	21	0.0%	428,398	-41,635	-8.9%
26	399,517	-42	0.0%	481,892	11,859	2.5%
27	399,568	9	0.0%	551,555	81,522	17.3%
28	399,573	14	0.0%	545,085	75,052	16.0%
29	399,534	-25	0.0%	397,144	-72,889	-15.5%
30	399,553	-6	0.0%	458,703	-11,330	-2.4%

31	399,544	-15	0.0%	432,649	-37,384	-8.0%
32	399,576	17	0.0%	428,898	-41,135	-8.8%
33	399,552	-7	0.0%	404,290	-65,743	-14.0%
34	399,596	37	0.0%	481,165	11,132	2.4%
35	399,563	4	0.0%	438,861	-31,172	-6.6%
36	399,575	16	0.0%	418,626	-51,407	-10.9%
37	399,552	-7	0.0%	480,189	10,156	2.2%
38	399,540	-19	0.0%	442,810	-27,223	-5.8%
39	399,606	47	0.0%	483,183	13,150	2.8%
40	399,488	-71	0.0%	448,543	-21,490	-4.6%

The law governing the reapportionment and redistricting of congressional and state legislative districts implicates the United States Constitution, the Florida Constitution, federal statutes, and a litany of case law.

U.S. Constitution

The United States Constitution requires the reapportionment of the House of Representatives every ten years to distribute each of the House of Representatives' 435 seats between the states and to equalize population between districts within each state.

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution provides that “[t]he Time, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof.” See also U.S. Const. art. I, § 2 (“The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States . . .”). The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that this language delegates to state legislatures the exclusive authority to create congressional districts. See e.g., *Grove v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 34 (1993); *League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399, 416 (2006) (“[T]he Constitution vests redistricting responsibilities foremost in the legislatures of the States and in Congress . . .”).

In addition to state specific requirements to redistrict, states are obligated to redistrict based on the principle commonly referred to as “one-person, one-vote.”¹ In *Reynolds*, the United States Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment required that seats in state legislature be reapportioned on a population basis. The Supreme Court concluded:

...”the basic principle of representative government remains, and must remain, unchanged – the weight of a citizen’s vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives. Population is, of necessity, the starting point for consideration and the controlling criterion for judgment in legislative apportionment controversies...The Equal Protection Clause demands no less than substantially equal state legislative representation for all citizens, of all places as well as of all races. We hold that, as a basic constitutional standard, the Equal Protection Clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis.”²

The Court went on to conclude that decennial reapportionment was a rational approach to readjust legislative representation to take into consideration population shifts and growth.³

In addition to requiring states to redistrict, the principle of one-person, one-vote, has come to generally stand for the proposition that each person’s vote should count as much as anyone else’s vote.

¹ *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

² *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 568 (1964).

³ *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 584 (1964).

The requirement that each district be equal in population applies differently to congressional districts than to state legislative districts. The populations of congressional districts must achieve absolute mathematical equality, with no *de minimis* exception.⁴ Limited population variances are permitted if they are “unavoidable despite a good faith effort” or if a valid “justification is shown.”⁵

In practice, congressional districting has strictly adhered to the requirement of exact mathematical equality. In *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler* the Court rejected several justifications for violating this principle, including “a desire to avoid fragmenting either political subdivisions or areas with distinct economic and social interests, considerations of practical politics, and even an asserted preference for geographically compact districts.”⁶

For state legislative districts, the courts have permitted a greater population deviation amongst districts. The populations of state legislative districts must be “substantially equal.”⁷ Substantial equality of population has come to generally mean that a legislative plan will not be held to violate the Equal Protection Clause if the difference between the smallest and largest district is less than ten percent.⁸ Nevertheless, any significant deviation (even within the 10 percent overall deviation margin) must be “based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy,”⁹ including “the integrity of political subdivisions, the maintenance of compactness and contiguity in legislative districts, or the recognition of natural or historical boundary lines.”¹⁰

However, states should not interpret this 10 percent standard to be a safe haven.¹¹ Additionally, nothing in the U.S. Constitution or case law prevents States from imposing stricter standards for population equality.¹²

After Florida last redistricted in 2002, Florida’s population deviation ranges were 2.79% for its State House districts, 0.03% for its State Senate districts, and 0.00% for its Congressional districts.¹³

The Voting Rights Act

Congress passed the Voting Rights Act (VRA) in 1965. The VRA protects the right to vote as guaranteed by the 15th Amendment to the United States Constitution. In addition, the VRA enforces the protections of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution by providing “minority voters an opportunity to participate in the electoral process and elect candidates of their choice, generally free of discrimination.”¹⁴

The relevant components of the Act are contained in Section 2 and Section 5. Section 2 applies to all jurisdictions, while Section 5 applies only to covered jurisdictions (states, counties, or other jurisdictions within a state).¹⁵ The two sections, and any analysis related to each, are considered independently of each other, and therefore a matter considered under by one section may be treated differently by the other section.

The phraseology for types of minority districts can be confusing and often times unintentionally misspoken. It is important to understand that each phrase can have significantly different implications for the courts, depending on the nature of a legal complaint.

⁴ *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526, 531 (1969).

⁵ *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526, 531 (1969).

⁶ *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526, 531 (1969).

⁷ *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 568 (1964).

⁸ *Chapman v. Meier*, 420 U.S. 1 (1975); *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 418 (1977).

⁹ *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 579.

¹⁰ *Swann v. Adams*, 385 U.S. 440, 444 (1967).

¹¹ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 36.

¹² *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 39.

¹³ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Pages 47-48.

¹⁴ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 51.

¹⁵ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 51.

A “majority-minority district” is a district in which the majority of the voting-age population (VAP) of the district is African American, Hispanic, Asian or Native-American. A “minority access district” is a district in which the dominant minority community is less than a majority of the VAP, but is still large enough to elect a candidate of its choice through either crossover votes from majority voters or a coalition with another minority community.

“Minority access” though is more jargon than meaningful in a legal context. There are two types of districts that fall under the definition. A “crossover district” is a minority-access district in which the dominant minority community is less than a majority of the VAP, but is still large enough that a crossover of majority voters is adequate enough to provide that minority community with the opportunity to elect a candidate of its choice. A “coalitional district” is a minority-access district in which two or more minority groups, which individually comprise less than a majority of the VAP, can form a coalition to elect their preferred candidate of choice. A distinction is sometimes made between the two in case law. For example, the legislative discretion asserted in *Bartlett v. Strickland*—as discussed later in this document—is meant for crossover districts, not for coalitional districts.

Lastly, the courts have recognized that an “influence district” is a district in which a minority community is not sufficiently large enough to form a coalition or meaningfully solicit crossover votes and thereby elect a candidate of its choice, but is able to effect election outcomes and therefore elect a candidate would be mindful of the minority community’s needs.

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

The most common challenge to congressional and state legislative districts arises under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Section 2 provides: “No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State...in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.”¹⁶ The purpose of Section 2 is to ensure that minority voters have an equal opportunity along with other members of the electorate to influence the political process and elect representatives of their choice.¹⁷

In general, Section 2 challenges have been brought against districting schemes that either disperse members of minority communities into districts where they constitute an ineffective minority—known as “cracking”¹⁸—or which concentrate minority voters into districts where they constitute excessive majorities—known as “packing”—thus diminishing minority influence in neighboring districts. In prior decades, it was also common that Section 2 challenges would be brought against multimember districts, in which “the voting strength of a minority group can be lessened by placing it in a larger multimember or at-large district where the majority can elect a number of its preferred candidates and the minority group cannot elect any of its preferred candidates.”¹⁹

The Supreme Court set forth the criteria of a vote-dilution claim in *Thornburg v. Gingles*.²⁰ A plaintiff must show:

1. A minority group must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district;
2. The minority group must be politically cohesive; and
3. White voters must vote sufficiently as a bloc to enable them usually to defeat the candidate preferred by the minority group.

¹⁶ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973(a) (2006).

¹⁷ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973(b); *Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146, 155 (1993).

¹⁸ Also frequently referred to as “fracturing.”

¹⁹ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 54.

²⁰ 478 U.S. 30 (1986).

The three “*Gingles* factors” are necessary, but not sufficient, to show a violation of Section 2.²¹ To determine whether minority voters have been denied an equal opportunity to influence the political process and elect representatives of their choice, a court must examine the totality of the circumstances.²²

This analysis requires consideration of the so-called “Senate factors,” which assess historical patterns of discrimination and the success, or lack thereof, of minorities in participating in campaigns and being elected to office.²³ Generally, these “Senate factors” were born in an attempt to distance Section 2 claims from standards that would otherwise require plaintiffs to prove “intent,” which Congress viewed as an additional and largely excessive burden of proof, because “It diverts the judicial inquiry from the crucial question of whether minorities have equal access to the electoral process to a historical question of individual motives.”²⁴

States are obligated to balance the existence and creation of districts that provide electoral opportunities for minorities with the reasonable availability of such opportunities and other traditional redistricting principles. For example, in *Johnson v. De Grandy*, the Court decided that while states are not obligated to maximize the number of minority districts, states are also not given safe harbor if they achieve proportionality between the minority population(s) of the state and the number of minority districts.²⁵ Rather, the Court considers the totality of the circumstances. In “examining the totality of the circumstances, the Court found that, since Hispanics and Blacks could elect representatives of their choice in proportion to their share of the voting age population and since there was no other evidence of either minority group having less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process, there was no violation of Section 2.”²⁶

In *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Perry*, the Court elaborated on the first *Gingles* precondition. “Although for a racial gerrymandering claim the focus should be on compactness in the district's shape, for the first *Gingles* prong in a Section 2 claim the focus should be on the compactness of the minority group.”²⁷

In *Shaw v. Reno*, the Court found that “state legislation that expressly distinguishes among citizens on account of race - whether it contains an explicit distinction or is “unexplainable on grounds other than race,”...must be narrowly tailored to further a compelling governmental interest. Redistricting legislation that is alleged to be so bizarre on its face that it is unexplainable on grounds other than race demands the same close scrutiny, regardless of the motivations underlying its adoption.”²⁸

Later, in *Shaw v. Hunt*, the Court found that the State of North Carolina made race the predominant consideration for redistricting, such that other race-neutral districting principles were subordinated, but the state failed to meet the strict scrutiny²⁹ test. The Court found that the district in question, “as drawn, is not a remedy narrowly tailored to the State's professed interest in avoiding liability under Section(s) 2 of the Act,” and “could not remedy any potential Section(s) 2 violation, since the minority group must be shown to be “geographically compact” to establish Section(s) 2 liability.”³⁰ Likewise, in *Bush v. Vera*, the Supreme Court supported the strict scrutiny approach, ruling against a Texas redistricting plan

²¹ *Johnson v. De Grandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1011-1012 (1994).

²² 42 U.S.C. Section 1973(b); *Thornburg vs. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 46 (1986).

²³ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 57.

²⁴ Senate Report Number 417, 97th Congress, Session 2 (1982).

²⁵ *Johnson v. De Grandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1017 (1994).

²⁶ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 61-62.

²⁷ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 62.

²⁸ *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993).

²⁹ “Strict scrutiny” is the most rigorous standard used in judicial review by courts that are reviewing federal law. Strict scrutiny is part of a hierarchy of standards courts employ to weigh an asserted government interest against a constitutional right or principle that conflicts with the manner in which the interest is being pursued.

