



Redistricting Committee

Meeting Packet

Friday, January 20, 2012

9:00 AM

404 HOB

Part 1 of 3

Committee Meeting Notice

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Redistricting Committee

Start Date and Time: Friday, January 20, 2012 09:00 am

End Date and Time: Friday, January 20, 2012 04:00 pm

Location: 404 HOB

Duration: 7.00 hrs

Workshop on the following:

HJR 6001 Joint Resolution of Apportionment by Senate Redistricting Subcommittee, Nehr

HB 6003 Establishing the Congressional Districts of the State by Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee, Legg

HB 6005 Establishing the Congressional Districts of the State by Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee, Legg

HB 6007 Establishing the Congressional Districts of the State by Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee, Legg

HJR 6009 Joint Resolution of Apportionment by House Redistricting Subcommittee, Schenck

HJR 6011 Joint Resolution of Apportionment by House Redistricting Subcommittee, Schenck

HJR 6013 Joint Resolution of Apportionment by House Redistricting Subcommittee, Schenck

Public Testimony

Review of Public Input

Additional Committee Business

NOTICE FINALIZED on 01/18/2012 15:00 by Crofoot.Katie

Table of Contents

Tab 1: Public Input

Tab 2: HJR 6001 (S000S9004)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map
- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Tab 3: HB 6003 (H000C9041)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map
- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Tab 4: HB 6005 (H000C9043)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map
- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Tab 5: HB 6007 (H000C9045)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map

- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Tab 6: HJR 6009 (H000H9025)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map
- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Tab 7: HJR 6011 (H000H9027)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map
- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Tab 8: HJR 6013 (H000H9031)

- Bill Analysis
- Statewide Map
- Northwest Map
- Big Bend Map
- Northeast Map
- Central North Map
- Central South Map
- Tampa Bay Map
- South Map
- Miami-Dade Map
- Southeast Map
- Data Report

Regarding the **Congressional** Map

Public suggestions received since the
House released redistricting options
on December 6, 2011

You replied on 12/7/2011 1:25 PM.

From: Eric Childers [eric@ericchilders.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting

Sent: Wed 12/7/2011 11:52 AM

I am pleased to see and support Nassau county remaining in tact as a rural/costal community and district.
Thank you,
Eric Childers
Commissioner
Fernandina Beach, FL

-----Original Message-----

From: myost54@bellsouth.net [mailto:myost54@bellsouth.net]

Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 1:22 PM

To: Weatherford, Will

Cc: myost54@bellsouth.net

Subject: From 'Write Your Representative' Website

Michael Yost

Jacksonville, Fl 32221-

(904)781-8680

12/07/11 1:22 PM

To the Honorable Will W. Weatherford;

First, let me thank the Congressional Redistricting Committee on the work you have done in the maps you presented.

Without saying, this is not an easy nor thankful job on your parts and I do understand the need to provide solid and legal maps for this State of Florida.

First, let me offer that I DO support your H000C9009 map. Based on all the factors that you could have compiled and weighing the benefits for Floridians, I fee this best exemplifies the needs of Floridians in having solid Congressional representation of any of the House or Senate proposals.

I would ask that the Sub Committee vote FOR this map and that the full Redistricting Committee approve this map and send on to the House for consideration. My only request is for the numbering of these proposed Districts be changed to better reflect the areas of the current Elected officials and to place the new 26th and 27th District numbering as you feel it should be- ie. the "new" 3rd as the 26th, etc. It would be far better for voters in their current Districts to NOT have to try to figure out where they are when final legislation is passed. Additionally, it would create far less confusion for the current incumbents in filing for seats they currently hold as well as the Federal Election Commission refiles for the seats they hold and plan to run in. That way it would affect only a small handful of candidates.

Again, I commend your committee on the H000C9009 map.

Sincerely,

Michael Yost

Jacksonville, FL.

Next Last

You replied on 12/12/2011 10:29 PM.

Sent: Mon 12/12/2011 9:18 PM

From: Scott Miller [smiller@clayelections.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc: Chris H. Chambliss; Holly DePaul
Subject: Clay County Redistricting Thoughts

The Lat/Long coordinates in RED are the bounding corners of the window which can be used to view the issue being discussed

S000C9002 and H000C9003, H000C9005, H000C9007, H0009009, H000C9011, H000C9013 are the Senate and House versions of the Congressional Redistricting Plan. All of these plans follow the same route through Clay County

-81.741,30.148,-81.680,30.193 These plans will create Congressional District splits within Orange Park Town Limits. I thought the plan was to hold municipal boundaries. I do realize that including all of the Orange Park municipal limits may cause issues with the overall population of the district

-81.714,30.095,-81.692,30.112 There is an odd triangle. The base is Pine Ave and the point is the intersection of Bald Eagle Rd and US Highway 17. There are also some Community Development District things going on in this same area. It would be better to remove this triangle and just follow Pine Ave.

-81.720,30.037,-81.698,30.053 The district currently crosses US Highway 17 and encompasses the parking lot area of the Black Creek Bike Trail. There is no reason for this; the district should follow US Highway 17

H000H9015, H000H9017, H000H9019, H000H9021, and H000H9023 are the House Redistricting plans.

-81.748,29.836,-81.563,29.975 H000H9019 gives Clay County three districts, one of which is the southeast corner of the county bounded by the St Johns River, the county line, US Highway 17, County Road 226, and Bayard Rd to the River. I see no reason to cut this little part of the county out.

-81.938,30.058,-81.921,30.071 H000H9015 and H000H9021 both run along Hibiscus Ave in Middleburg, but cut around Flax Ct. They should not do this; Flax Ct should be in the same district as all of its neighboring streets.

-81.736,30.027,-81.709,30.048 H000H9019 and H000H9023 follow Peters Creek to the railroad tracks and then follow the rail road tracks to Watkins Rd and then to County Road 209. They should just follow Peters Creek to County Road 209.

Regards,

Scott A. Miller

GIS / Tabulation Specialist
Clay County Elections Office
1417-1 South Orange Avenue
P.O. Box 337

Green Cove Springs, FL 32043
904-284-6350 Office

904-284-0935 Facsimile

www.ClayElections.com

[Follow Clay Elections on Twitter!](#)

[Become a Fan of Clay Elections on Facebook!](#)

[View Clay Elections on Flickr](#)

f

You replied on 1/15/2012 5:00 PM.

From: Scott Miller [smiller@clayelections.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Clay County Redistricting Thoughts

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 9:52 PM

HB 6003 (H000C9041)

- Blocks 120190313003028 and 120190313001004 should be moved to District 3. In both cases the current boundary divides a neighborhood

HB 6005 (H000C9043), HB 6007 (H000C9045)

- Block 120190314001052 should be moved to District 5 because the current boundary divides a neighborhood

HJR 6009 (H000H9025), HJR 6011 (H000H9027)

- Block 120190301023065 moved to District 19 to allow the boundary to follow the boundary of Camp Blanding (Florida National Guard Base)

HJR 6013 (H000H9031) – This is a poor choice for Clay Co. The northeast boundary of block 120190309041012 traverses several neighborhoods and correcting this issue would be very difficult given the available Census line work available in the area

- 30.112413 / -81.767779 zoom 15 – The southern boundary of block 120190308023009 traverses an occupied parcel. The following blocks should be included in District 15: 120190308023010, 120190308023012, 120190308023013, 120190308023014, 120190308023015, 120190308023016, 120190308023018, 120190308023025, 120190308023032, 120190308023041, 120190308023042
- Blocks 120190301023038 and 120190313003035 need to be included in District 18

Regards,

Scott A. Miller

GIS / Tabulation Specialist
Clay County Elections Office
1417-1 South Orange Avenue
P.O. Box 337
Green Cove Springs, FL 32043
904-284-6350 Office

5

You replied on 12/7/2011 5:34 PM.

From: SD Miller [adm1251@gmail.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Comments On Congressional Redistricting Plans

Sent: Wed 12/7/2011 3:02 PM

I am a voter in Clay County and am writing in support of Congressional Plan H000C9001.

The part I am specifically writing about is Northeast Florida. And my comments are solely in relation to Northeast Florida.

Prior to the redistricting in 1992, the counties of Clay and St Johns were always in the same Congressional District. In fact you would have to go back prior to WW2 to see these counties separated.

Both St Johns and Clay are now primarily suburban counties. The oddity is that both counties have 190,000 people. Just a couple hundred people separate these counties,

These 2 counties along with the southern sections of Jacksonville are basically the same city. The areas are fungible. For instance, when I wish to go to WalMart, it is easier for me to jump on I295, cross the river and go to the WalMart at that intersection on the opposite side of the river. It is faster and easier than fight traffic and go to the Orange Park WalMart.

We consider this all one city separated by arbitrary invisible boundaries.

Since both Clay and St Johns Counties are suburban, we face the same problems.

However, starting in 1992 the Black access district for Northeast Florida was drawn so that the district went down the St Johns River and took in the river front homes in Clay County. The effect has been that Clay and St Johns have been cutoff from the same Congressional Districts. What was once a historical fact, in the same Congressional District, became an impossibility.

Now Plan H000C9001 shows that a Black access district can be drawn that would send the section that connects to Gainesville can exit Duval County to the west and go thru Baker and Bradford. This allows for Clay and St Johns Counties to be reunited into the same Congressional District.

Additionally, the percentage of Blacks in CD5 of Plan H000C9001 would increase by going thru Bradford County to 51.2%.

Lastly, for 20 years the river front owners in Clay County have believed and expressed their feeling they have been politically disenfranchised by the sending the Black Access district down the river.

The other 6 House Congressional Proposal do send the Black access district down the St Johns and severs St Johns from Clay County.

Since Plan H000C9001 shows that the requirements of the Voting Rights Act and the Fair District Amendments can be met, I ask that as far as Northeast Florida is concerned that H000C9001 is adopted.

-30-
Steve Miller
Orange Park, Florida

From: Kass, Roger [Roger.Kass@thevillages.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting Maps

Sent: Sun 1/15/2012 10:56 PM

I am the past President of The Villages' Homeowners' Association. I have lived in The Villages for nearly 10 years and it is clear that The Villages is a community of common interest. I am asking the Legislatures consider this fact when voting on the new Legislative Districts.

As I understand the amendment the voters approved stated that districts should be drawn with the intent of keeping areas of common interest together and that district boundaries be drawn along logical boundaries such as roads, rivers and cities, county boundaries and communities, such as The Villages, that keep areas of common interest whole.

I am requesting that you keep The Villages together as a single district for State and Federal Congressional Districts.

Thank you for your efforts and consideration.

Roger Kass
17134 SE 78th Larchmont Ct.
The Villages, FL 32162
352-259-7174
RogerK@KNG-Marketing.com

7

o Southeast

o Miami-Dade

Share this:  Like 1  Tweet 0  Submit

 Press This  Digg  submit

 Email  Print

Like this:  Like Be the first to like this post.

Filed under: Congress - Complete Plans, House Redistricting Committee , florida, redistricting, statewide

4 Responses

Jake Seymour says:

December 7, 2011 at 4:51 pm (Edit)

This map sucks for the Grand Island community. You just cannot legitimately justify cutting it in half.

Mike says:

December 7, 2011 at 5:43 pm (Edit)

o HPUBC0166 – Weinbaum, M

o HPUBC0165 – Weinbaum, M

o HPUBH0164 – Laytham, Keit

o HPUBH0163 – Laytham, Keit

Search Redistricting Plan Month Submitted

o December 2011 (24)

o November 2011 (33)

o October 2011 (53)

o September 2011 (20)

o August 2011 (34)

o July 2011 (17)

o June 2011 (1)

o May 2011 (2)

From: billandbeamer@aol.com
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Re-districting

Sent: Wed 1/11/2012 9:22 AM

Dear Re-Districting Committee:

I support the proposed boundary to make Marion County ONE congressional district.

Thank You.

Patsy J. Bellomy

9

From: Rob Ranieri [rob@fireflyforyou.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 10:29 AM

To whom it may concern:

I have been a Martin County resident since 1994, and live in Palm City since 2000. I respectfully request that any redistricting plans for our state and federal districts keep Martin County as one district at the federal level, and Palm City does not get divided at the state level. Please do not weaken the voice of our community in the legislative process by making us an afterthought for multiple representatives. Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Rob Ranieri
Buzz Ops
The Firefly Group



1211 SW Sunset Trail
Palm City, FL 34990
772-287-5272 phone
772-287-5195 fax
rob@fireflyforyou.com
www.fireflyforyou.com

Connect with Firefly!



You forwarded this message on 1/15/2012 4:28 PM.

From: Bill Martin [wcm@wcmartinandassociates.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: CD22

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 2:10 PM

I am writing you to request that the western portions of Broward County be removed from the proposed District 22 maps and that coastal areas of northern Palm Beach County be included. This would make the district compact and respect existing political and geographical boundaries in accordance with Florida's Constitution. Further, it is doubtful that the residents of Plantation and Sunrise have the same interests of those residents along the coast. Residents of the northern areas of Palm Beach County, whether Jupiter, Palm Beach Gardens or Royal Palm Beach, would have interests vastly different than those residents of the same county to the south of the Seminole Golf Course.

In my testimony before the redistricting committee in Boca Raton, I stated, "I think our area has been well-served by having coastal districts that are separate from the inland areas." Please make it so.

Bill Martin
2010 La Porte Drive
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410
Office: 561-776-9880
Cell: 561-309-9740
wcm@wcmartinandassociates.com

Council Members

Carlos Hernandez
Mayor

Isis Garcia-Martinez
Council President

Luis Gonzalez
Council Vice President



Jose F. Caragol
Vivian Casals-Muñoz
Katharine E. Cue-Fuente
Paul B. Hernandez
Lourdes Lozano

City of Hialeah

December 7, 2011

The Honorable Will Weatherford
Chairman
Redistricting Committee
Florida House of Representatives
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Chairman Weatherford:

The City of Hialeah writes to express concerns regarding the congressional redistricting maps proposed by the House of Representatives as they impact the residents of the City of Hialeah. The currently proposed congressional redistricting maps divide the City of Hialeah between two separate congressional districts, thus ignoring its geographic boundaries.

It is our understanding that the legislature seeks to create compactly drawn districts that respect existing geographic and political boundaries such as municipalities, while also maintaining the rights of minority voters to elect candidates of their choice.

I urge the members of the House Reapportionment Committee to reevaluate the currently proposed congressional redistricting maps and ensure the integrity of City of Hialeah's municipal boundaries receive greater consideration. Such a reevaluation would serve to create more compact congressional districts that are more legally-compliant with the legal standards established by Constitutional Amendment Six and the Voting Rights Act.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter. We hope the Committee will review our concerns which we believe could negatively impact the City of Hialeah and its residents. If I may be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me at 305-883-5800.

Sincerely,

Carlos Hernandez
Mayor City of Hialeah

JR/aa

From: William Suddaby [suddaby1@bellsouth.net]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc: ooster@conchcolor.com
Subject: redistricting the Keys

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 4:22 PM

Dear Representative Weatherford,

In the difficult process of fairly redistricting representation for the Florida Keys, please be sure to consider that the Keys are a tourist, commercial fishing, and water-environment economy. It's population, as you know, is less than 100,000, so it is vital to us that you combine our district for Washington representation with coastal south florida which shares much of our economy and concerns, *not* with inland and western farm land which has practically none of our problems, would swallow up all our votes, and result in the Keys having virtually zilch representation in Washington. We already have this situation with our State Senate representation: we are virtually ignored, because we have only a small fraction of the votes in a large district which has practically none of our concerns. Please make sure we have a voice in what happens to our unique Keys!

Many thanks,

William Suddaby
Sugarloaf Key

PUBLIC INPUT

FRONTPAGE
return home

BROWSE
by topic

SUBSCRIBE
rss feed

« NEWER

OLDER »

JANUARY 13, 2012 • 5:39 AM (EDIT)

H000C9035 – Florida House's Redistricting Committee

[View in Google Maps](#)

Summary:

- o Congressional Redistricting Plan
- o 27 Districts
- o Complete: YES
- o Contiguous: YES
- o Direct Impacts: Statewide
- o Submitted by the Florida House's Redistricting Committee
- o For more information, visit the Florida House's [2012 Redistricting Bills, Amendments and Resources](#) page

Keith Laytham says:

January 13, 2012 at 11:06 am (Edit)

This violates amendment 6 because it splits the Poinciana CDP of 83,000 persons into three districts. Yes, Poinciana is not a city but only because when it tried to become one the same persons who will benefit from these new maps choose not to allow the people to vote to become a city.

REPLY

PUBLIC INPUT

FRONTPAGE
return home

BROWSE
by topic

SUBSCRIBE
rss feed

« NEWER

OLDER »

JANUARY 13, 2012 • 5:53 AM (EDIT)

H000C9045 – Florida House's Redistricting Committee

[View in Google Maps](#)

Summary:

- o Congressional Redistricting Plan
- o 27 Districts
- o Complete: YES
- o Contiguous: YES
- o Direct Impacts: Statewide
- o Submitted by the Florida House's Redistricting Committee
- o For more information, visit the Florida House's [2012 Redistricting Bills, Amendments and Resources](#) page

Keith Laytham says:

January 13, 2012 at 11:02 am (Edit)

This looks fine

14



MyDistrictBuilder (FloridaRedistricting.Org) shared a link.



Fla. House, Senate cooperating on redistricting - Florida Wires - MiamiHerald.com
www.miamiherald.com

Florida House and Senate redistricting panels will work off the other's map for its own chamber.

85 People Reached

Like · Comment · Share · 3 December 2011 at 08:00



Don Wright

I am a resident of Solivita, a +55 retirement development in Unincorporated Polk County. I recently read where we, Solivita, has been included within a new district (27) across county lines with "Poinciana" in Osceola County.

I have been active in our community and take exception to being removed from the district and elected officials that I and my neighbors had supported.

Please do not group/dump us into "Poinciana" in Osceola County, a community that we had rigorously opposed during an incorporation, cross county line venture back in 2009. We are also considered to be a part of Kissimmee, a city that is across the border in Osceola County and is 15 miles away from Solivita. Please follow the County Lines in the instance of Osceola and Polk Counties!!

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Like · Comment · 2 December 2011 at 18:42



MyDistrictBuilder (FloridaRedistricting.Org) Thank you for the very specific input

3 December 2011 at 08:06 · Like

Write a comment...



MyDistrictBuilder (FloridaRedistricting.Org)

Starting Tuesday, December 6, visit the Redistricting Bills button at www.floridarredistricting.org to check out the official legislative actions released by

You replied on 1/8/2012 10:51 AM.

From: Robert Drach [rdrach@gmail.com]

Sent: Sun 1/8/2012 10:28 AM

To: MyDistrictBuilder

Cc:

Subject: Written Suggestions for Congressional Majority-Minority Districts.

Understandably, one of the biggest obstacles to drawing elegant districts is the requirement to maintain the voting rights of minorities. Because of geographical demographics, it is easy to draw compact contiguous districts that follow political boundaries and maintain the current number (or even add one) of majority Hispanic districts. It is more difficult to maintain the three majority African American districts in a compact contiguous manner. The two majority AA districts in S. Fla seem to pretty closely match the spirit and letter of the Constitution. The third African American district as proposed by all House proposals closely matches Corrine Brown's current 3rd congressional district. This district seems to violate the Constitution on two grounds:

- It is not compact or within current political boundaries. The district includes part of as many as 9 counties.
- It seems designed to protect an incumbent. By largely mirroring Congresswoman Brown's current district while violating other aspects of the law, it seems to be built to protect Ms. Brown.

It seems the language of the Constitution necessitates a more novel approach. Population data indicates a much more compact majority AA district could be drawn between Orange, Osceola, Polk and Hillborough County. By stretching across only 4 counties It is the most compact alternative.

I hope the legislature considers this during its session, as the rest of the proposals are fairly reasonable.

-Robert Drach

L. Ashkar says:

January 15, 2012 at 5:37 am (Edit)

Of maps H000C9013, H000C9011, and H000C9009, map H000C9013 makes the least sense to me for my district and surrounding areas in East Orlando. Unfortunately, none of these three maps includes all of East Orlando with the Alafaya corridor. However, a map that keeps Cypress Springs (surrounded by Dean Road and Curry Ford Road) in the same district as Avalon Park to the east (as the other two maps do) would allow for East Orlando to have a voice in a way that this map does not.

REP_

You replied on 1/10/2012 1:35 PM.

From: Emilio Montero [emontero@digitalbaymanagement.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject:

Sent: Mon 1/9/2012 12:20 PM

Dear Committee Members,

I have a concern that the congressional maps are all showing the City of Lakeland in a mainly Hillsboro county district. I would like you to please pass the amended map #H000C9041 out of committee today as it would leave Lakeland in a Polk county district where it belongs.

Thank you,
Emilio Montero

DIGITALBay
1812 Lakeland Hills Blvd. • Lakeland, FL 33805

You replied on 1/10/2012 1:36 PM.

From: Rusty Kirven [rkirven@smartgrown.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Re-districting

Sent: Mon 1/9/2012 12:29 PM

Dear Committee Members:

I have a concern that the congressional maps are all showing the City of Lakeland in a mainly "Hillsboro County District". I would like you to please pass the amended map #H000C9041 out of committee today as it would leave Lakeland in a Polk County District where it belongs.

Thank you,

Leo E. "Rusty" Kirven, III
Managing Director
863.838.7004
P.O. Box 8942
Lakeland, FL 33806

rkirven@smartgrown.com



Confidentiality Notice and Virus Disclaimer: This e-mail transmission and any documents attached may contain confidential information which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the recipient named above. If you have received this e-mail transmission in error, please delete it immediately. You are hereby notified that any disclosure, printing, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance of the contents of this e-mail transmission or its attachments is strictly prohibited. Although our company attempts to scan e-mail and attachments for viruses, it does not guarantee that either is virus-free and accepts no liability for any damage sustained as a result of any viruses.

From: Jimmy Nelson [<mailto:jm.nelson@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2012 3:36 PM
To: Weatherford, Will; GAETZ.DON.WEB
Subject:

Dear Representative Weatherford and Senator Gaetz,

I am writing to you as a resident of Polk County (Currently serving as Chairman of the Polk County Republican Executive Committee) and I would like to voice my support for proposed Congressional Map 9043 as the best option of those proposed by the Florida House and Senate. It appears to me that Map 9043 provides the best solution for Lakeland, Polk County's largest city, by linking it with Hillsborough communities that share business, industry and geographical interests. In particular, proposed District 15 is compact and does not split Lakeland into multiple pieces, which should allow for solid communication and representation between its elected representative and constituents. Additionally, it seems very well reasoned to include the Poinciana area in proposed District 9, linking it to similar constituencies in Osceola County.

I would also, however, like to voice my significant concern for proposed District 17 as related to how far south and west it extends. I find little reasonable logic for including the population center of the Charlotte Harbor area in the same district as those of inland Polk, Highlands, Hardee and De Soto Counties. I feel very strongly that doing so would severely diminish the representation of either the citizens of Polk, Highlands, Hardee and De Soto Counties, or the citizens of Charlotte county. Likewise, I can find no common interests as to business, industry or geography when the Charlotte Harbor area is included.

If not already a foregone conclusion, I would suggest and request that serious consideration be given to drawing the southwest border of District 17 along I-75. I further suggest that the Charlotte Harbor area would be much better served and represented if included as part of proposed Districts 16 and/or 19.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Acknowledgment of your receipt of this correspondence would be most appreciated.

Thank you and God bless!

Jimmy Nelson

You replied on 1/9/2012 2:58 AM.

From: Jack Wolff [jcwolff@tampabay.rr.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Email Update - Florida House Redistricting - January 5, 2012

Sent: Sun 1/8/2012 12:51 PM

Dear Representative Weatherford,

Your House congressional redistricting is mostly acceptable throughout the state. It is very different from the Senate's redistricting which is totally unacceptable and not much different from the old gerrymandered districts that the voters rejected. The one major unacceptable portion of your plan is District 5 (Cong. Corinne Brown. It is basically the same old gerrymandered district as in the past.

I am generally satisfied with all of the House's plans for redistricting the Tampa Bay area congressional districts. I hope the Senate can be convinced to accept your plans as being more representative of the wishes of the voters and what the Florida constitution now calls for. Thanks for your very good efforts.

Jack C. Wolff
Plant City, Florida 33566
813-719-2463
jcwolff@tampabay.rr.com

From: MyDistrictBuilder
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2012 8:27 PM
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Subject: Email Update - Florida House Redistricting - January 5, 2012

**Florida House of Representatives – House Redistricting Committee
Redistricting Update – January 5, 2012**

Redistricting Amendments for January 9 Subcommittee Meetings

Yesterday, amendments were filed for most, but not all, of the proposed redistricting bills being heard Monday by the Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee and House Redistricting Subcommittee. You can download a summary of the amendments by [clicking here](#).

Maps, data and more regarding the amendments are accessible via the "Redistricting Bills" button at www.floridaredistricting.org or directly at

From: Tack, Cathy [<mailto:CTack@templeterrace.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2012 9:47 AM

To: Weatherford, Will


Cc: Leinbach, Kim; Small, Lisa; Alison Fernandez; Bob Boss; Joe Affronti, Sr.; Mary Jane Neale; Pogorilich, David; Ron Govin

Subject: Redistricting

Please be advised that at its Tuesday, January 17, 2012, meeting, the City of Temple Terrace City Council voted unanimously to support and urge the legislature to adopt Map 9009/HB 6003. Map 9009 keeps Temple Terrace intact with 99% of District 15 within Hillsborough County with less than 1% in Manatee County. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact City Manager Kim Leinbach at 813-506-6400.

Thank you,

Cathy Tack
Administrative Assistant
to the City Manager



Like Add to Share

52 views

Uploaded by [MyFloridaHouse](#) on Jan 17, 2012

This video was produced by the Florida House Office of Public Information (OPI). The video calls on the public for more input on the redrawing of Florida's political boundary lines. It highlights the numerous ways Florida residents

Show more

More from MyFloridaHouse's activity



Florida House Page Program 1-13-12
by MyFloridaHouse
39 views



Florida House Messenger Program 1-13
by MyFloridaHouse
34 views



UF President J. Bernard Machen Remarks
by MyFloridaHouse
55 views

Suggestions



Florida House Page Program 1-13-12
by MyFloridaHouse
32 views



Florida House Messenger Program 1-13
by MyFloridaHouse
18 views



UF President J. Bernard Machen Remarks
by MyFloridaHouse
30 views

I still believe that the District 14 (which was once District 11) for the US House of Representatives should be contiguous and only be in Hillsborough County.

[emorowati](#) 21 hours ago

You forwarded this message on 1/15/2012 1:51 PM.

From: Dent, Kathy [KDent@sarasotavotes.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Sarasota County

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 12:17 PM

All three of your plans keep Sarasota County in one Congressional district. That is good. The plan passed out of the Senate committee yesterday divides us into two Congressional districts. The lines actually divide the City of Venice and the City of North Port. This is not good.

Kathy Dent, CERA

Supervisor of Elections

Sarasota County Supervisor of Elections
101 S. Washington Blvd.
Sarasota, Florida 34236

(941)861-8606
(941)650-0992 (cell)
(941)861-8609 (fax)
kdent@sarasotavotes.com

www.sarasotavotes.com



This email has been scanned by the MX Police managed email security.

24

From: Diane Lawrence [dianelee33176@yahoo.com]

Sent: Mon 12/12/2011 4:51 PM

To: MyDistrictBuilder

Cc:

Subject: RE: Email Update - Florida House Redistricting - December 6, 2011

I have looked at the proposed redistricting map and am livid with what you have done. District 26 lumps the east and the west coasts of southern Florida in one district, District 26. This is totally unacceptable. I live in Miami and have been in District 25 for way too long. Our Congressman was supposed to travel from the east to the west coast. That is just plain stupid and does not comport with the language of Amendment 6. Miami residents have nothing in common with west coast residents.

I worked hard to get petition signatures to put the amendments on the ballot and then worked hard to get them approved by the voters. This is a slap in the face to me and many others who live in the Miami area. I testified at the legislative hearing held at Miami-Dade College downtown campus. Several people at that hearing spoke about District 25 and how bad it was that east Naples and Miami shared a congressman.

And what's that little brownish area on the map – presumably District 27? That looks gerrymandered to me.


As you can see, I am very angry and want an explanation for this really bad plan.

Diane Lawrence
10626 S.W. 102nd St.
Miami, FL 33176
305-595-5630

HPUBC0160 - FGCU RIF CLASS




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



HPUBC0162 - DRACH, ROBERT



Florida House of Representatives
 Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline


7 District Number
 — District Boundary
 — County Boundary
 — Interstate Highway
 — Major Highway
 — Shoreline



HPUBC0166 - WEINBAUM, MICHAEL



Florida House of Representatives
 Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org




Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

HPUBC0167 WEINBAUM, MICHAEL



Florida House of Representatives
 Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

SPUBC0168 - KING, BRUCE




Florida House of Representatives
 Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend


- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



SPUBC0172 - SARKIS, HANK




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



SPUBC0173 - SARKIS, HANK



Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org




Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

SPUBC0174 - SARKIS, HANK



Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Regarding the **State House** Map

Public suggestions received since the
House released redistricting options
on December 6, 2011

You replied on 1/7/2012 3:54 PM.
Extra line breaks in this message were removed.

From: David Stafford [dstafford@escamblavotes.com]
To: Kelly, Alex
Cc: GUTHRIE, JOHN; doug browne
Subject: Proposed changes to House districting plans

Sent: Fri 12/30/2011 5:56 PM

Message | House15A-.pdf (73 KB) | House19A_2.pdf (105 KB) | House19A_1.pdf (101 KB)

Alex,

Pursuant to our previous e-mail exchange, I have some input from an election administration perspective on the proposed House redistricting plans. It appears that four of the five versions have identical lines in Escambia County, with the exception being H9019. As such, the feedback is specific to the two different versions.

As I explained to John, we have single member districts for BCC, School Board, and the City of Pensacola, which holds its elections to coincide with state and county elections. They have all completed their redistricting processes. As such, we must be mindful of this when viewing these plans, so to avoid "islands" with only a handful of voters, and/or unnecessary splits.

Overall, where possible, we would encourage the House to follow the proposed Senate line (with the suggested edit we proposed to John).

We also prefer the House9019 version where it follows Airport Boulevard east to pick up the City of Pensacola boundary, heading south to Brent Lane, as opposed to the H9015 plan which follows I-110 to Brent Lane.

Further, we prefer the H9015 plan on the westernmost portion of the county, as opposed to H9019 which turns north on Blue Angel Parkway rather than following Lillian Highway west.

Also in the H9015 plan, at the intersection of Brent Lane and I-110 there appears to be a finger jetting to the east, in a median, for no apparent reason.

Here are some specific suggestions, to address "islands":

H9019 -- see attachment House19A1.pdf

Follow the proposed Senate line, which follows, like H9015, the City of Pensacola boundary. (light blue line is the City district and Senate line). This would avoid an "island" of voters. Move the following census blocks from H1 to H2: 120330035062002, 120330035062015, 120330035062014, 120330035062013, 120330035062012, 120330035062010, 120330035062011, 120330035061004, 120330035061020


H9019 -- see attachment House19A2.pdf

Follow the proposed Senate line (dark blue line), which follows H9015. This would avoid an "island" of voters. Move the following census blocks from H2 to H1: 120330017001023, 120330017001024, 120330017001025, 120330017001049, 120330017001048, 120330017001047, 120330017001058, 120330017001046, 120330017001054, 120330017001055, 120330017001056


H9015/17/21/23 -- see attachment House15A.pdf Move the following census blocks from House District 1 to District 2 to align with County district and proposed Senate District lines. This change impacts a total population of 87 Census blocks: 1203300120211001, 1203300120211002, 1203300120211003, 1203300120211004, 1203300120211005, 1203300120211006, 1203300120211009, 1203300120211010, 1203300120211011, 1203300120211012

Thanks in advance for your consideration. Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please let me know.

David H. Stafford, CERA
Escambia County Supervisor of Elections
(850) 595-3900
dstafford@escamblavotes.com
You can also follow us on Twitter or Facebook







A. Austin says:

December 16, 2011 at 4:17 pm (Edit)

This map looks the best in Navarre because it does not split up Navarre precincts like the other 4. I personally think Navarre Beach should be with Navarre as well, not Pensacola Beach and Pensacola. This map makes absolutely no sense in Santa Rosa County where it puts Avalon and Garcon Point in to District 2 with Pensacola. Garcon needs to be in District 3 and if any more Santa Rosa County needs to be put in to District 2, it should be in the South End in Gulf Breeze.

REP_

Like this: ★ Like Be the first to like this post.

Filed under: **House Redistricting Committee, State House - Complete Plans , florida, redistricting, statewide**

2 Responses

Louise McGirr says:

December 14, 2011 at 10:52 am (Edit)

In Okaloosa County, this plan ignores common sense boundaries and uses obscure waterways and block lines for borders. It also divides neighborhoods by using these obscure lines.

We suggest the following changes.

1. On the western side the line follows I-10 to the Crestview city limit, then continues to Hwy 4 (Antioch Rd), instead of meandering further up city limits and a small stream to Hwy 90, the line should go straight up Hwy 4 to Hwy 90 and then to the Yellow River. This line is a cleaner split.
2. On the eastern side, the line meanders from Hwy 90 southeast to the Shoal River along block lines that split neighborhoods. There are two choices for a cleaner boundary.
 - a. The line should continue east along Hwy 90 to the Shoal River
 - b. From Hwy 90, the line should go south along Okaloosa Ln to the railroad tracks, then follow the tracks southeast to the Shoal River.

Month Submitted

- December 2011 (19)
- November 2011 (33)
- October 2011 (53)
- September 2011 (20)
- August 2011 (34)
- July 2011 (17)
- June 2011 (1)
- May 2011 (2)

REP_

14

You replied on 12/6/2011 6:50 PM.

From: Jennifer Jones [jenniferjones@bayarts.org]
To: MyDistrictBuilder; GAETZ.DON.WEB; MARGOLIS.GWEN.WEB; MONTFORD.BILL.WEB
Cc:
Subject: Re: Email Update - Florida House Redistricting - December 6, 2011

Sent: Tue 12/6/2011 1:48 PM

Dear Redistricting Folks,

I'd like to express my preference for the redistricting map H000H9019 simply because Bay County garners three representatives in the house.

I understand that within the senate and the congress, there is less flexibility.

I am not well versed enough on the politics of the more southern districts and cannot speak to that.

Just wanted to give in to my need to comment and thank you for your leadership, time and the update.

Jennifer Jones
Bay Arts Alliance
Panama City, FL

On 12/6/2011 11:05 AM, MyDistrictBuilder wrote:
Florida House of Representatives – House Redistricting Committee
Redistricting Update – December 6, 2011

Florida House's Options for Redistricting Maps Online

The House Redistricting Committee just released seven (7) options for Florida's Congressional map and five (5) options for Florida's State House map. To view the options, visit the Redistricting Bills link at www.floridaredistricting.org (or directly via <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Redistricting/Redistricting2012.aspx>).

Additionally, you will find a guide to those options available under Legislative Headlines at www.floridaredistricting.org. The guide is identical to the meeting packet for today's 2 PM meeting of the House Redistricting Committee. To watch the meeting live, where Redistricting Committee Chair Will Weatherford will give an overview of the maps, visit the Florida Channel at <http://thefloridachannel.org/>, or visit <http://thefloridachannel.org/featured-stories/redistricting/> to watch the replay later.

All of the options released today are also accessible via our blog site at <http://mydistrictbuilderplanexplorer.wordpress.com/>.

these areas have a lot in common. Many are minorities, most work in Orlando Area jobs, receive newspapers and TV coverage from the Orlando area. Today they are split between multiple counties (Polk, Osceola, Lake and Orange) and covered by multiple Senate and State House Districts (41,65 and 79). The legal definitions of counties cannot be easily changed. The voting district can and need to be as a result of population growth. Every effort should be made to preserve 'communities of interest' attempting to keep communities within single districts wherever possible even if it crosses county lines which in fact the communities do.

