Redistricting Committee

Meeting Packet

Friday, January 27, 2012
9:30 AM
404 HOB

Part 3 of 3

Dean Cannon
Speaker

Will W. Weatherford
Chair

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HJR 6011 PCB HRS 12-02 Joint Resolution of Apportionment
SPONSOR(S): House Redistricting Subcommittee, Schenck
TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** HJR 6001 HJR 6009 HJR 6013 CS/SJR 1176 SJR 1628

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
Orig. Comm.: House Redistricting Subcommittee	10 Y, 4 N	Takacs	Kelly
1) Redistricting Committee		Takacs	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 H000H9027: This proposed committee bill (joint resolution) reapportions the resident population of Florida into 120 State House districts, as required by state and federal law.

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

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

- Reduce the number of counties split from 46 to 30;
- Reduce the number of cities split from 170 to 84;
- Reduce the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Reduce the distance and drive time to travel the average district;
- Reduce the total population deviation from 81.58% to 3.97%; and
- Maintain and possibly increase numbers of elected representation for African-American and Hispanic Floridians.

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 (~~p~~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 ~~o~~ne-person, one vote," such that each district must be substantially equal in total population.

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

Table 1. Florida House Districts 2002-2011

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

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
1	134,020	834	0.6%	159,402	2,724	1.7%
2	132,612	-574	-0.4%	139,453	-17,225	-11.0%
3	132,921	-265	-0.2%	126,253	-30,425	-19.4%
4	133,438	252	0.2%	144,198	-12,480	-8.0%
5	132,940	-246	-0.2%	154,014	-2,664	-1.7%
6	133,583	397	0.3%	147,936	-8,742	-5.6%
7	133,222	36	0.0%	169,309	12,631	8.1%
8	133,335	149	0.1%	152,934	-3,744	-2.4%
9	133,815	629	0.5%	147,197	-9,481	-6.1%
10	133,367	181	0.1%	151,214	-5,464	-3.5%
11	134,465	1,279	1.0%	163,223	6,545	4.2%
12	132,062	-1,124	-0.8%	159,354	2,676	1.7%
13	132,396	-790	-0.6%	195,431	38,753	24.7%
14	131,893	-1,293	-1.0%	134,417	-22,261	-14.2%
15	131,954	-1,232	-0.9%	124,511	-32,167	-20.5%

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
61	132,901	-285	-0.2%	242,396	85,718	54.7%
62	132,243	-943	-0.7%	162,165	5,487	3.5%
63	134,713	1,527	1.1%	156,183	-495	-0.3%
64	133,177	-9	0.0%	165,492	8,814	5.6%
65	133,436	250	0.2%	179,502	22,824	14.6%
66	134,437	1,251	0.9%	162,026	5,348	3.4%
67	133,046	-140	-0.1%	241,034	84,356	53.8%
68	131,868	-1,318	-1.0%	128,684	-27,994	-17.9%
69	134,830	1,644	1.2%	132,224	-24,454	-15.6%
70	132,331	-855	-0.6%	150,125	-6,553	-4.2%
71	133,334	148	0.1%	183,147	26,469	16.9%
72	133,199	13	0.0%	167,184	10,506	6.7%
73	133,440	254	0.2%	189,406	32,728	20.9%
74	133,276	90	0.1%	182,460	25,782	16.5%
75	133,374	188	0.1%	174,874	18,196	11.6%

16	131,880	-1,306	-1.0%	140,428	-16,250	-10.4%
17	131,971	-1,215	-0.9%	161,943	5,265	3.4%
18	131,882	-1,304	-1.0%	161,190	4,512	2.9%
19	134,499	1,313	1.0%	175,628	18,950	12.1%
20	132,090	-1,096	-0.8%	201,953	45,275	28.9%
21	134,384	1,198	0.9%	145,063	-11,615	-7.4%
22	133,859	673	0.5%	176,739	20,061	12.8%
23	134,120	934	0.7%	142,648	-14,030	-9.0%
24	134,662	1,476	1.1%	166,317	9,639	6.2%
25	134,252	1,066	0.8%	179,031	22,353	14.3%
26	134,314	1,128	0.8%	165,010	8,332	5.3%
27	132,503	-683	-0.5%	131,755	-24,923	-15.9%
28	133,183	-3	0.0%	154,175	-2,503	-1.6%
29	133,692	506	0.4%	160,290	3,612	2.3%
30	132,532	-654	-0.5%	180,594	23,916	15.3%
31	133,546	360	0.3%	138,215	-18,463	-11.8%
32	131,310	-1,876	-1.4%	177,523	20,845	13.3%
33	132,100	-1,086	-0.8%	196,662	39,984	25.5%
34	133,372	186	0.1%	144,119	-12,559	-8.0%
35	134,235	1,049	0.8%	154,735	-1,943	-1.2%
36	134,498	1,312	1.0%	157,126	448	0.3%
37	133,762	576	0.4%	135,554	-21,124	-13.5%
38	133,604	418	0.3%	162,248	5,570	3.6%
39	132,057	-1,129	-0.8%	132,191	-24,487	-15.6%
40	131,857	-1,329	-1.0%	149,664	-7,014	-4.5%
41	132,515	-671	-0.5%	252,332	95,654	61.1%
42	133,934	748	0.6%	214,866	58,188	37.1%
43	133,261	75	0.1%	162,052	5,374	3.4%
44	133,585	399	0.3%	171,652	14,974	9.6%
45	132,702	-484	-0.4%	146,618	-10,060	-6.4%
46	133,040	-146	-0.1%	142,772	-13,906	-8.9%
47	133,784	598	0.4%	157,056	378	0.2%
48	133,784	598	0.4%	136,924	-19,754	-12.6%
49	134,665	1,479	1.1%	172,598	15,920	10.2%
50	133,105	-81	-0.1%	131,026	-25,652	-16.4%
51	133,050	-136	-0.1%	129,144	-27,534	-17.6%
52	133,467	281	0.2%	139,789	-16,889	-10.8%
53	133,941	755	0.6%	133,115	-23,563	-15.0%
54	133,208	22	0.0%	130,417	-26,261	-16.8%
55	132,050	-1,136	-0.9%	133,112	-23,566	-15.0%
56	132,935	-251	-0.2%	192,632	35,954	22.9%
57	134,916	1,730	1.3%	148,460	-8,218	-5.2%
58	131,681	-1,505	-1.1%	131,897	-24,781	-15.8%
59	133,579	393	0.3%	141,651	-15,027	-9.6%
60	132,203	-983	-0.7%	162,605	5,927	3.8%
76	132,709	-477	-0.4%	149,992	-6,686	-4.3%
77	131,816	-1,370	-1.0%	147,455	-9,223	-5.9%
78	132,858	-328	-0.2%	156,153	-525	-0.3%
79	133,830	644	0.5%	187,203	30,525	19.5%
80	134,325	1,139	0.9%	148,503	-8,175	-5.2%
81	132,970	-216	-0.2%	201,633	44,955	28.7%
82	133,132	-54	0.0%	172,265	15,587	9.9%
83	133,850	664	0.5%	168,377	11,699	7.5%
84	132,198	-988	-0.7%	144,934	-11,744	-7.5%
85	132,080	-1,106	-0.8%	193,827	37,149	23.7%
86	133,526	340	0.3%	142,110	-14,568	-9.3%
87	133,861	675	0.5%	137,131	-19,547	-12.5%
88	134,078	892	0.7%	164,967	8,289	5.3%
89	133,810	624	0.5%	140,077	-16,601	-10.6%
90	134,668	1,482	1.1%	142,553	-14,125	-9.0%
91	132,744	-442	-0.3%	129,999	-26,679	-17.0%
92	134,594	1,408	1.1%	133,187	-23,491	-15.0%
93	131,438	-1,748	-1.3%	131,283	-25,395	-16.2%
94	132,783	-403	-0.3%	135,245	-21,433	-13.7%
95	134,393	1,207	0.9%	134,355	-22,323	-14.2%
96	132,697	-489	-0.4%	140,377	-16,301	-10.4%
97	132,239	-947	-0.7%	169,848	13,170	8.4%
98	135,043	1,857	1.4%	134,942	-21,736	-13.9%
99	134,167	981	0.7%	137,645	-19,033	-12.1%
100	132,197	-989	-0.7%	137,630	-19,048	-12.2%
101	133,642	456	0.3%	189,600	32,922	21.0%
102	133,470	284	0.2%	160,952	4,274	2.7%
103	133,827	641	0.5%	138,339	-18,339	-11.7%
104	132,832	-354	-0.3%	137,432	-19,246	-12.3%
105	133,173	-13	0.0%	151,273	-5,405	-3.4%
106	133,343	157	0.1%	150,952	-5,726	-3.7%
107	132,275	-911	-0.7%	156,177	-501	-0.3%
108	132,309	-877	-0.7%	132,251	-24,427	-15.6%
109	132,383	-803	-0.6%	135,230	-21,448	-13.7%
110	132,082	-1,104	-0.8%	132,138	-24,540	-15.7%
111	132,608	-578	-0.4%	139,430	-17,248	-11.0%
112	131,626	-1,560	-1.2%	210,556	53,878	34.4%
113	132,604	-582	-0.4%	136,597	-20,081	-12.8%
114	133,225	39	0.0%	133,125	-23,553	-15.0%
115	133,225	39	0.0%	135,054	-21,624	-13.8%
116	133,596	410	0.3%	134,681	-21,997	-14.0%
117	132,921	-265	-0.2%	150,960	-5,718	-3.6%
118	133,178	-8	0.0%	162,848	6,170	3.9%
119	133,349	163	0.1%	154,679	-1,999	-1.3%
120	133,507	321	0.2%	170,078	13,400	8.6%

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., Growe 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.

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]

[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).
[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).

For state legislative districts, the courts have permitted a greater population deviation amongst districts. The populations of state legislative districts must be ~~"s~~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 ~~"b~~based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy,"[9] including ~~"th~~e 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 it 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 ~~"m~~inority 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 ~~"m~~ajority-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 ~~"m~~inority 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.

~~"M~~inority access" though is more jargon than meaningful in a legal context. There are two types of districts that fall under the definition. A ~~"c~~rossover 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 ~~"c~~oalitional 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

[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.

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 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 injury from the

[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).
[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.

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 J*ohnson 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 ~~e~~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. ~~A~~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 ~~s~~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 scrutiny[29] test. The Court found that the district in question, ~~a~~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 ~~c~~ould 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 ~~b~~right line" distinction between majority-minority districts and other minority ~~c~~rossover" or ~~i~~nfluence districts. The Court ~~c~~oncluded 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:

> ~~M~~uch 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

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

> 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. ~~T~~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 ~~c~~covered jurisdictions" to obtain federal preclearance of any new enactment of or amendment to a ~~v~~oting qualification o 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 ~~d~~oes 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 ~~i~~nsure 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 ~~t~~he 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. ~~T~~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]

---

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

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 of 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 Population[43]

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

[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.

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 Population[44]

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 ~~t~~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 ~~c~~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 ~~s~~how, 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 ~~p~~laintiff must prove that the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles…to racial considerations."[49] If the plaintiff meets this burden, ~~t~~he State must demonstrate that its districting legislation is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling interest,"[50] i.e. ~~n~~narrowly tailored" to achieve that singular compelling state interest.

While compliance with federal antidiscrimination laws—specifically, the Voting Rights Act—is a ~~v~~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 ~~s~~trong basis in evidence" for concluding that a majority-minority district is ~~r~~easonably necessary" to comply with Section 2; (ii) the race-based districting ~~s~~ubstantially addresses" the Section 2 violation; and (iii) the district does ~~n~~ot subordinate traditional districting

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

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.[5556] 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. 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

[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.

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 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:

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

—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]

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]

---

[63] Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.
[64] Article III, Sections 20(c) and 21(c), Florida Constitution.
[65] In *Hartung v. Bradbury*, 33 P.3d 972, 987 (Or. 2001), the court held that —the mere fact that a particular reapportionment may result in a shift in political control of some legislative districts (assuming that every registered voter votes along party lines)," does not show that a redistricting plan was drawn with an improper intent. It is well recognized that political consequences are inseparable from the redistricting process. In *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 343 (2004) (Souter, J., dissenting) (—The choice to draw a district line one way, not another, always carries some consequence for politics, save in a mythical State with voters of every political identity distributed in an absolutely gray uniformity.").
[66] *Compare id*. with 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(b).

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 ~~d~~do not have a retrogressive effect."[67]

> ~~P~~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 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 ~~c~~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 ~~r~~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

---

[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)).
[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).

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]

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:

---

[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 Counsel was created within the geographic boundaries of each of the five district courts of appeal."); *A. Duda and Sons, Inc. v. St. Johns River Water Management Dist.*, 17 So.3d 738, 740 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (~~"~~Cocoa Ranch, is over 18,000 acres and is located within the [St. Johns River Water Management] District's geographical boundaries.").
[83] *E.g., Sbarra v. Florida Dept. of Corrections*, 2009 WL 4400112, 1 (N.D. Fla. 2009) (~~"~~Lee County is within the geographic bounds of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida."); *Benedict v. General Motors Corp.*, 142 F.Supp.2d 1330, 1333 (N.D. Fla. 2001) (~~"~~This was part of the traditional approach of obtaining jurisdiction through service of process within the geographic boundaries of the state at issue.").
[84] *Reynolds v. Sims,* 377 U.S. 533, 580 (1964)
[85] *Bd. of Ed. of Oklahoma City Pub. Sch., Indep. Dist. No. 89, Oklahoma County, Okl. v. Dowell,* 375 F.2d 158, 170 n.4 (10th Cir. 1967),
[86] *Moore v. Itawamba County, Miss.*, 431 F.3d 257, 260 (5th Cir. 2005).

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 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.

[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.*

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 H000H9027: Effect of Proposed Changes

Redistricting Plan Summary Statistics for the Proposed State House Map

Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000H9027

Plan File Name: H000H9027	
Plan Population Fundamentals	
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310
Ideal District Population::	156,677
District Population Remainder:	70
District Population Range:	153,748 to 159,978
District Deviation Range:	(-2,929) To 3,301
Deviation:	(-1.86) To 2.10 Total 3.97%

Plan Type: House - 120 Districts	
Plan Geography Fundamentals:	
Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481
Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)
County or District Split :	30 Split of 67 used
City or District Split :	84 Split of 411 used
VTD's Split :	525 Split of 9,436 used

Number of Districts by Race Language					
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+
Current Black VAP	23	17	13	11	3
New Black VAP	22	18	14	12	1
Current Hisp VAP	39	22	16	13	11
New Hisp VAP	35	23	19	16	11

Plan Name:	H000H9027			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
H9027-Map	12,763	65,934	19.35%	12,585	184,442	6.82%	98.60%	35.74%	10,077	86,795	11.61%	78.95%	75.96%	3,145	2,805	6,290
Current Map	16,491	65,913	25.01%	13,683	231,091	5.92%	82.97%	28.52%	10,728	100,440	10.68%	65.05%	65.62%	3,321	3,199	6,643
H9027-Simple	11,784	65,839	17.89%				106.79%	35.69%				85.51%	75.85%			
Current Map	14,650	65,813	22.26%				93.40%	28.47%				73.22%	65.52%			

	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route				Minutes to drive by fastest route			
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic
H9027-Map	9	9	9	7	14	14	12	11	22	22	20	19
Current Map	12	12	11	10	17	17	15	14	26	26	23	22

District-by-District Summary Statistics for the Proposed State House Map[90]

District ID	Pop Dev	TPOP10	%AllBlkVAP10	%AllHispVAP10	%HaitianPOPACS
1	-561	156,116	20.08	3.76	0.35
2	-558	156,119	20.31	4.75	0.27
3	2,120	158,797	6.04	3.57	0.10
4	2,104	158,781	9.88	6.27	0.04
5	2,521	159,198	13.78	3.73	0.23
6	2,589	159,266	10.83	4.16	0.21
7	-489	156,188	21.62	4.38	0.19
8	-435	156,242	50.01	6.74	0.90
9	-628	156,049	15.80	4.82	0.23
10	-254	156,423	16.71	5.03	0.16
11	-880	155,797	8.65	4.30	0.13
12	-791	155,886	13.61	8.88	0.31
13	-28	156,649	50.82	5.81	0.84
14	-474	156,203	52.51	4.48	0.57
15	-390	156,287	19.74	6.99	0.47
16	78	156,755	12.83	8.68	0.11
17	1,249	157,926	5.39	4.66	0.13
18	-2,133	154,544	10.55	7.31	0.55
19	-1,937	154,740	14.68	5.42	0.02
20	179	156,856	31.20	7.73	0.69
21	241	156,918	8.70	7.76	0.23
22	-1,951	154,726	8.68	11.15	0.31
23	-1,071	155,606	8.21	7.63	0.03
24	1,219	157,896	8.13	7.77	0.33
25	-1,403	155,274	3.07	3.45	0.14
26	-2,555	154,122	21.02	6.88	0.49
27	-1,567	155,110	7.48	17.85	0.62
28	2,136	158,813	10.63	14.35	0.19
29	2,485	159,162	11.88	14.45	0.19
30	-524	156,153	13.10	17.74	0.81
31	1,785	158,462	9.63	11.30	0.51
32	-1,013	155,664	11.16	13.51	0.71
33	-189	156,488	7.06	4.66	0.21
34	466	157,143	2.64	4.17	0.03
35	194	156,871	5.13	9.10	0.14
36	-1,830	154,847	2.49	7.76	0.02
37	-1,684	154,993	3.20	8.76	0.08
38	-1,820	154,857	7.33	13.10	0.18
39	-1,104	155,573	7.73	14.99	0.43

[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 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.

40	-1,649	155,028	15.98	11.41	0.32
41	-1,283	155,394	15.71	14.69	1.82
42	-1,762	154,915	11.52	24.76	0.88
43	886	157,563	15.48	54.95	1.91
44	808	157,485	9.25	17.10	0.57
45	-424	156,253	40.72	18.03	4.89
46	-520	156,157	52.10	21.17	8.92
47	1,597	158,274	7.21	16.34	0.41
48	-221	156,456	13.08	53.04	1.64
49	2,392	159,069	11.06	29.96	0.72
50	2,200	158,877	10.54	18.27	0.22
51	2,729	159,406	10.26	5.59	0.21
52	2,975	159,652	5.78	6.26	0.18
53	2,737	159,414	12.49	10.17	1.66
54	-624	156,053	8.76	8.68	0.69
55	-795	155,882	8.51	15.96	0.35
56	-1,777	154,900	11.96	22.82	0.21
57	741	157,418	9.74	17.07	0.16
58	1,891	158,568	12.90	20.02	0.54
59	1,555	158,232	14.17	18.91	0.45
60	1,840	158,517	7.13	15.97	0.33
61	2,844	159,521	51.26	20.60	1.95
62	1,776	158,453	12.68	51.89	0.41
63	1,495	158,172	14.19	18.01	0.71
64	1,141	157,818	5.55	14.15	0.27
65	1,192	157,869	2.85	5.33	0.02
66	1,901	158,578	5.85	5.23	0.01
67	1,747	158,424	7.36	11.26	0.05
68	1,874	158,551	5.88	7.12	0.05
69	2,233	158,910	4.04	6.31	0.12
70	-2,633	154,044	45.09	15.35	1.20
71	1,917	158,594	4.28	9.54	0.80
72	2,490	159,167	2.70	8.93	0.19
73	2,572	159,249	3.71	7.19	0.63
74	1,287	157,964	2.56	3.95	0.61
75	3,301	159,978	5.45	4.67	0.75
76	-2,925	153,752	1.39	8.96	0.02
77	805	157,482	3.98	17.00	0.70
78	-2,905	153,772	13.55	14.28	2.44
79	-2,929	153,748	10.88	21.93	2.02
80	-1,040	155,637	8.74	33.21	2.43
81	129	156,806	17.29	16.89	2.87
82	-144	156,533	4.17	11.50	0.52
83	-307	156,370	11.68	12.77	1.78
84	-147	156,530	18.97	13.65	3.48
85	2,162	158,839	8.69	10.19	1.13

86	107	156,784	16.71	19.48	2.53
87	-37	156,640	15.66	50.02	4.66
88	43	156,720	51.77	14.30	10.83
89	-1,505	155,172	7.60	9.54	3.53
90	-1,693	154,984	13.25	16.76	5.33
91	-55	156,622	4.85	7.19	3.22
92	-1,751	154,926	34.00	17.77	10.58
93	1,138	157,815	5.34	11.18	2.06
94	-316	156,361	54.56	12.05	10.57
95	-1,795	154,882	57.66	16.92	13.01
96	-1,582	155,095	15.82	19.04	3.65
97	-979	155,698	16.88	24.29	1.87
98	-1,495	155,182	12.87	23.72	1.86
99	-946	155,731	12.91	29.12	1.81
100	-1,893	154,784	6.11	34.00	0.76
101	-1,789	154,888	36.37	33.68	6.54
102	606	157,283	52.10	38.05	5.02
103	-844	155,833	10.04	82.09	1.57
104	-1,443	155,234	10.98	43.24	1.67
105	-1,151	155,526	11.20	68.65	2.92
106	-1,289	155,388	2.95	10.25	2.08
107	308	156,985	56.86	26.39	25.55
108	171	156,848	62.88	25.43	25.51
109	-2,556	154,121	50.63	45.74	4.72
110	-1,189	155,488	6.15	89.47	0.78
111	20	156,697	4.67	93.05	0.15
112	-1,782	154,895	4.83	73.01	0.10
113	-109	156,568	6.20	66.76	0.70
114	1,392	158,069	7.13	66.02	0.63
115	-462	156,215	5.69	65.51	0.63
116	888	157,565	3.14	84.57	0.53
117	204	156,881	36.99	55.15	3.58
118	-115	156,562	6.38	81.21	1.01
119	-507	156,170	3.97	86.77	0.49
120	-1,753	154,924	8.97	40.12	2.05

District-by-District Descriptions for the Proposed State House Map

District 1 is located wholly within Escambia County. Its predominant boundaries are the county line for its western, northern and eastern boundaries, while VTDs are used as its southern boundary as it curves around the city boundaries of Pensacola. The district edges around the City of Pensacola in order to keep all of the city within District 2. The Town of Century is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 1 in HPUBH0048, HPUBH0018, and District 2 in HPUBH0138 and others.

District 2 is located in Escambia and Santa Rosa Counties. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs on its northern end in Escambia County, and the county line as its eastern and southern boundaries. In Santa Rosa County, its predominant boundaries are the Santa Rosa Sound to the south, VTDs to the east and US-98 to the northwest. The Cities of Pensacola and Gulf Breeze are kept whole within the

district. This district is very similar to District 2 in HPUBH0048, HPUBH0018, and District 3 in HPUBH0138 and others.

District 3 is located in Santa Rosa and Okaloosa Counties. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs and US-98 to its south in Santa Rosa County, the county/state line to its north in both counties and I-10 to its south in Okaloosa County, with the exception of the City of Crestview on a few surrounding VTDs, which are wholly located in District 4. The Cities of Milton and Laurel Hill are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Jay. While Santa Rosa County may mathematically be able to be kept whole in a House plan by population, it's placement between two counties that are larger in population than the ideal population for a House district makes it impossible for Santa Rosa County to be kept whole. To that end, 85% of the District 3's population is in Santa Rosa County. This district is very similar to District 3 in HPUBH0107, HPUBH0048, and HPUBH0112 and others.

District 4 is located wholly within Okaloosa County. Its predominant boundaries are the county line to its west, south and east, and I-10 to the north, with the exception of the city boundaries of the City of Crestview and VTDs just outside of Crestview, which is wholly located within the district. The Cities of Crestview, Niceville, Valparaiso, Fort Walton Beach and Destin are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Shalimar. The Mayor of Destin testified at the Fort Walton Beach public hearing that the city of Destin should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 4 in HPUBH0107, SPUBH0067, and District 5 in HPUBH0048 and others.

It is important to note that Districts 1-4 we all built in order to have similar population deviations.

District 5 contains all of Walton, Holmes, Washington and Jackson Counties and is also located in Bay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county lines as well as W. Highway 388 and Highway 231 in Bay County. The Cities of Freeport, DeFuniak Springs, Vernon, Bonifay, Chipley, Graceville, Jacob City and Marianna are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Ebro, Paxton, Ponce de Leon, Westville, Caryville, Wausau, Esto, Noma, Alford, Cottondale, Campbellton, Greenwood, Malone, Bascom, Grand Ridge and Sneads. Since Bay County's population is too large to be kept whole within a House district, the remaining population needed to complete the district came from there. An individual at the Panama City public hearing testified that South Walton should be kept together in a district. This district is very similar to District 5 in HPUBH0107, SPUBH0067, and District 6 in HPUBH0048 and others.

District 6 is wholly located within Bay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line/shore line to the west south and east and W. Highway 388 and Highway 231and VTDs to the north. The Cities of Panama City Beach, Lynn Haven, Panama City, Callaway, Parker and Mexico Beach are kept whole within the district. In the Panama City public hearing, we heard testimony from numerous residents wanting to see Bay County kept whole with in a House district. While that is not possible due to the population of the county being more than that of an ideal House district, District 6 is all within the county. The Committee received written testimony saying that Bay County should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 6 in HPUBH0107, SPUBH0074, SPUBH0067 and others.

District 7 contains all of Calhoun, Gulf, Liberty, Franklin and Wakulla Counties and is also located in Leon County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the east, south and west and the county lines and VTDs in Leon County to the north. The Cities of Blountstown, Bristol, Wewahitcka, Port St. Joe, Apalachicola, Carabelle, Sopchoppy, St. Marks and the Town of Altha are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking that Franklin county be grouped with other rural counties. This district is very similar to District 7 in HPUBH0107.

District 8 contains all of Gadsden County and is also located in Leon County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Gadsden County line and VTDs in Leon County. The Cities of Chattahoochee, Gretna, Quincy and Midway are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Greensboro and Havana. This district is very similar to District 8 in SPUBH0156, HPUBH0116, HPUBH0107 and others.

District 9 is wholly located in Leon County. The predominant boundaries for the district are county lines to the north, east and south and the county line and VTDs to the west. This district is very similar to District 9 in HPUBH0018 and HPUBH0107, District 10 in HPUBH0048 and others.

District 10 contains all of Hamilton, Suwannee, Columbia and Baker Counties and is located in Union County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north, east and south and VTDs to the east in Union County. The Cities of Jasper, Live Oak, Lake City and Macclenny are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Jennings and Glen St. Mary. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to keep Columbia and Baker counties whole within a district.

It is important to note that the populations of Nassau and Duval counties combined are mathematically enough for six districts, which are Districts 11-16.

District 11 contains all of Nassau County and portions of Duval County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the Nassau County line to the west, north and east as well as US-9A and Cedar Point Road in Duval County. The Cities of Fernandina Beach, Atlantic Beach, Neptune Beach and Jacksonville Beach are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Callahan and Hilliard. The Committee received public testimony saying that we should keep Nassau County whole within a district.

District 12 is wholly contained within Duval County. Its predominant boundaries are US-9A and Cedar Point Road to the north, I-95 and VTDs to the west, Butler Blvd to the south and VTDs to the east. The district takes up a small amount of geography in an urban area that follows roadways as well as VTDs and railways. This district is very similar to District 15 in HPUBH0112, SPUBH0067, SPUBH0074 and others.

District 13 is wholly contained within Duval County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs in all directions. This district is very similar to District 14 in HPUBH0107 and District 15 in HPUBH0116.

District 14 is wholly contained within Duval County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs in all directions. This district is very similar to District 13 in HPUBH0107 and District 14 in HHPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156.

District 15 is wholly contained within Duval County. The predominant boundaries to the district are VTDs to the north and east and the county line to the west and south. The Town of Baldwin is kept whole within the district. The district had to cross the St. Johns River in order to meet an adequate population, but the Buckman Bridge was included into the district in order for residents to be able to travel throughout it.

District 16 is wholly contained within Duval County. The predominant boundaries to the district are VTDs to the west and north and the county line to the east and south. This district is very similar to District 14 in HPUBH0018, District 16 in HPUBH0048, and District 39 in HPUBH0027 and others.

District 17 is wholly contained within St. Johns County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and east and VTDs and County Road 214 to the south. The district's boundaries were built in such a way to keep the Cities of St. Augustine and St. Augustine Beach whole within the district. The Committee received testimony in the St. Augustine public hearing from numerous residents asking that St. Johns County be kept whole within a district. St. Johns County's population is too large for a House district, but District 17 was built wholly within the county. The Committee received written testimony that St. Augustine should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 7 in HPUBH0047, District 19 in HPUBH0018, and District 38 in HPUBH0027.

District 18 is wholly contained within Clay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and east and VTDs, Alligator Blvd., North Road and Sandridge Road to the south. The Town of Orange Park is kept whole within the district. During the Jacksonville public hearing, the Committee heard testimony from numerous residents of Clay County expressing their desire that their county be kept whole within a district. District 18 is in response to that as it is wholly within Clay County. The county's population was is too large for it to be kept within a district, so the remainder of its population was placed in District 19. This district is very similar to District 19 in SPUBH0087, SPUBH0074, and District 20 in HPUBH0018 and many others.

District 19 contains all of Bradford, Putnam and Union Counties and is located in Clay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county boundaries to the west, south and east and VTDs, Alligator Blvd., North Road and Sandridge Road to the north in Clay County. The Cities of Lake Butler, Lawtey, Starke, Hampton, Keystone Heights, Green Cove Springs, Palatka and Crescent City are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Worthington Springs, Brooker, Raiford, Penney Farms, Interlachen, Welaka and Pomona Park. The Committee received written testimony saying that Clay County should be split no more than two times. This district is very similar to District 21 in HPUBH0120, HPUBH0126 and others.

District 20 is located in Alachua and Marion Counties. This area has traditionally elected an African-American to the Florida House of Representatives and the district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, the county line to the north, the Alachua County line and N. US Highway 41 in Marion County to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Waldo and Hawthorne are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of LaCrosse, Micanopy, McIntosh and Reddick. This district is very similar to District 23 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 21 contains all of Dixie and Gilchrist Counties and is located in Alachua County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and south and VTDs to the east in Alachua County. The Cities of Trenton, Newberry and High Springs are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Horseshoe Beach, Cross City and Bell. This district is very similar to District 12 in HPUBH0018.

District 22 contains all of Levy and is located Marion County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and south and VTDs to the east in Marion County. The Cities of Chiefland, Cedar Key, Dunnellon and Williston are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Otter Creek, Yankeetown, Inglis and Bronson. The Committee received testimony throughout the public hearings calling for counties to be kept whole when possible. The Committee also received testimony from residents in Marion County calling for two House districts being placed within the county. District 23 is entirely within the county and 74% of District 22's population is within Marion County as well.

District 23 is wholly located in Marion County. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west and south and the county line to the north and east. The City of Belleview is kept whole within the district. This district is consistent with testimony that we heard in the Orlando and Gainesville public hearing requesting that Marion County be kept whole within a district. The county's population is too large for a House district, but District 23 is wholly located within the county. This district is very similar to District 24 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 24 contains all of Flagler County and is located in St. Johns and Volusia Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west and east and VTDs to the north and south. The district was also built in a way so that the City of Ormond Beach would only be split twice, as opposed to three times. The Cities of Palm Coast and Bunnell are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Hastings, Marineland and Pierson. During the St. Augustine public hearing, the Committee heard from many residents of the area that they would like to see St. Johns and Flagler County linked, keep Flagler County and parts within it (specifically the City of Palm Coast) whole within a district. All of these items that were brought forth by the public are addressed in District 24. This district is very similar to District 8 in HPUBH0047, District 20 in HPUBH0135, District 23 in SPUBH0074 and others.

It is important to note that after areas of Volusia County is assigned to District 24, the population of the county that is remaining is roughly equal to three House districts. Those districts are Districts 25, 26, and 27.

District 25 is wholly within Volusia County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the east, the city boundary for the City of Ormond Beach to the north, Tomoka Farms Road to the west and I-95 and SR 442 to the south. The Cities of Daytona Beach Shores, Port Orange and New Smyrna Beach are kept whole within the district as is the Town of Ponce Inlet. Between Districts 24 and 25, the boundaries were drawn to split the City of Ormond Beach as little as possible as the Committee received testimony asking for it to be kept whole. This district is very similar to District 30 in HPUBH0048.

District 26 is wholly located in Volusia County. This area has traditionally elected an African-American to the Florida House of Representatives and the district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are Clark Bay Road to the west, the county line and the city boundaries of The City of Ormond Beach to the north, the Halifax River to the east and the city boundaries of the City of Port Orange and East New York Avenue to the south. The City of DeLand is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 29 in HPUBH0048.

District 27 is wholly located in Volusia County. Its predominant borders are the county line to the west, south and east and State Road 44 and I-4 to the north. The Cities of DeBary, Deltona and Oak Hill are kept whole within the district. The Committee heard testimony from numerous residents of Deltona asking that they be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 31 in HPUBH0048.

District 28 is wholly within Seminole County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north, east and south and US 17-92 to the west. The Cities of Winter Springs and Oviedo are kept whole within the district. The Committee heard testimony throughout the public hearings asking for counties to be kept whole or split as little as possible.

District 29 is wholly within Seminole County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the east and north, US 17-92 to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Lake Mary and Longwood are kept whole within the district. The Committee received testimony that Casselberry, Altamonte Springs, Fern Park, and Longwood should be drawn into the same district.

District 30 is located in Seminole and Orange Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the north south and east and the county line and US-441 to the west. The Committee received testimony in favor of linking Maitland to a district that is in Seminole County as well.

District 31 is located in Lake and Orange Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and east, VTDs and US-441 to the south and VTDs to the west. The Cities of Tavares, Eustis and Mount Dora are kept whole in the district. The Committee received testimony asking that those three cities, known as "The Golden Triangle" be kept whole and together in a district.

District 32 is located wholly in Lake County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, south and east and VTDs to the north. The Cities of Leesburg, Mascotte, Groveland, Minneola and Clermont are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Howey-in-the-Hills, Astatula and Monteverde. The Committee received testimony requesting that southern lake county be kept together within a district.

District 33 contains all of Sumter County and is located in Lake and Marion Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Sumter County line to the west and south and VTDs to the north and east. The Cities of Wildwood, Coleman, Bushnell, Webster, Center Hill, Lady Lake and Fruitland Park are kept whole within the district. The district also contains all of The Villages, which is a large retirement community that spans all three counties. While keeping Sumter County whole within the district it also keeps cities whole and uses the remaining population need to complete the district in a

way that was able to keep one district wholly within Marion County and one district wholly within Lake County. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that we should keep all of Lake and Sumter counties, as well as part of Marion County together in a district. The Committee also received verbal and written testimony saying that The Villages should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 28 in HPUBH0067, HPUBH0134, District 42 in HPUBH0116, and others.

District 34 contains all of Citrus County and is located in Hernando County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north, the Suncoast Parkway and the county line to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Crystal River and Inverness are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that we should consider using the Suncoast Parkway as a boundary. This district is very similar to District 31 in HPUBH0107, District 43 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116, and others.

District 35 is wholly contained with Hernando County. Its predominant boundaries are the county line to the south and east, VTDs to the north and the Suncoast Parkway to the west. The Cities of Brooksville and Weeki Wachee are kept whole within the district. It is important to note that the district's boundaries were built in a manner to keep Weeki Wachee whole. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that we should consider using the Suncoast Parkway as a boundary. This district is very similar to District 33 in HPUBH0107, District 44 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156, and others.

It is important to note that the population of Pasco County is roughly that of three House districts. The Committee received testimony during the Wesley Chapel public hearing calling for three districts that run north to south in Pasco County, to create a western, central and eastern district. Those districts are 36, 37 and 38.

District 36 is wholly within Pasco County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the county line to the north, west and south and Little Road to the east. The Cities of Port Richey and New Port Richey are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 36 in HPUBH0107, District 45 in HPUBH0048, and District 57 in HPUBH0079.

District 37 is wholly within Pasco County. The predominant boundaries for the district are Little Road to the west, the county line to the north and south and VTDs to the east. The committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings that Central Pasco was a unique community. This district is very similar to District 37 in HPUBH0107 and District 44 in HPUBH0048.

District 38 is wholly within Pasco County. The predominant boundaries for the district are VTDs to the west and the county line to the north, south and east. The Cities of Dade City, San Antonio and Zephyrhills are kept whole within the district as is the Town of St. Leo. This district is very similar to District 38 in HPUBH0107 and District 61 in HPUBH0016 and HPUBH0024.

District 39 is located in Polk and Osceola Counties. The predominant boundaries for the district are the Polk and Osceola county lines to the North, the Polk county line to the west, US 17-92 to the south in Polk County, and Poinciana Blvd to the east in Osceola County. The City of Davenport and the Town of Polk City are kept whole in the district. The Committee received written testimony from The City of Davenport requesting that they be placed in a district that is predominantly in Polk County. 88% of District 39's population is in Polk County.

District 40 is wholly within Polk County. The predominant boundaries to the district are the county line to the west, S. Combee Road and Bartow Road to the east, Ewell Road and W. County Road 540A to the south and Desson Road and W. Daughtery Road to the north to create a small, geometric shape. This district is very similar to District 64 in SPUBH0087, SPUBH0067, HPUBH119, and others.

District 41 is wholly within Polk County. The predominant boundaries to the district are S. Combee Road and Bartow Road to the west, US 17-92, VTDs and the county line to the north, VTDs to the east and Thompson Nursery Road to the south. The Cities of Bartow and Eagle Lake and the Towns of

Dundee and Lake Hamilton are kept whole in the district. This district is very similar to District 65 in SPUBH0087, HPUBH0134, HPUBH0112, and others.

District 42 is located in Osceola and Polk Counties. The predominant boundaries to the district are the Osceola County line to the north and east, the Osceola and Polk County lines to the south and US-27 and VTDs to the west. The City of St. Cloud is kept whole within the district. The Committee received testimony from the Polk County Commission asking that four House districts have the majority of their populations be in Polk County. Those districts are Districts 39, 40, 41 and 56. District 42 was built in a manner to allow District 56 to have the majority of its population in Polk County.

District 43 is wholly in Osceola County. This area had produced a majority-minority Hispanic district between in and Orange County. After reviewing the demographics of the area, we determined that a majority-minority Hispanic district could be built wholly in Osceola and a second majority-minority Hispanic district could be built in Orange County. The predominant boundaries to District 43 are the county line to the north and south, East Lake Tohopekaliga, the city boundary for the City of Kissimmee and Pleasant Hill Road to the east and Poinciana Road and CR 530 to the west. The City of Kissimmee is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 36 in HPUBH0047 and District 41 in SPUBH0156.

District 44 is wholly in Orange County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the county line to the south and west, W. Colonial Drive to the north and John Young Parkway and Kirkman Road to the west. The Cities of Lake Buena Vista and Bay Lake are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Windermere and Oakland.

District 45 is wholly in Orange County. When looking at the demographics of the population of Orange County, there is the possibility of having both a majority minority Black district and a Black opportunity district, both solely contained within Orange County as well. District 45 is the Black opportunity district. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, Orange Blossom Trail to the north, US-441 to the east and W. Colonial Drive to the south.

District 46 is wholly in Orange County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are S. Kirkman Road and the Florida Turnpike to the west, Silver Star Road to the north, Orange Blossom Trail and N. Hughley Ave to the east and Oak Ridge Road W and Sand Lake Road W to the south.

District 47 is wholly in Orange County. The predominant boundaries of the district are Orange Blossom Trail and N. Hughley Ave to the west, Lee Road and Aloma Ave to the north, S. Semoran Blvd to the east and the Beachline Expressway to the south. The Committee received testimony throughout the public hearings calling for counties to be kept whole or split as little as possible.

District 48 is wholly in Orange County. This area had produced a majority-minority Hispanic district between it and Osceola County. After reviewing the demographics of the area, it can be determined that a majority-minority Hispanic district could be built wholly in Osceola and a second majority-minority Hispanic district could be built in Orange County. The predominant boundaries for District 48 are John Young Parkway and the Florida Turnpike to the east, Oak Ridge Road W, Sand Lake Road and E. Colonial Road to the north, VTDs and Narcoosee Road to the east and the county line to the south.

District 49 is located wholly in Orange County. The predominant boundaries of the district are S. Semoran Blvd and N. Goldenrod Road to the west, the county line to the north, Chuluota Road and VTDs/waterways to the east and Curry Ford Road to the south. The Committee also received testimony during the Orlando public hearing calling for a University of Central Florida based district. The entire campus of the university is located within the district as are many of the areas where students live and work.

District 50 is located in Orange and Brevard Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and south, VTDs to the west and east. The City of Titusville is kept whole

within the district. The Committee received written testimony saying that East Orange County should be kept together within a district.

It is important to note that after District 50 includes a portion of Brevard County, the remaining population is roughly that of three House districts. The Committee received testimony calling for three house districts that divide the county into northern, central and southern districts. To that end, Districts 51-53 are those three districts wholly in the county and take a northern, central and southern approach to dividing the county.

District 51 is wholly within Brevard County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and east, the Indian River and the Orange County line to the west and VTDs to the south. It is important to note that the boundaries were built in a manner to keep the City of Cocoa Beach whole within the district. Other cities kept whole in the district are Cocoa, Rockledge and Cape Canaveral. This district is very similar to District 46 in SPUBH0074, HPUBH0134 and others.

District 52 is wholly within Brevard County. The predominant boundaries for the district are VTDs to the north, the county line to the east and west and US 192 and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Satellite Beach and Indian Harbour Beach are kept whole within the district as is the Town of Indialantic. This district is very similar to District 28 in HPUBH0107 and others.

District 53 is wholly within Brevard County. The predominant boundaries for the district are US-192 and VTDs to the north, and the county line to the east, west and south. The Towns of Malabar and Grant-Valkaria are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 48 in SPUBH0087 and others.

District 54 contains all of Indian River County and is located in St. Lucie County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north, east and west and VTDs to the south in St. Lucie County. The Cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian and Vero Beach are kept whole within the district, as are the Towns of Orchid and Indian River Shores. This district is very similar to District 67 in SPUBH0087, HPUBH0119, and HPUBH0112.

District 55 is contains all of Highlands, Glades and Okeechobee Counties and is located in St. Lucie County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the county lines to the north, west and south and VTDs to the east in St. Lucie County. The Cities of Avon Park, Sebring, Okeechobee and Moore Haven are kept whole within the district as is the Town of Lake Placid. St. Lucie County's population is too large for a House district and mathematically had to be split. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings that Highlands County should be in one district and also received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that Highlands and Glades counties be in the same district. This district is very similar to District 62 in HPUBH0048, District 67 in HPUBH0047, and District 78 in HPUBH0107.

District 56 contains all of DeSoto and Hardee Counties and is located in Polk County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west and south, VTDs to the north and county lines and US Highway 27 to the east, making it near rectangular in shape. The Cities of Mulberry, Fort Meade, Bowling Green, Wauchula and Arcadia are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Zolfo Springs. This district is similar to a district that was requested in the Wauchula public hearing, where a district that has US-17 as a major transportation artery be created. The Committee also received verbal testimony asking that DeSoto County be grouped with Hardee County within a district.

It is important to note that mathematically, the combined populations of Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee and Sarasota Counties is roughly the same as 18 House districts. By segmenting these counties from the rest of the map, the northern borders of Pinellas and Hillsborough, as well as the eastern borders of Hillsborough, Manatee and Sarasota and the southern border of Sarasota Counties are kept intact. Those districts are Districts 57-74.

District 57 is wholly in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the south and east, State Road 60 West to the north and US Highway 41 and I-75 to the west. This district is very similar to District 70 in SPUBH0067, SPUBH0074, and SPUBH0087.

District 58 is wholly contained in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and east, State Road 60 and State Road 574 to the south and US Highway 301 and VTDs to the west. It is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep the City of Temple Terrace wholly within the district to the west. The other city kept whole in the district is Plant City. The Committee received written testimony asking that the City of Temple Terrace be kept whole.

District 59 is located wholly in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are US Highway 41 to the west, VTDs and State Road 574 to the north and VTDs to the east and south. This district is also consistent with testimony that we heard in the Tampa public hearing, which requested a district be built that contains the unincorporated areas of Brandon, Valrico and Riverview together. This district is very similar to District 48 in HPUBH0027, HPUBH0045, and HPUBH0079.

District 60 is located wholly in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, a railway, State Road 576 and VTDs to the north, US Highway 41 to the east and Cockroach Bay Road to the south. This district is very similar to District 52 in HPUBH0079, District 57 in HPUBH0037, and District 65 in HPUBH0107.

District 61 is wholly located in Hillsborough County, a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Hillsborough River and N. Armenia Ave. to the west, E. Fletcher Avenue and VTDs to the north, VTDs, US Highway 301 and State Road 574 to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is very similar to District 51 in HPUBH0045, District 59 in SPUBH0156, and District 62 in HPUBH0107 and others.

District 62 is wholly located in Hillsborough County, a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. This area has produced a Hispanic opportunity district in years past and this district improves that opportunity by making it a majority-minority Hispanic district. The predominant boundaries of the district are Memorial Highway and State Road 589 to the west, State Road 587 to the north, the Hillsborough River and N. Armenia Road to the east and W. John F Kennedy Blvd to the south. This district is very similar to District 61 in HPUBH0027, HPUBH0045, and HPUBH0079 and others.

District 63 is wholly located in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 597 to the west, the county line to the north, Morris Bridge Road and VTDs to the east and W. Busch Blvd to the south. The Committee received testimony requesting that counties be kept whole and or split as little as possible.

District 64 is located in Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 611 to the west, the county line and Keystone Road to the north, Dale Mabry Highway (State Road 597) to the east and State Road 587, a railway and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Oldsmar and Safety Harbor are kept whole in the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep both cities whole. The Committee received testimony requesting that small cities in Pinellas County be kept whole as well as requesting that Dale Mabry Highway in Hillsborough County be used as a boundary for districts.

District 65 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north, State Road 611 and Keystone Road to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Tarpon Springs and Dunedin are kept whole within the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep Dunedin whole. This district is very similar to District 48 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0107.

It is important to note that when a railway that essentially bisects the peninsula of Pinellas County in half, four district that are mainly the northwest, northeast, southwest and southeast quadrants of the peninsula can be created. Those districts are Districts 66-69.

District 66 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, VTDs to the north, South Missouri Avenue and a railway to the east and Park Blvd N to the south. The Cities of Belleair Beach, Belleair Bluffs, Indian Rocks Beach and Seminole are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Belleair Shore and Belleair. It is important to note that the district's boundary to the south was built in a manner to keep the City of Seminole whole. This district is very similar to District 54 in SPUBH0156.

District 67 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the S. Missouri Avenue and a railway to the west, VTDs to the north, VTDs and the county line to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is very similar to District 50 in SPUBH0156 and District 56 in HPUBH0048.

District 68 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the railway to the west, VTDs to the north and south and the county line to the east. This district is very similar to District 52 in SPUBH0156, District 65 in HPUBH0079 and others.

District 69 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county line to the west and south, VTDs to the north and a railway and I-275 to the east. The Cities of Madeira Beach, Treasure Island, Gulfport, St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Redington Shores, North Redington Beach, Redington Beach and Kenneth City. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking that Gulfport be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 59 in HPUBH0107.

District 70 is located in Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee and Sarasota Counties. Hillsborough County is a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district nearly recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the north in Pinellas County and Hillsborough County, State Road 674 and US Highway 41 to the east in Hillsborough County, 69th Street E and 28th Ave E and US Highway 301 to the east in Manatee County, VTDs to the east and south in Sarasota County, VTDs and I-275 to the west in Pinellas County, the county line to the west in Hillsborough County, I-275 and VTDs to the west in Manatee County and Tamiami Trail to the west in Sarasota County. It is important to note that the manner in which the district was built in Manatee and Sarasota Counties creates four districts to be in one or both of the counties, which is consistent with testimony that the Committee received during the public hearing in Sarasota. The Committee received testimony asking that the Sarasota-Bradenton Airport be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 55 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 71 is located in Manatee and Sarasota Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west, the county line and I-275 to the north, VTDs to the east and south. The Cities of Anna Maria, Holmes Beach, Bradenton Beach and the Town of Longboat Key are kept whole within the district. It is important to note that Longboat Key is kept whole within the district, despite that its boundaries span both Manatee and Sarasota counties. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four districts be built within the two counties. This district is very similar to District 64 in HPUBH0048, District 68 in HPUBH0037, and District 72 in HPUBH0134.

District 72 is wholly in Sarasota County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line and US Highway 301 to the west, the county line to the north, I-75 to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four district be built with Manatee and Sarasota Counties. This district is very similar to District 66 in HPUBH0048 and District 69 in SPUBH0156.

District 73 is located in Manatee and Sarasota Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are US-41, 69th Street E, US 301 and I-75 to the west, the Manatee County line to the north, the Manatee and Sarasota County lines to the east and VTDs and State Road 72 to the south. The district also includes the community of Lakewood Ranch, which was requested to be kept whole within a district during the Sarasota public hearing. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four district be built with Manatee and Sarasota Counties. This district is very similar to District 67 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 74 is wholly located in Sarasota County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, east and south and State Road 72 and the county line to the north. The Cities of Venice and North Port are kept whole within the district. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four district be built with Manatee and Sarasota Counties. This district is very similar to District 70 in SPUBH0156.

District 75 is all of Charlotte County. All of the county's boundaries are the boundaries of the district. The City of Punta Gorda is kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking for Charlotte to be contained within one district. This district is very similar to District 68 in HPUBH0048 and District 73 in HPUBH0107.

It is important to note that mathematically, Lee County's population is roughly the same as four House districts. Those districts are Districts 76-79.

District 76 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county line to the north, west and south and San Carlos Bay to the east. The Cities of Sanibel and Bonita Springs are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Fort Myers Beach. The Committee received written testimony asking to keep Bonita Springs whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 71 in HPUBH0048, District 75 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156 and others.

District 77 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries of the district are San Carlos Bay to the west and south, the county line to the north and the city boundaries of Cape Coral to the east. The City of Cape Coral is kept whole within the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep the City of Cape Coral whole, as the City's population is near that of a House district. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0027, District 74 in HPUBH0107 and HPUBH0116, and others.

District 78 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the city boundaries of Cape Coral to the west, the county line to the north, I-75 and State Road 82 to the west and Daniels Parkway to the south. The City of Fort Myers is kept whole within the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to do that. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156, District 76 in HPUBH0107 and others.

District 79 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries to the district are I-75, the boundaries of Fort Myers, State Road 82 and Tamiami Trail to the west, the county line to the north and east and Corkscrew Road and the county line to the south. The Committee received written testimony asking for Lehigh Acres to be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0055, District 74 in HPUBH0045 and HPUBH0079.

District 80 contains all of Hendry County and is located in Collier County, both of which are Florida counties that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west, north and east and I-75 (Alligator Alley) to the south. The Cities of Clewiston and LaBelle are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for Collier County to be split into three State House districts.

District 81 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county line to the west, the county line and VTDs to the north, VTDs to the east and the county line to the south. The Cities of Pahokee, Belle Glade and South Bay are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking that Palm Beach County be split into 9 State House districts and received verbal testimony from the public hearings asking that Belle Glade and Pahokee be kept together within a district.

District 82 is located in Martin and Palm Beach Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Martin County line and I-95 to the west, VTDs to the north, the county lines to the east and the Martin County line and VTDs to the south. The Town of Jupiter Island and the Village of Tequesta are kept whole within the district. This district is consistent with testimony that was received in the Stuart public hearing requesting that Martin County be connected with northern Palm Beach County in a district. The Committee also received written testimony asking that Palm Beach County be split into 9 State House districts. This district is very similar to District 78 in HPUBH0119, HPUBH0128, HPUBH0134 and others.

It is important to note that the population remaining in Palm Beach County after District 82 was built is roughly 8 House districts. Those districts are Districts 81 and 85-91. The Committee also received written testimony asking that Palm Beach County be split into 9 State House districts.

District 83 is located in St. Lucie and Martin Counties. The predominant boundaries to are the boundary of the City of Port St. Lucie and the Florida Turnpike to the west, VTDs and the county line to the north, the county line to the east and the boundaries of the City of Stuart to the south. The City of Stuart is kept whole within the district, as are the Towns of Ocean Breeze Park and Sewall's Point. This district is very similar to District 69 in HPUBH0112, HPUBH0122, SPUBH0067 and others.

District 84 is wholly located in St. Lucie County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north, east, and south and Okeechobee Road and VTDs to the west. The City of Fort Pierce is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 68 in SPUBH0067, HPUBH0119, HPUBH0122, and others.

District 85 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, the county line, I-95 and the boundary of the City of Palm Beach Gardens to the north, the county line and VTDs to the east and VTDs to the south. The City of Palm Beach Gardens and the Town of North Palm Beach are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 83 in HPUBH0116, District 85 in HPUBH0134 and HPUBH0128 and others.

District 86 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs and the city boundary of Wellington to the west, 60th Street north and Okeechobee Blvd to the north, the Florida Turnpike, N. Military Trail and VTDs to the east and the city boundary of Wellington and Lantana Road to the south. The Towns of Loxahatchee Groves and Haverhill are kept whole as are the Villages of Royal Palm Beach and Wellington. This district is very similar to District 87 in SPUBH0067, SPUBH0074, SPUBH0087, and one other.

District 87 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. When studying the demographics of the county, it can be determined that a majority-minority Hispanic district could be built wholly with Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are N. Military Trail and VTDs to the west and VTDs to the north, east and south. The Towns of Cloud Lake, Glen Ridge, Lake Clarke Shores and the Village of Palm Springs are all kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for a Hispanic or other minority State House district in this area. This district is very similar to District 76 in HPUBH0047, District 112 in HPUBH0045 and HPUBH0079 and others.