³⁰ *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899 (1996).

included highly irregularly shaped districts that were significantly more sensitive to racial data, and lacked any semblance to pre-existing race-neutral districts.³¹

Lastly, In *Bartlett v. Strickland*, the Supreme Court provided a “bright line” distinction between majority-minority districts and other minority “crossover” or “influence” districts. The Court “concluded that §2 does not require state officials to draw election district lines to allow a racial minority that would make up less than 50 percent of the voting-age population in the redrawn district to join with crossover voters to elect the minority’s candidate of choice.”³² However, the Court made clear that States had the flexibility to implement crossover districts as a method of compliance with the Voting Rights Act, where no other prohibition exists. In the opinion of the Court, Justice Kennedy stated as follows:

“Much like §5, §2 allows States to choose their own method of complying with the Voting Rights Act, and we have said that may include drawing crossover districts...When we address the mandate of §2, however, we must note it is not concerned with maximizing minority voting strength...and, as a statutory matter, §2 does not mandate creating or preserving crossover districts. Our holding also should not be interpreted to entrench majority-minority districts by statutory command, for that, too, could pose constitutional concerns...States that wish to draw crossover districts are free to do so where no other prohibition exists. Majority-minority districts are only required if all three *Gingles* factors are met and if §2 applies based on a totality of the circumstances. In areas with substantial crossover voting it is unlikely that the plaintiffs would be able to establish the third *Gingles* precondition—bloc voting by majority voters.”³³

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, is an independent mandate separate and distinct from the requirements of Section 2. “The intent of Section 5 was to prevent states that had a history of racially discriminatory electoral practices from developing new and innovative means to continue to effectively disenfranchise Black voters.”³⁴

Section 5 requires states that comprise or include “covered jurisdictions” to obtain federal preclearance of any new enactment of or amendment to a “voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting.”³⁵ This includes districting plans.

Five Florida counties—Collier, Hardee, Hendry, Hillsborough, and Monroe—have been designated as covered jurisdictions.³⁶

Preclearance may be secured either by initiating a declaratory judgment action in the District Court for the District of Columbia or, as is the case in almost all instances, submitting the new enactment or amendment to the United States Attorney General (United States Department of Justice).³⁷ Preclearance must be granted if the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure “does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.”³⁸

The purpose of Section 5 is to “insure that no voting procedure changes would be made that would lead to retrogression³⁹ in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the

³¹ *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996),

³² *Bartlett v. Strickland*, No. 07-689 (U.S. Mar. 9, 2009).

³³ *Bartlett v. Strickland*, No. 07-689 (U.S. Mar. 9, 2009).

³⁴ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 78.

³⁵ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973c.

³⁶ Some states were covered in their entirety. In other states only certain counties were covered.

³⁷ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973c.

³⁸ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973c

³⁹ A decrease in the absolute number of representatives which a minority group has a fair chance to elect.

electoral franchise.”⁴⁰ Whether a districting plan is retrogressive in effect requires an examination of “the entire statewide plan as a whole.”⁴¹

The Department of Justice requires that submissions for preclearance include numerous quantitative and qualitative pieces of data to satisfy the Section 5 review. “The Department of Justice, through the U.S. Attorney General, has 60 days in which to interpose an objection to a preclearance submission. The Department of Justice can request additional information within the period of review and following receipt of the additional information, the Department of Justice has an additional 60 days to review the additional information. A change, either approved or not objected to, can be implemented by the submitting jurisdiction. Without preclearance, proposed changes are not legally enforceable and cannot be implemented.”⁴²

Majority-Minority and Minority Access Districts in Florida

Legal challenges to the Florida’s 1992 state legislative and congressional redistricting plans resulted in a significant increase in elected representation for both African-Americans and Hispanics. Table 3 illustrates those increases. Prior to 1992, Florida Congressional Delegation included only one minority member, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Table 3. Number of Elected African-American and Hispanic Members in the Florida Legislature and Florida Congressional Delegation

	Congress		State Senate		State House	
	African-American	Hispanic	African-American	Hispanic	African-American	Hispanic
Pre-1982	0	0	0	0	5	0
1982 Plan	0	0-1	2	0-3	10-12	3-7
1992 Plan	3	2	5	3	14-16	9-11
2002 Plan	3	3	6-7	3	17-20	11-15

Prior to the legal challenges in the 1990s, the Florida Legislature established districts that generally included minority populations of less than 30 percent of the total population of the districts. For example, Table 4 illustrates that the 1982 plan for the Florida House of Representatives included 27 districts in which African-Americans comprised 20 percent or more of the total population. In the majority of those districts, 15 of 27, African-Americans represented 20 to 29 percent of the total population. None of the 15 districts elected an African-American to the Florida House of Representatives.

⁴⁰ *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130, 141 (1976).

⁴¹ *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 539 U.S. 461, 479 (2003).

⁴² *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 96.

**Table 4. 1982 House Plan
Only Districts with Greater Than 20% African-American Population⁴³**

Total African-American Population	House District Number	Total Districts	African-American Representatives Elected
20% - 29%	2, 12, 15, 22, 23, 25, 29, 42, 78, 81, 92, 94, 103, 118, 119	15	0
30% - 39%	8, 9	2	1
40% - 49%	55, 83, 91	3	2
50% - 59%	17, 40, 63, 108	4	4
60% - 69%	16, 106,	2	2
70% - 79%	107	1	1
TOTAL			10

Subsequent to the legal challenges in the 1990s, the Florida Legislature established districts that were compliant with provisions of federal law, and did not fracture or dilute minority voting strength. For example, Table 5 illustrates that the resulting districting plan doubled the number of African-American representatives in the Florida House of Representatives.

**Table 5. 2002 House Plan
Only Districts with Greater Than 20% African-American Population⁴⁴**

Total African-American Population	House District Number	Total Districts	African-American Representatives Elected
20% - 29%	10, 27, 36, 86	4	1
30% - 39%	3, 23, 92, 105	4	3
40% - 49%	118	1	1
50% - 59%	8, 14, 15, 55, 59, 84, 93, 94, 104, 108	10	10
60% - 69%	39, 109	2	2
70% - 79%	103	1	1
TOTAL			18

⁴³ It is preferred to use voting age population, rather than total population. However, for this analysis the 1982 voting age population data is not available. Therefore total population is used for the sake of comparison.

⁴⁴ It is preferred to use voting age population, rather than total population. However, since the 1982 voting age population data is not available for Table 2, total population is again used in Table 3 for the sake of comparison.

Equal Protection – Racial Gerrymandering

Racial gerrymandering is “the deliberate and arbitrary distortion of district boundaries...for (racial) purposes.”⁴⁵ Racial gerrymandering claims are justiciable under equal protection.⁴⁶ In the wake of *Shaw v. Reno*, the Court rendered several opinions that attempted to harmonize the balance between “competing constitutional guarantees that: 1) no state shall purposefully discriminate against any individual on the basis of race; and 2) members of a minority group shall be free from discrimination in the electoral process.”⁴⁷

To make a *prima facie* showing of impermissible racial gerrymandering, the burden rests with the plaintiff to “show, either through circumstantial evidence of a district’s shape and demographics or more direct evidence going to legislative purpose, that race was the predominant factor motivating the legislature’s decision to place a significant number of voters within or without a particular district.”⁴⁸ Thus, the “plaintiff must prove that the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles...to racial considerations.”⁴⁹ If the plaintiff meets this burden, “the State must demonstrate that its districting legislation is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling interest,”⁵⁰ i.e. “narrowly tailored” to achieve that singular compelling state interest.

While compliance with federal antidiscrimination laws—specifically, the Voting Rights Act—is a “very strong interest,” it is not in all cases a compelling interest sufficient to overcome strict scrutiny.⁵¹ With respect to Section 2, traditional districting principles may be subordinated to race, and strict scrutiny will be satisfied, where (i) the state has a “strong basis in evidence” for concluding that a majority-minority district is “reasonably necessary” to comply with Section 2; (ii) the race-based districting “substantially addresses” the Section 2 violation; and (iii) the district does “not subordinate traditional districting principles to race substantially more than is ‘reasonably necessary’ to avoid” the Section 2 violation.⁵² The Court has held that compliance with Section 5 is not a compelling interest where race-based districting is not “reasonably necessary” under a “correct reading” of the Voting Rights Act.⁵³

The Use of Statistical Evidence

Political vote histories are essential tools to ensure that new districts comply with the Voting Rights Act.⁵⁴ For example, the use of racial and political data is critical for a court’s consideration of the compelling interests that may be involved in a racial gerrymander. In *Bush v. Vera*, the Court stated:

“The use of sophisticated technology and detailed information in the drawing of majority minority districts is no more objectionable than it is in the drawing of majority majority districts. But ... the direct evidence of racial considerations, coupled with the fact that the computer program used was significantly more sophisticated with respect to race than with respect to other demographic data, provides substantial evidence that it was race that led to the neglect of traditional districting criteria...”

As noted previously, when the U.S. Department of Justice conducts a Section 5 preclearance review it requires that a submitting authority provide political data supporting a plan.⁵⁵⁶ Registration and performance data must be used under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to determine whether

⁴⁵ *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630, 640 (1993)

⁴⁶ *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630, 642 (1993)

⁴⁷ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 72.

⁴⁸ *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 916 (1995).

⁴⁹ *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 916 (1995).

⁵⁰ *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 920 (1995).

⁵¹ *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. at 653-654 (1993).

⁵² *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 977-979 (1996).

⁵³ *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 921 (1995).

⁵⁴ *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 539 U.S. 461, 487-88 (2003); *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 36-37, 48-49 (1986).

⁵⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 51.27(q) & 51.28(a)(1).

⁵⁶ Federal Register / Vol. 76, No. 73 / Friday, April 15, 2011. Page 21249.

geographically compact minority groups are politically cohesive, and also to determine whether the majority population votes as a block to defeat the minority's candidate of choice.

If Florida were to attempt to craft districts in areas of significant minority population without such data (or in any of the five Section 5 counties), the districts would be legally suspect and would probably invite litigation.

Florida Constitution, Article III, Section 16

Article III, Section 16 of the Florida Constitution requires the Legislature, by joint resolution at its regular session in the second year after the Census is conducted, to apportion the State into senatorial districts and representative districts. According to Article III, Section 16(a), Florida Constitution, senatorial districts must be:

1. Between 30 and 40 in numbers;
2. Consecutively numbered; and
3. Of contiguous, overlapping, or identical territory.

Representative districts must be:

1. Between 80 and 120 in number;
2. Consecutively numbered; and
3. Of contiguous, overlapping, or identical territory.

The joint resolution is not subject to gubernatorial approval. If the Legislature fails to make the apportionment, the Governor must reconvene the Legislature in a special apportionment session not to exceed 30 days. If the Legislature fails to adopt an apportionment plan at its regular or special apportionment session, the Attorney General must petition the Florida Supreme Court to make the apportionment.⁵⁷

Within 15 days after the Legislature adopts the joint resolution, the Attorney General must petition the Supreme Court to review the apportionment plan. The Supreme Court must "permit adversary interests to present their view and, within thirty days from the filing of the petition, shall enter its judgment."⁵⁸

If the Court invalidates the apportionment plan, the Governor must reconvene the Legislature in an extraordinary apportionment session, not to exceed 15 days.⁵⁹

Within 15 days after the adjournment of the extraordinary apportionment session, the Attorney General must petition the Supreme Court to review the apportionment plan adopted by the Legislature or, if no plan was adopted, report the fact to the Court.⁶⁰

If the Court invalidates the apportionment plan adopted by the Legislature at the extraordinary apportionment session, or if the Legislature fails to adopt a plan, the Court must draft the redistricting plan.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Article III, Section 16(b), Florida Constitution.

⁵⁸ Article III, Section 16(c), Florida Constitution.

⁵⁹ Article III, Section 16(d), Florida Constitution.

⁶⁰ Article III, Section 16(e), Florida Constitution.

⁶¹ Article III, Section 16(f), Florida Constitution.

The Florida Constitution is silent with respect to process for congressional redistricting. Article 1 Section 4 of the United States Constitution grants to each state legislature the exclusive authority to apportion seats designated to that state by providing the legislative bodies with the authority to determine the times place and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives. Consistent therewith, Florida has adopted its congressional apportionment plans by legislation subject to gubernatorial approval.⁶² Congressional apportionment plans are not subject to automatic review by the Florida Supreme Court.