REPLY

Neal Dunn says:

December 11, 2011 at 2:50 pm (Edit)

Dear Sirs,

Northwest Florida Beaches International Airport is a vital and integral part of the economy of Bay County. To separate it's representation into a different House and Senate Seat is potentially very dangerous to the largest population center that it serves. Please give very serious consideration to including the ECP airport into House District 6 and Senate District 4.

Sincerely,

Neal Dunn

REPLY

You replied on 12/6/2011 7:27 PM.

From: Christopher Moore [MooreChr@leoncountyfl.gov]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Comment on H000H9019

Sent: Tue 12/6/2011 3:55 PM

I am the GIS/Demographics Manager for the Supervisor of Elections, Leon County Florida. House Plan H000H9019, from a boundary and election administration viewpoint, is the best plan for Leon County voters. This plan respects our current precincts and communities very well, which include the new County Commission and School Board districts that have been recently adopted. Setting aside any racial, demographic or political angles that I do not plan to examine, H000H9019 is by far superior to the other submissions. H000H9015 would be my second choice with the other 3 plans not being ones I would support as they would be more disruptive to our existing precinct boundaries and communities in Leon County.

Sincerely,

Chris Moore, GISP
Demographics/GIS Manager
Supervisor of Elections Leon County
ph : 850-606-VOTE (8683)
fax: 850-606-8601

Physical Address:
315 South Calhoun Street Suite 110
Tallahassee FL 32301

Mailing Address:
PO Box 7357
Tallahassee FL 32314-7357

Visit our website at: www.leoncountyfl.gov/elect



Scan this QR barcode to capture my contact information

h

You forwarded this message on 1/10/2012 1:48 PM.

From: Christopher Moore [MooreChr@leoncountyfl.gov]
To: Kelly, Alex
Cc: MyDistrictBuilder
Subject: Comment on 9023

Sent: Mon 1/9/2012 4:26 PM



Map9023_LeonCounty_Area1.png (154 KB)

Map9023_LeonCounty_Area2.png (153 KB)

Map9023_LeonCounty_Area3.png (83 KB)

Map9023_LeonCountyOverview.png (253 KB)

Mr. Kelly,

I am following the House Redistricting meeting on the Florida Channel and submit these considerations for map 9023. Hearing that 9019 is falling out of favor with the representatives (which was the map that our office favored for obvious reasons) I will try and provide feedback on the maps that are relevant.

Please see attached comments on 9023. If this is a useful way to communicate, I can provide additional feedback for the Leon County area.

Chris Moore, GISP
Demographics/GIS Manager
Supervisor of Elections Leon County
ph : 850-606-VOTE (8683)
fax: 850-606-8601


Physical Address:
315 South Calhoun Street Suite 110
Tallahassee FL 32301


Mailing Address:
PO Box 7357
Tallahassee FL 32314-7357


Visit our website at: www.leoncountyfl.gov/elect



45







January 11, 2012
Kenneth Albritton
Taylor County

- The new maps are unfair to the rural counties of North Florida
- Putting rural counties with Leon County will give rural counties no say
- The way the maps are drawn will only give Leon and Bay a say in who is elected
- The Redistricting Committee has done an horrendous job redistricting
- Taylor Madison and Lafayette are in the same judicial circuit and should be in the same district
- Perry to Panama City is 148 miles. These are not compact districts.
- The Redistricting Committee is screwing North Florida

December 16, 2011
Kenneth Albritton
Taylor County

- Against all proposed maps
- "Taylor is grouped with Jackson and Liberty and Calhoun which are far away from us."
- Leon county has 58% of vote
- Rural counties have 42% in State Senate
- In Congressional, Leon and Bay have 60%
- Separate large population centers so that rural counties have more opportunities elect a candidate of their choice
- The maps are not fair to rural counties

From: Maria Ross [mjross61@gmail.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting

Sent: Wed 1/4/2012 9:34 AM

Dear Sirs,

I wanted you to know that I endorse the plan put forth by Doug Croley. I am a resident of Gadsden County living on Frank Smith Rd. I believe that this plan will best represent the citizens of our county.

Thank You,

Dr. William Ross

HPUBH0161 - LYONS, ROY




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



You replied on 1/17/2012 9:43 AM.

From: Robert L. Jones III [rjones@blackburnco.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder; Kelly, Alex; Weatherford, Will
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting and House District 15

Sent: Tue 1/17/2012 9:31 AM

Members of the Florida House, Speaker Designate Weatherford, and Staff:

Thank you for your service to the State of Florida and its citizens. I appreciate the open and transparent process as well as the unprecedented amount of information made available on the web. I would offer the following to the discussion regarding redistricting as a constituent and sixth generation resident of the new proposed Florida House District 15 ("District 15").

The Florida Constitution provides that geographic boundaries be considered during your deliberations and discussions regarding redistricting. Jacksonville, as you know, encompasses the entirety of Duval County. Splitting Duval County roughly in half is the largest natural geographic boundary in northeast Florida, the St. Johns River (the "River"). The River dominates Duval County such that Jacksonville residents relate their location to the River.

The proposed House districts, while compact, fail to utilize the River as a natural geographic boundary. In all three House plans under consideration, four of the six Duval House districts cross the River. District 15, specifically, encompasses large parts of the western side of Duval County. However, District 15 does cross the river and contains the neighborhoods of Miramar, Lakewood, San Jose, and Beauclerc. These neighborhoods have different concerns and needs than the predominantly rural western portion of Duval County.

Before finalizing the maps, I urge you to reconsider how Duval County is divided. Furthermore, I encourage you each to consolidate proposed District 15 such that District 15 does not cross the River. Such a proposed District 15 would be, in my humble opinion, best for the residents of Duval County.

Regards,

Robert L. Jones, III, Esq.
Blackburn & Company, L.C.
Attorneys at Law
5150 Belfort Road South
Building 500
Jacksonville, FL 32256
Phone: 904.296.7713

Speaker Designate Will Weatherford
 Chair, House Redistricting Committee
 Florida House of Representatives
 418 The Capital
 402 South Monroe Street
 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Senate President Designate Don Gaetz
 Chair, Senate Redistricting Committee
 420 Senate Office Building
 404 South Monroe Street
 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100

Dear Chairs Gaetz and Weatherford,

After careful review of each of the five preliminary maps released by the Florida House of Representatives in December, it has come to our attention that the Beaches Communities in Northeast Florida will no longer receive unified representation in the State Legislature.

The Northeast Florida barrier-island is a homogenous almost seamless community consisting of Jacksonville Beach, Atlantic Beach, Neptune Beach, Mayport, Ponte Vedra Beach, and Vilano Beach. Its geographical boundaries are the Atlantic Ocean on the East, the Intracoastal Waterway on the West, the St. Johns River to the North, and the St Augustine Inlet to the South. We are also blessed to have valuable natural resources including the beaches and the Guana Reserve. Part of the Island is in Duval County and the southern portion is currently in St Johns. Historically, all this land was part of St Johns County and even after Duval County was formed in 1822, the southern portion including the area now known as Ponte Vedra Beach was re-annexed back to St Johns County during the last century. Most residents frequent shops and restaurants across county lines more often than traveling to Jacksonville.

The recent Florida Constitutional Amendments that prompted the new changes to the current districts clearly states that future districts must be contiguous. All five of the preliminary maps show the northern half of this island community placed into proposed Florida House District 11 and the southern half into Florida House District 17. Currently, there is no land connection or bridge that connects the northern part of the island to District 11. This would mean that a State Representative living in Nassau County would have to leave their district and drive through Jacksonville to attend community functions. There is a ferry in Mayport, but since the State Legislature cut its funding years ago, its operations are limited and we expect even further reductions in service.

For the Florida House Districts to remain within the intent of the Constitutional Amendments, this should not qualify as being a compact and contiguous district.

It is our recommendation that Jacksonville Beach, Atlantic Beach, Neptune Beach, and Mayport be kept with the other beach communities on this island to assure adequate representation and be added to the proposed District 17. This will keep the island intact and would respect our natural geographic boundaries.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. We understand how challenging the Constitutional Amendments have made this process, but we hope you see how the current recommendations could adversely affect our representation on state issues.

Sincerely,

Name: Patricia A. Reese
Thomson, Richardson

Address: 121 33rd Ave S., Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250
39 33rd Ave So, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

Judy S. Weber
 Betsy Thompson
 Lucy P. Stewart
 Jane Andicri
 Hal W. Gough
 Gerald D. Dill
 Scott Snyder
 Joseph L. Forrest

124 33rd Ave. S. Jax. Bch., FL 32250
 129 36th Ave S, Jax Bch, FL 32250
 121- 33rd Ave. S., Jax Bch, FL 32250
 107 33rd Ave S 32250
 107 33rd Ave S 32250
~~107~~ 3811 S. 1st St Jax Bch 32250
 115 33rd Ave South Jax Bch FL 32250
 127- 33rd Ave South Jax Bch FL 32250

You replied on 12/12/2011 10:20 PM.

From: Scott Miller [mailto:smiller@clayelections.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc: Chris H. Chambers; Holly DePaul
Subject: Clay County Redistricting Thoughts

Sent: Mon 12/12/2011 9:18 PM

The Lat/Long coordinates in RED are the bounding corners of the window which can be used to view the issue being discussed

S000C9002 and H000C9003, H000C9005, H000C9007, H0009009, H000C9011, H000C9013 are the Senate and House versions of the Congressional Redistricting Plan. All of these plans follow the same route through Clay County

-81.741,30.148,-81.680,30.193 These plans will create Congressional District splits within Orange Park Town Limits. I thought the plan was to hold municipal boundaries. I do realize that including all of the Orange Park municipal limits may cause issues with the overall population of the district

-81.714,30.095,-81.692,30.112 There is an odd triangle. The base is Pine Ave and the point is the intersection of Bald Eagle Rd and US Highway 17. There are also some Community Development District things going on in this same area. It would be better to remove this triangle and just follow Pine Ave.

-81.720,30.037,-81.698,30.053 The district currently crosses US Highway 17 and encompasses the parking lot area of the Black Creek Bike Trail. There is no reason for this; the district should follow US Highway 17

H000H9015, H000H9017, H000H9019, H000H9021, and H000H9023 are the House Redistricting plans.

-81.748,29.836,-81.563,29.975 H000H9019 gives Clay County three districts, one of which is the southeast corner of the county bounded by the St Johns River, the county line, US Highway 17, County Road 226, and Bayard Rd to the River. I see no reason to cut this little part of the county out.

-81.938,30.058,-81.921,30.071 H000H9015 and H000H9021 both run along Hibiscus Ave in Middleburg, but cut around Flax Ct. They should not do this; Flax Ct should be in the same district as all of its neighboring streets.

-81.736,30.027,-81.709,30.048 H000H9019 and H000H9023 follow Peters Creek to the railroad tracks and then follow the rail road tracks to Watkins Rd and then to County Road 209. They should just follow Peters Creek to County Road 209.

Regards,

Scott A. Miller

GIS / Tabulation Specialist
Clay County Elections Office
1417-1 South Orange Avenue
P.O. Box 337

Green Cove Springs, FL 32043
904-284-6350 Office
904-284-0935 Facsimile

www.ClayElections.com

Follow Clay Elections on Twitter!

Become a Fan of Clay Elections on Facebook!

View Clay Elections on Flickr

You replied on 1/15/2012 5:00 PM.

From: Scott Miller [smiller@clayelections.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Clay County Redistricting Thoughts

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 9:52 PM

HB 6003 (H000C9041)

- Blocks 120190313003028 and 120190313001004 should be moved to District 3. In both cases the current boundary divides a neighborhood

HB 6005 (H000C9043), HB 6007 (H000C9045)

- Block 120190314001052 should be moved to District 5 because the current boundary divides a neighborhood

HJR 6009 (H000H9025), HJR 6011 (H000H9027)

- Block 120190301023065 moved to District 19 to allow the boundary to follow the boundary of Camp Blanding (Florida National Guard Base)

HJR 6013 (H000H9031) – This is a poor choice for Clay Co. The northeast boundary of block 120190309041012 traverses several neighborhoods and correcting this issue would be very difficult given the available Census line work available in the area

- 30.112413 / -81.767779 zoom 15 – The southern boundary of block 120190308023009 traverses an occupied parcel. The following blocks should be included in District 15: 120190308023010, 120190308023012, 120190308023013, 120190308023014, 120190308023015, 120190308023016, 120190308023018, 120190308023025, 120190308023032, 120190308023041, 120190308023042
- Blocks 120190301023038 and 120190313003035 need to be included in District 18

Regards,

Scott A. Miller

GIS / Tabulation Specialist
Clay County Elections Office
1417-1 South Orange Avenue
P.O. Box 337
Green Cove Springs, FL 32043
904-284-6350 Office

From: Kass, Roger [Roger.Kass@thevillages.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting Maps

Sent: Sun 1/15/2012 10:56 PM

I am the past President of The Villages' Homeowners' Association. I have lived in The Villages for nearly 10 years and it is clear that The Villages is a community of common interest. I am asking the Legislatures consider this fact when voting on the new Legislative Districts.

As I understand the amendment the voters approved stated that districts should be drawn with the intent of keeping areas of common interest together and that district boundaries be drawn along logical boundaries such as roads, rivers and cities, county boundaries and communities, such as The Villages, that keep areas of common interest whole.

I am requesting that you keep The Villages together as a single district for State and Federal Congressional Districts.

Thank you for your efforts and consideration.



Roger Kass
17134 SE 78th Larchmont Ct.
The Villages, FL 32162
352-259-7174
RogerK@KNG-Marketing.com

o Southeast

o Miami-Dade

Share this:  Like  Tweet 0  Submit

 Press This  Digg   submit

 Email  Print

Like this:  Like Be the first to like this post.

Filed under: House Redistricting Committee, State House - Complete Plans , florida, redistricting, statewide

3 Responses

Keith Laytham says:

December 8, 2011 at 7:47 am (Edit)

Poinciana was created by the state as a geographical single PUD spanning Polk and Osceola counties in the year 1972. Amendment six states 'Unless otherwise required, districts must be compact, as equal in population as feasible, and where feasible must make use of existing city, county and geographical boundaries.' Since defined among existing geographical boundaries recognized by the State of Florida, it would be contrary to Amendment 6 to split Poinciana among three separate state house districts. Maps that have been submitted show it is feasible to include Poinciana in a single district. Therefore why cannot Poinciana be defined within a single district as required by Amendment 6?

This comment applies to all other maps created splitting the Poinciana PUD into multiple congressional, senate or state house districts.

REPLY

- o HPUBC0166 – Weinbaum, Michael
- o HPUBC0165 – Weinbaum, Michael
- o HPUBH0164 – Laytham, Keith
- o HPUBH0163 – Laytham, Keith

Search Redistricting Plans by Month Submitted

- o December 2011 (24)
- o November 2011 (33)
- o October 2011 (53)
- o September 2011 (20)
- o August 2011 (34)
- o July 2011 (17)
- o June 2011 (1)
- o May 2011 (2)

M
R

o

o

o

o

o

Ei

Cli
no
Joi

[

59

HPUBH0164




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



HPUBH0163



Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



L. Ashkar says:

January 15, 2012 at 5:59 am (Edit)

All three maps under consideration group parts of East Orlando with part of the I-95 corridor, which would mean that many of East Orlando's residents would work and be involved mainly in communities outside their district. To minimize that effect, it seems that the easternmost region of East Orlando should be included with I-95. This map inexplicably groups the western part of East Orlando with I-95, making it a less sensible choice than the other two.

PEP

<http://thenoridachannel.org/featured-stories/redistricting/>

Happy New Year!

Share this:  Like 1  Tweet 4  Submit
 Press This  Digg   submit
 Email  Print

Like this:  Like Be the first to like this post.

Filed under: [Committee Meetings](#), [Timeline](#), [bill](#), [committee](#), [congress](#), [florida](#), [house](#), [redistricting](#), [senate](#), [The Florida Channel](#)

2 Responses

johnson says:

January 6, 2012 at 8:10 pm (Edit)

Dear Sir..It appears Indian River County is being slighted by not having two House Representatives as we had in 2011. We now have only one as proposed. Please move part of Brevard County into Indian River County for the second House Representative, Keep Senator Mike as the sole Senator in Indian River.County.It might appear the hard work done in the past was not appreciated...This is input for your Jan 9 meeting. Thanking you in advance..... Bob Johnson,Vero Beach,Fl

REPL

- o [Press Releases, Email Updates and Memos](#)
- o [Summer 2011 Public Input Meetings](#)
- o [Video and Audio Resources](#)

Search Posts by Category

- o [Committee Meetings \(14\)](#)
- o [Data & Code \(5\)](#)
- o [Legal \(1\)](#)
- o [MyDistrictBuilder \(25\)](#)
- o [On the Web \(7\)](#)
- o [Public Meetings \(42\)](#)
- o [Public Participation \(41\)](#)
- o [Timeline \(7\)](#)

Search Posts by Month

- o [January 2012 \(1\)](#)
- o [December 2011 \(4\)](#)
- o [November 2011 \(1\)](#)
- o [October 2011 \(5\)](#)
- o [September 2011 \(7\)](#)

satellite view or otherwise

Monday at 14:10 · Like



The Firefly Group

Regarding Martin County, FL our comments via an advocacy email are here: <http://conta.cc/yGaJqZ> Thank you for your consideration.

Like · Comment · 13 January at 15:10



MyDistrictBuilder (FloridaRedistricting.Org) shared a link.



House Redistricting Committee's Timeline Through January 27

mydistrictbuilder.wordpress.com

The House Redistricting Committee's timeline for Weeks 2-3 of the 2012 Legislative Session is explained below in an email the Committee's Chairman Will Weatherford sent to the Members of the Comm...

16 Jan

Jennifer Whiting @BuzzFlyJen
@FLRedistricting Regarding Martin County, our comments via a call to action email are here: conta.cc/yGaJqZ Thank you for your efforts.

13 Jan

Florida House @MyFLHouse
Thanks for the RTs MTs: @RenMoraitis @richardnorenran

11 Jan

Share: [f Like](#) 21 [Send](#)[Tweet](#) 4[f](#) [t](#) [in](#) [+](#)[Join Email List](#)Powered by
Constant Contact**PLEASE TAKE ACTION TODAY!****Current Florida Redistricting Map will negatively impact Palm City & Stuart****View the
Florida House of
Representative Districts**

Click the picture above to view a map
with proposed redistricting



Click the picture above to view a
closeup map of Proposed Districts 82
and 83

Speak Out

You can change this. You can voice your concern. All you need to do is send a quick email to the email address for the redistricting committee. But you need to do it **RIGHT NOW** because they are voting on this on Monday.

Friends,

Many of you are already aware that every ten years the state of Florida redraws its political boundary lines. Many of you have been following and participating in these efforts. However, many of you have not. For those of you who are not up to speed on this issue, our elected officials throughout the state are currently at the tail end of the process known as Redistricting - the redrawing of Florida's political boundary lines to reflect changes in population. We all live in districts... congressional, legislative, county, city, etc. The type of representation you have at the state level has a significant impact on what happens to you locally. That's why I'm sending this email to you - specifically to my friends and business associates in Palm City and Stuart.

I know a lot of you will immediately want to stop reading and say "This is political. I don't get involved in politics. What I say or think won't make a difference up in Tallahassee anyway."

But you are wrong. This should not be about politics. This is about you as a citizen not being properly represented by the proposed new districts.

The Redistricting Committee is currently working on the maps that will determine the House of Representative Districts for the next decade.

Redistricting will be voted on **Monday, January 16**. Here is the problem: the proposed maps whittle Martin County down to a small minority representation.

Sadly, as of yesterday, the redistricting committee up in Tallahassee has received some (but not many) comments from Stuart residents - and has not



Internet | Protects

Send your Email to
mydistrictbuilder@myfloridahouse.gov
 Below are some guidelines for the
 talking points to include:

- Explain that you are a resident of Palm City (or Stuart) or a business person in Palm City (or Stuart) and ask the committee to draw the District maps so that Palm City and Stuart remain within one house district seat.
- We need our community to be kept in one State House seat.
- Our elected officials should honor their commitment to using natural boundaries and interstates as well as common sense when adjusting the district map boundaries. Splitting up Palm City and splitting up Stuart makes no sense.
- Martin County is going to grow more slowly than counties adjacent to us. As much of Martin County as possible should be included in a single district. This will give our community a stronger voice over the next decade.
- If you are a Palm City resident, ask specifically that the maps be redrawn so that Palm City is contained in one house district.
- If you are a Stuart resident, ask specifically that the maps be redrawn so that Stuart is contained in one house district.
- While it's not likely to happen, ask that they FIX the Maps so that Martin County remains in one District - with a strong voice and representation - so that we don't get lost in the politics and population of St. Lucie and Palm Beach counties.

received any comments from the residents of Palm City!

Today (Friday) is your chance to speak up before the vote on Monday. Please do!



Stacy Ranieri, Palm City resident, business owner and concerned citizen

Connect With Me:



More Info About Each District

1) District 83 (Representative Gayle Harrell's new district, replacing District 81)

The proposed redistricting divides Palm City north and south along Martin Downs Blvd and does a very similar division to the City of Stuart. The outcome is that Martin County becomes a minority member of this new district and Port St Lucie will be the majority voice. To provide some perspective, in the year 2000, Gayle Harrell's old district had 120,000 residents. During the 10 year period it grew to 210,000 residents (mainly St. Lucie growth). Now imagine what happens between now and 2022, since these portions of Palm City and Stuart are already built to capacity and Port St. Lucie is projected to have large growth. Martin County will lose its voice, as we would only represent a small population percentage in the new District 83.

2) District 82 (Representative Will Snyder)

At the same time, the proposed map that's been drawn for District 82 consists of the remaining portions of Palm City and Stuart, as well as Hobe Sound and Palm Beach County all the way down to Abacoa. If this map is approved, the majority voice for District 82 will come from Palm Beach County because of its population density. The representative for this District would feel more beholden to do the bidding of the people in Palm



Visit the State Website

[Click here for the link to the State's Florida Redistricting website.](#) Be forewarned, there's lots of legal and government jargon on there and it's not easy to find simple information and explanations.

A couple of local articles in case you are interested:

TCPalm 01/05 12

[Legislative redistricting process could shift Treasure Coast voter bases](#)

Palm Beach Post 12/19/11

[Florida House redistricting ideas for Palm Beach County lean Democratic](#)

representative for this district would not have been beholden to do the bidding of the people in Palm Beach County when they are up in Tallahassee pushing legislation or trying to secure funding. As you know, Martin County is very different from Palm Beach County. We have a different approach to growth and have different needs than our more densely populated and urban neighbor to the south.

Historically, these two Districts didn't look like this. Martin County is in better shape now, even with our existing "minority" voice, than we will be with the proposed changes. The irony is that the House of Representatives' intention is to boost communities currently in the minority and create fair representation! And once these changes are made, we will be stuck with them for another ten years.



From: Nicoletti, Paul [pnicoletti@ci.stuart.fl.us]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc: Commissioners
Subject: Redistricting of Districts 81 & 82

Sent: Wed 1/11/2012 5:28 PM

I am a resident of the City of Stuart and currently serve as its City Manager. I am asking the Florida Legislature to draw the new District Map to maintain most of the City of Stuart within House District 82. This will keep the City of Stuart together with the remainder of Martin County and will give the City a reasonable voice in its future. The currently proposed House District maps (HB9025, HB9027 or HB9031) each place the entire City of Stuart into District 81, in St. Lucie County, where we have no commonality. We need our community to be kept in Florida House District 82. If the maps are drawn so that most of Stuart remains in the same District as the majority of Martin County that would be better than what is currently proposed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul J. Nicoletti, City Manager
City of Stuart
121 SW Flagler Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994-2139
pnicoletti@ci.stuart.fl.us
(772) 288-5386 (voice)
(772) 600-1219 (fax)
www.cityofstuart.com

18


You forwarded this message on 1/10/2012 5:34 PM.

From: Donald Cuzzo [dcuzzo@cdgplan.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: redistricting

Sent: Tue 1/10/2012 5:33 PM

I am a resident of Palm City and a business owner in Stuart, Florida. I am asking you please not to divide Palm City and the City of Stuart into separate districts. Martin County is unique and different than it's neighbors to the north and south, Martin County needs to maintain the representation it has historically achieved. This can be accomplished by using the natural and man made features such as the river and interstate I-95 Thank you for your consideration

--


819 SW Federal Highway Suite 106
Stuart, Florida 34990
cell 772-485-1600
office 772-221-2128

From: Paul Shirley [paul.a.shirley@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 8:50 PM

To: MyDistrictBuilder

Subject: The Current Map of Districts 81 and 82 all but silence the voice of Palm City

Greetings!

Please consider that Palm City in Martin County has been split long enough. The current house map divides our small town and this is disastrous as we are a very compact area. Splitting our representation between two seats in the House of Representatives has made it very difficult for residents to understand how to work with our Representative(s) and consequently our small town really doesn't get heard in Tallahassee.

The major "voice" for District 81 is St. Lucie County and the major "voice" for District 82 is Palm Beach County. Martin County and Palm City deserve better.

I have lived in Palm City for over ten years and am a business person serving both commercial and non-profit entities in Palm City and Martin County. Please draw the district map to maintain Palm City as one house district seat. This would be much better than the one proposed and is actually simple to accomplish if you use the highways and natural boundaries that surround Palm City.

Thank you for listening!

Paul Shirley

4156 SW Rivers End Way

Palm City, FL 34990

772-485-3007 

From: Amy Chappel [achappel@rgncpa.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 10:54 AM

I have recently been alerted that there are plans for both Palm City and Stuart to be split during redistricting. I am a resident of Palm City and work in Stuart. I am asking that the committee who draws the District maps do so in order that Palm City and Stuart remain within one house district seat. We need our community to be kept in one State House seat.

I believe the natural boundaries should be used in redistricting rather than splitting these towns. We are growing much more slowly than the counties around us and we don't want what is important to our communities to be dictated by adjacent counties. I believe that Martin County should be kept in one district so that we have a strong voice and representation aside from St. Lucie and Palm Beach counties.

Thank you,
Amy

Amy Duffett Chappel

RG RoegiersGoldin
CN ChappelNail
& Associates

701 Colorado Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994

772•283•7444

772•283•7446 fax

Any tax advice included in this written or electronic communication was not intended or written to be used, and it cannot be used by the taxpayer for purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on a taxpayer by any governmental taxing authority or agency.



Go Green. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

From: Forrest Yingling [pcfyingling@yahoo.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 11:28 AM

I am a resident and business owner in Martin County. I am asking that you do not incorporate my county in with either St. Lucie or Palm Beach county as we in Martin County do not have the same needs and desires as the two listed counties. As a taxpayer and citizen who is supposed to work for the citizen you should listen to the voters of this state and adhere to their wishes and desires.

Sincerely
Forrest Yingling
P.O.Box 716
Indiantown, Fl.34956

22

From: Lindsay Nickerson [lindsay@nickersonandcompany.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc: Harrell, Gayle
Subject: District 82

Sent: Thu 1/12/2012 6:04 PM

Message | Map 01122012.JPG (76 KB)


Good evening,

I know I emailed you earlier in the week. I've working on this map I hope this will serve as a better alternative to keep the district compact. Please use the river as a natural boundary.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Martin County Resident,

Lindsay Nickerson



From: Amber Ducote [amber@tarabiekcreative.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Seat for District 82

Sent: Wed 1/4/2012 3:23 PM

Just wanted to give my two cents in regards to the current redistricting. I think that the City of Stuart, FL should continue to be drawn in such a way that the river is used as a natural boundary between districts. It is an existing political and natural separation and I think it should continue going forward.

Thanks for your consideration and enjoy your day!

Amber Ducote
www.tarabiekcreative.com
772-283-0019

49 ADDYs to date!
Follow us! Friend us! Link in!
[Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [LinkedIn](#)

Where creative comes from...

Logos, Brochures, Corporate ID Packages, Print Ads, Email Blasts
Newsletters & Catalogs, Website Design & SEO

This communication (including any attachments) may contain privileged or confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this communication immediately and are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, dissemination, or distribution of this communication, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify us immediately by calling 772-283-0019. Thank You.

ML

From: RMonahan44020@aol.com
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting Proposals

Sent: Sun 1/15/2012 11:54 AM

I am asking the Florida Legislature to draw the new District Map to maintain most of the City of Stuart within House District 82. This will keep the City of Stuart together with the remainder of Martin County and will give the City a reasonable voice in its future. The currently proposed House District maps (HB9025, HB9027 or HB9031) each place the entire City of Stuart into District 81, in St. Lucie County, where we have no commonality. We need our community to be kept in Florida House District 82. If the maps are drawn so that most of Stuart remains in the same District as the majority of Martin County that would be better than what is currently proposed.

*Richard S Monahan
2600 SE Ocean Blvd M-3
Stuart, Fl. 34996*

You replied on 1/15/2012 2:12 PM.

From: Daniel Strauss [strauss.danny@gmail.com]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting concerns

Sent: Sun 1/15/2012 10:24 AM

I am a lifelong Stuart resident. The current House maps divide Stuart. We need our community to be kept in one State House seat. Dividing our community is disastrous as we are a very compact area. If the maps can be drawn so that Stuart is contained in one house district that would be better than what is currently proposed, and it is simple to achieve if you use natural boundaries and the interstates.

Thank you,

Danny Strauss
strauss.danny@gmail.com

You forwarded this message on 1/4/2012 10:57 AM.

This message was sent with High importance.

From: Tapscott, Candace M [candace.m.tapscott@hud.gov]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: DO NOT REDISTRICT MY AREA

Sent: Tue 1/3/2012 12:09 PM



To Whom it May Concern:

Our housing development Pembroke Falls in Pembroke Pines, Florida has been informed that the House intends to split and separate the portion of the development that I live in from district 104. As a result of this redistricting I will be forced to vote in district 99.

This is outrageous!!! It is horrible that Pembroke Falls is being cut up and that a corner of our development has been left out and given away to satisfy a legislator from another district.

I am writing to encourage that you keep the ENTIRETY of Pembroke Falls TOGETHER in one district (104 – Florida House) for the mutual benefit of the community.

Candace M. Tapscott

2191 NW 125 Terrace

Pembroke Pines, Florida 33028

(954) 443-3166

22

RESOLUTION 2012-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OLDSMAR, FLORIDA OPPOSING HOUSE REDISTRICTING LEGISLATION THAT AFFECTS THE CITY OF OLDSMAR INCLUDING HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 6009, 6011 AND 6013 WHERE IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE CITIES OF OLDSMAR AND SAFETY HARBOR BECOME PART OF DISTRICT 64; AUTHORIZING THE CITY CLERK TO DISTRIBUTE A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION TO THE HOUSE REDISTRICTING SUBCOMMITTEE, REPRESENTATIVES ROBERT C. SCHENCK, ED HOOPER, JAMES C. FRISHE, WILL W. WEATHERFORD AND SENATOR JACK LATVALA; AND PROVIDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE DATE HEREOF.

WHEREAS, 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 and legislative districts; and

WHEREAS, the 2010 Census revealed an unequal distribution of population growth amongst the State's legislative and Congressional districts; and

WHEREAS, the legislative and congressional districts must be adjusted to correct population differences; and

WHEREAS, the Florida House of Representatives Redistricting Subcommittee has proposed three Joint Resolutions, including HJR 6009, HJR 6011 and HJR 6013 which would reapportion the resident population of Florida into 120 State House districts; and

WHEREAS, all three of these Joint Resolutions provide for the inclusion of the City of Oldsmar and the City of Safety Harbor into a district that is predominantly located in Hillsborough County; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Oldsmar and Safety Harbor are located within Pinellas County, Florida and currently are located in District 48, along with the Cities of Tarpon Springs and Dunedin.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OLDSMAR, FLORIDA, IN SESSION DULY AND REGULARLY ASSEMBLED:

Section 1. That the City Council of the City of Oldsmar opposes House Joint Resolution 6009, 6011 and 6013, as well as any other House of Representatives redistricting subcommittee plan where the City of Oldsmar will be included in District 64 or any other District that is predominantly located in Hillsborough County.


Section 2. That the City Clerk shall distribute a copy of this Resolution to Representative Robert C. Schenck, Representative Ed Hooper, Representative James C.

Frishe, Representative Will W. Weatherford and Senator Jack Latvala, as well as the House of Representatives Redistricting Subcommittee.


Section 3. That this Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OLDSMAR, FLORIDA, THIS 17th DAY OF January, 2012.

CITY OF OLDSMAR


Jim Ronecker, Mayor

ATTEST:


Ann E. Stephan
City Clerk
City of Oldsmar

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


Thomas J. Trask
City Attorney
City of Oldsmar



18501 Murdock Circle, Suite 601
 Port Charlotte, FL 33948
 941-764-4941
 TheECEC@gmail.com
 www.TheECEC.com

January 6, 2012

The Honorable Will W. Weatherford
 Florida House of Representatives
 418 The Capitol
 402 South Monroe Street
 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Dear Chairman Weatherford:

I am writing to share with you the concerns of many Charlotte County business leaders, including the Enterprise Charlotte Economic Council.

As we reviewed the proposed maps for the Florida House of Representatives, three of them showed Charlotte County as being one House district. As you may know, Charlotte County currently has three State House members and three Senators. We believe the more representation we have in Tallahassee the better off our County will be.

While we realize the difficulties of complying with the complexities of Amendment 5 in redrawing districts, we believe a strong case can be made for dividing the County at the Peace River. The southern district would include Punta Gorda, the only incorporated city in the County, and extend into DeSoto County. The district north of the river would include most of the unincorporated section of the County and sections of North Port that have historic, medical, social and business ties to Charlotte County.

Our organization believes that two districts drawn in this manner would comply with the requirements of Amendment 5 and endorse this letter.

We ask your support for these districts.

Thank you.

Lew Albert, Chairman

**OUR MISSION: ENCOURAGE THE RECRUITMENT, EXPANSION AND
 RETENTION OF DIVERSIFIED HIGH IMPACT INDUSTRY**

- CREATE HIGH SKILL – HIGH WAGE JOBS
- DIVERSIFY THE ECONOMY AND TAX BASE

From: Julie Mathis [mailto:jmathis@charlottecountychamber.org]

Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 9:53 AM

To: Weatherford, Will

Subject: Charlotte County

Dear Chairman Weatherford:

I am writing to share with you the concerns of many of the citizens of Charlotte County including the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce and the Enterprise Charlotte Economic Council.

As we reviewed the proposed maps for the Florida House of Representatives, three of them showed Charlotte County as being one House district. As you may know, Charlotte County currently has three State House members and three Senators. We believe the more representation we have in Tallahassee the better off our County will be.

While we realize the difficulties of complying with the complexities of Amendment 5 in redrawing districts we believe a strong case can be made for dividing the County at the Peace River. The southern district would include the only incorporated city in the County and extend into DeSoto County. The district north of the river would include most of the unincorporated section of the County and sections of North Port that have historic medical, social and business ties to Charlotte County.

Our organizations believe that two districts drawn in this manner would comply with the requirements of Amendment 5.

We ask your support for these districts.

Thank you.

Julie Mathis
Executive Director
Charlotte County Chamber of Commerce
311 W. Retta Esplanade
Punta Gorda, FL 33950
(941) 639-2222 T
(941) 639-6330 F
jmathis@charlottecountychamber.org
www.charlottecountychamber.org

Between December 30, 2011 – January 7, 2012

The Redistricting Committee received more than 200 emails similar to the one below.

Committee staff inquired about what several of the authors believed to be the boundaries of Estero. The response received indicated the following as the borders of Estero: *"The borders of Estero include Estero Bay to the west; the city of Bonita springs to the south; San Carlos park (Estero Blvd) to the north and and I-75 to the East except for the area between Williams and Estero Blvd. where it is the Collier County line to the East."*

Dear ALEX KELLY,

Estero is an unincorporated community with about 30,000 registered voter located in south Lee County. During the last decade we have been in House District 75, home to Representative Trudi Williams.