District 88 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. Palm Beach County has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. However, this district does it in a different manner than the current district. This district is vertically-shaped with US-1 and I-95 as transportation corridors while the current district is more horizontally-shaped that uses Okeechobee Blvd as a transportation corridor. The predominant boundaries of the district are the city

boundaries of Lake Park and Riviera Beach, Haverhill Road N., N. Tamarind Avenue, N. Dixie Highway, I-95, State Road 807 and VTDs to the west, VTDs to the north, the shoreline of the mainland, S. Olive Ave, N. 8th Street, Overlook Road, US-1 and a railway to the east and W. Woolbright Road and SW 10th Street to the south. The Towns of Lake Park and Mangonia Park are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for a Hispanic or other minority State House district in this area.

District 89 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the shoreline of the mainland, S. Olive Avenue, US-1, I-95 and S. Military Trail to the west, VTDs to the north, the county line to the east and south. The Towns of Palm Beach, Palm Beach Shores, Manalapan, Ocean Ridge, Gulf Stream and Highland Beach are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for the coastal areas of Palm Beach County to be kept together in a district.

District 90 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike to the west, Forest Hill Blvd, Lake Worth Road and VTDs to the north, I-95 to the east and W. Boynton Beach Blvd to the south. The City of Atlantis is kept whole in the district.

District 91 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike to the west, W. Boynton Beach Blvd to the north, S. Congress Ave and N. Military Trail to the east and the county line to the south. The Village of Golf is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 92 in HPUBH0048.

District 92 is wholly located in Broward County. This area has produced a Black opportunity district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike and State Road 7 to the west, the county line to the north, State Road 811 to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is very similar to District 92 in SPUBH0156.

District 93 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 811 and US-1 to the west, the county line to the north and east and VTDs to the south to create a rectangular shape. The Towns of Lighthouse Point, Hillsboro Beach, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea and the Village of Sea Ranch Lakes are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 91 in HPUBH0116 and District 96 in HPUBH0107.

District 94 is wholly located in Broward County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are US Highway 441, E. Tropical Way and VTDs to the west, VTDs to the north, State Road 811 and US-1 to the east and Peters Road, Davie Blvd and SW 24th Street to the south. The Village of Lazy Lake is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 93 in SPUBH0156, District 98 in HPUBH0048, District 101 in HPUBH0134 and others.

District 95 is wholly located in Broward County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. This area also brings language minorities together into the same district. The predominant boundaries of the district are N. Pine Island Road and the city boundaries of North Lauderdale to the west, Southgate Blvd to the north, US-441 to the east and W. Sunrise Blvd to the south. This district is very similar to District 94 in SPUBH0156.

District 96 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the city boundaries of Parkland, Coral Springs Drive, N. University Drive and the boundary to the City of Coral Springs to the west, the county line to the north, the Florida Turnpike to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Parkland and Coconut Creek are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking for Parkland to be kept whole within a district.

District 97 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north, the city boundary of Coral Springs, N. University Blvd and Coral Springs Drive to the east and I-75 to the south to create a rectangular shape. This district is very similar to District 96 in SPUBH0156, District 103 in HPUBH0079 and HPUBH0045 and others.

District 98 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the boundary to the Town of Davie, Weston Road, NW 124th Avenue and VTDs to the west, NW 44th Street and VTDs to the north, N. Pine Island Road, VTDs and Davie Road to the east and Griffin Road to the south. The Committee received testimony requesting that counties be kept whole and or split as little as possible.

District 99 is wholly within Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are I-75 and Davie Road to the west, VTDs to the north, US A1A to the east and NW 17th St to the south. The City of Cooper City is kept whole in the district. The Committee received testimony requesting that Cooper City be kept whole in a district.

District 100 is located in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are US A1A and Biscayne Blvd to the west, VTDs to the north and south and the county lines to the east to create a rectangular shape. The Cities of Aventura, Sunny Isles Beach, the Towns of Golden Beach, Surfside, Bay Harbor Islands and the Villages of Bal Harbour and Indian Creek are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in the Miami Dade area. There are no public plans similar to this district.

District 101 is located wholly within Broward County. This area has created a Black opportunity district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are S. Douglas Road and S. University Drive to the west, Taft Street to the north, Dixie Highway to the east and the county line to the south. The City of West Park and the Town of Pembroke Park are kept whole within the district. The Committee received testimony requesting that counties be kept whole and or split as little as possible.

District 102 is located in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. This area has created a majority-minority Black district in years past, and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are N. Hiatus Road, S. Flamingo Road and NW 57th Ave to the west, Taft Street to the north, S. University Drive and the Florida Turnpike to the east and Palmetto Expressway and Biscayne Canal to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 103 is located in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. This area has created a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past, and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs and the Florida Turnpike to the west, VTDs to the north, VTDs and Palmetto Expressway to the east and NW 58th Street to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 103 in SPUBH0067, HPUBH0134, and HPUBH0119 and others.

District 104 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominate boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and south, I-75 to the north and boundary of the City of Weston and VTDs to the east. The City of Weston is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 98 in HPUBH0027 and HPUBH0045, District 101 in HPUBH0118, and others.

District 105 is located in Collier, Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. Collier County is a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. A similarly built district has been a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs and the Miami-Dade County line to the west, I-75, the Miami-Dade County line and the boundary of the City of Miramar to the north, VTDs to the east and Tamiami Trail, the Collier County line and VTDs to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to preserve opportunities for the Hispanic Community in Miami-Dade County and received written testimony asking for Collier County to be split into three State House districts.

District 106 is located wholly in Collier County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and south and Tamiami Trail to the east. The Cities of Naples, Marco Island and Everglades are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for Collier County to be split into three State House districts. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0048, District 76 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156 and others.

District 107 is located wholly in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. This area also brings language minorities together into the same district. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike to the west, the county line to the north, US-1 to the east and VTDs to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 113 in HPUBH0048.

District 108 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. This area also brings language minorities together into the same district. The predominant boundaries of the district are NW 17th Ave. and NW 12th Ave. to the west, VTDs, the boundary of the City of North Miami and NE 135th Street to the north, VTDs and boundaries of the cities of Miami and Miami Shores Village to the east, and I-195 to the south. The Villages of Miami Shores and El Portal are kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 109 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 823, NW 32nd Ave and VTDs to the west, Palmetto Expressway and VTDs to the north, NW 17th Ave, NW 12th Ave and NW 7th Ave to the south. The City of Opa-Locka is kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to consider the Palmetto Expressway as a boundary for districts.

District 110 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are Palmetto Expressway to the west, the boundary of the City of Miramar to the north, NW 57th Ave to the east and W 21st Street to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County and to consider the Palmetto Expressway as a district boundary.

District 111 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, E 65th Street to the north, NW 20th Street and a railway to the east and W. Flagler Street to the south. The city of Miami Springs is kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County and to preserve the opportunities for the Hispanic community in the area.

District 112 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are Old Cutler Road to the west, SW 7th Ave and NW 7th Ave to the north, the county line to the east and VTDs to the south. The Village of Key Biscayne is kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 113 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has not produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past, but this district creates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are NW 27th Ave and VTDs to the east, VTDs to the north and south and the county line to the east. The Cities Miami Beach and North Bay Village are kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 106 in HPUBH0118, District 114 in HPUBH0134 and HPUBH0122 and others.

District 114 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 67th Ave, a railway, Old Cutler Road and US-1 to the west, NW 7th Street to the north, NW 42nd Ave and VTDs to the west and VTDs to the south. The City of West Miami and the Town of Cutler Bay are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County., as well as testimony at the public hearings asking for the City Cutler Bay to be kept whole within a district.

District 115 is wholly located within Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 87th Ave, Don Shula Expressway, State Road 821, and the boundary of the Village of Palmetto Bay to the west, the city boundary of Doral and NW 58th Street to the north, a railway, SW 67th Ave and Old Cutler Road to the east and the boundary of the Village of Palmetto Bay to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 116 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are NW 170th Ave and the Florida Turnpike to the west, NW 58th Street, VTDs and SW 8th St to the north, NW 87th Ave and Din Shula Expressway to the east and SW 104th Street to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 111 in HPUBH0118.

District 117 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has traditionally elected in African-American to the Florida House of Representatives and this district is likely to recreate that opportunity, despite that is has a voting age population high enough to be a majority-minority Hispanic district. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike and US-1 to the west, VTDs to the north, US-1 and VTDs to the east and the city boundary of Florida City to the south. The City of Florida City is kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 118 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 118 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 137th Ave and VTDs to the west, SW 8th St to the north, SW 117th Ave to the east and VTDs to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 119 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 177th Ave to the west, SW 8th Street to the north, SW 137th Ave to the east and VTDs to the south to create a square-like shape. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 115 in SPUBH0087, HPUBH0128, HPUBH0134 and others.

District 120 contains all of Monroe County and is located in Miami-Dade County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, the county line and VTDs to the north and the county line to the east and south. The Cities of Key West, Marathon and Layton and the Village of Islamorada are kept whole within the district. This district is consistent with testimony that was received during the Key West public hearing request that Monroe County and the Keys be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 120 in HPUBH0112, HPUBH0119, HPUBH0122, and others.

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:

   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:

   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

When compared to the 120 State House Districts in HRS PCB 12-02 (Plan H000H9017), Amendment 1 (Plan H000H9027):

- Reduces the number of cities split from 99 to 84;
- Reduces the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Increases the total population deviation from 3.84% to 3.97%;
- Helps better maintain the existing representation for Hispanic Floridians.

Specifically, Amendment 1 makes the following changes:

- Incorporates most of the Miccosukee Indian Camps into District 105 pursuant to the request of the Tribal Chairman, thereby balancing populations between Districts 105 and 106 and improving the compactness of District 106.
- Includes the Burnt Store Marina in District 77, thereby reducing a likely travel burden for those residents to their remainder of their district;
- Increases the use of roadways as boundaries in the unincorporated neighborhoods around Crestview pursuant to the request of the office of the Okaloosa County Supervisor of Elections;
- Makes the unincorporated areas of Navarre and Navarre Beach whole and together in District 3 pursuant to the request of area residents;
- Makes the municipality of Stuart (Martin County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Bartow (Polk County) whole;
- Maintains the existing likelihood that District 113 will produce the Hispanic community‘s candidate of choice; maintains the existing likelihood that District 114 will produce the Hispanic community‘s candidate of choice; makes the municipality of Opa-locka (Miami-Dade County) whole; and improves the compactness of districts 102, 108, 109, and 111;
- Makes the municipalities of Leesburg, Groveland and Minneola (Lake County) whole; makes the municipalities of Maitland, Edgewood, Belle Isle and Lake Buena Vista (Orange County) whole; reduces county splits for Seminole County; and improves the compactness of districts 28, 29, 30, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49;

- Makes the municipality of Cooper City (Broward County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Dundee (Polk County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Coconut Creek (Broward County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Atlantis (Palm Beach County) whole.
- Connects District 6 to the Northwest Florida Beaches International Airport pursuant to the request of a Bay County resident, thereby balancing populations between Districts 5 and 6.

H000H9027



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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W
E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H90217



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9027



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000H9027

Plan File Name: H000H9027	
Plan Population Fundamentals	
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310
Ideal District Population::	156,677
District Population Remainder:	70
District Population Range:	153,748 to 159,978
District Deviation Range:	(-2,929) To 3,301
Deviation:	(-1.86) To 2.10 Total 3.97%

Plan Type: House - 120 Districts	
Plan Geography Fundamentals:	
Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481
Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)
County or District Split :	30 Split of 67 used
City or District Split :	84 Split of 411 used
VTD's Split :	525 Split of 9,436 used

Number of Districts by Race Language					
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+
Current Black VAP	23	17	13	11	3
New Black VAP	22	18	14	12	1
Current Hisp VAP	39	22	16	13	11
New Hisp VAP	35	23	19	16	11

Plan Name:	H000H9027			Number of Districts	120											
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
H9027-Map	12,763	65,934	19.35%	12,585	184,442	6.82%	98.60%	35.74%	10,077	86,795	11.61%	78.95%	75.96%	3,145	2,805	6,290
Current Map	16,491	65,913	25.01%	13,683	231,091	5.92%	82.97%	28.52%	10,728	100,440	10.68%	65.05%	65.62%	3,321	3,199	6,643
H9027-Simple	11,784	65,839	17.89%				106.79%	35.69%				85.51%	75.85%			
Current Map	14,650	65,813	22.26%				93.40%	28.47%				73.22%	65.52%			

	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route				Minutes to drive by fastest route			
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic
H9027-Map	9	9	9	7	14	14	12	11	22	22	20	19
Current Map	12	12	11	10	17	17	15	14	26	26	23	22

Plan Name:	H000H9027			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
1	172	570	30.21%	134	1,428	9.40%	77.92%	39.94%	119	881	13.50%	69.02%	64.75%	28	40	56
2	115	338	34.17%	125	1,240	10.09%	108.10%	27.31%	91	446	20.40%	78.61%	75.95%	35	21	71
3	229	1,571	14.60%	199	3,135	6.34%	86.70%	50.12%	170	1,987	8.55%	74.05%	79.09%	54	46	109
4	116	658	17.67%	114	1,046	10.98%	98.79%	62.90%	104	717	14.50%	89.37%	91.79%	24	33	48
5	286	3,612	7.93%	325	8,367	3.88%	113.48%	43.17%	254	4,019	6.31%	88.65%	89.89%	91	54	182
6	126	731	17.30%	145	1,686	8.65%	115.30%	43.37%	116	797	14.55%	91.67%	91.75%	36	31	73
7	556	7,273	7.64%	530	22,250	2.38%	95.32%	32.68%	408	10,169	4.01%	73.38%	71.52%	154	78	309
8	187	612	30.59%	149	1,776	8.43%	80.00%	34.45%	116	835	13.89%	61.95%	73.29%	42	26	84
9	131	434	30.18%	94	713	13.30%	72.34%	60.93%	88	530	16.60%	67.08%	81.98%	24	28	49
10	307	2,663	11.56%	273	5,923	4.61%	88.81%	44.97%	218	3,212	6.78%	70.79%	82.92%	75	56	150
11	241	937	25.79%	178	2,534	7.05%	73.98%	36.99%	153	1,534	9.97%	63.27%	61.11%	43	39	87
12	68	125	55.03%	61	295	20.67%	88.57%	42.40%	50	162	30.86%	72.49%	77.35%	14	14	28
13	47	57	82.71%	36	107	34.20%	77.50%	53.35%	31	70	44.28%	65.05%	82.3%	10	8	21
14	89	156	56.99%	72	412	17.49%	80.71%	38.01%	58	204	28.43%	64.83%	76.93%	13	23	27
15	101	238	42.53%	93	695	13.47%	92.54%	34.22%	72	310	23.22%	71.07%	76.83%	27	16	54
16	63	133	47.55%	58	267	21.71%	91.76%	49.76%	51	170	30%	80.49%	78.37%	15	13	30
17	120	526	22.89%	115	1,055	10.93%	95.83%	49.85%	99	646	15.32%	82.21%	81.43%	29	30	58
18	68	213	32.33%	79	502	15.85%	115.50%	42.44%	63	232	27.15%	91.35%	91.91%	22	11	44
19	258	1,812	14.24%	262	5,460	4.80%	101.67%	33.19%	196	2,402	8.15%	75.91%	75.47%	68	56	136
20	214	882	24.34%	161	2,071	7.80%	75.25%	42.59%	134	1,173	11.42%	62.37%	75.21%	30	51	60
21	245	1,502	16.34%	231	4,260	5.44%	94.44%	35.26%	177	2,021	8.75%	72.09%	74.34%	68	47	137
22	240	1,856	12.94%	240	4,597	5.23%	100.18%	40.37%	186	2,313	8.04%	77.38%	80.24%	69	46	139
23	159	929	17.11%	136	1,484	9.21%	85.99%	62.64%	119	1,019	11.67%	74.78%	91.25%	30	38	61
24	214	1,254	17.09%	174	2,426	7.21%	81.60%	51.69%	156	1,655	9.42%	72.75%	75.77%	40	58	81
25	118	238	49.52%	96	740	13.05%	81.66%	32.27%	79	375	21.06%	66.75%	63.71%	23	28	46
26	111	276	40.38%	90	645	13.97%	80.90%	42.78%	77	414	18.59%	69.03%	66.70%	25	24	50
27	160	537	29.93%	148	1,743	8.50%	92.20%	30.80%	112	813	13.77%	69.65%	66.06%	42	28	85
28	78	216	36.08%	74	440	16.92%	95.28%	49.23%	62	252	24.60%	79.30%	85.98%	20	15	41
29	52	96	54.03%	50	199	25.12%	96.50%	48.17%	42	119	35.29%	80.73%	80.89%	11	14	22
30	40	51	78.02%	47	175	26.82%	116.79%	29.42%	34	64	53.12%	84.49%	80.57%	13	5	27
31	141	579	24.49%	128	1,308	9.81%	90.55%	44.26%	108	724	14.91%	76.12%	80.00%	27	41	54
32	119	561	21.26%	116	1,078	10.81%	97.73%	52.01%	100	606	16.50%	83.80%	92.59%	18	34	37
33	190	732	26.02%	158	1,996	7.94%	83.16%	36.71%	137	1,150	11.91%	71.81%	63.73%	34	49	68
34	155	947	16.43%	140	1,566	8.97%	90.23%	60.47%	122	1,075	11.34%	78.31%	88.15%	41	36	82

Plan Name:	H000H9027			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
35	128	418	30.81%	143	1,639	8.76%	111.56%	25.50%	102	565	18.05%	79.14%	74.03%	42	18	84
36	63	172	36.61%	76	458	16.58%	120.09%	37.70%	59	202	29.20%	93.22%	85.57%	16	18	32
37	74	258	28.71%	74	436	16.99%	100.08%	59.11%	66	284	23.23%	89.04%	90.88%	18	18	36
38	95	439	21.59%	96	731	13.12%	101.09%	60.10%	84	478	17.57%	88.42%	92.01%	24	21	48
39	124	579	21.54%	133	1,412	9.44%	106.91%	41.00%	101	661	15.27%	80.94%	87.60%	38	21	77
40	45	105	42.76%	50	200	25.03%	111.40%	52.55%	42	116	36.20%	92.98%	91.05%	11	11	22
41	88	215	41.17%	93	696	13.45%	105.39%	31.00%	69	285	24.21%	77.65%	75.71%	26	15	53
42	197	1,926	10.26%	197	3,103	6.37%	99.99%	62.07%	172	2,008	8.56%	86.97%	95.94%	46	48	92
43	64	88	73.08%	59	278	21.28%	91.34%	31.88%	47	134	35.07%	72.50%	66.18%	13	14	26
44	60	182	33.03%	65	341	19.21%	108.86%	53.43%	55	198	27.77%	91.27%	92.13%	15	15	30
45	54	129	42.49%	60	294	20.68%	111.13%	43.78%	49	150	32.66%	89.31%	86.06%	15	13	30
46	30	39	77.23%	28	66	43.60%	94.56%	59.69%	26	47	55.31%	85.05%	84.21%	6	9	13
47	36	53	67.13%	37	109	33.91%	103.16%	48.96%	32	64	50%	88.83%	83.82%	6	11	13
48	54	76	70.39%	52	219	23.98%	97.17%	35.06%	42	112	37.5%	77.64%	68.60%	10	15	20
49	37	58	63.86%	39	123	32.00%	105.74%	47.39%	31	65	47.69%	83.24%	89.70%	11	7	23
50	134	555	24.11%	131	1,365	9.60%	97.84%	40.72%	106	706	15.01%	79.06%	78.74%	33	30	66
51	132	645	20.48%	122	1,195	10.27%	92.76%	54.03%	108	764	14.13%	81.62%	84.53%	26	37	52
52	82	279	29.42%	84	568	14.88%	103.11%	49.05%	69	314	21.97%	84.03%	88.85%	22	16	45
53	93	447	20.76%	109	948	11.52%	117.55%	47.21%	87	468	18.58%	93.54%	95.69%	29	18	59
54	125	744	16.90%	137	1,503	9.15%	109.29%	49.52%	110	827	13.30%	87.35%	90.05%	37	27	75
55	260	3,247	8.00%	282	6,317	4.46%	108.45%	51.40%	234	3,583	6.53%	89.98%	90.63%	71	60	143
56	198	1,891	10.48%	213	3,621	5.89%	107.70%	52.22%	185	1,982	9.33%	93.29%	95.42%	32	65	64
57	92	373	24.66%	99	789	12.63%	108.39%	47.24%	80	410	19.51%	86.94%	90.98%	24	20	48
58	78	263	29.64%	79	504	15.80%	102.24%	52.12%	67	295	22.71%	85.89%	89.17%	21	16	42
59	50	66	75.24%	43	152	28.75%	87.06%	43.88%	35	85	41.17%	69.52%	78.70%	12	9	24
60	97	204	47.83%	83	551	15.11%	85.38%	37.01%	69	300	23%	70.68%	68.02%	17	24	34
61	48	48	101.36%	40	129	31.22%	82.60%	37.28%	34	76	44.73%	69.58%	63.42%	9	12	19
62	31	44	71.37%	31	79	39.74%	100.34%	55.49%	28	51	54.90%	88.63%	86.78%	9	8	18
63	51	93	55.31%	57	259	22.04%	110.90%	35.94%	42	104	40.38%	81.49%	89.59%	15	9	30
64	57	116	49.42%	62	306	20.29%	107.83%	38.07%	48	153	31.37%	83.34%	76.15%	14	13	29
65	54	139	39.32%	57	265	21.77%	105.48%	52.47%	49	157	31.21%	89.28%	88.87%	15	12	31
66	48	95	51.32%	51	208	24.57%	104.75%	45.70%	43	121	35.53%	87.84%	78.81%	11	15	22
67	42	53	80.95%	40	128	31.35%	93.61%	41.37%	33	73	45.20%	76.88%	72.63%	11	9	23
68	49	99	50.09%	48	185	26.05%	97.34%	53.42%	41	115	35.65%	82.51%	86.26%	12	12	25

Plan Name:	H000H9027			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
69	69	130	53.53%	62	308	20.21%	89.11%	42.37%	51	173	29.47%	72.93%	75.50%	15	16	30
70	172	201	85.45%	96	734	13.09%	55.85%	27.44%	90	519	17.34%	52.27%	38.81%	26	30	53
71	82	234	35.24%	81	530	15.40%	98.92%	44.18%	67	274	24.45%	81.05%	85.60%	18	22	36
72	53	102	52.47%	50	204	24.78%	94.83%	49.81%	46	133	34.58%	85.85%	76.77%	11	16	22
73	123	793	15.61%	132	1,385	9.53%	106.66%	57.25%	112	831	13.47%	90.43%	95.46%	30	30	61
74	100	442	22.75%	106	905	11.79%	105.92%	48.91%	88	530	16.60%	87.30%	83.56%	30	22	61
75	138	860	16.12%	183	2,679	6.85%	132.32%	32.11%	134	903	14.83%	96.53%	95.30%	53	18	107
76	144	599	24.13%	169	2,281	7.42%	117.21%	26.25%	121	841	14.38%	83.69%	71.23%	41	32	83
77	63	147	43.18%	55	243	22.71%	87.04%	60.43%	49	165	29.69%	76.95%	89.35%	11	16	23
78	66	125	52.92%	57	262	21.88%	86.79%	47.63%	47	147	31.97%	70.91%	85.19%	12	15	25
79	101	343	29.64%	96	740	13.03%	94.70%	46.44%	83	441	18.82%	81.42%	77.97%	19	24	39
80	246	1,934	12.73%	245	4,769	5.13%	99.47%	40.55%	198	2,391	8.28%	80.38%	80.89%	54	56	108
81	185	1,570	11.79%	196	3,052	6.42%	105.77%	51.45%	163	1,737	9.38%	87.96%	90.43%	44	43	88
82	145	724	20.10%	182	2,640	6.90%	125.17%	27.43%	132	897	14.71%	90.62%	80.76%	54	22	109
83	71	153	46.48%	83	557	15.03%	117.60%	27.50%	60	199	30.15%	84.23%	77.00%	23	12	47
84	81	233	34.98%	77	477	16.24%	94.87%	48.92%	66	278	23.74%	80.74%	84.03%	20	20	41
85	112	301	37.17%	116	1,084	10.77%	104.32%	27.77%	84	403	20.84%	74.97%	74.78%	34	17	68
86	61	130	46.99%	58	272	21.49%	95.79%	47.74%	48	159	30.18%	78.50%	81.81%	16	12	33
87	35	31	113.43%	26	54	48.20%	74.15%	57.30%	23	39	58.97%	65.32%	79.58%	6	7	12
88	77	38	201.06%	74	440	16.89%	96.14%	8.73%	55	114	48.24%	70.97%	33.80%	5	24	11
89	89	176	50.96%	104	860	12.09%	115.95%	20.46%	79	227	34.80%	88.02%	77.58%	9	34	18
90	37	42	87.85%	32	83	38.82%	87.17%	50.70%	28	51	54.90%	75.30%	82.98%	6	8	13
91	39	52	75.39%	45	163	27.74%	115.56%	31.84%	37	65	56.92%	94.26%	80.09%	6	13	12
92	35	41	85.73%	38	116	32.81%	108.85%	35.15%	30	52	57.69%	85.15%	79.01%	6	11	13
93	43	97	44.68%	53	224	23.67%	121.48%	43.60%	43	100	43%	98.26%	97.92%	7	16	15
94	29	27	106.22%	28	62	44.83%	95.60%	44.15%	23	35	65.71%	78.36%	78.94%	7	6	14
95	21	19	109.30%	20	34	60.02%	98.54%	55.72%	18	23	78.26%	84.62%	84.60%	4	6	8
96	33	42	77.57%	36	104	34.78%	109.00%	41.13%	29	53	54.71%	87.34%	80.75%	8	9	16
97	107	494	21.76%	135	1,455	9.29%	125.84%	33.95%	101	522	19.34%	93.91%	94.66%	40	15	80
98	35	45	78.17%	31	80	39.49%	89.64%	56.36%	29	56	51.78%	81.62%	81.16%	8	8	16
99	39	49	80.28%	46	169	27.26%	115.98%	29.27%	34	63	53.96%	85.47%	78.65%	13	5	27
100	45	90	50.56%	51	207	24.61%	111.81%	43.53%	43	98	43.87%	94.05%	92.26%	7	15	15
101	22	24	92.22%	25	51	49.20%	113.48%	47.00%	21	27	77.77%	93.16%	90.51%	7	4	14
102	28	27	101.11%	26	56	47.05%	95.36%	48.80%	23	35	65.71%	82.05%	79.2%	6	7	12

Plan Name:	H000H9027			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
103	35	42	83.32%	37	113	33.32%	105.65%	37.84%	32	56	57.14%	89.56%	76.57%	5	12	10
104	99	401	24.65%	124	1,235	10.09%	125.84%	32.52%	92	448	20.53%	92.85%	89.69%	36	14	72
105	284	1,718	16.54%	292	6,802	4.30%	102.91%	25.25%	211	2,388	8.83%	74.22%	71.94%	84	44	169
106	142	512	27.73%	158	1,997	7.93%	111.44%	25.68%	117	743	15.74%	82.25%	69.03%	34	38	69
107	22	22	103.13%	22	38	57.15%	96.87%	57.20%	19	24	79.16%	83.58%	91.83%	5	5	10
108	27	25	107.52%	26	54	48.26%	95.52%	46.99%	22	31	70.96%	80.61%	81.87%	5	7	10
109	35	28	125.20%	34	97	35.96%	98.86%	29.05%	28	48	58.33%	79.16%	58.85%	6	10	13
110	21	16	128.64%	25	49	50.21%	119.17%	32.75%	20	17	117.64%	95.14%	96.11%	2	8	4
111	25	23	109.25%	25	53	48.40%	102.88%	43.06%	22	30	73.33%	87.09%	77.06%	5	7	10
112	38	79	48.76%	43	147	29.24%	111.08%	53.99%	36	89	40.44%	92.99%	89.19%	11	9	23
113	40	62	64.90%	42	145	29.41%	105.42%	42.98%	35	81	43.20%	86.24%	77.18%	11	10	22
114	52	77	67.70%	53	226	23.56%	101.46%	34.30%	45	120	37.5%	85.53%	64.75%	10	17	20
115	43	40	105.45%	47	181	26.30%	110.92%	22.48%	37	61	60.65%	85.80%	67.03%	5	15	10
116	27	26	105.23%	33	89	37.51%	121.87%	29.25%	26	30	86.66%	94.47%	87.16%	3	10	6
117	58	43	132.76%	50	203	24.85%	87.11%	21.49%	40	89	44.94%	68.88%	49.14%	9	16	19
118	31	30	104.04%	36	105	34.56%	115.04%	28.87%	29	40	72.5%	91.68%	76%	4	11	9
119	22	26	86.76%	25	51	49.38%	111.95%	50.84%	22	28	78.57%	96.70%	93.64%	4	7	8
120	594	4,942	12.03%	641	32,723	1.96%	107.83%	15.10%	442	10,842	4.07%	74.30%	45.59%	183	96	366

H000H9027 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	8.28	8.32	8.27	7.94	11.32	11.37	11.18	10.99	1.74	19.40	19.44	19.18	19.06
2	6.74	6.74	5.50	6.77	9.40	9.39	7.60	9.41	1.76	18.92	18.93	16.05	19.40
3	21.38	21.35	19.86	21.25	30.34	30.35	30.70	31.03	1.86	41.37	41.32	40.31	42.08
4	12.20	12.11	12.91	11.61	16.70	16.61	17.47	16.00	1.77	28.17	28.06	28.49	27.30
5	33.79	33.90	32.99	35.79	45.59	45.74	43.49	47.82	1.69	55.48	55.65	52.73	57.44
6	9.84	9.89	8.65	9.93	13.75	13.82	11.86	13.69	1.77	24.77	24.89	21.83	24.58
7	54.77	54.85	54.17	56.37	73.41	73.65	72.56	75.69	1.68	91.48	91.81	89.58	93.74
8	12.47	12.36	12.50	12.69	16.25	16.11	16.28	16.42	1.63	24.90	24.75	25.04	24.69
9	7.36	7.29	7.41	6.94	10.73	10.60	10.71	9.93	1.85	19.66	19.53	19.32	19.07
10	26.03	25.95	24.77	25.67	34.03	33.92	31.92	33.46	1.70	44.57	44.42	41.90	43.51
11	17.38	17.39	16.25	16.39	27.09	27.16	25.76	26.19	1.97	36.09	36.18	34.65	35.10
12	5.04	5.06	4.92	4.84	8.19	8.22	7.89	7.83	2.10	14.86	14.87	14.41	14.42
13	4.02	4.02	3.88	4.22	6.52	6.50	6.27	6.75	2.13	12.69	12.66	12.16	13.11
14	6.51	6.50	6.47	6.80	9.41	9.39	9.44	9.66	1.96	15.32	15.31	15.45	15.32
15	7.20	7.18	6.99	6.97	11.69	11.69	11.26	11.36	2.14	19.79	19.80	19.22	19.45
16	5.43	5.43	5.42	5.39	8.88	8.87	8.69	8.73	2.07	14.80	14.78	14.39	14.49
17	14.16	14.21	13.03	13.75	20.11	20.10	18.15	19.69	1.86	30.34	30.41	27.76	29.68
18	6.48	6.48	6.17	6.11	10.41	10.38	10.29	9.97	2.20	20.31	20.25	20.25	19.65
19	24.62	24.72	25.92	25.88	33.05	33.19	33.77	35.19	1.71	49.14	49.33	49.51	52.24
20	16.53	16.37	17.21	15.86	20.83	20.61	21.68	19.72	1.56	27.98	27.72	28.88	26.57
21	18.55	18.54	18.62	17.30	24.91	24.86	25.22	22.99	1.63	37.63	37.60	38.14	35.07
22	20.37	20.21	20.18	19.06	27.76	27.59	27.29	26.21	1.68	38.05	37.94	36.75	35.97
23	11.11	11.19	9.72	10.21	15.47	15.57	13.47	14.24	1.76	26.00	26.12	23.39	24.51
24	16.39	16.41	14.15	17.22	22.85	22.85	20.17	24.11	1.72	30.69	30.69	27.67	32.14
25	10.17	10.18	9.93	9.90	14.12	14.13	13.85	13.66	1.64	22.71	22.75	22.70	22.33
26	12.27	12.24	11.93	12.40	15.75	15.72	15.15	15.92	1.58	22.35	22.33	21.69	22.61
27	13.50	13.55	13.05	13.00	21.65	21.70	21.44	21.22	2.04	31.29	31.33	31.36	30.81
28	6.65	6.64	7.00	6.48	9.93	9.92	10.31	9.70	1.96	19.32	19.32	19.40	18.89
29	5.37	5.36	5.78	5.42	8.53	8.51	8.84	8.46	2.08	15.70	15.69	15.58	15.38
30	4.38	4.37	4.36	4.46	6.62	6.60	6.60	6.68	1.92	15.06	15.03	14.94	15.16
31	11.48	11.47	10.90	11.90	16.19	16.17	15.35	16.67	1.80	26.61	26.58	25.26	27.01
32	12.87	12.83	13.02	13.30	17.47	17.42	17.41	17.85	1.75	27.70	27.63	27.64	27.98
33	11.71	11.53	12.48	12.58	17.55	17.34	18.57	18.60	1.70	30.99	30.75	30.99	31.64
34	12.59	12.57	12.03	12.76	18.22	18.23	17.15	18.26	1.72	31.00	31.02	29.12	30.78
35	8.82	8.83	8.60	8.16	12.25	12.27	11.87	11.46	1.73	20.85	20.89	20.13	19.91

H000H9027 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
36	5.17	5.19	4.97	4.92	6.98	7.00	6.72	6.66	1.65	14.98	15.01	14.56	14.45
37	9.41	9.39	9.72	9.74	14.93	14.90	15.77	15.60	2.04	25.77	25.76	26.54	26.33
38	9.12	9.03	9.43	9.62	13.74	13.59	14.29	14.53	1.96	25.10	24.91	25.68	26.10
39	15.16	15.14	14.89	15.00	21.73	21.71	21.33	21.73	1.85	30.21	30.19	29.18	30.27
40	5.44	5.42	5.14	5.43	7.94	7.93	7.40	7.92	1.90	15.80	15.77	15.14	15.65
41	8.57	8.61	8.26	9.11	12.36	12.42	11.72	12.98	1.86	22.32	22.49	21.24	23.02
42	16.37	16.61	17.93	14.53	31.75	32.30	34.35	28.59	2.55	45.91	46.61	49.38	42.36
43	5.49	5.42	6.12	5.44	9.07	8.95	10.10	9.01	2.27	18.21	18.00	19.99	18.19
44	6.55	6.56	6.84	6.87	11.60	11.60	12.05	12.19	2.31	20.20	20.17	20.36	20.81
45	5.10	5.12	4.83	5.20	7.87	7.89	7.32	8.11	2.13	15.60	15.66	14.77	15.89
46	3.44	3.43	3.41	3.52	5.41	5.40	5.36	5.54	2.10	12.04	11.99	11.94	12.28
47	3.99	3.97	4.08	4.02	6.36	6.33	6.49	6.50	1.94	14.37	14.32	14.23	14.22
48	6.71	6.71	6.66	6.72	10.17	10.15	10.08	10.22	2.03	17.10	17.08	17.00	17.12
49	3.93	3.93	3.90	3.84	6.25	6.24	6.21	6.11	1.97	13.01	13.00	12.96	12.79
50	14.67	14.57	14.73	16.09	22.75	22.60	22.66	24.81	2.05	31.98	31.82	31.56	33.56
51	7.47	7.52	6.23	7.18	10.95	11.00	9.15	10.49	1.80	19.83	19.90	17.32	19.15
52	6.41	6.40	6.70	6.23	8.92	8.90	9.31	8.78	1.72	16.75	16.72	17.41	16.45
53	6.43	6.51	5.93	5.92	10.13	10.23	9.30	9.31	1.96	19.36	19.47	18.35	18.19
54	9.65	9.66	9.56	10.05	14.08	14.08	13.58	15.40	1.79	23.19	23.23	22.50	25.03
55	28.14	28.01	28.78	28.90	38.07	37.96	38.08	38.50	1.69	52.62	52.51	50.96	52.54
56	26.59	26.71	26.26	26.71	35.11	35.34	34.23	35.18	1.76	46.05	46.37	44.90	46.05
57	8.00	8.10	7.14	8.05	12.68	12.86	11.48	12.39	2.14	21.26	21.49	19.56	20.97
58	8.87	8.86	8.92	9.02	13.08	13.05	13.22	13.30	1.97	19.42	19.39	19.55	19.56
59	4.22	4.21	4.08	4.21	6.47	6.45	6.25	6.40	2.03	13.25	13.22	12.86	13.07
60	8.14	8.11	8.26	8.76	14.48	14.42	14.33	15.03	2.21	24.46	24.35	24.77	24.97
61	4.21	4.21	4.15	4.35	6.59	6.58	6.49	6.81	2.15	12.58	12.58	12.48	12.79
62	3.78	3.78	3.86	3.74	5.73	5.73	5.83	5.67	1.94	12.11	12.11	12.18	12.03
63	5.63	5.56	5.49	5.49	8.58	8.47	8.26	8.33	1.96	16.77	16.60	16.25	16.33
64	6.40	6.43	6.15	5.90	10.05	10.11	9.52	9.24	2.03	19.05	19.18	18.23	17.71
65	4.82	4.82	5.09	4.82	7.19	7.17	7.40	7.14	1.80	16.25	16.21	16.32	16.03
66	4.48	4.49	4.95	4.63	5.96	5.96	6.42	6.10	1.59	15.54	15.56	16.71	15.78
67	3.70	3.71	3.78	3.71	5.69	5.72	5.70	5.58	1.86	12.99	13.03	13.04	12.82
68	4.20	4.21	4.25	4.24	6.18	6.21	6.51	6.34	1.78	13.68	13.70	13.52	13.73
69	4.67	4.71	4.36	4.43	6.60	6.68	6.12	6.18	1.66	15.27	15.41	14.30	14.50
70	12.86	12.89	13.10	12.38	17.46	17.51	17.60	16.96	1.82	23.65	23.70	23.49	23.50

H000H9027 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
71	5.91	6.00	5.14	5.29	8.50	8.64	7.21	7.42	1.69	17.47	17.69	15.15	15.52
72	4.62	4.64	4.52	4.36	6.99	7.03	6.80	6.56	1.78	15.05	15.12	14.89	14.51
73	8.98	8.92	8.05	9.41	14.46	14.42	13.06	14.77	2.04	23.25	23.22	21.61	23.41
74	9.37	9.22	10.79	10.23	13.78	13.54	16.01	15.08	1.76	23.88	23.65	26.09	24.96
75	9.99	10.04	9.64	9.40	14.47	14.57	13.50	13.36	1.68	24.62	24.78	22.24	22.72
76	11.39	11.38	12.09	11.56	18.84	18.90	20.19	18.34	1.86	32.55	32.65	34.43	31.32
77	5.42	5.43	5.30	5.22	7.93	7.95	7.78	7.67	1.87	16.86	16.88	16.56	16.31
78	6.17	6.23	5.29	5.83	9.39	9.47	8.05	8.86	1.86	18.37	18.52	16.18	17.30
79	9.91	10.00	9.31	9.51	15.52	15.62	14.89	15.02	2.07	25.03	25.11	24.62	24.53
80	26.27	26.22	28.77	26.85	38.94	38.92	42.30	39.31	1.98	50.19	50.12	54.19	50.93
81	19.42	19.25	24.27	20.66	29.64	29.32	36.84	31.59	2.01	39.41	39.05	47.89	41.30
82	11.35	11.29	15.08	13.37	15.67	15.59	19.39	17.80	1.70	24.04	23.98	27.82	26.16
83	6.35	6.30	6.68	6.67	10.05	9.98	10.37	10.32	2.04	19.67	19.62	19.86	19.76
84	7.10	7.16	7.27	6.86	10.74	10.91	10.38	10.13	1.89	20.86	21.15	20.12	19.67
85	7.09	7.04	7.78	7.41	11.00	10.94	11.82	11.40	1.90	18.92	18.85	19.69	19.31
86	5.15	5.16	5.18	5.16	7.89	7.89	7.82	7.85	2.06	15.50	15.51	15.28	15.39
87	2.99	2.98	3.08	3.00	4.48	4.47	4.64	4.48	2.04	10.90	10.88	11.07	10.88
88	8.49	8.45	8.81	8.35	10.97	10.94	11.25	10.87	1.70	16.71	16.70	16.85	16.63
89	9.46	9.50	8.29	9.20	12.42	12.48	11.01	12.06	1.51	19.40	19.49	17.54	18.73
90	3.60	3.64	3.43	3.64	5.52	5.58	5.26	5.54	1.91	11.99	12.09	11.51	12.00
91	5.33	5.27	5.41	5.73	7.87	7.80	7.95	8.38	1.68	15.62	15.56	14.95	16.04
92	4.64	4.64	4.59	4.54	7.11	7.12	6.99	6.94	1.93	13.99	14.04	13.67	13.73
93	5.08	5.07	5.21	5.13	6.72	6.70	6.91	6.76	1.52	14.41	14.39	14.43	14.35
94	2.94	2.96	2.75	3.21	4.35	4.38	4.11	4.67	1.89	10.21	10.25	9.80	10.59
95	2.58	2.56	2.55	2.66	4.15	4.14	4.12	4.26	2.14	10.40	10.38	10.38	10.48
96	3.27	3.25	3.04	3.17	5.15	5.11	4.76	4.96	2.07	11.83	11.78	11.18	11.45
97	3.93	3.91	3.94	4.01	5.85	5.82	5.83	5.94	1.95	12.00	11.97	11.95	12.06
98	3.52	3.50	3.49	3.61	5.68	5.63	5.57	5.80	2.07	11.75	11.69	11.72	11.83
99	4.48	4.49	4.73	4.40	6.57	6.58	6.87	6.48	1.90	13.68	13.70	13.85	13.51
100	3.53	3.52	3.81	3.54	5.32	5.30	5.44	5.36	1.77	13.13	13.09	13.38	13.12
101	2.80	2.80	2.79	2.80	4.00	4.00	4.01	3.99	1.88	10.89	10.89	10.89	10.88
102	2.99	3.00	2.91	2.99	4.56	4.57	4.48	4.52	2.04	10.98	11.00	10.83	10.89
103	3.75	3.69	5.23	3.36	5.94	5.84	8.30	5.31	2.16	11.73	11.59	14.66	10.93
104	5.02	5.03	4.79	5.07	7.96	7.95	7.56	7.99	2.16	15.06	15.09	14.52	15.10
105	36.52	35.93	39.58	31.12	46.40	45.67	49.95	39.52	1.73	53.54	52.91	57.30	46.79

H000H9027 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
106	10.23	10.26	9.35	9.75	13.74	13.79	12.48	12.97	1.54	24.11	24.20	22.40	22.89
107	2.53	2.52	2.58	2.45	4.24	4.23	4.30	4.17	2.24	10.72	10.71	10.84	10.55
108	2.63	2.62	2.66	2.59	3.69	3.69	3.73	3.66	1.86	9.58	9.58	9.51	9.58
109	3.91	3.91	3.97	3.81	5.64	5.65	5.72	5.52	1.87	11.52	11.51	11.65	11.38
110	2.96	2.95	3.34	2.92	4.18	4.16	4.70	4.12	1.78	9.31	9.29	10.00	9.21
111	2.97	2.97	2.92	2.98	4.15	4.15	4.05	4.16	1.71	10.77	10.78	10.37	10.77
112	2.99	2.96	2.65	2.87	4.34	4.28	3.67	4.16	1.76	11.13	11.00	9.66	10.80
113	4.09	4.06	4.09	4.28	6.07	6.02	6.19	6.34	1.75	13.87	13.80	13.96	14.04
114	5.81	5.71	7.35	5.61	8.08	7.94	10.22	7.82	1.77	15.94	15.76	18.21	15.55
115	4.98	4.99	5.62	5.09	6.72	6.73	7.42	6.87	1.70	12.93	12.92	13.76	12.95
116	3.20	3.19	3.29	3.13	4.90	4.88	5.05	4.79	1.87	11.88	11.85	12.74	11.69
117	5.37	5.42	6.02	5.07	7.39	7.46	8.15	7.02	1.97	13.70	13.76	14.37	13.35
118	4.62	4.58	5.35	4.51	6.85	6.78	7.92	6.68	1.92	13.91	13.81	15.33	13.66
119	2.50	2.50	2.42	2.50	3.83	3.81	3.74	3.82	2.00	10.56	10.53	10.34	10.56
120	46.55	47.94	43.78	37.90	58.46	60.15	55.15	47.81	1.54	78.90	80.97	74.57	65.69

H000H9027 - 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	156,116	-561	121,580	24,408	20.07	4,577	3.76	0	0	1	2	78,787	50.46%	62,341	10,150	2,719
2	156,119	-558	123,114	24,999	20.30	5,852	4.75	2	0	1	3	86,600	55.47%	68,639	19,120	2,745
3	158,797	2,120	120,717	7,292	6.04	4,309	3.56	2	0	8	1	105,003	66.12%	80,617	4,971	2,346
4	158,781	2,104	123,651	12,220	9.88	7,751	6.26	0	0	8	4	105,437	66.40%	83,629	7,171	5,586
5	159,198	2,521	125,985	17,355	13.77	4,698	3.72	1	0	3	5	102,641	64.47%	81,306	12,684	3,016
6	159,266	2,589	124,614	13,492	10.82	5,180	4.15	0	0	3	6	128,215	80.50%	99,712	12,728	4,420
7	156,188	-489	124,335	26,884	21.62	5,442	4.37	1	0	2	10	67,190	43.01%	54,055	14,301	1,965
8	156,242	-435	125,541	62,787	50.01	8,466	6.74	1	1	6	8	131,718	84.30%	105,330	57,587	6,713
9	156,049	-628	123,882	19,577	15.80	5,973	4.82	0	1	6	9	127,096	81.44%	101,482	14,398	4,678
10	156,423	-254	120,635	20,153	16.70	6,069	5.03	1	1	4	11	96,860	61.92%	74,667	7,640	4,207
11	155,797	-880	122,675	10,613	8.65	5,275	4.29	1	1	2	12	73,671	47.28%	57,713	3,668	1,639
12	155,886	-791	119,727	16,295	13.61	10,627	8.87	0	0	5	17	101,745	65.26%	76,632	11,068	6,367
13	156,649	-28	119,009	60,480	50.81	6,918	5.81	0	0	0	15	85,150	54.35%	64,592	36,204	3,931
14	156,203	-474	114,930	60,349	52.50	5,145	4.47	0	0	0	14	101,134	64.74%	73,954	42,377	3,327
15	156,287	-390	118,441	23,379	19.73	8,279	6.98	0	1	2	13	90,340	57.80%	66,034	16,631	5,418
16	156,755	78	123,362	15,827	12.82	10,706	8.67	0	0	5	19	65,590	41.84%	50,969	3,796	3,537
17	157,926	1,249	120,029	6,465	5.38	5,599	4.66	0	0	2	20	57,611	36.47%	46,456	4,334	2,236
18	154,544	-2,133	112,715	11,891	10.54	8,241	7.31	0	0	4	13	80,228	51.91%	56,761	7,600	4,895
19	154,740	-1,937	120,969	17,762	14.68	6,558	5.42	1	0	4	21	96,682	62.48%	75,095	8,879	4,496
20	156,856	179	127,291	39,710	31.19	9,845	7.73	2	3	20	23	110,134	70.21%	87,979	32,926	5,914
21	156,918	241	128,894	11,213	8.69	10,001	7.75	1	4	14	22	57,093	36.38%	47,533	4,595	4,640
22	154,726	-1,951	125,768	10,920	8.68	14,026	11.15	1	2	6	22	77,882	50.33%	65,945	4,071	6,134
23	155,606	-1,071	121,630	9,985	8.20	9,279	7.62	0	1	5	24	122,338	78.62%	94,780	9,170	8,242
24	157,896	1,219	127,516	10,371	8.13	9,911	7.77	2	0	3	20	119,635	75.76%	96,536	9,231	6,512
25	155,274	-1,403	130,766	4,018	3.07	4,517	3.45	0	3	12	28	88,905	57.25%	74,860	2,597	2,336
26	154,122	-2,555	124,950	26,260	21.01	8,591	6.87	0	4	16	27	101,336	65.75%	82,496	23,897	5,357
27	155,110	-1,567	120,907	9,039	7.47	21,578	17.84	0	3	10	28	58,473	37.69%	45,477	3,069	5,989
28	158,813	2,136	120,940	12,850	10.62	17,357	14.35	0	2	3	33	110,256	69.42%	83,732	9,829	10,644
29	159,162	2,485	121,258	14,405	11.87	17,521	14.44	0	3	6	34	61,558	38.67%	47,404	4,777	7,739
30	156,153	-524	123,293	16,147	13.09	21,867	17.73	2	4	9	37	70,028	44.84%	55,312	6,647	10,398
31	158,462	1,785	123,715	11,918	9.63	13,979	11.29	2	1	7	25	96,875	61.13%	77,043	6,375	5,838
32	155,664	-1,013	120,674	13,470	11.16	16,303	13.50	0	0	7	42	89,905	57.75%	71,213	8,371	8,351
33	156,488	-189	139,794	9,863	7.05	6,511	4.65	2	0	6	42	124,956	79.85%	113,516	8,178	4,974
34	157,143	466	131,684	3,473	2.63	5,497	4.17	1	0	3	43	150,684	95.88%	126,202	3,358	5,271
35	156,871	194	125,778	6,455	5.13	11,443	9.09	0	0	3	44	148,757	94.82%	118,478	6,364	11,173

H000H9027 - 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
36	154,847	-1,830	125,696	3,131	2.49	9,756	7.76	0	0	4	46	99,576	64.30%	81,626	1,784	6,460
37	154,993	-1,684	120,471	3,859	3.20	10,550	8.75	0	0	6	61	66,979	43.21%	50,245	2,780	6,745
38	154,857	-1,820	119,957	8,795	7.33	15,719	13.10	0	0	2	61	152,503	98.47%	118,127	8,753	15,558
39	155,573	-1,104	120,209	9,287	7.72	18,017	14.98	2	5	14	64	86,518	55.61%	67,253	5,264	8,297
40	155,028	-1,649	119,242	19,053	15.97	13,611	11.41	0	1	11	64	78,974	50.94%	60,945	13,429	6,999
41	155,394	-1,283	119,556	18,786	15.71	17,564	14.69	0	5	13	65	97,717	62.88%	76,230	13,077	11,081
42	154,915	-1,762	115,872	13,349	11.52	28,686	24.75	2	1	9	79	99,639	64.31%	74,477	5,876	18,955
43	157,563	886	115,766	17,922	15.48	63,619	54.95	0	0	6	41	57,934	36.76%	41,403	7,558	20,691
44	157,485	808	120,020	11,102	9.25	20,521	17.09	0	3	1	41	99,036	62.88%	72,526	7,917	10,967
45	156,253	-424	112,443	45,782	40.71	20,272	18.02	0	4	6	38	70,561	45.15%	50,948	13,456	10,931
46	156,157	-520	116,996	60,956	52.10	24,766	21.16	0	1	4	36	87,621	56.11%	67,601	26,125	19,648
47	158,274	1,597	130,207	9,386	7.20	21,274	16.33	0	2	8	40	77,029	48.66%	61,746	5,185	13,836
48	156,456	-221	116,536	15,244	13.08	61,813	53.04	0	1	4	49	125,401	80.15%	93,163	12,290	50,134
49	159,069	2,392	128,296	14,193	11.06	38,443	29.96	0	0	8	35	112,782	70.90%	92,172	10,414	26,246
50	158,877	2,200	120,736	12,728	10.54	22,057	18.26	2	1	6	32	70,554	44.40%	53,828	5,614	12,801
51	159,406	2,729	128,426	13,178	10.26	7,185	5.59	0	0	2	32	90,555	56.80%	74,435	4,640	3,647
52	159,652	2,975	128,907	7,446	5.77	8,064	6.25	0	4	3	31	81,124	50.81%	66,434	4,939	3,923
53	159,414	2,737	126,116	15,753	12.49	12,831	10.17	0	4	2	30	84,928	53.27%	63,774	11,412	8,389
54	156,053	-624	126,929	11,119	8.76	11,012	8.67	1	0	5	80	104,664	67.06%	87,330	7,084	5,445
55	155,882	-795	125,035	10,635	8.50	19,956	15.96	1	0	4	77	99,436	63.78%	81,565	7,143	11,530
56	154,900	-1,777	115,066	13,762	11.96	26,258	22.81	1	3	8	66	77,900	50.29%	57,457	4,889	14,291
57	157,418	741	115,199	11,216	9.73	19,664	17.06	0	0	4	67	51,479	32.70%	37,483	5,961	6,862
58	158,568	1,891	118,578	15,291	12.89	23,742	20.02	0	1	4	62	88,905	56.06%	64,996	5,829	15,640
59	158,232	1,555	119,584	16,949	14.17	22,612	18.90	0	0	6	56	109,518	69.21%	83,581	12,356	15,755
60	158,517	1,840	127,954	9,128	7.13	20,432	15.96	0	1	9	57	108,090	68.18%	85,899	5,997	12,917
61	159,521	2,844	116,073	59,495	51.25	23,911	20.59	0	1	5	59	109,995	68.95%	77,808	48,162	14,395
62	158,453	1,776	123,359	15,641	12.67	64,013	51.89	0	1	5	58	92,419	58.32%	72,049	9,459	42,700
63	158,172	1,495	124,382	17,645	14.18	22,401	18.00	0	1	3	60	96,669	61.11%	77,805	9,930	12,013
64	157,818	1,141	121,334	6,737	5.55	17,170	14.15	2	1	3	47	93,077	58.97%	70,398	4,724	13,174
65	157,869	1,192	130,737	3,726	2.84	6,967	5.32	0	1	4	48	93,819	59.42%	76,204	2,384	4,282
66	158,578	1,901	131,512	7,697	5.85	6,874	5.22	0	4	12	54	78,093	49.24%	65,716	4,534	3,762
67	158,424	1,747	130,413	9,593	7.35	14,688	11.26	0	3	10	50	99,996	63.11%	81,841	5,961	10,027
68	158,551	1,874	130,529	7,672	5.87	9,300	7.12	0	2	12	52	100,904	63.64%	84,663	4,608	5,246
69	158,910	2,233	133,923	5,411	4.04	8,451	6.31	0	3	17	53	82,003	51.60%	66,439	4,142	5,511
70	154,044	-2,633	114,432	51,595	45.08	17,560	15.34	4	4	31	55	132,508	86.01%	98,191	48,745	13,414