Florida Constitution, Article III, Sections 20 and 21

As approved by Florida voters in the November 2010 General Election, Article III, Section 20 of the Florida Constitution establishes the following standards for congressional redistricting:

“In establishing congressional district boundaries:

(a) No apportionment plan or individual district shall be drawn with the intent to favor or disfavor a political party or an incumbent; and districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; and districts shall consist of contiguous territory.

(b) Unless compliance with the standards in this subsection conflicts with the standards in subsection 1(a) or with federal law, districts shall be as nearly equal in population as is practicable; districts shall be compact; and districts shall, where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries.

(c) The order in which the standards within subsections 1(a) and (b) of this section are set forth shall not be read to establish any priority of one standard over the other within that subsection.”

As approved by Florida voters in the November 2010 General Election, Article III, Section 21 of the Florida Constitution establishes the following standards for state legislative apportionment:

“In establishing legislative district boundaries:

(a) No apportionment plan or district shall be drawn with the intent to favor or disfavor a political party or an incumbent; and districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; and districts shall consist of contiguous territory.

(b) Unless compliance with the standards in this subsection conflicts with the standards in subsection 1(a) or with federal law, districts shall be as nearly equal in population as is practicable; districts shall be compact; and districts shall, where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries.

(c) The order in which the standards within subsections 1(a) and (b) of this section are set forth shall not be read to establish any priority of one standard over the other within that subsection.”

These new standards are set forth in two tiers. The first tier, subparagraphs (a) above, contains provisions regarding political favoritism, racial and language minorities, and contiguity. The second tier,

⁶² See generally Section 8.0001, et seq., Florida Statutes (2007).

subparagraphs (b) above, contains provisions regarding equal population, compactness and use of political and geographical boundaries.

To the extent that compliance with second-tier standards conflicts with first-tier standards or federal law, the second-tier standards do not apply.⁶³ The order in which the standards are set forth within either tier does not establish any priority of one standard over another within the same tier.⁶⁴

The first tier provides that no apportionment plan or district shall be drawn with the intent to favor or disfavor a political party or an incumbent. Redistricting decisions unconnected with an intent to favor or disfavor a political party and incumbent do not violate this provision of the Florida Constitution, even if their effect is to favor or disfavor a political party or incumbent.⁶⁵

The first tier of the new standards also provides the following protections for racial and language minorities:

- Districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process.
- Districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process.
- Districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of diminishing the ability of racial or language minorities to elect representatives of their choice.

The non-diminishment standard has comparable text to Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act, as amended in 2006, but the text in the Florida Constitution is not limited to the five counties protected by Section 5.⁶⁶

On March 29, 2011, the Florida Legislature submitted these new standards to the United States Department of Justice for preclearance. In the submission, the Legislature articulated that the amendments to Florida's Constitution "do not have a retrogressive effect."⁶⁷

"Properly interpreted, we (the Florida House of Representatives and the Florida Senate) do not believe that the Amendments create roadblocks to the preservation or enhancement of minority voting strength. To avoid retrogression in the position of racial minorities, the Amendments must be understood to preserve without change the Legislature's prior ability to construct effective minority districts. Moreover, the Voting Rights Provisions ensure that the Amendments in no way constrain the Legislature's discretion to preserve or enhance minority voting strength, and permit any practices or considerations that might be instrumental to that important purpose."⁶⁸

⁶³ Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.

⁶⁴ Article III, Sections 20(c) and 21(c), Florida Constitution.

⁶⁵ In *Hartung v. Bradbury*, 33 P.3d 972, 987 (Or. 2001), the court held that "the mere fact that a particular reapportionment may result in a shift in political control of some legislative districts (assuming that every registered voter votes along party lines)," does not show that a redistricting plan was drawn with an improper intent. It is well recognized that political consequences are inseparable from the redistricting process. In *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 343 (2004) (Souter, J., dissenting) ("The choice to draw a district line one way, not another, always carries some consequence for politics, save in a mythical State with voters of every political identity distributed in an absolutely gray uniformity.")

⁶⁶ Compare *id.* with 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(b).

⁶⁷ Letter from Andy Bardos, Special Counsel to the Senate President, and George Levesque, General Counsel to the Florida House of Representatives, to T. Christian Herren, Jr., Chief of the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice (Mar. 29, 2011) (on file with the Florida House of Representatives). Page 5.

⁶⁸ Letter from Andy Bardos, Special Counsel to the Senate President, and George Levesque, General Counsel to the Florida House of Representatives, to T. Christian Herren, Jr., Chief of the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice (Mar. 29, 2011) (on file with the Florida House of Representatives). Page 7.

Without comment, the Department of Justice granted preclearance on May 31, 2011.⁶⁹

The first tier also requires that districts consist of contiguous territory. In the context of state legislative districts, the Florida Supreme Court has held that a district is contiguous if no part of the district is isolated from the rest of the district by another district.⁷⁰ In a contiguous district, a person can travel from any point within the district to any other point without departing from the district.⁷¹ A district is not contiguous if its parts touch only at a common corner, such as a right angle.⁷² The Court has also concluded that the presence in a district of a body of water without a connecting bridge, even if it requires land travel outside the district in order to reach other parts of the district, does not violate contiguity.⁷³

The second tier of these standards requires that districts be compact.⁷⁴ The meaning of “compactness” can vary significantly, depending on the type of redistricting-related analysis in which the court is involved.⁷⁵ Primarily, courts have used compactness to assess whether some form of racial or political gerrymandering exists. That said, the drawing of a district that is less compact could conversely be the necessary component of a district or plan that attempts to eliminate the dilution of the minority vote. Therefore, compactness is not by itself a dispositive factor.

Courts in other states have used various measures of compactness, including mathematical calculations that compare districts according to their areas, perimeters, and other geometric criteria, and considerations of functional compactness. Geometric compactness considers the shapes of particular districts and the closeness of the territory of each district, while functional compactness looks to practical measures that facilitate effective representation from and access to elected officials. In a Voting Rights context, compactness “refers to the compactness of the minority population, not to the compactness of the contest district”⁷⁶ as a whole.

Overall, compactness is a functional factor in reviewing plans and districts. Albeit, compactness is not regarded as a trumping provision against the carrying out of other rationally formed districting decisions.⁷⁷ Additionally, interpretations of compactness require considerations of more than just geography. For example, the “interpretation of the *Gingles* compactness requirement has been termed ‘cultural compactness’ by some, because it suggests more than geographical compactness.”⁷⁸ In a vote dilution context, “While no precise rule has emerged governing § 2 compactness, the inquiry should take into account traditional districting principles.”⁷⁹

Florida courts have yet to interpret “compactness.”

The second tier of these standards also requires that “districts shall, where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries.”⁸⁰ The term “political boundaries” refers, at a minimum, to the boundaries of cities and counties.⁸¹ Florida case law does not specifically define the term

⁶⁹ Letter from T. Christian Herren, Jr., Chief of the Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice, to Andy Bardos, Special Counsel to the Senate President, and George Levesque, General Counsel to the Florida House of Representatives (May 31, 2011) (on file with Florida House of Representatives).

⁷⁰ *In re Senate Joint Resolution 2G, Special Apportionment Session 1992*, 597 So. 2d 276, 279 (Fla. 1992) (citing *In re Apportionment Law, Senate Joint Resolution 1E*, 414 So. 2d 1040, 1051 (Fla. 1982)).

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.* (citing *In re Apportionment Law, Senate Joint Resolution 1E*, 414 So. 2d at 1051).

⁷³ *Id.* at 280.

⁷⁴ Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.

⁷⁵ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Pages 109-112.

⁷⁶ *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 26 (2006).

⁷⁷ *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 756 (1983).

⁷⁸ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 111.

⁷⁹ *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 27 (2006).

⁸⁰ Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.

⁸¹ The ballot summary of the constitutional amendment that created the new standards referred to “existing city, county and geographical boundaries.” See *Advisory Opinion to Att’y Gen. re Standards for Establishing Legislative Dist. Boundaries*, 2 So. 3d 175, 179 (Fla. 2009).

“geographical boundaries.” Rather, numerous cases use the phrase generally when defining the borders of a state, county, city, court, special district, or other area of land.⁸²

Similarly, the federal courts have used the phrase “geographical boundaries” in a general sense.⁸³ The U.S. Supreme Court has used the phrase “geographical considerations” when referring to how difficult it is to travel within a district.⁸⁴

In addition to referring to the borders of a county, city, court, special district, the area of land referenced by “geographical boundaries” could be smaller areas, “such as major traffic streets, railroads, the river, etc.”,⁸⁵ or topographical features such as a waterway dividing a county or other natural borders within a state or county.⁸⁶

Moreover, it should be noted that in the context of geography, states use a number of geographical units to define the contours of their districting maps. The most common form of geography utilized is census blocks, followed by voter tabulation districts (VTDs). Several states also utilize designations such as counties, towns, political subdivisions, precincts, and wards.

For the 2002 redrawing of its congressional and state legislative maps, Florida used counties, census tracts, block groups and census blocks. For the current redistricting, the Florida House of Representatives’ web-based redistricting application, MyDistrictBuilder™, allows map-drawers to build districts with counties, cities, VTDs, and census blocks.

It should also be noted that these second tier standards are often overlapping. Purely mathematical measures of compactness often fail to account for county, city and other geographic boundaries, and so federal and state courts almost universally account for these boundaries into consideration when measuring compactness. Courts essentially take two views:

- 1) That county, city, and other geographic boundaries are accepted measures of compactness,⁸⁷ or
- 2) That county, city and other geographic boundaries are viable reasons to deviate from compactness.⁸⁸

Either way, county, city, and other geographic boundaries are primary considerations when evaluating compactness.⁸⁹

Public Outreach

In the summer of 2011, the House and Senate initiated an extensive public outreach campaign. On May 6, 2011, the Senate Committee on Reapportionment and the House Redistricting Committee jointly announced the schedule for a statewide tour of 26 public hearings. The purpose of the hearings

⁸² *E.g.*, *State v. Stepansky*, 761 So.2d 1027, 1035 (Fla. 2000) (“In fact, the Fifth District acknowledged the effects doctrine as a basis for asserting jurisdiction beyond the state’s geographic boundaries.”); *State v. Holloway*, 318 So.2d 421, 422 (Fla. 1975) (“The arrest was made outside the geographical boundaries of said city.”); *Deen v. Wilson*, 1 So.3d 1179, 1181 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (“An Office of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional Counsel was created within the geographic boundaries of each of the five district courts of appeal.”); *A. Duda and Sons, Inc. v. St. Johns River Water Management Dist.*, 17 So.3d 738, 740 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (“Cocoa Ranch, is over 18,000 acres and is located within the [St. Johns River Water Management] District’s geographical boundaries.”).

⁸³ *E.g.*, *Sbarra v. Florida Dept. of Corrections*, 2009 WL 4400112, 1 (N.D. Fla. 2009) (“Lee County is within the geographic bounds of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida.”); *Benedict v. General Motors Corp.*, 142 F.Supp.2d 1330, 1333 (N.D. Fla. 2001) (“This was part of the traditional approach of obtaining jurisdiction through service of process within the geographic boundaries of the state at issue.”).

⁸⁴ *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 580 (1964)

⁸⁵ *Bd. of Ed. of Oklahoma City Pub. Sch., Indep. Dist. No. 89, Oklahoma County, Okl. v. Dowell*, 375 F.2d 158, 170 n.4 (10th Cir. 1967),

⁸⁶ *Moore v. Itawamba County, Miss.*, 431 F.3d 257, 260 (5th Cir. 2005).

