



Senate Redistricting Subcommittee

**Monday, January 9, 2012
12:00 PM
Morris Hall (17 HOB)**

**Dean Cannon
Speaker**

**Dorothy L. Hukill and Peter Nehr
Chair**

Committee Meeting Notice

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(AMENDED 12/30/2011 12:44:18PM)

Amended(1)

Senate Redistricting Subcommittee

Start Date and Time: Monday, January 09, 2012 12:00 pm
End Date and Time: Monday, January 09, 2012 02:30 pm
Location: Morris Hall (17 HOB)
Duration: 2.50 hrs

Consideration of the following proposed committee bill(s):

PCB SRS 12-01 -- Legislative Apportionment

Pursuant to Rule 7.12(b) and the Special Amendment Deadlines and Procedures adopted by the House during the 2011 Regular Session, main amendments must be submitted to the House Redistricting Committee no later than 12pm on Wednesday, January 4, 2012. Substitute amendments must be submitted to the House Redistricting Committee no later than 12pm on Thursday, January 5, 2012.

NOTICE FINALIZED on 12/30/2011 12:44 by Crofoot.Katie

Table of Contents

Tab 1: PCB SRS 12-01 (S000S9004)

A. Bill Analysis

B. Statewide Map

C. Regional Maps

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

D. Data Report

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: PCB SRS 12-01 Legislative Apportionment

SPONSOR(S): Senate Redistricting Subcommittee

TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:**

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
Orig. Comm.: Senate Redistricting Subcommittee		Poreda	Kelly

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

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

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

This proposed committee bill (joint resolution) reapportions the resident population of Florida into 40 State Senate districts, as required by state and federal law.

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

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

- Reduce the number of counties split from 45 to 31;
- Reduce the number of cities split from 126 to 78;
- Reduce the total perimeter, width and height of the districts, consistently, based on various methods of measurement;
- Reduce the distance and drive time to travel the average district;
- Reduce the total population deviation from 38.60% to 2.50%; and
- Maintains elected representation for African-American and Hispanic Floridians.

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

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

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current Situation

The 2010 Census

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1 below shows the changes in population for each of Florida's current State Senate districts and their subsequent deviation from the new ideal population of 470,033 residents.

Table 1. Florida Senate Districts 2002-2011

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

District	2000 Population	2000 Deviation		2010 Population	2010 Deviation	
		Count	%		Count	%
1	399,563	4	0.0%	424,456	-45,577	-9.7%
2	399,543	-16	0.0%	449,902	-20,131	-4.3%
3	399,512	-47	0.0%	495,081	25,048	5.3%
4	399,586	27	0.0%	433,628	-36,405	-7.7%
5	399,573	14	0.0%	515,369	45,336	9.6%
6	399,586	27	0.0%	451,464	-18,569	-4.0%
7	399,552	-7	0.0%	432,554	-37,479	-8.0%
8	399,568	9	0.0%	525,674	55,641	11.8%
9	399,552	-7	0.0%	527,435	57,402	12.2%
10	399,547	-12	0.0%	565,921	95,888	20.4%
11	399,543	-16	0.0%	433,661	-36,372	-7.7%
12	399,594	35	0.0%	531,959	61,926	13.2%
13	399,563	4	0.0%	394,766	-75,267	-16.0%
14	399,571	12	0.0%	457,489	-12,544	-2.7%
15	399,559	0	0.0%	560,770	90,737	19.3%

16	399,549	-10	0.0%	431,916	-38,117	-8.1%
17	399,577	18	0.0%	456,960	-13,073	-2.8%
18	399,553	-6	0.0%	404,822	-65,211	-13.9%
19	399,553	-6	0.0%	477,068	7,035	1.5%
20	399,578	19	0.0%	576,207	106,174	22.6%
21	399,556	-3	0.0%	529,870	59,837	12.7%
22	399,568	9	0.0%	419,763	-50,270	-10.7%
23	399,561	2	0.0%	458,330	-11,703	-2.5%
24	399,554	-5	0.0%	524,254	54,221	11.5%
25	399,580	21	0.0%	428,398	-41,635	-8.9%
26	399,517	-42	0.0%	481,892	11,859	2.5%
27	399,568	9	0.0%	551,555	81,522	17.3%
28	399,573	14	0.0%	545,085	75,052	16.0%
29	399,534	-25	0.0%	397,144	-72,889	-15.5%
30	399,553	-6	0.0%	458,703	-11,330	-2.4%
31	399,544	-15	0.0%	432,649	-37,384	-8.0%
32	399,576	17	0.0%	428,898	-41,135	-8.8%
33	399,552	-7	0.0%	404,290	-65,743	-14.0%
34	399,596	37	0.0%	481,165	11,132	2.4%
35	399,563	4	0.0%	438,861	-31,172	-6.6%
36	399,575	16	0.0%	418,626	-51,407	-10.9%
37	399,552	-7	0.0%	480,189	10,156	2.2%
38	399,540	-19	0.0%	442,810	-27,223	-5.8%
39	399,606	47	0.0%	483,183	13,150	2.8%
40	399,488	-71	0.0%	448,543	-21,490	-4.6%