H000H9027 - 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
71	158,594	1,917	132,794	5,686	4.28	12,662	9.53	2	3	15	68	127,507	80.39%	105,660	4,701	10,212
72	159,167	2,490	134,094	3,621	2.70	11,971	8.92	0	1	6	69	101,467	63.74%	83,620	3,088	10,012
73	159,249	2,572	126,220	4,689	3.71	9,076	7.19	2	1	7	67	159,249	100%	126,220	4,689	9,076
74	157,964	1,287	133,818	3,424	2.55	5,281	3.94	0	0	2	70	91,851	58.14%	81,407	940	2,135
75	159,978	3,301	137,100	7,477	5.45	6,397	4.66	0	0	0	71	100,801	63.00%	86,072	4,088	3,831
76	153,752	-2,925	136,126	1,889	1.38	12,198	8.96	0	0	4	75	126,868	82.51%	111,429	1,569	11,487
77	157,482	805	122,636	4,882	3.98	20,845	16.99	0	0	5	74	149,148	94.70%	116,831	4,468	19,742
78	153,772	-2,905	124,249	16,840	13.55	17,741	14.27	0	0	8	73	116,192	75.56%	91,817	15,805	14,325
79	153,748	-2,929	114,874	12,496	10.87	25,188	21.92	0	0	7	73	70,002	45.53%	51,300	6,385	12,766
80	155,637	-1,040	116,289	10,168	8.74	38,615	33.20	1	0	3	101	92,598	59.49%	70,122	5,295	19,420
81	156,806	129	119,580	20,670	17.28	20,196	16.88	0	0	1	78	70,359	44.87%	52,538	3,407	8,428
82	156,533	-144	127,339	5,310	4.16	14,644	11.50	2	1	3	82	120,321	76.86%	97,445	3,366	10,646
83	156,370	-307	121,688	14,215	11.68	15,543	12.77	2	1	6	81	104,426	66.78%	81,779	7,818	9,394
84	156,530	-147	124,070	23,531	18.96	16,933	13.64	0	1	12	81	87,271	55.75%	70,083	8,291	8,958
85	158,839	2,162	130,459	11,333	8.68	13,290	10.18	0	2	3	83	122,111	76.87%	99,466	5,153	8,685
86	156,784	107	116,190	19,416	16.71	22,630	19.47	0	2	6	85	94,529	60.29%	70,204	7,580	11,972
87	156,640	-37	115,237	18,049	15.66	57,642	50.02	0	3	10	89	75,952	48.48%	56,553	9,040	30,049
88	156,720	43	119,233	61,723	51.76	17,051	14.30	0	6	10	84	83,680	53.39%	63,391	37,511	6,937
89	155,172	-1,505	133,938	10,181	7.60	12,772	9.53	0	7	7	87	93,654	60.35%	79,642	4,606	7,502
90	154,984	-1,693	122,699	16,257	13.24	20,562	16.75	0	3	3	85	48,140	31.06%	34,727	5,254	6,631
91	156,622	-55	138,975	6,737	4.84	9,986	7.18	0	3	4	90	60,996	38.94%	53,656	1,290	4,444
92	154,926	-1,751	122,959	41,807	34.00	21,845	17.76	0	8	3	92	86,125	55.59%	66,114	29,963	12,967
93	157,815	1,138	136,996	7,312	5.33	15,319	11.18	0	5	1	91	119,117	75.47%	104,754	3,339	9,678
94	156,361	-316	121,003	66,025	54.56	14,582	12.05	0	6	6	93	111,967	71.60%	85,308	49,515	9,310
95	154,882	-1,795	116,852	67,381	57.66	19,768	16.91	0	7	5	94	109,506	70.70%	81,177	53,826	11,058
96	155,095	-1,582	118,602	18,763	15.82	22,580	19.03	0	2	0	95	75,569	48.72%	61,433	10,836	11,935
97	155,698	-979	119,122	20,105	16.87	28,929	24.28	0	4	2	96	104,795	67.30%	80,412	13,619	17,936
98	155,182	-1,495	121,430	15,624	12.86	28,798	23.71	0	3	6	98	73,636	47.45%	58,993	10,972	13,380
99	155,731	-946	119,857	15,479	12.91	34,908	29.12	0	7	3	100	77,347	49.66%	59,504	9,714	16,659
100	154,784	-1,893	131,836	8,059	6.11	44,818	33.99	2	6	0	106	85,081	54.96%	71,139	3,381	28,752
101	154,888	-1,789	117,447	42,721	36.37	39,557	33.68	0	4	1	99	67,642	43.67%	52,866	10,531	20,164
102	157,283	606	116,881	60,895	52.09	44,473	38.04	2	3	3	103	73,497	46.72%	53,686	36,298	17,630
103	155,833	-844	115,612	11,609	10.04	94,906	82.09	2	5	1	102	107,788	69.16%	81,610	4,338	74,116
104	155,234	-1,443	113,419	12,449	10.97	49,039	43.23	0	3	2	101	55,479	35.73%	39,587	6,719	18,035
105	155,526	-1,151	115,664	12,953	11.19	79,408	68.65	3	3	5	112	64,284	41.33%	47,630	6,138	30,828

H000H9027 - 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
106	155,388	-1,289	135,129	3,993	2.95	13,850	10.24	0	0	5	76	133,860	86.14%	116,217	3,619	11,741
107	156,985	308	117,467	66,796	56.86	31,000	26.39	0	3	2	104	85,245	54.30%	64,574	33,992	19,132
108	156,848	171	118,792	74,697	62.88	30,213	25.43	0	2	8	108	99,942	63.71%	76,832	43,955	20,931
109	154,121	-2,556	118,409	59,945	50.62	54,160	45.73	0	3	12	109	86,204	55.93%	66,405	32,634	28,761
110	155,488	-1,189	123,183	7,573	6.14	110,212	89.47	0	3	1	110	86,385	55.55%	68,646	4,069	60,737
111	156,697	20	127,389	5,951	4.67	118,533	93.04	0	2	6	113	61,314	39.12%	49,284	2,665	47,013
112	154,895	-1,782	128,709	6,212	4.82	93,967	73.00	0	2	12	107	59,730	38.56%	49,390	1,438	32,738
113	156,568	-109	133,664	8,287	6.19	89,236	66.76	0	1	7	107	78,970	50.43%	69,069	4,498	47,554
114	158,069	1,392	125,567	8,955	7.13	82,897	66.01	0	5	12	117	79,302	50.16%	63,006	3,985	42,566
115	156,215	-462	123,590	7,034	5.69	80,961	65.50	0	5	8	115	77,429	49.56%	60,923	2,183	41,620
116	157,565	888	129,115	4,058	3.14	109,189	84.56	0	2	3	114	84,284	53.49%	69,590	2,713	56,592
117	156,881	204	108,393	40,097	36.99	59,779	55.15	0	1	5	118	115,611	73.69%	80,375	34,267	41,259
118	156,562	-115	121,790	7,771	6.38	98,900	81.20	0	0	1	119	90,486	57.79%	69,093	4,620	54,443
119	156,170	-507	119,182	4,735	3.97	103,418	86.77	0	0	1	116	59,886	38.34%	45,992	2,766	37,953
120	154,924	-1,753	122,292	10,970	8.97	49,064	40.12	1	2	5	120	93,941	60.63%	76,853	5,274	19,829

H000H9027 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	2	78,787	50.46%	62,341	16.28%	41.58%	4.36%	59.40%	0.16%	0.68%
	3	39,653	25.39%	30,210	33.18%	41.06%	3.81%	25.21%	0.74%	1.79%
	1	37,676	24.13%	29,029	14.58%	17.34%	2.42%	15.38%	0.14%	0.54%
2	3	86,600	55.47%	68,639	27.85%	76.48%	3.99%	46.90%	0.26%	1.07%
	2	60,666	38.85%	47,780	12.13%	23.18%	5.99%	48.92%	0.12%	0.58%
	1	8,853	5.67%	6,695	1.23%	0.33%	3.64%	4.16%	0%	0%
3	1	105,003	66.12%	80,617	6.16%	68.17%	2.91%	54.44%	0.04%	0.46%
	4	38,761	24.40%	28,767	6.14%	24.23%	5.61%	37.47%	0.08%	0.36%
	5	15,033	9.46%	11,333	4.88%	7.59%	3.07%	8.07%	0.00%	0.35%
4	4	105,437	66.40%	83,629	8.57%	58.68%	6.67%	72.06%	0.01%	0.44%
	5	36,340	22.88%	26,917	16.05%	35.36%	6.02%	20.93%	0.01%	0.18%
	7	9,134	5.75%	7,549	1.48%	0.91%	4.13%	4.02%	0%	0%
	1	7,870	4.95%	5,556	11.06%	5.03%	4.13%	2.96%	0%	0.32%
5	5	102,641	64.47%	81,306	15.60%	73.08%	3.70%	64.19%	0.17%	0.39%
	7	56,557	35.52%	44,679	10.45%	26.91%	3.76%	35.80%	0.06%	0.31%
6	6	128,215	80.50%	99,712	12.76%	94.33%	4.43%	85.32%	0.23%	0.59%
	7	31,051	19.49%	24,902	3.06%	5.66%	3.05%	14.67%	0%	0.08%
7	10	67,190	43.01%	54,055	26.45%	53.19%	3.63%	36.10%	0.03%	0.63%
	7	55,656	35.63%	43,171	16.19%	26.00%	4.19%	33.24%	0.36%	0.55%
	6	19,721	12.62%	16,378	20.17%	12.29%	4.51%	13.59%	0.02%	0.08%
	11	8,870	5.67%	7,085	18.51%	4.88%	10.57%	13.76%	0%	0%
	8	3,266	2.09%	2,453	28.90%	2.63%	6.31%	2.84%	0.03%	0.95%
	9	1,485	0.95%	1,193	22.21%	0.98%	2.01%	0.44%	0%	0.27%
8	8	131,718	84.30%	105,330	54.67%	91.71%	6.37%	79.29%	0.88%	2.91%
	9	18,616	11.91%	15,743	27.79%	6.96%	6.59%	12.26%	0.82%	1.89%
	7	5,908	3.78%	4,468	18.46%	1.31%	16.00%	8.44%	0.06%	0.26%
9	9	127,096	81.44%	101,482	14.18%	73.54%	4.60%	78.31%	0.14%	0.74%
	8	17,950	11.50%	14,033	28.89%	20.71%	6.54%	15.38%	0.58%	1.69%
	7	11,003	7.05%	8,367	13.43%	5.74%	4.49%	6.29%	0.03%	0.32%
10	11	96,860	61.92%	74,667	10.23%	37.90%	5.63%	69.31%	0.00%	0.57%
	10	32,448	20.74%	25,900	37.20%	47.80%	5.81%	24.81%	0.51%	0.85%
	12	27,115	17.33%	20,068	14.34%	14.28%	1.77%	5.86%	0%	0%
11	12	73,671	47.28%	57,713	6.35%	34.56%	2.83%	31.07%	0.04%	0.15%
	18	54,535	35.00%	44,856	8.81%	37.23%	5.60%	47.67%	0.23%	0.41%
	17	25,805	16.56%	18,681	14.54%	25.61%	5.63%	19.94%	0%	0.71%
	14	1,786	1.14%	1,425	19.29%	2.59%	4.84%	1.30%	0%	0%

H000H9027 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	17	101,745	65.26%	76,632	14.44%	67.92%	8.30%	59.91%	0.28%	1.10%
	18	30,834	19.77%	24,989	9.80%	15.02%	7.77%	18.29%	0.00%	0.70%
	16	19,140	12.27%	14,847	14.28%	13.01%	13.41%	18.73%	0.73%	1.45%
	15	4,109	2.63%	3,208	20.48%	4.03%	10.13%	3.05%	0.36%	1.54%
	14	58	0.03%	51	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.38%	1.47%
13	15	85,150	54.35%	64,592	56.05%	59.86%	6.08%	56.82%	0.61%	1.18%
	17	34,393	21.95%	25,692	30.38%	12.90%	8.73%	32.45%	1.10%	1.62%
	14	24,609	15.70%	18,482	85.38%	26.09%	1.34%	3.59%	0.58%	1.38%
	16	12,497	7.97%	10,243	6.71%	1.13%	4.81%	7.12%	0.74%	0.98%
14	14	101,134	64.74%	73,954	57.30%	70.21%	4.49%	64.66%	0.53%	1.29%
	15	25,758	16.49%	18,736	73.23%	22.73%	3.08%	11.23%	0.15%	0.73%
	13	24,863	15.91%	18,835	17.53%	5.47%	5.54%	20.31%	0.90%	1.52%
	16	4,448	2.84%	3,405	27.87%	1.57%	5.72%	3.79%	0%	0.40%
15	13	90,340	57.80%	66,034	25.18%	71.13%	8.20%	65.44%	0.81%	1.62%
	16	49,701	31.80%	39,440	13.02%	21.97%	5.89%	28.08%	0.04%	0.73%
	14	6,830	4.37%	5,225	12.55%	2.80%	3.44%	2.17%	0.05%	0.86%
	15	5,105	3.26%	4,277	20.34%	3.72%	5.47%	2.82%	0%	1.00%
	19	4,311	2.75%	3,465	2.42%	0.35%	3.52%	1.47%	0%	0.43%
16	19	65,590	41.84%	50,969	7.44%	23.98%	6.93%	33.03%	0.08%	0.76%
	16	54,642	34.85%	44,167	18.74%	52.32%	11.14%	45.96%	0.06%	1.11%
	18	32,134	20.49%	24,874	11.12%	17.48%	7.42%	17.26%	0.13%	0.34%
	15	4,389	2.79%	3,352	29.29%	6.20%	11.93%	3.73%	0%	0.37%
17	20	57,611	36.47%	46,456	9.32%	67.03%	4.81%	39.93%	0.13%	0.85%
	19	56,628	35.85%	39,116	4.05%	24.56%	5.45%	38.11%	0.18%	0.22%
	18	43,687	27.66%	34,457	1.57%	8.39%	3.56%	21.95%	0%	0.11%
18	13	80,228	51.91%	56,761	13.38%	63.91%	8.62%	59.39%	0.47%	1.17%
	19	49,099	31.77%	37,739	9.65%	30.64%	7.07%	32.38%	0.67%	0.87%
	12	16,130	10.43%	11,916	2.63%	2.64%	2.88%	4.17%	0%	0%
	20	9,087	5.87%	6,299	5.28%	2.80%	5.28%	4.04%	0%	0.09%
19	21	96,682	62.48%	75,095	11.82%	49.98%	5.98%	68.55%	0%	0.20%
	12	42,438	27.42%	34,009	22.72%	43.51%	3.99%	20.69%	0.04%	0.81%
	20	15,620	10.09%	11,865	9.71%	6.49%	5.94%	10.75%	0%	0.78%
20	23	110,134	70.21%	87,979	37.42%	82.91%	6.72%	60.07%	0.78%	1.91%
	22	41,764	26.62%	35,435	16.77%	14.96%	10.57%	38.05%	0.25%	1.02%
	11	3,195	2.03%	2,536	17.11%	1.09%	5.16%	1.33%	0.19%	3.54%
	10	1,704	1.08%	1,293	31.32%	1.01%	3.71%	0.48%	0%	0.07%

H000H9027 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
	24	59	0.03%	48	4.16%	0.00%	10.41%	0.05%	0%	0%
21	22	57,093	36.38%	47,533	9.66%	40.97%	9.76%	46.39%	0.22%	0.70%
	11	54,298	34.60%	42,465	7.19%	27.23%	5.51%	23.41%	0.16%	0.31%
	23	29,085	18.53%	25,601	9.38%	21.42%	10.32%	26.43%	0.45%	1.02%
	10	16,442	10.47%	13,295	8.74%	10.36%	2.82%	3.74%	0%	0.02%
22	22	77,882	50.33%	65,945	6.17%	37.28%	9.30%	43.73%	0.14%	1.03%
	24	38,560	24.92%	29,744	12.63%	34.42%	19.44%	41.23%	0.51%	2.41%
	10	33,430	21.60%	26,106	10.61%	25.36%	6.35%	11.82%	0%	0.43%
	43	3,254	2.10%	2,785	0.35%	0.09%	2.19%	0.43%	0%	1.26%
	23	1,600	1.03%	1,188	26.09%	2.83%	32.74%	2.77%	0.67%	1.73%
23	24	122,338	78.62%	94,780	9.67%	91.83%	8.69%	88.82%	0.03%	1.19%
	21	31,439	20.20%	25,487	2.06%	5.26%	3.63%	9.97%	0%	0.07%
	23	1,829	1.17%	1,363	21.20%	2.89%	8.14%	1.19%	0%	0.32%
24	20	119,635	75.76%	96,536	9.56%	89.00%	6.74%	65.70%	0.30%	1.76%
	26	32,484	20.57%	26,776	3.47%	8.96%	8.23%	22.25%	0.02%	0.62%
	21	5,773	3.65%	4,202	4.99%	2.02%	28.39%	12.03%	0%	0.16%
	27	4	0.00%	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.57%
25	28	88,905	57.25%	74,860	3.46%	64.63%	3.12%	51.71%	0.13%	0.52%
	26	35,954	23.15%	29,631	2.19%	16.20%	3.37%	22.11%	0%	0.24%
	27	30,415	19.58%	26,275	2.93%	19.16%	4.49%	26.16%	0.21%	1.47%
26	27	101,336	65.75%	82,496	28.96%	91.00%	6.49%	62.35%	0.57%	1.67%
	26	45,989	29.83%	36,468	5.47%	7.60%	8.19%	34.80%	0.01%	0.66%
	28	6,797	4.41%	5,986	6.13%	1.39%	4.07%	2.84%	1.70%	2.17%
27	28	58,473	37.69%	45,477	6.74%	33.95%	13.16%	27.75%	0.19%	0.95%
	26	50,583	32.61%	39,964	7.42%	32.81%	19.31%	35.76%	0.58%	1.54%
	25	35,258	22.73%	27,118	8.05%	24.15%	23.06%	28.99%	1.25%	2.33%
	33	10,796	6.96%	8,348	9.83%	9.08%	19.34%	7.48%	0.47%	1.73%
28	33	110,256	69.42%	83,732	11.73%	76.49%	12.71%	61.32%	0.11%	1.50%
	34	48,557	30.57%	37,208	8.11%	23.50%	18.04%	38.67%	0.25%	1.36%
29	34	61,558	38.67%	47,404	10.07%	33.16%	16.32%	44.16%	0.05%	1.00%
	37	61,176	38.43%	47,258	6.23%	20.44%	12.97%	35.00%	0.16%	1.44%
	25	29,014	18.22%	21,579	16.30%	24.42%	13.98%	17.22%	0.25%	1.31%
	33	7,414	4.65%	5,017	63.06%	21.96%	12.57%	3.60%	0.35%	0.40%
30	37	70,028	44.84%	55,312	12.01%	41.16%	18.79%	47.55%	0.71%	2.56%
	34	34,004	21.77%	27,463	7.31%	12.43%	17.92%	22.51%	0.60%	2.29%
	38	25,823	16.53%	20,366	17.27%	21.79%	16.17%	15.06%	1.01%	3.30%

H000H9027 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
	35	10,842	6.94%	8,719	7.20%	3.88%	15.40%	6.14%	0.30%	1.21%
	36	7,928	5.07%	5,816	49.34%	17.77%	12.15%	3.23%	1.77%	4.77%
	33	7,528	4.82%	5,617	8.45%	2.94%	21.36%	5.48%	0.13%	0.49%
31	25	96,875	61.13%	77,043	8.27%	53.49%	7.57%	41.76%	0.10%	0.54%
	38	52,529	33.14%	39,385	13.33%	44.05%	19.25%	54.25%	1.25%	2.96%
	21	4,703	2.96%	3,806	0.49%	0.15%	5.09%	1.38%	0%	0%
	37	4,350	2.74%	3,477	7.85%	2.29%	10.44%	2.59%	0.77%	3.42%
	42	5	0.00%	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
32	42	89,905	57.75%	71,213	11.75%	62.14%	11.72%	51.22%	0.56%	1.63%
	41	55,023	35.34%	40,832	11.88%	36.02%	17.84%	44.69%	0.69%	4.10%
	25	10,736	6.89%	8,629	2.86%	1.83%	7.70%	4.07%	0.52%	0.89%
33	42	124,956	79.85%	113,516	7.20%	82.91%	4.38%	76.39%	0.19%	0.60%
	44	12,558	8.02%	10,217	10.77%	11.16%	7.22%	11.33%	0.05%	0.37%
	25	7,148	4.56%	6,142	2.36%	1.47%	3.35%	3.16%	0.86%	0.92%
	21	6,466	4.13%	5,757	4.32%	2.52%	3.52%	3.11%	0%	0.43%
	24	5,360	3.42%	4,162	4.56%	1.92%	9.37%	5.98%	0%	0.16%
34	43	150,684	95.88%	126,202	2.66%	96.68%	4.17%	95.88%	0.01%	0.38%
	44	6,459	4.11%	5,482	2.09%	3.31%	4.12%	4.11%	0.16%	0.43%
35	44	148,757	94.82%	118,478	5.37%	98.59%	9.43%	97.64%	0.10%	0.45%
	43	8,114	5.17%	7,300	1.24%	1.40%	3.69%	2.35%	0%	0.01%
36	46	99,576	64.30%	81,626	2.18%	56.97%	7.91%	66.21%	0.01%	0.15%
	45	46,818	30.23%	37,347	2.81%	33.63%	7.29%	27.92%	0%	1.03%
	48	8,453	5.45%	6,723	4.37%	9.38%	8.50%	5.86%	0%	0.83%
37	61	66,979	43.21%	50,245	5.53%	72.03%	13.42%	63.93%	0.19%	1.71%
	46	43,196	27.86%	34,837	1.42%	12.90%	5.17%	17.09%	0%	0.16%
	45	41,979	27.08%	33,142	1.66%	14.33%	5.55%	17.45%	0%	0.22%
	44	2,042	1.31%	1,605	0.99%	0.41%	7.85%	1.19%	0%	0.26%
	48	797	0.51%	642	1.86%	0.31%	5.14%	0.31%	0%	0%
38	61	152,503	98.47%	118,127	7.40%	99.52%	13.17%	98.97%	0.14%	1.38%
	44	1,836	1.18%	1,444	2.21%	0.36%	8.37%	0.76%	0%	0%
	62	518	0.33%	386	2.59%	0.11%	10.36%	0.25%	0%	0%
39	64	86,518	55.61%	67,253	7.82%	56.68%	12.33%	46.05%	0.10%	0.90%
	65	49,793	32.00%	38,171	8.79%	36.15%	17.56%	37.22%	0.69%	1.61%
	41	19,249	12.37%	14,778	4.47%	7.11%	20.39%	16.72%	0.96%	2.88%
	63	13	0.00%	7	57.14%	0.04%	0%	0%	0%	0%
40	64	78,974	50.94%	60,945	22.03%	70.48%	11.48%	51.42%	0.46%	1.40%

H000H9027 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
	63	63,306	40.83%	49,094	9.94%	25.62%	11.60%	41.87%	0.08%	0.50%
	66	12,748	8.22%	9,203	8.05%	3.88%	9.92%	6.70%	0%	0.19%
41	65	97,717	62.88%	76,230	17.15%	69.61%	14.53%	63.08%	1.84%	2.79%
	66	35,860	23.07%	26,880	12.81%	18.34%	16.87%	25.83%	1.53%	2.55%
	63	21,817	14.03%	16,446	13.76%	12.04%	11.83%	11.07%	1.47%	1.74%
42	79	99,639	64.31%	74,477	7.88%	44.01%	25.45%	66.07%	0.83%	2.49%
	65	31,992	20.65%	23,573	16.58%	29.29%	31.37%	25.78%	1.59%	4.08%
	66	23,284	15.03%	17,822	19.99%	26.69%	13.10%	8.13%	0.00%	0.75%
43	41	57,934	36.76%	41,403	18.25%	42.17%	49.97%	32.52%	3.35%	8.15%
	79	56,738	36.00%	42,585	11.72%	27.84%	53.29%	35.67%	0.85%	2.06%
	49	42,891	27.22%	31,778	16.90%	29.97%	63.67%	31.80%	1.27%	4.64%
44	41	99,036	62.88%	72,526	10.91%	71.31%	15.12%	53.44%	0.28%	1.84%
	40	57,098	36.25%	46,494	6.49%	27.19%	19.83%	44.94%	0.86%	2.42%
	38	1,347	0.85%	996	16.66%	1.49%	33.03%	1.60%	1.27%	2.30%
	36	4	0.00%	4	0%	0%	50%	0.00%	1.13%	13.63%
45	38	70,561	45.15%	50,948	26.41%	29.39%	21.45%	53.92%	0.84%	3.73%
	39	67,865	43.43%	48,122	62.36%	65.55%	14.11%	33.50%	9.20%	19.83%
	41	17,827	11.40%	13,373	17.30%	5.05%	19.06%	12.57%	2.84%	5.85%
46	36	87,621	56.11%	67,601	38.64%	42.85%	29.06%	79.33%	8.56%	10.97%
	39	64,326	41.19%	46,037	74.54%	56.29%	10.00%	18.59%	10.03%	17.48%
	41	3,263	2.08%	2,563	19.46%	0.81%	18.61%	1.92%	0.43%	2.79%
	38	947	0.60%	795	1.88%	0.02%	4.65%	0.14%	0%	0%
47	40	77,029	48.66%	61,746	8.39%	55.24%	22.40%	65.03%	0.64%	2.05%
	36	39,456	24.92%	34,281	7.98%	29.18%	13.26%	21.37%	0%	0.38%
	35	30,199	19.08%	24,722	4.05%	10.67%	8.49%	9.87%	0.05%	0.28%
	38	11,041	6.97%	9,132	4.16%	4.04%	6.41%	2.75%	0%	0.09%
	49	549	0.34%	326	24.53%	0.85%	62.57%	0.95%	4.11%	7.58%
48	49	125,401	80.15%	93,163	13.19%	80.62%	53.81%	81.10%	1.18%	3.15%
	40	15,537	9.93%	11,541	13.34%	10.10%	48.31%	9.02%	4.25%	5.41%
	36	8,483	5.42%	6,465	14.74%	6.25%	55.96%	5.85%	2.39%	4.54%
	32	7,035	4.49%	5,367	8.58%	3.02%	46.30%	4.02%	1.06%	2.29%
49	35	112,782	70.90%	92,172	11.29%	73.37%	28.47%	68.27%	0.72%	3.19%
	33	20,072	12.61%	15,924	9.60%	10.77%	26.28%	10.88%	0.05%	1.27%
	36	13,634	8.57%	10,623	11.99%	8.97%	43.15%	11.92%	1.37%	3.37%
	32	8,824	5.54%	6,667	9.41%	4.42%	31.22%	5.41%	0.23%	3.88%
	49	3,757	2.36%	2,910	11.92%	2.44%	46.25%	3.50%	0%	0.33%

H000H9027 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
50	32	70,554	44.40%	53,828	10.42%	44.10%	23.78%	58.03%	0.31%	2.42%
	29	46,523	29.28%	36,994	11.85%	34.46%	5.21%	8.75%	0.03%	1.11%
	33	40,596	25.55%	29,024	9.12%	20.81%	24.27%	31.94%	0.13%	2.47%
	35	912	0.57%	666	11.41%	0.59%	26.27%	0.79%	0.19%	2.28%
	79	292	0.18%	224	0.89%	0.01%	46.87%	0.47%	0%	0%
51	32	90,555	56.80%	74,435	6.23%	35.21%	4.89%	50.75%	0.30%	0.70%
	29	47,721	29.93%	37,167	18.26%	51.51%	6.94%	35.94%	0.05%	0.65%
	30	21,130	13.25%	16,824	10.39%	13.27%	5.67%	13.29%	0.01%	0.62%
52	31	81,124	50.81%	66,434	7.43%	66.33%	5.90%	48.64%	0.21%	0.73%
	30	74,536	46.68%	59,387	4.03%	32.21%	6.58%	48.49%	0.04%	0.73%
	29	3,437	2.15%	2,661	4.02%	1.43%	7.85%	2.59%	0.13%	0.73%
	32	555	0.34%	425	0.23%	0.01%	4.94%	0.26%	3.89%	4.72%
53	30	84,928	53.27%	63,774	17.89%	72.44%	13.15%	65.38%	2.50%	8.01%
	31	57,091	35.81%	46,735	8.61%	25.54%	8.62%	31.40%	0.80%	2.78%
	29	13,926	8.73%	12,588	2.39%	1.91%	2.63%	2.58%	0.02%	0.51%
	80	3,469	2.17%	3,019	0.52%	0.10%	2.68%	0.63%	0%	0%
54	80	104,664	67.06%	87,330	8.11%	63.71%	6.23%	49.44%	0.73%	1.31%
	29	48,683	31.19%	37,617	6.69%	22.63%	14.54%	49.68%	0.24%	0.80%
	78	2,706	1.73%	1,982	76.58%	13.65%	4.84%	0.87%	1.80%	4.90%
55	77	99,436	63.78%	81,565	8.75%	67.16%	14.13%	57.77%	0.30%	1.09%
	79	30,534	19.58%	23,338	7.50%	16.47%	20.88%	24.42%	0.03%	0.63%
	66	12,234	7.84%	9,716	9.51%	8.68%	20.61%	10.03%	0.24%	1.89%
	78	9,847	6.31%	7,391	9.52%	6.61%	16.62%	6.15%	0.25%	0.26%
	80	3,831	2.45%	3,025	3.70%	1.05%	10.54%	1.59%	0.21%	0.94%
56	66	77,900	50.29%	57,457	8.50%	35.52%	24.87%	54.42%	0.00%	0.16%
	63	42,138	27.20%	30,582	17.54%	38.99%	16.10%	18.75%	0.12%	0.40%
	72	34,862	22.50%	27,027	12.97%	25.48%	26.05%	26.81%	0.55%	1.11%
57	67	51,479	32.70%	37,483	15.90%	53.14%	18.30%	34.89%	0.38%	2.21%
	56	44,825	28.47%	30,782	8.54%	23.44%	13.64%	21.35%	0.01%	1.78%
	62	32,205	20.45%	23,876	8.08%	17.21%	12.23%	14.85%	0.10%	1.76%
	63	28,909	18.36%	23,058	3.00%	6.18%	24.63%	28.88%	0%	0.19%
58	62	88,905	56.06%	64,996	8.96%	38.12%	24.06%	65.87%	0.06%	0.45%
	60	61,852	39.00%	47,983	17.43%	54.69%	14.55%	29.42%	1.02%	2.41%
	56	5,587	3.52%	3,983	13.10%	3.41%	20.03%	3.36%	0%	1.12%
	59	1,850	1.16%	1,308	43.42%	3.71%	22.47%	1.23%	3.49%	6.24%
	61	374	0.23%	308	2.59%	0.05%	8.11%	0.10%	0%	0.16%

H000H9027 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
59	56	109,518	69.21%	83,581	14.78%	72.90%	18.84%	69.67%	0.50%	2.28%
	62	40,537	25.61%	29,906	10.39%	18.34%	16.82%	22.25%	0.14%	1.19%
	59	8,177	5.16%	6,097	24.32%	8.74%	29.91%	8.06%	0.49%	2.01%
60	57	108,090	68.18%	85,899	6.98%	65.69%	15.03%	63.21%	0.31%	0.89%
	56	26,407	16.65%	23,072	6.27%	15.85%	16.18%	18.28%	0.36%	0.59%
	67	18,063	11.39%	14,483	2.59%	4.11%	14.49%	10.27%	0.26%	0.48%
	59	5,513	3.47%	4,104	31.65%	14.23%	40.10%	8.05%	0.05%	0.31%
	55	348	0.21%	314	0.63%	0.02%	7.00%	0.10%	0%	0%
	58	96	0.06%	82	8.53%	0.07%	14.63%	0.05%	0%	0%
61	59	109,995	68.95%	77,808	61.89%	80.95%	18.50%	60.20%	2.17%	5.34%
	58	37,494	23.50%	28,532	29.77%	14.27%	26.79%	31.96%	0.87%	2.94%
	56	6,171	3.86%	5,248	36.54%	3.22%	20.57%	4.51%	0.10%	3.91%
	47	3,152	1.97%	2,575	9.43%	0.40%	19.26%	2.07%	0%	1.11%
	60	2,709	1.69%	1,910	35.44%	1.13%	15.49%	1.23%	5.40%	9.79%
62	58	92,419	58.32%	72,049	13.12%	60.47%	59.26%	66.70%	0.50%	1.48%
	47	39,868	25.16%	30,773	13.01%	25.59%	40.56%	19.50%	0.17%	1.76%
	57	26,042	16.43%	20,434	10.57%	13.81%	43.00%	13.72%	0.07%	1.84%
	56	124	0.07%	103	16.50%	0.10%	39.80%	0.06%	0%	0%
63	60	96,669	61.11%	77,805	12.76%	56.27%	15.43%	53.62%	0.72%	3.04%
	61	22,540	14.25%	15,566	16.13%	14.23%	17.12%	11.89%	0%	0.79%
	47	20,959	13.25%	16,694	7.12%	6.74%	19.37%	14.43%	0%	0.40%
	59	16,116	10.18%	12,904	28.64%	20.94%	30.95%	17.83%	2.68%	6.19%
	58	1,888	1.19%	1,413	22.50%	1.80%	34.96%	2.20%	0%	0.77%
64	47	93,077	58.97%	70,398	6.71%	70.12%	18.71%	76.72%	0.23%	1.09%
	48	33,855	21.45%	27,340	2.99%	12.15%	7.04%	11.22%	0.51%	0.98%
	50	15,183	9.62%	12,113	5.10%	9.17%	5.32%	3.75%	0%	0.34%
	57	14,328	9.07%	10,312	5.27%	8.07%	12.39%	7.44%	0%	0.16%
	60	1,375	0.87%	1,171	2.73%	0.47%	12.46%	0.85%	0%	0%
65	48	93,819	59.42%	76,204	3.12%	63.98%	5.61%	61.46%	0%	0.15%
	45	57,821	36.62%	49,208	2.32%	30.73%	4.82%	34.04%	0.03%	0.21%
	50	6,229	3.94%	5,325	3.69%	5.28%	5.87%	4.49%	0%	0.06%
66	54	78,093	49.24%	65,716	6.89%	58.90%	5.72%	54.72%	0%	0.19%
	51	74,302	46.85%	61,027	1.87%	14.83%	4.61%	41.00%	0.02%	0.24%
	50	6,183	3.89%	4,769	42.37%	26.25%	6.14%	4.26%	0%	0.02%
67	50	99,996	63.11%	81,841	7.28%	62.13%	12.25%	68.26%	0.05%	0.24%
	52	36,511	23.04%	29,977	9.17%	28.67%	10.97%	22.39%	0%	0.46%

H000H9027 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
	51	13,011	8.21%	11,025	4.01%	4.61%	7.22%	5.42%	0%	0.06%
	54	8,906	5.62%	7,570	5.78%	4.56%	7.58%	3.90%	0%	0.18%
68	52	100,904	63.64%	84,663	5.44%	60.06%	6.19%	56.40%	0.00%	0.49%
	53	46,294	29.19%	36,588	7.36%	35.11%	9.30%	36.61%	0.00%	0.14%
	51	7,727	4.87%	6,164	4.20%	3.37%	7.81%	5.18%	0.01%	0.67%
	50	3,435	2.16%	2,929	3.37%	1.29%	5.25%	1.65%	0%	0.08%
	55	191	0.12%	185	6.48%	0.15%	7.02%	0.13%	3.38%	3.38%
69	53	82,003	51.60%	66,439	6.23%	76.54%	8.29%	65.21%	0.13%	0.63%
	54	42,738	26.89%	38,754	1.64%	11.77%	3.59%	16.49%	0.12%	0.14%
	51	34,104	21.46%	28,679	2.14%	11.36%	5.37%	18.23%	0.00%	0.18%
	55	65	0.04%	51	33.33%	0.31%	9.80%	0.05%	0%	0%
70	55	132,508	86.01%	98,191	49.64%	94.47%	13.66%	76.38%	1.23%	2.39%
	67	12,243	7.94%	8,553	11.78%	1.95%	39.82%	19.39%	0.50%	0.73%
	53	4,818	3.12%	3,865	22.32%	1.67%	6.93%	1.52%	0%	0.40%
	52	2,374	1.54%	2,244	19.91%	0.86%	6.10%	0.78%	0%	0%
	68	1,177	0.76%	809	28.05%	0.43%	35.22%	1.62%	2.09%	2.18%
	54	680	0.44%	591	37.56%	0.43%	2.53%	0.08%	0%	0.14%
	69	244	0.15%	179	46.36%	0.16%	19.55%	0.19%	0%	5.44%
71	68	127,507	80.39%	105,660	4.44%	82.67%	9.66%	80.65%	0.51%	0.98%
	69	30,513	19.23%	26,677	3.68%	17.27%	9.12%	19.23%	1.78%	1.94%
	70	574	0.36%	457	0.65%	0.05%	3.28%	0.11%	0%	0%
72	69	101,467	63.74%	83,620	3.69%	85.28%	11.97%	83.63%	0.22%	0.63%
	70	57,700	36.25%	50,474	1.05%	14.71%	3.88%	16.36%	0.04%	0.06%
73	67	159,249	100%	126,220	3.71%	100%	7.19%	100%	0.60%	0.87%
74	70	91,851	58.14%	81,407	1.15%	27.45%	2.62%	40.42%	0.11%	0.19%
	71	66,113	41.85%	52,411	4.73%	72.54%	6.00%	59.57%	0.86%	1.79%
75	71	100,801	63.00%	86,072	4.74%	54.67%	4.45%	59.88%	0.64%	2.39%
	72	59,157	36.97%	51,009	6.64%	45.32%	5.03%	40.11%	0.68%	3.08%
	74	20	0.01%	19	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
76	75	126,868	82.51%	111,429	1.40%	83.05%	10.30%	94.17%	0.01%	0.22%
	74	25,784	16.76%	23,671	1.29%	16.19%	2.88%	5.59%	0.00%	0.05%
	73	1,100	0.71%	1,026	1.36%	0.74%	2.72%	0.22%	0.25%	1%
77	74	149,148	94.70%	116,831	3.82%	91.51%	16.89%	94.70%	0.67%	1.07%
	71	6,222	3.95%	4,330	6.51%	5.77%	16.62%	3.45%	0%	1.51%
	73	2,112	1.34%	1,475	8.94%	2.70%	25.96%	1.83%	1.48%	2.33%
78	73	116,192	75.56%	91,817	17.21%	93.85%	15.60%	80.74%	2.88%	3.48%

H000H9027 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
	75	13,141	8.54%	10,900	5.25%	3.40%	16.65%	10.23%	1.02%	1.43%
	71	10,011	6.51%	9,834	0.38%	0.22%	1.29%	0.71%	0%	0.59%
	74	7,508	4.88%	6,177	2.13%	0.78%	7.20%	2.50%	1.29%	1.40%
	72	6,920	4.50%	5,521	5.28%	1.73%	18.63%	5.80%	1.24%	1.54%
79	73	70,002	45.53%	51,300	12.44%	51.09%	24.88%	50.68%	1.80%	4.24%
	72	66,245	43.08%	49,167	11.80%	46.45%	21.70%	42.36%	1.81%	4.42%
	75	17,501	11.38%	14,407	2.12%	2.44%	12.15%	6.95%	1.66%	2.05%
80	101	92,598	59.49%	70,122	7.55%	52.07%	27.69%	50.29%	2.74%	3.70%
	77	48,019	30.85%	33,945	13.32%	44.47%	50.80%	44.66%	1.28%	2.02%
	76	15,020	9.65%	12,222	2.87%	3.45%	15.94%	5.04%	3.50%	4.01%
81	78	70,359	44.87%	52,538	6.48%	16.48%	16.04%	41.73%	1.88%	3.42%
	84	34,458	21.97%	24,434	58.80%	69.51%	28.53%	34.52%	6.31%	11.15%
	90	25,153	16.04%	21,515	3.69%	3.84%	11.56%	12.32%	0.75%	1.57%
	85	18,375	11.71%	15,096	7.50%	5.48%	9.27%	6.93%	2.33%	6.60%
	83	8,461	5.39%	5,997	16.12%	4.67%	15.10%	4.48%	0%	1.96%
82	82	120,321	76.86%	97,445	3.45%	63.38%	10.92%	72.69%	0.48%	0.71%
	83	23,865	15.24%	20,380	0.83%	3.22%	4.08%	5.68%	0.00%	0.36%
	81	9,936	6.34%	7,921	14.90%	22.24%	32.57%	17.61%	1.48%	2.49%
	78	2,411	1.54%	1,593	37.16%	11.14%	36.78%	4.00%	1.43%	2.54%
83	81	104,426	66.78%	81,779	9.55%	54.99%	11.48%	60.43%	1.47%	3.67%
	82	51,944	33.21%	39,909	16.02%	45.00%	15.40%	39.56%	2.21%	4.67%
84	81	87,271	55.75%	70,083	11.83%	35.23%	12.78%	52.90%	2.82%	5.75%
	80	36,539	23.34%	30,766	10.58%	13.83%	9.90%	17.99%	3.42%	4.70%
	78	32,720	20.90%	23,221	51.60%	50.92%	21.22%	29.10%	4.32%	6.90%
85	83	122,111	76.87%	99,466	5.18%	45.46%	8.73%	65.34%	0.32%	2.34%
	88	26,790	16.86%	23,201	18.72%	38.33%	14.19%	24.78%	2.88%	6.13%
	84	9,938	6.25%	7,792	23.56%	16.20%	16.82%	9.86%	5.08%	9.86%
86	85	94,529	60.29%	70,204	10.79%	39.03%	17.05%	52.90%	1.30%	4.36%
	88	53,330	34.01%	39,468	24.31%	49.42%	22.80%	39.77%	4.50%	9.90%
	84	8,921	5.68%	6,514	34.38%	11.53%	25.37%	7.30%	3.31%	11.23%
	78	4	0.00%	4	0%	0%	75%	0.01%	0%	0%
87	89	75,952	48.48%	56,553	15.98%	50.08%	53.13%	52.13%	4.93%	6.90%
	88	41,135	26.26%	29,562	16.88%	27.66%	49.23%	25.24%	4.31%	7.33%
	85	32,783	20.92%	24,611	9.68%	13.20%	44.87%	19.15%	2.90%	4.91%
	84	6,770	4.32%	4,511	36.17%	9.04%	44.24%	3.46%	10.48%	11.82%
88	84	83,680	53.39%	63,391	59.17%	60.77%	10.94%	40.68%	7.38%	12.73%

H000H9027 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
	86	30,476	19.44%	22,778	68.61%	25.31%	9.89%	13.22%	20.40%	23.83%
	89	27,649	17.64%	21,161	25.53%	8.75%	28.50%	35.37%	12.89%	14.80%
	88	8,802	5.61%	6,928	27.52%	3.08%	16.46%	6.69%	5.34%	11.46%
	83	3,758	2.39%	3,198	17.07%	0.88%	12.13%	2.27%	0%	1.76%
	87	2,355	1.50%	1,777	40.91%	1.17%	16.76%	1.74%	7.06%	8.27%
89	87	93,654	60.35%	79,642	5.78%	45.24%	9.41%	58.73%	2.76%	3.56%
	86	24,108	15.53%	20,595	20.84%	42.16%	12.91%	20.81%	9.68%	10.73%
	89	17,690	11.40%	15,428	5.96%	9.03%	10.63%	12.84%	2.97%	4.01%
	83	10,182	6.56%	9,399	1.39%	1.28%	3.78%	2.78%	0%	0.19%
	91	8,371	5.39%	7,717	1.76%	1.33%	5.71%	3.45%	0%	0%
	84	1,167	0.75%	1,157	8.21%	0.93%	15.03%	1.36%	0%	0.92%
90	85	48,140	31.06%	34,727	15.12%	32.31%	19.09%	32.24%	5.19%	8.22%
	86	36,229	23.37%	29,633	11.02%	20.10%	12.74%	18.36%	4.10%	5.70%
	88	34,910	22.52%	29,505	15.22%	27.63%	21.14%	30.33%	5.55%	8.06%
	89	18,786	12.12%	14,639	16.71%	15.05%	19.37%	13.79%	7.09%	10.95%
	78	15,875	10.24%	13,272	5.37%	4.39%	7.35%	4.74%	5.09%	6.45%
	87	1,044	0.67%	923	8.88%	0.50%	11.37%	0.51%	7.74%	8.70%
91	90	60,996	38.94%	53,656	2.40%	19.14%	8.28%	44.50%	0.23%	0.62%
	86	51,297	32.75%	45,901	8.75%	59.64%	6.34%	29.15%	6.62%	7.97%
	78	22,231	14.19%	20,769	3.61%	11.14%	4.43%	9.23%	0.31%	1.58%
	87	22,098	14.10%	18,649	3.63%	10.06%	9.16%	17.11%	5.78%	6.90%
92	92	86,125	55.59%	66,114	45.32%	71.66%	19.61%	59.35%	13.60%	16.61%
	90	31,035	20.03%	26,572	12.99%	8.25%	14.79%	17.99%	4.79%	5.64%
	95	19,964	12.88%	16,525	21.86%	8.64%	20.37%	15.41%	7.47%	12.67%
	87	11,227	7.24%	9,143	9.61%	2.10%	13.57%	5.68%	1.88%	4.57%
	94	6,575	4.24%	4,605	84.66%	9.32%	7.36%	1.55%	18.56%	40.35%
93	91	119,117	75.47%	104,754	3.18%	45.66%	9.23%	63.17%	1.08%	1.65%
	92	29,912	18.95%	24,862	12.51%	42.56%	18.32%	29.74%	6.37%	7.49%
	87	6,753	4.27%	5,597	9.70%	7.42%	13.45%	4.91%	0.56%	1.91%
	93	2,033	1.28%	1,783	17.83%	4.34%	18.62%	2.16%	1.23%	1.47%
94	93	111,967	71.60%	85,308	58.04%	74.99%	10.91%	63.84%	10.53%	18.96%
	94	19,164	12.25%	14,373	86.75%	18.88%	4.98%	4.91%	13.86%	31.79%
	92	17,150	10.96%	14,707	19.63%	4.37%	20.07%	20.25%	9.96%	13.06%
	98	5,756	3.68%	4,714	17.69%	1.26%	21.72%	7.02%	3.42%	9.32%
	91	2,324	1.48%	1,901	16.78%	0.48%	30.40%	3.96%	8.95%	11.72%
95	94	109,506	70.70%	81,177	66.30%	79.88%	13.62%	55.93%	14.62%	37.18%

H000H9027 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
	96	19,317	12.47%	15,427	35.61%	8.15%	20.18%	15.75%	8.48%	25.12%
	98	16,097	10.39%	12,970	36.32%	6.99%	29.27%	19.20%	6.82%	24.64%
	95	9,962	6.43%	7,278	46.01%	4.97%	24.71%	9.10%	14.18%	28.52%
96	95	75,569	48.72%	61,433	17.63%	57.75%	19.42%	52.85%	4.14%	8.47%
	97	37,892	24.43%	26,562	12.00%	16.99%	15.45%	18.17%	1.20%	3.74%
	90	25,369	16.35%	18,578	14.26%	14.12%	21.68%	17.84%	2.89%	8.48%
	96	16,265	10.48%	12,029	17.34%	11.12%	20.88%	11.12%	7.81%	10.39%
97	96	104,795	67.30%	80,412	16.93%	67.73%	22.30%	62.00%	1.80%	7.53%
	95	28,860	18.53%	21,972	18.43%	20.14%	28.40%	21.57%	2.58%	9.19%
	98	15,208	9.76%	11,657	15.87%	9.20%	29.39%	11.84%	0.96%	7.85%
	97	6,835	4.38%	5,081	11.49%	2.90%	26.07%	4.58%	0.69%	5.41%
98	98	73,636	47.45%	58,993	18.59%	70.22%	22.68%	46.46%	2.89%	9.62%
	97	54,861	35.35%	40,413	7.07%	18.30%	25.61%	35.94%	0.46%	2.53%
	100	24,555	15.82%	20,341	7.89%	10.27%	23.67%	16.71%	1.01%	3.18%
	93	2,130	1.37%	1,683	11.11%	1.19%	14.97%	0.87%	3.47%	6.68%
99	100	77,347	49.66%	59,504	16.32%	62.75%	27.99%	47.72%	0.89%	4.78%
	99	43,026	27.62%	33,252	10.97%	23.58%	33.17%	31.60%	3.01%	6.57%
	97	18,441	11.84%	13,767	5.14%	4.58%	22.93%	9.04%	0.68%	3.13%
	93	15,153	9.73%	11,958	10.82%	8.35%	30.49%	10.44%	3.86%	7.86%
	101	1,760	1.13%	1,372	8.09%	0.71%	30.17%	1.18%	1.14%	7.11%
	91	4	0.00%	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.26%
100	106	85,081	54.96%	71,139	4.75%	41.95%	40.41%	64.15%	0.74%	1.60%
	105	36,745	23.73%	31,911	6.49%	25.71%	28.93%	20.60%	0.93%	2.24%
	99	20,609	13.31%	18,091	8.60%	19.32%	22.45%	9.06%	0.35%	2.52%
	100	8,788	5.67%	7,746	6.31%	6.06%	19.18%	3.31%	0.41%	2.71%
	108	3,378	2.18%	2,770	19.67%	6.76%	45.84%	2.83%	0.90%	2.87%
	91	183	0.11%	179	8.37%	0.18%	8.37%	0.03%	0.38%	1.90%
101	99	67,642	43.67%	52,866	19.92%	24.65%	38.14%	50.97%	3.65%	7.87%
	105	60,265	38.90%	44,698	47.74%	49.95%	30.48%	34.44%	6.65%	20.59%
	103	20,270	13.08%	14,742	66.49%	22.94%	22.43%	8.36%	17.18%	42.89%
	100	6,711	4.33%	5,141	20.38%	2.45%	47.81%	6.21%	5.45%	10.49%
102	103	73,497	46.72%	53,686	67.61%	59.60%	32.83%	39.64%	3.75%	13.83%
	105	39,631	25.19%	28,842	53.07%	25.13%	32.25%	20.91%	8.20%	24.67%
	110	16,136	10.25%	12,594	23.64%	4.89%	76.04%	21.53%	1.41%	3.82%
	100	15,772	10.02%	12,302	19.53%	3.94%	39.62%	10.96%	4.40%	11.64%
	99	6,368	4.04%	5,321	33.37%	2.91%	25.07%	2.99%	11.24%	24.92%