⁸⁷ *e.g.*, *DeWitt v. Wilson*, 856 F. Supp. 1409, 1414 (E.D. Cal. 1994).

⁸⁸ *e.g.*, *Jamerson v. Womack*, 423 S.E. 2d 180 (1992). *See generally*, 114 A.L.R. 5th 311 at § 3[a], 3[b].

⁸⁹ *See id.*

was to receive public comments to assist the Legislature in its creation of new redistricting plans. The schedule included stops in every region of the state, in rural and urban areas, and in all five counties subject to preclearance. The hearings were set primarily in the mornings and evenings to allow a variety of participants to attend. Specific sites were chosen based on their availability and their accessibility to members of each community.

Prior to each hearing, committee staff invited a number of interested parties in the region to attend and participate. Invitations were sent to representatives of civic organizations, public interest groups, school boards, and county elections offices, as well as to civil rights advocates, county commissioners and administrators, local elected officials, and the chairs and executive committees of statewide political parties. In all, over 4,000 invitations were sent.

In addition to distributing individual invitations, the House and Senate utilized paid advertising space in newspapers and airtime on local radio stations, free advertising through televised and radio public service announcements, legal advertisements in local print newspapers for each hearing, opinion editorials, and advertising in a variety of Spanish-language media to raise awareness about the hearings. Staff from both the House and Senate also informed the public of the hearings through social media websites and email newsletters.

The impact of the statewide tour and public outreach is observable in multiple ways. During the tour, committee members received testimony from over 1,600 speakers. To obtain an accurate count of attendance, committee staff asked guests to fill out attendance cards. Although not all attendees complied, the total recorded attendance for all 26 hearings amounted to 4,787.

**Table 6. Public Input Meeting Schedule
Attendance and Speakers**

City	Date	Recorded Attendance	Speakers
Tallahassee	June 20	154	63
Pensacola	June 21	141	36
Fort Walton Beach	June 21	132	47
Panama City	June 22	110	36
Jacksonville	July 11	368	96
St. Augustine	July 12	88	35
Daytona Beach	July 12	189	62
The Villages	July 13	114	55
Gainesville	July 13	227	71
Lakeland	July 25	143	46
Wauchula	July 26	34	13
Wesley Chapel	July 26	214	74
Orlando	July 27	621	153
Melbourne	July 28	198	78
Stuart	August 15	180	67
Boca Raton	August 16	237	93
Davie	August 16	263	83
Miami	August 17	146	59
South Miami (FIU)	August 17	137	68
Key West	August 18	41	12
Tampa	August 29	206	92
Largo	August 30	161	66
Sarasota	August 30	332	85
Naples	August 31	115	58
Lehigh Acres	August 31	191	69
Clewiston	September 1	45	20
TOTAL	26 meetings	4,787	1,637

In addition to the public input meetings, the House Redistricting Committee and Senate Committee on Reapportionment received hundreds of additional written suggestions for redistricting, both at the public hearings and via social media.

Throughout the summer and at each hearing, legislators and staff also encouraged members of the public to draw and submit their own redistricting plans (partial or complete maps) through web applications created and made available on the Internet by the House and Senate. At each hearing, staff from both the House and Senate was available to demonstrate how members of the public could illustrate their ideas by means of the redistricting applications.

In September 2011, the chairs of the House Redistricting Committee and Senate Committee on Reapportionment sent individual letters to more than fifty representatives of public-interest and voting-rights advocacy organizations to invite them to prepare and submit proposed redistricting plans.

As a result of these and other outreach efforts, the public submitted 157 proposed legislative and congressional redistricting maps between May 27 and November 1, 2011. Since then, ten additional plans have been submitted by members of the public. During the 2002 redistricting cycle, the Legislature received only four proposed maps from the public.

**Table 7. Complete and Partial Redistricting Maps
Submitted to the House or Senate by Florida Residents**

Map Type	Complete Maps	Partial Maps	Total Maps
House	20	24	44
Senate	29	18	47
Congressional	61	25	86
TOTAL	110	67	177

Publicly submitted maps, records from the public input hearings, and other public input are all accessible via www.floridaredistricting.org.

Redistricting Plan H000H9049: Effect of Proposed Changes

Redistricting Plan Summary Statistics for the Proposed State House Map

Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000H9049

Plan File Name: H000H9049				Plan Type: House - 120 Districts													
Plan Population Fundamentals				Plan Geography Fundamentals:													
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310			Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481												
Ideal District Population::	156,677			Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)												
District Population Remainder:	70			County or District Split :	30 Split of 67 used												
District Population Range:	153,745 to 159,978			City or District Split :	75 Split of 411 used												
District Deviation Range:	(-2,932) To 3,301			VID's Split :	552 Split of 9,436 used												
Deviation:	(-1.87) To 2.10 Total 3.97%																
Number of Districts by Race Language																	
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+												
Current Black VAP	23	17	13	11	3												
New Black VAP	23	18	14	12	1												
Current Hisp VAP	39	22	16	13	11												
New Hisp VAP	34	23	19	16	11												
Plan Name:	H000H9049			Number of Districts	120												
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																	
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation								
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H	
H9049-Map	12,738	65,934	19.32%	12,582	184,457	6.82%	98.77%	35.74%	10,080	86,854	11.60%	79.12%	75.91%	3,159	2,808	6,319	
Current Map	16,491	65,913	25.01%	13,683	231,091	5.92%	82.97%	28.52%	10,728	100,440	10.68%	65.05%	65.62%	3,321	3,199	6,643	
H9049-Simple	11,774	65,846	17.88%				106.86%	35.69%				85.61%	75.81%				
Current Map	14,650	65,813	22.26%				93.40%	28.47%				73.22%	65.52%				
	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route				Minutes to drive by fastest route								
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic					
H9049-Map	9	9	9	8	14	14	12	11	22	22	20	19					
Current Map	12	12	11	10	17	17	15	14	26	26	23	22					

District-by-District Summary Statistics for the Proposed State House Map⁹⁰

District ID	Pop Dev	TPOP10	%AllBlkVAP10	%AllHisVAP10	%HaitianPOPACS
1	-374	156,303	20.07	3.76	0.35
2	-745	155,932	20.31	4.76	0.27
3	2,120	158,797	6.04	3.57	0.10
4	2,104	158,781	9.88	6.27	0.04
5	2,521	159,198	13.78	3.73	0.23
6	2,589	159,266	10.83	4.16	0.21
7	-489	156,188	21.62	4.38	0.19
8	-756	155,921	50.02	6.74	0.90
9	-307	156,370	15.87	4.83	0.23
10	-254	156,423	16.71	5.03	0.16
11	-654	156,023	7.88	4.28	0.23
12	190	156,867	14.66	9.42	0.44
13	-173	156,504	50.65	6.21	0.72
14	-782	155,895	50.67	4.12	0.37
15	-880	155,797	22.94	7.29	0.66
16	-186	156,491	11.48	7.83	0.10
17	1,249	157,926	5.39	4.66	0.13
18	-2,133	154,544	10.55	7.31	0.55
19	-1,937	154,740	14.68	5.42	0.02
20	179	156,856	31.20	7.73	0.69
21	241	156,918	8.70	7.76	0.23
22	-1,951	154,726	8.68	11.15	0.31
23	-1,071	155,606	8.21	7.63	0.03
24	1,219	157,896	8.13	7.77	0.33
25	-1,403	155,274	3.07	3.45	0.14
26	-2,557	154,120	21.02	6.88	0.49
27	-1,565	155,112	7.48	17.85	0.62
28	2,136	158,813	10.63	14.35	0.19
29	2,485	159,162	11.88	14.45	0.19
30	-524	156,153	13.10	17.74	0.81
31	1,785	158,462	9.63	11.30	0.51
32	-1,013	155,664	11.16	13.51	0.71
33	-189	156,488	7.06	4.66	0.21
34	466	157,143	2.64	4.17	0.03
35	194	156,871	5.13	9.10	0.14
36	-1,830	154,847	2.49	7.76	0.02
37	-1,684	154,993	3.20	8.76	0.08

⁹⁰ "Pop Dev" is the population deviation above or below the ideal population. "TPOP10" is the proposed district's total resident population, according to the 2010 Census. "%AllBlkVAP10" is the percentage of the proposed district's voting age population that is Black, according to the 2010 Census. "%AllHisVAP10" is the percentage of the proposed district's voting age population that is Hispanic, according to the 2010 Census. "%HaitianPOPACS" is the percentage of the proposed district's voting age population that is Haitian according to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey.

38	-1,820	154,857	7.33	13.10	0.18
39	-1,860	154,817	7.85	13.05	0.46
40	-1,649	155,028	15.98	11.41	0.32
41	-950	155,727	15.53	16.59	1.66
42	-1,762	154,915	11.52	24.76	0.88
43	1,309	157,986	15.47	54.88	1.99
44	808	157,485	9.25	17.10	0.57
45	-424	156,253	40.72	18.03	4.89
46	-520	156,157	52.10	21.17	8.92
47	1,597	158,274	7.21	16.34	0.41
48	-221	156,456	13.08	53.04	1.64
49	2,392	159,069	11.06	29.96	0.72
50	2,200	158,877	10.54	18.27	0.22
51	2,729	159,406	10.26	5.59	0.21
52	2,761	159,438	4.78	6.30	0.17
53	2,951	159,628	13.53	10.14	1.65
54	-624	156,053	8.76	8.68	0.69
55	-795	155,882	8.51	15.96	0.35
56	-1,777	154,900	11.96	22.82	0.21
57	741	157,418	9.74	17.07	0.16
58	1,891	158,568	12.90	20.02	0.54
59	1,555	158,232	14.17	18.91	0.45
60	1,840	158,517	7.13	15.97	0.33
61	2,844	159,521	51.26	20.60	1.95
62	1,776	158,453	12.68	51.89	0.41
63	1,550	158,227	14.19	18.01	0.71
64	1,086	157,763	5.55	14.15	0.27
65	1,192	157,869	2.85	5.33	0.02
66	2,109	158,786	5.84	5.23	0.02
67	1,747	158,424	7.36	11.26	0.05
68	1,874	158,551	5.88	7.12	0.05
69	2,025	158,702	4.05	6.31	0.12
70	-2,633	154,044	45.09	15.35	1.20
71	1,917	158,594	4.28	9.54	0.80
72	2,490	159,167	2.70	8.93	0.19
73	2,572	159,249	3.71	7.19	0.63
74	1,287	157,964	2.56	3.95	0.61
75	3,301	159,978	5.45	4.67	0.75
76	-2,932	153,745	1.41	10.11	0.26
77	805	157,482	3.98	17.00	0.70
78	-2,896	153,781	13.93	15.05	2.25
79	-2,931	153,746	10.24	19.50	1.95
80	-1,040	155,637	8.74	33.21	2.43
81	-639	156,038	16.82	16.71	2.74
82	-144	156,533	4.17	11.50	0.52