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

U.S. Constitution

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

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

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

...”the basic principle of representative government remains, and must remain, unchanged – the weight of a citizen’s vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives. Population is, of necessity, the starting point for consideration and the controlling criterion for judgment in legislative apportionment controversies...The Equal Protection

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

Clause demands no less than substantially equal state legislative representation for all citizens, of all places as well as of all races. We hold that, as a basic constitutional standard, the Equal Protection Clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis.”²

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁹ *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 579.

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

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

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

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

The Voting Rights Act

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

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

In general, Section 2 challenges have been brought against districting schemes that either disperse members of minority communities into districts where they constitute an ineffective minority—known as “cracking”¹⁸—or which concentrate minority voters into districts where they constitute excessive majorities—known as “packing”—thus diminishing minority influence in neighboring districts. In prior

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

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

¹⁶ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973(a) (2006).

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

¹⁸ Also frequently referred to as “fracturing.”

decades, it was also common that Section 2 challenges would be brought against multimember districts, in which “the voting strength of a minority group can be lessened by placing it in a larger multimember or at-large district where the majority can elect a number of its preferred candidates and the minority group cannot elect any of its preferred candidates.”¹⁹

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

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

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

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

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

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

In *Shaw v. Reno*, the Court found that “state legislation that expressly distinguishes among citizens on account of race - whether it contains an explicit distinction or is “unexplainable on grounds other than race,”...must be narrowly tailored to further a compelling governmental interest. Redistricting

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

²⁰ 478 U.S. 30 (1986).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

legislation that is alleged to be so bizarre on its face that it is unexplainable on grounds other than race demands the same close scrutiny, regardless of the motivations underlying its adoption.”²⁸

Later, in *Shaw v. Hunt*, the Court found that the State of North Carolina made race the predominant consideration for redistricting, such that other race-neutral districting principles were subordinated, but the state failed to meet the strict scrutiny²⁹ test. The Court found that the district in question, “as drawn, is not a remedy narrowly tailored to the State’s professed interest in avoiding liability under Section(s) 2 of the Act,” and “could not remedy any potential Section(s) 2 violation, since the minority group must be shown to be “geographically compact” to establish Section(s) 2 liability.”³⁰ Likewise, in *Bush v. Vera*, the Supreme Court supported the strict scrutiny approach, ruling against a Texas redistricting plan included highly irregularly shaped districts that were significantly more sensitive to racial data, and lacked any semblance to pre-existing race-neutral districts.³¹

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

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

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

³⁵ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973c.

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

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

The purpose of Section 5 is to “insure that no voting procedure changes would be made that would lead to retrogression³⁹ in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise.”⁴⁰ Whether a districting plan is retrogressive in effect requires an examination of “the entire statewide plan as a whole.”⁴¹

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

Majority-Minority and Minority Access Districts in Florida

Legal challenges to the Florida’s 1992 state legislative and congressional redistricting plans resulted in a significant increase in elected representation for both African-Americans and Hispanics. Table 2 illustrates those increases. Prior to 1992, Florida Congressional Delegation included only one minority member, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Table 2. Number of Elected African-American and Hispanic Members in the Florida Legislature and Florida Congressional Delegation

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

Prior to the legal challenges in the 1990s, the Florida Legislature established districts that generally included minority populations of less than 30 percent of the total population of the districts. For example, Table 3 illustrates that the 1982 plan for the Florida House of Representatives included 27 districts in which African-Americans comprised 20 percent or more of the total population. In the majority of those districts, 15 of 27, African-Americans represented 20 to 29 percent of the total

³⁷ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973c.

³⁸ 42 U.S.C. Section 1973c

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 3. 1982 House Plan
Only Districts with Greater Than 20% African-American Population⁴³**

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

Subsequent to the legal challenges in the 1990s, the Florida Legislature established districts that were compliant with provisions of federal law, and did not fracture or dilute minority voting strength. For example, Table 4 illustrates that the resulting districting plan doubled the number of African-American representatives in the Florida House of Representatives.