Only one of the four Florida House Maps under consideration, Map H000H9021, keeps Estero whole. The residents of Estero like District 76 because all of Estero is within its boundaries and the district is entirely located in Lee County.

We urge you to support a final Florida House Map that contains the boundaries of District 76 in Map H000H9021,

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

N. Batos
9165 HOLLOW PINE DRIVE
BONITA SPRINGS, FLORIDA 34135

From: Mercedes Ballou [balloump@comcast.net]
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc:
Subject: House Map No. 23

Sent: Wed 12/14/2011 8:43 PM

I am a homeowner in Breckenridge, Estero and wish to support redistricting as it is represented in House map No. 23.

Bonita Springs and Estero have many common interests and similar economies.

Mercedes P. Ballou

19870 Breckenridge Drive

From: Anderson, Paige [panderson@fgcu.edu]

Sent: Fri 1/13/2012 10:29 AM

To: MyDistrictBuilder; Weatherford, Will; Caldwell, Matt; Aubuchon, Gary; Williams, Trudi; Dorworth, Chris; Schenck, Robert; Young, Dana; paige.kreegel@myfloridahouse.gov; Nunez, Jeanette; Frishe, Jim; Corcoran, Richard

Cc:

Subject: Proposed Redistricting of Pine Island

I have been a resident of Pine Island my entire life. As a Pine Islander I believe that we have a unique community much like that of the barrier islands and coastal communities we are incorporated with as the district stands now. The integrity of our unique community would be compromised and less appealing if we become a part of another district. I completely and whole heartedly disagree with a redistricting move that would lump us together with Cape Coral. The members of the Pine Island community are happy with the level of representation we have and feel that the support for the redistricting of Pine Island comes from individuals that live outside of the Pine Island area. The concerns of the residents of Pine Island should be more heavily weighted than the wishes of those outside of that community when considering this matter. Please listen to the voices of the Islanders as we express our concerns with this proposal. Thank you.

Paige Anderson

Florida Gulf Coast University

Procurement Services

Senior Fiscal Assistant

Phone: 590-1200

Fax: 590-1140

Note: Florida has a broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by Florida Gulf Coast University is subject to disclosure to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead contact this office by telephone or in writing.

From: PICAPIEXE@aol.com
To: MyDistrictBuilder
Cc: Dorworth, Chris; Schenck, Robert; Frishe, Jim
Subject: Reapportionment. Matlacha Isles needs to be in Map 76

Sent: Mon 1/16/2012 5:37 PM

sorry for the address errors. cf

From: PICAPIEXE@aol.com
To: mydistrictbuilder@myflorida.gov
CC: matt.caldwell@myfloridahouse.gov, will.weatherford@myfloridahouse.gov, gary.aubuchon@myfloridahouse.gov, trudi.williams@myfloridahouse.gov, chris.dorworth@myflorida.gov, robert.schenck@myflorida.gov, dana.young@myfloridahouse.gov, paige.kreegel@myfloridahouse.gov, jeannette.nunez@myfloridahouse.gov, james.frishe@myfloridahouse.gov, richard.corcoran@myfloridahouse.gov
Sent: 1/16/2012 5:32:05 P.M. Eastern Standard Time
Subj: Reapportionment. Matlacha Isles needs to be in Map 76

◀Next ▶Last

Sometime ago the Cape City Council passed Resolution 12-09. To put us in the wrong district may facilitate the unwanted overture to annexation of Matlacha Isles enclave and all points east of the Matlacha Bridge. We are coastal and have coastal interests. Eric Feichthaler brought this forward with his spokesperson Carl Schwing. You may google it Resolution 12-09. Tim Miller who is pushing this mapping of the wrong district to further make it easier to annex. Note that Tim Miller was the campaign manger of Feichthaler when he ran for Lee County Judge. We listened to all the use of Pine Islanders of the Cape Roads at that time. The Cape does not own all of the Roadways. Note the feud with County DOT over the Sta Barbara corner or the delay in funding the 4 laning of Burnt Store Rd. We have Lee County Utilities in sewers and Greater Pine Island water service. We are served by the Matlacha Pine Island Fire Service that plans to build a new fire Station number 4 on south side Pine Island rd. and east of Matlacha Isles. We belong to the Matlacha Civic Association, the Greater Pine Island Civic Association. We vote in Matlacha Park Precinct.

We do not want grouped with Cape Coral. We wish to be in House District #76 with Matlacha , Pine Island and the Coastal Communities.

John and Eileen Feldmann, Matlacha Isles, FL 33991-5601 tele #239-283-7667

85


Regarding the **State Senate** Map

Public suggestions received since the
House released redistricting options
on December 6, 2011

SPUBS0158 - SULLIVAN, PATRICIA



Florida House of Representatives
 Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

SPUBS0169 - KING, BRUCE




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



From: Kass, Roger [Roger.Kass@thevillages.com]

Sent: Sun 1/15/2012 10:56 PM

To: MyDistrictBuilder

Cc:

Subject: Redistricting Maps

I am the past President of The Villages' Homeowners' Association. I have lived in The Villages for nearly 10 years and it is clear that The Villages is a community of common interest. I am asking the Legislatures consider this fact when voting on the new Legislative Districts.

As I understand the amendment the voters approved stated that districts should be drawn with the intent of keeping areas of common interest together and that district boundaries be drawn along logical boundaries such as roads, rivers and cities, county boundaries and communities, such as The Villages, that keep areas of common interest whole.

I am requesting that you keep The Villages together as a single district for State and Federal Congressional Districts.

Thank you for your efforts and consideration.

Roger Kass
17134 SE 78th Larchmont Ct.
The Villages, FL 32162
352-259-7174
RogerK@KNG-Marketing.com

From: MATTHEW LYMAN [matthewlyman@me.com]
To: RedistrictFlorida
Cc:
Subject: Redistricting - Pasco County

Sent: Thu 1/5/2012 3:56 PM

To whom it may concern,

My name is Mathew Lyman, and I'm a small business owner in Dade City, which is in Pasco County. I am astounded at the horribly drawn map in SJR1176. Public testimony that was given at the hearings in Pasco County indicated an overwhelming consensus that if Pasco County is going to be split into two districts, that there should be an East, and a West district split somewhere west of Land O' Lakes.

Pasco County - if it has to be split - can only be split between East and West. Dade City and Zephyrhills are very similar, and share communities of business freely. They are right next to each other and are the two largest incorporated cities in the East of Pasco. Separating Dade City from Zephyrhills, and slicing East Pasco in half goes against all major boundaries (our major roads only run north and south, not east and west). East Pasco County needs to be unified - as it is in most everything in everyday life. The Pasco County Public Transportation system (PCPT) has their busing routes broken down as "East Pasco" and "West Pasco". The East Pasco bus routes run from Lacoochee, to Dade City, and down US301 to Zephyrhills. A second route then runs from Zephyrhills to The Groves in Wesley Chapel. The West Pasco PCPT routes don't even connect with East Pasco (because no one in the West comes to the East, and vice versa.) West Pasco's PCPT runs along US19.

Another indication of Pasco's East/West split is in Solid Waste Management by the County (http://portal.pascocountyfl.net/portal/server.pt/community/solid_waste_and_resource_recovery/261/). Pasco's Solid Waste Management is broken down into East, and West facilities - not North and South facilities (SJR1176 splits Pasco County into a northern and southern region for absolutely no explainable reason). Pasco's government offices are based in Dade City, and there are also duplicate offices in the west in New Port Richey. SJR1176 groups Dade City in the East with New Port Richey in the West for absolutely no good reason. Pasco County is an East/West County, not a North/South County.

Here is a link to a video of the entire 181 minutes of testimony at the Pasco County Hearing in Wesley Chapel, FL: <http://thefloridachannel.org/video/72611-redistricting-hearing-wesley-chapel/>

Not once in that video does someone say that they want the county split North and South as it is in SJR1176. Please, watch the video (since you all who were there didn't use any of the information in drawing the map) and draw a FAIR map - not the horrible politically motivated map in SJR1176 that ignores Pasco's citizens and their wishes. We have to live with this map for the next 10 years, so please put any personal political motives aside and give Pasco's citizens what we deserve; fair districts for representation.

Thanks for your time,
Matthew Lyman

HJR 6001

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HJR 6001 PCB SRS 12-01 Joint Resolution of Apportionment

SPONSOR(S): Senate Redistricting Subcommittee, Nehr

TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** HJR 6009 HJR 6011 HJR 6013 CS/SJR 1176 SJR 1628

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
Orig. Comm.: Senate Redistricting Subcommittee	10 Y, 4 N	Poreda	Kelly
1) Redistricting Committee		Poreda	Kelly

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

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 S000S9004: This proposed committee bill (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 78;
- 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 2.50%; 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 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.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED 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 Senate districts and their subsequent deviation from the new ideal population of 470,033 residents.

Table 1. 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

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

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.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.”

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.

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

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

²⁰ 478 U.S. 30 (1986).

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.

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 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

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).

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.

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 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 2 illustrates those increases. Prior to 1992, Florida Congressional Delegation included only one minority member, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Table 2. 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 3 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

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.

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.

population. None of the 15 districts elected an African-American to the Florida House of Representatives.

Table 3. 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 4 illustrates that the resulting districting plan doubled the number of African-American representatives in the Florida House of Representatives.

Table 4. 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

Equal Protection – Racial Gerrymandering

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.

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.⁵⁵ Registration and performance data must be used under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to determine whether 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.

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.

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

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

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.

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, 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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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)).

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 “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

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).

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 Council 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.”).

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 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

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.*

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

Map Type	Complete Maps	Partial Maps	Total Maps
House	17	25	42
Senate	26	18	44
Congressional	54	27	81
TOTAL	97	70	167

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

Redistricting Plan S000S9004: Effect of Proposed Changes

Redistricting Plan Summary Statistics for the Proposed State Senate Map

Redistricting Plan Data Report for S000S9004

Plan File Name: S000S9004						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:		464,088 to 475,858				City or District Split :				78 Split of 411 used									
District Deviation Range:		(-5,944) To 5,826				VID's Split :				372 Split of 9,436 used									
Deviation:		(-1.26) To 1.23 Total 2.50%																	
Number of Districts by Race Language																			
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+														
Current Black VAP	8	6	3	2	1														
New Black VAP	8	6	4	2	0														
Current Hisp VAP	14	8	6	3	3														
New Hisp VAP	13	7	5	5	3														
District		County		Count Blocks		Pop													
9		Osceola		1		0													

Plan Name:	S000S9004			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	
S9004-Map	9,941	65,934	15.07%	8,602	216,308	3.97%	86.53%	30.48%	6,823	98,963	6.89%	68.62%	66.62%	2,034	2,095	4,068	
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	
S9004-Simple	9,126	65,923	13.84%				94.26%	30.47%				74.76%	66.61%				
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					
S9004-Map	21	21	22	15	28	28	28	20	38	38	37	29					
Current Map	24	24	24	18	32	32	31	24	41	41	39	32					

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

STORAGE NAME: h6001.RDC.DOCX

DATE: 1/19/2012

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

District ID	Pop Dev	TPOP10	%AllBlkVAP10	%AllHisVAP10	%HaitianPOPACS
1	-1,598	468,434	47.85	5.87	0.70
2	4,135	474,167	14.45	3.55	0.22
3	-2,050	467,982	9.28	6.08	0.14
4	4,078	474,110	12.54	5.19	0.18
5	-5,730	464,302	10.93	6.82	0.17
6	4,376	474,408	29.61	5.29	0.45
7	-5,575	464,457	7.18	10.49	0.27
8	-1,553	468,479	6.40	5.58	0.22
9	-1,783	468,249	7.76	13.71	0.48
10	-4,710	465,322	11.45	17.32	0.42
11	2,027	472,059	5.36	8.60	0.12
12	4,411	474,443	6.92	19.06	0.23
13	1,096	471,128	5.58	7.43	0.06
14	-3,311	466,721	15.34	7.33	0.49
15	-973	469,059	10.35	15.23	0.69
16	1,329	471,361	4.96	7.60	0.12
17	-3,166	466,866	11.71	17.52	0.94
18	-5,944	464,088	37.33	27.51	1.37
19	-3,912	466,120	40.02	20.73	5.24
20	345	470,377	9.13	6.63	0.10
21	-2,021	468,011	8.43	11.71	0.58
22	3,987	474,019	8.30	16.74	0.35
23	-5,595	464,437	4.24	6.15	0.43
24	-1,237	468,795	14.35	50.53	1.62
25	-5,253	464,779	6.64	11.07	1.73
26	3,051	473,083	9.30	8.16	0.67
27	-5,011	465,021	8.52	14.64	1.52
28	486	470,518	10.60	9.89	1.52
29	3,544	473,576	55.70	15.47	11.73
30	2,183	472,215	11.26	20.79	4.57
31	5,826	475,858	14.20	31.01	2.49
32	3,449	473,481	21.34	21.14	5.16
33	3,767	473,799	57.75	27.99	16.21
34	4,885	474,917	13.80	24.34	1.99
35	5,769	475,801	9.65	50.54	2.37
36	4,821	474,853	5.44	83.44	0.53
37	-5,514	464,518	4.04	16.11	1.65
38	5,191	475,223	5.28	83.48	0.88
39	-890	469,142	35.11	39.55	6.27

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.

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

STORAGE NAME: h6001.RDC.DOCX

DATE: 1/19/2012

40	-2,900	467,132	8.32	86.88	1.01
----	--------	---------	------	-------	------

District-by-District Descriptions for the Proposed State Senate Map⁹¹

District 1 preserves the core of an existing district that has long elected an African-American member to the Senate. The district connects communities in the northeastern portion of the state from the St. Johns River basin to Interstate 95 between Daytona Beach and Jacksonville. The committee heard testimony in Jacksonville that urged the maintenance of such a district in order to preserve minority voting opportunities in Northeast Florida. District 1 has a black voting-age population of 47.9%, comparable to that of the existing district. The Legislature received several submissions from the public that proposed districts of a similar configuration and demographic composition. (See Plans HPUBS0090, SPUBS0142, SPUBS0148, and SPUBS0155).

District 2 links the rural communities of the Florida Panhandle in Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, Bay, Washington, Holmes, and Jackson Counties, utilizing political and geographical boundaries for nearly the entire length of its perimeter. It follows the boundaries of the state on the western, northern, and eastern sides of the district. The district's southern boundary follows the intercoastal waterway, the Yellow River, Interstate 10, the eastern boundary of Bay County and the southern boundary of Jackson County, and the outer boundaries of Pensacola to the west and Lynn Haven to the east. The committee heard testimony at the Pensacola, Panama City and Fort Walton Beach public hearings and at the October 5, 2011, Senate Reapportionment Committee meeting that rural and agricultural interests in the north part of the Panhandle have different traditions and representational needs than the urban and tourism interest in the south. Additionally the committee heard testimony pointing out that commerce and communication flow east to west along the main transportation corridors of the region, Interstate 10 and U.S. Highway 98, and not north to south. The Legislature received several submissions that proposed a similar orientation in the Panhandle. (See Plans HPUBS0007, HPUBS0080, HPUBS0099, HPUBS0090, SPUBS0105, and SPUBS0142.)

District 3 combines rural communities in North Florida and the Nature Coast. The plan makes extensive use of political boundaries, incorporating all of Citrus, Levy, Gilchrist, Lafayette, Suwannee, Columbia, Union, and Baker Counties. In Marion County, the district uses Interstate 75 and the western boundary of Ocala as its western boundary. In addition, District 3 enables District 6 to the west and District 14 to the east to consist entirely of whole counties.

At the public hearing in Gainesville, members of the public supported keeping rural counties such as Gilchrist and Union separate from major metropolitan areas like Jacksonville. At its meeting on October 18, 2011, the Senate Reapportionment Committee heard public support for keeping the Nature Coast region largely intact. The testimony pointed out that Dixie and Levy Counties and the rest of the region have a rural-industry focus quite different from urban areas like Gainesville. Plan SPUBS0143 contains a district similar to District 3.

District 4 unites the coastal communities of the Florida Panhandle in Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay Counties. Like District 2, District 4 uses political and geographical boundaries for nearly the entire length of its perimeter. It follows the boundaries of the state on its west, the eastern boundary of Bay County on its east, and the Gulf of Mexico on its south. The northern boundary of the district follows the intercoastal waterway, the Yellow River, Interstate 10, and the outer boundaries of Pensacola to the west and Lynn Haven to the east. District 4 is supported by the same testimony as District 2. Its horizontal configuration recognizes the differences between the rural North and the urban South. District 4 honors the request of members of the public who called for representation that reflects their distinct communities. Plans HPUBS0007, HPUBS0080, HPUBS0099, HPUBS0090, SPUBS0105, and SPUBS0142 all have a similar alignment in the Panhandle.

District 5 contains all of Nassau County and a portion of Duval County necessary to attain the population. The district is bounded by the State of Georgia on the west and north, the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and uses the Duval County line for most of its southern boundary. Part of its boundary is adjacent to the northeast Florida minority opportunity district (District 1). Several participants at the

⁹¹ District descriptions were provided by the Florida Senate and are available at www.flsenate.gov.

Jacksonville hearing requested that Nassau County be kept whole. In the benchmark plan, District 5 divided Nassau, Clay, and St. Johns Counties. Public plans HPUBS0056, SPUBS0066, and HPUBS0095 contain districts of a similar orientation, keeping Nassau County whole and combining it with a portion of Duval County to equalize populations.

District 6 combines the counties of the Capitol Region. The district consists entirely of whole counties, following political boundaries for its entire perimeter. The district includes Gadsden, Calhoun, Gulf, Liberty, Franklin, Taylor, Wakulla, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, and Hamilton Counties. Its location is largely dictated by District 2 and District 4 to its west. District 6 combines communities that associate with Tallahassee, which lies near the geographic center of the district. Many residents in the surrounding counties travel to Tallahassee for work and recreation, and the district is traversed by Interstate 10, which promotes intra-district travel and commerce. At the public hearing in Tallahassee, several members of the public urged the elimination of "fingers" like the one in District 3 of the benchmark plan that pushes into Tallahassee. Public plan SPUBS0143 includes a district that is identical to District 6.

District 7 combines the communities south and west of Daytona Beach in Volusia County with northern Brevard County and eastern Orange County. The district follows the western border of Volusia County, the northern border of Orange County, the Econlockhatchee River, and, as its southern boundary, the Beachline Expressway through Orange and Brevard Counties, and the northern boundary of the City of Cocoa. Its eastern boundary is the Atlantic Ocean. The Committee heard testimony from the public at the Daytona Beach hearing requesting at least one district based primarily in Volusia County. Additionally members of the public requested that cities in Volusia County be kept whole. Consistent with this testimony, District 7 does not divide cities, and it follows the boundaries of DeBary, Port Orange, Daytona Beach, and Daytona Beach Shores for portions of its boundary. Public plans HPUBS0084 and SPUBS0146 each contain a district similar to District 7.

District 8 combines the coastal communities of Northeast Florida from the Jacksonville beaches south of the mouth of the St. Johns River to Daytona Beach. The district is adjacent to the northeast Florida minority-access district to its west and is bordered by the Atlantic Ocean on the east. The district is connected through common interests along the northeast coast of Florida, from Atlantic Beach to St. Augustine Beach and Daytona Beach. Interstate 95 runs through most of District 8 and thus facilitates commerce and transportation across the district. Public plan SPUBS0155 includes a district similar to District 8.

District 9 includes communities along the Florida Turnpike from Leesburg to Orlando. Its western boundary is the western boundary of Lake County, and its southern boundary is the southern boundary of Lake and Orange Counties. On the east, the district abuts two minority opportunity districts in Central Florida. District 9 contains closely united territory. Travel through the district is facilitated not only by the Florida Turnpike, but by Interstate 4 to the east and Highway 441 to the north. The communities it unites are connected with Orlando, as well as Lake Buena Vista and Winter Park, in several respects. Residents of Mount Dora, Clermont, Minneola, Leesburg, and other municipalities throughout the district frequently travel to Orlando for work and recreation. Public plans SPUBS0146 and SPUBS0147 each contain districts of a similar configuration.

District 10 links the communities east of Tampa, partially encircling the city. On the north and south, District 10 follows the boundaries of Hillsborough County. On the west, it abuts Interstate 275 and a minority-opportunity district that generally follows Interstate 75 and Tampa Bay. On the east, District 10 follows State Road 39 and the western and northern outskirts of Plant City. The district is contained wholly within Hillsborough County. District 10 consists of the closely united territory along the eastern periphery of greater Tampa. Communities such as Brandon, Sun City Center, and Apollo Beach are associated by geographical proximity and shared interests. At the public hearing in Tampa, the committee heard from members of both communities requesting that they be kept whole.

District 11 connects the communities of northern and western Pasco County with all of Hernando County and most of Sumter County. The district 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 in Pasco County

along most of its southern border. At the public hearing in Wesley Chapel the Committee heard from several members of the public who pointed out the similarities between the rural portions of Hernando, Pasco, and Sumter Counties. This district combines the common interests described at the Wesley Chapel hearing. Members of the public also pointed out the growing interest of The Villages in Sumter County. District 11 does not include the portion of The Villages that falls within Sumter County. Instead, The Villages and its separate interests are preserved whole within District 20.

District 12 links the communities in northwest Hillsborough County with south-central and southeast Pasco County. In Hillsborough County, the district is bounded on the west by the boundary between Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties and on the east by a minority opportunity district and Interstate 275. In Pasco County, the district is bounded chiefly by State Road 52. The district does not divide any cities in Pasco County, following the boundaries of St. Leo and San Antonio. At the public hearing in Wesley Chapel the Committee heard from members of the public who pointed out the division between East Pasco, which has a coastal focus, and West Pasco, which is more rural. One member of the public suggested that communities like Wesley Chapel, Zephyrhills, and Lutz form a contiguous zone of common interest. The district provides ease of travel along Veterans Expressway, Suncoast Parkway, Interstates 75 and 275, and State Roads 52 and 56.

District 13 contains communities in northern Pinellas County. The district is bounded by the Pinellas County line on the north and east and by the Gulf of Mexico and Intracoastal Waterway on the west. On the south, the boundary crosses Pinellas County without dividing any municipalities. Parts of the boundary follow the municipal boundaries of St. Petersburg, Pinellas Park, Largo, Seminole, Indian Shores, Indian Rocks Beach, Belleair, Belleair Beach, and Clearwater. District 13 contains, in its entirety, the related communities of Largo, Belleair, Belleair Bluffs, Clearwater, Safety Harbor, Oldsmar, Dunedin, and Tarpon Springs. Many of the submissions received from the public contained districts that united the communities of northern Pinellas County. (See Plans HPUBS0007, HPUBS0056, HPUBS0083, SPUBS0091, HPUBS0092, and HPUBS0095)

District 14 consists of three whole counties—Alachua, Bradford, and Clay Counties—and therefore follows political boundaries for the entire extent of its perimeter. The regular shapes of the counties that compose District 14 result in a district of closely united territory. At the public hearings in Gainesville and Jacksonville, the committee heard from several members of the public urging the Legislature, to the extent possible, to avoid the division of the many communities in Alachua, Bradford, and Clay Counties. By maintaining Alachua, Bradford, and Clay Counties as whole counties, District 14 preserves each of the municipalities in the three counties. Public plan SPUBS0143 has a district similar to District 14.

District 15 links the mostly rural communities of Osceola, Polk, and Orange Counties. A portion of its boundary is defined by Hispanic-majority District 24. On the northwest, the district follows the boundary of Polk County. On the east, it follows the boundary of Osceola County. Along much of its northern and southern boundaries, it follows the Beachline Expressway and State Road 60, respectively. From its north-central point, the district is connected to the east by the Beachline Expressway, to the southeast by the Florida Turnpike, and to the southwest by Interstate 4. At the public hearing in Lakeland, the committee heard testimony pointing out the rural nature of the majority of Polk County outside of Lakeland, and the interests in the agricultural industry that the region shares, differentiating it from the urban areas in Tampa to the west and Orlando to the northeast. The portion of Osceola County contained in District 15 shares these rural and agricultural interests.

District 16 connects the southern and beach communities in Pinellas County with south Tampa. It is bounded on the west by the Gulf of Mexico, on the north by Interstate 275 and municipal boundaries across Pinellas County, and on the east and south by a minority opportunity district. The district unites the beach communities in western Pinellas County from Belleair Beach to St. Pete Beach. These communities share economic interests and contribute significantly to the economic life of Pinellas County. Interstate 275 provides easy transportation throughout the district.

District 17 includes the predominantly rural, agricultural areas from the Kissimmee basin to Lake Okeechobee. The district includes all of Hardee, Desoto, Glades, Highlands, and Okeechobee

Counties, as well as the largely rural parts of southern Polk County, northern Charlotte County, and eastern Martin and St. Lucie Counties. It 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. The district also follows State Road 60 through much of Polk County and County Road 74 through most of Charlotte County. At the public hearing in Wauchula, several members of the public urged the committee to group the inland communities in counties like Hardee, Highlands, and Glades with each other, rather than with coastal and urban communities. District 17 attempts to give effect to the expressed desire for an agricultural district. Public plan HPUBS0072 contains a similar district.

District 18 preserves the core of a minority access district for Tampa Bay that was created by the Florida Supreme Court in 1992 and has consistently elected the candidate of choice of minority voters. The district connects African-American and Hispanic communities in Hillsborough, Manatee, and Pinellas Counties, but also unites urban populations in Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Bradenton. The district follows geographical boundaries along portions of its perimeter, using Tampa Bay at its center and Interstate 75 on the east. At the Tampa public hearing, the committee heard from a number of members of the public who argued for a minority access district in Hillsborough County. District 18 has a black voting-age population of 37.3% and a Hispanic voting-age population of 27.5%. Public plans HPUBS0085, SPUBS0123, SPUBS0142, and SPUBS0155 each have a district substantially similar to District 18.

District 19 unites urban, largely minority communities in Orange and Seminole Counties. It includes parts of Orlando, Ocoee, Winter Garden, Apopka, Maitland Winter Park, and Sanford, as well as the historic City of Eatonville. At the public hearing in Orlando, the Committee heard from representatives of the minority communities in the Orlando area who argued for their junction in a single district. District 19 has a black voting-age population of 40%.

District 20 connects the largely rural area north of Central Florida. The district follows most of the boundaries of Putnam County and, on the east, part of the eastern boundary of Lake County. On the west, District 20 follows Interstate 75 and the western boundary of Ocala through Marion County. It includes The Villages in Marion and in the northern portion of Sumter and Lake Counties. District 20 includes The Villages, Ocala, rural areas in eastern Marion County and Putnam County, and most of central and east Lake County. At the public hearing in The Villages, the committee heard from many members of the public who expressed a desire to keep that community together, pointing out the common culture, lifestyle and interest shared by the people that live in The Villages.

District 21 combines the large share of Manatee County not in the Tampa Bay minority access district with communities in eastern Hillsborough and western Polk County. The district follows the boundaries of Manatee County adjacent to the minority access district. In Hillsborough County it follows Highways 579, 674, and 39 and the outskirts of Plant City. The boundary crosses into Polk County on Highway 582 and through the City of Lakeland using Interstate 4, U.S. 92, and U.S. 98. The district boundary passes between Mulberry, which is entirely inside the district, and Bartow, which is entirely outside the district. At the Tampa hearing, the committee heard from members of the public who testified that the rural communities in eastern Hillsborough County around Plant City associate more closely with each other than with neighboring Tampa. At the public hearing in Sarasota the committee heard similar testimony about the rural communities of eastern Manatee including testimony that the rural communities of Myakka Head, Old Myakka and Myakka City in Manatee share similarities with rural areas of southern Polk and eastern Hillsborough Counties.

District 22 combines the majority of Seminole County, excepting portions of northern and western Seminole County that are part of a minority opportunity district, with parts of northern Orange County as necessary to equalize the district population. The eastern boundary of the district consists of the eastern boundary of Seminole County and the Econlockhatchee River.

The district includes like communities such as Longwood, Casselberry, Winter Springs, Oviedo, and most of Lake Mary and Altamonte Springs. Public Plans SPUBS0064, HPUBS0072, SPUBS0146 and SPUBS0147 contain districts with an orientation similar to that of District 22.

District 23 includes all of Sarasota County and the eastern portion of Charlotte County. It follows the Gulf of Mexico on the west, the boundary of Sarasota County on the north and east, and Charlotte Harbor in the south. At the Sarasota public hearing, the committee heard testimony asking that Sarasota County be kept in a single district. Additionally, members of the public advocated combining Sarasota and western Charlotte counties, pointing out the common interest they share as coastal communities. District 23 ties the communities of Longboat Key, Sarasota, Venice, North Port, and Port Charlotte. It is intersected by Interstate 75, which runs from the northern to the southeastern boundary of the district. Public plan HPUBS0092 contains a district similar to District 23.

District 24 unites the predominantly Puerto-Rican Hispanic communities of Orange, Osceola, and Polk Counties. The communities in this region have similar commercial and economic interests. The committee received testimony from many members of the public at the Orlando public hearing and through email that pointed out the growing Hispanic population in Central Florida and the common culture, language, and business interests shared among the community. More than 50% of the voting-age population of District 24 is Hispanic. Plans HPUBS0092, HPUBS0095, HPUBS0102, SPUBS0123, and SPUBS0147 all have districts with the same general orientation and demographics as District 24.

District 25 connects the coastal communities of Broward and Palm Beach Counties. It is adjacent to the minority opportunity district to its west and the Atlantic Ocean to the east. In the northwest, the district follows the municipal boundaries of West Palm Beach and Palm Beach Gardens. In the northeast, it crosses through Jupiter following the Loxahatchee River. On the south, it follows the Ft. Lauderdale city boundary. The committee heard from many members of the public at the Davie and Boca Raton public hearings who emphasized the shared interests among coastal residents in the two counties, including tourism and affordable property insurance. A number of maps submitted by the public contain districts substantially similar to District 25. (See Plans HPUBS0089, SPUBS0123, SPUBS0147 and SPUBS0155.)

District 26 combines southern Brevard County with northern and western Indian River County, including the cities of Sebastian and Fellsmere. The district follows the borders of Brevard and Indian River Counties on the west and south, and is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean and Interstate 95. On the north, District 26 generally follows the Beachline Expressway, the municipal boundaries of Cocoa, and the barge canal that crosses Merritt Island and empties to the Atlantic at Port Canaveral. District 26 ties communities along the barrier islands of the Space Coast with similar communities along U.S. 1 and Interstate 95. The Committee heard testimony at the Melbourne hearing noting that the population of Brevard County must be divided into two Senate districts. In this plan, the majority of the county is in a single district, with a small remainder in District 7. Public plan HPUBS0085 contains a district similar to District 26.

District 27 combines eastern Lee and southern Charlotte Counties. The district 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. The district is traversed by Interstate 75 from Punta Gorda in the north to Fort Myers and Bonita Springs in the south. At the Lehigh Acres public hearing, many testified about their desire to see Lehigh Acres kept in a single district. The committee also heard multiple requests that the City of Bonita Springs be put in a mostly Lee County district. District 27 ties all of Lehigh Acres, Fort Myers, and Punta Gorda with almost all the population of Bonita Springs in a single district.

District 28 connects the Treasure Coast communities of Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, and northern Palm Beach Counties. On the east, the district is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean. On the west, it is generally bounded by the Florida Turnpike and Interstate 95. At the Stuart meeting, the committee received testimony that described the similar interests shared by the communities of northern Palm Beach County and the rest of the Treasure Coast. SPUBS0123 contains a district that is substantially similar to District 28.

District 29 unites communities along Interstate 95 and U.S. 1 in Palm Beach and Broward Counties. It also preserves the core of an existing district that has consistently elected candidates preferred by minority voters. The district 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. The Committee heard from several members of the public at both the Boca Raton and Davie hearings that expressed concerns that the African-American communities continue to have a voice. District 29 has a black voting-age population of 55.7%. A number of public maps contain similar districts. (Plans HPUBS0084, HPUBS0089, SPUBS0091, SPUBS0123, and SPUBS0155.)

District 30 includes communities in southern and central Palm Beach County between Interstate 95 on and the Florida Turnpike. District 30 is adjacent to the minority opportunity district to the east. In places, the district follows the municipal boundaries of Boca Raton, Greenacres, and other cities. The district combines the Century Village retirement communities in Palm Beach County as well as western Boca Raton and suburbs. It is oriented along the principal transportation routes that run from north to south through heavily populated areas in Palm Beach County.

District 31 includes communities of south Broward County. Its southern boundary follows the southern boundary of Broward County and the northern boundary of the minority-majority district in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties. Its eastern boundary is the Atlantic Ocean, and its northern boundary generally follows the city boundaries of Hallandale Beach, Hollywood, Dania Beach, Plantation, Pembroke Pines, and Miramar, as well as Interstate 595. Travel through the district is facilitated by Interstates 75, 95, and 595, and several major thoroughfares that cross the district east-to-west. The district unites most of Cooper City and Davie, which the committee heard at the public hearing in Davie share a single chamber of commerce and interest in equestrian issues. HPUBS0007 and SPUBS0105 both contain districts that combine the municipalities of Davie, Cooper City, and Diana Beach, and are substantially similar to District 31.

District 32 combines the inland municipalities in the northern portion of Broward County. The district is bounded on the west by the Sawgrass Expressway, on the north by the Broward County line, on the east and south by the minority opportunity district that parallels Interstate 95, and further along the south, by the Tamarac and Sunrise city lines. The district closely follows political boundaries and consists of a geographically concentrated area entirely within Broward County. The district includes, in their entirety, the municipalities of Tamarac, North Lauderdale, Coral Springs, Margate, Coconut Creek, and Parkland. It unites similar communities traversed through the center of the district by the Florida Turnpike, on the east of the district by Interstate 95, and on the west of the district by the Sawgrass Expressway. The committee received testimony at the public hearing in Davie requesting that these communities be grouped together because they share many interest and amenities, including schools, hospitals and Chambers of Commerce. This same testimony argued that these interests were distinct from those in the neighboring communities of Cooper City and Weston.

District 33 includes the core of a majority-black district that has a history of electing the candidate preferred by minority voters. The district 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. The district combines similar communities located in a geographically concentrated area of Miami-Dade and Broward Counties. It is intersected by Interstate 95 and the Florida Turnpike. The Committee heard considerable testimony at the Miami public hearing about the cohesiveness of the African-American community in Miami-Dade County, calling special attention to the similarities in the communities in Miami Gardens and the eastern part of Miramar in Broward County. The district has a black voting-age population of 57.8%. A number of publicly submitted maps, including Plans HPUBS0056, HPUBS0072, HPUBS0095, HPUBS0113, and SPUBS0155, include districts similar to District 33.

District 34 includes western portions of Palm Beach and Broward County. On the north, south, and west, the district follows the county boundaries of Broward and Palm Beach Counties. It includes the cities of Southwest Ranches, Weston, Wellington, Loxahatchee Groves, Royal Palm Beach, portions of Pembroke Pines, Davie, and Sunrise, plus a small portion of Cooper City. It also includes the entire Everglades Agricultural Area and conservation areas in western Broward and Palm Beach Counties. The Florida Turnpike, Sawgrass Expressway, Interstate 75, and U.S. 98 are major transportation arteries connecting communities within the district. It also utilizes the western boundaries of Miramar, Plantation, Tamarac, Coconut Creek, Parkland, Greenacres, West Palm Beach, and Palm Beach

Gardens. In Boca Raton, the committee heard that the areas of Palm Beach County west of the Florida Turnpike had an agricultural interest distinct from the economic focus of communities east of the Turnpike, and that the western communities should be grouped with similar communities. In District 34, these communities are grouped with communities in Broward County situated along a similar longitudinal line.

