Filing # 191060896 E-Filed 02/01/2024 03:17:51 PM

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

BLACK VOTERS MATTER CAPACITY BUILDING INSTITUTE, INC., et al., Petitioners, v. CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as Florida Secretary of State, the FLORIDA SENATE, and the FLORIDA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Respondents.	Case No.: SC23-1671 L.T. No.: 1D23-2252 2022-ca-000666

APPENDIX TO PETITIONERS' MOTION TO EXPEDITE FILING OF RECORD AND SET ORAL ARGUMENT FOR APRIL 2024

Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111
Thomas A. Zehnder
Florida Bar No. 0063274
Quinn B. Ritter
Florida Bar No. 1018135
King, Blackwell, Zehnder & Wermuth, P.A.
P.O. Box 1631
Orlando, Florida 32802
fwermuth@kbzwlaw.com
tzehnder@kbzwlaw.com
qritter@kbzwlaw.com

Christina A. Ford
Florida Bar No. 1011634
Joseph N. Posimato**
Jyoti Jasrasaria*
Julie Zuckerbrod**
Elias Law Group LLP
250 Massachusetts Ave.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20002
cford@elias.law
jposimato@elias.law
jjasrasaria@elias.law
jzuckerbrod@elias.law

Abha Khanna*
Elias Law Group LLP
1700 Seventh Ave.
Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
akhanna@elias.law

**Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

***Pro hac vice application forthcoming*

Counsel for Petitioners

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Document	Pages
Black Voters Matter Capacity Building Institute, Inc., et al. v. Cord Byrd, et al.; No. 2002-ca-000666, Joint Stipulation to Narrow Issues for Resolution	A1 – A32

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

BLACK VOTERS MATTER CAPACITY BUILDING INSTITUTE, INC., et al. Plaintiffs, v. CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as Florida Secretary of State, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 2022-ca-000666

JOINT STIPULATION TO NARROW ISSUES FOR RESOLUTION

The Parties submit this joint stipulation to narrow the issues before this Court and ensure a timely resolution of the dispute concerning Florida's congressional map.

I. Claims

A. Plaintiffs limit Count I in their Amended Complaint to North Florida.

B. Plaintiffs agree to dismiss with prejudice Counts II and III of the Amended Complaint.

II. Affirmative Defenses

A. Defendant, the Florida Secretary of State, agrees to withdraw his third and fourth affirmative defenses.

B. Defendant, the Florida House of Representatives, agrees to withdraw its first, second, third, and fourth affirmative defenses.

C. Defendant, the Florida Senate, agrees to withdraw its first, second, third, and fourth affirmative defenses.

III. Stipulated Facts Relating to Diminishment

A. The parties stipulate to the facts relevant to Plaintiffs' diminishment claim as set forth in **Exhibit 1** to this stipulation.

B. Defendants stipulate that Plaintiffs have standing to challenge the alleged diminishment in North Florida.

C. The parties agree that based on **Exhibit 1**, no material factual issues remain in dispute regarding Plaintiffs' diminishment claim and that the Court may rule on that claim as a matter of law.

D. The map attached to this stipulation as **Exhibit 2** contains a Black-performing district in North Florida (CD 5).[1]

IV. Remaining Legal Issues for Trial Court's Resolution

A. The Parties agree the only remaining legal disputes are the following that will be resolved at a final hearing with the resulting order having "the force and effect of a final judgment" as contemplated in section 86.011 of the Florida Statutes.

1. Whether Plaintiffs must satisfy the preconditions in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), for the non-diminishment provision to apply.

2. Whether the non-diminishment provision's application to North Florida violates the Equal Protection Clause to the U.S. Constitution.

3. Whether the non-diminishment provision facially violates the Equal Protection Clause to the U.S. Constitution.

4. Whether the public official standing doctrine bars the Secretary's affirmative defenses based on the Equal Protection Clause to the U.S. Constitution.[2]

B. Defendants concede that if the non-diminishment standard applies to North Florida (Question #1), then there is no Black-performing district in North Florida under the Enacted Map. The parties agree that the former congressional district 5 used for the 2016, 2018, and 2020 congressional elections was a Black-performing district.

C. Defendants maintain their argument that the Equal Protection Clause would nonetheless prohibit the creation of a Black-performing district in North Florida (Question #2), as set forth in the Governor's request for an advisory opinion, the Governor's and Florida Legislature's briefs concerning the request for an advisory opinion, the Governor's veto message, and the Secretary and Attorney General's response to Plaintiffs' emergency petition for constitutional writ before the Florida Supreme Court earlier in this litigation.

---

[1] A "Black-performing district" is defined as a district in which Black voters have an "ability to elect representatives of their choice." Fla. Const. art. III, § 20(a).

[2] This issue has been fully briefed in response to Plaintiffs' motion for judgment on the pleadings. The Court previously held that the public official standing doctrine does not bar the House's and Senate's affirmative defenses, and Plaintiffs' motion for judgment on the pleadings does not seek reconsideration of that ruling but preserves it for appeal. The Parties agree that the Court may consider the Parties' existing summary judgment briefing on the legal issues in resolving the outstanding issues.

D. The parties agree that if Plaintiffs ultimately prevail on Questions 1-3, then an appropriate remedy to the diminishment in North Florida would join the Black community in Duval County with the Black community in Leon and Gadsden Counties to create a North Florida district that satisfies *Apportionment I* and the non-diminishment standard, so long as that remedy is consistent with the courts' rulings.

V. Trial Court Schedule

A. The Parties propose to submit simultaneous, tailored briefing on the outstanding legal issues by Wednesday, August 16.