83	-307	156,370	11.68	12.77	1.78
84	-147	156,530	18.97	13.65	3.48
85	1,765	158,442	7.75	10.45	1.08
86	1,272	157,949	17.92	19.10	2.73
87	-37	156,640	15.66	50.02	4.66
88	43	156,720	51.77	14.30	10.83
89	-1,505	155,172	7.60	9.54	3.53
90	-1,693	154,984	13.25	16.76	5.33
91	-55	156,622	4.85	7.19	3.22
92	-1,751	154,926	34.00	17.77	10.58
93	1,138	157,815	5.34	11.18	2.06
94	-316	156,361	54.56	12.05	10.57
95	-1,795	154,882	57.66	16.92	13.01
96	-1,582	155,095	15.82	19.04	3.65
97	-979	155,698	16.88	24.29	1.87
98	-1,495	155,182	12.87	23.72	1.86
99	-946	155,731	12.91	29.12	1.81
100	-1,866	154,811	6.12	33.99	0.77
101	-1,789	154,888	36.37	33.68	6.54
102	606	157,283	52.10	38.05	5.02
103	-173	156,504	10.00	82.13	1.57
104	-1,443	155,234	10.98	43.24	1.67
105	692	157,369	11.08	69.00	2.90
106	-1,289	155,388	2.95	10.25	2.08
107	281	156,958	56.86	26.39	25.56
108	171	156,848	62.88	25.43	25.51
109	-2,556	154,121	50.63	45.74	4.72
110	-1,860	154,817	6.17	89.46	0.78
111	20	156,697	4.67	93.05	0.15
112	-1,782	154,895	4.83	73.01	0.10
113	-109	156,568	6.20	66.76	0.70
114	1,392	158,069	7.13	66.02	0.63
115	-462	156,215	5.69	65.51	0.63
116	-955	155,722	3.16	84.44	0.53
117	204	156,881	36.99	55.15	3.58
118	-115	156,562	6.38	81.21	1.01
119	-507	156,170	3.97	86.77	0.49
120	-1,753	154,924	8.97	40.12	2.05

District-by-District Descriptions for the State House Map as Provided in the Whereas Clauses of the Joint Resolution

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 1, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Escambia County; contains all of the municipality of Century; and uses the state line as its western and northern border and the county line as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 2, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Escambia and Santa Rosa counties; includes all of the municipalities of Gulf Breeze and Pensacola; and uses the state line as its western border and the Gulf of Mexico as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 3, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Santa Rosa and Okaloosa counties; includes all of the municipalities of Jay, Laurel Hill, and Milton; and uses portions of the Santa Rosa County line as its western border, the state line as its northern border, portions of the Santa Rosa County and Okaloosa County lines as its eastern borders, and portions the Gulf of Mexico and Interstate 10 as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 4, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located within Okaloosa County; contains all of the municipalities of Cinco Bayou, Crestview, Destin, Fort Walton Beach, Mary Esther, Niceville, Shalimar, and Valparaiso; and uses portions of the Okaloosa County line as its eastern and western borders, portions of Interstate 10 as its northern border, and portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Escambia, Okaloosa, and Santa Rosa counties are nearly equal to the population of four state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 5, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Walton, Holmes, Washington, and Jackson counties and portions of Bay County; created because the combined populations of Walton, Holmes, Washington, Jackson, and Bay counties have the necessary population for two state house districts, one wholly contained within Bay County; contains all of the municipalities of Alford, Bascom, Bonifay, Campbellton, Caryville, Chipley, Cottondale, DeFuniak Springs, Ebro, Esto, Freeport, Graceville, Grand Ridge, Greenwood, Jacob City, Malone, Marianna, Noma, Paxton, Ponce de Leon, Sneads, Vernon, Wausau, and Westville; and uses the Walton County line as its western border, the state line as its northern border, the Jackson County and Bay County lines as its eastern border, and portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 6, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located within Bay County; contains all of the municipalities of Callaway, Lynn Haven, Mexico Beach, Panama City, Panama City Beach, Parker, and Springfield; and uses the Bay County line as its eastern and western borders and portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Bay, Holmes, Jackson, Walton, and Washington counties are nearly equal to the population of two state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 7, which is more compact than the comparable district in the benchmark plan; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Calhoun, Gulf, Liberty, Franklin, and Wakulla counties and portions of Leon County; contains all of the municipalities of Altha, Apalachicola, Blountstown, Bristol, Carrabelle, Greenville, Lee, Madison, Mayo, Monticello, Perry, Port St. Joe, St. Marks, Sopchoppy, and Wewahitchka; and

uses the Calhoun and Gulf County lines as its western border, the Calhoun and Liberty County lines and the state line as portions of its northern border, the Madison and Lafayette County lines as its eastern border, and portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 8, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Gadsden County and portions of Leon County; contains all of the municipalities of Chattahoochee, Greensboro, Gretna, Havana, Midway, and Quincy; and uses the Gadsden County line as its western border and the state line as its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 9, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Leon County; and uses the Leon County line as portions of its eastern border, the Leon County line as its western and southern borders, and the state line as its northern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Calhoun, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, and Wakulla counties are nearly equal to the population of three state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 10, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Hamilton, Suwannee, Columbia, and Baker counties and portions of Alachua County; contains all of the municipalities of Branford, Fort White, Glen St. Mary, Jasper, Jennings, Lake City, Live Oak, Macclenny, and White Springs; and uses the Hamilton and Suwannee County lines as its western border, the state line as its northern border, the Baker and Columbia County lines as portions of its eastern border, and the Suwannee and Columbia County lines as portions of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 11, which is more compact than the comparable district in the benchmark plan; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Nassau County and portions of Duval County; contains all of the municipalities of Atlantic Beach, Callahan, Fernandina Beach, Hilliard, Jacksonville Beach, and Neptune Beach; and uses portions of the state line as its western and northern borders, portions of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and the Duval County line as portions of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 12, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within Duval County; and uses Interstate 95 as portions of its western border and the St. John's River as portions of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 13, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within Duval County; and uses State Road 9A, U.S. Highway 1, U.S. Highway 90, and State Road 228 as major transportation routes for the district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 14, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within Duval County; and uses portions of the Duval County line as its western and northern borders and State Road 9A as a major transportation route for the district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 15, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within Duval County; contains all of the

municipality of Baldwin; and uses portions of the Duval County line and a portion of State Road 134 as portions of its northern border and the St. Johns River as its eastern border, and
WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 16, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within Duval County; uses portions the St. Johns River as its western border; and uses portions of Butler Boulevard as a portion of its northern border and portions of the Duval County line as eastern and southern borders, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Duval and Nassau Counties are nearly equal to the population of six state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 17, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within St. Johns County; contains all of the municipalities of St. Augustine and St. Augustine Beach; and uses portions of the St. Johns County line as its western and northern borders and portions of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 18, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly contained within Clay County; contains all of the municipality of Orange Park; and uses portions of the Clay County line as its western, northern, and eastern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 19, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Bradford, Putnam, and Union counties and portions of Clay County; contains all of the municipalities of Brooker, Crescent City, Green Cove Springs, Hampton, Interlachen, Keystone Heights, Lake Butler, Lawtey, Palatka, Penney Farms, Pomona Park, Raiford, Starke, Welaka, and Worthington Springs; and uses portions of the Union and Bradford County lines as its western and northern borders, the Clay and Putnam County lines as its eastern border, and the Putnam County and Bradford County lines as portions of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Bradford, Clay, Putnam and Union Counties are nearly equal to the population of two state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 20, which does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains portions of Alachua and Marion counties; contains all of the municipalities of Archer, Hawthorne, La Crosse, McIntosh, Micanopy, Reddick, and Waldo; and uses portions of the Alachua County line as its northern and eastern borders and portions of the Marion County line as a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 21, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all Dixie and Gilchrist counties and portions of Alachua County; contains all of the municipalities of Bell, Cross City, Horseshoe Beach, Newberry, and Trenton; and uses a portion of the Gulf of Mexico as its western border and the Dixie and Gilchrist County lines as a portion of its northern and southern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 22, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Levy County and portions of Marion County; contains all of the municipalities of Bronson, Cedar Key, Chiefland, Dunnellon, Inglis, Otter Creek, Williston, and Yankeetown; and uses portions of the Gulf of Mexico and the Levy County line as its western border, the Levy County line as portions of its northern border, and portions of the Levy and Marion County lines as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 23, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Marion County; contains all of the

municipality of Belleview; and uses portions of the Marion County line as its northern and eastern borders and as portions of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 24, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Flagler County and portions of St. Johns and Volusia counties; contains all of the municipalities of Beverly Beach, Bunnell, Flagler Beach, Hastings, Marineland, Palm Coast, and Pierson; uses portions of the St. Johns, Flagler, and Volusia County lines as its western border and portions of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 25, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Volusia County; contains all of the municipalities of Daytona Beach Shores, New Smyrna Beach Ponce Inlet, and Port Orange; and uses portions of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 26, which does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Volusia County; contains all of the municipalities of DeLand Holly Hill and South Daytona; and uses the Volusia County line as portions of its western and northern borders and portions of State Road 44 as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 27, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Volusia County; contains all of the municipalities of DeBary, Deltona, and Oak Hill; and uses portions of the Volusia County line as its western and southern borders and portions of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Flagler, St. Johns, and Volusia counties are nearly equal to the population of five state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 28, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Seminole County; contains all of the municipalities of Oviedo and Winter Springs; and uses the Seminole County line as its northern and eastern borders and as portions of its southern border and U.S. Highway 17-92 as portions of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 29, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Seminole County; contains all of the municipalities of Lake Mary and Longwood; and uses the Seminole County line as its northern and western border and U.S. Highway 17-92 as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 30, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Seminole and Orange counties; contains all of the municipalities of Eatonville and Maitland; and uses portions of U.S. Highway 441 as portions of its western border and portions of Red Bug Lake Road as its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 31, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Lake and Orange counties; contains all of the municipalities of Eustis, Mount Dora, Tavares, and Umatilla; and uses the Lake County line as portions of its northern and eastern borders and portions of U.S. Highway 441 as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 32, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Lake County; contains all of the municipalities of Astatula, Clermont, Groveland, Howey-in-the-Hills, Leesburg, Mascotte, Minneola, and Montverde; and uses portions of the Lake County line as its western, southern, and eastern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 33, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Sumter County and portions of Lake and Marion counties; contains all of the municipalities of Bushnell, Center Hill, Coleman, Fruitland Park, Lady Lake, Webster, and Wildwood; and uses the Sumter County line as its western and southern borders and as portions of its northern and eastern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 34, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Citrus County and portions of Hernando County; contains all of the municipalities of Crystal River and Inverness; and uses portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its western border and the Citrus County line as its northern and as portions of its eastern and southern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 35, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hernando County; contains all of the municipalities of Brooksville and Weeki Wachee; and uses portions of the Gulf of Mexico as portions of its western border and the Hernando County line as its eastern and southern borders and as portions of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Citrus and Hernando counties are nearly equal to the population of two state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 36, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pasco County; contains all of the municipalities of New Port Richey and Port Richey; and uses portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its western border, portions of the Pasco County line as its northern and southern borders, and portions of Little Road as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 37, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pasco County; uses portions of Little Road as its western border and portions of the Pasco County line as its northern and southern borders; and uses the Suncoast Parkway as a major transportation route of the district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 38, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pasco County; contains all of the municipalities of Dade City, St. Leo, San Antonio, and Zephyrhills; and uses portions of the Pasco County line as its northern, eastern, and southern borders, and