District 35 includes the coastal communities of Miami-Dade County. The district generally encompasses areas east of U.S. 1 from the Miami-Dade County boundary on the north to Homestead in the south. Along its western boundary, the district follows the boundaries of Aventura, Miami Shores, El Portal, South Miami, Pinecrest, Palmetto Bay, and Cutler Bay, and the Homestead Extension of the Florida Turnpike. The district is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean. The committee received testimony at the public hearing in Miami and by email requesting that the coastal communities of Miami-Dade County be apportioned to a single district. The committee also received significant amounts of testimony that Miami Shores be included in a coastal district. These communities share concerns about oil drilling, tourism, and beach renourishment. The district has a Hispanic voting-age population of 50.5%. Public Plans HPUBS0084, HPUBS0085 and HPUBS0089 all have similarly oriented coastal districts in Miami-Dade County.

District 36 includes the Allapatah and Little Havana neighborhoods in Miami, Coral Gables north of U.S. 1, all of South Miami and West Miami, and unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County south of Miami International Airport and east of SW 107th Avenue (State Road 985). On the southeast, the district follows U.S. 1, the South Miami and Coral Gables city lines, and Coral Way (State Road 972). The neighborhoods in District 36 form a cohesive Hispanic community, with a shared culture, shared interests, and shared language. At the South Miami hearing, the committee heard testimony that the area around Kendall, Sunset, and Westchester formed a collection of like communities that should be grouped together. District 36 has a Hispanic voting-age population of 83.4% and is located exclusively within Miami-Dade County. Public plans SPUBS0108 and SPUBS0144 contain districts that similarly connect South Miami and West Miami and have a majority-Hispanic voting-age population.

District 37 combines coastal communities in Lee and Collier Counties. It is bounded on the west by the Gulf of Mexico, on the north by the Charlotte County line, and on the south by the Monroe County line. In Collier County it is adjacent to a minority opportunity district (District 39, which is covered by Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act, and it includes all of Naples and Marco Island. In Lee County, the district includes the barrier islands west of the Intracoastal Waterway, plus the entire City of Cape Coral (Sanibel and Fort Myers Beach also are wholly included in the district). Travel through the district is facilitated by Interstate 75 and the Tamiami Trail. Public plans HPUBS0083 and HPUBS0089 contain similar districts. Unlike those maps, District 37 keeps both Cape Coral (within the district) and Fort Myers (outside the district) whole.

District 38 includes Hispanic communities in western Miami-Dade County. As its boundaries, it utilizes the Tamiami Trail and Dolphin Expressway on the north, State Road 985 (West 107th Avenue) and the Homestead Extension on the east, and State Road 997 (Krome Avenue) on the west. The district consists of a geographically concentrated area entirely within Miami-Dade County. The committee received public testimony at the Miami public hearing pointing out that the communities of West Kendall and Hammocks share a distinct identity and should not be divided. District 38 has a Hispanic voting-age population of 83.5% and includes neighborhoods with a shared culture, shared interests, and shared language. Public plan HPUBS0085 includes a district in Miami-Dade County with a similar orientation and majority-Hispanic population.

District 39 preserves the core of an existing district that has consistently elected the candidate preferred by minority voters, and which is covered by Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act. The district includes all of Hendry and Monroe Counties plus agricultural and conservation areas in Collier and Miami-Dade Counties, including Everglades National Park and the Big Cypress National Preserve. Like the current Senate District 39, it also includes Brownsville, Liberty City, Little Haiti, and Overtown neighborhoods in Miami. It then extends north to include the City of El Portal and Gladeview and Pinewood neighborhoods. The committee heard testimony in Miami expressing that the desire for the African-American communities in existing District 39 to continue to have a voice in the region. The

proposed District 39 has a black voting-age population of 35.1% and Hispanic voting-age population of 39.5%. Public plans HPUBS0084 and SPUBS0155 both contain similar districts.

District 40 is a geographically concentrated district in northwest Miami-Dade County. It follows the Miami-Dade County boundary on the north and State Road 997 (Krome Avenue) on the west. On the south, it is adjacent to District 39 (a minority opportunity district covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act) and Miami International Airport. On the east, the district generally follows the municipal boundaries of Miami Gardens, Miami Lakes, Hialeah, Opa-Locka, and Miami Springs. District 40 ties together similar, predominantly Hispanic communities, including the municipalities of Hialeah, Hialeah Gardens, Miami Springs, Medley, Miami Lakes, Virginia Gardens, and most of Doral. At the Miami public hearing, the committee received testimony that Hialeah Gardens, Miami Lakes, Miami Springs, and Medley share many of the same services and have the same needs, like the Enterprise Zones and Historically Underutilized Business Zones, that are best addressed by being combined in a distinct district. These municipalities draw together a cohesive Hispanic community that shares common values and interests. The district is intersected by the Homestead Extension of the Florida Turnpike and Interstate 75. District 40 has a Hispanic voting-age population of 86.9%. A number of publicly submitted maps contain similar districts. (See Plans HPUBS0083, HPUBS0089, HPUBS0095, SPUBS0105, and SPUBS0155).

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

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:
None.
2. Expenditures:
3. 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.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

3. 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. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

None.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.


IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

None.

S000S9004



Florida House of Representatives
 Redistricting Committee
 402 S. Monroe Street
 House Office Building
 Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org




Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

S000S9004



Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



S000S9004




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



Redistricting Plan Data Report for S000S9004

Plan File Name: S000S9004						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:		464,088 to 475,858				City or District Split :		78 Split of 411 used									
District Deviation Range:		(-5,944) To 5,826				VTD's Split :		372 Split of 9,436 used									
Deviation:		(-1.26) To 1.23 Total 2.50%															

Number of Districts by Race Language						District				County				Count Blocks				Pop	
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+	9	Osceola			1			0						
Current Black VAP	8	6	3	2	1														
New Black VAP	8	6	4	2	0														
Current Hisp VAP	14	8	6	3	3														
New Hisp VAP	13	7	5	5	3														

Plan Name:		S000S9004		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	
S9004-Map	9,941	65,934	15.07%	8,602	216,308	3.97%	86.53%	30.48%	6,823	98,963	6.89%	68.62%	66.62%	2,034	2,095	4,068	
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	
S9004-Simple	9,126	65,923	13.84%				94.26%	30.47%				74.76%	66.61%				
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
S9004-Map	21	21	22	15	28	28	28	20	38	38	37	29
Current Map	24	24	24	18	32	32	31	24	41	41	39	32

Plan Name:	S000S9004			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
1	428	1,016	42.18%	319	8,077	3.95%	74.47%	12.58%	237	2,359	10.04%	55.27%	43.08%	51	101	103
2	541	5,630	9.61%	561	24,967	2.24%	103.73%	22.55%	394	7,678	5.13%	72.77%	73.33%	164	59	329
3	555	6,820	8.14%	401	12,751	3.14%	72.20%	53.48%	365	9,083	4.01%	65.69%	75.08%	85	133	170
4	397	1,852	21.45%	437	15,152	2.88%	110.07%	12.22%	297	3,978	7.46%	74.74%	46.56%	126	57	253
5	359	1,336	26.90%	182	2,632	6.92%	50.70%	50.78%	164	1,852	8.85%	45.60%	72.18%	43	50	87
6	542	8,291	6.54%	586	27,282	2.15%	108.11%	30.39%	433	10,971	3.94%	79.76%	75.57%	168	80	336
7	301	1,946	15.50%	305	7,386	4.13%	101.10%	26.35%	218	2,554	8.53%	72.21%	76.22%	73	68	146
8	301	1,009	29.83%	270	5,813	4.65%	89.92%	17.37%	207	1,703	12.15%	68.72%	59.29%	44	87	88
9	255	910	28.07%	157	1,964	8.01%	61.56%	46.35%	135	1,265	10.67%	52.81%	71.96%	41	34	83
10	181	594	30.53%	155	1,923	8.09%	85.68%	30.93%	121	904	13.38%	66.60%	65.80%	33	36	67
11	256	1,668	15.37%	242	4,649	5.20%	94.40%	35.88%	193	2,434	7.92%	75.25%	68.54%	57	54	115
12	134	508	26.41%	133	1,421	9.41%	99.66%	35.76%	106	711	14.90%	78.93%	71.49%	38	27	76
13	90	294	30.69%	82	537	15.31%	91.05%	54.79%	73	355	20.56%	80.77%	82.93%	19	22	38
14	252	1,918	13.15%	238	4,502	5.29%	94.46%	42.60%	189	2,456	7.69%	74.89%	78.09%	64	53	128
15	413	2,451	16.85%	284	6,408	4.43%	68.76%	38.26%	228	3,287	6.93%	55.17%	74.59%	75	62	151
16	125	312	40.24%	100	804	12.51%	80.13%	38.80%	87	475	18.31%	69.24%	65.72%	28	23	57
17	405	6,169	6.57%	399	12,664	3.15%	98.46%	48.71%	329	7,124	4.61%	81.11%	86.60%	112	85	224
18	208	363	57.29%	138	1,525	9.08%	66.53%	23.84%	115	818	14.05%	55.20%	44.45%	31	43	62
19	185	214	86.40%	107	909	11.77%	57.82%	23.56%	88	517	17.02%	47.52%	41.44%	28	29	56
20	354	2,519	14.09%	227	4,103	5.54%	64.09%	61.39%	213	3,215	6.62%	60.00%	78.35%	56	76	112
21	284	1,302	21.85%	210	3,513	5.98%	73.93%	37.05%	186	2,262	8.22%	65.36%	57.56%	57	60	114
22	137	345	39.64%	108	940	11.57%	79.40%	36.78%	84	488	17.21%	61.26%	70.87%	31	21	63
23	150	990	15.14%	177	2,494	7.10%	118.12%	39.72%	137	1,110	12.34%	91.31%	89.25%	39	42	79
24	201	350	57.51%	132	1,384	9.54%	65.44%	25.34%	105	619	16.96%	52.02%	56.68%	27	39	55
25	189	430	43.86%	176	2,478	7.12%	93.45%	17.38%	138	771	17.89%	73.01%	55.88%	18	58	37
26	195	1,332	14.67%	201	3,227	6.24%	103.11%	41.29%	167	1,633	10.22%	85.39%	81.61%	31	61	62
27	170	1,036	16.47%	156	1,954	8.02%	91.83%	53.05%	137	1,276	10.73%	80.20%	81.26%	33	44	66
28	178	815	21.83%	209	3,485	6.01%	117.70%	23.39%	159	1,016	15.64%	89.32%	80.25%	32	66	64
29	158	97	162.79%	152	1,853	8.24%	96.11%	5.26%	111	398	27.88%	69.85%	24.52%	13	50	27
30	79	134	59.40%	81	526	15.45%	102.22%	25.45%	61	164	37.19%	76.59%	81.74%	8	27	16
31	97	164	59.26%	86	600	14.47%	89.10%	27.42%	66	257	25.68%	67.67%	64.03%	24	14	49
32	58	110	52.89%	52	217	24.03%	89.94%	50.51%	45	129	34.88%	77.31%	85.28%	11	14	22
33	48	78	61.99%	40	132	30.83%	83.35%	59.67%	36	92	39.13%	73.54%	85.82%	10	10	20
34	250	2,693	9.28%	234	4,367	5.36%	93.77%	61.66%	210	2,941	7.14%	83.99%	91.57%	46	69	93
35	127	399	31.76%	132	1,385	9.52%	103.91%	28.86%	101	552	18.29%	79.49%	72.45%	25	35	50

S000S9004 Compactness of Populations within Districts													
	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 Hisp	Route/Straight Line	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic
1	29.87	30.20	30.02	29.12	37.38	37.73	37.30	36.57	1.65	43.77	44.06	43.13	43.38
2	54.81	55.00	57.24	54.76	67.58	67.84	69.40	67.24	1.58	73.60	73.83	74.05	72.92
3	49.78	49.32	55.80	47.43	62.78	62.23	69.59	60.08	1.57	77.61	77.06	83.85	73.79
4	43.97	43.91	42.91	42.48	54.53	54.48	52.61	52.51	1.57	73.90	73.82	71.28	72.22
5	14.72	14.67	13.80	13.13	21.52	21.47	20.16	19.38	1.87	28.66	28.61	27.01	26.23
6	32.22	32.20	30.80	31.29	42.14	42.13	39.94	40.68	1.63	54.12	54.16	51.20	52.07
7	23.75	23.75	23.87	22.83	32.60	32.54	32.64	32.28	1.72	41.38	41.30	41.57	41.70
8	35.50	35.36	35.64	35.33	43.69	43.52	44.03	43.55	1.53	49.64	49.54	49.38	49.20
9	17.06	17.12	17.35	17.03	24.05	24.10	24.26	23.97	1.77	33.65	33.66	33.78	33.59
10	12.69	12.75	12.37	12.92	18.20	18.27	17.65	18.50	1.88	26.18	26.26	25.36	26.41
11	20.85	20.89	26.64	21.35	28.05	28.09	35.70	28.75	1.66	40.33	40.38	47.83	41.17
12	12.63	12.70	12.15	11.79	18.30	18.39	17.62	17.10	1.86	28.88	28.98	27.88	27.16
13	7.63	7.62	7.11	7.18	10.81	10.80	9.91	10.12	1.71	21.86	21.86	20.50	20.65
14	27.62	27.69	27.80	28.12	35.28	35.30	35.37	35.50	1.62	50.55	50.59	50.47	51.03
15	24.94	24.88	24.95	24.86	36.34	36.27	36.20	36.20	1.89	47.49	47.49	47.10	47.08
16	8.88	8.91	8.70	9.20	12.16	12.20	12.32	12.62	1.64	22.50	22.53	22.33	22.72
17	50.14	49.84	52.09	49.40	64.74	64.46	66.71	63.49	1.67	80.09	79.90	81.40	78.53
18	16.94	16.89	16.91	16.72	23.60	23.55	23.45	23.31	1.87	29.05	29.00	28.69	28.97
19	12.06	12.07	11.74	12.46	17.52	17.53	16.95	17.96	1.96	25.14	25.12	24.44	25.53
20	25.91	25.81	25.95	25.90	36.22	36.12	35.54	36.34	1.71	52.20	52.12	50.50	51.96
21	25.84	25.52	31.61	27.37	35.34	34.91	42.17	37.03	1.76	42.90	42.55	48.27	43.85
22	8.63	8.60	8.73	8.80	13.09	13.04	13.25	13.43	1.94	23.09	23.02	23.11	23.29
23	17.36	17.34	18.93	18.12	23.23	23.18	25.10	24.04	1.58	33.28	33.30	34.46	33.40
24	12.72	12.67	13.52	12.48	18.92	18.85	19.88	18.60	2.02	28.56	28.40	30.07	28.24
25	22.74	22.75	21.67	22.82	27.35	27.38	26.25	27.32	1.41	33.07	33.14	31.87	32.69
26	15.82	15.83	15.67	16.58	21.55	21.54	21.38	22.65	1.69	30.52	30.56	29.84	31.33
27	14.68	14.78	13.39	14.41	20.25	20.36	18.76	20.00	1.68	30.40	30.54	28.25	29.82
28	21.09	21.14	20.33	20.35	27.37	27.44	26.27	26.28	1.60	38.25	38.43	36.63	36.60
29	19.20	19.16	18.86	20.20	22.53	22.48	22.20	23.46	1.55	26.94	26.90	26.71	27.52
30	8.03	8.04	7.82	8.08	11.24	11.27	10.92	11.22	1.72	18.93	18.99	18.43	18.81
31	7.19	7.17	7.52	7.40	10.66	10.63	11.20	11.01	1.90	18.83	18.81	19.29	19.33
32	5.47	5.48	5.25	5.37	8.35	8.37	7.99	8.18	1.95	16.28	16.32	15.84	16.05
33	4.69	4.70	4.53	4.90	7.01	7.02	6.81	7.28	2.00	14.47	14.48	14.14	14.85
34	24.48	24.34	26.41	26.22	34.18	33.97	35.95	36.60	1.88	41.72	41.52	43.73	43.44
35	13.10	12.87	13.87	13.02	18.32	18.02	19.17	18.20	1.75	27.98	27.66	28.25	27.75
36	4.97	4.94	5.47	4.90	7.27	7.24	8.02	7.20	1.80	13.81	13.77	14.51	13.70

S000S9004 Compactness of Populations within Districts													
Straight line in miles apart							Miles to drive by fastest route						
Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Black	VAP Black	VAP Black	VAP Black	Route/Straight Line	Pop	VAP
37	21.22	21.17	21.16	21.06	30.31	30.26	30.08	29.84	1.75	42.66	41.69	41.54	41.54
38	5.29	5.27	5.83	5.22	7.99	7.96	8.69	7.90	1.94	15.85	16.74	15.72	15.72
39	51.42	52.31	40.13	49.40	68.57	69.77	52.37	66.15	1.77	80.16	61.55	76.86	76.86
40	4.64	4.63	5.41	4.53	6.92	6.89	8.05	6.74	1.90	13.82	13.80	15.84	13.54

S000S9004 - Basic Data																
			Voting Age Population						Split Geography			District Core				
District	Total Pop	Deviation	TVAP	Black	%Black	Hispanic	%Hispanic	County	City	VTD	Core Dist	TPOP Core	%TPOP Dist	VAP Core	Black Core	Hisp Core
1	468,434	-1,598	349,448	167,219	47.85	20,525	5.87	5	7	71	1	327,870	69.99%	244,059	139,249	12,957
2	474,167	4,135	366,807	53,008	14.45	13,004	3.54	5	1	13	2	391,397	82.54%	300,880	39,048	10,210
3	467,982	-2,050	378,398	35,104	9.27	23,023	6.08	1	0	2	3	328,024	70.09%	266,851	21,439	16,273
4	474,110	4,078	372,854	46,758	12.54	19,363	5.19	5	1	13	4	407,583	85.96%	320,271	27,420	17,022
5	464,302	-5,730	362,771	39,634	10.92	24,743	6.82	1	1	34	5	204,728	44.09%	159,743	11,320	7,675
6	474,408	4,376	378,559	112,073	29.60	20,028	5.29	0	0	0	6	386,717	81.51%	308,197	94,556	16,492
7	464,457	-5,575	369,255	26,513	7.18	38,743	10.49	3	2	5	7	178,337	38.39%	145,607	5,991	10,125
8	468,479	-1,553	376,583	24,113	6.40	21,020	5.58	4	7	30	8	325,489	69.47%	263,532	17,457	15,319
9	468,249	-1,783	371,467	28,840	7.76	50,933	13.71	3	10	28	9	204,521	43.67%	160,228	11,674	23,516
10	465,322	-4,710	352,335	40,351	11.45	61,019	17.31	0	2	12	10	359,802	77.32%	269,171	26,434	48,820
11	472,059	2,027	380,467	20,405	5.36	32,728	8.60	2	1	4	11	253,753	53.75%	206,434	5,523	16,493
12	474,443	4,411	365,751	25,301	6.91	69,711	19.05	2	1	0	12	317,794	66.98%	242,488	18,487	54,766
13	471,128	1,096	388,385	21,661	5.57	28,873	7.43	0	0	8	13	239,698	50.87%	198,783	13,577	15,775
14	466,721	-3,311	366,631	56,238	15.33	26,867	7.32	0	0	0	14	275,856	59.10%	225,936	42,830	17,562
15	469,059	-973	361,986	37,468	10.35	55,145	15.23	3	7	23	15	244,783	52.18%	190,941	17,458	27,269
16	471,361	1,329	390,337	19,346	4.95	29,669	7.60	2	3	8	16	276,905	58.74%	223,877	12,104	20,261
17	466,866	-3,166	361,543	42,340	11.71	63,330	17.51	4	4	15	17	309,771	66.35%	240,145	27,673	45,135
18	464,088	-5,944	346,490	129,330	37.32	95,313	27.50	3	6	6	18	355,160	76.52%	264,527	115,662	67,516
19	466,120	-3,912	344,136	137,717	40.01	71,345	20.73	2	11	27	19	227,972	48.90%	165,310	94,540	33,532
20	470,377	345	384,365	35,090	9.12	25,470	6.62	4	5	16	20	212,338	45.14%	183,004	10,132	7,889
21	468,011	-2,021	366,802	30,931	8.43	42,948	11.70	3	4	12	21	276,705	59.12%	223,018	10,467	21,307
22	474,019	3,987	370,193	30,723	8.29	61,968	16.73	2	5	11	22	282,804	59.66%	222,503	18,275	38,138
23	464,437	-5,595	392,372	16,631	4.23	24,115	6.14	1	1	0	23	413,208	88.96%	350,613	13,728	20,349
24	468,795	-1,237	345,870	49,636	14.35	174,777	50.53	3	5	22	19	214,857	45.83%	160,193	20,878	87,737
25	464,779	-5,253	396,118	26,289	6.63	43,854	11.07	2	14	5	25	382,222	82.23%	326,823	21,844	36,102
26	473,083	3,051	379,104	35,258	9.30	30,947	8.16	2	0	3	26	265,429	56.10%	212,389	16,276	18,438
27	465,021	-5,011	377,724	32,199	8.52	55,295	14.63	2	1	5	27	256,622	55.18%	209,215	10,845	31,716
28	470,518	486	380,639	40,356	10.60	37,661	9.89	4	3	11	28	321,653	68.36%	264,031	16,562	24,550
29	473,576	3,544	359,129	200,050	55.70	55,556	15.46	2	16	7	29	376,245	79.44%	280,104	179,493	38,536
30	472,215	2,183	381,802	42,985	11.25	79,380	20.79	0	4	7	30	263,694	55.84%	220,829	18,083	35,968
31	475,858	5,826	371,503	52,744	14.19	115,204	31.01	0	9	0	31	332,582	69.89%	265,708	32,399	74,535
32	473,481	3,449	368,721	78,694	21.34	77,936	21.13	0	4	0	32	390,970	82.57%	300,919	67,490	64,722
33	473,799	3,767	351,969	203,270	57.75	98,527	27.99	2	6	4	33	231,652	48.89%	171,439	120,040	42,596
34	474,917	4,885	353,708	48,806	13.79	86,082	24.33	2	7	4	34	137,629	28.97%	98,450	8,226	39,587
35	475,801	5,769	385,170	37,166	9.64	194,648	50.53	0	7	6	35	299,585	62.96%	251,947	19,416	121,059
36	474,853	4,821	387,321	21,066	5.43	323,164	83.43	0	4	9	36	315,150	66.36%	257,410	13,462	222,076

S000S9004 - Basic Data																
			Voting Age Population					Split Geography			District Core					
District	Total Pop	Deviation	TVAP	Black	%Black	Hispanic	%Hispanic	County	City	VTD	Core Dist	TPOP Core	%TPOP Dist	VAP Core	Black Core	Hisp Core
37	464,518	-5,514	378,183	15,293	4.04	60,940	16.11	2	1	8	37	395,303	85.09%	324,676	12,612	51,742
38	475,223	5,191	370,963	19,573	5.27	309,691	83.48	0	1	6	38	312,002	65.65%	245,965	10,836	206,342
39	469,142	-890	346,753	121,760	35.11	137,136	39.54	2	6	13	39	352,752	75.19%	259,870	76,089	106,061
40	467,132	-2,900	366,607	30,498	8.31	318,501	86.87	0	1	2	40	395,005	84.55%	310,787	14,226	279,622

S000S9004 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
1	1	327,870	69.99%	244,059	57.05%	83.27%	5.30%	63.12%	0.54%	1.43%
	5	117,390	25.06%	86,718	26.62%	13.80%	7.66%	32.38%	0.66%	1.54%
	7	12,499	2.66%	10,006	27.26%	1.63%	4.32%	2.10%	3.61%	4.11%
	8	10,675	2.27%	8,665	24.84%	1.28%	5.62%	2.37%	0.64%	1.25%
2	2	391,397	82.54%	300,880	12.97%	73.66%	3.39%	78.51%	0.16%	0.58%
	6	56,725	11.96%	45,461	25.36%	21.75%	4.18%	14.63%	0.17%	0.58%
	4	26,045	5.49%	20,466	11.87%	4.58%	4.35%	6.85%	0.02%	0.74%
3	3	328,024	70.09%	266,851	8.03%	61.07%	6.09%	70.68%	0.11%	0.73%
	14	130,586	27.90%	103,240	13.15%	38.68%	6.35%	28.48%	0.04%	0.40%
	11	9,372	2.00%	8,307	1.02%	0.24%	2.29%	0.82%	0%	0.16%
4	4	407,583	85.96%	320,271	8.56%	58.64%	5.31%	87.90%	0.10%	0.43%
	2	58,505	12.33%	46,579	34.51%	34.37%	4.54%	10.93%	0.34%	1.31%
	6	8,022	1.69%	6,004	54.34%	6.97%	3.71%	1.15%	0.10%	0.65%
5	5	204,728	44.09%	159,743	7.08%	28.56%	4.80%	31.01%	0.06%	0.39%
	8	189,510	40.81%	148,336	12.95%	48.47%	7.84%	47.03%	0.21%	1.01%
	1	70,064	15.09%	54,692	16.64%	22.96%	9.92%	21.94%	0.19%	0.69%
6	6	386,717	81.51%	308,197	30.68%	84.37%	5.35%	82.34%	0.44%	1.51%
	3	87,691	18.48%	70,362	24.89%	15.62%	5.02%	17.65%	0.14%	0.58%
	7	178,337	38.39%	145,607	4.11%	22.59%	6.95%	26.13%	0.14%	0.54%
7	20	157,242	33.85%	121,868	9.52%	43.79%	17.55%	55.22%	0.54%	1.51%
	24	120,969	26.04%	95,570	9.21%	33.22%	7.25%	17.88%	0.02%	1.25%
	26	7,899	1.70%	6,203	1.61%	0.37%	4.67%	0.74%	0%	0%
	1	10	0.00%	7	0%	0%	14.28%	0.00%	0%	0.75%
	8	325,489	69.47%	263,532	6.62%	72.39%	5.81%	72.87%	0.14%	0.76%
8	7	79,955	17.06%	68,671	6.62%	18.86%	4.46%	14.57%	0.25%	1.28%
	5	37,579	8.02%	25,370	4.24%	4.46%	5.72%	6.90%	0.04%	0.12%
	1	25,456	5.43%	19,010	5.41%	4.27%	6.23%	5.64%	0.48%	1.52%
	9	204,521	43.67%	160,228	7.28%	40.47%	14.67%	46.17%	0.45%	1.71%
9	20	146,528	31.29%	115,365	9.34%	37.36%	11.98%	27.13%	0.29%	1.64%
	22	70,838	15.12%	58,696	6.21%	12.65%	12.09%	13.93%	0.16%	0.78%
	19	26,282	5.61%	22,834	5.43%	4.29%	11.94%	5.35%	0%	0.48%
	15	20,080	4.28%	14,344	10.45%	5.19%	26.27%	7.39%	1.57%	3.51%
10	10	359,802	77.32%	269,171	9.82%	65.51%	18.13%	80.00%	0.26%	1.47%
	12	98,726	21.21%	77,150	16.29%	31.15%	14.70%	18.59%	0.71%	2.85%
	18	6,794	1.46%	6,014	22.36%	3.33%	14.15%	1.39%	0.96%	2.10%
11	11	253,753	53.75%	206,434	2.67%	27.06%	7.98%	50.39%	0.04%	0.52%
	15	120,751	25.57%	95,991	6.93%	32.61%	8.37%	24.55%	0.06%	0.24%

S000S9004 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
	12	71,731	15.19%	55,828	4.82%	13.20%	10.41%	17.76%	0.09%	0.34%
	20	25,824	5.47%	22,214	24.90%	27.11%	10.73%	7.28%	0.51%	1.11%
12	12	317,794	66.98%	242,488	7.62%	73.06%	22.58%	78.56%	0.23%	1.64%
	10	73,792	15.55%	59,572	5.53%	13.02%	9.38%	8.02%	0.08%	0.71%
	16	60,733	12.80%	46,091	6.94%	12.64%	18.32%	12.11%	0.25%	1.15%
	11	21,787	4.59%	17,338	1.52%	1.04%	4.68%	1.16%	0%	0.10%
	18	337	0.07%	262	20.99%	0.21%	35.49%	0.13%	0.4%	1.6%
13	13	239,698	50.87%	198,783	6.83%	62.67%	7.93%	54.63%	0.00%	0.20%
	11	148,749	31.57%	122,338	2.56%	14.48%	5.21%	22.10%	0.01%	0.25%
	16	82,681	17.54%	67,264	7.35%	22.83%	9.98%	23.25%	0.27%	0.45%
14	14	275,856	59.10%	225,936	18.95%	76.15%	7.77%	65.36%	0.45%	1.34%
	5	155,672	33.35%	113,837	10.42%	21.11%	7.37%	31.24%	0.46%	0.95%
	7	35,193	7.54%	26,858	5.71%	2.72%	3.38%	3.38%	0%	0.35%
15	15	244,783	52.18%	190,941	9.14%	46.59%	14.28%	49.44%	0.61%	1.64%
	17	112,965	24.08%	88,229	14.98%	35.29%	10.46%	16.74%	1.20%	2.02%
	24	52,049	11.09%	38,812	11.05%	11.45%	27.44%	19.31%	0.14%	2.96%
	26	34,342	7.32%	25,527	3.95%	2.69%	15.84%	7.33%	0%	0.04%
	9	15,189	3.23%	11,599	3.93%	1.21%	17.13%	3.60%	0.01%	0.36%
	19	7,957	1.69%	5,697	8.86%	1.34%	29.52%	3.05%	0%	0.24%
	10	1,774	0.37%	1,181	44.36%	1.39%	23.37%	0.50%	1.61%	4.03%
16	16	276,905	58.74%	223,877	5.40%	62.56%	9.05%	68.29%	0.05%	0.38%
	13	154,727	32.82%	132,088	2.39%	16.35%	4.91%	21.87%	0.05%	0.26%
	18	39,729	8.42%	34,372	11.86%	21.07%	8.48%	9.83%	0.62%	1.84%
17	17	309,771	66.35%	240,145	11.52%	65.35%	18.79%	71.26%	0.22%	0.80%
	28	105,503	22.59%	78,681	14.93%	27.76%	18.74%	23.28%	2.70%	5.67%
	23	22,794	4.88%	19,167	8.66%	3.92%	6.57%	1.98%	1.62%	5.79%
	21	22,365	4.79%	18,460	6.32%	2.75%	4.88%	1.42%	0.85%	3.50%
	27	5,775	1.23%	4,480	1.83%	0.19%	27.76%	1.96%	0.15%	1.07%
	26	658	0.14%	610	0.49%	0.00%	7.21%	0.06%	1.88%	7.25%
18	18	355,160	76.52%	264,527	43.72%	89.43%	25.52%	70.83%	1.38%	3.26%
	10	46,928	10.11%	33,869	18.98%	4.97%	23.45%	8.33%	0.66%	2.98%
	12	43,708	9.41%	33,802	16.56%	4.32%	38.90%	13.79%	0.44%	2.35%
	16	11,597	2.49%	9,560	8.02%	0.59%	55.24%	5.54%	0.04%	0.77%
	21	6,354	1.36%	4,414	17.78%	0.60%	32.01%	1.48%	6.84%	7.40%
	13	341	0.07%	318	27.98%	0.06%	1.88%	0.00%	0%	0.22%
19	19	227,972	48.90%	165,310	57.18%	68.64%	20.28%	46.99%	9.26%	15.84%
	9	167,059	35.84%	125,455	21.26%	19.37%	22.58%	39.71%	1.60%	4.10%

S000S9004 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
	22	61,388	13.16%	46,518	32.13%	10.85%	17.65%	11.51%	0.53%	1.86%
	20	9,701	2.08%	6,853	22.61%	1.12%	18.45%	1.77%	0.23%	1.28%
20	20	212,338	45.14%	183,004	5.53%	28.87%	4.31%	30.97%	0.12%	0.59%
	7	126,570	26.90%	98,794	7.28%	20.50%	7.21%	27.98%	0.02%	0.58%
	3	79,366	16.87%	60,719	11.23%	19.44%	12.85%	30.65%	0.07%	1.33%
	14	51,047	10.85%	40,951	26.63%	31.08%	6.43%	10.34%	0.05%	0.25%
	1	1,056	0.22%	897	3.67%	0.09%	1.11%	0.03%	0%	0.98%
21	21	276,705	59.12%	223,018	4.69%	33.83%	9.55%	49.61%	0.77%	1.15%
	10	83,625	17.86%	60,578	22.02%	43.14%	19.34%	27.28%	0.19%	0.79%
	15	74,529	15.92%	56,965	9.60%	17.69%	13.75%	18.24%	0.20%	0.75%
	17	27,952	5.97%	21,704	6.69%	4.69%	8.03%	4.06%	0.12%	0.22%
	18	2,802	0.59%	2,254	8.29%	0.60%	13.79%	0.72%	0.46%	0.52%
	23	2,398	0.51%	2,283	0.26%	0.01%	1.18%	0.06%	0%	0.70%
22	22	282,804	59.66%	222,503	8.21%	59.48%	17.14%	61.54%	0.31%	2.02%
	24	118,880	25.07%	92,469	9.71%	29.23%	18.90%	28.20%	0.33%	1.80%
	9	47,761	10.07%	36,457	5.34%	6.34%	11.49%	6.76%	0.33%	1.37%
	20	24,574	5.18%	18,764	8.07%	4.93%	11.51%	3.48%	0.17%	0.83%
23	23	413,208	88.96%	350,613	3.91%	82.54%	5.80%	84.38%	0.36%	0.97%
	21	51,229	11.03%	41,759	6.95%	17.45%	9.01%	15.61%	0.06%	0.87%
24	19	214,857	45.83%	160,193	13.03%	42.06%	54.76%	50.19%	0.87%	3.11%
	15	100,627	21.46%	70,216	22.44%	31.74%	49.58%	19.92%	3.51%	7.69%
	9	92,905	19.81%	70,028	10.49%	14.79%	46.21%	18.51%	1.38%	3.08%
	26	27,297	5.82%	20,225	11.91%	4.85%	48.21%	5.57%	1.13%	3.27%
	24	24,702	5.26%	19,238	11.93%	4.62%	38.98%	4.29%	1.22%	3.60%
	22	4,733	1.00%	3,642	10.62%	0.77%	43.35%	0.90%	1.50%	3.38%
	17	3,674	0.78%	2,328	24.14%	1.13%	44.11%	0.58%	2.00%	4.27%
25	25	382,222	82.23%	326,823	6.68%	83.09%	11.04%	82.32%	1.76%	2.85%
	28	54,116	11.64%	44,269	1.83%	3.08%	9.12%	9.21%	0.07%	0.87%
	29	20,070	4.31%	18,120	10.55%	7.27%	14.58%	6.02%	3.29%	4.65%
	27	8,371	1.80%	6,906	24.93%	6.55%	15.47%	2.43%	5.39%	8.77%
26	26	265,429	56.10%	212,389	7.66%	46.16%	8.68%	59.57%	1.00%	3.01%
	24	207,654	43.89%	166,715	11.38%	53.83%	7.50%	40.42%	0.16%	1.11%
27	27	256,622	55.18%	209,215	5.18%	33.68%	15.15%	57.35%	0.67%	2.06%
	21	104,498	22.47%	83,240	7.61%	19.68%	13.81%	20.79%	1.65%	2.24%
	37	83,971	18.05%	67,201	21.57%	45.03%	17.11%	20.79%	3.45%	3.96%
	23	19,930	4.28%	18,068	2.86%	1.60%	3.22%	1.05%	0%	0.89%
28	28	321,653	68.36%	264,031	6.27%	41.03%	9.29%	65.18%	0.92%	2.04%