H000H9027 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
	112	5,879	3.73%	4,136	51.52%	3.49%	42.40%	3.94%	6.05%	20.65%
103	102	107,788	69.16%	81,610	5.31%	37.36%	90.81%	78.09%	0.30%	0.59%
	112	44,711	28.69%	31,567	20.65%	56.17%	62.36%	20.74%	3.59%	8.89%
	105	3,334	2.13%	2,435	30.80%	6.46%	45.25%	1.16%	2.52%	13.88%
104	101	55,479	35.73%	39,587	16.97%	53.97%	45.55%	36.77%	3.18%	9.21%
	97	51,819	33.38%	35,701	6.50%	18.64%	40.86%	29.74%	0.73%	3.36%
	98	24,245	15.61%	17,699	5.01%	7.12%	47.79%	17.25%	0.34%	2.81%
	105	11,298	7.27%	10,869	8.83%	7.71%	38.93%	8.62%	1.60%	3.91%
	112	7,936	5.11%	5,886	17.92%	8.47%	40.74%	4.88%	3.01%	8.36%
	100	4,457	2.87%	3,677	13.78%	4.07%	36.06%	2.70%	1.35%	6.20%
105	112	64,284	41.33%	47,630	12.88%	47.38%	64.72%	38.82%	2.27%	2.93%
	101	39,763	25.56%	27,981	17.37%	37.52%	48.94%	17.24%	6.20%	10.16%
	116	27,683	17.79%	21,396	4.93%	8.14%	85.99%	23.17%	0.62%	1.96%
	119	19,496	12.53%	15,303	4.18%	4.94%	91.39%	17.61%	0.41%	1.43%
	120	1,664	1.06%	1,233	7.05%	0.67%	80.77%	1.25%	3.63%	8.45%
	114	1,524	0.97%	1,241	3.46%	0.33%	98.79%	1.54%	0%	0%
	76	1,112	0.71%	880	14.54%	0.98%	31.59%	0.35%	12.10%	12.45%
106	76	133,860	86.14%	116,217	3.11%	90.63%	10.10%	84.77%	2.08%	2.59%
	75	17,364	11.17%	15,437	1.10%	4.25%	10.02%	11.16%	1.19%	1.80%
	112	4,164	2.67%	3,475	5.87%	5.10%	16.17%	4.05%	6.58%	7.86%
107	104	85,245	54.30%	64,574	52.64%	50.88%	29.62%	61.71%	27.25%	35.34%
	108	28,931	18.42%	21,595	65.59%	21.20%	22.31%	15.54%	37.43%	45.43%
	103	24,923	15.87%	17,931	86.19%	23.13%	11.25%	6.50%	18.51%	34.09%
	106	17,886	11.39%	13,367	23.81%	4.76%	37.64%	16.23%	9.21%	14.08%
108	108	99,942	63.71%	76,832	57.20%	58.84%	27.24%	69.27%	30.84%	35.22%
	109	33,919	21.62%	25,129	69.91%	23.51%	22.92%	19.07%	18.89%	22.06%
	104	22,983	14.65%	16,828	78.28%	17.63%	20.89%	11.64%	14.05%	19.38%
	106	4	0.00%	3	0%	0%	100%	0.00%	16.28%	20.64%
109	109	86,204	55.93%	66,405	49.14%	54.43%	43.31%	53.10%	3.72%	6.15%
	104	29,204	18.94%	21,569	64.93%	23.36%	36.71%	14.62%	11.63%	17.09%
	103	17,974	11.66%	13,377	70.76%	15.79%	30.35%	7.49%	3.61%	8.30%
	113	12,224	7.93%	9,716	22.02%	3.56%	79.82%	14.32%	1.13%	2.80%
	107	7,588	4.92%	6,562	24.26%	2.65%	76.71%	9.29%	0.01%	1.06%
	110	927	0.60%	780	13.71%	0.17%	80.64%	1.16%	1.06%	3.02%
110	110	86,385	55.55%	68,646	5.92%	53.73%	88.47%	55.10%	0.82%	2.41%
	102	53,164	34.19%	41,639	6.00%	33.01%	90.04%	34.01%	0.75%	1.59%

H000H9027 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
	111	13,593	8.74%	11,057	5.59%	8.17%	96.28%	9.65%	0%	0%
	103	1,675	1.07%	1,280	29.68%	5.01%	64.29%	0.74%	3.12%	9.67%
	112	671	0.43%	561	0.89%	0.06%	91.26%	0.46%	0%	0%
111	113	61,314	39.12%	49,284	5.40%	44.78%	95.39%	39.66%	0.18%	0.58%
	111	59,981	38.27%	49,045	3.58%	29.54%	89.70%	37.11%	0.06%	0.45%
	110	28,690	18.30%	23,730	2.00%	7.98%	95.62%	19.14%	0%	0%
	107	4,762	3.03%	3,826	17.22%	11.07%	91.61%	2.95%	1.01%	3.42%
	109	1,950	1.24%	1,504	26.19%	6.62%	88.29%	1.12%	2.03%	2.03%
112	107	59,730	38.56%	49,390	2.91%	23.14%	66.28%	34.83%	0.12%	0.35%
	113	46,593	30.08%	38,469	9.02%	55.85%	66.57%	27.25%	0.08%	1.16%
	117	36,484	23.55%	30,470	3.13%	15.35%	89.36%	28.97%	0%	0.01%
	111	12,088	7.80%	10,380	3.37%	5.63%	80.79%	8.92%	0%	0.29%
113	107	78,970	50.43%	69,069	6.51%	54.27%	68.84%	53.29%	1.19%	1.56%
	106	47,981	30.64%	40,312	5.71%	27.80%	61.72%	27.88%	0.38%	0.91%
	113	16,460	10.51%	13,306	4.26%	6.84%	97.14%	14.48%	0%	0%
	109	13,157	8.40%	10,977	8.36%	11.07%	35.29%	4.34%	0.07%	1.00%
114	117	79,302	50.16%	63,006	6.32%	44.50%	67.55%	51.34%	0.45%	2.69%
	111	51,834	32.79%	42,443	5.85%	27.77%	70.44%	36.06%	0.04%	0.41%
	118	17,214	10.89%	13,027	16.54%	24.06%	57.04%	8.96%	2.22%	7.16%
	107	5,127	3.24%	3,714	1.26%	0.52%	46.95%	2.10%	0.26%	1.61%
	115	4,586	2.90%	3,371	8.33%	3.13%	37.28%	1.51%	2.61%	7.75%
	113	6	0.00%	6	0%	0%	33.33%	0.00%	0%	0%
115	115	77,429	49.56%	60,923	3.58%	31.03%	68.31%	51.40%	0.32%	1.91%
	117	35,174	22.51%	28,324	3.29%	13.26%	67.84%	23.73%	0.35%	1.33%
	114	23,533	15.06%	18,292	5.64%	14.68%	55.26%	12.48%	0.77%	3.63%
	118	9,288	5.94%	7,030	22.43%	22.41%	44.83%	3.89%	1.73%	9.71%
	112	8,857	5.66%	7,349	10.45%	10.91%	83.95%	7.62%	0.66%	1.16%
	111	1,934	1.23%	1,672	32.29%	7.67%	41.50%	0.85%	0.10%	1.10%
116	114	84,284	53.49%	69,590	3.89%	66.85%	81.32%	51.82%	0.71%	1.58%
	115	53,039	33.66%	43,584	1.82%	19.61%	89.99%	35.92%	0.09%	0.25%
	112	17,559	11.14%	13,753	3.77%	12.78%	82.99%	10.45%	0.61%	1.09%
	119	2,683	1.70%	2,188	1.37%	0.73%	89.48%	1.79%	0%	0.08%
117	118	115,611	73.69%	80,375	42.63%	85.46%	51.33%	69.01%	3.46%	9.06%
	120	34,487	21.98%	23,607	19.15%	11.27%	66.72%	26.34%	3.54%	6.75%
	119	5,819	3.70%	3,658	32.28%	2.94%	61.01%	3.73%	4.20%	5.57%
	114	964	0.61%	753	16.99%	0.31%	71.31%	0.89%	0.58%	6.64%

H000H9027 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
118	119	90,486	57.79%	69,093	6.68%	59.45%	78.79%	55.04%	1.26%	4.36%
	116	47,112	30.09%	37,818	2.55%	12.45%	89.11%	34.07%	0.35%	1.24%
	114	18,767	11.98%	14,725	14.81%	28.07%	72.03%	10.72%	0.86%	4.22%
	112	197	0.12%	154	0.64%	0.01%	96.75%	0.15%	0%	0%
119	116	59,886	38.34%	45,992	6.01%	58.41%	82.52%	36.69%	0.85%	3.63%
	112	56,298	36.04%	43,258	2.11%	19.34%	90.42%	37.82%	0.13%	0.61%
	120	39,986	25.60%	29,932	3.51%	22.23%	88.02%	25.47%	0.10%	1.13%
120	120	93,941	60.63%	76,853	6.86%	48.07%	25.80%	40.41%	1.82%	2.81%
	119	36,195	23.36%	27,025	7.28%	17.94%	59.41%	32.72%	1.49%	2.88%
	118	20,735	13.38%	15,225	21.35%	29.63%	71.46%	22.17%	3.83%	8.77%
	114	4,053	2.61%	3,189	14.92%	4.33%	72.02%	4.68%	3.65%	8.22%

H000H9027 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
	Cities	Century
	Vtd's	120330218|2|2641 of 2894
2	Counties	Escambia|2|141,503 of 297,619, Santa Rosa|2|14,616 of 151,372
	Cities	Gulf Breeze, Pensacola
	Vtd's	120330218|2|253 of 2894
3	Counties	Okaloosa|2|22,041 of 180,822, Santa Rosa|2|136,756 of 151,372
	Cities	Jay, Laurel Hill, Milton
	Vtd's	120910003|2|1699 of 1912, 120910004|2|1285 of 1834, 120910008|2|2460 of 2465, 120910009|2|530 of 3193, 120910010|2|2004 of 2576, 120910011|2|1329 of 2855, 120910012|2|82 of 2915, 120910021|2|1342 of 2612
4	Counties	Okaloosa
	Cities	Cinco Bayou, Crestview, Destin, Fort Walton Beach, Mary Esther, Niceville, Shalimar, Valparaiso
	Vtd's	120910003|2|213 of 1912, 120910004|2|549 of 1834, 120910008|2|5 of 2465, 120910009|2|2663 of 3193, 120910010|2|572 of 2576, 120910011|2|1526 of 2855, 120910012|2|2833 of 2915, 120910021|2|1270 of 2612
5	Counties	Bay|2|9,586 of 168,852, Holmes, Jackson, Walton, Washington
	Cities	Alford, Bascom, Bonifay, Campbellton, Caryville, Chipley, Cottondale, De Funiak Springs, Ebro, Esto, Freeport, Graceville, Grand Ridge, Greenwood, Jacob City, Malone, Marianna, Noma, Paxton, Ponce de Leon, Sneads, Vernon, Wausau, Westville
	Vtd's	120050003|2|727 of 4383, 120050005|2|770 of 3567, 120050023|2|37 of 1601
6	Counties	Bay
	Cities	Callaway, Lynn Haven, Mexico Beach, Panama City, Panama City Beach, Parker, Springfield
	Vtd's	120050003|2|3656 of 4383, 120050005|2|2797 of 3567, 120050023|2|1564 of 1601
7	Counties	Calhoun, Franklin, Gulf, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon|3|9,585 of 275,487, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, Wakulla
	Cities	Altha, Apalachicola, Blountstown, Bristol, Carrabelle, Greenville, Lee, Madison, Mayo, Monticello, Perry, Port St. Joe, St. Marks, Sopchoppy, Wewahitchka
	Vtd's	120730039|2|1943 of 2484, 120730050|2|627 of 1743
8	Counties	Gadsden, Leon|3|109,853 of 275,487
	Cities	Chattahoochee, Greensboro, Gretna, Havana, Midway, Quincy, Tallahassee|2|94721 of 181376
	Vtd's	120730002|2|998 of 1061, 120730008|2|67 of 132, 120730011|2|50 of 1374, 120730050|2|1116 of 1743, 120730082|2|162 of 1303, 120730151|2|109 of 2782
9	Counties	Leon
	Cities	Tallahassee|2|86655 of 181376
	Vtd's	120730002|2|63 of 1061, 120730008|2|65 of 132, 120730011|2|1324 of 1374, 120730039|2|541 of 2484, 120730082|2|1141 of 1303, 120730151|2|2673 of 2782
10	Counties	Alachua|3|5,427 of 247,336, Baker, Columbia, Hamilton, Suwannee
	Cities	Branford, Fort White, Glen St. Mary, High Springs|2|3147 of 5350, Jasper, Jennings, Lake City, Live Oak, Macclenny, White Springs
	Vtd's	120010007|2|916 of 4132, 120010065|2|2815 of 3379, 120010066|2|1651 of 5079, 120010067|2|45 of 2056
11	Counties	Duval|6|82,483 of 864,263, Nassau
	Cities	Atlantic Beach, Callahan, Fernandina Beach, Hilliard, Jacksonville|6|41429 of 821784, Jacksonville Beach, Neptune Beach
	Vtd's	120310208|2|320 of 4164, 120310209|2|5865 of 7221
12	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville

H000H9027 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	120310070|2|509 of 3143, 120310077|2|1686 of 8223, 120310208|2|3844 of 4164, 120310209|2|1356 of 7221, 120310266|2|380 of 431
13	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville
14	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville
15	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Baldwin, Jacksonville|6|154862 of 821784
	Vtd's	120310084|2|911 of 2929, 120310185|2|357 of 2455
16	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville
	Vtd's	120310070|2|2634 of 3143, 120310077|2|6537 of 8223, 120310084|2|2018 of 2929, 120310185|2|2098 of 2455, 120310266|2|51 of 431
17	Counties	St. Johns
	Cities	St. Augustine, St. Augustine Beach
	Vtd's	121090046|2|4200 of 5208, 121090048|2|310 of 2347
18	Counties	Clay
	Cities	Orange Park
	Vtd's	120190002|2|4146 of 4769, 120190080|2|14 of 121, 120190081|2|4143 of 4148, 120190084|2|53 of 1608
19	Counties	Bradford, Clay|2|36,321 of 190,865, Putnam, Union
	Cities	Brooker, Crescent City, Green Cove Springs, Hampton, Interlachen, Keystone Heights, Lake Butler, Lawtey, Palatka, Penney Farms, Pomona Park, Raiford, Starke, Welaka, Worthington Springs
	Vtd's	120190002|2|623 of 4769, 120190080|2|107 of 121, 120190081|2|5 of 4148, 120190084|2|1555 of 1608
20	Counties	Alachua|3|118,352 of 247,336, Marion|4|38,504 of 331,298
	Cities	Alachua|2|2791 of 9059, Archer, Gainesville|2|66078 of 124354, Hawthorne, La Crosse, McIntosh, Micanopy, Ocala|3|11227 of 56315, Reddick, Waldo
	Vtd's	120010007|2|3216 of 4132, 120010008|2|314 of 5348, 120010009|2|693 of 3262, 120010010|2|4448 of 4775, 120010025|2|1710 of 2189, 120010026|2|2559 of 3522, 120010030|2|2927 of 4677, 120010034|2|821 of 1407, 120010051|2|489 of 4173, 120010052|2|448 of 2596, 120010053|2|435 of 4218, 120010061|2|4165 of 5823, 120010062|2|6343 of 7878, 120010067|2|2011 of 2056, 120830008|2|895 of 4656, 120830011|2|2034 of 2125, 120830021|2|1608 of 3410, 120830030|2|643 of 3787, 120830044|2|1802 of 3144, 120830051|2|1017 of 1393
21	Counties	Alachua|3|123,557 of 247,336, Dixie, Gilchrist
	Cities	Alachua|2|6268 of 9059, Bell, Cross City, Fanning Springs|2|278 of 764, Gainesville|2|58276 of 124354, High Springs|2|2203 of 5350, Horseshoe Beach, Newberry, Trenton
	Vtd's	120010008|2|5034 of 5348, 120010009|2|2569 of 3262, 120010010|2|327 of 4775, 120010025|2|479 of 2189, 120010026|2|963 of 3522, 120010030|2|1750 of 4677, 120010034|2|586 of 1407, 120010051|2|3684 of 4173, 120010052|2|2148 of 2596, 120010053|2|3783 of 4218, 120010061|2|1658 of 5823, 120010062|2|1535 of 7878, 120010065|2|564 of 3379, 120010066|2|3428 of 5079
22	Counties	Levy, Marion|4|113,925 of 331,298
	Cities	Bronson, Cedar Key, Chiefland, Dunnellon, Fanning Springs|2|486 of 764, Inglis, Ocala|3|14460 of 56315, Otter Creek, Williston, Yankeetown
	Vtd's	120830008|2|3761 of 4656, 120830021|2|1802 of 3410, 120830044|2|1342 of 3144, 120830051|2|376 of 1393, 120830073|2|1163 of 2705, 120830082|2|3019 of 3161
23	Counties	Marion
	Cities	Belleview, Ocala|3|30628 of 56315
	Vtd's	120830011|2|91 of 2125, 120830030|2|3144 of 3787, 120830065|2|3012 of 3799, 120830073|2|1542 of 2705, 120830082|2|142 of 3161
24	Counties	Flagler, St. Johns|2|32,113 of 190,039, Volusia|4|30,087 of 494,593

H000H9027 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	Beverly Beach, Bunnell, Flagler Beach, Hastings, Marineland, Palm Coast, Pierson
	Vtd's	121090046|2|1008 of 5208, 121090048|2|2037 of 2347, 121270105|2|823 of 3780
25	Counties	Volusia
	Cities	Daytona Beach|2|12063 of 61005, Daytona Beach Shores, Edgewater|2|2201 of 20750, New Smyrna Beach, Ormond Beach|2|35846 of 38137, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange
	Vtd's	121270105|2|2957 of 3780, 121270108|2|342 of 1387, 121270121|2|2976 of 5267, 121270130|2|218 of 4074, 121270159|2|2222 of 4346, 121270162|2|3 of 1081, 121270178|2|5075 of 5127, 121270181|2|4886 of 4927, 121270182|2|3882 of 5623, 121270200|3|532 of 1687, 121270216|2|1914 of 4451, 121270217|2|284 of 5366
26	Counties	Volusia
	Cities	Daytona Beach|2|48942 of 61005, DeLand, Holly Hill, Lake Helen|2|267 of 2624, Orange City|2|3802 of 10599, Ormond Beach|2|2291 of 38137, South Daytona
	Vtd's	121270043|2|267 of 2603, 121270046|2|45 of 1314, 121270052|2|1097 of 1104, 121270056|2|776 of 2446, 121270070|2|1184 of 4655, 121270074|2|4582 of 4727, 121270075|2|2615 of 5928, 121270108|2|1045 of 1387, 121270121|2|2291 of 5267, 121270130|2|3856 of 4074, 121270159|2|2124 of 4346, 121270162|2|1078 of 1081, 121270178|2|52 of 5127, 121270181|2|41 of 4927, 121270182|2|1741 of 5623, 121270200|3|323 of 1687
27	Counties	Volusia
	Cities	DeBary, Deltona, Edgewater|2|18549 of 20750, Lake Helen|2|2357 of 2624, Oak Hill, Orange City|2|6797 of 10599
	Vtd's	121270043|2|2336 of 2603, 121270046|2|1269 of 1314, 121270052|2|7 of 1104, 121270056|2|1670 of 2446, 121270070|2|3471 of 4655, 121270074|2|145 of 4727, 121270075|2|3313 of 5928, 121270200|3|832 of 1687, 121270216|2|2537 of 4451, 121270217|2|5082 of 5366
28	Counties	Seminole
	Cities	Casselberry|3|8205 of 26241, Oviedo, Sanford|2|21829 of 53570, Winter Springs
	Vtd's	121170244|2|2075 of 2441, 121170269|2|1130 of 3088, 121170275|2|1292 of 1404
29	Counties	Seminole
	Cities	Altamonte Springs|2|10090 of 41496, Casselberry|3|2804 of 26241, Lake Mary, Longwood, Sanford|2|31741 of 53570
	Vtd's	121170010|2|368 of 2503, 121170011|2|505 of 798, 121170231|2|123 of 3068, 121170244|2|366 of 2441, 121170269|2|1958 of 3088, 121170275|2|112 of 1404
30	Counties	Orange|9|51,410 of 1,145,956, Seminole|3|104,743 of 422,718
	Cities	Altamonte Springs|2|31406 of 41496, Casselberry|3|15232 of 26241, Eatonville, Maitland, Orlando|7|2 of 238300, Winter Park|2|9975 of 27852
	Vtd's	120950058|2|169 of 2416, 120950067|2|3221 of 3633, 120950068|2|208 of 5566, 120950219|2|1476 of 3838, 120950231|2|2060 of 2380, 120950240|2|739 of 4072, 121170010|2|2135 of 2503, 121170011|2|293 of 798, 121170231|2|2945 of 3068
31	Counties	Lake|3|101,583 of 297,052, Orange|9|56,879 of 1,145,956
	Cities	Apopka|2|26446 of 41542, Eustis, Mount Dora, Tavares, Umatilla
	Vtd's	120690017|2|9 of 2165, 120690033|2|1878 of 2216, 120690058|2|1061 of 3148, 120690077|2|5 of 1331, 120950082|2|5308 of 5339, 120950087|2|2815 of 5703, 120950089|2|5247 of 5279
32	Counties	Lake
	Cities	Astatula, Clermont, Groveland, Howey-in-the-Hills, Leesburg, Mascotte, Minneola, Montverde
	Vtd's	120690033|2|338 of 2216, 120690043|2|613 of 3883, 120690045|2|1308 of 1405, 120690052|2|1804 of 2743, 120690058|2|2087 of 3148, 120690077|2|1326 of 1331, 120690085|2|876 of 2495
33	Counties	Lake|3|39,805 of 297,052, Marion|4|23,263 of 331,298, Sumter
	Cities	Bushnell, Center Hill, Coleman, Fruitland Park, Lady Lake, Webster, Wildwood
	Vtd's	120690017|2|2156 of 2165, 120690043|2|3270 of 3883, 120690045|2|97 of 1405, 120690052|2|939 of 2743, 120690085|2|1619 of 2495, 120830065|2|787 of 3799
34	Counties	Citrus, Hernando|2|15,907 of 172,778
	Cities	Crystal River, Inverness
	Vtd's	120530003|2|715 of 1492, 120530013|2|1280 of 1288, 120530016|2|2311 of 2984

H000H9027 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).		
35	Counties	Hernando
	Cities	Brooksville, Weeki Wachee
	Vtd's	120530003|2|777 of 1492, 120530013|2|8 of 1288, 120530016|2|673 of 2984
36	Counties	Pasco
	Cities	New Port Richey, Port Richey
	Vtd's	121010128|2|858 of 3356, 121010152|2|557 of 4316, 121010183|2|641 of 2246, 121010201|2|37 of 4086
37	Counties	Pasco
	Cities	
	Vtd's	121010011|2|4291 of 5055, 121010128|2|2498 of 3356, 121010152|2|3759 of 4316, 121010170|2|5886 of 6068, 121010183|2|1605 of 2246, 121010201|2|4049 of 4086
38	Counties	Pasco
	Cities	Dade City, St. Leo, San Antonio, Zephyrhills
	Vtd's	121010011|2|764 of 5055, 121010170|2|182 of 6068
39	Counties	Osceola|3|19,249 of 268,685, Polk|5|136,324 of 602,095
	Cities	Auburndale|2|11679 of 13507, Davenport, Haines City|2|2034 of 20535, Lake Alfred|2|1192 of 5015, Lakeland|2|3877 of 97422, Polk City, Winter Haven|3|115 of 33874
	Vtd's	120970008|2|4 of 8804, 120970029|2|3632 of 6774, 120970032|2|327 of 3333, 121050011|2|2876 of 4025, 121050013|2|4172 of 5014, 121050014|2|4350 of 8504, 121050019|2|2676 of 7717, 121050020|2|2758 of 3246, 121050023|2|1750 of 3882, 121050036|2|13 of 3383, 121050041|2|84 of 1204, 121050068|2|5772 of 6437, 121050072|2|694 of 1136, 121050130|2|3121 of 7592
40	Counties	Polk
	Cities	Lakeland|2|93545 of 97422
	Vtd's	121050011|2|1149 of 4025, 121050013|2|842 of 5014, 121050014|2|4154 of 8504, 121050019|2|5041 of 7717, 121050020|2|488 of 3246, 121050023|2|2132 of 3882, 121050045|2|209 of 1481, 121050050|2|521 of 559, 121050053|2|3634 of 5071, 121050054|2|4953 of 5685, 121050061|3|1883 of 5627
41	Counties	Polk
	Cities	Auburndale|2|1828 of 13507, Dundee, Eagle Lake, Haines City|2|18501 of 20535, Lake Alfred|2|3823 of 5015, Lake Hamilton, Lake Wales|3|932 of 14225, Winter Haven|3|31996 of 33874
	Vtd's	121050036|2|3370 of 3383, 121050041|2|1120 of 1204, 121050045|2|1272 of 1481, 121050050|2|38 of 559, 121050054|2|732 of 5685, 121050061|3|621 of 5627, 121050068|2|665 of 6437, 121050072|2|442 of 1136, 121050079|2|7489 of 7495, 121050108|2|2131 of 5349, 121050111|2|2030 of 2981, 121050130|2|4471 of 7592, 121050136|2|4029 of 5081
42	Counties	Osceola|3|91,873 of 268,685, Polk|5|63,042 of 602,095
	Cities	Frostproof, Highland Park, Hillcrest Heights, Lake Wales|3|11807 of 14225, St. Cloud
	Vtd's	120970014|2|4494 of 5790, 120970088|2|1224 of 9263, 120970089|2|118 of 4224, 121050111|2|951 of 2981, 121050115|2|1338 of 1385, 121050120|2|525 of 721, 121050121|2|1838 of 5902, 121050136|2|1052 of 5081, 121050144|2|1375 of 2554
43	Counties	Osceola
	Cities	Kissimmee
	Vtd's	120970008|2|8800 of 8804, 120970014|2|1296 of 5790, 120970029|2|3142 of 6774, 120970032|2|3006 of 3333, 120970088|2|8039 of 9263, 120970089|2|4106 of 4224
44	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Bay Lake, Lake Buena Vista, Oakland, Ocoee|2|6593 of 35579, Orlando|7|7255 of 238300, Windermere, Winter Garden|2|19414 of 34568
	Vtd's	120950269|2|647 of 2889
45	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Apopka|2|15096 of 41542, Ocoee|2|28986 of 35579, Orlando|7|14533 of 238300, Winter Garden|2|15154 of 34568

H000H9027 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	120950057|3|194 of 1794, 120950067|2|412 of 3633, 120950068|2|5358 of 5566, 120950082|2|31 of 5339, 120950087|2|2888 of 5703, 120950089|2|32 of 5279
46	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Orlando|7|84166 of 238300
	Vtd's	120950057|3|947 of 1794, 120950268|2|3367 of 4767, 120950269|2|2242 of 2889, 120950290|2|2978 of 3940
47	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Belle Isle, Edgewood, Orlando|7|84088 of 238300, Winter Park|2|17877 of 27852
	Vtd's	120950057|3|653 of 1794, 120950058|2|2247 of 2416, 120950131|2|1966 of 3729, 120950154|2|2289 of 3623, 120950219|2|2362 of 3838, 120950231|2|320 of 2380, 120950237|2|653 of 2588, 120950290|2|962 of 3940
48	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Orlando|7|29843 of 238300
	Vtd's	120950112|2|4674 of 5275, 120950154|2|1334 of 3623, 120950183|2|3295 of 3339, 120950268|2|1400 of 4767
49	Counties	Orange
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120950112|2|601 of 5275, 120950131|2|1763 of 3729, 120950193|2|3809 of 4867, 120950196|2|4955 of 9159, 120950203|2|954 of 3594, 120950237|2|1935 of 2588, 120950240|2|3333 of 4072, 120950259|2|1902 of 5697
50	Counties	Brevard|4|64,904 of 543,376, Orange|9|93,973 of 1,145,956
	Cities	Orlando|7|18413 of 238300, Titusville
	Vtd's	120090215|2|18 of 1320, 120950183|2|44 of 3339, 120950193|2|1058 of 4867, 120950196|2|4204 of 9159, 120950203|2|2640 of 3594, 120950259|2|3795 of 5697
51	Counties	Brevard
	Cities	Cape Canaveral, Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, Rockledge
	Vtd's	120090106|2|638 of 1273, 120090215|2|1302 of 1320
52	Counties	Brevard
	Cities	Indialantic, Indian Harbour Beach, Melbourne|2|62854 of 76068, Melbourne Beach|2|1973 of 3101, Melbourne Village, Palm Bay|2|890 of 103190, Palm Shores, Satellite Beach, West Melbourne|2|5711 of 18355
	Vtd's	120090036|2|1973 of 3101, 120090106|2|635 of 1273, 120090158|2|890 of 3314
53	Counties	Brevard
	Cities	Grant-Valkaria, Malabar, Melbourne|2|13214 of 76068, Melbourne Beach|2|1128 of 3101, Palm Bay|2|102300 of 103190, West Melbourne|2|12644 of 18355
	Vtd's	120090036|2|1128 of 3101, 120090158|2|2424 of 3314
54	Counties	Indian River, St. Lucie|4|18,025 of 277,789
	Cities	Fellsmere, Indian River Shores, Orchid, St. Lucie Village, Sebastian, Vero Beach
	Vtd's	121110002|2|18 of 3016, 121110020|2|2486 of 4093, 121110028|2|241 of 907, 121110053|2|467 of 470, 121110054|2|2249 of 2929
55	Counties	Glades, Highlands, Okeechobee, St. Lucie|4|4,216 of 277,789
	Cities	Avon Park, Lake Placid, Moore Haven, Okeechobee, Sebring
	Vtd's	121110024|2|1468 of 3462, 121110027|2|717 of 1142, 121110028|2|666 of 907, 121110049|3|385 of 535
56	Counties	DeSoto, Hardee, Polk|5|92,307 of 602,095
	Cities	Arcadia, Bartow, Bowling Green, Fort Meade, Frostproof|2|0 of 2992, Lake Wales|3|1486 of 14225, Mulberry, Wauchula, Winter Haven|3|1763 of 33874, Zolfo Springs
	Vtd's	121050053|2|1437 of 5071, 121050061|3|3123 of 5627, 121050079|2|6 of 7495, 121050108|2|3218 of 5349, 121050115|2|47 of 1385, 121050120|2|196 of 721, 121050121|2|4064 of 5902, 121050144|2|1179 of 2554

H000H9027 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).		
57	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120570462|2|260 of 5854, 120570463|2|8 of 10, 120570486|2|3130 of 7274, 120570522|2|1207 of 1860
58	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Plant City, Tampa|5|153 of 335709, Temple Terrace
	Vtd's	120570121|2|8 of 1154, 120570275|2|58 of 2009, 120570281|2|46 of 1877, 120570297|2|339 of 347
59	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120570486|2|4144 of 7274, 120570522|2|653 of 1860, 120570525|2|24 of 119, 120570532|2|390 of 5060, 120570533|3|2698 of 5873, 120570534|2|993 of 3331
60	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|104539 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570131|2|1549 of 3768, 120570134|2|61 of 5727, 120570138|2|1283 of 5604, 120570147|2|4542 of 5448, 120570430|2|1437 of 4333, 120570432|2|1049 of 1279, 120570440|2|897 of 2666, 120570533|3|3175 of 5873, 120570534|2|2338 of 3331
61	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|119392 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570237|2|4189 of 4912, 120570275|2|1951 of 2009, 120570281|2|1831 of 1877, 120570525|2|95 of 119, 120570532|2|4670 of 5060
62	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|51408 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570131|2|2219 of 3768, 120570134|2|5666 of 5727, 120570138|2|4321 of 5604, 120570147|2|906 of 5448, 120570163|2|2480 of 2494
63	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|60217 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570121|2|1146 of 1154, 120570237|2|723 of 4912, 120570297|2|8 of 347
64	Counties	Hillsborough|9|108,780 of 1,229,226, Pinellas|7|49,038 of 916,542
	Cities	Clearwater|4|0 of 107685, Oldsmar, Safety Harbor
	Vtd's	120570163|2|14 of 2494, 121030340|2|5 of 3137, 121030343|2|1667 of 2400
65	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Clearwater|4|13129 of 107685, Dunedin, Tarpon Springs
	Vtd's	121030290|2|1164 of 2080, 121030340|2|3132 of 3137, 121030343|2|733 of 2400, 121030348|2|1349 of 1706
66	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Belleair, Belleair Beach, Belleair Bluffs, Belleair Shore, Clearwater|4|24356 of 107685, Indian Rocks Beach, Indian Shores|2|1212 of 1420, Largo|2|31230 of 77648, Pinellas Park|4|4010 of 49079, Seminole
	Vtd's	121030126|2|6 of 375, 121030147|3|4550 of 4784, 121030164|2|3475 of 3494, 121030166|2|1259 of 2354, 121030170|2|171 of 2817, 121030172|2|1908 of 3317, 121030173|2|1563 of 2829, 121030194|2|3232 of 3411, 121030239|2|1212 of 1420, 121030264|2|3418 of 3767, 121030266|2|1893 of 3648, 121030300|2|872 of 2671
67	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Clearwater|4|70200 of 107685, Largo|2|46418 of 77648, Pinellas Park|4|395 of 49079
	Vtd's	121030074|2|245 of 2070, 121030155|2|256 of 2800, 121030162|3|635 of 2468, 121030164|2|19 of 3494, 121030194|2|179 of 3411, 121030264|2|349 of 3767, 121030266|2|1755 of 3648, 121030290|2|916 of 2080, 121030300|2|1799 of 2671, 121030348|2|357 of 1706
68	Counties	Pinellas

H000H9027 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	Pinellas Park|4|37576 of 49079, St. Petersburg|3|101954 of 244769
	Vtd's	121030032|2|1815 of 1878, 121030037|2|54 of 1388, 121030038|2|307 of 1764, 121030050|2|2325 of 3295, 121030074|2|1825 of 2070, 121030135|2|1365 of 3775, 121030144|2|2717 of 3103, 121030147|3|156 of 4784, 121030155|2|2544 of 2800, 121030157|2|1199 of 2785, 121030159|2|1216 of 3037, 121030162|3|1833 of 2468
69	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Gulfport, Indian Shores|2|208 of 1420, Kenneth City, Madeira Beach, North Redington Beach, Pinellas Park|4|7098 of 49079, Redington Beach, Redington Shores, St. Pete Beach, St. Petersburg|3|67643 of 244769, South Pasadena, Treasure Island
	Vtd's	121030030|2|1951 of 1988, 121030031|2|2448 of 2496, 121030032|2|63 of 1878, 121030037|2|1334 of 1388, 121030038|2|1457 of 1764, 121030050|2|970 of 3295, 121030126|2|369 of 375, 121030135|2|2410 of 3775, 121030144|2|386 of 3103, 121030147|3|78 of 4784, 121030157|2|1586 of 2785, 121030159|2|1821 of 3037, 121030166|2|1095 of 2354, 121030170|2|2646 of 2817, 121030172|2|1409 of 3317, 121030173|2|1266 of 2829, 121030239|2|208 of 1420
70	Counties	Hillsborough|9|11,565 of 1,229,226, Manatee|3|49,192 of 322,833, Pinellas|7|75,172 of 916,542, Sarasota|5|18,115 of 379,448
	Cities	Bradenton|3|14170 of 49546, Palmetto|2|3856 of 12606, St. Petersburg|3|75172 of 244769, Sarasota|3|12754 of 51917
	Vtd's	120570430|2|2896 of 4333, 120570432|2|230 of 1279, 120570440|2|1769 of 2666, 120570462|2|5594 of 5854, 120570463|2|2 of 10, 120810008|2|281 of 357, 120810022|2|1307 of 2091, 120810031|2|872 of 1374, 120810033|2|18 of 3001, 120810038|2|776 of 1293, 120810042|2|314 of 427, 120810065|2|906 of 927, 120810066|2|21 of 836, 120810068|2|123 of 219, 120810089|2|642 of 1667, 120810090|2|30 of 118, 120810096|2|1803 of 1814, 120810099|2|2009 of 2552, 120810118|2|2935 of 3714, 120810124|2|858 of 2582, 120810128|2|83 of 1101, 120810142|2|747 of 868, 120810149|2|889 of 899, 120810183|2|384 of 450, 120810203|2|144 of 1428, 121030030|2|37 of 1988, 121030031|2|48 of 2496, 121150002|2|469 of 4037, 121150015|2|237 of 845, 121150024|2|217 of 3176, 121150098|2|985 of 4605
71	Counties	Manatee|3|138,111 of 322,833, Sarasota|5|20,483 of 379,448
	Cities	Anna Maria, Bradenton|3|29330 of 49546, Bradenton Beach, Holmes Beach, Longboat Key, Palmetto|2|8750 of 12606, Sarasota|3|15813 of 51917
	Vtd's	120810008|2|76 of 357, 120810022|2|784 of 2091, 120810038|2|517 of 1293, 120810042|2|113 of 427, 120810089|2|1025 of 1667, 120810090|2|88 of 118, 120810096|2|11 of 1814, 120810099|2|543 of 2552, 120810124|2|1724 of 2582, 120810142|2|121 of 868, 120810149|2|10 of 899, 120810183|2|66 of 450, 120810203|2|1284 of 1428, 121150030|2|574 of 1949, 121150098|2|3620 of 4605
72	Counties	Sarasota
	Cities	Sarasota|3|23350 of 51917
	Vtd's	121150002|2|3568 of 4037, 121150015|2|608 of 845, 121150024|2|2959 of 3176, 121150025|2|1505 of 6045, 121150030|2|1375 of 1949, 121150085|2|115 of 592
73	Counties	Manatee|3|135,530 of 322,833, Sarasota|5|23,719 of 379,448
	Cities	Bradenton|3|6046 of 49546
	Vtd's	120810031|2|502 of 1374, 120810033|2|2983 of 3001, 120810065|2|21 of 927, 120810066|2|815 of 836, 120810068|2|96 of 219, 120810118|2|779 of 3714, 120810128|2|1018 of 1101
74	Counties	Sarasota
	Cities	North Port, Venice
	Vtd's	121150025|2|4540 of 6045, 121150085|2|477 of 592
75	Counties	Charlotte
	Cities	Punta Gorda
76	Counties	Lee
	Cities	Bonita Springs, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
	Vtd's	120710123|2|1463 of 1471, 120710202|2|6 of 186, 120710286|2|2422 of 5442, 120710296|2|680 of 908
77	Counties	Lee
	Cities	Cape Coral
	Vtd's	120710011|2|1425 of 1440, 120710061|2|687 of 914, 120710095|2|128 of 2964, 120710146|2|42 of 47, 120710296|2|228 of 908

H000H9027 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).		
78	Counties	Lee
	Cities	Fort Myers
	Vtd's	120710011|2|15 of 1440, 120710061|2|227 of 914, 120710072|2|877 of 2853, 120710095|2|2836 of 2964, 120710099|2|61 of 2076, 120710146|2|5 of 47, 120710195|2|1187 of 3075, 120710262|2|173 of 10848
79	Counties	Lee
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120710072|2|1976 of 2853, 120710099|2|2015 of 2076, 120710123|2|8 of 1471, 120710195|2|1888 of 3075, 120710202|2|180 of 186, 120710262|2|10675 of 10848, 120710286|2|3020 of 5442
80	Counties	Collier|3|116,497 of 321,520, Hendry
	Cities	Clewiston, LaBelle
	Vtd's	120210030|2|891 of 1355, 120210076|2|2747 of 3706, 120210092|2|1948 of 2268
81	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Belle Glade, Pahokee, South Bay
	Vtd's	120990352|2|2 of 316
82	Counties	Martin|2|88,966 of 146,318, Palm Beach|9|67,567 of 1,320,134
	Cities	Jupiter|2|50622 of 55156, Jupiter Inlet Colony, Jupiter Island, Tequesta
	Vtd's	120850007|2|3880 of 3883, 120990117|2|1710 of 1726, 120990119|2|29 of 177
83	Counties	Martin|2|57,352 of 146,318, St. Lucie|4|99,018 of 277,789
	Cities	Ocean Breeze Park, Port St. Lucie|2|97459 of 164603, Sewall's Point, Stuart
	Vtd's	120850007|2|3 of 3883, 121110030|2|2691 of 3342, 121110047|2|1 of 5789, 121110063|2|2 of 5616, 121110066|2|22 of 2757, 121110079|2|5301 of 5359
84	Counties	St. Lucie
	Cities	Fort Pierce, Port St. Lucie|2|67144 of 164603
	Vtd's	121110002|2|2998 of 3016, 121110020|2|1607 of 4093, 121110024|2|1994 of 3462, 121110027|2|425 of 1142, 121110030|2|651 of 3342, 121110047|2|5788 of 5789, 121110049|3|150 of 535, 121110053|2|3 of 470, 121110054|2|680 of 2929, 121110063|2|5614 of 5616, 121110066|2|2735 of 2757, 121110079|2|58 of 5359
85	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Juno Beach, Jupiter|2|4534 of 55156, North Palm Beach, Palm Beach Gardens, West Palm Beach|5|21978 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990117|2|16 of 1726, 120990119|2|148 of 177, 120990758|2|1 of 1365
86	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Greenacres|3|678 of 37573, Haverhill, Loxahatchee Groves, Royal Palm Beach, Wellington, West Palm Beach|5|15 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990257|2|678 of 690, 120990352|2|314 of 316, 120990704|2|2768 of 3060, 120990705|2|1940 of 4915, 120990708|2|137 of 919, 120990738|2|2190 of 2198
87	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Cloud Lake, Glen Ridge, Greenacres|3|18986 of 37573, Lake Clarke Shores, Lake Worth|4|14088 of 34910, Palm Springs, West Palm Beach|5|13808 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990244|2|168 of 1581, 120990257|2|12 of 690, 120990338|2|1266 of 2237, 120990340|2|6355 of 6366, 120990704|2|292 of 3060, 120990705|2|2975 of 4915, 120990708|2|782 of 919, 120990738|2|8 of 2198, 120990796|2|583 of 1572, 120990803|2|2784 of 5319
88	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Boynton Beach|4|20922 of 68217, Delray Beach|3|13478 of 60522, Lake Park, Lake Worth|4|13599 of 34910, Lantana|2|4654 of 10423, Mangonia Park, Riviera Beach|2|28909 of 32488, West Palm Beach|5|58368 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990244|2|1413 of 1581, 120990246|2|844 of 2542, 120990249|2|1116 of 2166, 120990251|2|858 of 2163, 120990409|2|262 of 2173, 120990758|2|1364 of 1365, 120990794|2|1051 of 1593, 120990795|2|1017 of 2172, 120990796|2|989 of 1572, 120990803|2|2535 of 5319

H000H9027 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).		
89	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Boca Raton|2|57934 of 84392, Boynton Beach|4|12058 of 68217, Briny Breezes, Delray Beach|3|40505 of 60522, Gulf Stream, Highland Beach, Hypoluxo, Lake Worth|4|4601 of 34910, Lantana|2|5769 of 10423, Manalapan, Ocean Ridge, Palm Beach, Palm Beach Shores, Riviera Beach|2|3579 of 32488, South Palm Beach, West Palm Beach|5|5750 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990246|2|1698 of 2542, 120990249|2|1050 of 2166, 120990251|2|1305 of 2163, 120990442|2|1675 of 2028, 120990490|2|398 of 3146, 120990794|2|542 of 1593, 120990795|2|1155 of 2172
90	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Atlantis, Boynton Beach|4|21653 of 68217, Greenacres|3|17909 of 37573, Lake Worth|4|2622 of 34910
	Vtd's	120990338|2|971 of 2237, 120990340|2|11 of 6366, 120990402|2|554 of 1030
91	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Boca Raton|2|26458 of 84392, Boynton Beach|4|13584 of 68217, Delray Beach|3|6539 of 60522, Golf
	Vtd's	120990402|2|476 of 1030, 120990409|2|1911 of 2173, 120990442|2|353 of 2028, 120990490|2|2748 of 3146
92	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Deerfield Beach|2|60139 of 75018, Fort Lauderdale|5|5864 of 165521, Lauderdale Lakes|3|4692 of 32593, Margate|3|5583 of 53284, North Lauderdale|2|2151 of 41023, Oakland Park|3|23079 of 41363, Pompano Beach|2|50694 of 99845, Tamarac|3|2206 of 60427
	Vtd's	120110010|2|1509 of 1634, 120110126|2|2318 of 2507, 120110233|2|1233 of 5569
93	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Deerfield Beach|2|14879 of 75018, Fort Lauderdale|5|66540 of 165521, Hillsboro Beach, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Lighthouse Point, Oakland Park|3|5674 of 41363, Pompano Beach|2|49151 of 99845, Sea Ranch Lakes, Wilton Manors|2|2626 of 11632
	Vtd's	120110010|2|125 of 1634
94	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Fort Lauderdale|5|80159 of 165521, Lauderdale Lakes|3|13348 of 32593, Lauderhill|2|14592 of 66887, Lazy Lake, Oakland Park|3|12610 of 41363, Plantation|5|20360 of 84955, Wilton Manors|2|9006 of 11632
	Vtd's	120110126|2|189 of 2507, 120110299|2|1084 of 1722, 120110358|2|3158 of 3495, 120110366|2|1240 of 2250, 120110371|2|1651 of 3014, 120110381|2|2617 of 2727
95	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Lauderdale Lakes|3|14553 of 32593, Lauderhill|2|52295 of 66887, Margate|3|3469 of 53284, North Lauderdale|2|38872 of 41023, Plantation|5|936 of 84955, Sunrise|3|28191 of 84439, Tamarac|3|16566 of 60427
	Vtd's	120110233|2|4336 of 5569, 120110247|2|2171 of 3197, 120110299|2|638 of 1722, 120110329|2|179 of 1445, 120110358|2|337 of 3495
96	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Coconut Creek, Coral Springs|2|33396 of 121096, Margate|3|44232 of 53284, Parkland
97	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Coral Springs|2|87700 of 121096, Plantation|5|3934 of 84955, Sunrise|3|22409 of 84439, Tamarac|3|41655 of 60427
	Vtd's	120110247|2|1026 of 3197, 120110333|2|2212 of 3297
98	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Davie|3|64218 of 91992, Plantation|5|57105 of 84955, Sunrise|3|33839 of 84439
	Vtd's	120110329|2|1266 of 1445, 120110333|2|1085 of 3297, 120110366|2|1010 of 2250, 120110371|2|1363 of 3014, 120110381|2|110 of 2727, 120110615|2|1159 of 1259
99	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Cooper City, Dania Beach|2|21665 of 29639, Davie|3|24564 of 91992, Fort Lauderdale|5|12958 of 165521, Hollywood|3|38130 of 140768, Pembroke Pines|4|16320 of 154750, Plantation|5|2620 of 84955, Southwest Ranches|2|2058 of 7345

H000H9027 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	120110609|3|1445 of 2927, 120110614|2|1100 of 1413, 120110615|2|100 of 1259
100	Counties	Broward|14|66,325 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade|18|88,459 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Aventura, Bal Harbour, Bay Harbor Islands, Dania Beach|2|7974 of 29639, Fort Lauderdale|5|0 of 165521, Golden Beach, Hallandale Beach|2|25370 of 37113, Hollywood|3|32981 of 140768, Indian Creek, North Miami|3|9175 of 58786, North Miami Beach|2|7800 of 41523, Sunny Isles Beach, Surfside
101	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Hallandale Beach|2|11743 of 37113, Hollywood|3|69657 of 140768, Miramar|4|32153 of 122041, Pembroke Park, Pembroke Pines|4|21077 of 154750, West Park
	Vtd's	120110784|2|1679 of 3372
102	Counties	Broward|14|69,243 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade|18|88,040 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Miami Gardens|3|66994 of 107167, Miramar|4|33202 of 122041, Pembroke Pines|4|36041 of 154750
	Vtd's	120110772|2|1560 of 6836, 120110784|2|1693 of 3372, 120860275|2|3127 of 3129
103	Counties	Broward|14|39,835 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade|18|115,998 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Doral|4|8309 of 45704, Hialeah|4|49060 of 224669, Hialeah Gardens, Medley|2|167 of 838, Miami Lakes|2|15265 of 29361, Miramar|4|39835 of 122041
	Vtd's	120110772|2|5276 of 6836
104	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Davie|3|3210 of 91992, Pembroke Pines|4|81312 of 154750, Southwest Ranches|2|5287 of 7345, Weston
	Vtd's	120110609|3|1482 of 2927, 120110614|2|313 of 1413
105	Counties	Broward|14|16,851 of 1,748,066, Collier|3|49,635 of 321,520, Miami-Dade|18|89,040 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Doral|4|24482 of 45704, Miramar|4|16851 of 122041, Sweetwater|2|11656 of 13499
	Vtd's	120210076|2|959 of 3706, 120210112|2|2056 of 4281, 120210127|2|75 of 997, 120210140|2|102 of 394, 120860601|3|115 of 4152
106	Counties	Collier
	Cities	Everglades, Marco Island, Naples
	Vtd's	120210030|2|464 of 1355, 120210092|2|320 of 2268, 120210112|2|2225 of 4281, 120210127|2|922 of 997, 120210140|2|292 of 394
107	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Miami Gardens|3|29682 of 107167, North Miami|3|20137 of 58786, North Miami Beach|2|33723 of 41523
	Vtd's	120860158|2|1651 of 1658, 120860196|2|977 of 1498
108	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Biscayne Park, El Portal, Miami|7|53949 of 399457, Miami Shores, North Miami|3|29474 of 58786
	Vtd's	120860158|2|7 of 1658, 120860196|2|521 of 1498, 120860300|2|5 of 3380, 120860318|2|1482 of 3361, 120860778|2|1527 of 1598, 120860784|2|2815 of 2827, 120860790|3|1580 of 1988, 120860797|2|1763 of 2997
109	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Hialeah|4|459 of 224669, Miami|7|67560 of 399457, Miami Gardens|3|10491 of 107167, Opa-locka
	Vtd's	120860275|2|2 of 3129, 120860300|2|3375 of 3380, 120860318|2|1879 of 3361, 120860422|2|454 of 3368, 120860584|2|5 of 2534, 120860778|2|71 of 1598, 120860784|2|12 of 2827, 120860790|3|408 of 1988, 120860797|2|1234 of 2997, 120860909|2|30 of 458, 120860919|2|2835 of 2838, 120860921|2|353 of 2236
110	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Hialeah|4|91335 of 224669, Medley|2|671 of 838, Miami Lakes|2|14096 of 29361
	Vtd's	120860471|2|4203 of 5834
111	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Hialeah|4|83815 of 224669, Miami|7|52108 of 399457, Miami Springs, Virginia Gardens

H000H9027 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	120860422|2|2914 of 3368, 120860471|2|1631 of 5834, 120860584|2|2529 of 2534, 120860909|2|428 of 458, 120860921|2|1883 of 2236, 120861429|2|179 of 831
112	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Coral Gables|2|14238 of 46780, Key Biscayne, Miami|7|127490 of 399457
	Vtd's	120860829|2|408 of 4462, 120860842|2|608 of 2725, 120860856|2|2260 of 4502, 120860857|2|281 of 531, 120860861|2|731 of 7557, 120860862|2|504 of 7746, 120860863|2|4856 of 7077, 120860865|2|1745 of 3088, 120860926|2|792 of 2785, 120860927|2|3165 of 4168, 120860928|2|357 of 1832, 120860982|2|314 of 320
113	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Miami|7|61520 of 399457, Miami Beach, North Bay Village
	Vtd's	120860829|2|4054 of 4462, 120860842|2|2117 of 2725, 120860861|2|6826 of 7557, 120860862|2|7242 of 7746, 120860863|2|2221 of 7077, 120860865|2|1343 of 3088, 120860919|2|3 of 2838
114	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Coral Gables|2|32542 of 46780, Cutler Bay, Miami|7|34364 of 399457, Palmetto Bay|2|447 of 23410, Pinecrest|2|6377 of 18223, South Miami|2|10817 of 11657, West Miami
	Vtd's	120860669|2|2272 of 5187, 120860849|2|3995 of 4963, 120860856|2|2242 of 4502, 120860857|2|250 of 531, 120860926|2|1993 of 2785, 120860927|2|1003 of 4168, 120860928|2|1475 of 1832, 120860930|2|3602 of 4074, 120860982|2|6 of 320, 120861189|2|84 of 1424, 120861428|2|2322 of 2326, 120861429|2|652 of 831
115	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Doral|4|4035 of 45704, Miami|7|2466 of 399457, Palmetto Bay|2|22963 of 23410, Pinecrest|2|11846 of 18223, South Miami|2|840 of 11657
	Vtd's	120860601|3|4035 of 4152, 120860615|2|2499 of 2550, 120860669|2|2915 of 5187, 120860849|2|968 of 4963, 120860930|2|472 of 4074, 120861043|2|2062 of 2631, 120861189|2|1340 of 1424, 120861428|2|4 of 2326
116	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Doral|4|8878 of 45704, Sweetwater|2|1843 of 13499
	Vtd's	120860601|3|2 of 4152, 120860615|2|51 of 2550, 120861043|2|569 of 2631
117	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Florida City, Homestead|2|33998 of 60512
	Vtd's	120861220|2|2183 of 7982, 120861255|2|633 of 1693, 120861338|2|1418 of 1580, 120861339|2|2585 of 2719, 120861360|2|4 of 144
118	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120860734|2|12 of 1296
119	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120860734|2|1284 of 1296
120	Counties	Miami-Dade|18|81,834 of 2,496,435, Monroe
	Cities	Homestead|2|26514 of 60512, Islamorada, Village of Islands, Key Colony Beach, Key West, Layton, Marathon
	Vtd's	120861220|2|5799 of 7982, 120861255|2|1060 of 1693, 120861338|2|162 of 1580, 120861339|2|134 of 2719, 120861360|2|140 of 144

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HJR 6013 PCB HRS 12-05 Joint Resolution of Apportionment
SPONSOR(S): House Redistricting Subcommittee, Schenck
TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** HJR 6001 HJR 6009 HJR 6011 CS/SJR 1176 SJR 1628

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
Orig. Comm.: House Redistricting Subcommittee	12 Y, 3 N	Takacs	Kelly
1) Redistricting Committee		Takacs	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 H000H9031: This proposed committee bill (joint resolution) reapportions the resident population of Florida into 120 State House districts, as required by state and federal law.

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

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

- Reduce the number of counties split from 46 to 30;
- Reduce the number of cities split from 170 to 91;
- Reduce the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Reduce the distance and drive time to travel the average district;
- Reduce the total population deviation from 81.58% to 3.97%; and
- Maintain and possibly increase numbers of elected representation for African-American and Hispanic Floridians.

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 (~~p~~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 ~~o~~ne-person, one vote," such that each district must be substantially equal in total population.