**Table 4. 2002 House Plan
Only Districts with Greater Than 20% African-American Population⁴⁴**

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

Equal Protection – Racial Gerrymandering

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

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

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

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

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

The Use of Statistical Evidence

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

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

As noted previously, when the U.S. Department of Justice conducts a Section 5 preclearance review it requires that a submitting authority provide political data supporting a plan.⁵⁵ Registration and performance data must be used under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to determine whether geographically compact minority groups are politically cohesive, and also to determine whether the majority population votes as a block to defeat the minority’s candidate of choice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Florida Constitution, Article III, Section 16

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

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

Representative districts must be:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Florida Constitution is silent with respect to process for congressional redistricting. Article 1 Section 4 of the United States Constitution grants to each state legislature the exclusive authority to apportion seats designated to that state by providing the legislative bodies with the authority to determine the times place and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives. Consistent therewith, Florida has adopted its congressional apportionment plans by legislation subject to

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

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

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

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

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

gubernatorial approval.⁶² Congressional apportionment plans are not subject to automatic review by the Florida Supreme Court.

Florida Constitution, Article III, Sections 20 and 21

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

“In establishing congressional district boundaries:

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

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

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

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

“In establishing legislative district boundaries:

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

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

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

These new standards are set forth in two tiers. The first tier, subparagraphs (a) above, contains provisions regarding political favoritism, racial and language minorities, and contiguity. The second tier, subparagraphs (b) above, contains provisions regarding equal population, compactness and use of political and geographical boundaries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The first tier also requires that districts consist of contiguous territory. In the context of state legislative districts, the Florida Supreme Court has held that a district is contiguous if no part of the district is isolated from the rest of the district by another district.⁷⁰ In a contiguous district, a person can travel

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

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

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

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

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

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

from any point within the district to any other point without departing from the district.⁷¹ A district is not contiguous if its parts touch only at a common corner, such as a right angle.⁷² The Court has also concluded that the presence in a district of a body of water without a connecting bridge, even if it requires land travel outside the district in order to reach other parts of the district, does not violate contiguity.⁷³

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

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

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

Florida courts have yet to interpret “compactness.”

The second tier of these standards also requires that “districts shall, where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries.”⁸⁰ The term “political boundaries” refers, at a minimum, to the boundaries of cities and counties.⁸¹ Florida case law does not specifically define the term “geographical boundaries.” Rather, numerous cases use the phrase generally when defining the borders of a state, county, city, court, special district, or other area of land.⁸²

⁷¹ *Id.*

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

⁷³ *Id.* at 280.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁸² *E.g.*, *State v. Stepansky*, 761 So.2d 1027, 1035 (Fla. 2000) (“In fact, the Fifth District acknowledged the effects doctrine as a basis for asserting jurisdiction beyond the state’s geographic boundaries.”); *State v. Holloway*, 318 So.2d 421, 422 (Fla. 1975) (“The arrest was made outside the geographical boundaries of said city.”); *Deen v. Wilson*, 1 So.3d 1179, 1181 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (“An Office of Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional 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.”).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Outreach

In the summer of 2011, the House and Senate initiated an extensive public outreach campaign. On May 6, 2011, the Senate Committee on Reapportionment and the House Redistricting Committee jointly announced the schedule for a statewide tour of 26 public hearings. The purpose of the hearings was to receive public comments to assist the Legislature in its creation of new redistricting plans. The schedule included stops in every region of the state, in rural and urban areas, and in all five counties subject to preclearance. The hearings were set primarily in the mornings and evenings to allow a variety of participants to attend. Specific sites were chosen based on their availability and their accessibility to members of each community.

Prior to each hearing, committee staff invited a number of interested parties in the region to attend and participate. Invitations were sent to representatives of civic organizations, public interest groups, school boards, and county elections offices, as well as to civil rights advocates, county commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁸⁹ *See id.*

and administrators, local elected officials, and the chairs and executive committees of statewide political parties. In all, over 4,000 invitations were sent.

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

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

**Table 5. Public Input Meeting Schedule
Attendance and Speakers**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STORAGE NAME: pcb01.SRS.DOCX

DATE: 12/21/2011

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District 11 connects the communities of northern and western Pasco County with all of Hernando County and most of Sumter County. The district is bounded by the Gulf of Mexico on the west, the boundaries of Hernando and Sumter County on the north and east, and State Road 52 in Pasco County

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District 29 unites communities along Interstate 95 and U.S. 1 in Palm Beach and Broward Counties. It also preserves the core of an existing district that has consistently elected candidates preferred by minority voters. The district includes all of Lauderhill and Lauderdale Lakes and is bounded on the

south in part by the municipal boundaries of Plantation, Fort Lauderdale, and Dania Beach. The Committee heard from several members of the public at both the Boca Raton and Davie hearings that expressed concerns that the African-American communities continue to have a voice. District 29 has a black voting-age population of 55.7%. A number of public maps contain similar districts. (Plans HPUBS0084, HPUBS0089, SPUBS0091, SPUBS0123, and SPUBS0155.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