WHEREAS, the population Pasco County is nearly equal to the population of three state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 39, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Polk and Osceola counties; contains all of the municipalities of Auburndale and Polk City; and uses portions of the Osceola County line as a portion of its western border and the Osceola and Polk County lines as its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 40, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Polk County; and uses portions of the Polk County line as its western border and a portion of U.S. Highway 98 as a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 41, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Polk County; contains all of the municipalities of Davenport, Dundee, Eagle Lake, Haines City, Lake Alfred, and Lake Hamilton; and uses portions of State Road 429 as a portion of its western and northern borders and a portion of the Polk County line as its northern and eastern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 42, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Polk and Osceola counties; contains all of the municipalities of Frostproof, Highland Park, Hillcrest Heights, and St. Cloud; uses portions of the Osceola County line as its western and southern borders and as portions of its northern border and portions of U.S. Highway 27 as a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 43, which has a Hispanic Voting Age Population of approximately 55 percent; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is located wholly in Osceola County; contains all of the municipality of Kissimmee; and uses portions of the Osceola County line as portions of its southern and western borders and all of its northern border and portions of East Lake Tohopekaliga as a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 44, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Orange County; contains all of the municipalities of Bay Lake, Lake Buena Vista, Oakland, and Windermere; and uses portions of the Orange County line as its western and southern borders, portions of State Road 50 as a portion of its northern border, and a portion of John Young Parkway as a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 45, which has a Black Voting Age Population of approximately 41 percent; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is located wholly in Orange County; and uses portions of the Orange County line as its western border, portions of U.S. Highway 441 as a portion of its northern and eastern borders, and a portion of State Road 50 as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 46, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Orange County; and uses portions of the Florida Turnpike and Kirkman Road as a portion of its western border, a portion of Silver Star Road as its northern border, portions of U.S. Highway 441 and Orange Avenue as portions of its eastern border, and portions of State Road 482 as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 47, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Orange County; contains all of the municipalities of Belle Isle and Edgewood; and uses portions of U.S. Highway 441 as portions of its western border, portions of Lee Road as portions of its northern border, portions of State Road 436 as its eastern border, and portions of State Road 528 as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 48, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Orange County; and uses portions of John Young Parkway and State Road 436 as portions of its western border, portions of Oak Ridge Road, State Road 528, and State Road 50 as portions of its northern border, portions of Chickasaw Trail and Narcoossee Road as portions of its eastern border, and portions of the Orange County line as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 49, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Orange County; and uses portions of State Road 436 and North Goldenrod Road as portions of its western border, portions of the Orange County line as its northern border, portions of Chuluota Road as a portion of its eastern boundary, and a portion of Curry Ford Road as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 50, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Orange and Brevard counties; contains all of the municipality of Titusville; and uses portions of the Orange County lines as its southern border and as portions of its northern and eastern borders and portions of the Indian River as a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 51, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Brevard County; contains all of the municipalities of Cape Canaveral, Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, and Rockledge; and uses portions of the Brevard County line as its northern and portions of its western border, a portion of the Indian River as a portion of its western border, and a portion of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 52, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Brevard County; contains all of the municipalities of Indialantic, Indian Harbour Beach, Melbourne Beach, Melbourne Village, Palm Shores, and Satellite Beach; and uses portions of the Brevard County line as its western border, portions of U.S. Highway 192 as a portion of its southern border, and a portion of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 53, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Brevard County; contains all of the municipalities of Grant-Valkaria, Malabar, and Palm Bay; and uses portions of the Brevard County line as its western and southern borders, a portion of U.S. Highway 192 as a portion of its northern border, and a portion of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 54, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Indian River County and portions of St. Lucie County; contains all of the municipalities of Fellsmere, Indian River Shores, Orchid, St. Lucie Village, Sebastian, and Vero Beach; and uses portions of the Indian River County line as its northern border and as portions of its western borders and a portion of the Atlantic Ocean as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 55, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Okeechobee, Highlands, and Glades counties and portions of St. Lucie County; contains all of the municipalities of Avon Park, Lake Placid, Moore Haven, Okeechobee, and Sebring; and uses the Highlands and Glades County lines as its western border, the Highlands and Okeechobee County lines as its northern border, portions of the Okeechobee and Glades County lines as portions of its eastern border, and the Glades County line as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 56, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Hardee and DeSoto counties and portions of Polk County; contains all of the municipalities of Arcadia, Bartow, Bowling Green, Fort Meade, Mulberry, Wauchula, and Zolfo Springs; uses portions of the Polk County line and all of the Hardee and DeSoto County lines as its western border, portions of U.S. Highway 27 and the Hardee and DeSoto County lines as its eastern border, and the DeSoto County line as its southern border; and uses U.S. Highway 17 as a major transportation route for the district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 57, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; and uses portions of the Hillsborough County line as its southern and eastern borders and portions of State Road 60 as its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 58, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; contains all of the

municipalities of Plant City and Temple Terrace; and uses portions of the Hillsborough County line as its northern and eastern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 59, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; and uses portions of U.S. Highway 41 as its western border, portions of Gibsonton Drive and Boyette Road as its southern border, and portions of State Road 574 as a portion of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 60, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; and uses portions of the Hillsborough County line as its western border and portions of U.S. Highway 41 as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 61, which is consistent with Sections 2 and 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; and uses portions of State Road 582A as a portion of its northern border and portions of U.S. Highway 301 and Interstate 75 as portions of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 62, which is consistent with Sections 2 and 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; and uses a portions of State Road 587 and Busch Boulevard as its northern border and portions of West John F. Kennedy Boulevard as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 63, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Hillsborough County; and uses portions of State Road 597 as its western border, portions of the Hillsborough County line as its northern border, and portions of West Busch Boulevard as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 64, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Hillsborough and Pinellas counties; contains all of the municipalities of Oldsmar and Safety Harbor; and uses portions of East Lake Road as its western border, portions of the Hillsborough County line as its northern border, and portions of State Road 597 as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 65, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pinellas County; contains the municipalities of Dunedin and Tarpon Springs; and uses portions of the Gulf of Mexico as its western border, portions of the Pinellas County line as its northern border, and portions of East Lake Road as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 66, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pinellas County; contains all of the municipalities of Belleair, Belleair Beach, Belleair Bluffs, Belleair Shore, Indian Rocks Beach, Indian Shores, and Seminole; and uses a portion of the Gulf of Mexico as its western border, a portion of State Road 651 as a portion of its eastern border, and a portion of Park Boulevard North as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 67, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pinellas County; and uses a portion of State Road 651 as a portion of its western border and a portion of the Pinellas County line and a portion of State Road 611 as a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 68, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pinellas County; and uses a portion of the Pinellas County line as its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 69, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Pinellas County; contains all of the municipalities Gulfport, Kenneth City, Madeira Beach, North Redington Beach, Redington Beach, St. Pete Beach, South Pasadena, and Treasure Island; and uses a portion of the Gulf of Mexico as its western border, a portion of the Pinellas County line as its southern border, and a portion of Interstate 275 as a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 70, which is consistent with Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Hillsborough, Pinellas, Manatee, and Sarasota counties; and uses portions of the Hillsborough County line and Interstate 275 as its western border, portions of State Road 674 and State 683 as its eastern border, and a portion of Interstate 275 as a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 71, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains portions of Manatee and Sarasota counties; includes all of the municipalities of Anna Maria, Bradenton Beach, Holmes Beach, and Longboat Key; and uses the Manatee County line and Interstate 275 for its northern border and the Sarasota city line for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 72, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Sarasota County; and uses Interstate 75 for its eastern border, the Sarasota County line for its northern border, and the South Tamiami Trail for a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 73, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains portions of Manatee and Sarasota counties; and uses the Manatee and Sarasota county line for its northern and eastern borders, State Road 72 for a portion of its southern border, and Interstate 75 for a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 74, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Sarasota County; includes all of the municipalities of North Port and Venice; and uses the Sarasota County line for its western, southern, and eastern borders and portions of State Road 72 and the Sarasota County line for portions of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, the combined populations of Hillsborough, Manatee, Pinellas, and Sarasota counties are nearly equal to the population of eighteen state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 75, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Charlotte County; includes all of the municipality of Punta Gorda; and uses the Charlotte County line for its entire border, and

WHEREAS, the population Charlotte County is nearly equal to the population of one state house district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 76, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Lee County; includes all of the municipalities of Bonita Springs, Fort Myers Beach, and Sanibel; and uses the Lee County line for its

northern, southern, and western borders and the Cape Coral city line and Interstate 75 for portions of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 77, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Lee County; includes all of the municipality of Cape Coral; and uses the Lee County line for its northern border and the Cape Coral city line for portions of its eastern, southern, and western borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 78, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Lee County; includes all of the municipality of Fort Myers; and uses the Caloosahatchee River for a portion of its western border, State Road 82 for a portion of its northern border, the Lee County line for its eastern border, and Corkscrew Road for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 79, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Lee County; and uses the Lee County line for its northern and eastern borders and State Road 82, the Fort Myers city line, and the Cape Coral city line for portions of its southern and western borders, and

WHEREAS, the population Lee County is nearly equal to the population of four state house districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 80, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Hendry County and portions of Collier County; includes all of the municipalities of Clewiston and LaBelle; and uses the Hendry and Collier County lines for all of its northern and eastern borders and portions of its western border and Interstate 75 for portions of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 81, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipalities of Belle Glade, Pahokee, and South Bay; and uses the Palm Beach County line for its northern, western, and southern borders and the Florida Turnpike for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 82, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Martin and Palm Beach counties; includes all of the municipalities of Jupiter Inlet Colony, Jupiter Island, and Tequesta; and uses the Martin County line for portions of its northern border, the Jupiter city line and Martin County line for portions of its southern border, and the Martin County line for all of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 83, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of St. Lucie and Martin counties; includes all of the municipalities of Ocean Breeze Park, Sewall's Point, and Stuart; and uses the Port St. Lucie city line for a portion of its western border, the Martin County line for a portion of its northern border, and Southwest Martin Downs Boulevard for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 84, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in St. Lucie County; includes all of the municipality of Fort Pierce; and uses the St. Lucie County line and West Angle Road for a portion of its northern border, the Florida Turnpike and the Port St. Lucie city line for portions of its western border, and the Palm Beach County line for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 85, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipalities of Juno Beach, North Palm Beach, and Palm Beach Gardens; and uses the Palm Beach

County line for a portion of its northern border and the North Palm Beach, Palm Beach Gardens, Royal Palm Beach, and Loxahatchee Groves city lines for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 86, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipalities of Haverhill, Loxahatchee Groves, Royal Palm Beach, and Wellington; and uses the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge for a portion of its western border and South Military Trail for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 87, which has a 50 percent Hispanic Voting Age population; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipalities of Cloud Lake, Glen Ridge, Lake Clarke Shores, and Palm Springs; and uses U.S. Highway 1 for a portion of its eastern border, Okeechobee Boulevard for a portion its northern border, and the Atlantis city line for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 88, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is more compact than the comparable district in the benchmark plan; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipalities of Lake Park and Magnolia Park; and uses the Lake Park city line for a portion of its northern border, Interstate 95 and U.S. Highway 1 for portions of its western and eastern borders, and Southwest 10th Street for portions its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 89, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipalities of Briny Breezes, Gulf Stream, Highland Park, Hypoluxo, Manalapan, Ocean Ridge, Palm Beach, Palm Beach Shores, and South Palm Beach; uses the Palm Beach County line for its southern border, the Riviera Beach City line for its northern border, and South Military Trail and the Federal Highway for portions of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 90, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipality of Atlantis; and uses the Florida Turnpike as its western border, West Boynton Beach Boulevard for its southern border, and Interstate 95 for portions of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 91, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Palm Beach County; includes all of the municipality of Golf; and uses the Palm Beach county line as its southern border, the Florida turnpike as its western border, West Boynton Beach Boulevard for its northern border, and South Military Trail for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 92, which does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; and uses The Dixie Highway for a portion of its eastern border, the Florida Turnpike for a portion of its western border, and the Broward County line for its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 93, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; includes all of the municipalities of Hillsboro Beach, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Lighthouse Point, and Sea Ranch Lakes; and uses the Dixie and Federal Highways for a portion of its western border, the Fort Lauderdale city line for its southern border, and the Broward County line for its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 94, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; includes all of the municipality of Lazy Lake; and uses the Federal Highway for a portion of its eastern border, the South Fork New River for a portion of its southern border, and U.S. Highway 441 for a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 95, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; and uses U.S. Highway 441 for its eastern border and portions of the North Lauderdale, Lauderhill, and Sunrise city lines for portions of the southern, western, and northern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 96, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; includes all of the municipalities of Coconut Creek and Parkland; and uses the Broward County line for its northern border, the Florida Turnpike for its eastern border, and the Margate and Parkland city lines for portions of its southern and western borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 97, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; and uses Interstate 75 for a portion of its southern border, the Broward County line for its western and northern borders, and Coral Springs City line for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 98, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; and uses Griffin Road as its southern border, the Davie and Plantation city lines for a portion of the western border, and Northwest 44th Street for a portion of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 99, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; includes all of the municipality of Cooper City; and uses Taft Street for a portion of its southern border, Griffin Road for a portion of its northern border, and U.S. Highway 1 for its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 100, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Broward and Miami-Dade counties; includes all of the municipalities of Aventura, Bal Harbour, Bay Harbor Islands, Golden Beach, Indian Creek, Sunny Isles Beach, and Surfside; and uses U.S. Highway 1 and the Dixie Highway for a portion of its western border, the Hollywood city line for a portion of its northern border, and the Surfside town line for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 101, which does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; includes all of the municipalities of Pembroke Park and West Park; and uses the Broward County line as its southern border, Taft Street for a portion of its northern border, South University Drive for a portion of its western border, and the Dixie Highway for its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 102, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect

representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Broward and Miami-Dade counties; and uses Taft Street for a portion of its northern border, the Florida Turnpike for a portion of its eastern border, the Palmetto Expressway for a portion of its southern border, and South Flamingo Road for a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 103, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Broward and Miami-Dade counties; includes all of the municipality of Hialeah Gardens and Medley; and uses the Miramar city line as its northern border, the Palmetto Expressway for a portion of its eastern border, and the Florida Turnpike for a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 104, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Broward County; includes all of the municipality of Weston; and uses the Broward county line for its western border and a portion of its southern border, Interstate 75 for its northern border, and the Weston city line for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 105, which is consistent with Sections 2 and 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; includes portions of Collier and Miami-Dade counties; includes all of the municipality of Sweetwater; and uses Interstate 75 and the Miami-Dade County line for portions of its northern border and the Monroe County line for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 106, which is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Collier County; includes all of the municipalities of Everglades City, Marco Island, and Naples; and uses the Tamiami Trail East for a portion of its eastern border and the Gulf of Mexico for its western and southern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 107, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade county; and uses the Florida Turnpike for a portion of its western border, Biscayne Boulevard as its eastern border, and the Miami-Dade County line as its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 108, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipalities of Biscayne Park, El Portal, and Miami Shores; and uses Northwest 17th Avenue for a portion of its eastern border, Interstate 195 for a portion of its southern border, and Northeast 135th Street for a portion of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 109, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipality of Opa-locka; and uses the Palmetto Expressway for a portion of its northern border, Northwest 17th Avenue for a portion of its eastern border, and the Hialeah city line for a portion of its western border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 110, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade county; and uses the Miami-Dade County line as its northern border, the Palmetto Expressway for a portion of its western border, and portions of the Hialeah city line for its southern and eastern borders, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 111, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipalities of Miami Springs and Virginia Gardens; and uses Northwest 7th Street for a portion of its southern border and the Hialeah city line for a portion of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 112, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipality of Key Biscayne; and uses Southwest 42nd Avenue for a portion of its western border and Southwest 7th Street for a portion of its northern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 113, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipalities of Miami Beach and North Bay; and uses the Miami Beach city line as its northern border and Southwest 7th Street for a portion of its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 114, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is more compact than the comparable district in the benchmark plan; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipalities of Cutler Bay and West Miami; and uses Southwest 67th Avenue for a portion of its western border and 42nd Avenue for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 115, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; and uses Southwest 87th Avenue for a portion of its western border, the Palmetto Bay city line for a portion of its southern border, and Southwest 67th Avenue for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 116, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; and uses a portion of the Florida Turnpike for its western border, 87th Avenue for its eastern border, and a portion of the Don Shula Expressway for its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 117, which does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is more compact than the comparable district in the benchmark plan; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipality of Florida City; and uses U.S. Highway 1 and the Florida Turnpike as the major transportation routes for the district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 118, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; and uses the Florida Turnpike as its eastern border, Southwest 137th Avenue for portions of its western border, U.S. Highway 41 as its northern border, and Southwest 184th Street as its southern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 119, which is consistent with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act; does not deny or abridge the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice; is compact; is nearly equal in population as practicable; is wholly located in Miami-Dade County; and uses U.S. Highway 41 as its northern border, Southwest 177th Avenue as a portion of its western border, and Southwest 137th Avenue for a portion of its eastern border, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish State House District 120, which is as nearly compact as possible; is nearly equal in population as practicable; contains all of Monroe County and portions of Miami-Dade County; includes all of the municipalities of Islamorada, Village of Islands, Key Colony Beach, Key West, Layton, and Marathon; and uses U.S. Highway 1, the city limits of Florida City, and Homestead Air Force Base for portions of the boundary within Miami-Dade County.

Redistricting Plan S000S9008: Effect of Proposed Changes

Redistricting Plan Summary Statistics for the Proposed State Senate Map

Redistricting Plan Data Report for S000S9008

Plan File Name: S000S9008						Plan Type: Senate - 40 Districts											
Plan Population Fundamentals						Plan Geography Fundamentals:											
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310					Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481										
Ideal District Population::	470,032					Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)										
District Population Remainder:	30					County or District Split :	31 Split of 67 used										
District Population Range:	465,343 to 474,685					City or District Split :	54 Split of 411 used										
District Deviation Range:	(-4,689) To 4,653					VTD's Split :	421 Split of 9,436 used										
Deviation:	(-0.99) To 0.98 Total 1.98%																
Number of Districts by Race Language																	
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+												
Current Black VAP	8	6	3	2	1												
New Black VAP	8	6	3	2	0												
Current Hisp VAP	14	8	6	3	3												
New Hisp VAP	13	7	5	5	3												
Plan Name:	S000S9008				Number of Districts	40											
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																	
	Base Shapes						Circle - Dispersion						Convex Hull - Indentation				
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H	
S9008-Map	9,975	65,934	15.12%	8,604	216,439	3.97%	86.25%	30.46%	6,818	99,074	6.88%	68.34%	66.55%	2,036	2,093	4,073	
Current Map	11,470	65,934	17.39%	9,035	234,011	3.86%	78.77%	28.17%	7,143	108,049	6.61%	62.27%	61.02%	2,121	2,269	4,242	
S9008-Simple	9,138	65,937	13.85%				94.16%	30.46%				74.61%	66.55%				
Current Map	10,402	65,883	15.78%				86.86%	28.15%				68.66%	60.97%				
	Straight line in miles apart						Miles to drive by fastest route						Minutes to drive by fastest route				
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic					
S9008-Map	21	21	21	15	28	28	28	20	38	38	37	29					
Current Map	24	24	24	18	32	32	31	24	41	41	39	32					

District-by-District Summary Statistics for the Proposed State Senate Map⁹¹

District ID	Pop Dev	TPOP10	%AllBlkVAP10	%AllHispVAP10	%HaitianPOPACS
1	3,560	473,592	12.54	5.19	0.18
2	-2,050	467,982	9.28	6.08	0.14
3	4,653	474,685	14.45	3.55	0.22
4	-3,653	466,379	11.09	6.79	0.18
5	4,376	474,408	29.61	5.29	0.45
6	-4,556	465,476	47.72	5.88	0.70
7	-3,311	466,721	15.34	7.39	0.49
8	-74	469,958	7.21	10.38	0.27
9	-4,076	465,956	6.58	5.62	0.23
10	3,996	474,028	8.29	13.39	0.50
11	-3,269	466,763	8.69	6.91	0.08
12	-4,268	465,764	39.999	20.94	5.26
13	1,142	471,174	8.29	16.58	0.30
14	-3,128	466,904	14.34	50.50	1.62
15	4,538	474,570	6.87	18.98	0.23
16	-2,123	467,909	10.31	15.61	0.70
17	1,096	471,128	5.58	7.43	0.06
18	3,051	473,083	9.30	8.16	0.67
19	-2,889	467,143	37.22	27.42	1.35
20	140	470,172	5.38	8.65	0.12
21	-4,524	465,508	11.49	17.31	0.42
22	-1,027	469,005	4.88	7.59	0.12
23	-4,689	465,343	8.52	14.64	1.51
24	-2,207	467,825	8.43	11.71	0.58
25	744	470,776	10.60	9.90	1.51
26	-1,322	468,710	11.86	17.29	0.95
27	3,100	473,132	11.18	20.72	4.55
28	-4,656	465,376	4.18	6.17	0.42
29	-4,670	465,362	6.65	11.07	1.80
30	-4,535	465,497	4.05	16.10	1.65
31	3,449	473,481	21.34	21.14	5.16
32	3,958	473,990	13.90	24.43	2.00
33	-2,900	467,132	8.32	86.88	1.01
34	2,971	473,003	55.76	15.48	11.68
35	3,562	473,594	9.25	50.43	2.36
36	4,582	474,614	14.21	30.96	2.49

⁹¹ "Pop Dev" is the population deviation above or below the ideal population. "TPOP10" is the proposed district's total resident population, according to the 2010 Census. "%AllBlkVAP10" is the percentage of the proposed district's voting age population that is Black, according to the 2010 Census. "%AllHispVAP10" is the percentage of the proposed district's voting age population that is Hispanic, according to the 2010 Census. "%HaitianPOPACS" is the percentage of the proposed district's voting age population that is Haitian according to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey.

37	4,641	474,673	5.365	83.68	0.54
38	1,563	471,595	58.32	27.91	16.40
39	4,301	474,333	5.22	83.34	0.87
40	4,534	474,566	35.10	39.84	6.14

District-by-District Descriptions for the State Senate Map as Provided in the Whereas Clauses of the Joint Resolution

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 1, which ties coastal communities of the Florida Panhandle in Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; and follows the boundaries of the state on its west, the eastern boundary of Bay County on its east, the Gulf of Mexico on its south, and the Intracoastal Waterway, the Yellow River, and Interstate 10 on its north, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 2, which ties rural communities in North Florida and the Nature Coast; includes all of Baker, Citrus, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Lafayette, Levy, Suwannee, and Union Counties; includes portions of Marion County west of Interstate 75 and the Ocala city line; is equal in population to other districts; and follows political and geographical boundaries, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 3, which ties rural Panhandle communities in Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, Bay, Washington, Holmes, and Jackson Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the boundaries of the state on the western, northern, and eastern sides of the district; and follows the Yellow River, Interstate 10, the Intracoastal Waterway, and city lines in Pensacola and in Bay County on the south side of the district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 4, which includes all of Nassau County and a portion of Duval County not included in a minority-opportunity district; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; and is bounded by the State of Georgia on the west and north, the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and the Duval County line on the south, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 5, which ties counties of the Capitol Region that associate with Tallahassee, which lies near the geographic center of the district; includes all of Calhoun, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Hamilton, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, and Wakulla Counties; is equal in population to other districts; and follows political and geographical boundaries, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 6, which ties communities of similar socioeconomic characteristics in the northeastern portion of the state from the St. Johns River basin to Interstate 95 between Daytona Beach and Jacksonville, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; has a near majority black voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; is equal in population to other districts; and follows political and geographical boundaries, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 7, which includes all of Alachua, Bradford, and Clay Counties in north central Florida; is equal in population to other districts; and follows political and geographical boundaries, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 8, which ties communities south and west of Daytona Beach in Volusia County with northern Brevard County and eastern Orange County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the western border of Volusia County, the northern border of Orange County, the Econlockhatchee