S000S9004 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
	26	146,267	31.08%	114,075	20.83%	58.90%	11.45%	34.69%	2.46%	3.84%
	17	2,598	0.55%	2,533	0.82%	0.05%	1.77%	0.11%	0%	0%
29	29	376,245	79.44%	280,104	64.08%	89.72%	13.75%	69.36%	13.55%	22.63%
	32	35,091	7.40%	27,698	48.15%	6.66%	13.63%	6.80%	4.91%	24.78%
	31	33,364	7.04%	28,260	10.94%	1.54%	22.18%	11.28%	2.41%	4.46%
	30	10,630	2.24%	8,708	24.52%	1.06%	19.03%	2.98%	8.53%	10.05%
	27	8,843	1.86%	6,890	7.03%	0.24%	66.73%	8.27%	0.39%	1.43%
	25	8,070	1.70%	6,475	13.32%	0.43%	8.84%	1.03%	6.90%	8.31%
	34	1,333	0.28%	994	64.38%	0.31%	14.38%	0.25%	25.71%	52.62%
30	30	263,694	55.84%	220,829	8.18%	42.06%	16.28%	45.31%	3.95%	5.55%
	27	207,692	43.98%	160,302	15.45%	57.65%	27.01%	54.55%	5.27%	7.97%
	29	829	0.17%	671	18.03%	0.28%	16.39%	0.13%	8.37%	10.18%
31	31	332,582	69.89%	265,708	12.19%	61.42%	28.05%	64.69%	1.71%	5.14%
	34	140,880	29.60%	103,977	19.40%	38.25%	38.17%	34.45%	4.29%	10.66%
	35	2,396	0.50%	1,818	9.35%	0.32%	53.46%	0.84%	1.90%	5.49%
32	32	390,970	82.57%	300,919	22.42%	85.76%	21.50%	83.04%	5.27%	11.76%
	30	50,773	10.72%	41,587	12.32%	6.51%	15.48%	8.26%	4.83%	6.88%
	34	31,738	6.70%	26,215	23.19%	7.72%	25.83%	8.69%	4.06%	14.14%
33	33	231,652	48.89%	171,439	70.01%	59.05%	24.84%	43.23%	19.56%	28.38%
	35	133,230	28.11%	99,287	44.84%	21.90%	30.21%	30.44%	16.39%	25.60%
	31	60,362	12.74%	45,723	40.15%	9.03%	36.20%	16.80%	6.62%	17.53%
	34	48,404	10.21%	35,369	57.29%	9.96%	26.43%	9.48%	10.94%	31.35%
	40	151	0.03%	151	50.99%	0.03%	18.54%	0.02%	1.26%	3.53%
34	34	137,629	28.97%	98,450	8.35%	16.85%	40.21%	45.98%	1.09%	4.55%
	30	133,606	28.13%	104,386	5.98%	12.79%	13.76%	16.69%	1.47%	3.36%
	27	64,252	13.52%	48,292	17.42%	17.24%	23.32%	13.08%	2.70%	6.21%
	28	63,813	13.43%	47,533	15.79%	15.38%	17.20%	9.49%	1.89%	7.20%
	25	38,106	8.02%	27,963	14.90%	8.53%	19.56%	6.35%	1.32%	4.96%
	39	28,333	5.96%	20,094	65.39%	26.92%	24.48%	5.71%	6.60%	11.40%
	31	6,341	1.33%	4,825	16.82%	1.66%	35.87%	2.01%	1.00%	6.93%
	32	2,837	0.59%	2,165	13.53%	0.60%	25.81%	0.64%	0.56%	7.52%
35	35	299,585	62.96%	251,947	7.70%	52.24%	48.04%	62.19%	2.17%	3.39%
	36	90,686	19.05%	70,011	7.12%	13.42%	56.04%	20.15%	0.79%	3.18%
	39	77,453	16.27%	56,740	19.00%	29.01%	57.05%	16.63%	2.37%	6.12%
	33	8,077	1.69%	6,472	30.51%	5.31%	30.54%	1.01%	20.60%	26.02%
36	36	315,150	66.36%	257,410	5.22%	63.90%	86.27%	68.71%	0.59%	0.97%
	38	112,357	23.66%	90,582	2.81%	12.09%	80.77%	22.63%	0.25%	1.01%

S000S9004 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
	33	23,064	4.85%	18,536	15.48%	13.62%	88.87%	5.09%	0.62%	2.07%
	39	12,167	2.56%	10,072	16.04%	7.67%	38.40%	1.19%	0.10%	1.58%
	40	8,465	1.78%	7,241	2.95%	1.01%	94.48%	2.11%	0%	0%
	35	3,650	0.76%	3,480	10.22%	1.68%	21.29%	0.22%	0.28%	2.78%
37	37	395,303	85.09%	324,676	3.88%	82.46%	15.93%	84.90%	1.75%	2.35%
	21	68,719	14.79%	53,046	5.01%	17.38%	17.30%	15.06%	0.53%	1.02%
	39	496	0.10%	461	4.98%	0.15%	4.33%	0.03%	2.95%	5.91%
38	38	312,002	65.65%	245,965	4.40%	55.36%	83.89%	66.62%	0.67%	2.31%
	34	108,464	22.82%	81,351	8.10%	33.68%	78.43%	20.60%	1.11%	3.96%
	40	44,867	9.44%	36,003	2.69%	4.95%	94.12%	10.94%	0.49%	1.41%
	39	9,890	2.08%	7,644	15.35%	5.99%	73.99%	1.82%	3.70%	8.40%
39	39	352,752	75.19%	259,870	29.27%	62.49%	40.81%	77.34%	3.58%	6.32%
	33	71,470	15.23%	52,589	75.22%	32.48%	22.47%	8.62%	21.76%	25.37%
	38	18,451	3.93%	13,357	7.63%	0.83%	52.21%	5.08%	1.14%	1.93%
	36	12,782	2.72%	10,183	35.66%	2.98%	58.58%	4.35%	4.54%	7.11%
	34	12,717	2.71%	10,149	12.32%	1.02%	58.56%	4.33%	1.53%	4.24%
	37	915	0.19%	562	36.29%	0.16%	59.07%	0.24%	12.29%	12.56%
	40	55	0.01%	43	11.62%	0.00%	83.72%	0.02%	0.74%	1.43%
40	40	395,005	84.55%	310,787	4.57%	46.64%	89.97%	87.79%	0.28%	0.63%
	33	70,027	14.99%	54,307	28.01%	49.88%	70.72%	12.05%	4.30%	7.89%
	39	2,092	0.44%	1,506	70.05%	3.45%	31.00%	0.14%	2.06%	2.06%
	36	8	0.00%	7	28.57%	0.00%	85.71%	0.00%	0%	1.19%

S000S9004 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).	
1	Counties Duval 3 378,678 of 864,263, Flagler 2 6,813 of 95,696, Putnam 2 18,899 of 74,364, St. Johns 2 24,920 of 190,039, Volusia 3 39,124 of 494,593
	Cities Bunnell 2 1637 of 2676, Daytona Beach 2 32029 of 61005, Hastings, Holly Hill 2 0 of 11659, Jacksonville 3 378678 of 821784, Palatka, Palm Coast 2 0 of 75180, St. Augustine 2 3099 of 12975, South Daytona 2 1781 of 12252
	Vtd's 120310006 2 3533 of 4669, 120310017 2 1904 of 3287, 120310021 2 625 of 3827, 120310027 2 2837 of 3342, 120310029 2 1760 of 2235, 120310030 2 2782 of 3277, 120310069 2 1817 of 3789, 120310072 2 846 of 3142, 120310075 2 3796 of 4156, 120310078 2 22 of 2680, 120310084 2 44 of 2929, 120310097 2 659 of 2590, 120310101 2 658 of 2226, 120310102 2 146 of 3389, 120310115 2 319 of 1695, 120310157 2 1354 of 3203, 120310163 2 453 of 574, 120310164 2 1324 of 1491, 120310168 2 2774 of 2780, 120310172 2 310 of 1871, 120310177 2 3382 of 4474, 120310181 2 2543 of 2619, 120310184 2 535 of 752, 120310192 2 2233 of 2370, 120310198 2 1095 of 2675, 120310215 2 3791 of 3981, 120310223 2 2455 of 2769, 120310228 2 791 of 2720, 120310241 2 8726 of 9487, 120310269 2 1150 of 3627, 120310275 2 995 of 2522, 120310278 2 4155 of 4218, 120310280 2 2483 of 3580, 120310287 2 2931 of 3368, 120350002 2 1785 of 2636, 120350006 2 446 of 477, 120350018 2 184 of 200, 121070020 2 925 of 1110, 121070021 2 2478 of 3299, 121070022 2 216 of 1322, 121070046 2 49 of 317, 121070057 2 803 of 826, 121070068 2 100 of 1662, 121070069 2 731 of 1041, 121070100 2 45 of 2534, 121090003 2 2326 of 3228, 121090007 2 1208 of 4195, 121090009 2 1505 of 3742, 121090010 2 1006 of 1083, 121090015 2 1699 of 4903, 121090018 2 2040 of 2292, 121090019 2 282 of 6536, 121090020 2 1298 of 2996, 121090022 2 3783 of 4275, 121090023 2 32 of 1729, 121090024 2 1888 of 2112, 121090032 2 81 of 4750, 121090043 2 157 of 2166, 121270012 2 1646 of 3224, 121270143 2 428 of 3417, 121270145 2 20 of 22, 121270148 3 3038 of 3480, 121270149 2 2844 of 3384, 121270152 2 1458 of 3799, 121270154 2 2610 of 3063, 121270157 2 9 of 3878, 121270159 2 938 of 4346, 121270160 2 4853 of 6055, 121270161 2 3604 of 5022, 121270169 2 1781 of 4363, 121270182 3 71 of 5623
2	Counties Bay 2 29,168 of 168,852, Escambia 2 171,872 of 297,619, Holmes, Jackson, Okaloosa 2 52,446 of 180,822, Santa Rosa 2 89,521 of 151,372, Walton 2 36,591 of 55,043, Washington
	Cities Alford, Bascom, Bonifay, Campbellton, Caryville, Century, Chipley, Cottondale, Crestview, De Funiak Springs, Ebro, Esto, Freeport, Graceville, Grand Ridge, Greenwood, Jacob City, Jay, Laurel Hill, Malone, Marianna, Milton, Noma, Panama City 2 1875 of 36484, Paxton, Ponce de Leon, Sneads, Vernon, Wausau, Westville
	Vtd's 120050021 2 2287 of 2368, 120050022 2 1783 of 1810, 120050024 2 4084 of 4250, 120050057 2 427 of 2048, 120330008 2 235 of 503, 120330122 2 8 of 833, 120330150 2 192 of 222, 120330218 2 2318 of 2894, 120330223 2 2046 of 2383, 120910008 2 2460 of 2465, 120910011 2 1444 of 2855, 120910072 2 2999 of 3129, 121310030 2 180 of 1308
3	Counties Baker, Citrus, Columbia, Dixie, Gilchrist, Lafayette, Levy, Marion 2 91,982 of 331,298, Suwannee, Union
	Cities Bell, Branford, Bronson, Cedar Key, Chiefland, Cross City, Crystal River, Dunnellon, Fanning Springs, Fort White, Glen St. Mary, Horseshoe Beach, Inglis, Inverness, Lake Butler, Lake City, Live Oak, Maccleenny, Mayo, Otter Creek, Raiford, Trenton, Williston, Worthington Springs, Yankeetown
	Vtd's 120830045 2 628 of 6503, 120830046 2 4335 of 4685
4	Counties Bay 2 139,684 of 168,852, Escambia 2 125,747 of 297,619, Okaloosa 2 128,376 of 180,822, Santa Rosa 2 61,851 of 151,372, Walton 2 18,452 of 55,043
	Cities Callaway, Cinco Bayou, Destin, Fort Walton Beach, Gulf Breeze, Lynn Haven, Mary Esther, Mexico Beach, Niceville, Panama City 2 34609 of 36484, Panama City Beach, Parker, Pensacola, Shalimar, Springfield, Valparaiso
	Vtd's 120050021 2 81 of 2368, 120050022 2 27 of 1810, 120050024 2 166 of 4250, 120050057 2 1621 of 2048, 120330008 2 268 of 503, 120330122 2 825 of 833, 120330150 2 30 of 222, 120330218 2 576 of 2894, 120330223 2 337 of 2383, 120910008 2 5 of 2465, 120910011 2 1411 of 2855, 120910072 2 130 of 3129, 121310030 2 1128 of 1308
5	Counties Duval 3 390,988 of 864,263, Nassau
	Cities Baldwin, Callahan, Fernandina Beach, Hilliard, Jacksonville 3 389563 of 821784
	Vtd's 120310006 2 1136 of 4669, 120310017 2 1383 of 3287, 120310021 2 3202 of 3827, 120310027 2 505 of 3342, 120310029 2 475 of 2235, 120310030 2 495 of 3277, 120310069 2 1972 of 3789, 120310072 2 2296 of 3142, 120310075 2 360 of 4156, 120310078 2 2658 of 2680, 120310084 2 2885 of 2929, 120310097 2 1931 of 2590, 120310101 2 1568 of 2226, 120310102 2 3243 of 3389, 120310115 2 1376 of 1695, 120310157 2 1849 of 3203, 120310163 2 121 of 574, 120310164 2 167 of 1491, 120310168 2 6 of 2780, 120310172 2 1561 of 1871, 120310177 2 1092 of 4474, 120310181 2 76 of 2619, 120310184 2 217 of 752, 120310192 2 137 of 2370, 120310198 2 1580 of 2675, 120310215 2 190 of 3981, 120310223 2 314 of 2769, 120310228 2 1929 of 2720, 120310241 2 761 of 9487, 120310269 2 2477 of 3627, 120310275 2 1527 of 2522, 120310278 2 63 of 4218, 120310280 2 1097 of 3580, 120310287 2 437 of 3368
6	Counties Calhoun, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Hamilton, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, Wakulla
	Cities Altha, Apalachicola, Blountstown, Bristol, Carrabelle, Chattahoochee, Greensboro, Greenville, Gretna, Havana, Jasper, Jennings, Lee, Madison, Midway, Monticello, Perry, Port St. Joe, Quincy, St. Marks, Sopchoppy, Tallahassee, Wewahatchka, White Springs
7	Counties Brevard 2 109,209 of 543,376, Orange 6 19,659 of 1,145,956, Volusia 3 335,589 of 494,593

S000S9004 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
	Cities	Daytona Beach Shores 2 839 of 4247, DeBary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange 2 56045 of 56048, Titusville
	Vtd's	121270012 2 1578 of 3224, 121270148 3 84 of 3480, 121270176 2 847 of 4235, 121270177 2 6785 of 6789, 121270182 3 5494 of 5623
8	Counties	Duval 3 94,597 of 864,263, Flagler 2 88,883 of 95,696, St. Johns 2 165,119 of 190,039, Volusia 3 119,880 of 494,593
	Cities	Atlantic Beach, Beverly Beach, Bunnell 2 1039 of 2676, Daytona Beach 2 28976 of 61005, Daytona Beach Shores 2 3408 of 4247, Flagler Beach, Holly Hill, Jacksonville 3 53543 of 821784, Jacksonville Beach, Marineland, Neptune Beach, Ormond Beach, Palm Coast, Port Orange 2 3 of 56048, St. Augustine 2 9876 of 12975, St. Augustine Beach, South Daytona 2 10471 of 12252
	Vtd's	120350002 2 851 of 2636, 120350006 2 31 of 477, 120350018 2 16 of 200, 121090003 2 902 of 3228, 121090007 2 2987 of 4195, 121090009 2 2237 of 3742, 121090010 2 77 of 1083, 121090015 2 3204 of 4903, 121090018 2 252 of 2292, 121090019 2 6254 of 6536, 121090020 2 1698 of 2996, 121090022 2 492 of 4275, 121090023 2 1697 of 1729, 121090024 2 224 of 2112, 121090032 2 4669 of 4750, 121090043 2 2009 of 2166, 121270143 2 2989 of 3417, 121270145 2 2 of 22, 121270148 3 358 of 3480, 121270149 2 540 of 3384, 121270152 2 2341 of 3799, 121270154 2 453 of 3063, 121270157 2 3869 of 3878, 121270159 2 3408 of 4346, 121270160 2 1202 of 6055, 121270161 2 1418 of 5022, 121270169 2 2582 of 4363, 121270176 2 3388 of 4235, 121270177 2 4 of 6789, 121270182 3 58 of 5623
9	Counties	Lake 2 166,608 of 297,052, Orange 6 301,641 of 1,145,956, Osceola 3 0 of 268,685
	Cities	Apopka 3 553 of 41542, Astatula, Bay Lake, Belle Isle, Clermont, Edgewood 2 1132 of 2503, Fruitland Park 2 0 of 4078, Groveland, Howey-in-the-Hills, Lake Buena Vista, Leesburg 2 7903 of 20117, Mascotte, Minneola, Montverde, Mount Dora, Oakland 2 2081 of 2538, Ocoee 2 9407 of 35579, Orlando 4 74281 of 238300, Tavares 2 8 of 13951, Windermere, Winter Garden 2 15299 of 34568, Winter Park 2 24208 of 27852
	Vtd's	120690054 2 104 of 4075, 120690059 2 6581 of 6666, 120950009 2 3301 of 3799, 120950020 2 2577 of 3326, 120950023 2 2862 of 5266, 120950030 2 1377 of 3496, 120950031 2 1549 of 3983, 120950035 2 4420 of 5565, 120950036 2 2930 of 4702, 120950040 2 3794 of 5494, 120950052 2 1471 of 1618, 120950058 2 2247 of 2416, 120950080 2 3277 of 3656, 120950084 2 9 of 4109, 120950087 2 72 of 5703, 120950088 2 3445 of 4838, 120950104 2 327 of 2358, 120950150 2 1542 of 3406, 120950163 2 437 of 5256, 120950172 2 1912 of 3877, 120950174 2 1744 of 4263, 120950219 2 729 of 3838, 120950224 3 1592 of 2255, 120950228 2 92 of 2522, 120950239 2 3709 of 3738, 120950241 2 4988 of 5367, 120950268 2 444 of 4767, 120950269 2 643 of 2889
10	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa 4 47131 of 335709, Temple Terrace 2 15136 of 24541
	Vtd's	120570102 2 214 of 4522, 120570295 2 1977 of 4074, 120570313 2 2168 of 2686, 120570334 2 4474 of 4680, 120570335 2 1895 of 2821, 120570338 2 3729 of 3740, 120570339 2 4678 of 4714, 120570353 2 3832 of 4049, 120570357 2 703 of 3002, 120570441 2 8724 of 9249, 120570445 2 203 of 558, 120570511 2 972 of 976
11	Counties	Hernando, Pasco 2 251,013 of 464,697, Sumter 2 48,268 of 93,420
	Cities	Brooksville, Bushnell, Center Hill, Coleman, Dade City, New Port Richey, Port Richey, St. Leo, San Antonio, Webster, Weeki Wachee, Wildwood 2 6669 of 6709
	Vtd's	121190003 2 23 of 105, 121190011 2 5162 of 5405, 121190021 2 2044 of 2208, 121190022 2 20 of 73
12	Counties	Hillsborough 5 260,759 of 1,229,226, Pasco 2 213,684 of 464,697
	Cities	Tampa 4 8968 of 335709, Zephyrhills
13	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Belleair, Belleair Bluffs, Clearwater, Dunedin, Largo, Oldsmar, Safety Harbor, Tarpon Springs
	Vtd's	121030111 2 1336 of 3255, 121030164 2 3048 of 3494, 121030165 2 126 of 333, 121030172 2 1908 of 3317, 121030178 2 2009 of 2563, 121030187 2 463 of 2156, 121030189 2 826 of 1026, 121030305 2 3420 of 3435
14	Counties	Alachua, Bradford, Clay
	Cities	Alachua, Archer, Brooker, Gainesville, Green Cove Springs, Hampton, Hawthorne, High Springs, Keystone Heights, La Crosse, Lawtey, Micanopy, Newberry, Orange Park, Penney Farms, Starke, Waldo
15	Counties	Orange 6 60,006 of 1,145,956, Osceola 3 83,783 of 268,685, Polk 4 325,270 of 602,095
	Cities	Auburndale, Davenport 2 2255 of 2888, Dundee, Haines City 2 8578 of 20535, Kissimmee 2 0 of 59682, Lake Alfred, Lake Hamilton, Lakeland 3 34382 of 97422, Lake Wales 2 3933 of 14225, Orlando 4 7367 of 238300, Polk City, St. Cloud 2 32421 of 35183, Winter Haven
	Vtd's	120950184 2 4181 of 5393, 120950190 2 1156 of 1438, 120950201 2 2517 of 3673, 120970029 2 1322 of 6774, 120970087 2 3555 of 3557, 120970099 2 522 of 7238, 120970100 2 1444 of 1956, 120970111 2 5610 of 6090, 120970114 2 4363 of 5567, 120970159 2 12 of 361, 121050032 2 1622 of 2659, 121050045 2 1272 of 1481,

S000S9004 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
		121050075 2 7534 of 7813, 121050079 2 2 of 7495, 121050080 2 13547 of 15990, 121050083 2 4421 of 5463, 121050084 2 2000 of 5598, 121050085 2 3182 of 3502, 121050103 2 3 of 2799, 121050107 2 1097 of 1297, 121050108 2 3151 of 5349, 121050123 2 534 of 1665, 121050136 2 4631 of 5081
16	Counties	Hillsborough 5 101,025 of 1,229,226, Pinellas 3 370,336 of 916,542
	Cities	Belleair Beach, Belleair Shore, Gulfport 2 8688 of 12029, Indian Rocks Beach, Indian Shores, Kenneth City, Madeira Beach, North Redington Beach, Pinellas Park, Redington Beach, Redington Shores, St. Pete Beach, St. Petersburg 2 173032 of 244769, Seminole, South Pasadena, Tampa 4 101025 of 335709, Treasure Island
	Vtd's	121030111 2 1919 of 3255, 121030164 2 446 of 3494, 121030165 2 207 of 333, 121030172 2 1409 of 3317, 121030178 2 554 of 2563, 121030187 2 1693 of 2156, 121030189 2 200 of 1026, 121030305 2 15 of 3435
17	Counties	Charlotte 3 41,886 of 159,978, DeSoto, Glades, Hardee, Highlands, Martin 2 19,537 of 146,318, Okeechobee, Polk 4 108,093 of 602,095, St. Lucie 2 83,091 of 277,789
	Cities	Arcadia, Avon Park, Bartow, Bowling Green, Eagle Lake, Fort Meade, Fort Pierce 2 146 of 41590, Frostproof, Highland Park, Hillcrest Heights, Lakeland 3 0 of 97422, Lake Placid, Lake Wales 2 10292 of 14225, Moore Haven, Okeechobee, Port St. Lucie 2 73745 of 164603, Sebring, Wauchula, Zolfo Springs
	Vtd's	120150047 2 401 of 1037, 120150117 2 276 of 348, 120850014 2 10 of 325, 120850030 2 1259 of 1723, 121050075 2 279 of 7813, 121050079 2 7493 of 7495, 121050103 2 2796 of 2799, 121050107 2 200 of 1297, 121050108 2 2198 of 5349, 121050123 2 1131 of 1665, 121110026 2 19 of 2617, 121110027 2 717 of 1142, 121110028 2 658 of 907, 121110049 2 526 of 535, 121110077 2 8 of 7846
18	Counties	Hillsborough 5 348,082 of 1,229,226, Manatee 2 40,928 of 322,833, Pinellas 3 75,078 of 916,542
	Cities	Bradenton 2 13759 of 49546, Gulfport 2 3341 of 12029, Palmetto 2 4371 of 12606, St. Petersburg 2 71737 of 244769, Tampa 4 178585 of 335709, Temple Terrace 2 9405 of 24541
	Vtd's	120570102 2 4308 of 4522, 120570295 2 2097 of 4074, 120570313 2 518 of 2686, 120570511 2 4 of 976, 120810054 2 1 of 84, 120810066 2 21 of 836
19	Counties	Orange 6 402,481 of 1,145,956, Seminole 2 63,639 of 422,718
	Cities	Altamonte Springs 2 5767 of 41496, Apopka 3 38433 of 41542, Eatonville, Edgewood 2 1371 of 2503, Lake Mary 2 99 of 13822, Maitland 2 7007 of 15751, Oakland 2 457 of 2538, Ocoee 2 26172 of 35579, Orlando 4 102685 of 238300, Sanford 2 43198 of 53570, Winter Garden 2 19269 of 34568, Winter Park 2 3644 of 27852
	Vtd's	120950009 2 498 of 3799, 120950023 2 2404 of 5266, 120950030 2 2119 of 3496, 120950031 2 2434 of 3983, 120950035 2 1145 of 5565, 120950036 2 1772 of 4702, 120950040 2 1700 of 5494, 120950052 2 147 of 1618, 120950058 2 169 of 2416, 120950080 2 379 of 3656, 120950081 2 4368 of 5139, 120950084 2 4100 of 4109, 120950085 2 2751 of 4445, 120950087 2 5631 of 5703, 120950088 2 1393 of 4838, 120950150 2 1864 of 3406, 120950163 2 4819 of 5256, 120950218 2 436 of 3257, 120950219 2 3109 of 3838, 120950224 3 76 of 2255, 120950268 2 4323 of 4767, 120950269 2 2246 of 2889, 121170006 2 871 of 1844, 121170122 2 566 of 598, 121170125 2 1366 of 2021, 121170143 2 586 of 2858, 121170303 2 1468 of 3083
20	Counties	Lake 2 130,444 of 297,052, Marion 2 239,316 of 331,298, Putnam 2 55,465 of 74,364, Sumter 2 45,152 of 93,420
	Cities	Bellevue, Crescent City, Eustis, Fruitland Park, Interlachen, Lady Lake, Leesburg 2 12214 of 20117, McIntosh, Mount Dora 2 0 of 12370, Ocala, Palatka 2 0 of 10558, Pomona Park, Reddick, Tavares 2 13943 of 13951, Umatilla, Welaka, Wildwood 2 40 of 6709
	Vtd's	120690054 2 3971 of 4075, 120690059 2 85 of 6666, 120830045 2 5875 of 6503, 120830046 2 350 of 4685, 121070020 2 185 of 1110, 121070021 2 821 of 3299, 121070022 2 1106 of 1322, 121070046 2 268 of 317, 121070057 2 23 of 826, 121070068 2 1562 of 1662, 121070069 2 310 of 1041, 121070100 2 2489 of 2534, 121190003 2 82 of 105, 121190011 2 243 of 5405, 121190021 2 164 of 2208, 121190022 2 53 of 73
21	Counties	Hillsborough 5 54,038 of 1,229,226, Manatee 2 281,905 of 322,833, Polk 4 132,068 of 602,095
	Cities	Anna Maria, Bradenton 2 35787 of 49546, Bradenton Beach, Holmes Beach, Lakeland 3 63040 of 97422, Longboat Key 2 2398 of 6888, Mulberry, Palmetto 2 8235 of 12606, Plant City
	Vtd's	120570334 2 206 of 4680, 120570335 2 926 of 2821, 120570338 2 11 of 3740, 120570339 2 36 of 4714, 120570353 2 217 of 4049, 120570357 2 2299 of 3002, 120570441 2 525 of 9249, 120570445 2 355 of 558, 120810054 2 83 of 84, 120810066 2 815 of 836, 121050032 2 1037 of 2659, 121050045 2 209 of 1481
22	Counties	Orange 6 114,940 of 1,145,956, Seminole 2 359,079 of 422,718
	Cities	Altamonte Springs 2 35729 of 41496, Apopka 3 2556 of 41542, Casselberry, Lake Mary 2 13723 of 13822, Longwood, Maitland 2 8744 of 15751, Oviedo, Sanford 2 10372 of 53570, Winter Springs
	Vtd's	120950081 2 771 of 5139, 120950085 2 1694 of 4445, 120950118 2 3604 of 4468, 120950218 2 2821 of 3257, 120950224 3 587 of 2255, 120950228 2 2430 of 2522, 121170006 2 973 of 1844, 121170122 2 32 of 598, 121170125 2 655 of 2021, 121170143 2 2272 of 2858, 121170303 2 1615 of 3083
23	Counties	Charlotte 3 84,989 of 159,978, Sarasota

S000S9004 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
	Cities	Longboat Key 2 4490 of 6888, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
24	Counties	Orange 6 247,229 of 1,145,956, Osceola 3 184,902 of 268,685, Polk 4 36,664 of 602,095
	Cities	Belle Isle 2 0 of 5988, Davenport 2 633 of 2888, Haines City 2 11957 of 20535, Kissimmee, Orlando 4 53967 of 238300, St. Cloud 2 2762 of 35183
	Vtd's	120950020 2 749 of 3326, 120950104 2 2031 of 2358, 120950118 2 864 of 4468, 120950172 2 1965 of 3877, 120950174 2 2519 of 4263, 120950184 2 1212 of 5393, 120950190 2 282 of 1438, 120950201 2 1156 of 3673, 120950239 2 29 of 3738, 120950241 2 379 of 5367, 120970029 2 5452 of 6774, 120970087 2 2 of 3557, 120970099 2 6716 of 7238, 120970100 2 512 of 1956, 120970111 2 480 of 6090, 120970114 2 1204 of 5567, 120970159 2 349 of 361, 121050080 2 2443 of 15990, 121050083 2 1042 of 5463, 121050084 2 3598 of 5598, 121050085 2 320 of 3502, 121050136 2 450 of 5081
25	Counties	Broward 6 172,692 of 1,748,066, Palm Beach 5 292,087 of 1,320,134
	Cities	Boca Raton 3 57249 of 84392, Boynton Beach 3 7040 of 68217, Briny Breezes, Deerfield Beach 3 14713 of 75018, Delray Beach 3 13668 of 60522, Fort Lauderdale 4 66154 of 165521, Gulf Stream, Highland Beach, Hillsboro Beach, Hypoluxo 2 2015 of 2588, Juno Beach, Jupiter 2 35374 of 55156, Lake Worth 3 6421 of 34910, Lantana 2 2648 of 10423, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Lighthouse Point, Manalapan, North Palm Beach, Oakland Park 2 17106 of 41363, Ocean Ridge, Palm Beach, Palm Beach Gardens, Palm Beach Shores, Pompano Beach 3 53126 of 99845, Riviera Beach 2 8000 of 32488, Sea Ranch Lakes, South Palm Beach, West Palm Beach 3 47801 of 99919, Wilton Manors 2 2626 of 11632
	Vtd's	120990093 2 657 of 889, 120990321 2 1820 of 2006, 120990427 2 2015 of 2588, 120990779 2 879 of 4107, 120990794 2 1416 of 1593
26	Counties	Brevard 2 434,167 of 543,376, Indian River 2 38,916 of 138,028
	Cities	Cape Canaveral, Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, Fellsmere, Grant-Valkaria, Indialantic, Indian Harbour Beach, Malabar, Melbourne, Melbourne Beach, Melbourne Village, Palm Bay, Palm Shores, Rockledge, Satellite Beach, Sebastian, West Melbourne
	Vtd's	120610014 2 58 of 2817, 120610018 2 81 of 183, 120610041 2 372 of 3293
27	Counties	Charlotte 3 33,103 of 159,978, Lee 2 431,918 of 618,754
	Cities	Bonita Springs 2 42773 of 43914, Fort Myers, Punta Gorda
	Vtd's	120150047 2 636 of 1037, 120150117 2 72 of 348, 120710012 2 1558 of 2651, 120710062 2 1005 of 2348, 120710095 2 2836 of 2964
28	Counties	Indian River 2 99,112 of 138,028, Martin 2 126,781 of 146,318, Palm Beach 5 49,927 of 1,320,134, St. Lucie 2 194,698 of 277,789
	Cities	Fort Pierce 2 41444 of 41590, Indian River Shores, Jupiter 2 19782 of 55156, Jupiter Inlet Colony, Jupiter Island, Ocean Breeze Park, Orchid, Port St. Lucie 2 90858 of 164603, St. Lucie Village, Sewall's Point, Stuart, Tequesta, Vero Beach
	Vtd's	120610014 2 2759 of 2817, 120610018 2 102 of 183, 120610041 2 2921 of 3293, 120850014 2 315 of 325, 120850030 2 464 of 1723, 120990093 2 232 of 889, 121110026 2 2598 of 2617, 121110027 2 425 of 1142, 121110028 2 249 of 907, 121110049 2 9 of 535, 121110077 2 7838 of 7846
29	Counties	Broward 6 295,781 of 1,748,066, Palm Beach 5 177,795 of 1,320,134
	Cities	Boca Raton 3 685 of 84392, Boynton Beach 3 24994 of 68217, Deerfield Beach 3 17631 of 75018, Delray Beach 3 26878 of 60522, Fort Lauderdale 4 94925 of 165521, Hypoluxo 2 573 of 2588, Lake Park, Lake Worth 3 24245 of 34910, Lantana 2 7775 of 10423, Lauderdale Lakes, Lauderhill, Lazy Lake, Mangonia Park, Oakland Park 2 24257 of 41363, Plantation 2 7384 of 84955, Pompano Beach 3 23385 of 99845, Riviera Beach 2 24488 of 32488, Sunrise 4 13427 of 84439, Tamarac 2 0 of 60427, West Palm Beach 3 52108 of 99919, Wilton Manors 2 9006 of 11632
	Vtd's	120990241 2 10 of 189, 120990321 2 186 of 2006, 120990427 2 573 of 2588, 120990490 2 398 of 3146, 120990779 2 3228 of 4107, 120990794 2 177 of 1593, 120990811 2 3543 of 3545
30	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Atlantis, Boca Raton 3 26458 of 84392, Boynton Beach 3 36183 of 68217, Cloud Lake, Delray Beach 3 19976 of 60522, Glen Ridge, Golf, Greenacres, Haverhill, Lake Clarke Shores, Lake Worth 3 4244 of 34910, Palm Springs
	Vtd's	120990238 2 5140 of 5623, 120990241 2 179 of 189, 120990276 2 46 of 2628, 120990490 2 2748 of 3146, 120990602 2 1332 of 2174, 120990705 2 2975 of 4915, 120990811 2 2 of 3545
31	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Cooper City 2 27515 of 28547, Dania Beach, Davie 2 63687 of 91992, Fort Lauderdale 4 0 of 165521, Hallandale Beach 2 25370 of 37113, Hollywood 2 97232 of 140768, Miramar 3 58246 of 122041, Pembroke Pines 3 87729 of 154750, Plantation 2 77571 of 84955, Sunrise 4 0 of 84439

S000S9004 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
32	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Coconut Creek, Coral Springs, Deerfield Beach 3 42674 of 75018, Fort Lauderdale 4 4442 of 165521, Margate, North Lauderdale, Parkland, Pompano Beach 3 23334 of 99845, Sunrise 4 49238 of 84439, Tamarac
33	Counties	Broward 6 183,447 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade 6 290,352 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Biscayne Park, Hallandale Beach 2 11743 of 37113, Hollywood 2 43536 of 140768, Miami Gardens, Miramar 3 63795 of 122041, North Miami 2 49611 of 58786, North Miami Beach 2 20227 of 41523, Opa-locka, Pembroke Park, Pembroke Pines 3 44115 of 154750, West Park
	Vtd's	120860081 2 2209 of 3259, 120860124 2 1266 of 1697, 120860175 3 2614 of 5180, 120860346 2 1856 of 3253
34	Counties	Broward 6 146,807 of 1,748,066, Palm Beach 5 328,110 of 1,320,134
	Cities	Belle Glade, Cooper City 2 1032 of 28547, Davie 2 28305 of 91992, Greenacres 2 0 of 37573, Loxahatchee Groves, Miramar 3 0 of 122041, Pahokee, Pembroke Pines 3 22906 of 154750, Royal Palm Beach, South Bay, Southwest Ranches, Sunrise 4 21774 of 84439, Wellington, Weston, West Palm Beach 3 10 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990238 2 483 of 5623, 120990276 2 2582 of 2628, 120990602 2 842 of 2174, 120990705 2 1940 of 4915
35	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Aventura, Bal Harbour, Bay Harbor Islands, Coral Gables 2 14251 of 46780, Cutler Bay, Golden Beach, Homestead 2 12880 of 60512, Indian Creek, Key Biscayne, Miami 3 101745 of 399457, Miami Beach, Miami Shores, North Bay Village, North Miami 2 9175 of 58786, North Miami Beach 2 21296 of 41523, Palmetto Bay, Pinecrest 2 18206 of 18223, South Miami 2 0 of 11657, Sunny Isles Beach, Surfside
	Vtd's	120860081 2 1050 of 3259, 120860124 2 431 of 1697, 120860175 3 439 of 5180, 120860800 2 3044 of 3798, 120860987 2 124 of 4674, 120861224 2 877 of 2759
36	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Coral Gables 2 32529 of 46780, Doral 4 0 of 45704, Miami 3 227766 of 399457, Pinecrest 2 17 of 18223, South Miami, West Miami
	Vtd's	120860366 2 1745 of 2183, 120860374 2 108 of 113, 120860800 2 754 of 3798, 120860921 2 1883 of 2236, 120860987 2 4550 of 4674, 120861048 2 1858 of 2278, 120861053 2 978 of 1916, 120861097 2 838 of 886, 120861107 2 1495 of 2301
37	Counties	Collier 2 277,682 of 321,520, Lee 2 186,836 of 618,754
	Cities	Bonita Springs 2 1141 of 43914, Cape Coral, Everglades, Fort Myers Beach, Marco Island, Naples, Sanibel
	Vtd's	120210112 2 2225 of 4281, 120210113 2 2585 of 3666, 120210120 2 5390 of 9821, 120210127 2 922 of 997, 120210140 2 292 of 394, 120710012 2 1093 of 2651, 120710062 2 1343 of 2348, 120710095 2 128 of 2964
38	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Doral 4 0 of 45704, Sweetwater
	Vtd's	120861048 2 420 of 2278, 120861053 2 938 of 1916, 120861097 2 48 of 886, 120861107 2 806 of 2301, 120861175 2 964 of 2472, 120861228 2 3759 of 3775
39	Counties	Collier 2 43,838 of 321,520, Hendry, Miami-Dade 6 313,074 of 2,496,435, Monroe
	Cities	Clewiston, Doral 4 4 of 45704, El Portal, Everglades 2 0 of 400, Florida City, Homestead 2 47632 of 60512, Islamorada, Village of Islands, Key Colony Beach, Key West, LaBelle, Layton, Marathon, Miami 3 69946 of 399457, Virginia Gardens 2 0 of 2375
	Vtd's	120210112 2 2056 of 4281, 120210113 2 1081 of 3666, 120210120 2 4431 of 9821, 120210127 2 75 of 997, 120210140 2 102 of 394, 120860175 3 2127 of 5180, 120860366 2 438 of 2183, 120860374 2 5 of 113, 120860601 2 4 of 4152, 120860921 2 353 of 2236, 120861175 2 1508 of 2472, 120861224 2 1882 of 2759, 120861228 2 16 of 3775
40	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Doral 4 45700 of 45704, Hialeah, Hialeah Gardens, Medley, Miami Lakes, Miami Springs, Virginia Gardens
	Vtd's	120860346 2 1397 of 3253, 120860601 2 4148 of 4152

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 6003 PCB CRS 12-05 Establishing the Congressional Districts of the State
SPONSOR(S): Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee, Legg
TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** HB 6005 HB 6007 CS/SB 1174 SB 1608

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
Orig. Comm.: Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee	10 Y, 4 N	Poreda	Kelly
1) Redistricting Committee		Poreda	Kelly

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

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 H000C9041: This proposed committee bill redistricts the resident population of Florida into 27 congressional districts, as required by state and federal law.