B. The Parties propose to respond to each other's briefs by Monday, August 21.

C. The Parties propose the Court hear oral argument on Thursday, August 24.

VI. Appellate Proceedings

A. The Parties agree that any written order from this Court declaring the Enacted Map to be valid or invalid or enjoining the administration of elections in any district contained in the Enacted Map can be immediately appealed and that any notice of appeal will be filed within two calendar days of this Court issuing its written order.

B. The Parties agree to jointly seek pass-through jurisdiction to the Florida Supreme Court within two days after an appeal is docketed with the First District.

C. The Parties agree to file a joint motion to expedite briefing, oral argument, and resolution of the appeal by the earliest of the following dates: (1) two days after the Florida Supreme Court accepts pass-through jurisdiction or (2) two days after the First District denies certification.

D. Assuming the Parties' joint suggestion for certification is granted, the Parties will propose a schedule that will permit resolution by the Florida Supreme Court by December 31, 2023, to allow the Florida Legislature to take up any remedial map, if necessary, during the 2024 legislative session beginning on January 9, 2024 for enactment no later than April 1, 2024.[3]

VII. Remedy

A. If Plaintiffs prevail on Count I before this Court and, as of April 1, 2024, the Court's decision has not been reversed on appeal, the Parties agree to the following:

[3] In the event the First District denies certification, the Parties agree to work in good faith to propose an expedited schedule to allow for resolution of all appellate proceedings in time for the Florida Legislature to take up any remedial plan, if necessary, during the 2024 regular legislative session.

- If the Legislature fails to enact a remedial map by April 1, 2024, or if the Legislature enacts[4] a remedial map by April 1, 2024 but Plaintiffs inform Defendants by April 3, 2024 of their position that the remedial map does not remedy the diminishment in the Enacted Map, the Parties will jointly ask this Court to vacate the automatic stay to conduct remedial proceedings. In agreeing to this paragraph, Defendants do not waive their right to assert in the remedial proceeding that the remedial map enacted by the Legislature remedied the diminishment in the Enacted Map.

- If the Plaintiffs contend that the remedial map enacted by the Legislature does not remedy the diminishment in the Enacted Map, then Plaintiffs may challenge the enacted remedial map before this Court on an expedited basis. Defendants will not oppose an expeditious review.

- The Parties agree that any proposed remedial map submitted to the Court shall be tailored to address the diminishment violation in North Florida and shall only modify other districts in the Enacted Map to the extent necessary to remedy Plaintiffs' diminishment claim.

- If the Legislature fails to enact a remedial map by April 1, 2024 that will take effect for the 2024 congressional elections, or if the Court agrees with Plaintiffs that the Legislature's enacted remedial map does not remedy the diminishment in the Enacted Map, neither Plaintiffs nor Defendants will oppose the Court's adoption of or seek a stay of **Exhibit 2** (assuming **Exhibit 2** is consistent with the ruling of an appeals court).

- The remedial map ordered by the Court will take effect on April 30, 2024 absent a contrary decision by an appellate court on or before that date.

B. If Plaintiffs do not prevail before this Court but succeed on appeal on or before April 1, 2024, the same remedial provisions as set forth in Section VII (A) apply.

C. The Parties agree that if a remedial map is in place by April 30, 2024, and a decision in favor Plaintiffs on Count I has not been reversed by April 30, 2024, the remedial map shall serve as the map for the 2024 congressional election unless otherwise ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

D. Defendant Secretary of State agrees to assist any affected Supervisor of Elections with implementing a remedial map such that the map can and would be implemented for the 2024 congressional elections.

[4] For purposes of this stipulation, "enact" includes all steps necessary for a bill to become a law under Article III of the Florida Constitution.

Dated: August 11, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Abha Khanna
Abha Khanna*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 656-0177
Facsimile: (206) 656-0180
akhanna@elias.law

Christina A. Ford
Florida Bar No. 1011634
Joseph N. Posimato*
Jyoti Jasrasaria*
Julie Zuckerbrod*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
250 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 968-4490
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498
cford@elias.law
jposimato@elias.law
jjasrasaria@elias.law
jzuckerbrod@elias.law
**Admitted pro hac vice*

Counsel for Plaintiffs

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth
Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111
Thomas A. Zehnder
Florida Bar No. 0063274
Quinn B. Ritter
Florida Bar No. 1018135
KING, BLACKWELL, ZEHNDER
& WERMUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 1631
Orlando, Florida 32802
Telephone: (407) 422-2472
Facsimile: (407) 648-0161
fwermuth@kbzwlaw.com
tzehnder@kbzwlaw.com

/s/ Mohammad O. Jazil
Mohammad O. Jazil (FBN 72556)
mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com
Gary V. Perko (FBN 855898)
gperko@holtzmanvogel.com
Michael Beato (FBN 1017715)
mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com
zbennington@holtzmanvogel.com
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN
TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIAK
119 South Monroe Street, Suite 500
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: 850-279-5938

Counsel for Defendant
Secretary of State

/s/ Andy Bardos
Andy Bardos (FBN 822671)
GRAYROBINSON, P.A.
301 South Bronough Street, Suite 600
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: 850-577-9090
andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com
vanessa.reichel@gray-robinson.com

Counsel for Defendant
Florida House of Representatives

/s/ Daniel E. Nordby
Daniel E. Nordby (FBN 14588)
George N. Meros, Jr. (FBN 263321)
Tara R. Price (FBN 98073)
SHUTTS & BOWEN LLP
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 804
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: 850-241-1717
dnordby@shutts.com
gmeros@shutts.com
tprice@shutts.com
chill@shutts.com

Carlos Rey
Kyle E. Gray

qritter@kbzwlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

302 The Capitol
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Carlos.rey@flsenate.gov
gray.kyle@flsenate.gov

Counsel for Defendant Florida Senate

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on August 11, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing using the State of Florida ePortal Filing System, which will serve an electronic copy to counsel in the Service List below.