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

Table 1. Florida House Districts 2002-2011

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

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
1	134,020	834	0.6%	159,402	2,724	1.7%
2	132,612	-574	-0.4%	139,453	-17,225	-11.0%
3	132,921	-265	-0.2%	126,253	-30,425	-19.4%
4	133,438	252	0.2%	144,198	-12,480	-8.0%
5	132,940	-246	-0.2%	154,014	-2,664	-1.7%
6	133,583	397	0.3%	147,936	-8,742	-5.6%
7	133,222	36	0.0%	169,309	12,631	8.1%
8	133,335	149	0.1%	152,934	-3,744	-2.4%
9	133,815	629	0.5%	147,197	-9,481	-6.1%
10	133,367	181	0.1%	151,214	-5,464	-3.5%
11	134,465	1,279	1.0%	163,223	6,545	4.2%
12	132,062	-1,124	-0.8%	159,354	2,676	1.7%
13	132,396	-790	-0.6%	195,431	38,753	24.7%
14	131,893	-1,293	-1.0%	134,417	-22,261	-14.2%
15	131,954	-1,232	-0.9%	124,511	-32,167	-20.5%

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
61	132,901	-285	-0.2%	242,396	85,718	54.7%
62	132,243	-943	-0.7%	162,165	5,487	3.5%
63	134,713	1,527	1.1%	156,183	-495	-0.3%
64	133,177	-9	0.0%	165,492	8,814	5.6%
65	133,436	250	0.2%	179,502	22,824	14.6%
66	134,437	1,251	0.9%	162,026	5,348	3.4%
67	133,046	-140	-0.1%	241,034	84,356	53.8%
68	131,868	-1,318	-1.0%	128,684	-27,994	-17.9%
69	134,830	1,644	1.2%	132,224	-24,454	-15.6%
70	132,331	-855	-0.6%	150,125	-6,553	-4.2%
71	133,334	148	0.1%	183,147	26,469	16.9%
72	133,199	13	0.0%	167,184	10,506	6.7%
73	133,440	254	0.2%	189,406	32,728	20.9%
74	133,276	90	0.1%	182,460	25,782	16.5%
75	133,374	188	0.1%	174,874	18,196	11.6%

16	131,880	-1,306	-1.0%	140,428	-16,250	-10.4%
17	131,971	-1,215	-0.9%	161,943	5,265	3.4%
18	131,882	-1,304	-1.0%	161,190	4,512	2.9%
19	134,499	1,313	1.0%	175,628	18,950	12.1%
20	132,090	-1,096	-0.8%	201,953	45,275	28.9%
21	134,384	1,198	0.9%	145,063	-11,615	-7.4%
22	133,859	673	0.5%	176,739	20,061	12.8%
23	134,120	934	0.7%	142,648	-14,030	-9.0%
24	134,662	1,476	1.1%	166,317	9,639	6.2%
25	134,252	1,066	0.8%	179,031	22,353	14.3%
26	134,314	1,128	0.8%	165,010	8,332	5.3%
27	132,503	-683	-0.5%	131,755	-24,923	-15.9%
28	133,183	-3	0.0%	154,175	-2,503	-1.6%
29	133,692	506	0.4%	160,290	3,612	2.3%
30	132,532	-654	-0.5%	180,594	23,916	15.3%
31	133,546	360	0.3%	138,215	-18,463	-11.8%
32	131,310	-1,876	-1.4%	177,523	20,845	13.3%
33	132,100	-1,086	-0.8%	196,662	39,984	25.5%
34	133,372	186	0.1%	144,119	-12,559	-8.0%
35	134,235	1,049	0.8%	154,735	-1,943	-1.2%
36	134,498	1,312	1.0%	157,126	448	0.3%
37	133,762	576	0.4%	135,554	-21,124	-13.5%
38	133,604	418	0.3%	162,248	5,570	3.6%
39	132,057	-1,129	-0.8%	132,191	-24,487	-15.6%
40	131,857	-1,329	-1.0%	149,664	-7,014	-4.5%
41	132,515	-671	-0.5%	252,332	95,654	61.1%
42	133,934	748	0.6%	214,866	58,188	37.1%
43	133,261	75	0.1%	162,052	5,374	3.4%
44	133,585	399	0.3%	171,652	14,974	9.6%
45	132,702	-484	-0.4%	146,618	-10,060	-6.4%
46	133,040	-146	-0.1%	142,772	-13,906	-8.9%
47	133,784	598	0.4%	157,056	378	0.2%
48	133,784	598	0.4%	136,924	-19,754	-12.6%
49	134,665	1,479	1.1%	172,598	15,920	10.2%
50	133,105	-81	-0.1%	131,026	-25,652	-16.4%
51	133,050	-136	-0.1%	129,144	-27,534	-17.6%
52	133,467	281	0.2%	139,789	-16,889	-10.8%
53	133,941	755	0.6%	133,115	-23,563	-15.0%
54	133,208	22	0.0%	130,417	-26,261	-16.8%
55	132,050	-1,136	-0.9%	133,112	-23,566	-15.0%
56	132,935	-251	-0.2%	192,632	35,954	22.9%
57	134,916	1,730	1.3%	148,460	-8,218	-5.2%
58	131,681	-1,505	-1.1%	131,897	-24,781	-15.8%
59	133,579	393	0.3%	141,651	-15,027	-9.6%
60	132,203	-983	-0.7%	162,605	5,927	3.8%
76	132,709	-477	-0.4%	149,992	-6,686	-4.3%
77	131,816	-1,370	-1.0%	147,455	-9,223	-5.9%
78	132,858	-328	-0.2%	156,153	-525	-0.3%
79	133,830	644	0.5%	187,203	30,525	19.5%
80	134,325	1,139	0.9%	148,503	-8,175	-5.2%
81	132,970	-216	-0.2%	201,633	44,955	28.7%
82	133,132	-54	0.0%	172,265	15,587	9.9%
83	133,850	664	0.5%	168,377	11,699	7.5%
84	132,198	-988	-0.7%	144,934	-11,744	-7.5%
85	132,080	-1,106	-0.8%	193,827	37,149	23.7%
86	133,526	340	0.3%	142,110	-14,568	-9.3%
87	133,861	675	0.5%	137,131	-19,547	-12.5%
88	134,078	892	0.7%	164,967	8,289	5.3%
89	133,810	624	0.5%	140,077	-16,601	-10.6%
90	134,668	1,482	1.1%	142,553	-14,125	-9.0%
91	132,744	-442	-0.3%	129,999	-26,679	-17.0%
92	134,594	1,408	1.1%	133,187	-23,491	-15.0%
93	131,438	-1,748	-1.3%	131,283	-25,395	-16.2%
94	132,783	-403	-0.3%	135,245	-21,433	-13.7%
95	134,393	1,207	0.9%	134,355	-22,323	-14.2%
96	132,697	-489	-0.4%	140,377	-16,301	-10.4%
97	132,239	-947	-0.7%	169,848	13,170	8.4%
98	135,043	1,857	1.4%	134,942	-21,736	-13.9%
99	134,167	981	0.7%	137,645	-19,033	-12.1%
100	132,197	-989	-0.7%	137,630	-19,048	-12.2%
101	133,642	456	0.3%	189,600	32,922	21.0%
102	133,470	284	0.2%	160,952	4,274	2.7%
103	133,827	641	0.5%	138,339	-18,339	-11.7%
104	132,832	-354	-0.3%	137,432	-19,246	-12.3%
105	133,173	-13	0.0%	151,273	-5,405	-3.4%
106	133,343	157	0.1%	150,952	-5,726	-3.7%
107	132,275	-911	-0.7%	156,177	-501	-0.3%
108	132,309	-877	-0.7%	132,251	-24,427	-15.6%
109	132,383	-803	-0.6%	135,230	-21,448	-13.7%
110	132,082	-1,104	-0.8%	132,138	-24,540	-15.7%
111	132,608	-578	-0.4%	139,430	-17,248	-11.0%
112	131,626	-1,560	-1.2%	210,556	53,878	34.4%
113	132,604	-582	-0.4%	136,597	-20,081	-12.8%
114	133,225	39	0.0%	133,125	-23,553	-15.0%
115	133,225	39	0.0%	135,054	-21,624	-13.8%
116	133,596	410	0.3%	134,681	-21,997	-14.0%
117	132,921	-265	-0.2%	150,960	-5,718	-3.6%
118	133,178	-8	0.0%	162,848	6,170	3.9%
119	133,349	163	0.1%	154,679	-1,999	-1.3%
120	133,507	321	0.2%	170,078	13,400	8.6%

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., Growe 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.

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]

[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).
[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).

For state legislative districts, the courts have permitted a greater population deviation amongst districts. The populations of state legislative districts must be ~~"s~~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 ~~"b~~based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy,"[9] including ~~"th~~e 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 it 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 ~~"m~~inority 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 ~~"m~~ajority-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 ~~"m~~inority 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.

~~"M~~inority access" though is more jargon than meaningful in a legal context. There are two types of districts that fall under the definition. A ~~"c~~rossover 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 ~~"c~~oalitional 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

[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.

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 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 injury from the

[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).
[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.

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 J*ohnson 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 ~~e~~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. ~~A~~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 ~~s~~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 scrutiny[29] test. The Court found that the district in question, ~~a~~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 ~~c~~ould 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 ~~b~~right line" distinction between majority-minority districts and other minority ~~c~~rossover" or ~~i~~nfluence districts. The Court ~~c~~oncluded 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:

> ~~M~~uch 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

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

> 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. ~~T~~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 ~~c~~covered jurisdictions" to obtain federal preclearance of any new enactment of or amendment to a ~~v~~oting qualification o 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 ~~d~~oes 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 ~~i~~nsure 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 ~~t~~he 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. ~~T~~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]

---

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

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 of 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 Population[43]

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

[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.

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 Population[44]

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 ~~t~~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 ~~c~~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 ~~s~~how, 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 ~~p~~laintiff must prove that the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles…to racial considerations."[49] If the plaintiff meets this burden, ~~t~~he State must demonstrate that its districting legislation is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling interest,"[50] i.e. ~~n~~narrowly tailored" to achieve that singular compelling state interest.

While compliance with federal antidiscrimination laws—specifically, the Voting Rights Act—is a ~~v~~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 ~~s~~trong basis in evidence" for concluding that a majority-minority district is ~~r~~easonably necessary" to comply with Section 2; (ii) the race-based districting ~~s~~ubstantially addresses" the Section 2 violation; and (iii) the district does ~~n~~ot subordinate traditional districting

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

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.[5556] 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. 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

[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.

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 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:

---

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

—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]

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]

---

[63] Article III, Sections 20(b) and 21(b), Florida Constitution.
[64] Article III, Sections 20(c) and 21(c), Florida Constitution.
[65] In *Hartung v. Bradbury*, 33 P.3d 972, 987 (Or. 2001), the court held that —the mere fact that a particular reapportionment may result in a shift in political control of some legislative districts (assuming that every registered voter votes along party lines)," does not show that a redistricting plan was drawn with an improper intent. It is well recognized that political consequences are inseparable from the redistricting process. In *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 343 (2004) (Souter, J., dissenting) (—The choice to draw a district line one way, not another, always carries some consequence for politics, save in a mythical State with voters of every political identity distributed in an absolutely gray uniformity.").
[66] *Compare id*. with 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(b).

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 ~~d~~do not have a retrogressive effect."[67]

> ~~P~~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 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 ~~c~~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 ~~r~~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

---

[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)).
[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).

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]

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:

---

[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 Counsel was created within the geographic boundaries of each of the five district courts of appeal."); *A. Duda and Sons, Inc. v. St. Johns River Water Management Dist.*, 17 So.3d 738, 740 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (~~"~~Cocoa Ranch, is over 18,000 acres and is located within the [St. Johns River Water Management] District's geographical boundaries.").
[83] *E.g., Sbarra v. Florida Dept. of Corrections*, 2009 WL 4400112, 1 (N.D. Fla. 2009) (~~"~~Lee County is within the geographic bounds of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida."); *Benedict v. General Motors Corp.*, 142 F.Supp.2d 1330, 1333 (N.D. Fla. 2001) (~~"~~This was part of the traditional approach of obtaining jurisdiction through service of process within the geographic boundaries of the state at issue.").
[84] *Reynolds v. Sims,* 377 U.S. 533, 580 (1964)
[85] *Bd. of Ed. of Oklahoma City Pub. Sch., Indep. Dist. No. 89, Oklahoma County, Okl. v. Dowell,* 375 F.2d 158, 170 n.4 (10th Cir. 1967),
[86] *Moore v. Itawamba County, Miss.*, 431 F.3d 257, 260 (5th Cir. 2005).

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 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.

[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.*

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 H000H9031: Effect of Proposed Changes

Redistricting Plan Summary Statistics for the Proposed State House Map

Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000H9031

Plan File Name: H000H9031	
Plan Population Fundamentals	
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310
Ideal District Population::	156,677
District Population Remainder:	70
District Population Range:	153,748 to 159,978
District Deviation Range:	(-2,929) To 3,301
Deviation:	(-1.86) To 2.10 Total 3.97%

Plan Type: House - 120 Districts	
Plan Geography Fundamentals:	
Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481
Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)
County or District Split :	30 Split of 67 used
City or District Split :	91 Split of 411 used
VTD's Split :	516 Split of 9,436 used

Number of Districts by Race Language					
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+
Current Black VAP	23	17	13	11	3
New Black VAP	21	17	13	12	2
Current Hisp VAP	39	22	16	13	11
New Hisp VAP	35	23	19	16	11

Plan Name:	H000H9031			Number of Districts				120							
Spatial Measurements - Map Based															
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
H9031-Map	12,791	65,934	19.40%	12,553	184,342	6.80%	98.13%	35.76%	10,078	86,990	11.58%	78.78%	75.79%	3,144	2,825	6,289
Current Map	16,491	65,913	25.01%	13,683	231,091	5.92%	82.97%	28.52%	10,728	100,440	10.68%	65.05%	65.62%	3,321	3,199	6,643
H9031-Simple	11,804	65,848	17.92%				106.34%	35.72%				85.37%	75.69%			
Current Map	14,650	65,813	22.26%				93.40%	28.47%				73.22%	65.52%			

	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route				Minutes to drive by fastest route			
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic
H9031-Map	9	9	9	7	14	14	12	11	22	22	20	19
Current Map	12	12	11	10	17	17	15	14	26	26	23	22

District-by-District Summary Statistics for the Proposed State House Map[90]

District ID	Pop Dev	TPOP10	%AllBlkVAP10	%AllHispVAP10	%HaitianPOPACS
1	-561	156,116	20.08	3.76	0.35
2	-558	156,119	20.31	4.75	0.27
3	2,120	158,797	6.04	3.57	0.10
4	2,104	158,781	9.88	6.27	0.04
5	2,521	159,198	13.78	3.73	0.23
6	2,589	159,266	10.83	4.16	0.21
7	-489	156,188	21.62	4.38	0.19
8	-435	156,242	50.01	6.74	0.90
9	-628	156,049	15.80	4.82	0.23
10	-254	156,423	16.71	5.03	0.16
11	-880	155,797	8.65	4.30	0.13
12	-791	155,886	13.61	8.88	0.31
13	-28	156,649	50.82	5.81	0.84
14	-474	156,203	52.51	4.48	0.57
15	-1,056	155,621	16.74	7.35	0.49
16	78	156,755	12.83	8.68	0.11
17	1,249	157,926	5.39	4.66	0.13
18	-1,581	155,096	13.65	6.92	0.51
19	-1,823	154,854	14.67	5.42	0.02
20	179	156,856	31.20	7.73	0.69
21	241	156,918	8.70	7.76	0.23
22	-1,951	154,726	8.68	11.15	0.31
23	-1,071	155,606	8.21	7.63	0.03
24	1,219	157,896	8.13	7.77	0.33
25	-1,403	155,274	3.07	3.45	0.14
26	-2,555	154,122	21.02	6.88	0.49
27	-1,567	155,110	7.48	17.85	0.62
28	-640	156,037	10.84	14.91	0.18
29	1,670	158,347	12.06	14.94	0.22
30	2,612	159,289	12.44	14.59	0.78
31	-272	156,405	7.59	6.72	0.26
32	494	157,171	9.71	16.66	0.61
33	-195	156,482	8.35	4.77	0.22
34	466	157,143	2.64	4.17	0.03
35	194	156,871	5.13	9.10	0.14
36	-1,830	154,847	2.49	7.76	0.02
37	-1,684	154,993	3.20	8.76	0.08
38	-1,820	154,857	7.33	13.10	0.18
39	-1,104	155,573	7.73	14.99	0.43

[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 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.

40	-1,649	155,028	15.98	11.41	0.32
41	-1,283	155,394	15.71	14.69	1.82
42	-1,762	154,915	11.52	24.76	0.88
43	886	157,563	15.48	54.95	1.91
44	552	157,229	16.80	29.91	3.95
45	1,833	158,510	18.71	19.74	0.94
46	0	156,677	61.04	13.50	8.36
47	379	157,056	16.48	19.56	2.26
48	-248	156,429	12.41	52.44	1.24
49	2,080	158,757	10.44	23.47	0.47
50	2,247	158,924	10.14	18.66	0.20
51	2,729	159,406	10.26	5.59	0.21
52	2,975	159,652	5.78	6.26	0.18
53	2,737	159,414	12.49	10.17	1.66
54	-624	156,053	8.76	8.68	0.69
55	-795	155,882	8.51	15.96	0.35
56	-1,777	154,900	11.96	22.82	0.21
57	741	157,418	9.74	17.07	0.16
58	1,891	158,568	12.90	20.02	0.54
59	1,555	158,232	14.17	18.91	0.45
60	1,840	158,517	7.13	15.97	0.33
61	2,844	159,521	51.26	20.60	1.95
62	1,776	158,453	12.68	51.89	0.41
63	1,495	158,172	14.19	18.01	0.71
64	1,141	157,818	5.55	14.15	0.27
65	1,192	157,869	2.85	5.33	0.02
66	1,901	158,578	5.85	5.23	0.01
67	1,747	158,424	7.36	11.26	0.05
68	1,874	158,551	5.88	7.12	0.05
69	2,233	158,910	4.04	6.31	0.12
70	-2,633	154,044	45.09	15.35	1.20
71	1,917	158,594	4.28	9.54	0.80
72	2,490	159,167	2.70	8.93	0.19
73	2,572	159,249	3.71	7.19	0.63
74	1,287	157,964	2.56	3.95	0.61
75	3,301	159,978	5.45	4.67	0.75
76	-2,925	153,752	1.39	8.96	0.02
77	805	157,482	3.98	17.00	0.70
78	-2,905	153,772	13.55	14.28	2.44
79	-2,929	153,748	10.88	21.93	2.02
80	-1,040	155,637	8.74	33.21	2.43
81	129	156,806	17.29	16.89	2.87
82	-144	156,533	4.17	11.50	0.52
83	-307	156,370	11.68	12.77	1.78
84	-147	156,530	18.97	13.65	3.48
85	2,162	158,839	8.69	10.19	1.13

86	107	156,784	16.71	19.48	2.53
87	-37	156,640	15.66	50.02	4.66
88	43	156,720	51.77	14.30	10.83
89	-1,505	155,172	7.60	9.54	3.53
90	-1,693	154,984	13.25	16.76	5.33
91	-55	156,622	4.85	7.19	3.22
92	-1,751	154,926	34.00	17.77	10.58
93	1,138	157,815	5.34	11.18	2.06
94	-316	156,361	54.56	12.05	10.57
95	-1,795	154,882	57.66	16.92	13.01
96	-1,582	155,095	15.82	19.04	3.65
97	-979	155,698	16.88	24.29	1.87
98	-1,495	155,182	12.87	23.72	1.86
99	-946	155,731	12.91	29.12	1.81
100	-1,893	154,784	6.11	34.00	0.76
101	-1,789	154,888	36.37	33.68	6.54
102	606	157,283	52.10	38.05	5.02
103	-844	155,833	10.04	82.09	1.57
104	-1,443	155,234	10.98	43.24	1.67
105	-1,151	155,526	11.20	68.65	2.92
106	-1,289	155,388	2.95	10.25	2.08
107	308	156,985	56.86	26.39	25.55
108	171	156,848	62.88	25.43	25.51
109	-2,556	154,121	50.63	45.74	4.72
110	-1,189	155,488	6.15	89.47	0.78
111	20	156,697	4.67	93.05	0.15
112	-1,782	154,895	4.83	73.01	0.10
113	-109	156,568	6.20	66.76	0.70
114	1,392	158,069	7.13	66.02	0.63
115	-462	156,215	5.69	65.51	0.63
116	888	157,565	3.14	84.57	0.53
117	204	156,881	36.99	55.15	3.58
118	-115	156,562	6.38	81.21	1.01
119	-507	156,170	3.97	86.77	0.49
120	-1,753	154,924	8.97	40.12	2.05

District-by-District Descriptions for the Proposed State House Map

District 1 is located wholly within Escambia County. Its predominant boundaries are the county line for its western, northern and eastern boundaries, while VTDs are used as its southern boundary as it curves around the city boundaries of Pensacola. The district edges around the City of Pensacola in order to keep all of the city within District 2. The Town of Century is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 1 in HPUBH0048, HPUBH0018, and District 2 in HPUBH0138 and others.

District 2 is located in Escambia and Santa Rosa Counties. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs on its northern end in Escambia County, and the county line as its eastern and southern boundaries. In Santa Rosa County, its predominant boundaries are the Santa Rosa Sound to the south, VTDs to the east and US-98 to the northwest. The Cities of Pensacola and Gulf Breeze are kept whole within the

district. This district is very similar to District 2 in HPUBH0048, HPUBH0018, and District 3 in HPUBH0138 and others.

District 3 is located in Santa Rosa and Okaloosa Counties. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs and US-98 to its south in Santa Rosa County, the county/state line to its north in both counties and I-10 to its south in Okaloosa County, with the exception of the City of Crestview on a few surrounding VTDs, which are wholly located in District 4. The Cities of Milton and Laurel Hill are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Jay. While Santa Rosa County may mathematically be able to be kept whole in a House plan by population, it's placement between two counties that are larger in population than the ideal population for a House district makes it impossible for Santa Rosa County to be kept whole. To that end, 85% of the District 3's population is in Santa Rosa County. This district is very similar to District 3 in HPUBH0107, HPUBH0048, and HPUBH0112 and others.

District 4 is located wholly within Okaloosa County. Its predominant boundaries are the county line to its west, south and east, and I-10 to the north, with the exception of the city boundaries of the City of Crestview and VTDs just outside of Crestview, which is wholly located within the district. The Cities of Crestview, Niceville, Valparaiso, Fort Walton Beach and Destin are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Shalimar. The Mayor of Destin testified at the Fort Walton Beach public hearing that the city of Destin should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 4 in HPUBH0107, SPUBH0067, and District 5 in HPUBH0048 and others.

It is important to note that Districts 1-4 we all built in order to have similar population deviations.

District 5 contains all of Walton, Holmes, Washington and Jackson Counties and is also located in Bay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county lines as well as W. Highway 388 and Highway 231 in Bay County. The Cities of Freeport, DeFuniak Springs, Vernon, Bonifay, Chipley, Graceville, Jacob City and Marianna are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Ebro, Paxton, Ponce de Leon, Westville, Caryville, Wausau, Esto, Noma, Alford, Cottondale, Campbellton, Greenwood, Malone, Bascom, Grand Ridge and Sneads. Since Bay County's population is too large to be kept whole within a House district, the remaining population needed to complete the district came from there. An individual at the Panama City public hearing testified that South Walton should be kept together in a district. This district is very similar to District 5 in HPUBH0107, SPUBH0067, and District 6 in HPUBH0048 and others.

District 6 is wholly located within Bay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line/shore line to the west south and east and W. Highway 388 and Highway 231and VTDs to the north. The Cities of Panama City Beach, Lynn Haven, Panama City, Callaway, Parker and Mexico Beach are kept whole within the district. In the Panama City public hearing, we heard testimony from numerous residents wanting to see Bay County kept whole with in a House district. While that is not possible due to the population of the county being more than that of an ideal House district, District 6 is all within the county. The Committee received written testimony saying that Bay County should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 6 in HPUBH0107, SPUBH0074, SPUBH0067 and others.

District 7 contains all of Calhoun, Gulf, Liberty, Franklin and Wakulla Counties and is also located in Leon County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the east, south and west and the county lines and VTDs in Leon County to the north. The Cities of Blountstown, Bristol, Wewahitcka, Port St. Joe, Apalachicola, Carabelle, Sopchoppy, St. Marks and the Town of Altha are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking that Franklin county be grouped with other rural counties. This district is very similar to District 7 in HPUBH0107.

District 8 contains all of Gadsden County and is also located in Leon County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Gadsden County line and VTDs in Leon County. The Cities of Chattahoochee, Gretna, Quincy and Midway are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Greensboro and Havana. This district is very similar to District 8 in SPUBH0156, HPUBH0116, HPUBH0107 and others.

District 9 is wholly located in Leon County. The predominant boundaries for the district are county lines to the north, east and south and the county line and VTDs to the west. This district is very similar to District 9 in HPUBH0018 and HPUBH0107, District 10 in HPUBH0048 and others.

District 10 contains all of Hamilton, Suwannee, Columbia and Baker Counties and is located in Union County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north, east and south and VTDs to the east in Union County. The Cities of Jasper, Live Oak, Lake City and Macclenny are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Jennings and Glen St. Mary. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to keep Columbia and Baker counties whole within a district.

It is important to note that the populations of Nassau and Duval counties combined are mathematically enough for six districts, which are Districts 11-16.

District 11 contains all of Nassau County and portions of Duval County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the Nassau County line to the west, north and east as well as US-9A and Cedar Point Road in Duval County. The Cities of Fernandina Beach, Atlantic Beach, Neptune Beach and Jacksonville Beach are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Callahan and Hilliard. The Committee received public testimony saying that we should keep Nassau County whole within a district.

District 12 is wholly contained within Duval County. Its predominant boundaries are US-9A and Cedar Point Road to the north, I-95 and VTDs to the west, Butler Blvd to the south and VTDs to the east. The district takes up a small amount of geography in an urban area that follows roadways as well as VTDs and railways. This district is very similar to District 15 in HPUBH0112, SPUBH0067, SPUBH0074 and others.

District 13 is wholly contained within Duval County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs in all directions. This district is very similar to District 14 in HPUBH0107 and District 15 in HPUBH0116.

District 14 is wholly contained within Duval County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. Its predominant boundaries are VTDs in all directions. This district is very similar to District 13 in HPUBH0107 and District 14 in HHPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156.

District 15 is located in Duval and Clay Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are Shindler Drive and VTDs to the west, I-10, Roosevelt Blvd and VTDs to the north and VTDs to the east and south. The City of Orange Park is kept whole within the district. During the Jacksonville public hearing, the Committee heard testimony from numerous residents of Clay County expressing their desire that their county be kept whole within a district..

District 16 is wholly contained within Duval County. The predominant boundaries to the district are VTDs to the west and north and the county line to the east and south. This district is very similar to District 14 in HPUBH0018, District 16 in HPUBH0048, and District 39 in HPUBH0027 and others.

District 17 is wholly contained within St. Johns County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and east and VTDs and County Road 214 to the south. The district's boundaries were built in such a way to keep the Cities of St. Augustine and St. Augustine Beach whole within the district. The Committee received testimony in the St. Augustine public hearing from numerous residents asking that St. Johns County be kept whole within a district. St. Johns County's population is too large for a House district, but District 17 was built wholly within the county. The Committee received written testimony that St. Augustine should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 7 in HPUBH0047, District 19 in HPUBH0018, and District 38 in HPUBH0027.

District 18 is located in Duval and Clay Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north and VTDs to the east and south. The Town of Baldwin is kept whole within the district. During the Jacksonville public hearing, the Committee heard testimony from numerous residents of Clay County expressing their desire that their county be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 13 in SPUBH0156.

District 19 contains all of Bradford, Putnam and Union Counties and is located in Clay County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county boundaries to the west, south and east and VTDs, Alligator Blvd., North Road and Sandridge Road to the north in Clay County. The Cities of Lake Butler, Lawtey, Starke, Hampton, Keystone Heights, Green Cove Springs, Palatka and Crescent City are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Worthington Springs, Brooker, Raiford, Penney Farms, Interlachen, Welaka and Pomona Park. The Committee received written testimony saying that Clay County should be split no more than two times. This district is very similar to District 21 in HPUBH0120, HPUBH0126 and others.

District 20 is located in Alachua and Marion Counties. This area has traditionally elected an African-American to the Florida House of Representatives and the district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, the county line to the north, the Alachua County line and N. US Highway 41 in Marion County to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Waldo and Hawthorne are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of LaCrosse, Micanopy, McIntosh and Reddick. This district is very similar to District 23 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 21 contains all of Dixie and Gilchrist Counties and is located in Alachua County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and south and VTDs to the east in Alachua County. The Cities of Trenton, Newberry and High Springs are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Horseshoe Beach, Cross City and Bell. This district is very similar to District 12 in HPUBH0018.

District 22 contains all of Levy and is located Marion County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and south and VTDs to the east in Marion County. The Cities of Chiefland, Cedar Key, Dunnellon and Williston are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Otter Creek, Yankeetown, Inglis and Bronson. The Committee received testimony throughout the public hearings calling for counties to be kept whole when possible. The Committee also received testimony from residents in Marion County calling for two House districts being placed within the county. District 23 is entirely within the county and 74% of District 22‘s population is within Marion County as well.

District 23 is wholly located in Marion County. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west and south and the county line to the north and east. The City of Belleview is kept whole within the district. This district is consistent with testimony that we heard in the Orlando and Gainesville public hearing requesting that Marion County be kept whole within a district. The county‘s population is too large for a House district, but District 23 is wholly located within the county. This district is very similar to District 24 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 24 contains all of Flagler County and is located in St. Johns and Volusia Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west and east and VTDs to the north and south. The district was also built in a way so that the City of Ormond Beach would only be split twice, as opposed to three times. The Cities of Palm Coast and Bunnell are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Hastings, Marineland and Pierson. During the St. Augustine public hearing, the Committee heard from many residents of the area that they would like to see St. Johns and Flagler County linked, keep Flagler County and parts within it (specifically the City of Palm Coast) whole within a district. All of these items that were brought forth by the public are addressed in District 24. This district is very similar to District 8 in HPUBH0047, District 20 in HPUBH0135, District 23 in SPUBH0074 and others.

It is important to note that after areas of Volusia County is assigned to District 24, the population of the county that is remaining is roughly equal to three House districts. Those districts are Districts 25, 26, and 27.

District 25 is wholly within Volusia County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the east, the city boundary for the City of Ormond Beach to the north, Tomoka Farms Road to the west and I-95 and SR 442 to the south. The Cities of Daytona Beach Shores, Port Orange and New Smyrna Beach are kept whole within the district as is the Town of Ponce Inlet. Between Districts 24 and 25, the boundaries were drawn to split the City of Ormond Beach as little as possible as the Committee received testimony asking for it to be kept whole. This district is very similar to District 30 in HPUBH0048.

District 26 is wholly located in Volusia County. This area has traditionally elected an African-American to the Florida House of Representatives and the district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are Clark Bay Road to the west, the county line and the city boundaries of The City of Ormond Beach to the north, the Halifax River to the east and the city boundaries of the City of Port Orange and East New York Avenue to the south. The City of DeLand is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 29 in HPUBH0048.

District 27 is wholly located in Volusia County. Its predominant borders are the county line to the west, south and east and State Road 44 and I-4 to the north. The Cities of DeBary, Deltona and Oak Hill are kept whole within the district. The Committee heard testimony from numerous residents of Deltona asking that they be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 31 in HPUBH0048.

District 28 is wholly within Seminole County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north, east and south and US 17-92 to the west. The Cities of Winter Springs and Oviedo are kept whole within the district. The Committee heard testimony throughout the public hearings requesting that counties be kept whole or split as little as possible.

District 29 is located in Orange and Seminole Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs near Wekiva Springs State Park to the west, the county lines to the north, US 17-92 to the east and Semoran Blvd and State Road 434 to the south. The City of Lake Mary is kept whole in the district. The Committee received written testimony requesting that South Lake County be kept together and that its natural connection to Orlando be considered.

District 30 is located in Orange and Seminole Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line and VTDs to the west, States Road 436 and 434 to the north, S. Winter Park Drive, Lake Howell Road and Semoran Blvd to the east and VTDs to the south. The cities of Winter Park, Eatonville and Maitland kept whole in the district. This district is very similar to District 14 in HPUBH0047.

District 31 is located wholly within Lake County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and east, VTDs to the west and the Florida Turnpike to the south. The Cities of Umatilla, Mount Dora, Eustis and Tavares and the Towns of Howey-in-the-Hills, Astatula and Monteverde are all kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that Mount Dora, Eustis, and Tavares should be in the same district. This district is very similar to District 25 in HPUBH0011, District 35 in HPUBH0107, and District 47 in HPUBH0048 and others.

District 32 is located in Lake and Orange counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and south, the Florida turnpike to the north and S. Apopka Vineland Road to the east. The Cities of Mascotte, Clermont, Bay Lake and Lake Buena Vista are kept whole within the district.

District 33 contains all of Sumter County and is located in Lake and Marion Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Sumter County line to the west and south and VTDs to the north and east. The Cities of Wildwood, Coleman, Bushnell, Webster, Center Hill, Lady Lake and Fruitland Park

are kept whole within the district. The district also contains all of The Villages, which is a large retirement community that spans all three counties. While keeping Sumter County whole within the district it also keeps cities whole and uses the remaining population need to complete the district in a way that was able to keep one district wholly within Marion County and one district wholly within Lake County. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that we should keep all of Lake and Sumter counties, as well as part of Marion County together in a district. The Committee also received verbal and written testimony saying that The Villages should be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 28 in HPUBH0067, HPUBH0134, District 42 in HPUBH0116, and others.

District 34 contains all of Citrus County and is located in Hernando County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north, the Suncoast Parkway and the county line to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Crystal River and Inverness are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that we should consider using the Suncoast Parkway as a boundary. This district is very similar to District 31 in HPUBH0107, District 43 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116, and others.

District 35 is wholly contained with Hernando County. Its predominant boundaries are the county line to the south and east, VTDs to the north and the Suncoast Parkway to the west. The Cities of Brooksville and Weeki Wachee are kept whole within the district. It is important to note that the district's boundaries were built in a manner to keep Weeki Wachee whole. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that we should consider using the Suncoast Parkway as a boundary. This district is very similar to District 33 in HPUBH0107, District 44 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156, and others.

It is important to note that the population of Pasco County is roughly that of three House districts. The Committee received testimony during the Wesley Chapel public hearing calling for three districts that run north to south in Pasco County, to create a western, central and eastern district. Those districts are 36, 37 and 38.

District 36 is wholly within Pasco County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the county line to the north, west and south and Little Road to the east. The Cities of Port Richey and New Port Richey are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 36 in HPUBH0107, District 45 in HPUBH0048, and District 57 in HPUBH0079.

District 37 is wholly within Pasco County. The predominant boundaries for the district are Little Road to the west, the county line to the north and south and VTDs to the east. The committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings that Central Pasco was a unique community. This district is very similar to District 37 in HPUBH0107 and District 44 in HPUBH0048.

District 38 is wholly within Pasco County. The predominant boundaries for the district are VTDs to the west and the county line to the north, south and east. The Cities of Dade City, San Antonio and Zephyrhills are kept whole within the district as is the Town of St. Leo. This district is very similar to District 38 in HPUBH0107 and District 61 in HPUBH0016 and HPUBH0024.

District 39 is located in Polk and Osceola Counties. The predominant boundaries for the district are the Polk and Osceola county lines to the North, the Polk county line to the west, US 17-92 to the south in Polk County, and Poinciana Blvd to the east in Osceola County. The City of Davenport and the Town of Polk City are kept whole in the district. The Committee received written testimony from The City of Davenport requesting that they be placed in a district that is predominantly in Polk County. 88% of District 39's population is in Polk County.

District 40 is wholly within Polk County. The predominant boundaries to the district are the county line to the west, S. Combee Road and Bartow Road to the east, Ewell Road and W. County Road 540A to the south and Desson Road and W. Daughtery Road to the north to create a small, geometric shape. This district is very similar to District 64 in SPUBH0087, SPUBH0067, HPUBH119, and others.

District 41 is wholly within Polk County. The predominant boundaries to the district are S. Combee Road and Bartow Road to the west, US 17-92, VTDs and the county line to the north, VTDs to the east and Thompson Nursery Road to the south. The Cities of Bartow and Eagle Lake and the Towns of Dundee and Lake Hamilton are kept whole in the district. This district is very similar to District 65 in SPUBH0087, HPUBH0134, HPUBH0112, and others.

District 42 is located in Osceola and Polk Counties. The predominant boundaries to the district are the Osceola County line to the north and east, the Osceola and Polk County lines to the south and US-27 and VTDs to the west. The City of St. Cloud is kept whole within the district. The Committee received testimony from the Polk County Commission asking that four House districts have the majority of their populations be in Polk County. Those districts are Districts 39, 40, 41 and 56. District 42 was built in a manner to allow District 56 to have the majority of its population in Polk County.

District 43 is wholly in Osceola County. This area had produced a majority-minority Hispanic district between in and Orange County. After reviewing the demographics of the area, we determined that a majority-minority Hispanic district could be built wholly in Osceola and a second majority-minority Hispanic district could be built in Orange County. The predominant boundaries to District 43 are the county line to the north and south, East Lake Tohopekaliga, the city boundary for the City of Kissimmee and Pleasant Hill Road to the east and Poinciana Road and CR 530 to the west. The City of Kissimmee is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 36 in HPUBH0047 and District 41 in SPUBH0156.

District 44 is wholly located in Orange County. The predominant boundaries of the district are s. Apopka Vineland Road to the west, VTDs to the north, the Florida Turnpike to the east and the county line to the south. The Committee heard testimony throughout the public hearings requesting that counties be kept whole or split as little as possible.

District 45 is wholly located in Orange County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, the county line and VTDs near Wekiwa Springs State Park to the north and VTDs to the east and south. The Town of Oakland is kept whole in the district. This district is very similar to District 38 in HPUBH0037 and HPUBH0116.

District 46 is wholly contained in Orange County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, north, east and south. This district is very similar to District 39 in HPUBH0037, SPUBH0156, and HPUBH0116.

District 47 is wholly located in Orange County. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 423, VTDs, I-4 and US-41 to the west, VTDs to the north, Semoran Blvd to the east and Hoffner Avenue and VTDs to the south. The City of Edge wood is kept whole within the district. The Committee heard testimony throughout the public hearings requesting that counties be kept whole or split as little as possible.

District 48 is wholly located in Orange County. This area had produced a majority-minority Hispanic district between it and Osceola County. After reviewing the demographics of the area, we determined that a majority-minority Hispanic district could be built wholly in Osceola and a second majority-minority Hispanic district could be built in Orange County. The predominant boundaries of the district are US 17-92 and the Florida Turnpike to the west, E. Colonial Drive, Hoffner Avenue and VTDs to the north, VTDs and the boundary to the City of Orlando to the east and the county line to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony during the public hearings saying that a Hispanic majority district in Orange County should be created. This district is very similar to District 1 in HPUBH0101.

District 49 is located in Seminole and Orange Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 436, Dodd Road and Forsythe Road N to the west, Red Bug Lake Road, VTDs and the county line to the north, a railway to the east and VTDs to the south. The Committee received testimony during the Orlando public hearing calling for a University of Central Florida based district.

The entire campus of the university is located within the district as are many of the areas where students live and work.

District 50 is located in Orange and Brevard Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and south, VTDs to the west and east. The City of Titusville is kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony saying that East Orange County should be kept together within a district.

It is important to note that after District 50 includes a portion of Brevard County, the remaining population is roughly that of three House districts. The Committee received testimony calling for three house districts that divide the county into northern, central and southern districts. To that end, Districts 51-53 are those three districts wholly in the county and take a northern, central and southern approach to dividing the county.

District 51 is wholly within Brevard County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and east, the Indian River and the Orange County line to the west and VTDs to the south. It is important to note that the boundaries were built in a manner to keep the City of Cocoa Beach whole within the district. Other cities kept whole in the district are Cocoa, Rockledge and Cape Canaveral. This district is very similar to District 46 in SPUBH0074, HPUBH0134 and others.

District 52 is wholly within Brevard County. The predominant boundaries for the district are VTDs to the north, the county line to the east and west and US 192 and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Satellite Beach and Indian Harbour Beach are kept whole within the district as is the Town of Indialantic. This district is very similar to District 28 in HPUBH0107 and others.

District 53 is wholly within Brevard County. The predominant boundaries for the district are US-192 and VTDs to the north, and the county line to the east, west and south. The Towns of Malabar and Grant-Valkaria are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 48 in SPUBH0087 and others.

District 54 contains all of Indian River County and is located in St. Lucie County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north, east and west and VTDs to the south in St. Lucie County. The Cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian and Vero Beach are kept whole within the district, as are the Towns of Orchid and Indian River Shores. This district is very similar to District 67 in SPUBH0087, HPUBH0119, and HPUBH0112.

District 55 is contains all of Highlands, Glades and Okeechobee Counties and is located in St. Lucie County. The predominant boundaries for the district are the county lines to the north, west and south and VTDs to the east in St. Lucie County. The Cities of Avon Park, Sebring, Okeechobee and Moore Haven are kept whole within the district as is the Town of Lake Placid. St. Lucie County's population is too large for a House district and mathematically had to be split. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings that Highlands County should be in one district and also received verbal testimony at the public hearings saying that Highlands and Glades counties be in the same district. This district is very similar to District 62 in HPUBH0048, District 67 in HPUBH0047, and District 78 in HPUBH0107.

District 56 contains all of DeSoto and Hardee Counties and is located in Polk County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west and south, VTDs to the north and county lines and US Highway 27 to the east, making it near rectangular in shape. The Cities of Mulberry, Fort Meade, Bowling Green, Wauchula and Arcadia are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Zolfo Springs. This district is similar to a district that was requested in the Wauchula public hearing, where a district that has US-17 as a major transportation artery be created. The Committee also received verbal testimony asking that DeSoto County be grouped with Hardee County within a district.

It is important to note that mathematically, the combined populations of Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee and Sarasota Counties is roughly the same as 18 House districts. By segmenting these counties from

the rest of the map, the northern borders of Pinellas and Hillsborough, as well as the eastern borders of Hillsborough, Manatee and Sarasota and the southern border of Sarasota Counties are kept intact. Those districts are Districts 57-74.

District 57 is wholly in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the south and east, State Road 60 West to the north and US Highway 41 and I-75 to the west. This district is very similar to District 70 in SPUBH0067, SPUBH0074, and SPUBH0087.

District 58 is wholly contained in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north and east, State Road 60 and State Road 574 to the south and US Highway 301 and VTDs to the west. It is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep the City of Temple Terrace wholly within the district to the west. The other city kept whole in the district is Plant City. The Committee received written testimony asking that the City of Temple Terrace be kept whole.

District 59 is located wholly in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are US Highway 41 to the west, VTDs and State Road 574 to the north and VTDs to the east and south. This district is also consistent with testimony that we heard in the Tampa public hearing, which requested a district be built that contains the unincorporated areas of Brandon, Valrico and Riverview together. This district is very similar to District 48 in HPUBH0027, HPUBH0045, and HPUBH0079.

District 60 is located wholly in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, a railway, State Road 576 and VTDs to the north, US Highway 41 to the east and Cockroach Bay Road to the south. This district is very similar to District 52 in HPUBH0079, District 57 in HPUBH0037, and District 65 in HPUBH0107.

District 61 is wholly located in Hillsborough County, a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Hillsborough River and N. Armenia Ave. to the west, E. Fletcher Avenue and VTDs to the north, VTDs, US Highway 301 and State Road 574 to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is very similar to District 51 in HPUBH0045, District 59 in SPUBH0156, and District 62 in HPUBH0107 and others.

District 62 is wholly located in Hillsborough County, a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. This area has produced a Hispanic opportunity district in years past and this district improves that opportunity by making it a majority-minority Hispanic district. The predominant boundaries of the district are Memorial Highway and State Road 589 to the west, State Road 587 to the north, the Hillsborough River and N. Armenia Road to the east and W. John F Kennedy Blvd to the south. This district is very similar to District 61 in HPUBH0027, HPUBH0045, and HPUBH0079 and others.

District 63 is wholly located in Hillsborough County. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 597 to the west, the county line to the north, Morris Bridge Road and VTDs to the east and W. Busch Blvd to the south. The Committee received testimony requesting that counties be kept whole and or split as little as possible.

District 64 is located in Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 611 to the west, the county line and Keystone Road to the north, Dale Mabry Highway (State Road 597) to the east and State Road 587, a railway and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Oldsmar and Safety Harbor are kept whole in the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep both cities whole. The Committee received testimony requesting that small cities in Pinellas County be kept whole as well as requesting that Dale Mabry Highway in Hillsborough County be used as a boundary for districts.

District 65 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north, State Road 611 and Keystone Road to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Tarpon Springs and Dunedin are kept whole within the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep Dunedin whole. This district is very similar to District 48 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0107.

It is important to note that when a railway that essentially bisects the peninsula of Pinellas County in half, four district that are mainly the northwest, northeast, southwest and southeast quadrants of the peninsula can be created. Those districts are Districts 66-69.

District 66 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, VTDs to the north, South Missouri Avenue and a railway to the east and Park Blvd N to the south. The Cities of Belleair Beach, Belleair Bluffs, Indian Rocks Beach and Seminole are kept whole in the district as are the Towns of Belleair Shore and Belleair. It is important to note that the district's boundary to the south was built in a manner to keep the City of Seminole whole. This district is very similar to District 54 in SPUBH0156.

District 67 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the S. Missouri Avenue and a railway to the west, VTDs to the north, VTDs and the county line to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is very similar to District 50 in SPUBH0156 and District 56 in HPUBH0048.

District 68 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the railway to the west, VTDs to the north and south and the county line to the east. This district is very similar to District 52 in SPUBH0156, District 65 in HPUBH0079 and others.

District 69 is wholly located in Pinellas County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county line to the west and south, VTDs to the north and a railway and I-275 to the east. The Cities of Madeira Beach, Treasure Island, Gulfport, St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena are kept whole within the district as are the Towns of Redington Shores, North Redington Beach, Redington Beach and Kenneth City. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking that Gulfport be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 59 in HPUBH0107.

District 70 is located in Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee and Sarasota Counties. Hillsborough County is a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district nearly recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the north in Pinellas County and Hillsborough County, State Road 674 and US Highway 41 to the east in Hillsborough County, 69th Street E and 28th Ave E and US Highway 301 to the east in Manatee County, VTDs to the east and south in Sarasota County, VTDs and I-275 to the west in Pinellas County, the county line to the west in Hillsborough County, I-275 and VTDs to the west in Manatee County and Tamiami Trail to the west in Sarasota County. It is important to note that the manner in which the district was built in Manatee and Sarasota Counties creates four districts to be in one or both of the counties, which is consistent with testimony that the Committee received during the public hearing in Sarasota. The Committee received testimony asking that the Sarasota-Bradenton Airport be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 55 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 71 is located in Manatee and Sarasota Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west, the county line and I-275 to the north, VTDs to the east and south. The Cities of Anna Maria, Holmes Beach, Bradenton Beach and the Town of Longboat Key are kept whole within the district. It is important to note that Longboat Key is kept whole within the district, despite that its boundaries span both Manatee and Sarasota counties. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four districts be built within the two counties. This district is very similar to District 64 in HPUBH0048, District 68 in HPUBH0037, and District 72 in HPUBH0134.

District 72 is wholly in Sarasota County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line and US Highway 301 to the west, the county line to the north, I-75 to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four district be built with Manatee and Sarasota Counties. This district is very similar to District 66 in HPUBH0048 and District 69 in SPUBH0156.

District 73 is located in Manatee and Sarasota Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are US-41, 69th Street E, US 301 and I-75 to the west, the Manatee County line to the north, the Manatee and Sarasota County lines to the east and VTDs and State Road 72 to the south. The district also includes the community of Lakewood Ranch, which was requested to be kept whole within a district during the Sarasota public hearing. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four district be built with Manatee and Sarasota Counties. This district is very similar to District 67 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 74 is wholly located in Sarasota County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, east and south and State Road 72 and the county line to the north. The Cities of Venice and North Port are kept whole within the district. This district is also consistent with testimony that the Committee received in the Sarasota public hearing requesting that four district be built with Manatee and Sarasota Counties. This district is very similar to District 70 in SPUBH0156.

District 75 is all of Charlotte County. All of the county's boundaries are the boundaries of the district. The City of Punta Gorda is kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking for Charlotte to be contained within one district. This district is very similar to District 68 in HPUBH0048 and District 73 in HPUBH0107.

It is important to note that mathematically, Lee County's population is roughly the same as four House districts. Those districts are Districts 76-79.

District 76 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county line to the north, west and south and San Carlos Bay to the east. The Cities of Sanibel and Bonita Springs are kept whole within the district, as is the Town of Fort Myers Beach. The Committee received written testimony asking to keep Bonita Springs whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 71 in HPUBH0048, District 75 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156 and others.

District 77 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries of the district are San Carlos Bay to the west and south, the county line to the north and the city boundaries of Cape Coral to the east. The City of Cape Coral is kept whole within the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to keep the City of Cape Coral whole, as the City's population is near that of a House district. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0027, District 74 in HPUBH0107 and HPUBH0116, and others.

District 78 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the city boundaries of Cape Coral to the west, the county line to the north, I-75 and State Road 82 to the west and Daniels Parkway to the south. The City of Fort Myers is kept whole within the district and it is important to note that the district was built in a manner to do that. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156, District 76 in HPUBH0107 and others.

District 79 is wholly located in Lee County. The predominant boundaries to the district are I-75, the boundaries of Fort Myers, State Road 82 and Tamiami Trail to the west, the county line to the north and east and Corkscrew Road and the county line to the south. The Committee received written testimony asking for Lehigh Acres to be kept whole within a district. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0055, District 74 in HPUBH0045 and HPUBH0079.

District 80 contains all of Hendry County and is located in Collier County, both of which are Florida counties that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county lines to the west,

north and east and I-75 (Alligator Alley) to the south. The Cities of Clewiston and LaBelle are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for Collier County to be split into three State House districts.

District 81 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are county line to the west, the county line and VTDs to the north, VTDs to the east and the county line to the south. The Cities of Pahokee, Belle Glade and South Bay are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking that Palm Beach County be split into 9 State House districts and received verbal testimony from the public hearings asking that Belle Glade and Pahokee be kept together within a district.

District 82 is located in Martin and Palm Beach Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Martin County line and I-95 to the west, VTDs to the north, the county lines to the east and the Martin County line and VTDs to the south. The Town of Jupiter Island and the Village of Tequesta are kept whole within the district. This district is consistent with testimony that was received in the Stuart public hearing requesting that Martin County be connected with northern Palm Beach County in a district. The Committee also received written testimony asking that Palm Beach County be split into 9 State House districts. This district is very similar to District 78 in HPUBH0119, HPUBH0128, HPUBH0134 and others.

It is important to note that the population remaining in Palm Beach County after District 82 was built is roughly 8 House districts. Those districts are Districts 81 and 85-91. The Committee also received written testimony asking that Palm Beach County be split into 9 State House districts.

District 83 is located in St. Lucie and Martin Counties. The predominant boundaries to are the boundary of the City of Port St. Lucie and the Florida Turnpike to the west, VTDs and the county line to the north, the county line to the east and the boundaries of the City of Stuart to the south. The City of Stuart is kept whole within the district, as are the Towns of Ocean Breeze Park and Sewall's Point. This district is very similar to District 69 in HPUBH0112, HPUBH0122, SPUBH0067 and others.

District 84 is wholly located in St. Lucie County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the north, east, and south and Okeechobee Road and VTDs to the west. The City of Fort Pierce is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 68 in SPUBH0067, HPUBH0119, HPUBH0122, and others.

District 85 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, the county line, I-95 and the boundary of the City of Palm Beach Gardens to the north, the county line and VTDs to the east and VTDs to the south. The City of Palm Beach Gardens and the Town of North Palm Beach are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 83 in HPUBH0116, District 85 in HPUBH0134 and HPUBH0128 and others.

District 86 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs and the city boundary of Wellington to the west, 60th Street north and Okeechobee Blvd to the north, the Florida Turnpike, N. Military Trail and VTDs to the east and the city boundary of Wellington and Lantana Road to the south. The Towns of Loxahatchee Groves and Haverhill are kept whole as are the Villages of Royal Palm Beach and Wellington. This district is very similar to District 87 in SPUBH0067, SPUBH0074, SPUBH0087, and one other.

District 87 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. When studying the demographics of the county, it can be determined that a majority-minority Hispanic district could be built wholly with Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are N. Military Trail and VTDs to the west and VTDs to the north, east and south. The Towns of Cloud Lake, Glen Ridge, Lake Clarke Shores and the Village of Palm Springs are all kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for a Hispanic or other minority State House district in this area. This district is very similar to District 76 in HPUBH0047, District 112 in HPUBH0045 and HPUBH0079 and others.

District 88 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. Palm Beach County has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. However, this district does it in a different manner than the current district. This district is vertically-shaped with US-1 and I-95 as transportation corridors while the current district is more horizontally-shaped that uses Okeechobee Blvd as a transportation corridor. The predominant boundaries of the district are the city boundaries of Lake Park and Riviera Beach, Haverhill Road N., N. Tamarind Avenue, N. Dixie Highway, I-95, State Road 807 and VTDs to the west, VTDs to the north, the shoreline of the mainland, S. Olive Ave, N. 8th Street, Overlook Road, US-1 and a railway to the east and W. Woolbright Road and SW 10th Street to the south. The Towns of Lake Park and Mangonia Park are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for a Hispanic or other minority State House district in this area.