This proposed committee bill would substantially amend Chapter 8 of the Florida Statutes.

When compared to the existing 25 congressional districts, this proposed committee bill would:

- Reduce the number of counties split from 30 to 26;
- Reduce the number of cities split from 110 to 44;
- 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 42.45% to 0.00%; and
- Maintain elected representation for African-American and Hispanic Floridians.

Upon approval by the Legislature, this bill is subject to review by the Governor.

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

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED 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 congressional districts and their subsequent deviation from the new ideal population of 696,345 residents.

Table 1. Florida Congressional Districts 2002-2011

Florida Congressional Districts 2002-2011				2000	2010
Total State Population, Decennial Census				15,982,378	18,801,310
Maximum Number of Districts				25	27
Ideal District Population (Total State Population / 23 or 25)				639,295	696,345

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
1	639,295	0	0.0%	694,158	-2,187	-0.3%
2	639,295	0	0.0%	737,519	41,174	5.9%
3	639,295	0	0.0%	659,055	-37,290	-5.4%
4	639,295	0	0.0%	744,418	48,073	6.9%
5	639,295	0	0.0%	929,533	233,188	33.5%
6	639,295	0	0.0%	812,727	116,382	16.7%
7	639,295	0	0.0%	812,442	116,097	16.7%
8	639,295	0	0.0%	805,608	109,263	15.7%
9	639,296	1	0.0%	753,549	57,204	8.2%
10	639,295	0	0.0%	633,889	-62,456	-9.0%
11	639,295	0	0.0%	673,799	-22,546	-3.2%
12	639,296	1	0.0%	842,199	145,854	20.9%
13	639,295	0	0.0%	757,805	61,460	8.8%
14	639,295	0	0.0%	858,956	162,611	23.4%
15	639,295	0	0.0%	813,570	117,225	16.8%

16	639,295	0	0.0%	797,711	101,366	14.6%
17	639,296	1	0.0%	655,160	-41,185	-5.9%
18	639,295	0	0.0%	712,790	16,445	2.4%
19	639,295	0	0.0%	736,419	40,074	5.8%
20	639,295	0	0.0%	691,727	-4,618	-0.7%
21	639,295	0	0.0%	693,501	-2,844	-0.4%
22	639,295	0	0.0%	694,259	-2,086	-0.3%
23	639,295	0	0.0%	684,107	-12,238	-1.8%
24	639,295	0	0.0%	799,233	102,888	14.8%
25	639,295	0	0.0%	807,176	110,831	15.9%
26				0	-696,345	-100.0%
27				0	-696,345	-100.0%

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.

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

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).

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 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

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).

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

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 retrogression"³⁹ in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the 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

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.

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

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

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 2 illustrates those increases. Prior to 1992, Florida Congressional Delegation included only one minority member, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Table 2. 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 3 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.

**Table 3. 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

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

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.

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 4 illustrates that the resulting districting plan doubled the number of African-American representatives in the Florida House of Representatives.

**Table 4. 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

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.

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.

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).

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.⁵⁵ Registration and performance data must be used under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to determine whether 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.

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.⁵⁷ Congressional apportionment plans are not subject to automatic review by the Florida Supreme Court.

Florida Constitution, Article III, Sections 20 and 21

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.

⁵⁷ See generally Section 8.0001, et seq., Florida Statutes (2007).

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, 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.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹

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.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.

⁵⁹ Article III, Sections 20(c) and 21(c), Florida Constitution.

⁶⁰ 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

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 5.⁶¹

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."⁶²

"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."⁶³

Without comment, the Department of Justice granted preclearance on May 31, 2011.⁶⁴

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.⁶⁵ In a contiguous district, a person can travel from any point within the district to any other point without departing from the district.⁶⁶ A district is not contiguous if its parts touch only at a common corner, such as a right angle.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸

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.").

⁶¹ Compare *id.* with 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(b).

⁶² 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.

⁶³ 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.

⁶⁴ 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).

⁶⁵ *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)).

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.* (citing *In re Apportionment Law, Senate Joint Resolution 1E*, 414 So. 2d at 1051).

⁶⁸ *Id.* at 280.

The second tier of these standards requires that districts be compact.⁶⁹ The meaning of “compactness” can vary significantly, depending on the type of redistricting-related analysis in which the court is involved.⁷⁰ 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”⁷¹ 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.⁷² 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.”⁷³ In a vote dilution context, “While no precise rule has emerged governing § 2 compactness, the inquiry should take into account traditional districting principles.”⁷⁴

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.”⁷⁵ The term “political boundaries” refers, at a minimum, to the boundaries of cities and counties.⁷⁶ Florida case law does not specifically define the term “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.⁷⁷

Similarly, the federal courts have used the phrase “geographical boundaries” in a general sense.⁷⁸ The U.S. Supreme Court has used the phrase “geographical considerations” when referring to how difficult it is to travel within a district.⁷⁹

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,

⁶⁹ Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.

⁷⁰ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Pages 109-112.

⁷¹ *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 26 (2006).

⁷² *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 756 (1983).

⁷³ *Redistricting Law 2010*. National Conference of State Legislatures. November 2009. Page 111.

⁷⁴ *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 27 (2006).

⁷⁵ Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.

⁷⁶ 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).

⁷⁷ 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.”).

⁷⁸ 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.”).

⁷⁹ *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 580 (1964)

etc.”⁸⁰ or topographical features such as a waterway dividing a county or other natural borders within a state or county.⁸¹

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,⁸² or
- 2) That county, city and other geographic boundaries are viable reasons to deviate from compactness.⁸³

Either way, county, city, and other geographic boundaries are primary considerations when evaluating compactness.⁸⁴

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 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.

⁸⁰ *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),

⁸¹ *Moore v. Itawamba County, Miss.*, 431 F.3d 257, 260 (5th Cir. 2005).

⁸² *e.g.*, *DeWitt v. Wilson*, 856 F. Supp. 1409, 1414 (E.D. Cal. 1994).

⁸³ *e.g.*, *Jamerson v. Womack*, 423 S.E. 2d 180 (1992). *See generally*, 114 A.L.R. 5th 311 at § 3[a], 3[b].

⁸⁴ *See id.*

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 5. 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 6. Complete and Partial Redistricting Maps

Submitted to the House or Senate by Florida Residents

Map Type	Complete Maps	Partial Maps	Total Maps
House	17	25	42
Senate	26	18	44
Congressional	54	27	81
TOTAL	97	70	167

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

Redistricting Plan H000C9041: Effect of Proposed Changes

Redistricting Plan Summary Statistics for the Proposed Congressional Map

Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000C9041

Plan File Name: H000C9041					
Plan Population Fundamentals					
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310				
Ideal District Population::	696,344				
District Population Remainder:	22				
District Population Range:	696,344 to 696,345				
District Deviation Range:	(0) To 1				
Deviation:	(0) To 0.00 Total 0.00%				

Number of Districts by Race Language					
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+
Current Black VAP	5	3	3	2	0
New Black VAP	5	3	3	2	0
Current Hisp VAP	7	4	3	3	3
New Hisp VAP	7	6	3	3	3

Plan Type: Congress - 27 Districts																
Plan Geography Fundamentals:																
Census Blocks Assigned:										484,481 out of 484,481						
Number Non-Contiguous Sections:										1 (normally one)						
County or District Split :										26 Split of 67 used						
City or District Split :										44 Split of 411 used						
VID's Split :										291 Split of 9,436 used						

Plan Name: H000C9041																
Number of Districts										27						
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
C9041-Map	7,548	65,934	11.44%	6,917	183,618	3.76%	91.63%	35.90%	5,571	90,799	6.13%	73.80%	72.61%	1,679	1,697	3,358
Current Map	10,064	65,934	15.26%	7,767	252,642	3.07%	77.18%	26.09%	6,041	105,234	5.74%	60.02%	62.65%	1,898	1,830	3,797
C9041-Simple	7,017	65,827	10.65%				98.57%	35.84%				79.39%	72.49%			
Current Map	9,153	65,906	13.88%				84.86%	26.08%				66.00%	62.62%			

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
C9041-Map	23	23	25	18	30	30	32	25	40	40	40	33
Current Map	29	29	30	22	38	38	38	29	48	48	46	38

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

STORAGE NAME: h6003.RDC.DOCX

DATE: 1/19/2012

District-by-District Summary Statistics for the Proposed Congressional Map⁸⁵

District ID	Pop Dev	TPOP10	%AllBlkVAP10	%AllHispVAP10	%HaitianPOPACS
1	1	696,345	13.19	4.55	0.19
2	1	696,345	23.83	4.75	0.38
3	1	696,345	14.72	6.62	0.39
4	1	696,345	10.99	6.79	0.23
5	1	696,345	48.05	11.12	3.30
6	1	696,345	9.85	8.64	0.36
7	1	696,345	10.71	18.67	0.42
8	0	696,344	9.12	7.66	0.56
9	1	696,345	11.99	38.50	1.39
10	1	696,345	12.76	13.52	0.72
11	1	696,345	8.63	6.73	0.15
12	1	696,345	4.30	9.25	0.13
13	0	696,344	5.12	7.18	0.05
14	1	696,345	24.58	23.89	0.83
15	1	696,345	11.14	17.72	0.35
16	1	696,345	5.80	8.80	0.71
17	1	696,345	9.47	14.62	0.63
18	1	696,345	10.98	12.06	1.74
19	1	696,345	5.76	13.69	1.54
20	1	696,345	50.21	18.55	10.02
21	0	696,344	11.21	18.30	3.01
22	1	696,345	10.16	17.58	3.92
23	0	696,344	9.93	37.56	1.41
24	0	696,344	55.73	33.15	14.92
25	1	696,345	8.25	70.08	1.78
26	1	696,345	10.02	68.91	1.35
27	1	696,345	7.71	75.04	0.78

District-by-District Descriptions for the Proposed Congressional Map

District 1 encompasses the eastern most portion of the Florida panhandle. The district includes the entirety of Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa and Walton counties and a part of Holmes County. The northern and western boundary of the district is the Florida State line shared with Alabama and the southern boundary is the Gulf of Mexico. The Eastern boundary line follows the eastern Walton County line from the Gulf of Mexico north to the Holmes County line. The district then follows VTD lines with the county until the area of the county where equal population was achieved. The district then follows Stevenson Road and State Highway 173 running north and south.

District 2 encompasses the entirety of 12 counties including all of Bay, Washington, Jackson, Calhoun, Gulf, Franklin, Liberty, Gadsden, Leon, Wakulla, Jefferson and Taylor Counties. The district also includes parts of Holmes County and Madison County. The northern boundary is created by the state lines with Alabama and Georgia and southern boundary is created by the Gulf of Mexico. The western

⁸⁵ "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.

boundary is the western county lines of Bay County and Washington County and then follows VTD lines within Holmes County as well as Stevenson Road to State Highway 173 running north and south. The Eastern Boundary of the district follows the eastern county line of Taylor County continuing into Madison County. Within Madison County the boundary runs north and south following primarily Tom Gunter Road, San Pedro Road, county road 360, Callaway Terrace, Bryan Earnhart Road, County Route 14, Farm Center Road, Prescott Road, Settlement Road, County Route 253 and State Route 53.

District 3 is made up of seven whole counties as well as part of six others. Hamilton, Suwannee, Columbia, Lafayette, Union, Bradford and Baker Counties are all entirely within the district. Part of Madison, Gilchrist, Alachua, Clay, Duval and Nassau counties are also within the district. The northern border follows the Georgia state line from County Road 121A in Nassau County to State Road 53 in Madison County. The western boundary line continues through Madison County south predominantly following VTD lines, County Road 14 and State Road 53 until it reaches the Madison and Lafayette County lines. The boundary line continues along the county line until it reaches Gilchrist County where it then predominantly follows NW 55th Street, NW 60th Street, NW 65th Street and VTD lines through the county going west to east until it reaches the Gilchrist/Alachua county line. The district continues to follow the Alachua County line until County Road 225. The district primarily follows VTD and roadways up into Gainesville including county roads 225, 234, 2082, Camp Ranch Road, 16th Ave, 6th Street, University Ave, 3rd Ave, 13th Street and State Road 26 until it reaches the eastern Alachua County line. The district boundary then continues along the southern line of Clay County until US 17 which it then primarily follows north to the Duval County line except when it uses roadways to travel around the Green Cove Springs city line making sure that none of the city is included within District 3. The district then travels into Duval County following I-295 west then following the county border west until it starts north along the Ortega River. From there the district predominantly follows VTD lines but follows additional road and railways that either share a VTD line or is a standalone border for the district. The predominate roads and railways that the district follows are 103rd St, Normandy Blvd, Wilson Blvd, Hyde Grove Ave, Wiley Rd, Lane Ave, old Middleburg Road, Ramona Blvd, Arques Road, Deenville Road, Le Brun Drive, Memorial Park Road, I-295, Beaver St W, railways leading to and from NS Jacksonville, Soutel Drive, Moncrief Road, New Kings Road, Trout River Blvd, railways leading northwest from CSX Jacksonville, Plummer Road, railways paralleling US 1, Old Kings road, and US-1. The district continues to follow US-1 into Nassau County until it reaches Musselwhite Road which it travel along north becoming Middle Road and County Road 121A until it reaches the Florida/Georgia line.

District 4 is constituted of portions of Nassau, Duval and St. Johns Counties. The northern border of the district is the Georgia state line along the northern edge of Nassau County. From the Atlantic Ocean to County Road 121A. The district then predominantly follows this road and US-1 to the Nassau/Duval County line. The district then continues south in Duval County traveling next to District 5 predominately following Lem Turner Road, I-295, I-95, Heckscher Drive, N Main Street, the St. Johns River, Edenfield Road, University Club Blvd, Briarforest road, Jimtom Drive, Laudonniere Drive, Heidi Road, Fort Caroline Road, Peeler Road, Shetland Road, Searchwood Drive, Oak Summit Drive, Cesey Blvd, Lake Lucina Drive and back to the St. Johns River. From here the district predominantly follows Arlington Road, Lone Star Road, Eddy Road, Townsend Blvd, Bowland Street, Acme Street, Atlantic Blvd, Southside Blvd, Ivey Road, Crane Ave, Laurina Street, University Blvd S, Beach Blvd, Bedford Road, Emerson Street, Victor Street, Jerrigan Road, St. Augustine Road, Hendricks Ave, Phillips Highway, The Arlington River and the St. Johns River. From here the district follows the St. Johns River to the Fuller Warren Bridge and predominantly continues along I-10, Cassat Ave, Woodcrest Road, S Ellis Road, the Cedar River, San Juan Ave, Hyde Park Road, Wilson Blvd, McGregor Drive, Cinderella Road, Lane Ave, Melvin Ave, I-295, 103rd Street and Roosevelt Blvd to the southern Duval county line. The district then follows the St. Johns River south, shared with the Duval and St. Johns County lines until it reaches County Road 214 in St. Johns County. The southern edge of the district then primarily follows County Road 214 east to the St. Augustine Inlet and out to the Atlantic Ocean which the district then follows north creating the eastern border of the district until it reaches the Florida State line.

District 5 joins the Jacksonville area with areas to the south such as Gainesville, the Ocala National Forest, to Apopka and Orlando. This region has long elected a minority candidate of choice and this proposed district maintains that likelihood. Within Duval County, District 5 starts at the southern border of the county going all the way north to the northern border of the county and then back through

downtown Jacksonville to the southern border of the county. Within the county the district follows VTD lines as well as roadways. The district boundary begins by following I-295 where a railway crosses the Duval/Clay County line. The district follows I-295 west then following the county border west until it starts north along the Ortega River. From there the district predominantly follows VTD lines but follows additional road and railways that either share a VTD line or is a standalone border for the district. The predominant roads and railways that the district follows are 103rd St, Normandy Blvd, Wilson Blvd, Hyde Grove Ave, Wiley Rd, Lane Ave, old Middleburg Road, Ramona Blvd, Arques Road, Deanville Road, Le Brun Drive, Memorial Park Road, I-295, Beaver St W, Railways leading to and from NS Jacksonville, Soutel Drive, Moncrief Road, New Kings Road, Trout River Blvd, railways leading northwest from CSX Jacksonville, Plummer Road, railways paralleling US 1, Old Kings road, and US 1. The district then follows the Duval County line east for a short distance before heading south back into the district. The district then predominantly follows Lem Turner Road, I-295, I-95, Heckscher Drive, N Main Street, the St. Johns River, Edenfield Road, University Club Blvd, Briarforest road, Jimtom Drive, Laudonniere Drive, Heidi Road, Fort Caroline Road, Peeler Road, Shetland Road, Searchwood Drive, Oak Summit Drive, Cesey Blvd, Lake Lucina Drive and back to the St. Johns River. From here the district predominantly follows Arlington Road, Lone Star Road, Eddy Road, Townsend Blvd, Bowland Street, Acme Street, Atlantic Blvd, Southside Blvd, Ivey Road, Crane Ave, Laurina Street, University Blvd S, Beach Blvd, Bedford Road, Emerson Street, Victor Street, Jerrigan Road, St. Augustine Road, Hendricks Ave, Phillips Highway, the Arlington River and the St. Johns River. From here the district follows the St. Johns River to the Fuller Warren Bridge and predominantly continues along I-10, Cassat Ave, Woodcrest Road, S Ellis Road, the Cedar River, San Juan Ave, Hyde Park Road, Wilson Blvd, McGregor Drive, Cinderella Road, Lane Ave, Melvin Ave, I-295, 103rd Street and Roosevelt Blvd back to the Duval County line. Within Clay County the eastern side of the district runs along the St. Johns River, the western boundary predominantly follows US-17 through the county except when it uses roadways to travel around the Green Cove Springs city so that the whole city is included within the district. Within Putnam County the district follows the county line to the north with the eastern boundary following along the St. Johns River until it reaches the City of Palatka. There it follows the city limits so that the whole city is within the district. It then primarily follows State Road 20 to the west except when it reaches the City of Interlachen where it follows the city limits as to not split the city keeping all of the city in District 6. Within Alachua County the district primarily follows VTD and roadways up into Gainesville including County roads 225, 234, 2082, Camp Ranch Road, 16th Ave, 6th Street, University Ave, 3rd Ave, 13th Street and State Road 26. On the east the district follows the county line. Within Marion county the boundary line predominantly follows VTD lines, roadways and rivers including, NF 599-1, NF 599-2, NF 584, NF 588, the Florida Black Bear Scenic Byway, 196th Terrace Road, 49th Street Road, County Road 314A, the Ocklawula River, County Road 316, Jacksonville Road, US 441, 21st Court, 140th Street, 145th Street, 144th Place, 1-75, NW 193rd St and US 441 back to the county line except where it follows the city lines of McIntosh so that the city is entirely kept within the district. Along the west side of the district the Marion County line is followed. Within Lake county the eastern boundary follows the county line along the west the district predominately follows major roadways including County Road 435, State Road 46, County Road 437 (Plymouth Sorrento Road), County Road 44A, County Road 439 and Kismet Road back to the Lake County line. Within Orange County the district predominantly follows VTD and city lines. The district follows the Orange/Seminole county line until it reaches Overland Road which it follows south primarily following Pine Hills Road and Clarcona Ocoee Road until it reaches the city of Eatonville where it follows the city lines making to keep the city whole and within the district. The district then primarily follows the John Young Parkway south to Colonial Drive to I-4 which the border then primarily follows to the south to Orange Blossom Trail. The district then predominantly follows Sand Lake Road, Kirkman Road, I-4, Conroy Road, Hiawasse Road, Old Winter Garden Road, the East-West Expressway and Good Homes Road until it reaches the city of Ocoee where the district line surrounds the city to make sure not to split the city. The border then crosses Lake Apopka until it reaches the orange county line.

District 6 contains all of Volusia and Flagler counties and parts of Putnam and St. Johns counties. The northern border of the district follows primarily County Road 214 within St. Johns County from the Atlantic Ocean west to the St. Johns County line shared with the St. Johns River. The boundary line then follows the river within the Putnam County to the City of Palatka where it follows the city boundary around to the west without ever including a part of the city in District 6. The northern border then follows State Road 20 west all the way to the Putnam County line except when the border follows the

Interlachen city lines so that it includes all of the city with the district. The western edge of the district then follows the Putnam County line south and continues to follow the western Volusia County line all the way south to the Volusia/Brevard county line completing the western edge of the district. The boundary line then continues to follow the Volusia County line east to the Atlantic Ocean. The district is completed with its eastern border the Atlantic Ocean following the coast of Volusia, Flagler and St. Johns counties back to the St. Augustine Inlet and County Road 214.

District 7 is contains all of Seminole County connects the it with parts of Orange County. The northern, western and eastern borders follows the Seminole County line exactly. The southern edge of the district goes into Orange County. Within Orange County the district predominantly follows VTD lines, city lines and roadways. The Cities of Maitland and Winter Park in Orange County are entirely within the district and carefully follows the city lines of Eatonville keeping that city whole and entirely outside the boundary lines of district 7. The southern border of the district then continues east predominately following the East-West Expressway, Curry Ford Road, Dean Road S, and Colonial Drive. From here the district predominately follows VTD lines until it reaches the Orange/Seminole county line along Chuluota Road where it again follows the Seminole County line.

District 8 contains all of Brevard and Indian River Counties as well as a small part of eastern Orange County. The district boundaries to the north follow the Brevard County line to the Atlantic Ocean which creates the eastern boarder of the district all the way south to the Indian River County line to the south. The southern edge of the district continues to follow the county line west and continues to follow the county line of both Indian River and Brevard County north into Orange County. The district extends into Orange County to achieve equal population but follows major roadways within the county to do so. From the Brevard County line the district follows the Orange County line to Dallas Blvd. which it follows north to the Beachline Expressway. From here the district predominately follows VTD lines, the Econlockhatchee River and Colonial Drive, until it reaches the Orange/Seminole county line along Chuluota Road where it again follows the Orange County line east back to the eastern and northern Brevard County line it shares with Volusia County.

District 9 connects parts of Osceola, Orange and Polk counties. The northern district boundary starts at by following the southern Orange County line from its eastern most point to Dallas Blvd which the district follows north into the county to the Beachline Expressway. From here the district predominantly follows VTD lines, and the Econlockhatchee River until it reaches Colonial Drive. From here the district lines continue west along this road until it reaches and primarily follows the East-West Expressway which it primarily follows to the west to Dean Road S where it then primarily follows Curry Ford Road, and the East-West Expressway again to I-4. The district then turns south predominately following I-4 and Orange Blossom Trail and Sand Lake Road until it again reaches I-4. The district line then follows I-4 through Osceola County into Polk County. The western edge of the district begins here following primarily US-27, US-17 and VTD lines south to where the district starts heading east along predominantly Edwards Road and Lake Hatchineha Road until it reaches the Osceola County line. The boundary line continues to follow the Osceola county line to the Cypress Lake area where the district then follows VTD lines to the Florida Turnpike for a short distance before it again follows VTD lines within the county along Ox Pond road to the east until it reaches the Osceola county line. District 9 then follows the Osceola County line for the remainder of the district boundary all the way back to the Orange/Osceola County line to the north.

District 10 contains a large geographic area of Lake County as well parts of Orange, Osceola, Sumter and Polk counties. These areas on the proposed map, including the areas known as the "Four Corners" and the "Golden Triangle" are kept whole within this district. The northern border of the district starts at the Lake County line at County Road 435 where it begins to head west primarily following County Road 435, State Road 46, County Road 437 (Plymouth Sorrento Road) and County Road 44A where it then primarily follows VTD lines and the Eustis City lines further west to County Road 473 where it again follows roadways to the Lake County Line primarily using US 441 and State Road 44. District 10 then follows the Lake County line south until it crosses into Sumter County at State Road 50. District 10 then primarily uses State Road 50, County Road 707, County Road 721 and State Road 471 to cross Sumter County traveling east to west until it joins up with the Sumter County line. The district line then heads south along the Sumter and Polk County lines until the district crosses into Polk County at Drane

Field Road. The southern edge of the district then predominately uses Drane Field Road, the Polk Parkway, Winter Lake Road, Lake Howard Drive and Dundee Road until US-27 to travel through Polk County from west to east. The eastern edge of the district begins by predominantly following US-27 and VTD lines north to I-4. The district then follows I-4 through Osceola County into Orange County until it reaches Sand Lake Road. From there the district line predominately follows Kirkman Road, I-4, Conroy Road, Hiawassee Road, Old Winter Garden Road, the East-West Expressway and Good Homes Road until it reaches the City of Ocoee where the district line surrounds the city to include the city in its entirety. The eastern border then crosses Lake Apopka until it reaches the Orange County line where it follows that boundary line into Lake County at County Road 435.

District 11 contains all of Citrus, Levy and Dixie counties and parts of Marion, Lake, Sumter, Hernando and Gilchrist counties. The northern border of the district begins at the Gulf of Mexico along the northern Dixie County line. The district travels east following the Dixie County line until it reaches Gilchrist County where it then predominately follows NW 55th Street, NW 60th Street, NW 65th Street and VTD lines through the county going west to east until it reaches the Gilchrist/Alachua county line. The northern border then follows the Alachua County line west until it reaches US 441 which it primarily follows south to NW 193rd Street except where it follows the city lines of McIntosh so that the city is entirely kept within the district. From here the district follows this road to I-75 which it follows south reaching 144th Place. The district then travels east through the county predominately following 145th Street, 140th Street, 21st Court, US-441, Jacksonville Road, County Road 316, the Ocklawula River, County road 314A, , 49th Street Road, 196th Terrace Road, , the Florida Black Bear Scenic Byway, NF 588, NF 599-2 and NF 599-1 until it reaches the Marion County line. The district then travels into Lake County primarily following NFs-572-1 and County Road 439 until it reaches County Road 44A. From here the line primarily follows VTD lines and the Eustis City lines further west to County Road 473 where it again follows roadways to the Sumter/ Lake county line primarily using US 441 and State Road 44. The district then follows the Sumter County line south to State Road 50. The district border then travels east to west through Sumter County predominately along State Road 50, County Road 707, County Road 721 and State Road 471 until it joins up with the Sumter County line. The southern edge of the district then follows the Sumter and Citrus county lines until it reaches Broad Street in Hernando County which it begins to follow south in to the county. The district then predominately travels along Broad Street, Snow Memorial Highway, Lake Lindsey Road, Centralia Road and US 19 before rejoining with the Hernando/Citrus county line which it then follows west to the Gulf of Mexico.

District 12 includes all of Pasco County and part Hernando and Pinellas counties. The proposed district's eastern border is the Pasco and Hernando County lines along the Gulf of Mexico. The southern boundary line continues along the Pasco County line until it reaches US-19 which it follows into Pinellas County. The boundary line predominately follows US-19 until it reaches Curlew Road which it follows east to the Pinellas County line. The district then follows the Pinellas County north to the Pasco County and continues to follow the county line east and then north to Hernando County. The eastern border of the district follows the Hernando County line until it turns west starting the northern border of the district until it reaches Broad Street in Hernando County which it begins to follow south in to the county. The district then predominately travels along Broad Street, Snow Memorial Highway, Lake Lindsey Road, Centralia Road and US 19 before rejoining with the Hernando County line which it then follows west to the Gulf of Mexico.

District 13 is entirely within Pinellas County. The southern border of the proposed district follows the southern edge of Pinellas County until it reaches I-275 which it then follows north beginning the eastern border of the district. The district follows I-275 until it reaches 34th St. where it then predominately uses VTD lines and roadways including 42nd Ave, 38th Ave, to Boca Ciega Bay. The district then follows 58th Street north from the bay to 5th Ave. The district then uses roadways including 31st Street, 6th Ave, 32nd St, 7th Ave, 30th St, 9th Ave. The district follows 9th Ave to Dr Martin Luther King Jr. Street which it then follows north until the district borders again joins back with I-275 until it reaches the Pinellas County line. The district line then follows the county line north until it reaches Curlew Road which it then follows west into the county. The border follows Curlew Road until it reaches US-19 which it predominately follows north to the Pinellas County line. The district then follows the county line west to the Gulf of Mexico which it follows for the entire length of the county creating the western edge of the district.

District 14 includes part of Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties. The region has traditionally elected a minority candidate of choice which is protected by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act by virtue of its inclusion of parts of Hillsborough County. The proposed district maintains the likelihood of the minority population electing their candidate of choice. The proposed district predominantly uses major roadways, VTD lines as well as part of the Hillsborough and Pinellas county line. The southern boundary of the district follows the Hillsborough County line from Tampa Bay until it reaches I-75. The district follows I-75 north into Hillsborough County until it reaches Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd E. From there the northern district line predominantly follows the Hamey Canal and the Hillsborough River until it primarily follows the Temple Terrace City lines so that all of the city is within the district before heading northwest using VTD lines. These VTD lines follow many major roadways including Serena Drive, Bougainvillea Ave, N 30th Street,, Bruce B Downs Blvd, Bearss Ave, I-275, Busch Blvd, Gunn Highway, Sheldon Road and a railway until the border reaches the Hillsborough/ Pinellas County line. The western district boundary line follows the county line south until it reaches I-275 and the Howard Frankland Bridge. The border of the district follows I-275 into Pinellas County to Dr Martin Luther King Jr Street which it follows south to 9th Ave which it then primarily follows until it reaches 5th Ave. The district continues west along 5th Ave until it reaches 58th Street. The district then continues south to Boca Ciega Bay. From the bay the district follows I-275 south to the Pinellas/Hillsborough county line.

District 15 contains part of Manatee and Hillsborough counties. The district includes the entire Cities of Plant City and Temple Terrace. The border of District 15 starts at State Road 64 in Manatee County. The district's southern boundary then follows this road west into the county primarily following it, Lake Manatee and the Manatee River to Fort Hammer Road. The district line continues along this road then predominately following State Road 43 and VTD lines north to I-75. The district follows I-75 north into Hillsborough County until it reaches Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd E. From there the northern district line predominantly follows the Hamey Canal and the Hillsborough River until it primarily follows the Temple Terrace City lines so that all of the city is within the district before heading northwest using VTD lines. These VTD lines follow many major roadways including Serena Drive, Bougainvillea Ave, N 30th Street,, Bruce B Downs Blvd, Bearss Ave, I-275, Busch Blvd, Gunn Highway, Sheldon Road and a railway until the border reaches the Hillsborough/ Pinellas county line. District 15 is then completed by following the Hillsborough County line north then west and finally south where it joins and follows the Manatee County line until it reaches State Road 64.

District 16 includes all of Sarasota county and a portion of Manatee County. The western border of the district follows the Manatee and Sarasota county lines along the Gulf of Mexico. The southern boundary line continues to follow the Sarasota County line which it continues to do as it begins the eastern edge of the district. The district line continues along the Sarasota and Manatee county lines until it reaches State Road 64 in Manatee County. The district then follows this road west into the county primarily following it, Lake Manatee and the Manatee River to Fort Hammer Road. The district line continues along this road then predominately following State Road 43 and VTD lines north to the Manatee County line. The district line then continues west to the Gulf of Mexico along the county line.

District 17 contains all of Hardee, De Soto, Highlands, Glades and Charlotte counties. It also contains part of Polk, Osceola, Okeechobee and Lee counties. The border of District 17 starts at the Gulf of Mexico along the southern Charlotte County line until it reaches I-75 and heads into Lee County to begin the districts southern border. The district follows I-75 to Palm Beach Blvd which it follows for a very short distance east until it reaches Orange River Blvd which it follows east to Buckingham Road. The district follows this road until it splits off and becomes Gunnery Road which it follows further south. The district then joins up with State Road 82 until it reaches Parkdale Blvd and then several other roadways until it reaches the Lee County line including Laramie Ave, Creuset Ave, Homestead Road and Milwaukee Blvd. From here the district lines follow the Lee and Glades County lines until it reaches Lake Okeechobee where the eastern boundary line begins. From the lake the district line travels into Okeechobee County following primarily VTD lines that share a border with a railway, cannels from Lake Okeechobee and State Road 70 which it follows north to the Okeechobee County line. The district continues to follow the Okeechobee County line north to the Osceola County line. District 17 continues to follow the Osceola County line until it follows VTD lines within the county along Ox Pond road to lines to the Florida Turnpike. The border then reaches the Cypress Lake area where the district reaches the Osceola County line through the Lake. The northern border of the district then predominately travels

east to west along Lake Hatchineha Road and Edwards Road until it reaches the US-27 where it begins to primarily follow Dundee Road, Lake Howard Drive, Winter Lake Road, The Polk Parkway, and Drane Field Road when it reaches the Hillsborough County line. The district boundary is completed along its western side by following the Hillsborough County line from this point south then following the Hardee, De Soto and Charlotte county lines to the Gulf of Mexico.