/s/ Christina A. Ford
Christina A. Ford
Florida Bar No. 1011634
Counsel for Plaintiffs

SERVICE LIST

Bradley R. McVay
Ashley Davis
David Chappell
Christopher DeLorenz
Joseph S. Van de Bogart
Florida Department of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com
ashley.davis@dos.myflorida.com
david.chappell@dos.myflorida.com
christopher.delorenz@eog.myflorida.com
joseph.vandebogart@dos.myflorida.com

Mohammed O. Jazil
Michael Beato
Chad E. Revis
Holtzman Vogel Baran Torchinsky & Josefiak, PLLC
119 S. Monroe Street, Suite 500
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Daniel E. Nordby
Shutts & Bowen LLP
215 S. Monroe Street
Suite 804
Tallahassee, FL 32301
ndordby@shutts.com

Kyle E. Gray
Deputy General Counsel of the Florida Senate
302 The Capitol
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
gray.kyle@flsenate.gov

Counsel for Florida Senate

Andy Bardos, Esq.
GrayRobinson, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street
Suite 600
Tallahassee, FL 32302
andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com

mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com
mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com
crevis@holtzmanvogel.com

Counsel for Florida Secretary of State

Counsel for the Florida House of Representatives

EXHIBIT 1

The Parties agree to the following facts for the purposes of this case only:

1. The compactness numbers, demographic information, political information, and other districting criteria (such as boundary analysis and city and county splits) for all districts used for the 2016-2020 congressional elections ("Benchmark Plan") and all districts used for the 2022 congressional election ("Enacted Plan"), as available on floridaredistricting.gov. The Benchmark Plan and Enacted Plan are specifically available as attachments to this stipulation as **Exhibit 3** and **Exhibit 4**, respectively.

2. The following are judicially noticeable: (1) Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings, (2) the Governor's Veto Message and Advisory Request to the Florida Supreme Court, (3) Florida's prior congressional plans, (4) the Florida Legislature's redistricting plans that were published during the 2021-2022 redistricting cycle, and (5) redistricting committee meeting materials from the 2022 regular session and special session.

3. Congressional District 5 in the Benchmark Plan had the following characteristics:

    a. Voting Age Population (based on 2020 Census): 46.2% Black, 40.2% White, and 9.1% Hispanic.

    b. Population Breakdown by County (based on 2020 Census): 60.5% in Duval, 22.2% in Leon, 5.9% in Gadsden, 3.8% in Baker, 2.4% in Madison, 1.9% in Hamilton, 1.8% in Jefferson, and 1.6% in Columbia.

    c. Of the 128,235 people who voted in either the Democratic or Republican primary in the district in 2020, 94,780 (73.9%) voted in the Democratic Primary and 33,455 (22.1%) voted in the Republican Primary.

    d. For the 2020 General Election, Black voters comprised 46.1% of all registered voters in the district.

e. For the 2020 General Election, Black voters comprised 68.6% of all registered Democrats in the district.

f. Black voters accounted for approximately 70% of votes cast in Benchmark CD-5 in the 2020 Democratic Primary; approximately 70% of votes cast in Benchmark CD-5 in the 2018 Democratic Primary; and approximately 67% of votes cast in Benchmark CD-5 in the 2016 Democratic Primary.

g. Black voters were politically cohesive in elections in the district because, in the 2016, 2018, and 2020 general elections, approximately 89% of Black voters in the district voted for Democratic candidates.

h. White voters were politically cohesive in elections in the district because, in the 2016, 2018, and 2020 general elections, approximately two-thirds of White voters in the district voted for candidates opposed to the candidates preferred by Black voters.

i. In the 2016, 2018, and 2020 general elections, voting was racially polarized in the district.

j. A Black candidate (Al Lawson) won each of the U.S. House elections held in the district.

k. Al Lawson was the candidate of choice for Black voters in the district.

l. Al Lawson was not the candidate of choice for White voters in the district.

m. Al Lawson won 65% of the general election vote in 2020, 67% of the general election vote in 2018, and 64% of the general election vote in 2016.

n. In Florida's eight statewide elections in 2016, 2018, and 2020, the Black-preferred candidates won a majority of the vote in Benchmark CD-5 in each election.

o. Black voters had the ability to elect the candidate of their choice in the district.

4. The Enacted Plan has the following characteristics in North Florida:

a. Enacted CD-4 is the district with the highest percentage of population that comes from Benchmark CD-5.

b. Under the Enacted Plan, 45.2% of the population of Benchmark CD-5 resides in Enacted CD-4.

c. The remaining 54.8% of the population of Benchmark CD-5 is divided across Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, and Enacted CD-5.

d. The Black VAP of Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5 is 23.1%, 15.9%, 31.7%, and 12.8%, respectively.

e. Most registered voters in each of Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5 are White.

f. White voters cast most of the votes cast in the 2016, 2018, and 2020 general elections in each of Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5.

g. More than three-quarters of Black voters in each of Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5 voted for the Democratic candidate in 2022.

h. More than 70% of White voters in each of Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5 voted for the Republican candidate in 2022.

i. White voters cast most of the votes cast in the 2016, 2018, and 2020 primary elections in each of Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5.

j. Representative Al Lawson, who is Black and represented Benchmark CD-5, ran for re-election in Enacted CD-2, and won 40.2% of the 2022 general election vote, but lost to Representative Neal Dunn, who is White.

k. LaShonda Holloway, who is Black, ran for election in Enacted CD-4, and won 39.5% of the 2022 general election vote, but lost to Aaron Bean, who is White.

l. Under the Enacted Plan in 2022, North Florida did not elect a Black member of Congress for the first time since 1990.

m. In the 2016, 2018, and 2020 statewide elections, candidates preferred by Black voters failed to win a majority of votes in any of the four Enacted CDs that took parts of Benchmark CD-5.

n. In Enacted CD-2, Enacted CD-3, Enacted CD-4, and Enacted CD-5, the White-preferred candidates won the majority of votes cast in the 2016, 2018, and 2020 statewide elections.

o. None of the Enacted districts in North Florida are districts in which Black voters have the ability to elect their preferred candidates.