District 89 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the shoreline of the mainland, S. Olive Avenue, US-1, I-95 and S. Military Trail to the west, VTDs to the north, the county line to the east and south. The Towns of Palm Beach, Palm Beach Shores, Manalapan, Ocean Ridge, Gulf Stream and Highland Beach are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for the coastal areas of Palm Beach County to be kept together in a district.

District 90 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike to the west, Forest Hill Blvd, Lake Worth Road and VTDs to the north, I-95 to the east and W. Boynton Beach Blvd to the south. The City of Atlantis is kept whole in the district.

District 91 is wholly located in Palm Beach County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike to the west, W. Boynton Beach Blvd to the north, S. Congress Ave and N. Military Trail to the east and the county line to the south. The Village of Golf is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 92 in HPUBH0048.

District 92 is wholly located in Broward County. This area has produced a Black opportunity district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike and State Road 7 to the west, the county line to the north, State Road 811 to the east and VTDs to the south. This district is very similar to District 92 in SPUBH0156.

District 93 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 811 and US-1 to the west, the county line to the north and east and VTDs to the south to create a rectangular shape. The Towns of Lighthouse Point, Hillsboro Beach, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea and the Village of Sea Ranch Lakes are kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 91 in HPUBH0116 and District 96 in HPUBH0107.

District 94 is wholly located in Broward County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are US Highway 441, E. Tropical Way and VTDs to the west, VTDs to the north, State Road 811 and US-1 to the east and Peters Road, Davie Blvd and SW 24th Street to the south. The Village of Lazy Lake is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 93 in SPUBH0156, District 98 in HPUBH0048, District 101 in HPUBH0134 and others.

District 95 is wholly located in Broward County. This area had produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. This area also brings language minorities together into the same district. The predominant boundaries of the district are N. Pine Island Road and the city boundaries of North Lauderdale to the west, Southgate Blvd to the north, US-441 to the east and W. Sunrise Blvd to the south. This district is very similar to District 94 in SPUBH0156.

District 96 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the city boundaries of Parkland, Coral Springs Drive, N. University Drive and the boundary to the City of Coral Springs to the west, the county line to the north, the Florida Turnpike to the east and VTDs to the south. The Cities of Parkland and Coconut Creek are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking for Parkland to be kept whole within a district.

District 97 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and north, the city boundary of Coral Springs, N. University Blvd and Coral Springs Drive to the east and I-75 to the south to create a rectangular shape. This district is very similar to District 96 in SPUBH0156, District 103 in HPUBH0079 and HPUBH0045 and others.

District 98 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the boundary to the Town of Davie, Weston Road, NW 124th Avenue and VTDs to the west, NW 44th Street and VTDs to the north, N. Pine Island Road, VTDs and Davie Road to the east and Griffin Road to the south. The Committee received testimony requesting that counties be kept whole and or split as little as possible.

District 99 is wholly within Broward County. The predominant boundaries of the district are I-75 and Davie Road to the west, VTDs to the north, US A1A to the east and NW 17th St to the south. The City of Cooper City is kept whole in the district. The Committee received testimony requesting that Cooper City be kept whole in a district.

District 100 is located in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. The predominant boundaries of the district are US A1A and Biscayne Blvd to the west, VTDs to the north and south and the county lines to the east to create a rectangular shape. The Cities of Aventura, Sunny Isles Beach, the Towns of Golden Beach, Surfside, Bay Harbor Islands and the Villages of Bal Harbour and Indian Creek are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in the Miami Dade area. There are no public plans similar to this district.

District 101 is located wholly within Broward County. This area has created a Black opportunity district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are S. Douglas Road and S. University Drive to the west, Taft Street to the north, Dixie Highway to the east and the county line to the south. The City of West Park and the Town of Pembroke Park are kept whole within the district. The Committee received testimony requesting that counties be kept whole and or split as little as possible.

District 102 is located in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. This area has created a majority-minority Black district in years past, and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are N. Hiatus Road, S. Flamingo Road and NW 57th Ave to the west, Taft Street to the north, S. University Drive and the Florida Turnpike to the east and Palmetto Expressway and Biscayne Canal to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 103 is located in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. This area has created a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past, and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs and the Florida Turnpike to the west, VTDs to the north, VTDs and Palmetto Expressway to the east and NW 58th Street to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 103 in SPUBH0067, HPUBH0134, and HPUBH0119 and others.

District 104 is wholly located in Broward County. The predominate boundaries of the district are the county line to the west and south, I-75 to the north and boundary of the City of Weston and VTDs to the east. The City of Weston is kept whole within the district. This district is very similar to District 98 in HPUBH0027 and HPUBH0045, District 101 in HPUBH0118, and others.

District 105 is located in Collier, Broward and Miami-Dade Counties. Collier County is a Florida county that will receive extra scrutiny from the Department of Justice regarding the opportunity for minority communities to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice per Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. A similarly built district has been a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs and the Miami-Dade County line to the west, I-75, the Miami-Dade County line and the boundary of the City of

Miramar to the north, VTDs to the east and Tamiami Trail, the Collier County line and VTDs to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to preserve opportunities for the Hispanic Community in Miami-Dade County and received written testimony asking for Collier County to be split into three State House districts.

District 106 is located wholly in Collier County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, north and south and Tamiami Trail to the east. The Cities of Naples, Marco Island and Everglades are kept whole within the district. The Committee received written testimony asking for Collier County to be split into three State House districts. This district is very similar to District 73 in HPUBH0048, District 76 in HPUBH0116 and SPUBH0156 and others.

District 107 is located wholly in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. This area also brings language minorities together into the same district. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike to the west, the county line to the north, US-1 to the east and VTDs to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 113 in HPUBH0048.

District 108 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. This area also brings language minorities together into the same district. The predominant boundaries of the district are NW 17th Ave. and NW 12th Ave. to the west, VTDs, the boundary of the City of North Miami and NE 135th Street to the north, VTDs and boundaries of the cities of Miami and Miami Shores Village to the east, and I-195 to the south. The Villages of Miami Shores and El Portal are kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 109 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Black district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are State Road 823, NW 32nd Ave and VTDs to the west, Palmetto Expressway and VTDs to the north, NW 17th Ave, NW 12th Ave and NW 7th Ave to the south. The City of Opa-Locka is kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to consider the Palmetto Expressway as a boundary for districts.

District 110 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are Palmetto Expressway to the west, the boundary of the City of Miramar to the north, NW 57th Ave to the east and W 21st Street to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County and to consider the Palmetto Expressway as a district boundary.

District 111 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are VTDs to the west, E 65th Street to the north, NW 20th Street and a railway to the east and W. Flagler Street to the south. The city of Miami Springs is kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County and to preserve the opportunities for the Hispanic community in the area.

District 112 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are Old Cutler Road to the west, SW 7th Ave and NW 7th Ave to the north, the county line to the east and VTDs to the south. The Village of Key Biscayne is kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 113 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has not produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past, but this district creates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of

the district are NW 27th Ave and VTDs to the east, VTDs to the north and south and the county line to the east. The Cities Miami Beach and North Bay Village are kept whole in the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 106 in HPUBH0118, District 114 in HPUBH0134 and HPUBH0122 and others.

District 114 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 67th Ave, a railway, Old Cutler Road and US-1 to the west, NW 7th Street to the north, NW 42nd Ave and VTDs to the west and VTDs to the south. The City of West Miami and the Town of Cutler Bay are kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County., as well as testimony at the public hearings asking for the City Cutler Bay to be kept whole within a district.

District 115 is wholly located within Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 87th Ave, Don Shula Expressway, State Road 821, and the boundary of the Village of Palmetto Bay to the west, the city boundary of Doral and NW 58th Street to the north, a railway, SW 67th Ave and Old Cutler Road to the east and the boundary of the Village of Palmetto Bay to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 116 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are NW 170th Ave and the Florida Turnpike to the west, NW 58th Street, VTDs and SW 8th St to the north, NW 87th Ave and Din Shula Expressway to the east and SW 104th Street to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 111 in HPUBH0118.

District 117 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has traditionally elected in African-American to the Florida House of Representatives and this district is likely to recreate that opportunity, despite that is has a voting age population high enough to be a majority-minority Hispanic district. The predominant boundaries of the district are the Florida Turnpike and US-1 to the west, VTDs to the north, US-1 and VTDs to the east and the city boundary of Florida City to the south. The City of Florida City is kept whole within the district. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 118 in SPUBH0156 and HPUBH0116.

District 118 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 137th Ave and VTDs to the west, SW 8th St to the north, SW 117th Ave to the east and VTDs to the south. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County.

District 119 is wholly located in Miami-Dade County. This area has produced a majority-minority Hispanic district in years past and this district recreates that opportunity. The predominant boundaries of the district are SW 177th Ave to the west, SW 8th Street to the north, SW 137th Ave to the east and VTDs to the south to create a square-like shape. The Committee received verbal testimony at the public hearings asking to create districts that run north and south in Miami-Dade County. This district is very similar to District 115 in SPUBH0087, HPUBH0128, HPUBH0134 and others.

District 120 contains all of Monroe County and is located in Miami-Dade County. The predominant boundaries of the district are the county line to the west, the county line and VTDs to the north and the county line to the east and south. The Cities of Key West, Marathon and Layton and the Village of Islamorada are kept whole within the district. This district is consistent with testimony that was received during the Key West public hearing request that Monroe County and the Keys be kept whole within a

district. This district is very similar to District 120 in HPUBH0112, HPUBH0119, HPUBH0122, and others.

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:

   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:

   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

When compared to the 120 State House Districts in HRS PCB 12-05 (Plan H000H9023), Amendment 1 (Plan H000H9031):

- Reduces the number of cities split from 98 to 91;
- Reduces the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Increases the total population deviation from 3.84% to 3.97%;
- Helps better maintain the existing representation for Hispanic Floridians.

Specifically, Amendment 1 makes the following changes:

- Incorporates most of the Miccosukee Indian Camps into District 105 pursuant to the request of the Tribal Chairman, thereby balancing populations between Districts 105 and 106 and improving the compactness of District 106.
- Includes the Burnt Store Marina in District 77, thereby reducing a likely travel burden for those residents to their remainder of their district;
- Increases the use of roadways as boundaries in the unincorporated neighborhoods around Crestview pursuant to the request of the office of the Okaloosa County Supervisor of Elections;
- Makes the unincorporated areas of Navarre and Navarre Beach whole and together in District 3 pursuant to the request of area residents;
- Makes the municipality of Stuart (Martin County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Bartow (Polk County) whole;
- Maintains the existing likelihood that District 113 will produce the Hispanic community‘s candidate of choice; maintains the existing likelihood that District 114 will produce the Hispanic community‘s

candidate of choice; makes the municipality of Opa-locka (Miami-Dade County) whole; and improves the compactness of districts 102, 108, 109, and 111;
- Makes the municipality of Cooper City (Broward County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Dundee (Polk County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Coconut Creek (Broward County) whole;
- Makes the municipality of Atlantis (Palm Beach County) whole.
- Connects District 6 to the Northwest Florida Beaches International Airport pursuant to the request of a Bay County resident, thereby balancing populations between Districts 5 and 6.

H000H9031



GOLD COAST

JACKSONVILLE

ORLANDO

TAMPA

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

N
W
E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031





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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

H000H9031



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

N
W E
S

Legend

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

Redistricting Plan Data Report for H000H9031

Plan File Name: H000H9031	
Plan Population Fundamentals	
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310
Ideal District Population::	156,677
District Population Remainder:	70
District Population Range:	153,748 to 159,978
District Deviation Range:	(-2,929) To 3,301
Deviation:	(-1.86) To 2.10 Total 3.97%

Plan Type: House - 120 Districts	
Plan Geography Fundamentals:	
Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481
Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)
County or District Split :	30 Split of 67 used
City or District Split :	91 Split of 411 used
VTD's Split :	516 Split of 9,436 used

Number of Districts by Race Language					
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+
Current Black VAP	23	17	13	11	3
New Black VAP	21	17	13	12	2
Current Hisp VAP	39	22	16	13	11
New Hisp VAP	35	23	19	16	11

Plan Name:	H000H9031			Number of Districts	120											
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
H9031-Map	12,791	65,934	19.40%	12,553	184,342	6.80%	98.13%	35.76%	10,078	86,990	11.58%	78.78%	75.79%	3,144	2,825	6,289
Current Map	16,491	65,913	25.01%	13,683	231,091	5.92%	82.97%	28.52%	10,728	100,440	10.68%	65.05%	65.62%	3,321	3,199	6,643
H9031-Simple	11,804	65,848	17.92%				106.34%	35.72%				85.37%	75.69%			
Current Map	14,650	65,813	22.26%				93.40%	28.47%				73.22%	65.52%			

	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route				Minutes to drive by fastest route			
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic
H9031-Map	9	9	9	7	14	14	12	11	22	22	20	19
Current Map	12	12	11	10	17	17	15	14	26	26	23	22

Plan Name:	H000H9031			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
1	172	570	30.21%	134	1,428	9.40%	77.92%	39.94%	119	881	13.50%	69.02%	64.75%	28	40	56
2	115	338	34.17%	125	1,240	10.09%	108.10%	27.31%	91	446	20.40%	78.61%	75.95%	35	21	71
3	229	1,571	14.60%	199	3,135	6.34%	86.70%	50.12%	170	1,987	8.55%	74.05%	79.09%	54	46	109
4	116	658	17.67%	114	1,046	10.98%	98.79%	62.90%	104	717	14.50%	89.37%	91.79%	24	33	48
5	286	3,612	7.93%	325	8,367	3.88%	113.48%	43.17%	254	4,019	6.31%	88.65%	89.89%	91	54	182
6	126	731	17.30%	145	1,686	8.65%	115.30%	43.37%	116	797	14.55%	91.67%	91.75%	36	31	73
7	556	7,273	7.64%	530	22,250	2.38%	95.32%	32.68%	408	10,169	4.01%	73.38%	71.52%	154	78	309
8	187	612	30.59%	149	1,776	8.43%	80.00%	34.45%	116	835	13.89%	61.95%	73.29%	42	26	84
9	131	434	30.18%	94	713	13.30%	72.34%	60.93%	88	530	16.60%	67.08%	81.98%	24	28	49
10	307	2,663	11.56%	273	5,923	4.61%	88.81%	44.97%	218	3,212	6.78%	70.79%	82.92%	75	56	150
11	241	937	25.79%	178	2,534	7.05%	73.98%	36.99%	153	1,534	9.97%	63.27%	61.11%	43	39	87
12	68	125	55.03%	61	295	20.67%	88.57%	42.40%	50	162	30.86%	72.49%	77.35%	14	14	28
13	47	57	82.71%	36	107	34.20%	77.50%	53.35%	31	70	44.28%	65.05%	82.3%	10	8	21
14	89	156	56.99%	72	412	17.49%	80.71%	38.01%	58	204	28.43%	64.83%	76.93%	13	23	27
15	53	90	59.17%	46	172	27.04%	86.79%	52.65%	41	111	36.93%	76.23%	81.87%	12	14	25
16	63	133	47.55%	58	267	21.71%	91.76%	49.76%	51	170	30%	80.49%	78.37%	15	13	30
17	120	526	22.89%	115	1,055	10.93%	95.83%	49.85%	99	646	15.32%	82.21%	81.43%	29	30	58
18	105	359	29.32%	89	633	14.11%	84.74%	56.81%	82	434	18.89%	77.69%	82.93%	22	27	44
19	258	1,813	14.26%	262	5,460	4.80%	101.46%	33.21%	196	2,402	8.15%	75.75%	75.50%	68	56	136
20	214	882	24.34%	161	2,071	7.80%	75.25%	42.59%	134	1,173	11.42%	62.37%	75.21%	30	51	60
21	245	1,502	16.34%	231	4,260	5.44%	94.44%	35.26%	177	2,021	8.75%	72.09%	74.34%	68	47	137
22	240	1,856	12.94%	240	4,597	5.23%	100.18%	40.37%	186	2,313	8.04%	77.38%	80.24%	69	46	139
23	159	929	17.11%	136	1,484	9.21%	85.99%	62.64%	119	1,019	11.67%	74.78%	91.25%	30	38	61
24	214	1,254	17.09%	174	2,426	7.21%	81.60%	51.69%	156	1,655	9.42%	72.75%	75.77%	40	58	81
25	118	238	49.52%	96	740	13.05%	81.66%	32.27%	79	375	21.06%	66.75%	63.71%	23	28	46
26	111	276	40.38%	90	645	13.97%	80.90%	42.78%	77	414	18.59%	69.03%	66.70%	25	24	50
27	160	537	29.93%	148	1,743	8.50%	92.20%	30.80%	112	813	13.77%	69.65%	66.06%	42	28	85
28	82	215	38.51%	75	447	16.78%	90.52%	48.13%	63	259	24.32%	75.92%	83.17%	20	15	41
29	62	125	49.60%	60	290	20.84%	97.15%	43.25%	49	171	28.65%	78.72%	73.36%	17	14	34
30	41	56	73.84%	36	105	34.54%	88.03%	53.13%	32	70	45.71%	77.16%	80.22%	9	8	18
31	168	716	23.52%	147	1,721	8.55%	87.45%	41.59%	127	1,044	12.16%	75.38%	68.59%	36	49	72
32	111	492	22.56%	121	1,175	10.35%	109.59%	41.88%	101	578	17.47%	90.94%	85.16%	29	29	59
33	171	696	24.57%	155	1,928	8.08%	91.10%	36.11%	132	997	13.23%	77.12%	69.86%	29	49	58
34	155	947	16.43%	140	1,566	8.97%	90.23%	60.47%	122	1,075	11.34%	78.31%	88.15%	41	36	82

Plan Name:	H000H9031			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
35	128	418	30.81%	143	1,639	8.76%	111.56%	25.50%	102	565	18.05%	79.14%	74.03%	42	18	84
36	63	172	36.61%	76	458	16.58%	120.09%	37.70%	59	202	29.20%	93.22%	85.57%	16	18	32
37	74	258	28.71%	74	436	16.99%	100.08%	59.11%	66	284	23.23%	89.04%	90.88%	18	18	36
38	95	439	21.59%	96	731	13.12%	101.09%	60.10%	84	478	17.57%	88.42%	92.01%	24	21	48
39	124	579	21.54%	133	1,412	9.44%	106.91%	41.00%	101	661	15.27%	80.94%	87.60%	38	21	77
40	45	105	42.76%	50	200	25.03%	111.40%	52.55%	42	116	36.20%	92.98%	91.05%	11	11	22
41	88	215	41.17%	93	696	13.45%	105.39%	31.00%	69	285	24.21%	77.65%	75.71%	26	15	53
42	197	1,926	10.26%	197	3,103	6.37%	99.99%	62.07%	172	2,008	8.56%	86.97%	95.94%	46	48	92
43	64	88	73.08%	59	278	21.28%	91.34%	31.88%	47	134	35.07%	72.50%	66.18%	13	14	26
44	47	72	65.00%	44	155	28.49%	93.62%	46.82%	38	90	42.22%	80.44%	80.74%	9	12	18
45	64	176	36.48%	59	280	21.20%	92.29%	62.97%	54	195	27.69%	83.83%	90.52%	12	18	24
46	33	43	77.95%	29	68	42.98%	86.56%	63.70%	27	54	50%	79.71%	80.46%	8	8	17
47	40	43	92.97%	35	101	35.28%	87.35%	43.44%	30	61	49.18%	73.34%	72.11%	8	9	17
48	57	78	73.45%	55	244	22.71%	96.62%	32.00%	44	116	37.93%	76.58%	67.42%	11	15	22
49	43	63	69.17%	46	169	27.30%	105.02%	37.58%	34	78	43.58%	77.36%	81.44%	12	8	25
50	142	553	25.79%	129	1,323	9.75%	90.53%	41.79%	106	736	14.40%	74.28%	75.16%	34	30	68
51	132	645	20.48%	122	1,195	10.27%	92.76%	54.03%	108	764	14.13%	81.62%	84.53%	26	37	52
52	82	279	29.42%	84	568	14.88%	103.11%	49.05%	69	314	21.97%	84.03%	88.85%	22	16	45
53	93	447	20.76%	109	948	11.52%	117.55%	47.21%	87	468	18.58%	93.54%	95.69%	29	18	59
54	125	744	16.90%	137	1,503	9.15%	109.29%	49.52%	110	827	13.30%	87.35%	90.05%	37	27	75
55	260	3,247	8.00%	282	6,317	4.46%	108.45%	51.40%	234	3,583	6.53%	89.98%	90.63%	71	60	143
56	198	1,891	10.48%	213	3,621	5.89%	107.70%	52.22%	185	1,982	9.33%	93.29%	95.42%	32	65	64
57	92	373	24.66%	99	789	12.63%	108.39%	47.24%	80	410	19.51%	86.94%	90.98%	24	20	48
58	78	263	29.64%	79	504	15.80%	102.24%	52.12%	67	295	22.71%	85.89%	89.17%	21	16	42
59	50	66	75.24%	43	152	28.75%	87.06%	43.88%	35	85	41.17%	69.52%	78.70%	12	9	24
60	97	204	47.83%	83	551	15.11%	85.38%	37.01%	69	300	23%	70.68%	68.02%	17	24	34
61	48	48	101.36%	40	129	31.22%	82.60%	37.28%	34	76	44.73%	69.58%	63.42%	9	12	19
62	31	44	71.37%	31	79	39.74%	100.34%	55.49%	28	51	54.90%	88.63%	86.78%	9	8	18
63	51	93	55.31%	57	259	22.04%	110.90%	35.94%	42	104	40.38%	81.49%	89.59%	15	9	30
64	57	116	49.42%	62	306	20.29%	107.83%	38.07%	48	153	31.37%	83.34%	76.15%	14	13	29
65	54	139	39.32%	57	265	21.77%	105.48%	52.47%	49	157	31.21%	89.28%	88.87%	15	12	31
66	48	95	51.32%	51	208	24.57%	104.75%	45.70%	43	121	35.53%	87.84%	78.81%	11	15	22
67	42	53	80.95%	40	128	31.35%	93.61%	41.37%	33	73	45.20%	76.88%	72.63%	11	9	23
68	49	99	50.09%	48	185	26.05%	97.34%	53.42%	41	115	35.65%	82.51%	86.26%	12	12	25

Plan Name:	H000H9031			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
69	69	130	53.53%	62	308	20.21%	89.11%	42.37%	51	173	29.47%	72.93%	75.50%	15	16	30
70	172	201	85.45%	96	734	13.09%	55.85%	27.44%	90	519	17.34%	52.27%	38.81%	26	30	53
71	82	234	35.24%	81	530	15.40%	98.92%	44.18%	67	274	24.45%	81.05%	85.60%	18	22	36
72	53	102	52.47%	50	204	24.78%	94.83%	49.81%	46	133	34.58%	85.85%	76.77%	11	16	22
73	123	793	15.61%	132	1,385	9.53%	106.66%	57.25%	112	831	13.47%	90.43%	95.46%	30	30	61
74	100	442	22.75%	106	905	11.79%	105.92%	48.91%	88	530	16.60%	87.30%	83.56%	30	22	61
75	138	860	16.12%	183	2,679	6.85%	132.32%	32.11%	134	903	14.83%	96.53%	95.30%	53	18	107
76	144	599	24.13%	169	2,281	7.42%	117.21%	26.25%	121	841	14.38%	83.69%	71.23%	41	32	83
77	63	147	43.18%	55	243	22.71%	87.04%	60.43%	49	165	29.69%	76.95%	89.35%	11	16	23
78	66	125	52.92%	57	262	21.88%	86.79%	47.63%	47	147	31.97%	70.91%	85.19%	12	15	25
79	101	343	29.64%	96	740	13.03%	94.70%	46.44%	83	441	18.82%	81.42%	77.97%	19	24	39
80	246	1,934	12.73%	245	4,769	5.13%	99.47%	40.55%	198	2,391	8.28%	80.38%	80.89%	54	56	108
81	185	1,570	11.79%	196	3,052	6.42%	105.77%	51.45%	163	1,737	9.38%	87.96%	90.43%	44	43	88
82	145	724	20.10%	182	2,640	6.90%	125.17%	27.43%	132	897	14.71%	90.62%	80.76%	54	22	109
83	71	153	46.48%	83	557	15.03%	117.60%	27.50%	60	199	30.15%	84.23%	77.00%	23	12	47
84	81	233	34.98%	77	477	16.24%	94.87%	48.92%	66	278	23.74%	80.74%	84.03%	20	20	41
85	112	301	37.17%	116	1,084	10.77%	104.32%	27.77%	84	403	20.84%	74.97%	74.78%	34	17	68
86	61	130	46.99%	58	272	21.49%	95.79%	47.74%	48	159	30.18%	78.50%	81.81%	16	12	33
87	35	31	113.43%	26	54	48.20%	74.15%	57.30%	23	39	58.97%	65.32%	79.58%	6	7	12
88	77	38	201.06%	74	440	16.89%	96.14%	8.73%	55	114	48.24%	70.97%	33.80%	5	24	11
89	89	176	50.96%	104	860	12.09%	115.95%	20.46%	79	227	34.80%	88.02%	77.58%	9	34	18
90	37	42	87.85%	32	83	38.82%	87.17%	50.70%	28	51	54.90%	75.30%	82.98%	6	8	13
91	39	52	75.39%	45	163	27.74%	115.56%	31.84%	37	65	56.92%	94.26%	80.09%	6	13	12
92	35	41	85.73%	38	116	32.81%	108.85%	35.15%	30	52	57.69%	85.15%	79.01%	6	11	13
93	43	97	44.68%	53	224	23.67%	121.48%	43.60%	43	100	43%	98.26%	97.92%	7	16	15
94	29	27	106.22%	28	62	44.83%	95.60%	44.15%	23	35	65.71%	78.36%	78.94%	7	6	14
95	21	19	109.30%	20	34	60.02%	98.54%	55.72%	18	23	78.26%	84.62%	84.60%	4	6	8
96	33	42	77.57%	36	104	34.78%	109.00%	41.13%	29	53	54.71%	87.34%	80.75%	8	9	16
97	107	494	21.76%	135	1,455	9.29%	125.84%	33.95%	101	522	19.34%	93.91%	94.66%	40	15	80
98	35	45	78.17%	31	80	39.49%	89.64%	56.36%	29	56	51.78%	81.62%	81.16%	8	8	16
99	39	49	80.28%	46	169	27.26%	115.98%	29.27%	34	63	53.96%	85.47%	78.65%	13	5	27
100	45	90	50.56%	51	207	24.61%	111.81%	43.53%	43	98	43.87%	94.05%	92.26%	7	15	15
101	22	24	92.22%	25	51	49.20%	113.48%	47.00%	21	27	77.77%	93.16%	90.51%	7	4	14
102	28	27	101.11%	26	56	47.05%	95.36%	48.80%	23	35	65.71%	82.05%	79.2%	6	7	12

Plan Name:	H000H9031			Number of Districts				120								
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
103	35	42	83.32%	37	113	33.32%	105.65%	37.84%	32	56	57.14%	89.56%	76.57%	5	12	10
104	99	401	24.65%	124	1,235	10.09%	125.84%	32.52%	92	448	20.53%	92.85%	89.69%	36	14	72
105	284	1,718	16.54%	292	6,802	4.30%	102.91%	25.25%	211	2,388	8.83%	74.22%	71.94%	84	44	169
106	142	512	27.73%	158	1,997	7.93%	111.44%	25.68%	117	743	15.74%	82.25%	69.03%	34	38	69
107	22	22	103.13%	22	38	57.15%	96.87%	57.20%	19	24	79.16%	83.58%	91.83%	5	5	10
108	27	25	107.52%	26	54	48.26%	95.52%	46.99%	22	31	70.96%	80.61%	81.87%	5	7	10
109	35	28	125.20%	34	97	35.96%	98.86%	29.05%	28	48	58.33%	79.16%	58.85%	6	10	13
110	21	16	128.64%	25	49	50.21%	119.17%	32.75%	20	17	117.64%	95.14%	96.11%	2	8	4
111	25	23	109.25%	25	53	48.40%	102.88%	43.06%	22	30	73.33%	87.09%	77.06%	5	7	10
112	38	79	48.76%	43	147	29.24%	111.08%	53.99%	36	89	40.44%	92.99%	89.19%	11	9	23
113	40	62	64.90%	42	145	29.41%	105.42%	42.98%	35	81	43.20%	86.24%	77.18%	11	10	22
114	52	77	67.70%	53	226	23.56%	101.46%	34.30%	45	120	37.5%	85.53%	64.75%	10	17	20
115	43	40	105.45%	47	181	26.30%	110.92%	22.48%	37	61	60.65%	85.80%	67.03%	5	15	10
116	27	26	105.23%	33	89	37.51%	121.87%	29.25%	26	30	86.66%	94.47%	87.16%	3	10	6
117	58	43	132.76%	50	203	24.85%	87.11%	21.49%	40	89	44.94%	68.88%	49.14%	9	16	19
118	31	30	104.04%	36	105	34.56%	115.04%	28.87%	29	40	72.5%	91.68%	76%	4	11	9
119	22	26	86.76%	25	51	49.38%	111.95%	50.84%	22	28	78.57%	96.70%	93.64%	4	7	8
120	594	4,942	12.03%	641	32,723	1.96%	107.83%	15.10%	442	10,842	4.07%	74.30%	45.59%	183	96	366

H000H9031 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	8.28	8.32	8.27	7.94	11.32	11.37	11.18	10.99	1.74	19.40	19.44	19.18	19.06
2	6.74	6.74	5.50	6.77	9.40	9.39	7.60	9.41	1.76	18.92	18.93	16.05	19.40
3	21.38	21.35	19.86	21.25	30.34	30.35	30.70	31.03	1.86	41.37	41.32	40.31	42.08
4	12.20	12.11	12.91	11.61	16.70	16.61	17.47	16.00	1.77	28.17	28.06	28.49	27.30
5	33.79	33.90	32.99	35.79	45.59	45.74	43.49	47.82	1.69	55.48	55.65	52.73	57.44
6	9.84	9.89	8.65	9.93	13.75	13.82	11.86	13.69	1.77	24.77	24.89	21.83	24.58
7	54.77	54.85	54.17	56.37	73.41	73.65	72.56	75.69	1.68	91.48	91.81	89.58	93.74
8	12.47	12.36	12.50	12.69	16.25	16.11	16.28	16.42	1.63	24.90	24.75	25.04	24.69
9	7.36	7.29	7.41	6.94	10.73	10.60	10.71	9.93	1.85	19.66	19.53	19.32	19.07
10	26.03	25.95	24.77	25.67	34.03	33.92	31.92	33.46	1.70	44.57	44.42	41.90	43.51
11	17.38	17.39	16.25	16.39	27.09	27.16	25.76	26.19	1.97	36.09	36.18	34.65	35.10
12	5.04	5.06	4.92	4.84	8.19	8.22	7.89	7.83	2.10	14.86	14.87	14.41	14.42
13	4.02	4.02	3.88	4.22	6.52	6.50	6.27	6.75	2.13	12.69	12.66	12.16	13.11
14	6.51	6.50	6.47	6.80	9.41	9.39	9.44	9.66	1.96	15.32	15.31	15.45	15.32
15	5.69	5.72	5.33	5.51	9.61	9.66	9.02	9.33	2.16	17.77	17.83	16.92	17.39
16	5.43	5.43	5.42	5.39	8.88	8.87	8.69	8.73	2.07	14.80	14.78	14.39	14.49
17	14.16	14.21	13.03	13.75	20.11	20.10	18.15	19.69	1.86	30.34	30.41	27.76	29.68
18	9.10	9.14	9.44	8.53	13.98	14.04	14.41	13.18	2.14	24.21	24.28	24.55	23.13
19	24.61	24.71	25.91	25.84	33.04	33.17	33.76	35.15	1.71	49.13	49.32	49.49	52.19
20	16.53	16.37	17.21	15.86	20.83	20.61	21.68	19.72	1.56	27.98	27.72	28.88	26.57
21	18.55	18.54	18.62	17.30	24.91	24.86	25.22	22.99	1.63	37.63	37.60	38.14	35.07
22	20.37	20.21	20.18	19.06	27.76	27.59	27.29	26.21	1.68	38.05	37.94	36.75	35.97
23	11.11	11.19	9.72	10.21	15.47	15.57	13.47	14.24	1.76	26.00	26.12	23.39	24.51
24	16.39	16.41	14.15	17.22	22.85	22.85	20.17	24.11	1.72	30.69	30.69	27.67	32.14
25	10.17	10.18	9.93	9.90	14.12	14.13	13.85	13.66	1.64	22.71	22.75	22.70	22.33
26	12.27	12.24	11.93	12.40	15.75	15.72	15.15	15.92	1.58	22.35	22.33	21.69	22.61
27	13.50	13.55	13.05	13.00	21.65	21.70	21.44	21.22	2.04	31.29	31.33	31.36	30.81
28	6.66	6.65	7.09	6.47	9.91	9.90	10.42	9.67	1.95	19.25	19.23	19.54	18.79
29	5.54	5.52	5.93	5.60	8.85	8.82	9.11	8.78	2.11	15.87	15.85	15.60	15.50
30	4.08	4.08	3.90	4.03	6.35	6.35	6.05	6.26	1.94	14.60	14.61	13.95	14.41
31	11.99	11.98	10.86	11.83	16.79	16.79	15.07	16.49	1.72	28.47	28.48	26.07	27.93
32	10.79	10.81	10.38	10.86	17.13	17.17	16.18	17.05	2.13	26.99	26.98	25.82	26.90
33	11.05	10.88	11.56	11.85	16.43	16.24	17.13	17.48	1.69	29.24	29.05	28.79	29.85
34	12.59	12.57	12.03	12.76	18.22	18.23	17.15	18.26	1.72	31.00	31.02	29.12	30.78
35	8.82	8.83	8.60	8.16	12.25	12.27	11.87	11.46	1.73	20.85	20.89	20.13	19.91

H000H9031 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
36	5.17	5.19	4.97	4.92	6.98	7.00	6.72	6.66	1.65	14.98	15.01	14.56	14.45
37	9.41	9.39	9.72	9.74	14.93	14.90	15.77	15.60	2.04	25.77	25.76	26.54	26.33
38	9.12	9.03	9.43	9.62	13.74	13.59	14.29	14.53	1.96	25.10	24.91	25.68	26.10
39	15.16	15.14	14.89	15.00	21.73	21.71	21.33	21.73	1.85	30.21	30.19	29.18	30.27
40	5.44	5.42	5.14	5.43	7.94	7.93	7.40	7.92	1.90	15.80	15.77	15.14	15.65
41	8.57	8.61	8.26	9.11	12.36	12.42	11.72	12.98	1.86	22.32	22.49	21.24	23.02
42	16.37	16.61	17.93	14.53	31.75	32.30	34.35	28.59	2.55	45.91	46.61	49.38	42.36
43	5.49	5.42	6.12	5.44	9.07	8.95	10.10	9.01	2.27	18.21	18.00	19.99	18.19
44	5.20	5.22	5.11	5.12	8.27	8.29	8.03	8.10	2.03	15.80	15.78	15.56	15.53
45	7.23	7.25	7.00	7.06	10.99	11.00	10.63	10.78	2.05	18.29	18.33	17.65	17.99
46	3.38	3.39	3.35	3.38	5.29	5.30	5.26	5.27	2.17	12.21	12.22	12.18	12.16
47	3.63	3.62	3.85	3.76	5.75	5.74	6.00	6.03	1.94	12.99	12.95	13.12	13.21
48	6.17	6.12	6.34	6.26	9.85	9.76	10.12	9.98	2.15	15.90	15.80	16.17	16.00
49	4.67	4.61	4.64	4.72	7.68	7.54	7.55	7.72	2.07	15.51	15.32	15.33	15.55
50	15.12	15.04	15.10	16.35	23.06	22.92	22.94	24.78	1.99	32.13	32.00	31.66	33.27
51	7.47	7.52	6.23	7.18	10.95	11.00	9.15	10.49	1.80	19.83	19.90	17.32	19.15
52	6.41	6.40	6.70	6.23	8.92	8.90	9.31	8.78	1.72	16.75	16.72	17.41	16.45
53	6.43	6.51	5.93	5.92	10.13	10.23	9.30	9.31	1.96	19.36	19.47	18.35	18.19
54	9.65	9.66	9.56	10.05	14.08	14.08	13.58	15.40	1.79	23.19	23.23	22.50	25.03
55	28.14	28.01	28.78	28.90	38.07	37.96	38.08	38.50	1.69	52.62	52.51	50.96	52.54
56	26.59	26.71	26.26	26.71	35.11	35.34	34.23	35.18	1.76	46.05	46.37	44.90	46.05
57	8.00	8.10	7.14	8.05	12.68	12.86	11.48	12.39	2.14	21.26	21.49	19.56	20.97
58	8.87	8.86	8.92	9.02	13.08	13.05	13.22	13.30	1.97	19.42	19.39	19.55	19.56
59	4.22	4.21	4.08	4.21	6.47	6.45	6.25	6.40	2.03	13.25	13.22	12.86	13.07
60	8.14	8.11	8.26	8.76	14.48	14.42	14.33	15.03	2.21	24.46	24.35	24.77	24.97
61	4.21	4.21	4.15	4.35	6.59	6.58	6.49	6.81	2.15	12.58	12.58	12.48	12.79
62	3.78	3.78	3.86	3.74	5.73	5.73	5.83	5.67	1.94	12.11	12.11	12.18	12.03
63	5.63	5.56	5.49	5.49	8.58	8.47	8.26	8.33	1.96	16.77	16.60	16.25	16.33
64	6.40	6.43	6.15	5.90	10.05	10.11	9.52	9.24	2.03	19.05	19.18	18.23	17.71
65	4.82	4.82	5.09	4.82	7.19	7.17	7.40	7.14	1.80	16.25	16.21	16.32	16.03
66	4.48	4.49	4.95	4.63	5.96	5.96	6.42	6.10	1.59	15.54	15.56	16.71	15.78
67	3.70	3.71	3.78	3.71	5.69	5.72	5.70	5.58	1.86	12.99	13.03	13.04	12.82
68	4.20	4.21	4.25	4.24	6.18	6.21	6.51	6.34	1.78	13.68	13.70	13.52	13.73
69	4.67	4.71	4.36	4.43	6.60	6.68	6.12	6.18	1.66	15.27	15.41	14.30	14.50
70	12.86	12.89	13.10	12.38	17.46	17.51	17.60	16.96	1.82	23.65	23.70	23.49	23.50

H000H9031 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
71	5.91	6.00	5.14	5.29	8.50	8.64	7.21	7.42	1.69	17.47	17.69	15.15	15.52
72	4.62	4.64	4.52	4.36	6.99	7.03	6.80	6.56	1.78	15.05	15.12	14.89	14.51
73	8.98	8.92	8.05	9.41	14.46	14.42	13.06	14.77	2.04	23.25	23.22	21.61	23.41
74	9.37	9.22	10.79	10.23	13.78	13.54	16.01	15.08	1.76	23.88	23.65	26.09	24.96
75	9.99	10.04	9.64	9.40	14.47	14.57	13.50	13.36	1.68	24.62	24.78	22.24	22.72
76	11.39	11.38	12.09	11.56	18.84	18.90	20.19	18.34	1.86	32.55	32.65	34.43	31.32
77	5.42	5.43	5.30	5.22	7.93	7.95	7.78	7.67	1.87	16.86	16.88	16.56	16.31
78	6.17	6.23	5.29	5.83	9.39	9.47	8.05	8.86	1.86	18.37	18.52	16.18	17.30
79	9.91	10.00	9.31	9.51	15.52	15.62	14.89	15.02	2.07	25.03	25.11	24.62	24.53
80	26.27	26.22	28.77	26.85	38.94	38.92	42.30	39.31	1.98	50.19	50.12	54.19	50.93
81	19.42	19.25	24.27	20.66	29.64	29.32	36.84	31.59	2.01	39.41	39.05	47.89	41.30
82	11.35	11.29	15.08	13.37	15.67	15.59	19.39	17.80	1.70	24.04	23.98	27.82	26.16
83	6.35	6.30	6.68	6.67	10.05	9.98	10.37	10.32	2.04	19.67	19.62	19.86	19.76
84	7.10	7.16	7.27	6.86	10.74	10.91	10.38	10.13	1.89	20.86	21.15	20.12	19.67
85	7.09	7.04	7.78	7.41	11.00	10.94	11.82	11.40	1.90	18.92	18.85	19.69	19.31
86	5.15	5.16	5.18	5.16	7.89	7.89	7.82	7.85	2.06	15.50	15.51	15.28	15.39
87	2.99	2.98	3.08	3.00	4.48	4.47	4.64	4.48	2.04	10.90	10.88	11.07	10.88
88	8.49	8.45	8.81	8.35	10.97	10.94	11.25	10.87	1.70	16.71	16.70	16.85	16.63
89	9.46	9.50	8.29	9.20	12.42	12.48	11.01	12.06	1.51	19.40	19.49	17.54	18.73
90	3.60	3.64	3.43	3.64	5.52	5.58	5.26	5.54	1.91	11.99	12.09	11.51	12.00
91	5.33	5.27	5.41	5.73	7.87	7.80	7.95	8.38	1.68	15.62	15.56	14.95	16.04
92	4.64	4.64	4.59	4.54	7.11	7.12	6.99	6.94	1.93	13.99	14.04	13.67	13.73
93	5.08	5.07	5.21	5.13	6.72	6.70	6.91	6.76	1.52	14.41	14.39	14.43	14.35
94	2.94	2.96	2.75	3.21	4.35	4.38	4.11	4.67	1.89	10.21	10.25	9.80	10.59
95	2.58	2.56	2.55	2.66	4.15	4.14	4.12	4.26	2.14	10.40	10.38	10.38	10.48
96	3.27	3.25	3.04	3.17	5.15	5.11	4.76	4.96	2.07	11.83	11.78	11.18	11.45
97	3.93	3.91	3.94	4.01	5.85	5.82	5.83	5.94	1.95	12.00	11.97	11.95	12.06
98	3.52	3.50	3.49	3.61	5.68	5.63	5.57	5.80	2.07	11.75	11.69	11.72	11.83
99	4.48	4.49	4.73	4.40	6.57	6.58	6.87	6.48	1.90	13.68	13.70	13.85	13.51
100	3.53	3.52	3.81	3.54	5.32	5.30	5.44	5.36	1.77	13.13	13.09	13.38	13.12
101	2.80	2.80	2.79	2.80	4.00	4.00	4.01	3.99	1.88	10.89	10.89	10.89	10.88
102	2.99	3.00	2.91	2.99	4.56	4.57	4.48	4.52	2.04	10.98	11.00	10.83	10.89
103	3.75	3.69	5.23	3.36	5.94	5.84	8.30	5.31	2.16	11.73	11.59	14.66	10.93
104	5.02	5.03	4.79	5.07	7.96	7.95	7.56	7.99	2.16	15.06	15.09	14.52	15.10
105	36.52	35.93	39.58	31.12	46.40	45.67	49.95	39.52	1.73	53.54	52.91	57.30	46.79

H000H9031 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
106	10.23	10.26	9.35	9.75	13.74	13.79	12.48	12.97	1.54	24.11	24.20	22.40	22.89
107	2.53	2.52	2.58	2.45	4.24	4.23	4.30	4.17	2.24	10.72	10.71	10.84	10.55
108	2.63	2.62	2.66	2.59	3.69	3.69	3.73	3.66	1.86	9.58	9.58	9.51	9.58
109	3.91	3.91	3.97	3.81	5.64	5.65	5.72	5.52	1.87	11.52	11.51	11.65	11.38
110	2.96	2.95	3.34	2.92	4.18	4.16	4.70	4.12	1.78	9.31	9.29	10.00	9.21
111	2.97	2.97	2.92	2.98	4.15	4.15	4.05	4.16	1.71	10.77	10.78	10.37	10.77
112	2.99	2.96	2.65	2.87	4.34	4.28	3.67	4.16	1.76	11.13	11.00	9.66	10.80
113	4.09	4.06	4.09	4.28	6.07	6.02	6.19	6.34	1.75	13.87	13.80	13.96	14.04
114	5.81	5.71	7.35	5.61	8.08	7.94	10.22	7.82	1.77	15.94	15.76	18.21	15.55
115	4.98	4.99	5.62	5.09	6.72	6.73	7.42	6.87	1.70	12.93	12.92	13.76	12.95
116	3.20	3.19	3.29	3.13	4.90	4.88	5.05	4.79	1.87	11.88	11.85	12.74	11.69
117	5.37	5.42	6.02	5.07	7.39	7.46	8.15	7.02	1.97	13.70	13.76	14.37	13.35
118	4.62	4.58	5.35	4.51	6.85	6.78	7.92	6.68	1.92	13.91	13.81	15.33	13.66
119	2.50	2.50	2.42	2.50	3.83	3.81	3.74	3.82	2.00	10.56	10.53	10.34	10.56
120	46.55	47.94	43.78	37.90	58.46	60.15	55.15	47.81	1.54	78.90	80.97	74.57	65.69

H000H9031 - 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	156,116	-561	121,580	24,408	20.07	4,577	3.76	0	0	1	2	78,787	50.46%	62,341	10,150	2,719
2	156,119	-558	123,114	24,999	20.30	5,852	4.75	2	0	1	3	86,600	55.47%	68,639	19,120	2,745
3	158,797	2,120	120,717	7,292	6.04	4,309	3.56	2	0	8	1	105,003	66.12%	80,617	4,971	2,346
4	158,781	2,104	123,651	12,220	9.88	7,751	6.26	0	0	8	4	105,437	66.40%	83,629	7,171	5,586
5	159,198	2,521	125,985	17,355	13.77	4,698	3.72	1	0	3	5	102,641	64.47%	81,306	12,684	3,016
6	159,266	2,589	124,614	13,492	10.82	5,180	4.15	0	0	3	6	128,215	80.50%	99,712	12,728	4,420
7	156,188	-489	124,335	26,884	21.62	5,442	4.37	1	0	2	10	67,190	43.01%	54,055	14,301	1,965
8	156,242	-435	125,541	62,787	50.01	8,466	6.74	1	1	6	8	131,718	84.30%	105,330	57,587	6,713
9	156,049	-628	123,882	19,577	15.80	5,973	4.82	0	1	6	9	127,096	81.44%	101,482	14,398	4,678
10	156,423	-254	120,635	20,153	16.70	6,069	5.03	1	1	4	11	96,860	61.92%	74,667	7,640	4,207
11	155,797	-880	122,675	10,613	8.65	5,275	4.29	1	1	2	12	73,671	47.28%	57,713	3,668	1,639
12	155,886	-791	119,727	16,295	13.61	10,627	8.87	0	0	5	17	101,745	65.26%	76,632	11,068	6,367
13	156,649	-28	119,009	60,480	50.81	6,918	5.81	0	0	0	15	85,150	54.35%	64,592	36,204	3,931
14	156,203	-474	114,930	60,349	52.50	5,145	4.47	0	0	0	14	101,134	64.74%	73,954	42,377	3,327
15	155,621	-1,056	120,744	20,208	16.73	8,878	7.35	2	1	7	13	59,186	38.03%	44,350	10,615	3,951
16	156,755	78	123,362	15,827	12.82	10,706	8.67	0	0	5	19	65,590	41.84%	50,969	3,796	3,537
17	157,926	1,249	120,029	6,465	5.38	5,599	4.66	0	0	2	20	57,611	36.47%	46,456	4,334	2,236
18	155,096	-1,581	110,328	15,062	13.65	7,640	6.92	2	1	6	13	111,382	71.81%	78,445	13,616	6,362
19	154,854	-1,823	121,053	17,762	14.67	6,560	5.41	1	0	1	21	96,682	62.43%	75,095	8,879	4,496
20	156,856	179	127,291	39,710	31.19	9,845	7.73	2	3	20	23	110,134	70.21%	87,979	32,926	5,914
21	156,918	241	128,894	11,213	8.69	10,001	7.75	1	4	14	22	57,093	36.38%	47,533	4,595	4,640
22	154,726	-1,951	125,768	10,920	8.68	14,026	11.15	1	2	6	22	77,882	50.33%	65,945	4,071	6,134
23	155,606	-1,071	121,630	9,985	8.20	9,279	7.62	0	1	5	24	122,338	78.62%	94,780	9,170	8,242
24	157,896	1,219	127,516	10,371	8.13	9,911	7.77	2	0	3	20	119,635	75.76%	96,536	9,231	6,512
25	155,274	-1,403	130,766	4,018	3.07	4,517	3.45	0	3	12	28	88,905	57.25%	74,860	2,597	2,336
26	154,122	-2,555	124,950	26,260	21.01	8,591	6.87	0	4	16	27	101,336	65.75%	82,496	23,897	5,357
27	155,110	-1,567	120,907	9,039	7.47	21,578	17.84	0	3	10	28	58,473	37.69%	45,477	3,069	5,989
28	156,037	-640	118,929	12,894	10.84	17,731	14.90	0	3	4	33	95,911	61.46%	72,126	9,093	9,164
29	158,347	1,670	120,138	14,490	12.06	17,950	14.94	2	4	2	37	61,650	38.93%	47,509	3,134	6,778
30	159,289	2,612	127,193	15,826	12.44	18,563	14.59	2	5	5	37	69,554	43.66%	55,061	6,458	9,753
31	156,405	-272	126,974	9,631	7.58	8,532	6.71	0	3	8	25	114,759	73.37%	91,814	6,767	6,709
32	157,171	494	116,381	11,298	9.70	19,389	16.65	2	6	12	41	99,047	63.01%	72,346	7,373	12,044
33	156,482	-195	139,042	11,613	8.35	6,626	4.76	2	1	5	42	132,098	84.41%	118,906	10,073	5,295
34	157,143	466	131,684	3,473	2.63	5,497	4.17	1	0	3	43	150,684	95.88%	126,202	3,358	5,271
35	156,871	194	125,778	6,455	5.13	11,443	9.09	0	0	3	44	148,757	94.82%	118,478	6,364	11,173

H000H9031 - 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
36	154,847	-1,830	125,696	3,131	2.49	9,756	7.76	0	0	4	46	99,576	64.30%	81,626	1,784	6,460
37	154,993	-1,684	120,471	3,859	3.20	10,550	8.75	0	0	6	61	66,979	43.21%	50,245	2,780	6,745
38	154,857	-1,820	119,957	8,795	7.33	15,719	13.10	0	0	2	61	152,503	98.47%	118,127	8,753	15,558
39	155,573	-1,104	120,209	9,287	7.72	18,017	14.98	2	5	14	64	86,518	55.61%	67,253	5,264	8,297
40	155,028	-1,649	119,242	19,053	15.97	13,611	11.41	0	1	11	64	78,974	50.94%	60,945	13,429	6,999
41	155,394	-1,283	119,556	18,786	15.71	17,564	14.69	0	5	13	65	97,717	62.88%	76,230	13,077	11,081
42	154,915	-1,762	115,872	13,349	11.52	28,686	24.75	2	1	9	79	99,639	64.31%	74,477	5,876	18,955
43	157,563	886	115,766	17,922	15.48	63,619	54.95	0	0	6	41	57,934	36.76%	41,403	7,558	20,691
44	157,229	552	122,587	20,595	16.80	36,664	29.90	0	2	3	36	54,279	34.52%	41,206	13,341	14,136
45	158,510	1,833	116,631	21,825	18.71	23,024	19.74	0	3	8	38	116,812	73.69%	85,873	17,535	18,086
46	156,677	0	112,317	68,554	61.03	15,167	13.50	0	2	0	39	129,806	82.84%	92,251	62,855	11,221
47	157,056	379	128,270	21,143	16.48	25,095	19.56	0	3	3	40	73,279	46.65%	58,626	5,476	14,150
48	156,429	-248	116,779	14,487	12.40	61,238	52.43	0	2	2	49	94,984	60.72%	70,154	9,471	40,206
49	158,757	2,080	127,268	13,281	10.43	29,871	23.47	2	0	5	35	79,639	50.16%	66,618	7,947	16,314
50	158,924	2,247	122,399	12,407	10.13	22,834	18.65	2	1	5	32	79,148	49.80%	60,330	6,239	14,847
51	159,406	2,729	128,426	13,178	10.26	7,185	5.59	0	0	2	32	90,555	56.80%	74,435	4,640	3,647
52	159,652	2,975	128,907	7,446	5.77	8,064	6.25	0	4	3	31	81,124	50.81%	66,434	4,939	3,923
53	159,414	2,737	126,116	15,753	12.49	12,831	10.17	0	4	2	30	84,928	53.27%	63,774	11,412	8,389
54	156,053	-624	126,929	11,119	8.76	11,012	8.67	1	0	5	80	104,664	67.06%	87,330	7,084	5,445
55	155,882	-795	125,035	10,635	8.50	19,956	15.96	1	0	4	77	99,436	63.78%	81,565	7,143	11,530
56	154,900	-1,777	115,066	13,762	11.96	26,258	22.81	1	3	8	66	77,900	50.29%	57,457	4,889	14,291
57	157,418	741	115,199	11,216	9.73	19,664	17.06	0	0	4	67	51,479	32.70%	37,483	5,961	6,862
58	158,568	1,891	118,578	15,291	12.89	23,742	20.02	0	1	4	62	88,905	56.06%	64,996	5,829	15,640
59	158,232	1,555	119,584	16,949	14.17	22,612	18.90	0	0	6	56	109,518	69.21%	83,581	12,356	15,755
60	158,517	1,840	127,954	9,128	7.13	20,432	15.96	0	1	9	57	108,090	68.18%	85,899	5,997	12,917
61	159,521	2,844	116,073	59,495	51.25	23,911	20.59	0	1	5	59	109,995	68.95%	77,808	48,162	14,395
62	158,453	1,776	123,359	15,641	12.67	64,013	51.89	0	1	5	58	92,419	58.32%	72,049	9,459	42,700
63	158,172	1,495	124,382	17,645	14.18	22,401	18.00	0	1	3	60	96,669	61.11%	77,805	9,930	12,013
64	157,818	1,141	121,334	6,737	5.55	17,170	14.15	2	1	3	47	93,077	58.97%	70,398	4,724	13,174
65	157,869	1,192	130,737	3,726	2.84	6,967	5.32	0	1	4	48	93,819	59.42%	76,204	2,384	4,282
66	158,578	1,901	131,512	7,697	5.85	6,874	5.22	0	4	12	54	78,093	49.24%	65,716	4,534	3,762
67	158,424	1,747	130,413	9,593	7.35	14,688	11.26	0	3	10	50	99,996	63.11%	81,841	5,961	10,027
68	158,551	1,874	130,529	7,672	5.87	9,300	7.12	0	2	12	52	100,904	63.64%	84,663	4,608	5,246
69	158,910	2,233	133,923	5,411	4.04	8,451	6.31	0	3	17	53	82,003	51.60%	66,439	4,142	5,511
70	154,044	-2,633	114,432	51,595	45.08	17,560	15.34	4	4	31	55	132,508	86.01%	98,191	48,745	13,414