District 18 contains all of St. Lucie and Martin counties as well as a part of Okeechobee and Palm Beach counties. The district's eastern boundary is along the coast of the Atlantic Ocean with the northern border following along the St. Lucie County line west and continues to follow the St. Lucie county line as it starts the western edge of the district heading south. The district follows the county line until it reaches State Road 70 where it heads into Okeechobee County. It continues to follow State Road 70 as well as railways and channels extending from Lake Okeechobee until it reaches Lake Okeechobee itself. From the lake, the southern border of the district begin to head east following the northern edge of the Martin/Palm Beach county line. The district lines begin to extend into Palm Beach county following predominantly VTD lines and water ways that extend from Lake Okeechobee until it reaches Okeechobee Blvd where the lines primarily continue follow that road and other roadways including State Road 7, Belvedere Road, Military Trail, Community Drive, Village Blvd, Palm Beach Lakes Blvd, I-95, Shenandoah Drive, Haverhill Road, The Palm Beach Gardens city line and the North Palm Beach city line until it reaches the Atlantic Ocean.

District 19 contains the coastal areas of Lee and Collier counties. The eastern border of the district follows the county lines of Lee and Collier along the Gulf of Mexico. The district continues to follow the Lee County line along the northern edge of the county until it reaches I-75 where the district continues into the county following the interstate south. The district follows I-75 to Palm Beach Blvd which it follows for a very short distance east until it reaches Orange River Blvd which it follows east to Buckingham Road. The district follows this road until it splits off and becomes Gunnery Road which it follows further south. The district then joins up with State Road 82 until it reaches Parkdale Blvd and then several other roadways until it reaches the Lee County line including Laramie Ave, Creuset Ave, Homestead Road and Milwaukee Blvd. From here the district follows the Lee County line south until it reaches I-75 again and begins to follow the roadway into Collier County. The district line follows I-75 until it reaches Golden Gate Parkway which it follows west for a short distance before it heads south along Livingston Road. The district primarily follows VTD lines that would parallel Livingston road if it continued further south until it reaches Rattlesnake Hammock road. The district follows this road until Collier Blvd which it then follows south until it reaches the Tamiami Trail. The district then follows Tamiami Trail until it reaches County Road 92 and continues along this road to the Goodland Bay and the Gulf of Mexico.

District 20 contains portions of Palm Beach, Broward and Hendry counties. This region has elected a minority candidate of choice. This district also includes a part of Hendry County, which is a covered jurisdiction under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The district's western border starts in Lake Okeechobee where it heads into Hendry County. Within Hendry County the district lines follow primarily VTD lines before it joins back with the Hendry/Palm Beach County line. The area included contains the whole city of Clewiston as well as the area known as South Clewiston. The eastern border follows the Hendry/Palm Beach county line south and continues to follow that line when it turns into the Broward County line. The district follows the Broward County line until it reaches Alligator Alley (I-75). The southern border follows I-75 east into Broward County until it reaches a waterway that parallels Markham Park and the Sawgrass Expressway going northeast. The district then continues into the more populated parts of Broward county before rejoining the Sawgrass expressway and heading further north. The district lines predominantly follow major roadways, waterways and city lines where possible including a waterway paralleling NW 13th Ave, a waterway paralleling NW 18th Dr, University Drive, a waterway paralleling Sunrise Blvd, The Florida Turnpike, Broward, Blvd, SW 40th Ave, Davie Blvd, SW 15th Ave, SW, 5th Place, SW 18th Ave, SW 2nd Street, Middle Street, SW 18th Ave, NW 2nd Street, Flagler Ave, NE 5th St, NE 2nd Ave, NE 6th Street, NE 5th Ave, NE 17th Court, Dixie Highway, NE 16th St, Andrews Ave, Oakland Park Blvd, NE 41st Street, NW 44th Street, a railway paralleling I-95, Pompano Park Place, Dr. ML King Blvd, the Hillsboro Canal, Hillsboro Blvd, I-95, SW 10th Street, SW 11th Street, NE 3rd Ave, NE 48th St, Green Road, Military Trail, a railway paralleling Military Trail, Copans Road, Atlantic Blvd, and a waterway paralleling Atlantic Blvd. The district then follows the Sawgrass

Expressway north and continues north crossing into Palm Beach County along a canal until it reaches Loxahatchee Road in Palm Beach County. The district then follows a waterway north that follows the edge of the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The district then heads into the more populated areas of Palm Beach County along Southern Blvd (US 98/441) before rejoining the same waterway and heading north. From Southern Blvd the district heads into the populated areas of the county first heading south. The district follows a variety of transportation routes and city lines including Gun Club Road, Kirk Road, Summit Blvd, The Glenn Ridge City lines, I-95, Boyton Beach Blvd, SW 8th Street, Woolbright Road, a railway paralleling the Federal Highway, the Federal Highway, Overlook Road, N 18th Street, 6th Ave S, S A Street, the West Palm Beach Canal, a railway paralleling US 1, Forest Hill Blvd, Parker Ave, Australian Ave, Bayan Blvd, Dixie Highway, Poinsettia Ave, Flagler Drive, US 1, E 22nd Street, E 24th Street, The North Palm Beach City line, Northlake Blvd, The Palm Beach Gardens city line, Haverhill Road, 45th Street, Roebuck Road, Shenandoah Drive, Village Blvd, Palm Beach Lakes Road, Community Drive, Okeechobee Blvd, Belvedere Road, W Alan Black Road, W Sycamore Drive, and Hanover Circle. The district lines then rejoin the waterway it started from that at this point is paralleling Connors Highway northwest all the way to the Palm Beach County line which it then follows to Lake Okeechobee.

District 21 is a district that is located in the areas of Palm Beach and Broward counties that border the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and other areas to the west. The northern border of the district primarily uses the east-west travel corridor of US 98/441 (Southern Blvd) as its northern border from the canal the borders the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge to Military Trail. The district western edge follows this canal all the way south into Broward County until it reaches the Pompano Canal. This canal becomes the predominant boundary line for the southern edge of the district joining for a short distance Atlantic Ave until it reaches the Florida Turnpike. The district lines follow the turnpike to Copans Road followed by a railway, Military Trail, Green Road, NW 48th St, NE 3rd St, SW 11th Street, SW 10th St, and I-95. From here the district heads back west for a short time primarily along Hillsboro Blvd, the Hillsboro Canal, SW 18th St, Powerline Road, Palmetto Park Road and the Florid Turnpike. The district line then heads north primarily using the Florida Turnpike, Clint Moore Road, and Military Trail until it again rejoins with Southern Blvd.

District 22 is primarily a coastal district connecting Palm Beach and Broward Counties. The northern border of the district starts along the coast along the southern edge of the city of North Palm Beach. The district then follows the city lines west to Lake Shore Drive and then head south primarily following or paralleling US 1 until it reaches W Woodbright Road. It follows this road west for a short time before heading back north predominantly following I-95 to the Glenn Ridge City line which it follows to Summit Blvd which it then primarily follows west for a short distance to S Military Trail which completes the northern boundary of District 22. The district line continues south starting the western edge of the district following predominantly Military Trail south. The district continues along this path until it reaches a waterway the parallels Clint Moore Road west until it reaches the Florida Turnpike. The district heads south until it reaches Palmetto Park Road followed by Powerline road, SW 18th Street, the Hillsboro Canal and the Dixie Highway. The district continues to follow this roadway until it joins a railway that parallels I-95 via Pompano Park place and continues south. At this point the district heads into the Fort Lauderdale and Plantation areas of Broward County. The district predominantly follows VTD lines and major roadways heading further south before heading west and ultimately back to the coast. From the railway the roadways the district predominantly follows west are NW 44th St, NE 5th Ave, Oakland Park Blvd, Andrews Ave, NE 16th St, a Railway paralleling Flagler Drive, NE 6th Street, NE 5th Street, NW Flagler Ave, NW 2nd Street, NW 18th Street, Middle Street, SW 18th Ave, SW 5th Place, SW 15th Ave, Davie Blvd, SW 40th Ave, Broward Blvd, The Florida Turnpike, a waterway paralleling Sunrise Blvd, University Drive, a waterway paralleling NW 20th Court, NW 28th Court and NW 27th Street. The district now heads south and back east to the coast following primarily Flamingo Road, the Port Everglades Expressway, Federal Highway, and Spangler Blvd. The district then follows the coast line of the Atlantic Ocean back north into Palm Beach County for its eastern boundary line.

District 23 contains part of southern Broward County and the northeast part of Miami-Dade County. The district boundary line to the north start with the Atlantic ocean to the east and heads west following predominantly Spangler Blvd, Federal Highway, Port Everglades Expressway and Flamingo Road before it begins to follow a waterway that parallels the Sawgrass Expressway, Markham Park and I-75

heading further east until that waterway joins another waterway that heads south paralleling US-27 and begins the western boundary of the district. The district lines follow this waterway to Sheridan Street where the district begins to head back east before heading south into Miami Dade County. The district lines primarily follow roadways as it heads back east. These roadways include NW 17th Street, NW 178th Ave, Pines Blvd, I-75, Pembroke Road, Palm Ave, Washington Blvd, S Douglas Road, SW 5th Street, University Drive and Hollywood Blvd. From here the district heads south following NE 1st Ave which merges with US 1 (Biscayne Blvd). From here the district crossed into Biscayne Bay and heads south using it and the Miami and Miami Shores city lines as a boundary line including all of the Bay Harbor Islands, North Bay Village, Miami Beach and Dodge Island with the Port of Miami. The district briefly rejoins with Biscayne Blvd in downtown Miami heading as far south as SE 14th St before heading back to the Bay and the Atlantic ocean. The district eastern boundary line is the Ocean heading back north completing the district lines.

District 24 is connects south Broward County with north Miami-Dade County. The northern boundary of District 24 starts at the Dixie Highway heading west primarily along Hollywood Blvd, University Ave, S Douglas Road, Palm Ave, and Pembroke Road until it reaches Flamingo Road. The western boundary follows Flamingo Road until it reaches the Broward/ Miami-Dade County line which it follows for a short distance east before continuing south to NW 57th Ave. The district then follows Biscayne Canal to NW 37th Ave to the Gratigny Parkway for a very short distance before following VTD lines to the Little River Canal. The district then continues south predominantly following NW 27th Ave, NW 100th Street, NW 32nd Ave, NE 95th Street, NW 36th Ave, NW 79th Street, NW 32nd Street, NW 54th Street, NW 35th Ave, the Airport Expressway, NW 27th Ave, NW 32nd Street, NW 22nd Ave, NW 20th Street, NW 17th Ave, the Dolphin Expressway, NW 8th Street Road to the North Fork Miami River. From here the district boundary line heads back north following NE 2nd Ave, Biscayne Blvd and MacArthur Causeway to Biscayne Bay. From here the district follows the bay north using it and the Miami and Miami Shores city lines as a boundary line. The district lines rejoin Biscayne Blvd around the area of N Bayshore Drive. From here the district follows Biscayne Blvd until it splits off with the Dixie Highway continuing to follow that roadway north until it reaches Hollywood Blvd.

District 25 connects part of Hendry, Collier Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. The district begins in the north including all of Hendry County except the VTD's that include Clewiston and the surrounding area that is a part of District 20. The northern border is same as the Hendry County line to the north. The district continues to the south following the Hendry County line to the west. The district continues to follows the Lee/Collier County line until it reaches I-75. The district line follows I-75 until it reaches Golden Gate Parkway which it follows west for a short distance before it heads south along Livingston Road. The district primarily follows VTD lines that would parallel Livingston Road if it continued further south until it reaches Rattlesnake Hammock Road. The district follows this road until Collier Blvd which it then follows south until it reaches the Tamiami Trail. The district then follows Tamiami Trail until it reaches County Road 92 and continues along this road to the Goodland Bay and the Gulf of Mexico. The district then comes back from the Gulf along the Collier/ Monroe County line following that until it reaches the Miami-Dade/ Monroe County line which it follows for a short time before it reaches the Tamiami Trail (US 41). The district follows this roadway east until it reaches SW 87th Ave completing the southern boundary line for the district. The eastern boundary line follows SW 87th Ave north to the Doral City line. The district then follows the city line followed by VTD lines that travel through the Miami International Airport before it follows a canal that parallels NW 72nd Ave. From here the district follows road and waterways to the north beginning with W 21st St, primarily followed by W 4th Ave, E 41st Street, NW 95th Street, NW 32nd Ave, NW 100th Street, NW 27th Ave, The little River Canal, Gratigny Parkway, 37th Ave, Biscayne Canal, NW 57th Ave, SW 55th Street, Flamingo Road, Pembroke Road, I-75, Pines Blvd, NW 178th Ave, NW 17th Street and Sheridan Street. From here the district lines follow a waterway that parallels US 27 north until it reaches Alligator Alley (I-75). It follows Alligator Alley west until it joins the Broward County line and follows that line as it turns into the Hendry County line up until it reaches the VTD's of Hendry County that contain Clewiston. The district follows these lines until it join back with the northern border of the county.

District 26 contains all of Monroe County as well as a part of Miami-Dade County. The northern border of the district follows US-41 from SW 87th Ave in Miami-Dade County west until it meets the Monroe County line. From here the district follows the Monroe County line until it reaches the Gulf of Mexico.

The district's western and southern border follow the Monroe County lines exactly, including the Dry Tortugas National Park. The eastern border of the district follows the Monroe County line and crosses into Miami-Dade County at Card Sound Road. From here the border of the district continues north on Card Sound Road until it reaches the city of Florida City. The district then follows the city lines so that all of the city is included within the district. The district then continues north using predominantly the Florida City Canal, SW 152nd Ave, S Canal Drive, N Audubon Drive, SE 8th Street, SE 14th Place, SW 12th terrace, SE 5th Street, SW 162nd Ave, NE 8th Street to the Dixie Highway (US 1). The district then follows the Dixie Highway all the way to SW 152nd Street briefly following the Cutler Bay City line so that the district does not break the city line and then joins SW 97th Ave via a waterway. The district follows SW 97th Ave north until it reaches SW 88th Street. The district then follows SW 88th Street to SW 87th Ave which it follows north until it reaches US 41 and the northern boundary of the district.

District 27 is entirely within Miami-Dade County and primarily a coastal district traveling along the Miami-Dade coast line from Miami and Hialeah to the county boundary in the south. This proposed district is not like any of the current districts as much of the area the proposed district has is connected to a district that goes into Monroe County on the current map. The district's southern border of the district follows the Miami-Dade County line from the Atlantic Ocean to Card Sound Road. From here the eastern border of the district continues north on Card Sound Road until it reaches the city of Florida City. The district then follows the city lines so that all of the city is included within the neighboring district 26. The district then continues north using predominantly the Florida City Canal, SW 152nd Ave, S Canal Drive, N Audubon Drive, SE 8th Street, SE 14th Place, SW 12th terrace, SE 5th Street, SW 162nd Ave, NE 8th Street to the Dixie Highway (US-1). The district then follows the Dixie Highway all the way to SW 152nd Street briefly following the Cutler Bay City line as to included all of the city within the district and then joins SW 97th Ave via a waterway. The district follows SW 97th Ave north until it reaches SW 88th Street. The district then follows SW 88th Street to SW 87th Ave. The boundary line follows SW 87th Ave north to the Doral City line. The district then follows the city line followed by VTD lines that travel through the Miami International Airport before it follows a canal that parallels NW 72nd Ave. From here the district follows road and waterways to the north beginning with W 21st St, primarily followed by W 4th Ave and E 41st Street. The eastern boundary begins at E 41st Street where it meets NW 36th Ave. the district continues south and eventually back to the bay by using predominantly NW 79th Street, NW 32nd Street, NW 54th Street, NW 35th Ave, The Airport Expressway, NW 27th Ave, NW 32nd Street, NW 22nd Ave, NW 20th Street, NW 17th Ave, The Dolphin Expressway, NW 8th Street Road to the North Fork Miami River. From here the district boundary line heads south along a railway for a short distance before joining SW 8th Street S Miami Ave and SE 14th St before joining Biscayne Bay. From here the eastern boundary line follows the bay and the Atlantic Ocean south to the southern border of Miami-Dade County. This district includes Key Biscayne, Old Rhodes Key and several other barrier islands.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Section 1 | Provides that the 2010 Census is the official census of the state for the purposes of this bill; Lists and defines the geography utilized for the purposes of this bill in accordance with Public Law 94-171. |
| Section 2 | Provides for the geographical description of the redistricting of the 27 congressional districts. |
| Section 3 | Provides for the apportionment of any territory not specified for inclusion in any district. |
| Section 4 | Provides that the districts created by this joint resolution constitute and form the congressional districts of the State. |
| Section 5 | Provides a severability clause in the event that any portion of this joint resolution is held invalid. |

- Section 6 Provides that this joint resolution applies with respect to the qualification, nomination, and election to the office of representative to the Congress of the United States in the primary and general elections held in 2012 and thereafter.
- Section 7 Provides that, except as otherwise expressly provided, this act shall take effect upon expiration of the terms of the representatives to the United States House of Representatives serving on the date that this act becomes a law.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

The 2012 redistricting 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.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

The 2012 redistricting 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. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

None.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

When compared to the 27 congressional districts in PCB CRS 12-05 (Plan H000C9009), Amendment 1 (Plan H000C9041):

- Reduces the number of cities split from 52 to 44.


Specifically, Amendment 1 makes the following changes:

- Makes the municipality of Miami Shores (Miami-Dade County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Cutler Bay (Miami-Dade County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Doral (Miami-Dade County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Palm Beach Gardens (Palm Beach County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of North Palm Beach (Palm Beach County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Glen Ridge (Palm Beach County) whole;
- Increases the use of roadways as boundary lines in Clay County pursuant to the request of the office of the Clay County Supervisor of Elections;
- Makes the municipality of Temple Terrace (Hillsborough County) whole; and
- Makes the municipality of Eustis (Lake County) whole.

H000C9041



Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org




Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

H000C9041



Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline

H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



H000C9041




Florida House of Representatives
Redistricting Committee
402 S. Monroe Street
House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
www.floridaredistricting.org



Legend

- 7 District Number
- District Boundary
- County Boundary
- Interstate Highway
- Major Highway
- Shoreline



Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000C9041

Plan File Name: H000C9041						Plan Type: Congress - 27 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:: 696,344						Number Non-Contiguous Sections: 1 (normally one)											
District Population Remainder: 22						County or District Split : 26 Split of 67 used											
District Population Range: 696,344 to 696,345						City or District Split : 44 Split of 411 used											
District Deviation Range: (0) To 1						VTD's Split : 291 Split of 9,436 used											
Deviation: (0) To 0.00 Total 0.00%																	
Number of Districts by Race Language																	
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+												
Current Black VAP	5	3	3	2	0												
New Black VAP	5	3	3	2	0												
Current Hisp VAP	7	4	3	3	3												
New Hisp VAP	7	6	3	3	3												
Plan Name:		H000C9041				Number of Districts		27									
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
C9041-Map	7,548	65,934	11.44%		6,917	183,618	3.76%	91.63%	35.90%	5,571	90,799	6.13%	73.80%	72.61%	1,679	1,697	3,358
Current Map	10,064	65,934	15.26%		7,767	252,642	3.07%	77.18%	26.09%	6,041	105,234	5.74%	60.02%	62.65%	1,898	1,830	3,797
C9041-Simple	7,017	65,827	10.65%					98.57%	35.84%				79.39%	72.49%			
Current Map	9,153	65,906	13.88%					84.86%	26.08%				66.00%	62.62%			
	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					
C9041-Map	23	23	25	18	30	30	32	25	40	40	40	33					
Current Map	29	29	30	22	38	38	38	29	48	48	46	38					

Plan Name:	H000C9041			Number of Districts			27									
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
1	397	4,771	8.33%	423	14,228	2.97%	106.63%	33.53%	324	5,790	5.59%	81.49%	82.41%	122	54	244
2	550	10,102	5.44%	556	24,505	2.26%	101.12%	41.22%	439	12,903	3.40%	79.81%	78.29%	159	100	318
3	530	6,098	8.69%	397	12,483	3.18%	74.86%	48.85%	337	7,974	4.22%	63.54%	76.48%	109	93	218
4	268	1,373	19.52%	213	3,615	5.91%	79.69%	37.98%	174	1,737	10.01%	64.89%	79.06%	36	65	73
5	641	1,713	37.40%	426	14,414	2.95%	66.52%	11.88%	322	4,903	6.56%	50.22%	34.95%	59	142	118
6	350	2,848	12.31%	326	8,468	3.85%	93.18%	33.63%	261	3,947	6.61%	74.41%	72.16%	83	90	167
7	125	445	28.16%	98	774	12.75%	78.73%	57.51%	86	534	16.10%	68.50%	83.45%	28	25	57
8	270	2,418	11.19%	290	6,674	4.34%	107.11%	36.23%	233	3,175	7.33%	86.05%	76.17%	54	85	108
9	197	1,258	15.71%	170	2,304	7.39%	86.10%	54.63%	148	1,505	9.83%	74.78%	83.64%	48	39	97
10	230	1,588	14.49%	207	3,400	6.08%	89.90%	46.71%	172	1,965	8.75%	74.68%	80.84%	40	62	81
11	426	5,300	8.05%	411	13,451	3.06%	96.47%	39.40%	312	6,415	4.86%	73.07%	82.62%	113	90	227
12	205	1,452	14.15%	187	2,790	6.72%	91.23%	52.02%	162	1,875	8.64%	78.80%	77.44%	51	45	103
13	113	447	25.45%	119	1,141	10.50%	105.20%	39.23%	97	556	17.44%	85.09%	80.54%	19	38	39
14	139	547	25.49%	132	1,399	9.48%	95.10%	39.12%	106	720	14.72%	75.92%	76.04%	30	35	60
15	193	1,104	17.50%	187	2,804	6.70%	97.25%	39.36%	156	1,469	10.61%	80.70%	75.15%	36	49	72
16	172	1,353	12.74%	191	2,921	6.56%	111.12%	46.34%	155	1,562	9.92%	89.80%	86.67%	47	48	94
17	423	7,115	5.95%	392	12,263	3.20%	92.76%	58.02%	346	8,693	3.98%	81.67%	81.85%	107	105	214
18	220	1,998	11.03%	211	3,536	5.96%	95.66%	56.51%	186	2,298	8.09%	84.31%	86.96%	55	59	111
19	233	1,375	17.00%	254	5,163	4.93%	108.96%	26.64%	193	1,958	9.85%	82.50%	70.27%	47	70	95
20	346	2,101	16.51%	229	4,196	5.47%	66.23%	50.07%	202	2,829	7.14%	58.21%	74.27%	56	58	113
21	110	264	41.64%	102	835	12.27%	93.07%	31.65%	88	434	20.27%	79.85%	60.97%	17	31	34
22	188	370	50.83%	159	2,015	7.90%	84.65%	18.36%	122	603	20.23%	64.85%	61.37%	21	50	42
23	125	288	43.63%	114	1,033	11.03%	90.64%	27.89%	92	527	17.45%	73.13%	54.70%	25	32	50
24	59	111	53.43%	53	224	23.69%	89.36%	49.61%	46	129	35.65%	77.41%	86.20%	10	16	20
25	344	3,990	8.63%	332	8,782	3.78%	96.46%	45.44%	276	4,894	5.63%	80.09%	81.54%	93	70	186
26	550	4,912	11.21%	604	29,033	2.08%	109.69%	16.92%	433	10,691	4.05%	78.61%	45.95%	176	96	353
27	130	579	22.46%	120	1,155	10.43%	92.63%	50.13%	103	713	14.44%	79.14%	81.25%	26	39	53

H000C9041 Compactness of Populations within Districts													
	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 Hisp	Route/Straight Line	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic
1	30.17	30.19	26.44	29.93	39.99	40.05	34.87	39.74	1.70	51.67	51.75	45.36	52.53
2	49.72	49.65	44.60	46.97	62.86	62.77	56.22	59.36	1.59	76.65	76.59	68.54	72.77
3	39.79	39.88	41.37	40.16	50.48	50.52	52.22	50.50	1.62	63.00	63.06	63.68	63.05
4	14.95	14.92	13.87	13.67	22.26	22.21	20.51	20.40	1.91	29.70	29.66	27.76	27.68
5	63.03	62.91	63.33	71.50	79.48	79.37	79.05	89.76	1.70	83.88	83.84	82.33	92.40
6	28.15	28.13	27.05	27.83	36.55	36.49	35.13	36.71	1.60	45.06	45.00	43.29	45.44
7	9.06	9.06	9.23	9.30	13.41	13.41	13.50	13.83	1.88	22.54	22.53	22.25	22.51
8	26.00	26.02	25.72	26.04	33.10	33.11	32.74	33.33	1.58	41.14	41.21	40.38	41.06
9	13.76	13.72	14.20	13.11	20.67	20.60	21.34	19.80	2.00	31.25	31.12	32.36	30.26
10	26.33	26.42	27.04	25.38	36.18	36.28	36.67	34.88	1.77	44.71	44.83	44.76	43.08
11	29.39	29.27	29.21	27.73	38.55	38.45	37.71	36.47	1.59	54.58	54.52	52.15	51.36
12	18.69	18.72	19.34	18.64	25.99	25.99	27.14	26.19	1.74	38.94	38.97	40.03	39.13
13	9.42	9.44	9.01	9.03	12.67	12.71	12.04	12.09	1.62	24.31	24.38	23.33	23.28
14	12.03	12.00	12.62	11.58	18.25	18.22	18.48	17.28	1.96	26.15	26.12	25.57	25.26
15	14.70	14.68	13.77	14.75	21.50	21.44	20.09	21.58	1.93	30.56	30.50	28.81	30.51
16	15.67	15.75	12.98	13.28	21.44	21.52	17.86	18.30	1.65	30.74	30.88	26.27	27.15
17	47.75	47.45	48.69	48.14	62.79	62.50	63.22	62.80	1.68	78.65	78.43	78.48	78.42
18	22.23	22.15	25.35	22.91	29.50	29.38	33.29	30.35	1.66	38.11	38.07	40.97	38.48
19	18.13	18.15	17.89	18.42	25.16	25.21	24.41	25.37	1.68	36.89	37.02	34.70	36.38
20	23.03	22.87	22.80	24.10	29.49	29.30	29.01	31.07	1.70	35.70	35.54	35.04	37.41
21	13.03	12.94	13.61	13.67	18.11	17.98	18.78	18.80	1.78	26.62	26.51	27.06	27.08
22	16.63	16.60	16.58	17.73	20.99	20.95	20.94	22.07	1.51	27.07	27.06	26.60	27.70
23	10.58	10.61	9.78	11.10	15.45	15.49	14.18	16.16	1.82	24.10	24.19	22.76	25.04
24	6.16	6.18	5.94	6.46	8.70	8.72	8.39	9.13	1.86	15.58	15.60	15.20	16.02
25	35.88	35.70	35.28	29.01	46.53	46.25	45.90	37.96	1.70	51.19	50.92	50.91	43.05
26	23.09	23.69	21.39	18.36	30.32	31.07	27.99	24.36	1.64	42.15	43.03	39.10	35.07
27	9.41	9.28	10.97	9.23	12.96	12.78	14.78	12.76	1.76	20.89	20.70	22.62	20.54

H000C9041 - Basic Data																
			Voting Age Population					Split Geography			District Core					
District	Total Pop	Deviation	TVAP	Black	%Black	Hispanic	%Hispanic	County	City	VTD	Core Dist	TPOP Core	%TPOP Dist	VAP Core	Black Core	Hisp Core
1	696,345	1	541,696	71,459	13.19	24,637	4.54	1	0	1	1	660,824	94.89%	513,015	71,014	23,258
2	696,345	1	552,670	131,705	23.83	26,270	4.75	2	0	4	2	635,155	91.21%	504,382	120,647	24,492
3	696,345	1	540,877	79,596	14.71	35,780	6.61	6	4	34	6	472,951	67.91%	367,057	48,830	26,807
4	696,345	1	541,454	59,511	10.99	36,785	6.79	3	3	32	4	550,611	79.07%	432,836	51,763	31,104
5	696,345	1	516,338	248,119	48.05	57,418	11.12	7	4	81	3	549,809	78.95%	407,307	222,383	41,468
6	696,345	1	563,843	55,516	9.84	48,717	8.64	2	1	8	7	479,575	68.87%	386,146	42,821	35,953
7	696,345	1	548,270	58,717	10.70	102,349	18.66	1	1	12	24	314,143	45.11%	249,100	23,700	46,484
8	696,344	0	559,112	51,017	9.12	42,811	7.65	1	0	3	15	550,926	79.11%	443,288	41,051	35,749
9	696,345	1	522,984	62,722	11.99	201,350	38.50	3	4	18	8	281,212	40.38%	217,537	22,667	81,559
10	696,345	1	535,857	68,398	12.76	72,423	13.51	5	7	14	8	249,209	35.78%	189,423	21,666	27,889
11	696,345	1	576,108	49,701	8.62	38,759	6.72	5	1	12	5	293,676	42.17%	251,712	13,539	11,754
12	696,345	1	552,749	23,762	4.29	51,136	9.25	2	2	8	5	438,855	63.02%	344,175	18,866	36,654
13	696,344	0	576,766	29,555	5.12	41,422	7.18	0	4	11	10	542,811	77.95%	451,570	20,605	29,340
14	696,345	1	539,523	132,606	24.57	128,871	23.88	2	3	12	11	566,095	81.29%	434,745	121,521	116,102
15	696,345	1	525,864	58,592	11.14	93,158	17.71	2	1	7	9	342,526	49.18%	253,852	19,422	42,362
16	696,345	1	571,929	33,195	5.80	50,342	8.80	1	0	1	13	668,192	95.95%	552,116	25,354	44,534
17	696,345	1	547,966	51,872	9.46	80,121	14.62	4	3	7	16	252,983	36.33%	208,236	16,912	24,040
18	696,345	1	556,176	61,045	10.97	67,097	12.06	2	5	10	16	461,755	66.31%	367,365	33,468	45,257
19	696,345	1	574,006	33,038	5.75	78,589	13.69	2	0	7	14	680,681	97.75%	562,254	31,440	74,525
20	696,345	1	525,755	264,002	50.21	97,539	18.55	3	17	32	23	511,335	73.43%	376,527	229,435	60,934
21	696,344	0	544,609	61,029	11.20	99,674	18.30	2	5	12	19	530,826	76.23%	422,535	46,289	77,863
22	696,345	1	580,368	58,946	10.15	102,042	17.58	2	13	28	22	399,962	57.43%	338,898	20,088	51,703
23	696,344	0	554,838	55,108	9.93	208,395	37.55	2	9	7	20	474,497	68.14%	371,721	33,454	123,793
24	696,344	0	525,014	292,576	55.72	174,060	33.15	2	8	7	17	591,480	84.94%	440,594	271,343	122,888
25	696,345	1	532,937	43,982	8.25	373,507	70.08	4	4	13	21	360,059	51.70%	278,641	26,804	225,545
26	696,345	1	541,358	54,265	10.02	373,073	68.91	1	2	9	25	477,823	68.61%	362,081	38,965	275,015
27	696,345	1	550,152	42,403	7.70	412,857	75.04	0	3	14	18	463,692	66.58%	370,822	28,492	282,663

H000C9041 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
1	1	660,824	94.89%	513,015	13.84%	99.37%	4.53%	94.40%	0.14%	0.63%
	2	35,521	5.10%	28,681	1.55%	0.62%	4.80%	5.59%	0%	0.00%
2	2	635,155	91.21%	504,382	23.91%	91.60%	4.85%	93.23%	0.33%	1.05%
	1	33,334	4.78%	26,350	15.22%	3.04%	2.63%	2.64%	0.10%	0.18%
	4	27,856	4.00%	21,938	32.11%	5.34%	4.94%	4.12%	0.44%	1.53%
3	6	472,951	67.91%	367,057	13.30%	61.34%	7.30%	74.92%	0.44%	1.06%
	4	159,707	22.93%	123,436	19.62%	30.43%	3.96%	13.68%	0.12%	0.56%
	2	50,421	7.24%	39,187	12.38%	6.09%	7.87%	8.62%	0%	0.43%
	3	13,266	1.90%	11,197	15.08%	2.12%	8.85%	2.77%	0.86%	1.51%
4	4	550,611	79.07%	432,836	11.95%	86.98%	7.18%	84.55%	0.22%	0.78%
	7	125,470	18.01%	92,996	4.36%	6.81%	4.76%	12.03%	0.12%	0.44%
	3	20,264	2.91%	15,622	23.63%	6.20%	8.02%	3.40%	0.14%	0.71%
	3	549,809	78.95%	407,307	54.59%	89.62%	10.18%	72.22%	3.84%	6.90%
5	24	59,589	8.55%	44,495	12.74%	2.28%	20.30%	15.73%	1.08%	2.88%
	6	52,623	7.55%	38,754	31.36%	4.89%	8.27%	5.58%	0.67%	2.03%
	8	23,628	3.39%	17,826	25.83%	1.85%	18.68%	5.79%	1.14%	3.82%
	4	6,244	0.89%	4,636	49.87%	0.93%	5.17%	0.41%	0.12%	0.70%
	7	4,452	0.63%	3,320	29.84%	0.39%	4.18%	0.24%	0%	0%
	7	479,575	68.87%	386,146	11.08%	77.13%	9.31%	73.79%	0.39%	1.42%
6	24	189,040	27.14%	156,166	5.51%	15.50%	6.57%	21.08%	0.20%	0.67%
	3	27,730	3.98%	21,531	18.98%	7.36%	11.58%	5.11%	0%	0.44%
	24	314,143	45.11%	249,100	9.51%	40.36%	18.66%	45.41%	0.49%	2.32%
7	7	202,945	29.14%	155,749	9.31%	24.69%	14.31%	21.78%	0.19%	1.28%
	8	147,824	21.22%	119,967	8.05%	16.45%	25.27%	29.62%	0.36%	1.48%
	3	31,433	4.51%	23,454	46.26%	18.48%	13.86%	3.17%	0.50%	2.11%
	15	550,926	79.11%	443,288	9.26%	80.46%	8.06%	83.50%	0.65%	2.08%
8	24	145,418	20.88%	115,824	8.60%	19.53%	6.09%	16.49%	0.03%	1.21%
	8	281,212	40.38%	217,537	10.41%	36.13%	37.49%	40.50%	1.19%	2.92%
9	15	237,645	34.12%	177,303	10.26%	29.00%	41.65%	36.68%	0.98%	2.80%
	24	91,043	13.07%	66,547	11.64%	12.35%	29.18%	9.64%	0.25%	2.57%
	12	85,891	12.33%	61,152	22.99%	22.42%	42.84%	13.01%	3.55%	8.34%
	3	554	0.07%	445	10.56%	0.07%	70.11%	0.15%	19.13%	20.67%
	8	249,209	35.78%	189,423	11.43%	31.67%	14.72%	38.50%	0.61%	1.94%
10	12	205,572	29.52%	160,009	18.23%	42.65%	11.19%	24.74%	0.94%	1.74%
	5	197,002	28.29%	151,872	8.78%	19.50%	12.97%	27.21%	0.41%	1.78%
	15	23,922	3.43%	18,652	7.35%	2.00%	23.92%	6.16%	0%	0.81%