EXHIBIT 2


PLAN A
1
2
5
4
3
6
7
11
10
12
9
15
13
14
8
16
18
21
17
19
20
22
23
26
25
24
27
28
NORTH FLORIDA
1
2
5
4
3
6
N
200 km

EXHIBIT 3


South Florida
Jacksonville Area
Tampa Bay Area
Orlando Area
Legend
County boundary
Interstate
US Highway
Major road
Sea, lake, or river
District boundary & number
Scale bar for statewide map
0 5 10 20 30 40 50 60 Miles
Scale bar for insets
0 5 10 20 Miles
2016-2022
Florida
Congressional Districts
* * * * *
Court Ordered on
December 2, 2015
* * * * *
See League of Women Voters
of Fla. v. Detzner,
172 So. 3d 363 (Fla. 2015)
Map produced by professional staff:
Florida Senate Committee on Reapportionment
404 S. Monroe St., Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100
Office: 2000 The Capitol; Phone: (850) 487-5855;
Website: https://www.floridaredistricting.gov

Plan FLCD2016

Dist.	Deviation		Voting Age Population:		Area	Perim.	Convex	Polsby-	Reock	Counties:		Cities:		Political and Geographic Boundaries:					
	Total	%	Black	Hisp.	(sq.mi.)	(mi.)	Hull	Popper	Ratio	Whole	Parts	Whole	Parts	City	County	Road	Water	Rail	Non-Pol/Geo
	228,137	29.66%	15.54%	24.99%	2,644.6	289.8	0.77	0.36	0.44	49	50	373	84	18%	56%	10%	39%	1%	14%
1	38,660	5.03%	13.23%	6.60%	5,393	412	0.82	0.40	0.40	4	1	21	0	3%	94%	0%	60%	0%	6%
2	-41,365	-5.38%	12.42%	6.68%	14,594	942	0.68	0.21	0.31	14	5	51	3	7%	75%	11%	48%	1%	10%
3	-3,088	-0.40%	16.10%	10.29%	3,844	303	0.89	0.53	0.71	5	1	27	1	19%	75%	14%	25%	0%	7%
4	102,663	13.35%	10.36%	8.84%	1,963	379	0.72	0.17	0.37	1	2	9	1	9%	58%	18%	51%	1%	15%
5	-20,311	-2.64%	46.20%	9.14%	3,910	711	0.71	0.10	0.12	4	4	15	3	7%	59%	17%	10%	2%	16%
6	27,033	3.51%	10.12%	12.07%	2,682	316	0.77	0.34	0.44	2	2	22	3	8%	82%	4%	62%	0%	4%
7	19,297	2.51%	12.19%	24.65%	436	122	0.81	0.37	0.57	1	1	7	4	16%	65%	10%	51%	0%	19%
8	14,532	1.89%	9.68%	10.35%	2,412	271	0.76	0.41	0.34	2	1	21	0	0%	89%	2%	41%	0%	10%
9	186,381	24.23%	14.26%	41.53%	2,620	268	0.87	0.46	0.63	1	2	12	4	17%	49%	14%	5%	6%	17%
10	104,583	13.60%	26.70%	28.95%	516	115	0.89	0.49	0.49	0	1	9	4	19%	70%	15%	21%	0%	11%
11	51,614	6.71%	7.22%	10.12%	3,202	375	0.74	0.29	0.42	3	2	16	8	14%	66%	14%	40%	0%	12%
12	37,916	4.93%	5.83%	12.50%	1,288	187	0.82	0.46	0.38	1	2	8	3	11%	77%	11%	36%	0%	9%
13	-41,756	-5.43%	11.88%	9.81%	610	106	0.93	0.68	0.66	0	1	19	3	38%	74%	2%	89%	0%	4%
14	18,226	2.37%	17.89%	30.15%	366	101	0.82	0.45	0.48	0	1	0	2	43%	38%	10%	32%	1%	28%
15	50,632	6.58%	15.39%	22.74%	1,170	240	0.76	0.26	0.33	0	3	2	8	25%	28%	13%	17%	0%	24%
16	114,826	14.93%	9.33%	15.94%	1,910	213	0.90	0.53	0.58	1	2	7	0	12%	61%	10%	56%	0%	6%
17	10,734	1.40%	7.15%	13.26%	6,546	433	0.77	0.44	0.51	6	3	15	1	4%	69%	9%	28%	3%	9%
18	25,503	3.32%	12.95%	15.60%	1,889	228	0.82	0.45	0.50	2	1	14	4	10%	65%	3%	45%	0%	20%
19	65,791	8.55%	6.78%	18.08%	1,972	249	0.79	0.40	0.34	0	2	8	0	4%	66%	9%	60%	0%	15%
20	7,062	0.92%	52.37%	26.75%	2,406	387	0.75	0.20	0.48	0	2	14	12	30%	35%	10%	11%	1%	33%
21	18,786	2.44%	14.97%	22.58%	353	123	0.64	0.29	0.37	0	1	16	5	29%	24%	12%	30%	1%	37%
22	16,535	2.15%	15.22%	21.37%	253	119	0.73	0.22	0.46	0	2	12	5	25%	28%	12%	32%	2%	32%
23	135	0.02%	15.21%	39.74%	252	112	0.65	0.25	0.35	0	2	12	6	58%	15%	13%	29%	3%	17%
24	-26,679	-3.47%	43.62%	44.87%	115	69	0.77	0.30	0.47	0	2	9	2	64%	13%	15%	29%	7%	19%
25	2,213	0.29%	4.86%	74.37%	3,674	357	0.68	0.36	0.41	1	2	11	1	8%	70%	12%	22%	0%	7%
26	18,693	2.43%	11.34%	72.44%	6,710	594	0.55	0.24	0.22	1	1	7	0	1%	88%	6%	87%	0%	1%
27	-29,396	-3.82%	5.95%	70.35%	317	91	0.88	0.48	0.50	0	1	9	1	21%	26%	25%	61%	0%	8%
28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Overall numbers of county and city splits:

District lines and City and County Boundaries	In Plan FLCD2016
Number of Counties	67
Counties with only one district	49
Districts with only one county	5
Counties split into more than one district	18
Counties with all population in a single district	49
Aggregate number of county splits	50
Aggregate number of splits with population	50
Number of Cities	412
Cities with only one district	373
Cities split into more than one district	39
Cities with all population in only one district	390
Aggregate number of city splits	84
Aggregate number of splits with population	67

Split Counties and Cities

Plan FLCD2016

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%
Broward	20	519,827	26.7%	890.2	68.0%
Broward	22	645,095	33.2%	187.0	14.3%
Broward	23	691,006	35.5%	218.0	16.7%
Broward	24	88,447	4.6%	13.2	1.0%
Collier	19	168,394	44.8%	636.6	24.4%
Collier	25	207,358	55.2%	1,968.6	75.6%
Columbia	2	58,045	83.3%	431.0	53.8%
Columbia	5	11,653	16.7%	370.3	46.2%
Duval	4	542,200	54.5%	647.5	70.5%
Duval	5	453,367	45.5%	271.0	29.5%
Hillsborough	12	13,604	0.9%	21.4	1.6%
Hillsborough	14	787,447	53.9%	366.3	27.5%
Hillsborough	15	408,739	28.0%	376.5	28.3%
Hillsborough	16	249,972	17.1%	567.8	42.6%
Holmes	1	11,003	56.0%	388.6	79.5%
Holmes	2	8,650	44.0%	100.4	20.5%
Jefferson	2	1,154	8.0%	245.9	36.6%
Jefferson	5	13,356	92.1%	426.7	63.4%
Lake	6	93,240	24.3%	446.2	38.6%
Lake	11	171,836	44.8%	413.0	35.7%
Lake	15	118,880	31.0%	297.6	25.7%
Lee	17	94,204	12.4%	179.0	11.8%
Lee	19	666,618	87.6%	1,335.8	88.2%
Leon	2	125,721	43.0%	211.6	30.1%
Leon	5	166,477	57.0%	490.2	69.9%
Marion	2	53,370	14.2%	275.6	16.6%
Marion	3	151,649	40.3%	854.4	51.4%
Marion	11	170,889	45.5%	532.7	32.0%
Miami-Dade	23	78,350	2.9%	33.8	1.4%
Miami-Dade	24	654,095	24.2%	102.0	4.3%
Miami-Dade	25	524,457	19.4%	516.3	21.6%
Miami-Dade	26	705,040	26.1%	1,420.0	59.4%
Miami-Dade	27	739,825	27.4%	317.3	13.3%
Orange	7	317,662	22.2%	90.3	9.0%
Orange	8	17,353	1.2%	238.1	23.7%
Orange	9	221,089	15.5%	158.9	15.8%
Orange	10	873,804	61.1%	516.1	51.4%
Palm Beach	18	307,067	20.6%	448.3	18.8%
Palm Beach	20	256,456	17.2%	1,515.8	63.6%
Palm Beach	21	788,007	52.8%	353.0	14.8%
Palm Beach	22	140,661	9.4%	66.2	2.8%
Pinellas	12	231,642	24.2%	252.3	29.3%
Pinellas	13	727,465	75.9%	610.2	70.8%
Polk	9	345,857	47.7%	955.2	47.5%
Polk	15	292,234	40.3%	496.1	24.7%
Polk	17	86,955	12.0%	559.1	27.8%
Sarasota	16	234,365	54.0%	378.3	38.8%
Sarasota	17	199,641	46.0%	597.3	61.2%
St. Johns	4	239,332	87.5%	589.2	71.7%
St. Johns	6	34,093	12.5%	232.3	28.3%