H000H9031 - 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
71	158,594	1,917	132,794	5,686	4.28	12,662	9.53	2	3	15	68	127,507	80.39%	105,660	4,701	10,212
72	159,167	2,490	134,094	3,621	2.70	11,971	8.92	0	1	6	69	101,467	63.74%	83,620	3,088	10,012
73	159,249	2,572	126,220	4,689	3.71	9,076	7.19	2	1	7	67	159,249	100%	126,220	4,689	9,076
74	157,964	1,287	133,818	3,424	2.55	5,281	3.94	0	0	2	70	91,851	58.14%	81,407	940	2,135
75	159,978	3,301	137,100	7,477	5.45	6,397	4.66	0	0	0	71	100,801	63.00%	86,072	4,088	3,831
76	153,752	-2,925	136,126	1,889	1.38	12,198	8.96	0	0	4	75	126,868	82.51%	111,429	1,569	11,487
77	157,482	805	122,636	4,882	3.98	20,845	16.99	0	0	5	74	149,148	94.70%	116,831	4,468	19,742
78	153,772	-2,905	124,249	16,840	13.55	17,741	14.27	0	0	8	73	116,192	75.56%	91,817	15,805	14,325
79	153,748	-2,929	114,874	12,496	10.87	25,188	21.92	0	0	7	73	70,002	45.53%	51,300	6,385	12,766
80	155,637	-1,040	116,289	10,168	8.74	38,615	33.20	1	0	3	101	92,598	59.49%	70,122	5,295	19,420
81	156,806	129	119,580	20,670	17.28	20,196	16.88	0	0	1	78	70,359	44.87%	52,538	3,407	8,428
82	156,533	-144	127,339	5,310	4.16	14,644	11.50	2	1	3	82	120,321	76.86%	97,445	3,366	10,646
83	156,370	-307	121,688	14,215	11.68	15,543	12.77	2	1	6	81	104,426	66.78%	81,779	7,818	9,394
84	156,530	-147	124,070	23,531	18.96	16,933	13.64	0	1	12	81	87,271	55.75%	70,083	8,291	8,958
85	158,839	2,162	130,459	11,333	8.68	13,290	10.18	0	2	3	83	122,111	76.87%	99,466	5,153	8,685
86	156,784	107	116,190	19,416	16.71	22,630	19.47	0	2	6	85	94,529	60.29%	70,204	7,580	11,972
87	156,640	-37	115,237	18,049	15.66	57,642	50.02	0	3	10	89	75,952	48.48%	56,553	9,040	30,049
88	156,720	43	119,233	61,723	51.76	17,051	14.30	0	6	10	84	83,680	53.39%	63,391	37,511	6,937
89	155,172	-1,505	133,938	10,181	7.60	12,772	9.53	0	7	7	87	93,654	60.35%	79,642	4,606	7,502
90	154,984	-1,693	122,699	16,257	13.24	20,562	16.75	0	3	3	85	48,140	31.06%	34,727	5,254	6,631
91	156,622	-55	138,975	6,737	4.84	9,986	7.18	0	3	4	90	60,996	38.94%	53,656	1,290	4,444
92	154,926	-1,751	122,959	41,807	34.00	21,845	17.76	0	8	3	92	86,125	55.59%	66,114	29,963	12,967
93	157,815	1,138	136,996	7,312	5.33	15,319	11.18	0	5	1	91	119,117	75.47%	104,754	3,339	9,678
94	156,361	-316	121,003	66,025	54.56	14,582	12.05	0	6	6	93	111,967	71.60%	85,308	49,515	9,310
95	154,882	-1,795	116,852	67,381	57.66	19,768	16.91	0	7	5	94	109,506	70.70%	81,177	53,826	11,058
96	155,095	-1,582	118,602	18,763	15.82	22,580	19.03	0	2	0	95	75,569	48.72%	61,433	10,836	11,935
97	155,698	-979	119,122	20,105	16.87	28,929	24.28	0	4	2	96	104,795	67.30%	80,412	13,619	17,936
98	155,182	-1,495	121,430	15,624	12.86	28,798	23.71	0	3	6	98	73,636	47.45%	58,993	10,972	13,380
99	155,731	-946	119,857	15,479	12.91	34,908	29.12	0	7	3	100	77,347	49.66%	59,504	9,714	16,659
100	154,784	-1,893	131,836	8,059	6.11	44,818	33.99	2	6	0	106	85,081	54.96%	71,139	3,381	28,752
101	154,888	-1,789	117,447	42,721	36.37	39,557	33.68	0	4	1	99	67,642	43.67%	52,866	10,531	20,164
102	157,283	606	116,881	60,895	52.09	44,473	38.04	2	3	3	103	73,497	46.72%	53,686	36,298	17,630
103	155,833	-844	115,612	11,609	10.04	94,906	82.09	2	5	1	102	107,788	69.16%	81,610	4,338	74,116
104	155,234	-1,443	113,419	12,449	10.97	49,039	43.23	0	3	2	101	55,479	35.73%	39,587	6,719	18,035
105	155,526	-1,151	115,664	12,953	11.19	79,408	68.65	3	3	5	112	64,284	41.33%	47,630	6,138	30,828

H000H9031 - 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
106	155,388	-1,289	135,129	3,993	2.95	13,850	10.24	0	0	5	76	133,860	86.14%	116,217	3,619	11,741
107	156,985	308	117,467	66,796	56.86	31,000	26.39	0	3	2	104	85,245	54.30%	64,574	33,992	19,132
108	156,848	171	118,792	74,697	62.88	30,213	25.43	0	2	8	108	99,942	63.71%	76,832	43,955	20,931
109	154,121	-2,556	118,409	59,945	50.62	54,160	45.73	0	3	12	109	86,204	55.93%	66,405	32,634	28,761
110	155,488	-1,189	123,183	7,573	6.14	110,212	89.47	0	3	1	110	86,385	55.55%	68,646	4,069	60,737
111	156,697	20	127,389	5,951	4.67	118,533	93.04	0	2	6	113	61,314	39.12%	49,284	2,665	47,013
112	154,895	-1,782	128,709	6,212	4.82	93,967	73.00	0	2	12	107	59,730	38.56%	49,390	1,438	32,738
113	156,568	-109	133,664	8,287	6.19	89,236	66.76	0	1	7	107	78,970	50.43%	69,069	4,498	47,554
114	158,069	1,392	125,567	8,955	7.13	82,897	66.01	0	5	12	117	79,302	50.16%	63,006	3,985	42,566
115	156,215	-462	123,590	7,034	5.69	80,961	65.50	0	5	8	115	77,429	49.56%	60,923	2,183	41,620
116	157,565	888	129,115	4,058	3.14	109,189	84.56	0	2	3	114	84,284	53.49%	69,590	2,713	56,592
117	156,881	204	108,393	40,097	36.99	59,779	55.15	0	1	5	118	115,611	73.69%	80,375	34,267	41,259
118	156,562	-115	121,790	7,771	6.38	98,900	81.20	0	0	1	119	90,486	57.79%	69,093	4,620	54,443
119	156,170	-507	119,182	4,735	3.97	103,418	86.77	0	0	1	116	59,886	38.34%	45,992	2,766	37,953
120	154,924	-1,753	122,292	10,970	8.97	49,064	40.12	1	2	5	120	93,941	60.63%	76,853	5,274	19,829

H000H9031 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	2	78,787	50.46%	62,341	16.28%	41.58%	4.36%	59.40%	0.16%	0.68%
	3	39,653	25.39%	30,210	33.18%	41.06%	3.81%	25.21%	0.74%	1.79%
	1	37,676	24.13%	29,029	14.58%	17.34%	2.42%	15.38%	0.14%	0.54%
2	3	86,600	55.47%	68,639	27.85%	76.48%	3.99%	46.90%	0.26%	1.07%
	2	60,666	38.85%	47,780	12.13%	23.18%	5.99%	48.92%	0.12%	0.58%
	1	8,853	5.67%	6,695	1.23%	0.33%	3.64%	4.16%	0%	0%
3	1	105,003	66.12%	80,617	6.16%	68.17%	2.91%	54.44%	0.04%	0.46%
	4	38,761	24.40%	28,767	6.14%	24.23%	5.61%	37.47%	0.08%	0.36%
	5	15,033	9.46%	11,333	4.88%	7.59%	3.07%	8.07%	0.00%	0.35%
4	4	105,437	66.40%	83,629	8.57%	58.68%	6.67%	72.06%	0.01%	0.44%
	5	36,340	22.88%	26,917	16.05%	35.36%	6.02%	20.93%	0.01%	0.18%
	7	9,134	5.75%	7,549	1.48%	0.91%	4.13%	4.02%	0%	0%
	1	7,870	4.95%	5,556	11.06%	5.03%	4.13%	2.96%	0%	0.32%
5	5	102,641	64.47%	81,306	15.60%	73.08%	3.70%	64.19%	0.17%	0.39%
	7	56,557	35.52%	44,679	10.45%	26.91%	3.76%	35.80%	0.06%	0.31%
6	6	128,215	80.50%	99,712	12.76%	94.33%	4.43%	85.32%	0.23%	0.59%
	7	31,051	19.49%	24,902	3.06%	5.66%	3.05%	14.67%	0%	0.08%
7	10	67,190	43.01%	54,055	26.45%	53.19%	3.63%	36.10%	0.03%	0.63%
	7	55,656	35.63%	43,171	16.19%	26.00%	4.19%	33.24%	0.36%	0.55%
	6	19,721	12.62%	16,378	20.17%	12.29%	4.51%	13.59%	0.02%	0.08%
	11	8,870	5.67%	7,085	18.51%	4.88%	10.57%	13.76%	0%	0%
	8	3,266	2.09%	2,453	28.90%	2.63%	6.31%	2.84%	0.03%	0.95%
	9	1,485	0.95%	1,193	22.21%	0.98%	2.01%	0.44%	0%	0.27%
8	8	131,718	84.30%	105,330	54.67%	91.71%	6.37%	79.29%	0.88%	2.91%
	9	18,616	11.91%	15,743	27.79%	6.96%	6.59%	12.26%	0.82%	1.89%
	7	5,908	3.78%	4,468	18.46%	1.31%	16.00%	8.44%	0.06%	0.26%
9	9	127,096	81.44%	101,482	14.18%	73.54%	4.60%	78.31%	0.14%	0.74%
	8	17,950	11.50%	14,033	28.89%	20.71%	6.54%	15.38%	0.58%	1.69%
	7	11,003	7.05%	8,367	13.43%	5.74%	4.49%	6.29%	0.03%	0.32%
10	11	96,860	61.92%	74,667	10.23%	37.90%	5.63%	69.31%	0.00%	0.57%
	10	32,448	20.74%	25,900	37.20%	47.80%	5.81%	24.81%	0.51%	0.85%
	12	27,115	17.33%	20,068	14.34%	14.28%	1.77%	5.86%	0%	0%
11	12	73,671	47.28%	57,713	6.35%	34.56%	2.83%	31.07%	0.04%	0.15%
	18	54,535	35.00%	44,856	8.81%	37.23%	5.60%	47.67%	0.23%	0.41%
	17	25,805	16.56%	18,681	14.54%	25.61%	5.63%	19.94%	0%	0.71%
	14	1,786	1.14%	1,425	19.29%	2.59%	4.84%	1.30%	0%	0%

H000H9031 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	17	101,745	65.26%	76,632	14.44%	67.92%	8.30%	59.91%	0.28%	1.10%
	18	30,834	19.77%	24,989	9.80%	15.02%	7.77%	18.29%	0.00%	0.70%
	16	19,140	12.27%	14,847	14.28%	13.01%	13.41%	18.73%	0.73%	1.45%
	15	4,109	2.63%	3,208	20.48%	4.03%	10.13%	3.05%	0.36%	1.54%
	14	58	0.03%	51	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.38%	1.47%
13	15	85,150	54.35%	64,592	56.05%	59.86%	6.08%	56.82%	0.61%	1.18%
	17	34,393	21.95%	25,692	30.38%	12.90%	8.73%	32.45%	1.10%	1.62%
	14	24,609	15.70%	18,482	85.38%	26.09%	1.34%	3.59%	0.58%	1.38%
	16	12,497	7.97%	10,243	6.71%	1.13%	4.81%	7.12%	0.74%	0.98%
14	14	101,134	64.74%	73,954	57.30%	70.21%	4.49%	64.66%	0.53%	1.29%
	15	25,758	16.49%	18,736	73.23%	22.73%	3.08%	11.23%	0.15%	0.73%
	13	24,863	15.91%	18,835	17.53%	5.47%	5.54%	20.31%	0.90%	1.52%
	16	4,448	2.84%	3,405	27.87%	1.57%	5.72%	3.79%	0%	0.40%
15	13	59,186	38.03%	44,350	23.93%	52.52%	8.90%	44.50%	0.83%	1.62%
	16	49,701	31.93%	39,440	13.02%	25.42%	5.89%	26.18%	0.04%	0.73%
	19	40,079	25.75%	31,535	10.40%	16.24%	7.24%	25.74%	0.61%	0.83%
	15	5,105	3.28%	4,277	20.34%	4.30%	5.47%	2.63%	0%	1.00%
	14	1,550	0.99%	1,142	26.53%	1.49%	7.18%	0.92%	0.17%	2.93%
16	19	65,590	41.84%	50,969	7.44%	23.98%	6.93%	33.03%	0.08%	0.76%
	16	54,642	34.85%	44,167	18.74%	52.32%	11.14%	45.96%	0.06%	1.11%
	18	32,134	20.49%	24,874	11.12%	17.48%	7.42%	17.26%	0.13%	0.34%
	15	4,389	2.79%	3,352	29.29%	6.20%	11.93%	3.73%	0%	0.37%
17	20	57,611	36.47%	46,456	9.32%	67.03%	4.81%	39.93%	0.13%	0.85%
	19	56,628	35.85%	39,116	4.05%	24.56%	5.45%	38.11%	0.18%	0.22%
	18	43,687	27.66%	34,457	1.57%	8.39%	3.56%	21.95%	0%	0.11%
18	13	111,382	71.81%	78,445	17.35%	90.39%	8.11%	83.27%	0.55%	1.30%
	12	16,078	10.36%	11,879	2.64%	2.08%	2.87%	4.47%	0%	0%
	19	13,331	8.59%	9,669	4.61%	2.96%	5.22%	6.60%	0.65%	0.86%
	20	9,025	5.81%	6,252	5.32%	2.21%	5.32%	4.35%	0%	0%
	14	5,280	3.40%	4,083	8.64%	2.34%	2.40%	1.28%	0%	0%
19	21	96,682	62.43%	75,095	11.82%	49.98%	5.98%	68.53%	0%	0.20%
	12	42,490	27.43%	34,046	22.70%	43.51%	3.99%	20.71%	0.04%	0.81%
	20	15,682	10.12%	11,912	9.67%	6.49%	5.91%	10.74%	0%	0.81%
20	23	110,134	70.21%	87,979	37.42%	82.91%	6.72%	60.07%	0.78%	1.91%
	22	41,764	26.62%	35,435	16.77%	14.96%	10.57%	38.05%	0.25%	1.02%
	11	3,195	2.03%	2,536	17.11%	1.09%	5.16%	1.33%	0.19%	3.54%

H000H9031 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
	10	1,704	1.08%	1,293	31.32%	1.01%	3.71%	0.48%	0%	0.07%
	24	59	0.03%	48	4.16%	0.00%	10.41%	0.05%	0%	0%
21	22	57,093	36.38%	47,533	9.66%	40.97%	9.76%	46.39%	0.22%	0.70%
	11	54,298	34.60%	42,465	7.19%	27.23%	5.51%	23.41%	0.16%	0.31%
	23	29,085	18.53%	25,601	9.38%	21.42%	10.32%	26.43%	0.45%	1.02%
	10	16,442	10.47%	13,295	8.74%	10.36%	2.82%	3.74%	0%	0.02%
22	22	77,882	50.33%	65,945	6.17%	37.28%	9.30%	43.73%	0.14%	1.03%
	24	38,560	24.92%	29,744	12.63%	34.42%	19.44%	41.23%	0.51%	2.41%
	10	33,430	21.60%	26,106	10.61%	25.36%	6.35%	11.82%	0%	0.43%
	43	3,254	2.10%	2,785	0.35%	0.09%	2.19%	0.43%	0%	1.26%
	23	1,600	1.03%	1,188	26.09%	2.83%	32.74%	2.77%	0.67%	1.73%
23	24	122,338	78.62%	94,780	9.67%	91.83%	8.69%	88.82%	0.03%	1.19%
	21	31,439	20.20%	25,487	2.06%	5.26%	3.63%	9.97%	0%	0.07%
	23	1,829	1.17%	1,363	21.20%	2.89%	8.14%	1.19%	0%	0.32%
24	20	119,635	75.76%	96,536	9.56%	89.00%	6.74%	65.70%	0.30%	1.76%
	26	32,484	20.57%	26,776	3.47%	8.96%	8.23%	22.25%	0.02%	0.62%
	21	5,773	3.65%	4,202	4.99%	2.02%	28.39%	12.03%	0%	0.16%
	27	4	0.00%	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.57%
25	28	88,905	57.25%	74,860	3.46%	64.63%	3.12%	51.71%	0.13%	0.52%
	26	35,954	23.15%	29,631	2.19%	16.20%	3.37%	22.11%	0%	0.24%
	27	30,415	19.58%	26,275	2.93%	19.16%	4.49%	26.16%	0.21%	1.47%
26	27	101,336	65.75%	82,496	28.96%	91.00%	6.49%	62.35%	0.57%	1.67%
	26	45,989	29.83%	36,468	5.47%	7.60%	8.19%	34.80%	0.01%	0.66%
	28	6,797	4.41%	5,986	6.13%	1.39%	4.07%	2.84%	1.70%	2.17%
27	28	58,473	37.69%	45,477	6.74%	33.95%	13.16%	27.75%	0.19%	0.95%
	26	50,583	32.61%	39,964	7.42%	32.81%	19.31%	35.76%	0.58%	1.54%
	25	35,258	22.73%	27,118	8.05%	24.15%	23.06%	28.99%	1.25%	2.33%
	33	10,796	6.96%	8,348	9.83%	9.08%	19.34%	7.48%	0.47%	1.73%
28	33	95,911	61.46%	72,126	12.60%	70.52%	12.70%	51.68%	0.10%	1.59%
	34	60,126	38.53%	46,803	8.12%	29.47%	18.30%	48.31%	0.20%	1.29%
29	37	61,650	38.93%	47,509	6.59%	21.62%	14.26%	37.76%	0.16%	1.57%
	34	56,443	35.64%	43,154	10.40%	30.97%	16.56%	39.82%	0.05%	0.94%
	25	29,014	18.32%	21,579	16.30%	24.28%	13.98%	16.81%	0.25%	1.31%
	33	7,414	4.68%	5,017	63.06%	21.83%	12.57%	3.51%	0.35%	0.40%
	38	3,826	2.41%	2,879	6.39%	1.26%	12.99%	2.08%	0.54%	2.03%
30	37	69,554	43.66%	55,061	11.72%	40.80%	17.71%	52.53%	0.70%	2.44%

H000H9031 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
	38	32,223	20.22%	25,647	15.19%	24.63%	14.62%	20.21%	0.92%	3.25%
	35	27,377	17.18%	22,415	3.63%	5.14%	7.56%	9.13%	0.08%	0.32%
	34	16,496	10.35%	13,340	7.08%	5.97%	16.85%	12.11%	0.94%	2.62%
	36	13,445	8.44%	10,584	34.93%	23.36%	10.34%	5.89%	1.15%	3.30%
	39	194	0.12%	146	8.90%	0.08%	13.01%	0.10%	5.24%	15.23%
31	25	114,759	73.37%	91,814	7.37%	70.26%	7.30%	78.63%	0.21%	0.61%
	42	33,495	21.41%	28,643	9.71%	28.88%	4.86%	16.33%	0.05%	0.72%
	21	4,703	3.00%	3,806	0.49%	0.19%	5.09%	2.27%	0%	0%
	41	3,448	2.20%	2,711	2.32%	0.65%	8.66%	2.75%	1.11%	2.48%
32	41	99,047	63.01%	72,346	10.19%	65.25%	16.64%	62.11%	0.39%	2.66%
	42	49,273	31.34%	37,184	9.93%	32.69%	17.84%	34.22%	0.75%	1.96%
	40	8,851	5.63%	6,851	3.37%	2.04%	10.34%	3.65%	0.51%	0.77%
33	42	132,098	84.41%	118,906	8.47%	86.73%	4.45%	79.91%	0.26%	0.75%
	44	12,558	8.02%	10,217	10.77%	9.48%	7.22%	11.13%	0.05%	0.37%
	21	6,466	4.13%	5,757	4.32%	2.14%	3.52%	3.06%	0%	0.43%
	24	5,360	3.42%	4,162	4.56%	1.63%	9.37%	5.88%	0%	0.16%
34	43	150,684	95.88%	126,202	2.66%	96.68%	4.17%	95.88%	0.01%	0.38%
	44	6,459	4.11%	5,482	2.09%	3.31%	4.12%	4.11%	0.16%	0.43%
35	44	148,757	94.82%	118,478	5.37%	98.59%	9.43%	97.64%	0.10%	0.45%
	43	8,114	5.17%	7,300	1.24%	1.40%	3.69%	2.35%	0%	0.01%
36	46	99,576	64.30%	81,626	2.18%	56.97%	7.91%	66.21%	0.01%	0.15%
	45	46,818	30.23%	37,347	2.81%	33.63%	7.29%	27.92%	0%	1.03%
	48	8,453	5.45%	6,723	4.37%	9.38%	8.50%	5.86%	0%	0.83%
37	61	66,979	43.21%	50,245	5.53%	72.03%	13.42%	63.93%	0.19%	1.71%
	46	43,196	27.86%	34,837	1.42%	12.90%	5.17%	17.09%	0%	0.16%
	45	41,979	27.08%	33,142	1.66%	14.33%	5.55%	17.45%	0%	0.22%
	44	2,042	1.31%	1,605	0.99%	0.41%	7.85%	1.19%	0%	0.26%
	48	797	0.51%	642	1.86%	0.31%	5.14%	0.31%	0%	0%
38	61	152,503	98.47%	118,127	7.40%	99.52%	13.17%	98.97%	0.14%	1.38%
	44	1,836	1.18%	1,444	2.21%	0.36%	8.37%	0.76%	0%	0%
	62	518	0.33%	386	2.59%	0.11%	10.36%	0.25%	0%	0%
39	64	86,518	55.61%	67,253	7.82%	56.68%	12.33%	46.05%	0.10%	0.90%
	65	49,793	32.00%	38,171	8.79%	36.15%	17.56%	37.22%	0.69%	1.61%
	41	19,249	12.37%	14,778	4.47%	7.11%	20.39%	16.72%	0.96%	2.88%
	63	13	0.00%	7	57.14%	0.04%	0%	0%	0%	0%
40	64	78,974	50.94%	60,945	22.03%	70.48%	11.48%	51.42%	0.46%	1.40%

H000H9031 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
	63	63,306	40.83%	49,094	9.94%	25.62%	11.60%	41.87%	0.08%	0.50%
	66	12,748	8.22%	9,203	8.05%	3.88%	9.92%	6.70%	0%	0.19%
41	65	97,717	62.88%	76,230	17.15%	69.61%	14.53%	63.08%	1.84%	2.79%
	66	35,860	23.07%	26,880	12.81%	18.34%	16.87%	25.83%	1.53%	2.55%
	63	21,817	14.03%	16,446	13.76%	12.04%	11.83%	11.07%	1.47%	1.74%
42	79	99,639	64.31%	74,477	7.88%	44.01%	25.45%	66.07%	0.83%	2.49%
	65	31,992	20.65%	23,573	16.58%	29.29%	31.37%	25.78%	1.59%	4.08%
	66	23,284	15.03%	17,822	19.99%	26.69%	13.10%	8.13%	0.00%	0.75%
43	41	57,934	36.76%	41,403	18.25%	42.17%	49.97%	32.52%	3.35%	8.15%
	79	56,738	36.00%	42,585	11.72%	27.84%	53.29%	35.67%	0.85%	2.06%
	49	42,891	27.22%	31,778	16.90%	29.97%	63.67%	31.80%	1.27%	4.64%
44	36	54,279	34.52%	41,206	32.37%	64.77%	34.30%	38.55%	9.27%	11.47%
	40	50,266	31.96%	41,206	7.07%	14.15%	21.94%	24.66%	1.05%	2.90%
	49	34,723	22.08%	26,245	12.36%	15.76%	43.73%	31.30%	1.79%	3.36%
	41	17,961	11.42%	13,930	7.83%	5.30%	14.41%	5.47%	0.11%	1.30%
45	38	116,812	73.69%	85,873	20.41%	80.34%	21.06%	78.55%	0.96%	3.16%
	41	37,348	23.56%	27,281	14.72%	18.40%	16.76%	19.87%	0.36%	2.27%
	37	4,350	2.74%	3,477	7.85%	1.25%	10.44%	1.57%	0.77%	3.42%
46	39	129,806	82.84%	92,251	68.13%	91.68%	12.16%	73.98%	9.65%	18.76%
	41	17,345	11.07%	13,026	23.31%	4.43%	18.56%	15.94%	3.02%	7.06%
	36	6,925	4.41%	5,335	30.68%	2.38%	23.58%	8.29%	1.14%	3.53%
	38	2,601	1.66%	1,705	60.11%	1.49%	15.83%	1.78%	3.16%	11.00%
47	40	73,279	46.65%	58,626	9.34%	25.89%	24.13%	56.38%	0.84%	2.24%
	36	63,079	40.16%	52,801	25.55%	63.82%	17.59%	37.02%	4.32%	5.84%
	35	11,721	7.46%	9,563	5.92%	2.68%	12.72%	4.84%	0%	0.69%
	38	6,786	4.32%	5,518	2.62%	0.68%	5.07%	1.11%	0%	0%
	39	2,191	1.39%	1,762	82.91%	6.91%	8.85%	0.62%	8.62%	10.82%
48	49	94,984	60.72%	70,154	13.50%	65.37%	57.31%	65.65%	0.96%	3.04%
	35	20,483	13.09%	15,437	11.76%	12.53%	47.76%	12.03%	1.63%	3.41%
	40	17,268	11.03%	13,098	8.55%	7.73%	36.14%	7.73%	2.64%	3.78%
	36	16,325	10.43%	12,470	12.94%	11.14%	50.68%	10.32%	0.15%	1.74%
	32	7,079	4.52%	5,398	8.57%	3.19%	46.31%	4.08%	1.12%	2.43%
	79	290	0.18%	222	0.90%	0.01%	47.29%	0.17%	0%	0%
49	35	79,639	50.16%	66,618	11.92%	59.83%	24.48%	54.61%	0.58%	3.07%
	33	64,805	40.82%	49,344	9.29%	34.52%	22.53%	37.22%	0.14%	1.53%
	34	11,054	6.96%	8,778	6.50%	4.29%	16.07%	4.72%	0.41%	2.71%

H000H9031 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
	36	3,073	1.93%	2,394	7.39%	1.33%	41.97%	3.36%	1.89%	4.12%
	32	186	0.11%	134	0.74%	0.00%	15.67%	0.07%	0%	0%
50	32	79,148	49.80%	60,330	10.34%	50.28%	24.60%	65.02%	0.30%	2.46%
	29	46,523	29.27%	36,994	11.85%	35.35%	5.21%	8.45%	0.03%	1.11%
	33	17,736	11.16%	12,827	6.27%	6.48%	21.75%	12.22%	0.09%	2.53%
	35	15,515	9.76%	12,246	7.96%	7.86%	26.66%	14.30%	0.04%	3.55%
	79	2	0.00%	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
51	32	90,555	56.80%	74,435	6.23%	35.21%	4.89%	50.75%	0.30%	0.70%
	29	47,721	29.93%	37,167	18.26%	51.51%	6.94%	35.94%	0.05%	0.65%
	30	21,130	13.25%	16,824	10.39%	13.27%	5.67%	13.29%	0.01%	0.62%
52	31	81,124	50.81%	66,434	7.43%	66.33%	5.90%	48.64%	0.21%	0.73%
	30	74,536	46.68%	59,387	4.03%	32.21%	6.58%	48.49%	0.04%	0.73%
	29	3,437	2.15%	2,661	4.02%	1.43%	7.85%	2.59%	0.13%	0.73%
	32	555	0.34%	425	0.23%	0.01%	4.94%	0.26%	3.89%	4.72%
53	30	84,928	53.27%	63,774	17.89%	72.44%	13.15%	65.38%	2.50%	8.01%
	31	57,091	35.81%	46,735	8.61%	25.54%	8.62%	31.40%	0.80%	2.78%
	29	13,926	8.73%	12,588	2.39%	1.91%	2.63%	2.58%	0.02%	0.51%
	80	3,469	2.17%	3,019	0.52%	0.10%	2.68%	0.63%	0%	0%
54	80	104,664	67.06%	87,330	8.11%	63.71%	6.23%	49.44%	0.73%	1.31%
	29	48,683	31.19%	37,617	6.69%	22.63%	14.54%	49.68%	0.24%	0.80%
	78	2,706	1.73%	1,982	76.58%	13.65%	4.84%	0.87%	1.80%	4.90%
55	77	99,436	63.78%	81,565	8.75%	67.16%	14.13%	57.77%	0.30%	1.09%
	79	30,534	19.58%	23,338	7.50%	16.47%	20.88%	24.42%	0.03%	0.63%
	66	12,234	7.84%	9,716	9.51%	8.68%	20.61%	10.03%	0.24%	1.89%
	78	9,847	6.31%	7,391	9.52%	6.61%	16.62%	6.15%	0.25%	0.26%
	80	3,831	2.45%	3,025	3.70%	1.05%	10.54%	1.59%	0.21%	0.94%
56	66	77,900	50.29%	57,457	8.50%	35.52%	24.87%	54.42%	0.00%	0.16%
	63	42,138	27.20%	30,582	17.54%	38.99%	16.10%	18.75%	0.12%	0.40%
	72	34,862	22.50%	27,027	12.97%	25.48%	26.05%	26.81%	0.55%	1.11%
57	67	51,479	32.70%	37,483	15.90%	53.14%	18.30%	34.89%	0.38%	2.21%
	56	44,825	28.47%	30,782	8.54%	23.44%	13.64%	21.35%	0.01%	1.78%
	62	32,205	20.45%	23,876	8.08%	17.21%	12.23%	14.85%	0.10%	1.76%
	63	28,909	18.36%	23,058	3.00%	6.18%	24.63%	28.88%	0%	0.19%
58	62	88,905	56.06%	64,996	8.96%	38.12%	24.06%	65.87%	0.06%	0.45%
	60	61,852	39.00%	47,983	17.43%	54.69%	14.55%	29.42%	1.02%	2.41%
	56	5,587	3.52%	3,983	13.10%	3.41%	20.03%	3.36%	0%	1.12%

H000H9031 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
	59	1,850	1.16%	1,308	43.42%	3.71%	22.47%	1.23%	3.49%	6.24%
	61	374	0.23%	308	2.59%	0.05%	8.11%	0.10%	0%	0.16%
59	56	109,518	69.21%	83,581	14.78%	72.90%	18.84%	69.67%	0.50%	2.28%
	62	40,537	25.61%	29,906	10.39%	18.34%	16.82%	22.25%	0.14%	1.19%
	59	8,177	5.16%	6,097	24.32%	8.74%	29.91%	8.06%	0.49%	2.01%
60	57	108,090	68.18%	85,899	6.98%	65.69%	15.03%	63.21%	0.31%	0.89%
	56	26,407	16.65%	23,072	6.27%	15.85%	16.18%	18.28%	0.36%	0.59%
	67	18,063	11.39%	14,483	2.59%	4.11%	14.49%	10.27%	0.26%	0.48%
	59	5,513	3.47%	4,104	31.65%	14.23%	40.10%	8.05%	0.05%	0.31%
	55	348	0.21%	314	0.63%	0.02%	7.00%	0.10%	0%	0%
	58	96	0.06%	82	8.53%	0.07%	14.63%	0.05%	0%	0%
61	59	109,995	68.95%	77,808	61.89%	80.95%	18.50%	60.20%	2.17%	5.34%
	58	37,494	23.50%	28,532	29.77%	14.27%	26.79%	31.96%	0.87%	2.94%
	56	6,171	3.86%	5,248	36.54%	3.22%	20.57%	4.51%	0.10%	3.91%
	47	3,152	1.97%	2,575	9.43%	0.40%	19.26%	2.07%	0%	1.11%
	60	2,709	1.69%	1,910	35.44%	1.13%	15.49%	1.23%	5.40%	9.79%
62	58	92,419	58.32%	72,049	13.12%	60.47%	59.26%	66.70%	0.50%	1.48%
	47	39,868	25.16%	30,773	13.01%	25.59%	40.56%	19.50%	0.17%	1.76%
	57	26,042	16.43%	20,434	10.57%	13.81%	43.00%	13.72%	0.07%	1.84%
	56	124	0.07%	103	16.50%	0.10%	39.80%	0.06%	0%	0%
63	60	96,669	61.11%	77,805	12.76%	56.27%	15.43%	53.62%	0.72%	3.04%
	61	22,540	14.25%	15,566	16.13%	14.23%	17.12%	11.89%	0%	0.79%
	47	20,959	13.25%	16,694	7.12%	6.74%	19.37%	14.43%	0%	0.40%
	59	16,116	10.18%	12,904	28.64%	20.94%	30.95%	17.83%	2.68%	6.19%
	58	1,888	1.19%	1,413	22.50%	1.80%	34.96%	2.20%	0%	0.77%
64	47	93,077	58.97%	70,398	6.71%	70.12%	18.71%	76.72%	0.23%	1.09%
	48	33,855	21.45%	27,340	2.99%	12.15%	7.04%	11.22%	0.51%	0.98%
	50	15,183	9.62%	12,113	5.10%	9.17%	5.32%	3.75%	0%	0.34%
	57	14,328	9.07%	10,312	5.27%	8.07%	12.39%	7.44%	0%	0.16%
	60	1,375	0.87%	1,171	2.73%	0.47%	12.46%	0.85%	0%	0%
65	48	93,819	59.42%	76,204	3.12%	63.98%	5.61%	61.46%	0%	0.15%
	45	57,821	36.62%	49,208	2.32%	30.73%	4.82%	34.04%	0.03%	0.21%
	50	6,229	3.94%	5,325	3.69%	5.28%	5.87%	4.49%	0%	0.06%
66	54	78,093	49.24%	65,716	6.89%	58.90%	5.72%	54.72%	0%	0.19%
	51	74,302	46.85%	61,027	1.87%	14.83%	4.61%	41.00%	0.02%	0.24%
	50	6,183	3.89%	4,769	42.37%	26.25%	6.14%	4.26%	0%	0.02%

H000H9031 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
67	50	99,996	63.11%	81,841	7.28%	62.13%	12.25%	68.26%	0.05%	0.24%
	52	36,511	23.04%	29,977	9.17%	28.67%	10.97%	22.39%	0%	0.46%
	51	13,011	8.21%	11,025	4.01%	4.61%	7.22%	5.42%	0%	0.06%
	54	8,906	5.62%	7,570	5.78%	4.56%	7.58%	3.90%	0%	0.18%
68	52	100,904	63.64%	84,663	5.44%	60.06%	6.19%	56.40%	0.00%	0.49%
	53	46,294	29.19%	36,588	7.36%	35.11%	9.30%	36.61%	0.00%	0.14%
	51	7,727	4.87%	6,164	4.20%	3.37%	7.81%	5.18%	0.01%	0.67%
	50	3,435	2.16%	2,929	3.37%	1.29%	5.25%	1.65%	0%	0.08%
	55	191	0.12%	185	6.48%	0.15%	7.02%	0.13%	3.38%	3.38%
69	53	82,003	51.60%	66,439	6.23%	76.54%	8.29%	65.21%	0.13%	0.63%
	54	42,738	26.89%	38,754	1.64%	11.77%	3.59%	16.49%	0.12%	0.14%
	51	34,104	21.46%	28,679	2.14%	11.36%	5.37%	18.23%	0.00%	0.18%
	55	65	0.04%	51	33.33%	0.31%	9.80%	0.05%	0%	0%
70	55	132,508	86.01%	98,191	49.64%	94.47%	13.66%	76.38%	1.23%	2.39%
	67	12,243	7.94%	8,553	11.78%	1.95%	39.82%	19.39%	0.50%	0.73%
	53	4,818	3.12%	3,865	22.32%	1.67%	6.93%	1.52%	0%	0.40%
	52	2,374	1.54%	2,244	19.91%	0.86%	6.10%	0.78%	0%	0%
	68	1,177	0.76%	809	28.05%	0.43%	35.22%	1.62%	2.09%	2.18%
	54	680	0.44%	591	37.56%	0.43%	2.53%	0.08%	0%	0.14%
	69	244	0.15%	179	46.36%	0.16%	19.55%	0.19%	0%	5.44%
71	68	127,507	80.39%	105,660	4.44%	82.67%	9.66%	80.65%	0.51%	0.98%
	69	30,513	19.23%	26,677	3.68%	17.27%	9.12%	19.23%	1.78%	1.94%
	70	574	0.36%	457	0.65%	0.05%	3.28%	0.11%	0%	0%
72	69	101,467	63.74%	83,620	3.69%	85.28%	11.97%	83.63%	0.22%	0.63%
	70	57,700	36.25%	50,474	1.05%	14.71%	3.88%	16.36%	0.04%	0.06%
73	67	159,249	100%	126,220	3.71%	100%	7.19%	100%	0.60%	0.87%
74	70	91,851	58.14%	81,407	1.15%	27.45%	2.62%	40.42%	0.11%	0.19%
	71	66,113	41.85%	52,411	4.73%	72.54%	6.00%	59.57%	0.86%	1.79%
75	71	100,801	63.00%	86,072	4.74%	54.67%	4.45%	59.88%	0.64%	2.39%
	72	59,157	36.97%	51,009	6.64%	45.32%	5.03%	40.11%	0.68%	3.08%
	74	20	0.01%	19	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
76	75	126,868	82.51%	111,429	1.40%	83.05%	10.30%	94.17%	0.01%	0.22%
	74	25,784	16.76%	23,671	1.29%	16.19%	2.88%	5.59%	0.00%	0.05%
	73	1,100	0.71%	1,026	1.36%	0.74%	2.72%	0.22%	0.25%	1%
77	74	149,148	94.70%	116,831	3.82%	91.51%	16.89%	94.70%	0.67%	1.07%
	71	6,222	3.95%	4,330	6.51%	5.77%	16.62%	3.45%	0%	1.51%

H000H9031 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
	73	2,112	1.34%	1,475	8.94%	2.70%	25.96%	1.83%	1.48%	2.33%
78	73	116,192	75.56%	91,817	17.21%	93.85%	15.60%	80.74%	2.88%	3.48%
	75	13,141	8.54%	10,900	5.25%	3.40%	16.65%	10.23%	1.02%	1.43%
	71	10,011	6.51%	9,834	0.38%	0.22%	1.29%	0.71%	0%	0.59%
	74	7,508	4.88%	6,177	2.13%	0.78%	7.20%	2.50%	1.29%	1.40%
	72	6,920	4.50%	5,521	5.28%	1.73%	18.63%	5.80%	1.24%	1.54%
79	73	70,002	45.53%	51,300	12.44%	51.09%	24.88%	50.68%	1.80%	4.24%
	72	66,245	43.08%	49,167	11.80%	46.45%	21.70%	42.36%	1.81%	4.42%
	75	17,501	11.38%	14,407	2.12%	2.44%	12.15%	6.95%	1.66%	2.05%
80	101	92,598	59.49%	70,122	7.55%	52.07%	27.69%	50.29%	2.74%	3.70%
	77	48,019	30.85%	33,945	13.32%	44.47%	50.80%	44.66%	1.28%	2.02%
	76	15,020	9.65%	12,222	2.87%	3.45%	15.94%	5.04%	3.50%	4.01%
81	78	70,359	44.87%	52,538	6.48%	16.48%	16.04%	41.73%	1.88%	3.42%
	84	34,458	21.97%	24,434	58.80%	69.51%	28.53%	34.52%	6.31%	11.15%
	90	25,153	16.04%	21,515	3.69%	3.84%	11.56%	12.32%	0.75%	1.57%
	85	18,375	11.71%	15,096	7.50%	5.48%	9.27%	6.93%	2.33%	6.60%
	83	8,461	5.39%	5,997	16.12%	4.67%	15.10%	4.48%	0%	1.96%
82	82	120,321	76.86%	97,445	3.45%	63.38%	10.92%	72.69%	0.48%	0.71%
	83	23,865	15.24%	20,380	0.83%	3.22%	4.08%	5.68%	0.00%	0.36%
	81	9,936	6.34%	7,921	14.90%	22.24%	32.57%	17.61%	1.48%	2.49%
	78	2,411	1.54%	1,593	37.16%	11.14%	36.78%	4.00%	1.43%	2.54%
83	81	104,426	66.78%	81,779	9.55%	54.99%	11.48%	60.43%	1.47%	3.67%
	82	51,944	33.21%	39,909	16.02%	45.00%	15.40%	39.56%	2.21%	4.67%
84	81	87,271	55.75%	70,083	11.83%	35.23%	12.78%	52.90%	2.82%	5.75%
	80	36,539	23.34%	30,766	10.58%	13.83%	9.90%	17.99%	3.42%	4.70%
	78	32,720	20.90%	23,221	51.60%	50.92%	21.22%	29.10%	4.32%	6.90%
85	83	122,111	76.87%	99,466	5.18%	45.46%	8.73%	65.34%	0.32%	2.34%
	88	26,790	16.86%	23,201	18.72%	38.33%	14.19%	24.78%	2.88%	6.13%
	84	9,938	6.25%	7,792	23.56%	16.20%	16.82%	9.86%	5.08%	9.86%
86	85	94,529	60.29%	70,204	10.79%	39.03%	17.05%	52.90%	1.30%	4.36%
	88	53,330	34.01%	39,468	24.31%	49.42%	22.80%	39.77%	4.50%	9.90%
	84	8,921	5.68%	6,514	34.38%	11.53%	25.37%	7.30%	3.31%	11.23%
	78	4	0.00%	4	0%	0%	75%	0.01%	0%	0%
87	89	75,952	48.48%	56,553	15.98%	50.08%	53.13%	52.13%	4.93%	6.90%
	88	41,135	26.26%	29,562	16.88%	27.66%	49.23%	25.24%	4.31%	7.33%
	85	32,783	20.92%	24,611	9.68%	13.20%	44.87%	19.15%	2.90%	4.91%

H000H9031 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
	84	6,770	4.32%	4,511	36.17%	9.04%	44.24%	3.46%	10.48%	11.82%
88	84	83,680	53.39%	63,391	59.17%	60.77%	10.94%	40.68%	7.38%	12.73%
	86	30,476	19.44%	22,778	68.61%	25.31%	9.89%	13.22%	20.40%	23.83%
	89	27,649	17.64%	21,161	25.53%	8.75%	28.50%	35.37%	12.89%	14.80%
	88	8,802	5.61%	6,928	27.52%	3.08%	16.46%	6.69%	5.34%	11.46%
	83	3,758	2.39%	3,198	17.07%	0.88%	12.13%	2.27%	0%	1.76%
	87	2,355	1.50%	1,777	40.91%	1.17%	16.76%	1.74%	7.06%	8.27%
89	87	93,654	60.35%	79,642	5.78%	45.24%	9.41%	58.73%	2.76%	3.56%
	86	24,108	15.53%	20,595	20.84%	42.16%	12.91%	20.81%	9.68%	10.73%
	89	17,690	11.40%	15,428	5.96%	9.03%	10.63%	12.84%	2.97%	4.01%
	83	10,182	6.56%	9,399	1.39%	1.28%	3.78%	2.78%	0%	0.19%
	91	8,371	5.39%	7,717	1.76%	1.33%	5.71%	3.45%	0%	0%
	84	1,167	0.75%	1,157	8.21%	0.93%	15.03%	1.36%	0%	0.92%
90	85	48,140	31.06%	34,727	15.12%	32.31%	19.09%	32.24%	5.19%	8.22%
	86	36,229	23.37%	29,633	11.02%	20.10%	12.74%	18.36%	4.10%	5.70%
	88	34,910	22.52%	29,505	15.22%	27.63%	21.14%	30.33%	5.55%	8.06%
	89	18,786	12.12%	14,639	16.71%	15.05%	19.37%	13.79%	7.09%	10.95%
	78	15,875	10.24%	13,272	5.37%	4.39%	7.35%	4.74%	5.09%	6.45%
	87	1,044	0.67%	923	8.88%	0.50%	11.37%	0.51%	7.74%	8.70%
91	90	60,996	38.94%	53,656	2.40%	19.14%	8.28%	44.50%	0.23%	0.62%
	86	51,297	32.75%	45,901	8.75%	59.64%	6.34%	29.15%	6.62%	7.97%
	78	22,231	14.19%	20,769	3.61%	11.14%	4.43%	9.23%	0.31%	1.58%
	87	22,098	14.10%	18,649	3.63%	10.06%	9.16%	17.11%	5.78%	6.90%
92	92	86,125	55.59%	66,114	45.32%	71.66%	19.61%	59.35%	13.60%	16.61%
	90	31,035	20.03%	26,572	12.99%	8.25%	14.79%	17.99%	4.79%	5.64%
	95	19,964	12.88%	16,525	21.86%	8.64%	20.37%	15.41%	7.47%	12.67%
	87	11,227	7.24%	9,143	9.61%	2.10%	13.57%	5.68%	1.88%	4.57%
	94	6,575	4.24%	4,605	84.66%	9.32%	7.36%	1.55%	18.56%	40.35%
93	91	119,117	75.47%	104,754	3.18%	45.66%	9.23%	63.17%	1.08%	1.65%
	92	29,912	18.95%	24,862	12.51%	42.56%	18.32%	29.74%	6.37%	7.49%
	87	6,753	4.27%	5,597	9.70%	7.42%	13.45%	4.91%	0.56%	1.91%
	93	2,033	1.28%	1,783	17.83%	4.34%	18.62%	2.16%	1.23%	1.47%
94	93	111,967	71.60%	85,308	58.04%	74.99%	10.91%	63.84%	10.53%	18.96%
	94	19,164	12.25%	14,373	86.75%	18.88%	4.98%	4.91%	13.86%	31.79%
	92	17,150	10.96%	14,707	19.63%	4.37%	20.07%	20.25%	9.96%	13.06%
	98	5,756	3.68%	4,714	17.69%	1.26%	21.72%	7.02%	3.42%	9.32%

H000H9031 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
	91	2,324	1.48%	1,901	16.78%	0.48%	30.40%	3.96%	8.95%	11.72%
95	94	109,506	70.70%	81,177	66.30%	79.88%	13.62%	55.93%	14.62%	37.18%
	96	19,317	12.47%	15,427	35.61%	8.15%	20.18%	15.75%	8.48%	25.12%
	98	16,097	10.39%	12,970	36.32%	6.99%	29.27%	19.20%	6.82%	24.64%
	95	9,962	6.43%	7,278	46.01%	4.97%	24.71%	9.10%	14.18%	28.52%
96	95	75,569	48.72%	61,433	17.63%	57.75%	19.42%	52.85%	4.14%	8.47%
	97	37,892	24.43%	26,562	12.00%	16.99%	15.45%	18.17%	1.20%	3.74%
	90	25,369	16.35%	18,578	14.26%	14.12%	21.68%	17.84%	2.89%	8.48%
	96	16,265	10.48%	12,029	17.34%	11.12%	20.88%	11.12%	7.81%	10.39%
97	96	104,795	67.30%	80,412	16.93%	67.73%	22.30%	62.00%	1.80%	7.53%
	95	28,860	18.53%	21,972	18.43%	20.14%	28.40%	21.57%	2.58%	9.19%
	98	15,208	9.76%	11,657	15.87%	9.20%	29.39%	11.84%	0.96%	7.85%
	97	6,835	4.38%	5,081	11.49%	2.90%	26.07%	4.58%	0.69%	5.41%
98	98	73,636	47.45%	58,993	18.59%	70.22%	22.68%	46.46%	2.89%	9.62%
	97	54,861	35.35%	40,413	7.07%	18.30%	25.61%	35.94%	0.46%	2.53%
	100	24,555	15.82%	20,341	7.89%	10.27%	23.67%	16.71%	1.01%	3.18%
	93	2,130	1.37%	1,683	11.11%	1.19%	14.97%	0.87%	3.47%	6.68%
99	100	77,347	49.66%	59,504	16.32%	62.75%	27.99%	47.72%	0.89%	4.78%
	99	43,026	27.62%	33,252	10.97%	23.58%	33.17%	31.60%	3.01%	6.57%
	97	18,441	11.84%	13,767	5.14%	4.58%	22.93%	9.04%	0.68%	3.13%
	93	15,153	9.73%	11,958	10.82%	8.35%	30.49%	10.44%	3.86%	7.86%
	101	1,760	1.13%	1,372	8.09%	0.71%	30.17%	1.18%	1.14%	7.11%
	91	4	0.00%	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.26%
100	106	85,081	54.96%	71,139	4.75%	41.95%	40.41%	64.15%	0.74%	1.60%
	105	36,745	23.73%	31,911	6.49%	25.71%	28.93%	20.60%	0.93%	2.24%
	99	20,609	13.31%	18,091	8.60%	19.32%	22.45%	9.06%	0.35%	2.52%
	100	8,788	5.67%	7,746	6.31%	6.06%	19.18%	3.31%	0.41%	2.71%
	108	3,378	2.18%	2,770	19.67%	6.76%	45.84%	2.83%	0.90%	2.87%
	91	183	0.11%	179	8.37%	0.18%	8.37%	0.03%	0.38%	1.90%
101	99	67,642	43.67%	52,866	19.92%	24.65%	38.14%	50.97%	3.65%	7.87%
	105	60,265	38.90%	44,698	47.74%	49.95%	30.48%	34.44%	6.65%	20.59%
	103	20,270	13.08%	14,742	66.49%	22.94%	22.43%	8.36%	17.18%	42.89%
	100	6,711	4.33%	5,141	20.38%	2.45%	47.81%	6.21%	5.45%	10.49%
102	103	73,497	46.72%	53,686	67.61%	59.60%	32.83%	39.64%	3.75%	13.83%
	105	39,631	25.19%	28,842	53.07%	25.13%	32.25%	20.91%	8.20%	24.67%
	110	16,136	10.25%	12,594	23.64%	4.89%	76.04%	21.53%	1.41%	3.82%