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

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:
None.
2. Expenditures:
3. The 2012 reapportionment will have an undetermined fiscal impact on Florida's election officials, including 67 Supervisor of Elections offices and the Department of State, Division of Election. Local

supervisors will incur the cost of data-processing and labor to change each of Florida's 11 million voter records to reflect new districts. As precincts are aligned to new districts, postage and printing will be required to provide each active voter whose precinct has changed with mail notification. Temporary staffing will be hired to assist with mapping, data verification, and voter inquiries.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

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

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

None.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:



None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

S000S9004



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




Legend

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

S000S9004




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



Legend



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



S000S9004



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




Legend

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

S000S9004




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



Legend


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



S000S9004




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



Legend



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



S000S9004



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





Legend

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

S000S9004



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





Legend

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

S000S9004



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




Legend

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

S000S9004




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



Legend


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



S000S9004




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



Legend

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



Redistricting Plan Data Report for S000S9004

Plan File Name: S000S9004						Plan Type: Senate - 40 Districts																			
Plan Population Fundamentals						Plan Geography Fundamentals:																			
Total Population Assigned:	18,801,310 of 18,801,310					Census Blocks Assigned:	484,481 out of 484,481																		
Ideal District Population::	470,032					Number Non-Contiguous Sections:	1 (normally one)																		
District Population Remainder:	30					County or District Split :	31 Split of 67 used																		
District Population Range:	464,088 to 475,858					City or District Split :	78 Split of 411 used																		
District Deviation Range:	(-5,944) To 5,826					VTD's Split :	372 Split of 9,436 used																		
Deviation:	(-1.26) To 1.23 Total 2.50%																								
Number of Districts by Race Language						<table border="1"> <tr> <th>District</th> <th>County</th> <th>Count Blocks</th> <th>Pop</th> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>Osceola</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>												District	County	Count Blocks	Pop	9	Osceola	1	0
District	County	Count Blocks	Pop																						
9	Osceola	1	0																						
	20%+	30%+	40%+	50%+	60%+																				
Current Black VAP	8	6	3	2	1																				
New Black VAP	8	6	4	2	0																				
Current Hisp VAP	14	8	6	3	3																				
New Hisp VAP	13	7	5	5	3																				
Plan Name:	S000S9004				Number of Districts	40																			
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																									
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation																
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H									
S9004-Map	9,941	65,934	15.07%	8,602	216,308	3.97%	86.53%	30.48%	6,823	98,963	6.89%	68.62%	66.62%	2,034	2,095	4,068									
Current Map	11,470	65,934	17.39%	9,035	234,011	3.86%	78.77%	28.17%	7,143	108,049	6.61%	62.27%	61.02%	2,121	2,269	4,242									
S9004-Simple	9,126	65,923	13.84%				94.26%	30.47%				74.76%	66.61%												
Current Map	10,402	65,883	15.78%				86.86%	28.15%				68.66%	60.97%												
	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route				Minutes to drive by fastest route																
	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic	Pop	VAP	VAP Black	VAP Hispanic													
S9004-Map	21	21	22	15	28	28	28	20	38	38	37	29													
Current Map	24	24	24	18	32	32	31	24	41	41	39	32													

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

Plan Name:	S000S9004			Number of Districts	40											
Spatial Measurements - Map Based																
	Base Shapes			Circle - Dispersion					Convex Hull - Indentation							
	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Perimeter	Area	P/A	Pc/P	A/Ac	Width	Height	W+H
36	49	61	81.43%	51	207	24.61%	102.26%	29.56%	39	85	45.88%	78.04%	72.18%	11	12	22
37	306	1,313	23.33%	287	6,563	4.37%	93.78%	20.00%	208	2,299	9.04%	67.87%	57.11%	61	70	122
38	54	106	50.99%	58	275	21.37%	107.90%	38.85%	47	125	37.6%	86.20%	85.53%	9	18	18
39	852	8,194	10.40%	663	34,968	1.89%	77.76%	23.43%	545	18,841	2.89%	63.91%	43.49%	177	176	355
40	58	144	40.55%	56	256	22.16%	96.62%	56.55%	49	166	29.51%	83.43%	87.22%	16	11	32

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

S000S9004 Compactness of Populations within Districts													
	Straight line in miles apart				Miles to drive by fastest route					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
37	21.22	21.17	21.16	21.06	30.31	30.26	30.08	29.84	1.75	42.66	42.69	41.69	41.54
38	5.29	5.27	5.83	5.22	7.99	7.96	8.69	7.90	1.94	15.85	15.80	16.74	15.72
39	51.42	52.31	40.13	49.40	68.57	69.77	52.37	66.15	1.77	80.16	81.76	61.55	76.86
40	4.64	4.63	5.41	4.53	6.92	6.89	8.05	6.74	1.90	13.82	13.80	15.84	13.54

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