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Plan FLCD2016

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%
Auburndale	9	15,606	99.9%	20.4	99.2%
Auburndale	15	10	0.1%	0.2	0.8%
Boca Raton	21	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Boca Raton	22	97,422	100.0%	31.6	100.0%
Clearwater	12	19,795	16.9%	5.3	14.8%
Clearwater	13	97,497	83.1%	30.6	85.2%
Clermont	11	76	0.2%	0.4	2.0%
Clermont	15	42,945	99.8%	18.7	98.0%
Dania Beach	22	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Dania Beach	23	31,723	100.0%	8.3	100.0%
Eatonville	7	0	0.0%	0.1	4.0%
Eatonville	10	2,349	100.0%	1.1	96.1%
Eustis	6	23,189	100.0%	12.8	99.7%
Eustis	11	0	0.0%	0.0	0.3%
Fort Lauderdale	20	59,474	32.5%	12.3	33.9%
Fort Lauderdale	22	123,208	67.4%	23.9	65.7%
Fort Lauderdale	23	78	0.0%	0.1	0.4%
Groveland	11	46	0.3%	4.8	18.3%
Groveland	15	18,459	99.8%	21.4	81.7%
Hollywood	23	86,010	56.2%	21.5	69.8%
Hollywood	24	67,057	43.8%	9.3	30.2%
Jacksonville	4	496,244	52.3%	603.5	69.0%
Jacksonville	5	453,367	47.7%	271.0	31.0%
Lake City	2	8,072	65.5%	7.5	61.5%
Lake City	5	4,257	34.5%	4.7	38.5%
Maitland	7	19,543	100.0%	6.5	100.0%
Maitland	10	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Mascotte	11	6,609	100.0%	18.1	100.0%
Mascotte	15	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Miami	24	147,747	33.4%	18.9	33.7%
Miami	25	6,034	1.4%	0.6	1.1%
Miami	27	288,460	65.2%	36.6	65.2%
Minneola	11	13,825	99.9%	11.4	99.8%
Minneola	15	18	0.1%	0.0	0.2%
Mount Dora	6	16,341	100.0%	9.2	99.8%
Mount Dora	11	0	0.0%	0.0	0.2%
Oakland Park	20	10,353	23.4%	2.4	29.3%
Oakland Park	22	33,876	76.6%	5.8	70.7%
Ocala	2	0	0.0%	0.2	0.3%
Ocala	3	63,566	100.0%	45.6	96.5%
Ocala	11	25	0.0%	1.5	3.2%
Oldsmar	12	14,887	99.9%	10.1	100.0%
Oldsmar	13	11	0.1%	0.0	0.0%
Orlando	7	70,064	22.8%	16.4	13.8%
Orlando	9	74,391	24.2%	48.7	41.0%
Orlando	10	163,118	53.0%	53.7	45.2%
Palm Beach	20	0	0.0%	0.0	0.2%
Palm Beach	21	9,245	100.0%	7.8	99.8%
Palm Beach Gardens	18	59,182	100.0%	59.3	100.0%
Palm Beach Gardens	20	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Plantation	20	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Plantation	23	91,750	100.0%	22.1	100.0%
Polk City	9	8	0.3%	0.1	2.0%
Polk City	15	2,705	99.7%	5.0	98.0%
Pompano Beach	20	35,438	31.6%	8.6	34.8%

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%
Pompano Beach	22	76,608	68.4%	16.1	65.2%
Riviera Beach	18	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Riviera Beach	20	37,604	100.0%	9.7	100.0%
Royal Palm Beach	18	16,526	42.5%	5.6	47.6%
Royal Palm Beach	20	22,346	57.4%	6.1	51.8%
Royal Palm Beach	21	60	0.2%	0.1	0.6%
Safety Harbor	12	17,072	100.0%	5.1	100.0%
Safety Harbor	13	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Sunrise	20	45,532	46.8%	6.4	35.1%
Sunrise	23	51,803	53.2%	11.8	64.9%
Tallahassee	2	77,828	39.7%	54.4	52.4%
Tallahassee	5	118,341	60.3%	49.4	47.6%
Tampa	14	384,959	100.0%	175.8	100.0%
Tampa	15	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Tavares	6	0	0.0%	0.0	0.1%
Tavares	11	19,003	100.0%	13.8	99.9%
Temple Terrace	14	6	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Temple Terrace	15	26,684	100.0%	7.6	100.0%
Wellington	20	112	0.2%	0.1	0.1%
Wellington	21	61,525	99.8%	45.4	99.9%
West Palm Beach	18	27,356	23.3%	36.1	62.3%
West Palm Beach	20	57,443	48.9%	15.3	26.4%
West Palm Beach	21	32,616	27.8%	6.6	11.3%
Weston	20	0	0.0%	0.1	0.4%
Weston	23	68,107	100.0%	26.0	99.7%
Winter Haven	9	49,219	100.0%	41.1	100.0%
Winter Haven	17	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Winter Park	7	29,774	99.9%	10.4	100.0%
Winter Park	10	21	0.1%	0.0	0.0%

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Functional Analysis - Summary

Plan FLCD2016

Dist.	2020 Census		2020 General Election Registered Voters																	
	VAP who are:		RV who are:			RV who are:		Black Voters who are:			Hisp. Voters who are:			DEM who are:		REP who are:		NPAOth who are:	
	Black	Hisp	DEM	REP	OTH	Black	Hisp	DEM	REP	NPAOth	DEM	REP	NPAOth	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.
5	46.20%	9.14%	56.62%	24.04%	19.34%	46.07%	4.78%	84.27%	2.69%	13.03%	44.76%	19.87%	34.91%	68.56%	3.78%	5.15%	3.95%	31.03%	8.62%
9	14.26%	41.53%	39.35%	27.53%	33.12%	10.82%	36.46%	74.89%	3.67%	21.41%	45.38%	13.86%	40.75%	20.60%	42.06%	1.44%	18.35%	6.99%	44.86%
10	26.70%	28.95%	45.12%	24.69%	30.19%	23.22%	21.39%	77.55%	3.27%	19.17%	46.15%	15.09%	38.74%	39.90%	21.88%	3.07%	13.07%	14.74%	27.45%
20	52.37%	26.75%	62.04%	12.78%	25.18%	49.67%	18.33%	81.53%	2.49%	15.95%	43.62%	19.47%	36.81%	65.28%	12.89%	9.69%	27.93%	31.47%	26.80%
24	43.62%	44.87%	61.55%	12.12%	26.34%	46.16%	31.90%	82.85%	2.45%	14.68%	42.06%	21.48%	36.45%	62.14%	21.80%	9.35%	56.56%	25.72%	44.13%
25	4.86%	74.37%	27.57%	40.22%	32.21%	3.13%	62.61%	73.13%	5.88%	20.88%	27.47%	37.80%	34.73%	8.29%	62.39%	0.46%	58.84%	2.03%	67.50%
26	11.34%	72.44%	34.64%	32.40%	32.96%	10.02%	62.59%	78.51%	3.29%	18.16%	28.59%	35.99%	35.41%	22.71%	51.67%	1.02%	69.53%	5.52%	67.25%
27	5.95%	70.35%	35.31%	32.02%	32.67%	4.60%	58.79%	75.92%	4.30%	19.74%	29.35%	37.54%	33.10%	9.89%	48.88%	0.62%	68.94%	2.78%	59.56%