H000C9041 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
	3	15,999	2.29%	12,106	20.26%	3.58%	18.32%	3.06%	0.57%	2.09%
	6	4,641	0.66%	3,795	10.22%	0.56%	5.90%	0.30%	0%	0%
11	5	293,676	42.17%	251,712	5.37%	27.24%	4.66%	30.32%	0.09%	0.45%
	6	282,512	40.57%	230,309	11.77%	54.54%	8.87%	52.75%	0.16%	0.98%
	8	103,735	14.89%	80,809	9.76%	15.87%	7.65%	15.94%	0.05%	1.15%
	2	16,422	2.35%	13,278	8.75%	2.33%	2.81%	0.96%	0%	0.01%
12	5	438,855	63.02%	344,175	5.48%	79.39%	10.64%	71.67%	0.11%	0.90%
	9	257,490	36.97%	208,574	2.34%	20.60%	6.94%	28.32%	0.07%	0.45%
13	10	542,811	77.95%	451,570	4.56%	69.71%	6.49%	70.83%	0.03%	0.23%
	9	153,533	22.04%	125,196	7.14%	30.28%	9.65%	29.16%	0.03%	0.33%
14	11	566,095	81.29%	434,745	27.95%	91.64%	26.70%	90.09%	0.87%	2.51%
	10	91,078	13.07%	76,157	8.88%	5.10%	6.35%	3.75%	0.14%	0.80%
	12	39,172	5.62%	28,621	15.09%	3.25%	27.70%	6.15%	0.47%	1.56%
15	9	342,526	49.18%	253,852	7.65%	33.14%	16.68%	45.47%	0.18%	1.19%
	12	268,332	38.53%	201,770	14.37%	49.49%	18.61%	40.31%	0.31%	1.75%
	11	79,551	11.42%	65,908	15.17%	17.06%	19.05%	13.48%	1.02%	2.99%
	13	5,936	0.85%	4,334	3.83%	0.28%	15.68%	0.72%	0%	0%
16	13	668,192	95.95%	552,116	4.59%	76.37%	8.06%	88.46%	0.55%	0.93%
	11	28,153	4.04%	19,813	39.57%	23.62%	29.31%	11.53%	2.35%	2.84%
17	16	252,983	36.33%	208,236	8.12%	32.60%	11.54%	30.00%	0.54%	2.07%
	12	243,232	34.92%	184,325	11.30%	40.18%	13.69%	31.50%	0.32%	0.78%
	14	115,376	16.56%	88,313	10.18%	17.33%	18.13%	19.98%	1.22%	4.06%
	13	83,677	12.01%	66,242	7.72%	9.87%	22.30%	18.44%	0.22%	0.49%
	15	1,077	0.15%	850	0.47%	0.00%	6%	0.06%	0%	0.03%
18	16	461,755	66.31%	367,365	9.11%	54.82%	12.31%	67.45%	1.65%	3.52%
	22	155,089	22.27%	125,634	4.70%	9.69%	9.45%	17.70%	0.37%	1.71%
	23	60,280	8.65%	45,825	42.72%	32.07%	16.52%	11.28%	4.42%	7.79%
	19	19,221	2.76%	17,352	11.99%	3.40%	13.75%	3.55%	1.89%	3.83%
19	14	680,681	97.75%	562,254	5.59%	95.16%	13.25%	94.82%	1.30%	1.77%
	25	15,664	2.24%	11,752	13.59%	4.83%	34.58%	5.17%	10.24%	10.75%
20	23	511,335	73.43%	376,527	60.93%	86.90%	16.18%	62.47%	12.05%	22.13%
	20	87,977	12.63%	71,600	30.21%	8.19%	23.28%	17.09%	5.90%	19.07%
	19	61,593	8.84%	50,580	17.46%	3.34%	23.04%	11.94%	2.71%	7.30%
	16	22,602	3.24%	16,997	11.79%	0.75%	31.42%	5.47%	1.57%	4.75%
	22	12,838	1.84%	10,051	20.81%	0.79%	29.22%	3.01%	4.52%	7.26%
21	19	530,826	76.23%	422,535	10.95%	75.84%	18.42%	78.11%	3.23%	5.74%

H000C9041 Compare New District Core to the Current Districts										
District	Current Dist	Common Pop	Pop of Part	Common VAP	Black VAP	% of the Black	Hispanic VAP	% or the Hispanic	Haitian POP	W. Indies POP
	22	107,378	15.42%	79,565	12.81%	16.70%	17.92%	14.30%	2.34%	5.76%
	16	38,305	5.50%	28,563	8.76%	4.10%	19.21%	5.50%	1.80%	4.21%
	23	19,835	2.84%	13,946	14.62%	3.34%	14.79%	2.07%	1.75%	8.39%
22	22	399,962	57.43%	338,898	5.92%	34.07%	15.25%	50.66%	2.57%	3.62%
	19	124,779	17.91%	101,923	12.79%	22.11%	18.14%	18.12%	5.78%	8.07%
	20	114,174	16.39%	93,645	11.85%	18.83%	21.91%	20.11%	3.24%	6.78%
	23	57,430	8.24%	45,902	32.06%	24.96%	24.66%	11.09%	11.04%	13.27%
23	20	474,497	68.14%	371,721	8.99%	60.70%	33.30%	59.40%	1.10%	3.84%
	18	97,728	14.03%	86,595	5.15%	8.09%	55.51%	23.06%	0.29%	0.77%
	17	63,445	9.11%	49,447	23.55%	21.13%	39.92%	9.47%	4.28%	10.38%
	21	28,734	4.12%	20,513	17.84%	6.64%	44.62%	4.39%	2.69%	8.81%
	22	18,992	2.72%	14,497	6.18%	1.62%	21.50%	1.49%	0.49%	1.33%
	23	12,948	1.85%	12,065	8.16%	1.78%	37.43%	2.16%	2.00%	6.18%
24	17	591,480	84.94%	440,594	61.58%	92.74%	27.89%	70.60%	16.80%	24.83%
	18	46,301	6.64%	38,869	20.48%	2.72%	68.62%	15.32%	2.36%	3.61%
	21	24,749	3.55%	19,145	17.90%	1.17%	81.49%	8.96%	2.72%	7.03%
	23	18,735	2.69%	13,547	60.76%	2.81%	28.16%	2.19%	6.79%	25.31%
	20	15,079	2.16%	12,859	12.52%	0.55%	39.52%	2.92%	7.85%	9.76%
25	21	360,059	51.70%	278,641	9.61%	60.94%	80.94%	60.38%	1.63%	4.04%
	25	234,256	33.64%	173,019	7.40%	29.11%	70.65%	32.72%	2.03%	2.68%
	14	62,899	9.03%	51,465	4.40%	5.15%	12.98%	1.78%	2.09%	2.75%
	16	22,066	3.16%	15,852	4.57%	1.64%	50.32%	2.13%	0.02%	0.34%
	18	13,469	1.93%	11,104	6.16%	1.55%	91.65%	2.72%	0.21%	1.61%
	23	3,544	0.50%	2,817	24.38%	1.56%	30.10%	0.22%	1.39%	3.24%
	17	52	0.00%	39	17.94%	0.01%	87.17%	0.00%	3.53%	9.46%
26	25	477,823	68.61%	362,081	10.76%	71.80%	75.95%	73.71%	1.50%	3.94%
	21	126,922	18.22%	102,078	11.04%	20.77%	71.41%	19.54%	0.73%	3.00%
	18	91,600	13.15%	77,199	5.21%	7.42%	32.58%	6.74%	0.91%	1.26%
27	18	463,692	66.58%	370,822	7.68%	67.19%	76.22%	68.46%	0.42%	1.36%
	21	153,037	21.97%	122,440	4.00%	11.55%	77.94%	23.11%	0.20%	1.32%
	25	79,433	11.40%	56,738	15.85%	21.21%	61.01%	8.38%	3.57%	7.48%
	17	183	0.02%	152	10.52%	0.03%	94.73%	0.03%	0%	0%

H000C9041 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
1	Counties	Escambia, Holmes 2 11,489 of 19,927, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Walton
	Cities	Century, Cinco Bayou, Crestview, De Funiak Springs, Destin, Esto, Fort Walton Beach, Freeport, Gulf Breeze, Jay, Laurel Hill, Mary Esther, Milton, Niceville, Noma, Paxton, Pensacola, Ponce de Leon, Shalimar, Valparaiso, Westville
	Vtd's	120590006 2 2538 of 3756
2	Counties	Bay, Calhoun, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Holmes 2 8,438 of 19,927, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Madison 2 4,028 of 19,224, Taylor, Wakulla, Washington
	Cities	Alford, Altha, Apalachicola, Bascom, Blountstown, Bonifay, Bristol, Callaway, Campbellton, Carrabelle, Caryville, Chattahoochee, Chipley, Cottontale, Ebro, Graceville, Grand Ridge, Greensboro, Greenville, Greenwood, Gretna, Havana, Jacob City, Lynn Haven, Malone, Marianna, Mexico Beach, Midway, Monticello, Panama City, Panama City Beach, Parker, Perry, Port St. Joe, Quincy, St. Marks, Sneads, Sopchoppy, Springfield, Tallahassee, Vernon, Wausau, Wewahitchka
	Vtd's	120590006 2 1218 of 3756, 120790001 2 2 of 3498, 120790007 2 258 of 1648, 120790010 2 253 of 3710
3	Counties	Alachua 2 203,019 of 247,336, Baker, Bradford, Clay 2 172,485 of 190,865, Columbia, Duval 3 78,609 of 864,263, Gilchrist 2 3,584 of 16,939, Hamilton, Lafayette, Madison 2 15,196 of 19,224, Nassau 2 19,531 of 73,314, Suwannee, Union
	Cities	Alachua , Archer, Baldwin, Branford, Brooker, Callahan 2 417 of 1123, Fort White, Gainesville 2 93046 of 124354, Glen St. Mary, Hampton, High Springs, Hilliard, Jacksonville 3 77184 of 821784, Jasper, Jennings, Keystone Heights, La Crosse, Lake Butler, Lake City, Lawtey, Lee, Live Oak, Macclenny, Madison, Mayo, Micanopy, Newberry, Orange Park 2 6415 of 8412, Penney Farms, Raiford, Starke, Waldo, White Springs, Worthington Springs
	Vtd's	120010004 2 41 of 1226, 120010006 2 790 of 1559, 120010013 2 45 of 3958, 120010031 2 5047 of 5470, 120010036 2 703 of 2600, 120010046 2 1402 of 4482, 120010054 2 2352 of 3971, 120010068 2 1968 of 1994, 120190047 2 1083 of 1099, 120190049 2 737 of 1724, 120190084 2 313 of 1608, 120190093 2 808 of 1056, 120190101 2 584 of 882, 120310145 2 116 of 1835, 120310157 2 152 of 3203, 120310192 2 1319 of 2370, 120310193 2 60 of 1819, 120310198 2 2459 of 2675, 120310200 2 747 of 2999, 120310205 2 820 of 842, 120310215 2 726 of 3981, 120310229 2 759 of 1691, 120310235 2 1531 of 4271, 120310237 2 2908 of 3379, 120310241 2 7223 of 9487, 120310245 2 3592 of 3775, 120310277 2 2374 of 2844, 120410006 2 354 of 2094, 120790001 2 3496 of 3498, 120790007 2 1390 of 1648, 120790010 2 3457 of 3710, 120890010 2 5623 of 5843, 120890015 2 2983 of 5649, 120890018 2 417 of 1123
4	Counties	Duval 3 517,092 of 864,263, Nassau 2 53,783 of 73,314, St. Johns2 125,470 of 190,039
	Cities	Atlantic Beach, Callahan 2 706 of 1123, Fernandina Beach, Jacksonville 3 476038 of 821784, Jacksonville Beach, Neptune Beach, St. Augustine 2 5091 of 12975
	Vtd's	120310005 2 3872 of 4261, 120310010 2 134 of 2274, 120310012 2 2183 of 2208, 120310013 2 1710 of 3243, 120310014 2 475 of 3607, 120310023 2 1438 of 1980, 120310027 2 1872 of 3342, 120310061 2 2012 of 4403, 120310066 2 1048 of 2066, 120310067 2 3432 of 3745, 120310069 2 1977 of 3789, 120310072 2 2153 of 3142, 120310075 2 373 of 4156, 120310078 2 2658 of 2680, 120310084 2 2873 of 2929, 120310116 2 2 of 2206, 120310128 2 2277 of 2515, 120310138 2 2394 of 2452, 120310143 2 289 of 2622, 120310172 2 1582 of 1871, 120310177 2 1092 of 4474, 120310184 2 206 of 752, 120310191 2 567 of 2844, 120310213 2 1975 of 4458, 120310280 2 3056 of 3580, 120310285 2 2616 of 2683, 120890010 2 220 of 5843, 120890015 2 2666 of 5649, 120890018 2 706 of 1123, 121090020 2 2226 of 2996, 121090022 2 2028 of 4275, 121090043 2 515 of 2166
5	Counties	Alachua 2 44,317 of 247,336, Clay 2 18,380 of 190,865, Duval 3 268,562 of 864,263, Lake3 17,490 of 297,052, Marion2 15,019 of 331,298, Orange 5 299,700 of 1,145,956, Putnam2 32,877 of 74,364
	Cities	Apopka, Eatonville, Gainesville 2 31308 of 124354, Green Cove Springs, Hawthorne, Jacksonville 3 268562 of 821784, McIntosh, Orange Park 2 1997 of 8412, Orlando 4 77843 of 238300, Palatka, Reddick
	Vtd's	120010004 2 1185 of 1226, 120010006 2 769 of 1559, 120010013 2 3913 of 3958, 120010031 2 423 of 5470, 120010036 2 1897 of 2600, 120010046 2 3080 of 4482, 120010054 2 1619 of 3971, 120010068 2 26 of 1994, 120190047 2 16 of 1099, 120190049 2 987 of 1724, 120190084 2 1295 of 1608, 120190093 2 248 of 1056, 120190101 2 298 of 882, 120310005 2 389 of 4261, 120310010 2 2140 of 2274, 120310012 2 25 of 2208, 120310013 2 1533 of 3243, 120310014 2 3132 of 3607, 120310023 2 542 of 1980, 120310027 2 1470 of 3342, 120310061 2 2391 of 4403, 120310066 2 1018 of 2066, 120310067 2 313 of 3745, 120310069 2 1812 of 3789, 120310072 2 989 of 3142, 120310075 2 3783 of 4156, 120310078 2 22 of 2680, 120310084 2 56 of 2929, 120310116 2 2204 of 2206, 120310128 2 238 of 2515, 120310138 2 58 of 2452, 120310143 2 2333 of 2622, 120310145 2 1719 of 1835, 120310157 2 1051 of 3203, 120310172 2 289 of 1871, 120310177 2 3382 of 4474, 120310184 2 546 of 752, 120310191 2 2277 of 2844, 120310192 2 1051 of 2370, 120310193 2 1759 of 1819, 120310198 2 216 of 2675, 120310200 2 2252 of 2999, 120310205 2 22 of 842, 120310213 2 2483 of 4458, 120310215 2 3255 of 3981, 120310229 2 932 of 1691, 120310235 2 2740 of 4271, 120310237 2 471 of 3379, 120310241 2 2264 of 9487, 120310245 2 183 of 3775, 120310277 2 470 of 2844, 120310280 2 524 of 3580, 120310285 2 67 of 2683, 120690003 2 117 of 1984, 120690008 2 2263 of 3901, 120690116 2 1874 of 2308, 120690118 2 1282 of 4837, 120830026 2 1927 of 2521, 120830032 2 1559 of 2799, 120830034 2 227 of 1882, 120830043 2 966 of 1152, 120950023 2 744 of 5266, 120950059 2 319 of 3793, 120950061 2 1145 of 5132, 120950062 2 40 of 1947, 120950065 2 3865 of 3974, 120950068 2 5481 of 5566, 120950079 2 2992 of 3191, 120950150 2 304 of 3406, 120950160 2 338 of 1721, 120950210 2 1 of 1548, 120950268 2 3965 of 4767,

H000C9041 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
		120950269 3 2242 of 2889, 120950281 2 6929 of 7125, 120950287 2 2720 of 6604, 120950290 2 3473 of 3940, 121070028 2 23 of 32, 121070046 2 63 of 317, 121070047 2 6 of 1594, 121070068 2 78 of 1662, 121070100 2 45 of 2534
6	Counties	Flagler, Putnam 2 41,487 of 74,364, St. Johns 2 64,569 of 190,039, Volusia
	Cities	Beverly Beach, Bunnell, Crescent City, Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, DeBary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Flagler Beach, Hastings, Holly Hill, Interlachen, Lake Helen, Marineland, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Palm Coast, Pierson, Pomona Park, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, St. Augustine 2 7884 of 12975, St. Augustine Beach, South Daytona, Welaka
	Vtd's	121070028 2 9 of 32, 121070046 2 254 of 317, 121070047 2 1588 of 1594, 121070068 2 1584 of 1662, 121070100 2 2489 of 2534, 121090020 2 770 of 2996, 121090022 2 2247 of 4275, 121090043 2 1651 of 2166
7	Counties	Orange 5 273,627 of 1,145,956, Seminole
	Cities	Altamonte Springs, Casselberry, Lake Mary, Longwood, Maitland, Orlando 4 43408 of 238300, Oviedo, Sanford, Winter Park, Winter Springs
	Vtd's	120950059 2 3474 of 3793, 120950061 2 3987 of 5132, 120950062 2 1907 of 1947, 120950065 2 109 of 3974, 120950068 2 85 of 5566, 120950110 2 2421 of 2458, 120950114 2 1462 of 3774, 120950133 2 413 of 2933, 120950137 2 2618 of 4963, 120950138 2 2733 of 3386, 120950210 2 1547 of 1548, 120950259 3 5201 of 5697
8	Counties	Brevard, Indian River, Orange 5 14,940 of 1,145,956
	Cities	Cape Canaveral, Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, Fellsmere, Grant-Valkaria, Indialantic, Indian Harbour Beach, Indian River Shores, Malabar, Melbourne, Melbourne Beach, Melbourne Village, Orchid, Palm Bay, Palm Shores, Rockledge, Satellite Beach, Sebastian, Titusville, Vero Beach, West Melbourne
	Vtd's	120950196 2 228 of 9159, 120950205 2 163 of 9008, 120950259 3 465 of 5697
9	Counties	Orange 5 364,932 of 1,145,956, Osceola 3 262,136 of 268,685, Polk 3 69,277 of 602,095
	Cities	Belle Isle, Davenport, Dundee 3 4 of 3717, Edgewood, Haines City 2 14456 of 20535, Kissimmee, Lake Hamilton 2 1163 of 1231, Orlando 4 89386 of 238300, St. Cloud
	Vtd's	120950110 2 37 of 2458, 120950114 2 2312 of 3774, 120950133 2 2520 of 2933, 120950137 2 2345 of 4963, 120950138 2 653 of 3386, 120950150 2 3102 of 3406, 120950160 2 1383 of 1721, 120950196 2 8931 of 9159, 120950205 2 8845 of 9008, 120950259 3 31 of 5697, 120950268 2 802 of 4767, 120950269 3 643 of 2889, 120950281 2 196 of 7125, 120950290 2 467 of 3940, 120970001 2 329 of 1907, 121050082 2 5525 of 5788, 121050083 2 124 of 5463, 121050087 2 1971 of 2039
10	Counties	Lake 3 207,677 of 297,052, Orange 5 192,757 of 1,145,956, Osceola 3 5,472 of 268,685, Polk 3 289,586 of 602,095, Sumter 2 853 of 93,420
	Cities	Astatula, Auburndale, Bay Lake, Clermont, Dundee 3 0 of 3717, Eustis, Groveland, Haines City 2 6079 of 20535, Howey-in-the-Hills, Lake Alfred, Lake Buena Vista, Lake Hamilton 2 68 of 1231, Lakeland 2 86624 of 97422, Leesburg 2 9219 of 20117, Mascotte, Minneola, Montverde, Mount Dora, Oakland, Ocoee, Orlando 4 27663 of 238300, Polk City, Tavares, Windermere, Winter Garden, Winter Haven 2 18693 of 33874
	Vtd's	120690008 2 1638 of 3901, 120690050 2 1847 of 1931, 120690051 2 1223 of 1765, 120690118 2 3555 of 4837, 120950023 2 4522 of 5266, 120950079 2 199 of 3191, 120950269 3 4 of 2889, 120950287 2 3884 of 6604, 120970001 2 1578 of 1907, 121050075 2 4705 of 7813, 121050082 2 263 of 5788, 121050083 2 5339 of 5463, 121050087 2 68 of 2039, 121050128 2 13037 of 13050
11	Counties	Citrus, Dixie, Gilchrist 2 13,355 of 16,939, Hernando 2 3,800 of 172,778, Lake 3 71,885 of 297,052, Levy, Marion 2 316,279 of 331,298, Sumter 2 92,567 of 93,420
	Cities	Bell, Belleview, Bronson, Bushnell, Cedar Key, Center Hill, Chiefland, Coleman, Cross City, Crystal River, Dunnellon, Fanning Springs, Fruitland Park, Horseshoe Beach, Inglis, Inverness, Lady Lake, Leesburg 2 10898 of 20117, Ocala, Otter Creek, Trenton, Umatilla, Webster, Wildwood, Williston, Yankeetown
	Vtd's	120410006 2 1740 of 2094, 120530002 2 651 of 1188, 120530003 2 1439 of 1492, 120530049 2 1710 of 3679, 120690003 2 1867 of 1984, 120690050 2 84 of 1931, 120690051 2 542 of 1765, 120690116 2 434 of 2308, 120830026 2 594 of 2521, 120830032 2 1240 of 2799, 120830034 2 1655 of 1882, 120830043 2 186 of 1152
12	Counties	Hernando 2 168,978 of 172,778, Pasco, Pinellas 3 62,670 of 916,542
	Cities	Brooksville, Dade City, New Port Richey, Oldsmar 2 5101 of 13591, Port Richey, St. Leo, San Antonio, Tarpon Springs 2 2498 of 23484, Weeki Wachee, Zephyrhills
	Vtd's	120530002 2 537 of 1188, 120530003 2 53 of 1492, 120530049 2 1969 of 3679, 121030317 2 1745 of 2459, 121030318 2 3019 of 3728, 121030320 2 2100 of 2135, 121030334 2 817 of 3133, 121030359 2 405 of 4101
13	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Belleair, Belleair Beach, Belleair Bluffs, Belleair Shore, Clearwater, Dunedin, Gulfport 2 5509 of 12029, Indian Rocks Beach, Indian Shores, Kenneth City, Largo, Madeira Beach, North Redington Beach, Oldsmar 2 8490 of 13591, Pinellas Park, Redington Beach, Redington Shores, Safety Harbor, St. Pete Beach, St. Petersburg 2 95027 of 244769, Seminole, South Pasadena, Tarpon Springs 2 20986 of 23484, Treasure Island

H000C9041 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
Vtd's	121030031 2 1101 of 2496, 121030032 2 1110 of 1878, 121030070 2 303 of 5609, 121030072 2 2889 of 4462, 121030093 2 588 of 2599, 121030103 2 1116 of 2975, 121030317 2 714 of 2459, 121030318 2 709 of 3728, 121030320 2 35 of 2135, 121030334 2 2316 of 3133, 121030359 2 3696 of 4101	
14 Counties	Hillsborough 2 538,817 of 1,229,226, Pinellas 3 157,528 of 916,542	
Cities	Gulfport 2 6520 of 12029, St. Petersburg 2 149742 of 244769, Tampa 2 281167 of 335709	
Vtd's	120570102 2 4308 of 4522, 120570163 2 2480 of 2494, 120570263 2 11 of 4083, 120570282 2 87 of 1614, 120570284 2 159 of 447, 120570421 2 215 of 5264, 121030031 2 1395 of 2496, 121030032 2 768 of 1878, 121030070 2 5306 of 5609, 121030072 2 1573 of 4462, 121030093 2 2011 of 2599, 121030103 2 1859 of 2975	
15 Counties	Hillsborough 2 690,409 of 1,229,226, Manatee 2 5,936 of 322,833	
Cities	Plant City, Tampa 2 54542 of 335709, Temple Terrace	
Vtd's	120570102 2 214 of 4522, 120570163 2 14 of 2494, 120570263 2 4072 of 4083, 120570282 2 1527 of 1614, 120570284 2 288 of 447, 120570421 2 5049 of 5264, 120810019 2 4594 of 6430	
16 Counties	Manatee 2 316,897 of 322,833, Sarasota	
Cities	Anna Maria, Bradenton, Bradenton Beach, Holmes Beach, Longboat Key, North Port, Palmetto, Sarasota, Venice	
Vtd's	120810019 2 1836 of 6430	
17 Counties	Charlotte, DeSoto, Glades, Hardee, Highlands, Lee 2 83,137 of 618,754, Okeechobee 2 34,658 of 39,996, Osceola 3 1,077 of 268,685, Polk 3 243,232 of 602,095	
Cities	Arcadia, Avon Park, Bartow, Bowling Green, Dundee 3 3713 of 3717, Eagle Lake, Fort Meade, Frostproof, Highland Park, Hillcrest Heights, Lakeland 2 10798 of 97422, Lake Placid, Lake Wales, Moore Haven, Mulberry, Okeechobee, Punta Gorda, Sebring, Wauchula, Winter Haven 2 15181 of 33874, Zolfo Springs	
Vtd's	120710072 2 37 of 2853, 120710078 2 4294 of 5864, 120710082 2 6282 of 9783, 120710099 2 2015 of 2076, 120930007 2 1783 of 1890, 121050075 2 3108 of 7813, 121050128 2 13 of 13050	
18 Counties	Martin, Okeechobee 2 5,338 of 39,996, Palm Beach 4 266,900 of 1,320,134, St. Lucie	
Cities	Fort Pierce, Juno Beach, Jupiter, Jupiter Inlet Colony, Jupiter Island, Lake Park 3 0 of 8155, Loxahatchee Groves 2 1681 of 3180, North Palm Beach, Ocean Breeze Park, Palm Beach Gardens, Port St. Lucie, Riviera Beach 3 0 of 32488, Royal Palm Beach 3 14734 of 34140, St. Lucie Village, Sewall's Point, Stuart, Tequesta, West Palm Beach 3 20693 of 99919	
Vtd's	120930007 2 107 of 1890, 120990208 2 1354 of 1783, 120990227 2 34 of 333, 120990228 2 116 of 977, 120990232 2 2432 of 2929, 120990234 2 154 of 934, 120990303 2 2791 of 2796, 120990675 2 2326 of 3195, 120990678 2 1681 of 3180, 120990758 2 1 of 1365	
19 Counties	Collier 2 160,728 of 321,520, Lee 2 535,617 of 618,754	
Cities	Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Marco Island, Naples, Sanibel	
Vtd's	120210079 2 1330 of 2119, 120210092 2 320 of 2268, 120210112 2 2225 of 4281, 120710072 2 2816 of 2853, 120710078 2 1570 of 5864, 120710082 2 3501 of 9783, 120710099 2 61 of 2076	
20 Counties	Broward 6 455,445 of 1,748,066, Hendry 2 13,550 of 39,140, Palm Beach 4 227,350 of 1,320,134	
Cities	Belle Glade, Boynton Beach 2 19978 of 68217, Clewiston, Cloud Lake, Coconut Creek 2 433 of 52909, Deerfield Beach 3 26242 of 75018, Fort Lauderdale 3 60588 of 165521, Glen Ridge, Haverhill, Lake Park 3 7242 of 8155, Lake Worth 2 10654 of 34910, Lantana 2 4654 of 10423, Lauderdale Lakes, Lauderdale, Loxahatchee Groves 2 1499 of 3180, Mangonia Park, Margate 2 14535 of 53284, North Lauderdale, Oakland Park 2 20289 of 41363, Pahokee, Plantation 3 13381 of 84955, Pompano Beach 3 46314 of 99845, Riviera Beach 3 28156 of 32488, Royal Palm Beach 3 16299 of 34140, South Bay, Sunrise 3 62665 of 84439, Tamarac, West Palm Beach 3 48663 of 99919, Wilton Manors 2 3311 of 11632	
Vtd's	120110010 2 1509 of 1634, 120110069 2 4326 of 4334, 120110088 2 1050 of 1053, 120110120 2 4534 of 6202, 120110195 2 433 of 4377, 120110216 2 1836 of 4005, 120110491 2 361 of 1663, 120110501 2 2570 of 2624, 120110503 2 869 of 1606, 120110504 2 4697 of 5624, 120110543 2 71 of 896, 120990190 2 435 of 1348, 120990208 2 429 of 1783, 120990227 2 299 of 333, 120990228 2 861 of 977, 120990232 2 497 of 2929, 120990234 2 780 of 934, 120990242 2 33 of 726, 120990247 2 1440 of 3897, 120990248 2 786 of 3218, 120990250 2 215 of 587, 120990252 2 379 of 1035, 120990254 2 776 of 3585, 120990303 2 5 of 2796, 120990675 2 869 of 3195, 120990678 2 1499 of 3180, 120990737 2 971 of 5837, 120990758 2 1364 of 1365, 120990772 2 3338 of 3364, 120990779 2 2760 of 4107, 120990800 2 1013 of 5484, 120990803 2 962 of 5319	
21 Counties	Broward 6 272,224 of 1,748,066, Palm Beach 4 424,120 of 1,320,134	

H000C9041 Plan Geography Splits (note: area listed in red if district does not contain total population of area and district also contains population outside of area).		
Cities	Coconut Creek 2 52476 of 52909, Coral Springs, Deerfield Beach 3 33897 of 75018 , Greenacres, Margate 2 38749 of 53284 , Parkland, Pompano Beach 3 1447 of 99845 , Royal Palm Beach 3 3107 of 34140 , Wellington	
Vtd's	120110195 2 3944 of 4377, 120110216 2 2169 of 4005, 120990252 2 656 of 1035, 120990254 2 2809 of 3585, 120990262 2 1304 of 2339, 120990265 2 23 of 3747, 120990344 2 2477 of 2495, 120990503 2 1738 of 2210, 120990504 2 614 of 617, 120990511 2 459 of 463, 120990578 2 396 of 1253, 120990737 2 4866 of 5837	
22 Counties	Broward 6 294,581 of 1,748,066, Palm Beach 4 401,764 of 1,320,134	
Cities	Atlantis, Boca Raton, Boynton Beach 2 48239 of 68217 , Briny Breezes, Deerfield Beach 3 14879 of 75018 , Delray Beach, Fort Lauderdale 3 104933 of 165521, Golf, Gulf Stream, Highland Beach, Hillsboro Beach, Hypoluxo, Lake Clarke Shores, Lake Park 3 913 of 8155 , Lake Worth 2 24256 of 34910 , Lantana 2 5769 of 10423, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Lazy Lake, Lighthouse Point, Manalapan, Oakland Park 2 21074 of 41363, Ocean Ridge, Palm Beach, Palm Beach Shores, Palm Springs, Plantation 3 67448 of 84955, Pompano Beach 3 52084 of 99845, Riviera Beach 3 4332 of 32488, Sea Ranch Lakes, South Palm Beach, Sunrise 3 0 of 84439, West Palm Beach 3 30563 of 99919, Wilton Manors 2 8321 of 11632	
Vtd's	120110010 2 125 of 1634, 120110069 2 8 of 4334, 120110088 2 3 of 1053, 120110120 2 1668 of 6202, 120110362 2 34 of 3934, 120110393 2 1349 of 1575, 120110491 2 1302 of 1663, 120110501 2 54 of 2624, 120110503 2 737 of 1606, 120110504 2 927 of 5624, 120110543 2 825 of 896, 120110867 2 1729 of 1918, 120990190 2 913 of 1348, 120990242 2 693 of 726, 120990247 2 2457 of 3897, 120990248 2 2432 of 3218, 120990250 2 372 of 587, 120990262 2 1035 of 2339, 120990265 2 3724 of 3747, 120990344 2 18 of 2495, 120990503 2 472 of 2210, 120990504 2 3 of 617, 120990511 2 4 of 463, 120990578 2 857 of 1253, 120990772 2 26 of 3364, 120990779 2 1347 of 4107, 120990800 2 4471 of 5484, 120990803 2 4357 of 5319	
23 Counties	Broward 6 498,411 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade 5 197,933 of 2,496,435	
Cities	Aventura, Bal Harbour, Bay Harbor Islands, Cooper City, Dania Beach, Davie, Fort Lauderdale 3 0 of 165521, Golden Beach, Hallandale Beach 2 25370 of 37113, Hollywood 2 114568 of 140768, Indian Creek, Miami 3 15273 of 399457, Miami Beach, North Bay Village, North Miami 2 9175 of 58786, North Miami Beach 2 6953 of 41523, Pembroke Pines 3 107607 of 154750, Plantation 3 4126 of 84955, Southwest Ranches, Sunny Isles Beach, Sunrise 3 21774 of 84439, Surfside, Weston	
Vtd's	120110362 2 3900 of 3934, 120110393 2 226 of 1575, 120110689 2 473 of 2982, 120110705 2 1127 of 2033, 120110813 2 2 of 2553, 120110867 2 189 of 1918, 120860135 2 1478 of 2352	
24 Counties	Broward 6 136,412 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade 5 559,932 of 2,496,435	
Cities	Biscayne Park, El Portal, Hallandale Beach 2 11743 of 37113, Hollywood 2 26200 of 140768, Miami 3 133006 of 399457, Miami Gardens, Miami Shores, Miramar 2 65355 of 122041 , North Miami 2 49611 of 58786, North Miami Beach 2 34570 of 41523, Opa-locka 2 14894 of 15219, Pembroke Park, Pembroke Pines 3 12856 of 154750, West Park	
Vtd's	120110689 2 2509 of 2982, 120110705 2 906 of 2033, 120110772 2 1560 of 6836, 120860135 2 874 of 2352, 120860311 2 41 of 6111, 120860313 2 6106 of 6155, 120860382 2 5 of 8	
25 Counties	Broward 6 90,993 of 1,748,066, Collier 2 160,792 of 321,520, Hendry 2 25,590 of 39,140, Miami-Dade 5 418,970 of 2,496,435	
Cities	Doral, Everglades, Hialeah 2 162856 of 224669, Hialeah Gardens, LaBelle, Medley, Miami Lakes, Miramar 2 56686 of 122041 , Opa-locka 2 325 of 15219, Pembroke Pines 3 34287 of 154750, Sweetwater	
Vtd's	120110772 2 5276 of 6836, 120110813 2 2551 of 2553, 120210079 2 789 of 2119, 120210092 2 1948 of 2268, 120210112 2 2056 of 4281, 120860311 2 6070 of 6111, 120860313 2 49 of 6155, 120860382 2 3 of 8, 120860454 2 2340 of 3346, 120860455 2 540 of 3355, 120860456 2 829 of 4377, 120860471 2 4174 of 5834, 120860615 2 51 of 2550	
26 Counties	Miami-Dade 5 623,255 of 2,496,435, Monroe	
Cities	Florida City, Homestead 2 42640 of 60512 , Islamorada, Village of Islands, Key Colony Beach, Key West, Layton, Marathon	
Vtd's	120861043 2 569 of 2631, 120861104 2 558 of 2082, 120861115 2 319 of 1176, 120861221 2 1973 of 3284, 120861268 2 2 of 2754, 120861297 2 454 of 540, 120861299 2 188 of 292, 120861360 2 140 of 144, 120861386 2 39 of 469	
27 Counties	Miami-Dade	
Cities	Coral Gables, Cutler Bay, Hialeah 2 61813 of 224669, Homestead 2 17872 of 60512, Key Biscayne, Miami 3 251178 of 399457, Miami Springs, Palmetto Bay, Pinecrest, South Miami, Virginia Gardens, West Miami	
Vtd's	120860454 2 1006 of 3346, 120860455 2 2815 of 3355, 120860456 2 3548 of 4377, 120860471 2 1660 of 5834, 120860615 2 2499 of 2550, 120861043 2 2062 of 2631, 120861104 2 1524 of 2082, 120861115 2 857 of 1176, 120861221 2 1311 of 3284, 120861268 2 2752 of 2754, 120861297 2 86 of 540, 120861299 2 104 of 292, 120861360 2 4 of 144, 120861386 2 430 of 469	