River, the Beachline Expressway through Orange and Brevard Counties, the northern boundary of Cape Canaveral, and the Atlantic Ocean; and follows the city lines of DeBary, Port Orange, Daytona Beach, and Daytona Beach Shores for portions of its boundary, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 9, which ties the coastal communities of northeast Florida from the mouth of the St. Johns River to Daytona Beach; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is adjacent to a minority-opportunity district to its west; is bordered by the Atlantic Ocean on the east; and is traversed by Interstate 95, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 10, which includes communities in Lake and Orange Counties from Leesburg to Orlando; is adjacent to two minority-opportunity districts in central Florida; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the western boundary of Lake County and the southern boundaries of Lake and Orange Counties; and is traversed by the Florida Turnpike, Interstate 4, and Highway 441, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 11, which ties rural areas in eastern Marion County, western Putnam County, and northern and eastern Lake County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the Lake and Putnam County lines on the north, east, and south; and includes The Villages Community Development District in Sumter County, the City of Ocala, and portions of Marion County east of Interstate 75, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 12, which ties urban communities of similar socioeconomic characteristics in Orange and Seminole Counties, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; has a majority-minority voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; and includes parts of Orlando, Ocoee, Winter Garden, Apopka, Maitland Winter Park, and Sanford, as well as the City of Eatonville, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 13, which includes portions of Seminole County and Orange Counties, including communities in Altamonte Springs, Casselberry, Lake Mary, Maitland, Longwood, Oviedo, and Winter Springs; is adjacent to a minority-opportunity district; follows the Seminole County line and municipal boundaries; is equal in population to other districts; and follows political and geographical boundaries, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 14, which ties communities in Orange, Osceola, and Polk Counties of similar language, cultural, and socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; and has a majority Hispanic voting-age population, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 15, which ties communities in northwest Hillsborough County and south Pasco County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is bounded by the Hillsborough County line on the west, State Road 52, U.S. Highway 98, and city lines on the north, and the Pasco County line and Interstate 275 on the east; and is adjacent to a minority-opportunity district to the south, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 16, which links rural communities in Osceola, Polk, and Orange Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is adjacent to a minority-opportunity district; follows the Polk County and Osceola County lines, the Beachline Expressway, and State Road 60; and is traversed by the Florida Turnpike and Interstate 4, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 17, which includes the cities of Belleair, Belleair Bluffs, Clearwater, Dunedin, Largo, Oldsmar, Safety Harbor, and Tarpon Springs in

northern Pinellas County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is bounded by the Pinellas County line on the north and east, the Gulf of Mexico and Intracoastal Waterway on the west, and municipal boundaries on the south, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 18, which ties Space Coast communities along U.S. 1 and Interstate 95 in southern Brevard County with northern and western Indian River County, including the cities of Sebastian and Fellsmere; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the borders of Brevard and Indian River Counties on the west and south; is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean and Interstate 95; and is bounded on the north by the Beachline Expressway, the Cocoa city line, and the barge canal that crosses Merritt Island and empties to the Atlantic Ocean at Port Canaveral, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 19, which ties urban communities in the Tampa Bay area of similar socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; has a majority-minority voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries, including at its center and Interstate 75 on the east; and is traversed by Interstate 275, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 20, which ties communities of northern and western Pasco County with all of Hernando County and most of Sumter County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; and is bounded by the Gulf of Mexico on the west, the boundaries of Hernando and Sumter County on the north and east, and State Road 52, U.S. Highway 98, and city lines of San Antonio and St. Leo in Pasco County on the south, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 21, which is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; ties Hillsborough County communities east and south of Tampa, including Brandon, Sun City Center, and Apollo Beach; and follows the boundaries of Hillsborough County on the north and south, Interstate 275, a minority-opportunity district that generally abuts Interstate 75, and Tampa Bay on the west, and State Road 39 and the outskirts of Plant City on the east, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 22, which ties the southern and beach communities in Pinellas County with south Tampa; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; includes all of the beach communities in Pinellas County from Belleair Beach to St. Pete Beach; is bounded on the west by the Gulf of Mexico; and follows city lines across Pinellas County and Interstate 275, State Road 60, and Tampa Bay in Hillsborough County, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 23, which ties southern Charlotte and eastern Lee Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the county boundaries of Lee and Charlotte Counties on the east and south and the Caloosahatchee River, the municipal boundary of Cape Coral, and Charlotte Harbor on the west; and is traversed by Interstate 75, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 24, which includes the portion of Manatee County not included in a minority-opportunity district with communities in eastern Hillsborough and western Polk County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the boundaries of Manatee County; follows highways and the outskirts of Plant City in Hillsborough County; and follows highways and passes between Mulberry and Bartow in Polk County, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 25, which ties the Treasure Coast communities of Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, and northern Palm Beach Counties; is equal in

population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean; and is generally bounded on the west by the Florida Turnpike and Interstate 95, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 26, which includes rural agricultural areas from the Kissimmee basin to Lake Okeechobee; includes all of Hardee, Desoto, Glades, Highlands, and Okeechobee Counties, as well as southern Polk County, northern Charlotte County, and eastern Martin and St. Lucie Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the western boundaries of Hardee and DeSoto Counties, the southern boundaries of Glades and Martin Counties, and the northern boundaries of St. Lucie and Okeechobee Counties; and follows State Road 60 through much of Polk County and County Road 74 through most of Charlotte County, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 27, which includes communities in southern and central Palm Beach County between Interstate 95 and the Florida Turnpike; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is adjacent to the minority-opportunity district to the east; in places follows the municipal boundaries of Boca Raton, Greenacres, and other cities; combines the Century Village retirement communities in Palm Beach County as well as western Boca Raton and its suburbs; and is traversed by major transportation routes that run from north to south through heavily populated areas in Palm Beach County, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 28, which includes all of Sarasota County and the western portion of Charlotte County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the Gulf of Mexico on the west, the boundary of Sarasota County on the north and east, and Charlotte Harbor in the south; ties the communities of Longboat Key, Sarasota, Venice, North Port, and Port Charlotte; and is traversed by Interstate 75, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 29, which ties the coastal communities of Broward and Palm Beach Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is adjacent to a minority-opportunity district to its west and the Atlantic Ocean to the east; and follows the municipal boundaries of West Palm Beach and Palm Beach Gardens in the northwest, the Loxahatchee River in the northeast, and the Ft. Lauderdale city boundary in the south, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 30, which ties coastal communities in Lee and Collier Counties; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; is bounded on the west by the Gulf of Mexico, on the north by the Lee County line, and on the south by the Collier County line; is adjacent to a minority-opportunity district; includes all of Naples and Marco Island in Collier County; includes the barrier islands west of the Intracoastal Waterway and the entire City of Cape Coral in Lee County; and is traversed by Interstate 75 and the Tamiami Trail, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 31, which ties inland communities in north Broward County, including Coconut Creek, Coral Springs, Margate, North Lauderdale, Parkland, and Tamarac; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the Sawgrass Expressway on the west, the Broward County line on the north, a minority-opportunity district on the east, and city lines on the south; and is traversed by the Florida Turnpike, Interstate 95, and the Sawgrass Expressway, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 32, which includes western portions of Palm Beach and Broward County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the Broward and Palm Beach County lines on the north, south, and west, and city lines on the east; includes the cities of Loxahatchee Groves, Royal Palm Beach, Southwest Ranches, Wellington, and Weston, and portions of Pembroke Pines, Davie, and Sunrise; includes the entire Everglades Agricultural Area and conservation areas in western Broward and Palm

Beach Counties; and is traversed by the Florida Turnpike, Sawgrass Expressway, Interstate 75, and U.S. 98, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 33, which ties communities in northwest Miami-Dade County of similar language, cultural, and socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; includes the municipalities of Hialeah, Hialeah Gardens, Miami Springs, Medley, Miami Lakes, Virginia Gardens, and most of Doral; has a majority Hispanic voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the Miami-Dade County boundary on the north and State Road 997 on the west; and is adjacent to other minority districts to the east and south, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 34, which ties communities of similar socioeconomic characteristics along Interstate 95 and U.S. 1 in Palm Beach and Broward Counties, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; has a majority black voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; includes all of Lauderhill and Lauderdale Lakes; and is bounded on the south in part by the municipal boundaries of Plantation, Fort Lauderdale, and Dania Beach, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 35, which includes all the coastal communities in Miami-Dade County; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; generally includes areas east of U.S. 1 from the Miami-Dade County boundary in the north to Homestead in the south; is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean; and is adjacent to minority-opportunity districts, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 36, which ties communities in south Broward County, including Cooper City, Dania Beach, Davie, Hallendale Beach, Hollywood, Miramar, and Pembroke Pines; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows the Broward county line and the boundary of a minority district in the south, the Atlantic Ocean in the east, and city boundaries and Interstate 595 in the north; and is traversed by Interstates 75, 95, and 595, and several major thoroughfares that cross the district east to west, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 37, which ties neighborhoods of similar language, cultural, and socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; includes Allapatah, Little Havana, South Miami, and West Miami, the portion of Coral Gables north of U.S. 1, and unincorporated neighborhoods of Miami-Dade County south of Miami International Airport; has a majority Hispanic voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; is equal in population to other districts; and follows political and geographical boundaries, including U.S. 1, the South Miami and Coral Gables city lines, and Coral Way, Southwest 97th Avenue, and Southwest 107th Avenue, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 38, which ties communities in north Miami-Dade and south Broward Counties of similar socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; includes all of Miami Gardens, Opa-Locka, Biscayne Park, West Park, and Pembroke Park, plus portions of North Miami, North Miami Beach, Hallandale Beach, Hollywood, Miramar, and Pembroke Pines; has a majority black voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district; and is traversed by Interstate 95 and the Florida Turnpike, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 39, which ties communities in western Miami-Dade County of similar language, cultural, and socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; follows Tamiami Trail, the Dolphin Expressway,

Southwest 97th Avenue, Southwest 107th Avenue, the Homestead Extension, and State Road 997; and has a majority Hispanic voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Legislature to establish Senate District 40, which includes the Miami neighborhoods of Brownsville, Gladeview, Liberty City, Little Haiti, Overtown, and Pinewood, the City of El Portal, agricultural and conservation areas in Miami-Dade and Collier Counties, including Everglades National Park and the Big Cypress National Preserve, and all of Hendry and Monroe Counties; ties communities of similar socioeconomic characteristics, consistent with traditional, race-neutral redistricting principles; is equal in population to other districts; follows political and geographical boundaries; and has a majority-minority voting-age population, comparable to that of the existing district.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

- Section 1 Provides that the 2010 Census is the official census of the state for the purposes of this joint resolution; Lists and defines the geography utilized for the purposes of this joint resolution in accordance with Public Law 94-171.
- Section 2 Provides for the geographical description of the apportionment of the 120 State House districts.
- Section 3 Provides for the geographical description of the apportionment of the 40 State Senate districts.
- Section 4 Provides for the apportionment of any territory not specified for inclusion in any district.
- Section 5 Provides for the apportionment of any noncontiguous territory.
- Section 6 Provides that the districts created by this joint resolution constitute and form the representative and senatorial districts of the State.
- Section 7 Provides a severability clause in the event that any portion of this joint resolution is held invalid.
- Section 8 Provides that this joint resolution applies with respect to the qualification, nomination, and election of members of the Florida Legislature in the primary and general elections held in 2012 and thereafter.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

2. Revenues:

None.

3. Expenditures:

The 2012 reapportionment will have an undetermined fiscal impact on Florida's election officials, including 67 Supervisor of Elections offices and the Department of State, Division of Election. Local supervisors will incur the cost of data-processing and labor to change each of Florida's 11 million voter records to reflect new districts. As precincts are aligned to new districts, postage and printing will be required to provide each active voter whose precinct has changed with mail notification. Temporary staffing will be hired to assist with mapping, data verification, and voter inquiries.

C. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

The 2012 reapportionment will have an undetermined fiscal impact on Florida's election officials, including 67 Supervisor of Elections offices and the Department of State, Division of Election. Local supervisors will incur the cost of data-processing and labor to change each of Florida's 11 million voter records to reflect new districts. As precincts are aligned to new districts, postage and printing will be required to provide each active voter whose precinct has changed with mail notification. Temporary staffing will be hired to assist with mapping, data verification, and voter inquiries.

D. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

E. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.