Functional Analysis - Summary

Plan FLCD2016

Dist.	2020 Census		Average Primary Election Turnout				Average General Election Turnout															General Election Performance in Statewide Elections 2012-2020						
	VAP who are:		DEM who are:		REP who are:		Voters who are:			DEM who are:		REP who are:		NPAOth who are:		Black Voters who are:			Hisp. Voters who are:			Avg. Perf.		Wins		Margins		
	Black	Hisp	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	DEM	REP	NPAOth	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	DEM	REP	NPAOth	DEM	REP	NPAOth	DEM	REP	DEM	REP	MAX	MIN	AVG
5	46.20%	9.14%	66.89%	1.10%	3.18%	1.60%	60.90%	26.03%	13.05%	67.14%	2.42%	3.77%	2.87%	27.66%	6.62%	89.83%	2.15%	7.94%	46.26%	24.61%	27.94%	60.9%	37.6%	14	0	D +37%	D +11.8%	D +23.7%
9	14.26%	41.53%	21.78%	25.89%	0.79%	8.48%	41.14%	33.73%	25.13%	21.65%	33.88%	1.08%	12.62%	6.39%	34.24%	81.78%	3.31%	14.78%	52.01%	15.84%	32.10%	51.2%	47.0%	11	3	D +24.6%	D +1.7%	D +4.5%
10	26.70%	28.95%	49.28%	11.19%	2.05%	6.42%	46.21%	30.41%	23.38%	43.09%	17.79%	2.27%	9.37%	13.12%	22.22%	84.01%	2.91%	13.03%	50.49%	17.46%	31.98%	58.6%	39.8%	14	0	D +32.1%	D +1%	D +19.3%
20	52.37%	26.75%	71.18%	4.86%	7.69%	16.30%	67.65%	13.26%	19.08%	66.96%	10.00%	8.22%	23.91%	30.92%	23.72%	86.57%	2.08%	11.27%	46.24%	22.14%	31.26%	80.3%	18.9%	14	0	D +68.4%	D +55.2%	D +61.6%
24	43.62%	44.87%	72.58%	10.82%	8.04%	53.14%	68.80%	11.56%	19.63%	66.18%	17.39%	8.49%	52.65%	27.10%	41.06%	87.88%	1.89%	10.21%	45.45%	23.64%	30.88%	82.2%	16.9%	14	0	D +72.4%	D +51.4%	D +65.4%
25	4.86%	74.37%	9.41%	48.39%	0.28%	56.85%	27.94%	45.66%	26.40%	9.02%	56.83%	0.35%	56.62%	1.74%	63.79%	80.09%	5.11%	14.74%	27.06%	44.21%	28.72%	39.7%	59.0%	0	14	R +32.8%	R +2.2%	R +19.1%
26	11.34%	72.44%	27.03%	33.42%	0.62%	65.65%	36.69%	36.43%	26.88%	24.64%	44.68%	0.85%	66.14%	5.39%	63.18%	83.69%	2.86%	13.40%	28.38%	42.08%	29.53%	51.4%	47.4%	9	5	D +16.2%	R +1.2%	D +4.3%
27	5.95%	70.35%	12.14%	36.09%	0.35%	72.64%	36.60%	36.49%	26.92%	10.67%	43.66%	0.48%	68.13%	2.60%	58.06%	81.50%	3.71%	14.68%	28.21%	44.12%	27.66%	51.9%	47.0%	11	3	D +19.5%	D +0.6%	D +5.5%