H000H9031 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
	100	15,772	10.02%	12,302	19.53%	3.94%	39.62%	10.96%	4.40%	11.64%
	99	6,368	4.04%	5,321	33.37%	2.91%	25.07%	2.99%	11.24%	24.92%
	112	5,879	3.73%	4,136	51.52%	3.49%	42.40%	3.94%	6.05%	20.65%
103	102	107,788	69.16%	81,610	5.31%	37.36%	90.81%	78.09%	0.30%	0.59%
	112	44,711	28.69%	31,567	20.65%	56.17%	62.36%	20.74%	3.59%	8.89%
	105	3,334	2.13%	2,435	30.80%	6.46%	45.25%	1.16%	2.52%	13.88%
104	101	55,479	35.73%	39,587	16.97%	53.97%	45.55%	36.77%	3.18%	9.21%
	97	51,819	33.38%	35,701	6.50%	18.64%	40.86%	29.74%	0.73%	3.36%
	98	24,245	15.61%	17,699	5.01%	7.12%	47.79%	17.25%	0.34%	2.81%
	105	11,298	7.27%	10,869	8.83%	7.71%	38.93%	8.62%	1.60%	3.91%
	112	7,936	5.11%	5,886	17.92%	8.47%	40.74%	4.88%	3.01%	8.36%
	100	4,457	2.87%	3,677	13.78%	4.07%	36.06%	2.70%	1.35%	6.20%
105	112	64,284	41.33%	47,630	12.88%	47.38%	64.72%	38.82%	2.27%	2.93%
	101	39,763	25.56%	27,981	17.37%	37.52%	48.94%	17.24%	6.20%	10.16%
	116	27,683	17.79%	21,396	4.93%	8.14%	85.99%	23.17%	0.62%	1.96%
	119	19,496	12.53%	15,303	4.18%	4.94%	91.39%	17.61%	0.41%	1.43%
	120	1,664	1.06%	1,233	7.05%	0.67%	80.77%	1.25%	3.63%	8.45%
	114	1,524	0.97%	1,241	3.46%	0.33%	98.79%	1.54%	0%	0%
	76	1,112	0.71%	880	14.54%	0.98%	31.59%	0.35%	12.10%	12.45%
106	76	133,860	86.14%	116,217	3.11%	90.63%	10.10%	84.77%	2.08%	2.59%
	75	17,364	11.17%	15,437	1.10%	4.25%	10.02%	11.16%	1.19%	1.80%
	112	4,164	2.67%	3,475	5.87%	5.10%	16.17%	4.05%	6.58%	7.86%
107	104	85,245	54.30%	64,574	52.64%	50.88%	29.62%	61.71%	27.25%	35.34%
	108	28,931	18.42%	21,595	65.59%	21.20%	22.31%	15.54%	37.43%	45.43%
	103	24,923	15.87%	17,931	86.19%	23.13%	11.25%	6.50%	18.51%	34.09%
	106	17,886	11.39%	13,367	23.81%	4.76%	37.64%	16.23%	9.21%	14.08%
108	108	99,942	63.71%	76,832	57.20%	58.84%	27.24%	69.27%	30.84%	35.22%
	109	33,919	21.62%	25,129	69.91%	23.51%	22.92%	19.07%	18.89%	22.06%
	104	22,983	14.65%	16,828	78.28%	17.63%	20.89%	11.64%	14.05%	19.38%
	106	4	0.00%	3	0%	0%	100%	0.00%	16.28%	20.64%
109	109	86,204	55.93%	66,405	49.14%	54.43%	43.31%	53.10%	3.72%	6.15%
	104	29,204	18.94%	21,569	64.93%	23.36%	36.71%	14.62%	11.63%	17.09%
	103	17,974	11.66%	13,377	70.76%	15.79%	30.35%	7.49%	3.61%	8.30%
	113	12,224	7.93%	9,716	22.02%	3.56%	79.82%	14.32%	1.13%	2.80%
	107	7,588	4.92%	6,562	24.26%	2.65%	76.71%	9.29%	0.01%	1.06%
	110	927	0.60%	780	13.71%	0.17%	80.64%	1.16%	1.06%	3.02%

H000H9031 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
110	110	86,385	55.55%	68,646	5.92%	53.73%	88.47%	55.10%	0.82%	2.41%
	102	53,164	34.19%	41,639	6.00%	33.01%	90.04%	34.01%	0.75%	1.59%
	111	13,593	8.74%	11,057	5.59%	8.17%	96.28%	9.65%	0%	0%
	103	1,675	1.07%	1,280	29.68%	5.01%	64.29%	0.74%	3.12%	9.67%
	112	671	0.43%	561	0.89%	0.06%	91.26%	0.46%	0%	0%
111	113	61,314	39.12%	49,284	5.40%	44.78%	95.39%	39.66%	0.18%	0.58%
	111	59,981	38.27%	49,045	3.58%	29.54%	89.70%	37.11%	0.06%	0.45%
	110	28,690	18.30%	23,730	2.00%	7.98%	95.62%	19.14%	0%	0%
	107	4,762	3.03%	3,826	17.22%	11.07%	91.61%	2.95%	1.01%	3.42%
	109	1,950	1.24%	1,504	26.19%	6.62%	88.29%	1.12%	2.03%	2.03%
112	107	59,730	38.56%	49,390	2.91%	23.14%	66.28%	34.83%	0.12%	0.35%
	113	46,593	30.08%	38,469	9.02%	55.85%	66.57%	27.25%	0.08%	1.16%
	117	36,484	23.55%	30,470	3.13%	15.35%	89.36%	28.97%	0%	0.01%
	111	12,088	7.80%	10,380	3.37%	5.63%	80.79%	8.92%	0%	0.29%
113	107	78,970	50.43%	69,069	6.51%	54.27%	68.84%	53.29%	1.19%	1.56%
	106	47,981	30.64%	40,312	5.71%	27.80%	61.72%	27.88%	0.38%	0.91%
	113	16,460	10.51%	13,306	4.26%	6.84%	97.14%	14.48%	0%	0%
	109	13,157	8.40%	10,977	8.36%	11.07%	35.29%	4.34%	0.07%	1.00%
114	117	79,302	50.16%	63,006	6.32%	44.50%	67.55%	51.34%	0.45%	2.69%
	111	51,834	32.79%	42,443	5.85%	27.77%	70.44%	36.06%	0.04%	0.41%
	118	17,214	10.89%	13,027	16.54%	24.06%	57.04%	8.96%	2.22%	7.16%
	107	5,127	3.24%	3,714	1.26%	0.52%	46.95%	2.10%	0.26%	1.61%
	115	4,586	2.90%	3,371	8.33%	3.13%	37.28%	1.51%	2.61%	7.75%
	113	6	0.00%	6	0%	0%	33.33%	0.00%	0%	0%
115	115	77,429	49.56%	60,923	3.58%	31.03%	68.31%	51.40%	0.32%	1.91%
	117	35,174	22.51%	28,324	3.29%	13.26%	67.84%	23.73%	0.35%	1.33%
	114	23,533	15.06%	18,292	5.64%	14.68%	55.26%	12.48%	0.77%	3.63%
	118	9,288	5.94%	7,030	22.43%	22.41%	44.83%	3.89%	1.73%	9.71%
	112	8,857	5.66%	7,349	10.45%	10.91%	83.95%	7.62%	0.66%	1.16%
	111	1,934	1.23%	1,672	32.29%	7.67%	41.50%	0.85%	0.10%	1.10%
116	114	84,284	53.49%	69,590	3.89%	66.85%	81.32%	51.82%	0.71%	1.58%
	115	53,039	33.66%	43,584	1.82%	19.61%	89.99%	35.92%	0.09%	0.25%
	112	17,559	11.14%	13,753	3.77%	12.78%	82.99%	10.45%	0.61%	1.09%
	119	2,683	1.70%	2,188	1.37%	0.73%	89.48%	1.79%	0%	0.08%
117	118	115,611	73.69%	80,375	42.63%	85.46%	51.33%	69.01%	3.46%	9.06%
	120	34,487	21.98%	23,607	19.15%	11.27%	66.72%	26.34%	3.54%	6.75%

H000H9031 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
	119	5,819	3.70%	3,658	32.28%	2.94%	61.01%	3.73%	4.20%	5.57%
	114	964	0.61%	753	16.99%	0.31%	71.31%	0.89%	0.58%	6.64%
118	119	90,486	57.79%	69,093	6.68%	59.45%	78.79%	55.04%	1.26%	4.36%
	116	47,112	30.09%	37,818	2.55%	12.45%	89.11%	34.07%	0.35%	1.24%
	114	18,767	11.98%	14,725	14.81%	28.07%	72.03%	10.72%	0.86%	4.22%
	112	197	0.12%	154	0.64%	0.01%	96.75%	0.15%	0%	0%
119	116	59,886	38.34%	45,992	6.01%	58.41%	82.52%	36.69%	0.85%	3.63%
	112	56,298	36.04%	43,258	2.11%	19.34%	90.42%	37.82%	0.13%	0.61%
	120	39,986	25.60%	29,932	3.51%	22.23%	88.02%	25.47%	0.10%	1.13%
120	120	93,941	60.63%	76,853	6.86%	48.07%	25.80%	40.41%	1.82%	2.81%
	119	36,195	23.36%	27,025	7.28%	17.94%	59.41%	32.72%	1.49%	2.88%
	118	20,735	13.38%	15,225	21.35%	29.63%	71.46%	22.17%	3.83%	8.77%
	114	4,053	2.61%	3,189	14.92%	4.33%	72.02%	4.68%	3.65%	8.22%

H000H9031 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
	Cities	Century
	Vtd's	120330218|2|2641 of 2894
2	Counties	Escambia|2|141,503 of 297,619, Santa Rosa|2|14,616 of 151,372
	Cities	Gulf Breeze, Pensacola
	Vtd's	120330218|2|253 of 2894
3	Counties	Okaloosa|2|22,041 of 180,822, Santa Rosa|2|136,756 of 151,372
	Cities	Jay, Laurel Hill, Milton
	Vtd's	120910003|2|1699 of 1912, 120910004|2|1285 of 1834, 120910008|2|2460 of 2465, 120910009|2|530 of 3193, 120910010|2|2004 of 2576, 120910011|2|1329 of 2855, 120910012|2|82 of 2915, 120910021|2|1342 of 2612
4	Counties	Okaloosa
	Cities	Cinco Bayou, Crestview, Destin, Fort Walton Beach, Mary Esther, Niceville, Shalimar, Valparaiso
	Vtd's	120910003|2|213 of 1912, 120910004|2|549 of 1834, 120910008|2|5 of 2465, 120910009|2|2663 of 3193, 120910010|2|572 of 2576, 120910011|2|1526 of 2855, 120910012|2|2833 of 2915, 120910021|2|1270 of 2612
5	Counties	Bay|2|9,586 of 168,852, Holmes, Jackson, Walton, Washington
	Cities	Alford, Bascom, Bonifay, Campbellton, Caryville, Chipley, Cottondale, De Funiak Springs, Ebro, Esto, Freeport, Graceville, Grand Ridge, Greenwood, Jacob City, Malone, Marianna, Noma, Paxton, Ponce de Leon, Sneads, Vernon, Wausau, Westville
	Vtd's	120050003|2|727 of 4383, 120050005|2|770 of 3567, 120050023|2|37 of 1601
6	Counties	Bay
	Cities	Callaway, Lynn Haven, Mexico Beach, Panama City, Panama City Beach, Parker, Springfield
	Vtd's	120050003|2|3656 of 4383, 120050005|2|2797 of 3567, 120050023|2|1564 of 1601
7	Counties	Calhoun, Franklin, Gulf, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon|3|9,585 of 275,487, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, Wakulla
	Cities	Altha, Apalachicola, Blountstown, Bristol, Carrabelle, Greenville, Lee, Madison, Mayo, Monticello, Perry, Port St. Joe, St. Marks, Sopchoppy, Wewahitchka
	Vtd's	120730039|2|1943 of 2484, 120730050|2|627 of 1743
8	Counties	Gadsden, Leon|3|109,853 of 275,487
	Cities	Chattahoochee, Greensboro, Gretna, Havana, Midway, Quincy, Tallahassee|2|94721 of 181376
	Vtd's	120730002|2|998 of 1061, 120730008|2|67 of 132, 120730011|2|50 of 1374, 120730050|2|1116 of 1743, 120730082|2|162 of 1303, 120730151|2|109 of 2782
9	Counties	Leon
	Cities	Tallahassee|2|86655 of 181376
	Vtd's	120730002|2|63 of 1061, 120730008|2|65 of 132, 120730011|2|1324 of 1374, 120730039|2|541 of 2484, 120730082|2|1141 of 1303, 120730151|2|2673 of 2782
10	Counties	Alachua|3|5,427 of 247,336, Baker, Columbia, Hamilton, Suwannee
	Cities	Branford, Fort White, Glen St. Mary, High Springs|2|3147 of 5350, Jasper, Jennings, Lake City, Live Oak, Macclenny, White Springs
	Vtd's	120010007|2|916 of 4132, 120010065|2|2815 of 3379, 120010066|2|1651 of 5079, 120010067|2|45 of 2056
11	Counties	Duval|7|82,483 of 864,263, Nassau
	Cities	Atlantic Beach, Callahan, Fernandina Beach, Hilliard, Jacksonville|7|41429 of 821784, Jacksonville Beach, Neptune Beach
	Vtd's	120310208|2|320 of 4164, 120310209|2|5865 of 7221
12	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville

H000H9031 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	120310070|2|509 of 3143, 120310077|2|1686 of 8223, 120310208|2|3844 of 4164, 120310209|2|1356 of 7221, 120310266|2|380 of 431
13	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville
14	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville
15	Counties	Clay|3|46,550 of 190,865, Duval|7|109,071 of 864,263
	Cities	Jacksonville|7|109071 of 821784, Orange Park
	Vtd's	120190042|2|1001 of 1786, 120310084|2|911 of 2929, 120310185|2|357 of 2455, 120310224|2|2691 of 4382, 120310245|2|33 of 3775, 120310272|2|640 of 3656, 120310273|2|1655 of 5450
16	Counties	Duval
	Cities	Jacksonville
	Vtd's	120310070|2|2634 of 3143, 120310077|2|6537 of 8223, 120310084|2|2018 of 2929, 120310185|2|2098 of 2455, 120310266|2|51 of 431
17	Counties	St. Johns
	Cities	St. Augustine, St. Augustine Beach
	Vtd's	121090046|2|4200 of 5208, 121090048|2|310 of 2347
18	Counties	Clay|3|107,880 of 190,865, Duval|7|47,216 of 864,263
	Cities	Baldwin, Jacksonville|7|45791 of 821784
	Vtd's	120190002|2|4094 of 4769, 120190042|2|785 of 1786, 120310224|2|1691 of 4382, 120310245|2|3742 of 3775, 120310272|2|3016 of 3656, 120310273|2|3795 of 5450
19	Counties	Bradford, Clay|3|36,435 of 190,865, Putnam, Union
	Cities	Brooker, Crescent City, Green Cove Springs, Hampton, Interlachen, Keystone Heights, Lake Butler, Lawtey, Palatka, Penney Farms, Pomona Park, Raiford, Starke, Welaka, Worthington Springs
	Vtd's	120190002|2|675 of 4769
20	Counties	Alachua|3|118,352 of 247,336, Marion|4|38,504 of 331,298
	Cities	Alachua|2|2791 of 9059, Archer, Gainesville|2|66078 of 124354, Hawthorne, La Crosse, McIntosh, Micanopy, Ocala|3|11227 of 56315, Reddick, Waldo
	Vtd's	120010007|2|3216 of 4132, 120010008|2|314 of 5348, 120010009|2|693 of 3262, 120010010|2|4448 of 4775, 120010025|2|1710 of 2189, 120010026|2|2559 of 3522, 120010030|2|2927 of 4677, 120010034|2|821 of 1407, 120010051|2|489 of 4173, 120010052|2|448 of 2596, 120010053|2|435 of 4218, 120010061|2|4165 of 5823, 120010062|2|6343 of 7878, 120010067|2|2011 of 2056, 120830008|2|895 of 4656, 120830011|2|2034 of 2125, 120830021|2|1608 of 3410, 120830030|2|643 of 3787, 120830044|2|1802 of 3144, 120830051|2|1017 of 1393
21	Counties	Alachua|3|123,557 of 247,336, Dixie, Gilchrist
	Cities	Alachua|2|6268 of 9059, Bell, Cross City, Fanning Springs|2|278 of 764, Gainesville|2|58276 of 124354, High Springs|2|2203 of 5350, Horseshoe Beach, Newberry, Trenton
	Vtd's	120010008|2|5034 of 5348, 120010009|2|2569 of 3262, 120010010|2|327 of 4775, 120010025|2|479 of 2189, 120010026|2|963 of 3522, 120010030|2|1750 of 4677, 120010034|2|586 of 1407, 120010051|2|3684 of 4173, 120010052|2|2148 of 2596, 120010053|2|3783 of 4218, 120010061|2|1658 of 5823, 120010062|2|1535 of 7878, 120010065|2|564 of 3379, 120010066|2|3428 of 5079
22	Counties	Levy, Marion|4|113,925 of 331,298
	Cities	Bronson, Cedar Key, Chiefland, Dunnellon, Fanning Springs|2|486 of 764, Inglis, Ocala|3|14460 of 56315, Otter Creek, Williston, Yankeetown
	Vtd's	120830008|2|3761 of 4656, 120830021|2|1802 of 3410, 120830044|2|1342 of 3144, 120830051|2|376 of 1393, 120830073|2|1163 of 2705, 120830082|2|3019 of 3161
23	Counties	Marion
	Cities	Belleview, Ocala|3|30628 of 56315
	Vtd's	120830011|2|91 of 2125, 120830030|2|3144 of 3787, 120830065|2|3012 of 3799, 120830073|2|1542 of 2705, 120830082|2|142 of 3161

H000H9031 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).		
24	Counties	Flagler, St. Johns|2|32,113 of 190,039, Volusia|4|30,087 of 494,593
	Cities	Beverly Beach, Bunnell, Flagler Beach, Hastings, Marineland, Palm Coast, Pierson
	Vtd's	121090046|2|1008 of 5208, 121090048|2|2037 of 2347, 121270105|2|823 of 3780
25	Counties	Volusia
	Cities	Daytona Beach|2|12063 of 61005, Daytona Beach Shores, Edgewater|2|2201 of 20750, New Smyrna Beach, Ormond Beach|2|35846 of 38137, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange
	Vtd's	121270105|2|2957 of 3780, 121270108|2|342 of 1387, 121270121|2|2976 of 5267, 121270130|2|218 of 4074, 121270159|2|2222 of 4346, 121270162|2|3 of 1081, 121270178|2|5075 of 5127, 121270181|2|4886 of 4927, 121270182|2|3882 of 5623, 121270200|3|532 of 1687, 121270216|2|1914 of 4451, 121270217|2|284 of 5366
26	Counties	Volusia
	Cities	Daytona Beach|2|48942 of 61005, DeLand, Holly Hill, Lake Helen|2|267 of 2624, Orange City|2|3802 of 10599, Ormond Beach|2|2291 of 38137, South Daytona
	Vtd's	121270043|2|267 of 2603, 121270046|2|45 of 1314, 121270052|2|1097 of 1104, 121270056|2|776 of 2446, 121270070|2|1184 of 4655, 121270074|2|4582 of 4727, 121270075|2|2615 of 5928, 121270108|2|1045 of 1387, 121270121|2|2291 of 5267, 121270130|2|3856 of 4074, 121270159|2|2124 of 4346, 121270162|2|1078 of 1081, 121270178|2|52 of 5127, 121270181|2|41 of 4927, 121270182|2|1741 of 5623, 121270200|3|323 of 1687
27	Counties	Volusia
	Cities	DeBary, Deltona, Edgewater|2|18549 of 20750, Lake Helen|2|2357 of 2624, Oak Hill, Orange City|2|6797 of 10599
	Vtd's	121270043|2|2336 of 2603, 121270046|2|1269 of 1314, 121270052|2|7 of 1104, 121270056|2|1670 of 2446, 121270070|2|3471 of 4655, 121270074|2|145 of 4727, 121270075|2|3313 of 5928, 121270200|3|832 of 1687, 121270216|2|2537 of 4451, 121270217|2|5082 of 5366
28	Counties	Seminole
	Cities	Casselberry|2|12959 of 26241, Longwood|3|89 of 13657, Oviedo, Sanford|2|21829 of 53570, Winter Springs
	Vtd's	121170185|2|32 of 3918, 121170244|2|1262 of 2441, 121170260|2|226 of 4427, 121170269|2|1130 of 3088
29	Counties	Orange|10|3,826 of 1,145,956, Seminole|4|154,521 of 422,718
	Cities	Altamonte Springs|2|14032 of 41496, Apopka|2|1488 of 41542, Lake Mary, Longwood|3|11528 of 13657, Sanford|2|31741 of 53570
	Vtd's	120950080|2|2132 of 3656, 120950085|2|1694 of 4445
30	Counties	Orange|10|80,056 of 1,145,956, Seminole|4|79,233 of 422,718
	Cities	Altamonte Springs|2|27464 of 41496, Casselberry|2|13282 of 26241, Eatonville, Longwood|3|2040 of 13657, Maitland, Orlando|7|2547 of 238300, Winter Park, Winter Springs|2|0 of 33282
	Vtd's	120950057|2|197 of 1794, 120950238|2|1419 of 4558, 121170185|2|3886 of 3918, 121170244|2|1179 of 2441, 121170269|2|1958 of 3088
31	Counties	Lake
	Cities	Astatula, Eustis, Groveland|2|24 of 8729, Howey-in-the-Hills, Leesburg|3|15221 of 20117, Minneola|2|1 of 9403, Montverde, Mount Dora, Tavares, Umatilla
	Vtd's	120690023|2|3060 of 3144, 120690024|2|70 of 970, 120690044|2|3455 of 4109, 120690047|2|1988 of 4453, 120690050|2|1847 of 1931, 120690051|2|1311 of 1765, 120690065|2|1449 of 1975, 120690103|2|30 of 2231
32	Counties	Lake|3|100,848 of 297,052, Orange|10|56,323 of 1,145,956
	Cities	Bay Lake, Clermont, Groveland|2|8705 of 8729, Lake Buena Vista, Leesburg|3|15 of 20117, Mascotte, Minneola|2|9402 of 9403, Ocoee|3|896 of 35579, Orlando|7|886 of 238300, Windermere, Winter Garden|2|4419 of 34568
	Vtd's	120690023|2|84 of 3144, 120690024|2|900 of 970, 120690065|2|526 of 1975, 120690103|2|2201 of 2231, 120950005|2|886 of 4216, 120950006|2|2548 of 5328, 120950010|2|1143 of 3472, 120950024|2|1030 of 4675, 120950040|2|860 of 5494, 120950052|2|1471 of 1618, 120950053|2|1286 of 4693, 120950056|2|3116 of 3243
33	Counties	Lake|3|39,799 of 297,052, Marion|4|23,263 of 331,298, Sumter
	Cities	Bushnell, Center Hill, Coleman, Fruitland Park, Lady Lake, Leesburg|3|4881 of 20117, Webster, Wildwood
	Vtd's	120690044|2|654 of 4109, 120690047|2|2465 of 4453, 120690050|2|84 of 1931, 120690051|2|454 of 1765, 120830065|2|787 of 3799
34	Counties	Citrus, Hernando|2|15,907 of 172,778

H000H9031 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	Crystal River, Inverness
	Vtd's	120530003|2|715 of 1492, 120530013|2|1280 of 1288, 120530016|2|2311 of 2984
35	Counties	Hernando
	Cities	Brooksville, Weeki Wachee
	Vtd's	120530003|2|777 of 1492, 120530013|2|8 of 1288, 120530016|2|673 of 2984
36	Counties	Pasco
	Cities	New Port Richey, Port Richey
	Vtd's	121010128|2|858 of 3356, 121010152|2|557 of 4316, 121010183|2|641 of 2246, 121010201|2|37 of 4086
37	Counties	Pasco
	Cities	
	Vtd's	121010011|2|4291 of 5055, 121010128|2|2498 of 3356, 121010152|2|3759 of 4316, 121010170|2|5886 of 6068, 121010183|2|1605 of 2246, 121010201|2|4049 of 4086
38	Counties	Pasco
	Cities	Dade City, St. Leo, San Antonio, Zephyrhills
	Vtd's	121010011|2|764 of 5055, 121010170|2|182 of 6068
39	Counties	Osceola|3|19,249 of 268,685, Polk|5|136,324 of 602,095
	Cities	Auburndale|2|11679 of 13507, Davenport, Haines City|2|2034 of 20535, Lake Alfred|2|1192 of 5015, Lakeland|2|3877 of 97422, Polk City, Winter Haven|3|115 of 33874
	Vtd's	120970008|2|4 of 8804, 120970029|2|3632 of 6774, 120970032|2|327 of 3333, 121050011|2|2876 of 4025, 121050013|2|4172 of 5014, 121050014|2|4350 of 8504, 121050019|2|2676 of 7717, 121050020|2|2758 of 3246, 121050023|2|1750 of 3882, 121050036|2|13 of 3383, 121050041|2|84 of 1204, 121050068|2|5772 of 6437, 121050072|2|694 of 1136, 121050130|2|3121 of 7592
40	Counties	Polk
	Cities	Lakeland|2|93545 of 97422
	Vtd's	121050011|2|1149 of 4025, 121050013|2|842 of 5014, 121050014|2|4154 of 8504, 121050019|2|5041 of 7717, 121050020|2|488 of 3246, 121050023|2|2132 of 3882, 121050045|2|209 of 1481, 121050050|2|521 of 559, 121050053|2|3634 of 5071, 121050054|2|4953 of 5685, 121050061|3|1883 of 5627
41	Counties	Polk
	Cities	Auburndale|2|1828 of 13507, Dundee, Eagle Lake, Haines City|2|18501 of 20535, Lake Alfred|2|3823 of 5015, Lake Hamilton, Lake Wales|3|932 of 14225, Winter Haven|3|31996 of 33874
	Vtd's	121050036|2|3370 of 3383, 121050041|2|1120 of 1204, 121050045|2|1272 of 1481, 121050050|2|38 of 559, 121050054|2|732 of 5685, 121050061|3|621 of 5627, 121050068|2|665 of 6437, 121050072|2|442 of 1136, 121050079|2|7489 of 7495, 121050108|2|2131 of 5349, 121050111|2|2030 of 2981, 121050130|2|4471 of 7592, 121050136|2|4029 of 5081
42	Counties	Osceola|3|91,873 of 268,685, Polk|5|63,042 of 602,095
	Cities	Frostproof, Highland Park, Hillcrest Heights, Lake Wales|3|11807 of 14225, St. Cloud
	Vtd's	120970014|2|4494 of 5790, 120970088|2|1224 of 9263, 120970089|2|118 of 4224, 121050111|2|951 of 2981, 121050115|2|1338 of 1385, 121050120|2|525 of 721, 121050121|2|1838 of 5902, 121050136|2|1052 of 5081, 121050144|2|1375 of 2554
43	Counties	Osceola
	Cities	Kissimmee
	Vtd's	120970008|2|8800 of 8804, 120970014|2|1296 of 5790, 120970029|2|3142 of 6774, 120970032|2|3006 of 3333, 120970088|2|8039 of 9263, 120970089|2|4106 of 4224
44	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Lake Buena Vista|2|0 of 10, Orlando|7|35557 of 238300
	Vtd's	120950005|2|3330 of 4216, 120950010|2|2329 of 3472, 120950281|2|691 of 7125

H000H9031 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).		
45	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Apopka|2|40054 of 41542, Oakland, Ocoee|3|34673 of 35579, Winter Garden|2|30149 of 34568
	Vtd's	120950006|2|2780 of 5328, 120950024|2|3645 of 4675, 120950040|2|4634 of 5494, 120950052|2|147 of 1618, 120950053|2|3407 of 4693, 120950056|2|127 of 3243, 120950080|2|1524 of 3656, 120950085|2|2751 of 4445
46	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Ocoee|3|10 of 35579, Orlando|7|58022 of 238300
47	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Belle Isle|2|1416 of 5988, Edgewood, Orlando|7|91477 of 238300, Winter Park|2|0 of 27852
	Vtd's	120950057|2|1597 of 1794, 120950167|2|1496 of 2523, 120950281|2|6434 of 7125
48	Counties	Orange
	Cities	Belle Isle|2|4572 of 5988, Orlando|7|31442 of 238300
	Vtd's	120950167|2|1027 of 2523, 120950184|2|290 of 5393
49	Counties	Orange|10|125,830 of 1,145,956, Seminole|4|32,927 of 422,718
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120950138|2|2733 of 3386, 120950238|2|3139 of 4558, 120950249|2|1714 of 4722, 120950259|2|5542 of 5697, 121170260|2|4201 of 4427
50	Counties	Brevard|4|64,904 of 543,376, Orange|10|94,020 of 1,145,956
	Cities	Orlando|7|18369 of 238300, Titusville
	Vtd's	120090215|2|18 of 1320, 120950138|2|653 of 3386, 120950184|2|5103 of 5393, 120950249|2|3008 of 4722, 120950259|2|155 of 5697
51	Counties	Brevard
	Cities	Cape Canaveral, Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, Rockledge
	Vtd's	120090106|2|638 of 1273, 120090215|2|1302 of 1320
52	Counties	Brevard
	Cities	Indialantic, Indian Harbour Beach, Melbourne|2|62854 of 76068, Melbourne Beach|2|1973 of 3101, Melbourne Village, Palm Bay|2|890 of 103190, Palm Shores, Satellite Beach, West Melbourne|2|5711 of 18355
	Vtd's	120090036|2|1973 of 3101, 120090106|2|635 of 1273, 120090158|2|890 of 3314
53	Counties	Brevard
	Cities	Grant-Valkaria, Malabar, Melbourne|2|13214 of 76068, Melbourne Beach|2|1128 of 3101, Palm Bay|2|102300 of 103190, West Melbourne|2|12644 of 18355
	Vtd's	120090036|2|1128 of 3101, 120090158|2|2424 of 3314
54	Counties	Indian River, St. Lucie|4|18,025 of 277,789
	Cities	Fellsmere, Indian River Shores, Orchid, St. Lucie Village, Sebastian, Vero Beach
	Vtd's	121110002|2|18 of 3016, 121110020|2|2486 of 4093, 121110028|2|241 of 907, 121110053|2|467 of 470, 121110054|2|2249 of 2929
55	Counties	Glades, Highlands, Okeechobee, St. Lucie|4|4,216 of 277,789
	Cities	Avon Park, Lake Placid, Moore Haven, Okeechobee, Sebring
	Vtd's	121110024|2|1468 of 3462, 121110027|2|717 of 1142, 121110028|2|666 of 907, 121110049|3|385 of 535
56	Counties	DeSoto, Hardee, Polk|5|92,307 of 602,095
	Cities	Arcadia, Bartow, Bowling Green, Fort Meade, Frostproof|2|0 of 2992, Lake Wales|3|1486 of 14225, Mulberry, Wauchula, Winter Haven|3|1763 of 33874, Zolfo Springs
	Vtd's	121050053|2|1437 of 5071, 121050061|3|3123 of 5627, 121050079|2|6 of 7495, 121050108|2|3218 of 5349, 121050115|2|47 of 1385, 121050120|2|196 of 721, 121050121|2|4064 of 5902, 121050144|2|1179 of 2554

H000H9031 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).		
57	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120570462|2|260 of 5854, 120570463|2|8 of 10, 120570486|2|3130 of 7274, 120570522|2|1207 of 1860
58	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Plant City, Tampa|5|153 of 335709, Temple Terrace
	Vtd's	120570121|2|8 of 1154, 120570275|2|58 of 2009, 120570281|2|46 of 1877, 120570297|2|339 of 347
59	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120570486|2|4144 of 7274, 120570522|2|653 of 1860, 120570525|2|24 of 119, 120570532|2|390 of 5060, 120570533|3|2698 of 5873, 120570534|2|993 of 3331
60	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|104539 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570131|2|1549 of 3768, 120570134|2|61 of 5727, 120570138|2|1283 of 5604, 120570147|2|4542 of 5448, 120570430|2|1437 of 4333, 120570432|2|1049 of 1279, 120570440|2|897 of 2666, 120570533|3|3175 of 5873, 120570534|2|2338 of 3331
61	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|119392 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570237|2|4189 of 4912, 120570275|2|1951 of 2009, 120570281|2|1831 of 1877, 120570525|2|95 of 119, 120570532|2|4670 of 5060
62	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|51408 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570131|2|2219 of 3768, 120570134|2|5666 of 5727, 120570138|2|4321 of 5604, 120570147|2|906 of 5448, 120570163|2|2480 of 2494
63	Counties	Hillsborough
	Cities	Tampa|5|60217 of 335709
	Vtd's	120570121|2|1146 of 1154, 120570237|2|723 of 4912, 120570297|2|8 of 347
64	Counties	Hillsborough|9|108,780 of 1,229,226, Pinellas|7|49,038 of 916,542
	Cities	Clearwater|4|0 of 107685, Oldsmar, Safety Harbor
	Vtd's	120570163|2|14 of 2494, 121030340|2|5 of 3137, 121030343|2|1667 of 2400
65	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Clearwater|4|13129 of 107685, Dunedin, Tarpon Springs
	Vtd's	121030290|2|1164 of 2080, 121030340|2|3132 of 3137, 121030343|2|733 of 2400, 121030348|2|1349 of 1706
66	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Belleair, Belleair Beach, Belleair Bluffs, Belleair Shore, Clearwater|4|24356 of 107685, Indian Rocks Beach, Indian Shores|2|1212 of 1420, Largo|2|31230 of 77648, Pinellas Park|4|4010 of 49079, Seminole
	Vtd's	121030126|2|6 of 375, 121030147|3|4550 of 4784, 121030164|2|3475 of 3494, 121030166|2|1259 of 2354, 121030170|2|171 of 2817, 121030172|2|1908 of 3317, 121030173|2|1563 of 2829, 121030194|2|3232 of 3411, 121030239|2|1212 of 1420, 121030264|2|3418 of 3767, 121030266|2|1893 of 3648, 121030300|2|872 of 2671
67	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Clearwater|4|70200 of 107685, Largo|2|46418 of 77648, Pinellas Park|4|395 of 49079
	Vtd's	121030074|2|245 of 2070, 121030155|2|256 of 2800, 121030162|3|635 of 2468, 121030164|2|19 of 3494, 121030194|2|179 of 3411, 121030264|2|349 of 3767, 121030266|2|1755 of 3648, 121030290|2|916 of 2080, 121030300|2|1799 of 2671, 121030348|2|357 of 1706
68	Counties	Pinellas

H000H9031 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	Pinellas Park|4|37576 of 49079, St. Petersburg|3|101954 of 244769
	Vtd's	121030032|2|1815 of 1878, 121030037|2|54 of 1388, 121030038|2|307 of 1764, 121030050|2|2325 of 3295, 121030074|2|1825 of 2070, 121030135|2|1365 of 3775, 121030144|2|2717 of 3103, 121030147|3|156 of 4784, 121030155|2|2544 of 2800, 121030157|2|1199 of 2785, 121030159|2|1216 of 3037, 121030162|3|1833 of 2468
69	Counties	Pinellas
	Cities	Gulfport, Indian Shores|2|208 of 1420, Kenneth City, Madeira Beach, North Redington Beach, Pinellas Park|4|7098 of 49079, Redington Beach, Redington Shores, St. Pete Beach, St. Petersburg|3|67643 of 244769, South Pasadena, Treasure Island
	Vtd's	121030030|2|1951 of 1988, 121030031|2|2448 of 2496, 121030032|2|63 of 1878, 121030037|2|1334 of 1388, 121030038|2|1457 of 1764, 121030050|2|970 of 3295, 121030126|2|369 of 375, 121030135|2|2410 of 3775, 121030144|2|386 of 3103, 121030147|3|78 of 4784, 121030157|2|1586 of 2785, 121030159|2|1821 of 3037, 121030166|2|1095 of 2354, 121030170|2|2646 of 2817, 121030172|2|1409 of 3317, 121030173|2|1266 of 2829, 121030239|2|208 of 1420
70	Counties	Hillsborough|9|11,565 of 1,229,226, Manatee|3|49,192 of 322,833, Pinellas|7|75,172 of 916,542, Sarasota|5|18,115 of 379,448
	Cities	Bradenton|3|14170 of 49546, Palmetto|2|3856 of 12606, St. Petersburg|3|75172 of 244769, Sarasota|3|12754 of 51917
	Vtd's	120570430|2|2896 of 4333, 120570432|2|230 of 1279, 120570440|2|1769 of 2666, 120570462|2|5594 of 5854, 120570463|2|2 of 10, 120810008|2|281 of 357, 120810022|2|1307 of 2091, 120810031|2|872 of 1374, 120810033|2|18 of 3001, 120810038|2|776 of 1293, 120810042|2|314 of 427, 120810065|2|906 of 927, 120810066|2|21 of 836, 120810068|2|123 of 219, 120810089|2|642 of 1667, 120810090|2|30 of 118, 120810096|2|1803 of 1814, 120810099|2|2009 of 2552, 120810118|2|2935 of 3714, 120810124|2|858 of 2582, 120810128|2|83 of 1101, 120810142|2|747 of 868, 120810149|2|889 of 899, 120810183|2|384 of 450, 120810203|2|144 of 1428, 121030030|2|37 of 1988, 121030031|2|48 of 2496, 121150002|2|469 of 4037, 121150015|2|237 of 845, 121150024|2|217 of 3176, 121150098|2|985 of 4605
71	Counties	Manatee|3|138,111 of 322,833, Sarasota|5|20,483 of 379,448
	Cities	Anna Maria, Bradenton|3|29330 of 49546, Bradenton Beach, Holmes Beach, Longboat Key, Palmetto|2|8750 of 12606, Sarasota|3|15813 of 51917
	Vtd's	120810008|2|76 of 357, 120810022|2|784 of 2091, 120810038|2|517 of 1293, 120810042|2|113 of 427, 120810089|2|1025 of 1667, 120810090|2|88 of 118, 120810096|2|11 of 1814, 120810099|2|543 of 2552, 120810124|2|1724 of 2582, 120810142|2|121 of 868, 120810149|2|10 of 899, 120810183|2|66 of 450, 120810203|2|1284 of 1428, 121150030|2|574 of 1949, 121150098|2|3620 of 4605
72	Counties	Sarasota
	Cities	Sarasota|3|23350 of 51917
	Vtd's	121150002|2|3568 of 4037, 121150015|2|608 of 845, 121150024|2|2959 of 3176, 121150025|2|1505 of 6045, 121150030|2|1375 of 1949, 121150085|2|115 of 592
73	Counties	Manatee|3|135,530 of 322,833, Sarasota|5|23,719 of 379,448
	Cities	Bradenton|3|6046 of 49546
	Vtd's	120810031|2|502 of 1374, 120810033|2|2983 of 3001, 120810065|2|21 of 927, 120810066|2|815 of 836, 120810068|2|96 of 219, 120810118|2|779 of 3714, 120810128|2|1018 of 1101
74	Counties	Sarasota
	Cities	North Port, Venice
	Vtd's	121150025|2|4540 of 6045, 121150085|2|477 of 592
75	Counties	Charlotte
	Cities	Punta Gorda
76	Counties	Lee
	Cities	Bonita Springs, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
	Vtd's	120710123|2|1463 of 1471, 120710202|2|6 of 186, 120710286|2|2422 of 5442, 120710296|2|680 of 908
77	Counties	Lee
	Cities	Cape Coral
	Vtd's	120710011|2|1425 of 1440, 120710061|2|687 of 914, 120710095|2|128 of 2964, 120710146|2|42 of 47, 120710296|2|228 of 908

H000H9031 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).		
78	Counties	Lee
	Cities	Fort Myers
	Vtd's	120710011|2|15 of 1440, 120710061|2|227 of 914, 120710072|2|877 of 2853, 120710095|2|2836 of 2964, 120710099|2|61 of 2076, 120710146|2|5 of 47, 120710195|2|1187 of 3075, 120710262|2|173 of 10848
79	Counties	Lee
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120710072|2|1976 of 2853, 120710099|2|2015 of 2076, 120710123|2|8 of 1471, 120710195|2|1888 of 3075, 120710202|2|180 of 186, 120710262|2|10675 of 10848, 120710286|2|3020 of 5442
80	Counties	Collier|3|116,497 of 321,520, Hendry
	Cities	Clewiston, LaBelle
	Vtd's	120210030|2|891 of 1355, 120210076|2|2747 of 3706, 120210092|2|1948 of 2268
81	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Belle Glade, Pahokee, South Bay
	Vtd's	120990352|2|2 of 316
82	Counties	Martin|2|88,966 of 146,318, Palm Beach|9|67,567 of 1,320,134
	Cities	Jupiter|2|50622 of 55156, Jupiter Inlet Colony, Jupiter Island, Tequesta
	Vtd's	120850007|2|3880 of 3883, 120990117|2|1710 of 1726, 120990119|2|29 of 177
83	Counties	Martin|2|57,352 of 146,318, St. Lucie|4|99,018 of 277,789
	Cities	Ocean Breeze Park, Port St. Lucie|2|97459 of 164603, Sewall's Point, Stuart
	Vtd's	120850007|2|3 of 3883, 121110030|2|2691 of 3342, 121110047|2|1 of 5789, 121110063|2|2 of 5616, 121110066|2|22 of 2757, 121110079|2|5301 of 5359
84	Counties	St. Lucie
	Cities	Fort Pierce, Port St. Lucie|2|67144 of 164603
	Vtd's	121110002|2|2998 of 3016, 121110020|2|1607 of 4093, 121110024|2|1994 of 3462, 121110027|2|425 of 1142, 121110030|2|651 of 3342, 121110047|2|5788 of 5789, 121110049|3|150 of 535, 121110053|2|3 of 470, 121110054|2|680 of 2929, 121110063|2|5614 of 5616, 121110066|2|2735 of 2757, 121110079|2|58 of 5359
85	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Juno Beach, Jupiter|2|4534 of 55156, North Palm Beach, Palm Beach Gardens, West Palm Beach|5|21978 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990117|2|16 of 1726, 120990119|2|148 of 177, 120990758|2|1 of 1365
86	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Greenacres|3|678 of 37573, Haverhill, Loxahatchee Groves, Royal Palm Beach, Wellington, West Palm Beach|5|15 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990257|2|678 of 690, 120990352|2|314 of 316, 120990704|2|2768 of 3060, 120990705|2|1940 of 4915, 120990708|2|137 of 919, 120990738|2|2190 of 2198
87	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Cloud Lake, Glen Ridge, Greenacres|3|18986 of 37573, Lake Clarke Shores, Lake Worth|4|14088 of 34910, Palm Springs, West Palm Beach|5|13808 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990244|2|168 of 1581, 120990257|2|12 of 690, 120990338|2|1266 of 2237, 120990340|2|6355 of 6366, 120990704|2|292 of 3060, 120990705|2|2975 of 4915, 120990708|2|782 of 919, 120990738|2|8 of 2198, 120990796|2|583 of 1572, 120990803|2|2784 of 5319
88	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Boynton Beach|4|20922 of 68217, Delray Beach|3|13478 of 60522, Lake Park, Lake Worth|4|13599 of 34910, Lantana|2|4654 of 10423, Mangonia Park, Riviera Beach|2|28909 of 32488, West Palm Beach|5|58368 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990244|2|1413 of 1581, 120990246|2|844 of 2542, 120990249|2|1116 of 2166, 120990251|2|858 of 2163, 120990409|2|262 of 2173, 120990758|2|1364 of 1365, 120990794|2|1051 of 1593, 120990795|2|1017 of 2172, 120990796|2|989 of 1572, 120990803|2|2535 of 5319

H000H9031 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).		
89	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Boca Raton|2|57934 of 84392, Boynton Beach|4|12058 of 68217, Briny Breezes, Delray Beach|3|40505 of 60522, Gulf Stream, Highland Beach, Hypoluxo, Lake Worth|4|4601 of 34910, Lantana|2|5769 of 10423, Manalapan, Ocean Ridge, Palm Beach, Palm Beach Shores, Riviera Beach|2|3579 of 32488, South Palm Beach, West Palm Beach|5|5750 of 99919
	Vtd's	120990246|2|1698 of 2542, 120990249|2|1050 of 2166, 120990251|2|1305 of 2163, 120990442|2|1675 of 2028, 120990490|2|398 of 3146, 120990794|2|542 of 1593, 120990795|2|1155 of 2172
90	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Atlantis, Boynton Beach|4|21653 of 68217, Greenacres|3|17909 of 37573, Lake Worth|4|2622 of 34910
	Vtd's	120990338|2|971 of 2237, 120990340|2|11 of 6366, 120990402|2|554 of 1030
91	Counties	Palm Beach
	Cities	Boca Raton|2|26458 of 84392, Boynton Beach|4|13584 of 68217, Delray Beach|3|6539 of 60522, Golf
	Vtd's	120990402|2|476 of 1030, 120990409|2|1911 of 2173, 120990442|2|353 of 2028, 120990490|2|2748 of 3146
92	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Deerfield Beach|2|60139 of 75018, Fort Lauderdale|5|5864 of 165521, Lauderdale Lakes|3|4692 of 32593, Margate|3|5583 of 53284, North Lauderdale|2|2151 of 41023, Oakland Park|3|23079 of 41363, Pompano Beach|2|50694 of 99845, Tamarac|3|2206 of 60427
	Vtd's	120110010|2|1509 of 1634, 120110126|2|2318 of 2507, 120110233|2|1233 of 5569
93	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Deerfield Beach|2|14879 of 75018, Fort Lauderdale|5|66540 of 165521, Hillsboro Beach, Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Lighthouse Point, Oakland Park|3|5674 of 41363, Pompano Beach|2|49151 of 99845, Sea Ranch Lakes, Wilton Manors|2|2626 of 11632
	Vtd's	120110010|2|125 of 1634
94	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Fort Lauderdale|5|80159 of 165521, Lauderdale Lakes|3|13348 of 32593, Lauderhill|2|14592 of 66887, Lazy Lake, Oakland Park|3|12610 of 41363, Plantation|5|20360 of 84955, Wilton Manors|2|9006 of 11632
	Vtd's	120110126|2|189 of 2507, 120110299|2|1084 of 1722, 120110358|2|3158 of 3495, 120110366|2|1240 of 2250, 120110371|2|1651 of 3014, 120110381|2|2617 of 2727
95	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Lauderdale Lakes|3|14553 of 32593, Lauderhill|2|52295 of 66887, Margate|3|3469 of 53284, North Lauderdale|2|38872 of 41023, Plantation|5|936 of 84955, Sunrise|3|28191 of 84439, Tamarac|3|16566 of 60427
	Vtd's	120110233|2|4336 of 5569, 120110247|2|2171 of 3197, 120110299|2|638 of 1722, 120110329|2|179 of 1445, 120110358|2|337 of 3495
96	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Coconut Creek, Coral Springs|2|33396 of 121096, Margate|3|44232 of 53284, Parkland
97	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Coral Springs|2|87700 of 121096, Plantation|5|3934 of 84955, Sunrise|3|22409 of 84439, Tamarac|3|41655 of 60427
	Vtd's	120110247|2|1026 of 3197, 120110333|2|2212 of 3297
98	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Davie|3|64218 of 91992, Plantation|5|57105 of 84955, Sunrise|3|33839 of 84439
	Vtd's	120110329|2|1266 of 1445, 120110333|2|1085 of 3297, 120110366|2|1010 of 2250, 120110371|2|1363 of 3014, 120110381|2|110 of 2727, 120110615|2|1159 of 1259
99	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Cooper City, Dania Beach|2|21665 of 29639, Davie|3|24564 of 91992, Fort Lauderdale|5|12958 of 165521, Hollywood|3|38130 of 140768, Pembroke Pines|4|16320 of 154750, Plantation|5|2620 of 84955, Southwest Ranches|2|2058 of 7345

H000H9031 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	120110609|3|1445 of 2927, 120110614|2|1100 of 1413, 120110615|2|100 of 1259
100	Counties	Broward|14|66,325 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade|18|88,459 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Aventura, Bal Harbour, Bay Harbor Islands, Dania Beach|2|7974 of 29639, Fort Lauderdale|5|0 of 165521, Golden Beach, Hallandale Beach|2|25370 of 37113, Hollywood|3|32981 of 140768, Indian Creek, North Miami|3|9175 of 58786, North Miami Beach|2|7800 of 41523, Sunny Isles Beach, Surfside
101	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Hallandale Beach|2|11743 of 37113, Hollywood|3|69657 of 140768, Miramar|4|32153 of 122041, Pembroke Park, Pembroke Pines|4|21077 of 154750, West Park
	Vtd's	120110784|2|1679 of 3372
102	Counties	Broward|14|69,243 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade|18|88,040 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Miami Gardens|3|66994 of 107167, Miramar|4|33202 of 122041, Pembroke Pines|4|36041 of 154750
	Vtd's	120110772|2|1560 of 6836, 120110784|2|1693 of 3372, 120860275|2|3127 of 3129
103	Counties	Broward|14|39,835 of 1,748,066, Miami-Dade|18|115,998 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Doral|4|8309 of 45704, Hialeah|4|49060 of 224669, Hialeah Gardens, Medley|2|167 of 838, Miami Lakes|2|15265 of 29361, Miramar|4|39835 of 122041
	Vtd's	120110772|2|5276 of 6836
104	Counties	Broward
	Cities	Davie|3|3210 of 91992, Pembroke Pines|4|81312 of 154750, Southwest Ranches|2|5287 of 7345, Weston
	Vtd's	120110609|3|1482 of 2927, 120110614|2|313 of 1413
105	Counties	Broward|14|16,851 of 1,748,066, Collier|3|49,635 of 321,520, Miami-Dade|18|89,040 of 2,496,435
	Cities	Doral|4|24482 of 45704, Miramar|4|16851 of 122041, Sweetwater|2|11656 of 13499
	Vtd's	120210076|2|959 of 3706, 120210112|2|2056 of 4281, 120210127|2|75 of 997, 120210140|2|102 of 394, 120860601|3|115 of 4152
106	Counties	Collier
	Cities	Everglades, Marco Island, Naples
	Vtd's	120210030|2|464 of 1355, 120210092|2|320 of 2268, 120210112|2|2225 of 4281, 120210127|2|922 of 997, 120210140|2|292 of 394
107	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Miami Gardens|3|29682 of 107167, North Miami|3|20137 of 58786, North Miami Beach|2|33723 of 41523
	Vtd's	120860158|2|1651 of 1658, 120860196|2|977 of 1498
108	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Biscayne Park, El Portal, Miami|7|53949 of 399457, Miami Shores, North Miami|3|29474 of 58786
	Vtd's	120860158|2|7 of 1658, 120860196|2|521 of 1498, 120860300|2|5 of 3380, 120860318|2|1482 of 3361, 120860778|2|1527 of 1598, 120860784|2|2815 of 2827, 120860790|3|1580 of 1988, 120860797|2|1763 of 2997
109	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Hialeah|4|459 of 224669, Miami|7|67560 of 399457, Miami Gardens|3|10491 of 107167, Opa-locka
	Vtd's	120860275|2|2 of 3129, 120860300|2|3375 of 3380, 120860318|2|1879 of 3361, 120860422|2|454 of 3368, 120860584|2|5 of 2534, 120860778|2|71 of 1598, 120860784|2|12 of 2827, 120860790|3|408 of 1988, 120860797|2|1234 of 2997, 120860909|2|30 of 458, 120860919|2|2835 of 2838, 120860921|2|353 of 2236
110	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Hialeah|4|91335 of 224669, Medley|2|671 of 838, Miami Lakes|2|14096 of 29361
	Vtd's	120860471|2|4203 of 5834
111	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Hialeah|4|83815 of 224669, Miami|7|52108 of 399457, Miami Springs, Virginia Gardens

H000H9031 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	120860422|2|2914 of 3368, 120860471|2|1631 of 5834, 120860584|2|2529 of 2534, 120860909|2|428 of 458, 120860921|2|1883 of 2236, 120861429|2|179 of 831
112	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Coral Gables|2|14238 of 46780, Key Biscayne, Miami|7|127490 of 399457
	Vtd's	120860829|2|408 of 4462, 120860842|2|608 of 2725, 120860856|2|2260 of 4502, 120860857|2|281 of 531, 120860861|2|731 of 7557, 120860862|2|504 of 7746, 120860863|2|4856 of 7077, 120860865|2|1745 of 3088, 120860926|2|792 of 2785, 120860927|2|3165 of 4168, 120860928|2|357 of 1832, 120860982|2|314 of 320
113	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Miami|7|61520 of 399457, Miami Beach, North Bay Village
	Vtd's	120860829|2|4054 of 4462, 120860842|2|2117 of 2725, 120860861|2|6826 of 7557, 120860862|2|7242 of 7746, 120860863|2|2221 of 7077, 120860865|2|1343 of 3088, 120860919|2|3 of 2838
114	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Coral Gables|2|32542 of 46780, Cutler Bay, Miami|7|34364 of 399457, Palmetto Bay|2|447 of 23410, Pinecrest|2|6377 of 18223, South Miami|2|10817 of 11657, West Miami
	Vtd's	120860669|2|2272 of 5187, 120860849|2|3995 of 4963, 120860856|2|2242 of 4502, 120860857|2|250 of 531, 120860926|2|1993 of 2785, 120860927|2|1003 of 4168, 120860928|2|1475 of 1832, 120860930|2|3602 of 4074, 120860982|2|6 of 320, 120861189|2|84 of 1424, 120861428|2|2322 of 2326, 120861429|2|652 of 831
115	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Doral|4|4035 of 45704, Miami|7|2466 of 399457, Palmetto Bay|2|22963 of 23410, Pinecrest|2|11846 of 18223, South Miami|2|840 of 11657
	Vtd's	120860601|3|4035 of 4152, 120860615|2|2499 of 2550, 120860669|2|2915 of 5187, 120860849|2|968 of 4963, 120860930|2|472 of 4074, 120861043|2|2062 of 2631, 120861189|2|1340 of 1424, 120861428|2|4 of 2326
116	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Doral|4|8878 of 45704, Sweetwater|2|1843 of 13499
	Vtd's	120860601|3|2 of 4152, 120860615|2|51 of 2550, 120861043|2|569 of 2631
117	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	Florida City, Homestead|2|33998 of 60512
	Vtd's	120861220|2|2183 of 7982, 120861255|2|633 of 1693, 120861338|2|1418 of 1580, 120861339|2|2585 of 2719, 120861360|2|4 of 144
118	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120860734|2|12 of 1296
119	Counties	Miami-Dade
	Cities	
	Vtd's	120860734|2|1284 of 1296
120	Counties	Miami-Dade|18|81,834 of 2,496,435, Monroe
	Cities	Homestead|2|26514 of 60512, Islamorada, Village of Islands, Key Colony Beach, Key West, Layton, Marathon
	Vtd's	120861220|2|5799 of 7982, 120861255|2|1060 of 1693, 120861338|2|162 of 1580, 120861339|2|134 of 2719, 120861360|2|140 of 144