Functional Analysis - Returns

			5	9	10	20	24	25	26	27
Plan FLCD2016		BVAP	46.20%	14.26%	26.70%	52.37%	43.62%	4.86%	11.34%	5.95%
Primary Elections		HVAP	9.14%	41.53%	28.95%	26.75%	44.87%	74.37%	72.44%	70.35%
2018	Governor (REP)	R_Baldauf	0.67%	0.60%	0.73%	1.46%	2.49%	1.72%	1.79%	1.49%
		R_DeSantis	50.91%	43.76%	53.04%	60.72%	63.42%	66.96%	67.81%	67.52%
		R_Devine	1.16%	1.26%	1.61%	2.07%	3.63%	2.79%	3.35%	3.02%
		R_Langford	1.21%	1.03%	1.61%	1.66%	2.18%	1.40%	1.69%	1.59%
		R_Mercadante	0.47%	0.75%	0.86%	1.54%	2.92%	1.78%	1.98%	2.15%
		R_Nathan	0.75%	0.66%	0.86%	1.49%	2.13%	1.02%	1.36%	1.55%
		R_Putnam	42.67%	49.98%	38.99%	25.91%	17.92%	21.75%	18.18%	19.02%
		R_White	1.63%	1.83%	2.10%	2.92%	4.65%	2.52%	3.59%	3.42%
	Governor (DEM)	D_Gillum	58.61%	30.20%	45.10%	57.43%	53.26%	22.99%	34.50%	25.61%
		D_Graham	22.66%	31.00%	27.10%	11.98%	10.90%	23.62%	20.26%	23.07%
		D_Greene	5.55%	13.26%	9.56%	9.05%	10.02%	11.00%	10.07%	7.50%
		D_King	1.33%	3.87%	3.50%	0.79%	0.88%	2.82%	1.97%	1.52%
		D_Levine	10.24%	18.68%	13.36%	19.91%	23.97%	36.52%	31.17%	40.79%
		D_Lundmark	0.45%	1.15%	0.47%	0.27%	0.46%	1.50%	0.89%	0.71%
		D_Wetherbee	0.79%	1.60%	0.82%	0.32%	0.40%	1.43%	0.95%	0.62%
	Attorney General (REP)	R_Moody	58.32%	57.66%	55.16%	55.28%	51.96%	51.91%	54.79%	54.98%
		R_White	41.59%	42.32%	44.85%	44.03%	47.82%	48.07%	45.11%	45.03%
	Attorney General (DEM)	D_Shaw	79.03%	62.16%	72.79%	82.42%	82.19%	62.60%	71.18%	73.79%
		D_Torrens	20.91%	37.82%	27.22%	17.55%	17.80%	37.41%	28.82%	26.23%
	Agriculture Commissioner (REP)	R_Caldwell	36.46%	28.61%	35.26%	42.40%	40.96%	42.29%	42.31%	39.76%
		R_Grimsley	22.86%	27.50%	31.60%	26.92%	30.65%	28.78%	31.19%	32.65%
		R_McCalister	9.16%	11.88%	15.39%	20.21%	17.38%	12.73%	16.58%	17.11%
		R_Troutman	30.93%	31.82%	17.64%	8.43%	10.37%	16.18%	9.67%	10.38%
	Agriculture Commissioner (DEM)	D_Fried	60.02%	53.62%	55.07%	62.94%	57.49%	50.87%	53.09%	61.30%
		D_Porter	19.67%	18.77%	18.25%	16.26%	18.80%	19.65%	20.63%	13.91%
		D_Walker	20.19%	27.55%	26.67%	20.75%	23.70%	29.42%	26.23%	24.76%
	US Senate (REP)	R_De La Fuente	11.04%	9.15%	11.06%	14.74%	17.08%	9.41%	12.22%	13.20%
		R_Scott	88.77%	90.79%	88.92%	84.33%	82.85%	90.58%	87.73%	86.78%
2016	US Senate (REP)	R_Beruff	21.35%	19.39%	17.64%	13.07%	8.02%	9.59%	6.37%	6.02%
		R_Rivera	3.83%	3.05%	2.52%	4.45%	3.64%	2.20%	2.81%	1.99%
		R_Rubio	68.10%	70.54%	74.37%	72.02%	79.92%	84.44%	86.01%	88.05%
		R_Young	6.23%	6.82%	5.36%	8.29%	7.97%	3.74%	4.77%	3.79%
	US Senate (DEM)	D_De La Fuente	4.17%	12.55%	4.89%	3.29%	6.37%	20.68%	12.73%	11.64%
		D_Grayson	18.26%	39.05%	42.68%	9.52%	10.12%	12.29%	11.19%	11.78%
		D_Keith	14.98%	10.52%	12.27%	14.91%	13.73%	14.57%	15.83%	17.86%
		D_Luster	11.29%	1.42%	2.23%	2.35%	2.89%	1.72%	1.85%	1.30%
		D_Murphy	50.92%	36.18%	37.83%	69.44%	66.77%	50.65%	58.14%	57.19%
2014	Governor (REP)	R_Adeshina	1.50%	1.58%	1.64%	2.45%	3.30%	1.26%	1.82%	1.88%
		R_Cuevas-Neunder	8.71%	10.78%	9.92%	15.26%	15.62%	10.21%	14.79%	13.77%
		R_Scott	89.43%	87.50%	88.32%	80.79%	80.75%	88.46%	83.24%	84.26%
	Governor (DEM)	D_Crist	75.18%	74.85%	80.06%	84.62%	84.92%	74.04%	78.65%	73.25%
		D_Rich	24.65%	24.92%	19.90%	15.25%	15.09%	25.79%	21.27%	26.63%
	Attorney General (DEM)	D_Sheldon	61.06%	59.89%	50.11%	37.37%	44.20%	67.24%	58.97%	69.29%
		D_Thurston	38.89%	39.98%	49.91%	62.53%	55.81%	32.69%	40.88%	30.61%
2012	US Senate (REP)	R_Mack	56.41%	47.68%	57.84%	65.27%	71.55%	73.61%	73.54%	76.92%
		R_McCalister	18.56%	12.36%	11.36%	12.26%	7.28%	8.49%	7.35%	5.34%
		R_Stuart	6.21%	6.68%	5.24%	7.54%	13.33%	11.71%	13.34%	12.65%
		R_Weldon	17.97%	32.91%	25.43%	12.50%	7.17%	6.17%	5.61%	4.86%
	US Senate (DEM)	D_Burkett	21.27%	22.72%	13.74%	13.71%	14.80%	22.81%	18.27%	14.18%
		D_Nelson	78.59%	77.05%	86.18%	86.04%	85.18%	77.05%	81.63%	85.74%

Functional Analysis - Returns

			5	9	10	20	24	25	26	27
Plan FLCD2016		BVAP	46.20%	14.26%	26.70%	52.37%	43.62%	4.86%	11.34%	5.95%
General Elections		HVAP	9.14%	41.53%	28.95%	26.75%	44.87%	74.37%	72.44%	70.35%
2020	President	D_Biden	62.59%	52.99%	62.01%	77.32%	75.42%	37.85%	46.86%	51.18%
		R_Trump	36.27%	46.05%	37.02%	22.12%	24.00%	61.61%	52.56%	48.27%
2018	Governor	D_Gillum	64.88%	54.67%	63.26%	82.18%	83.57%	41.38%	53.02%	54.60%
		R_DeSantis	34.20%	43.91%	35.72%	17.25%	15.65%	57.27%	45.81%	44.34%
	Attorney General	D_Shaw	61.58%	51.49%	59.61%	80.60%	81.90%	39.54%	51.46%	53.50%
		R_Moody	36.88%	46.64%	38.78%	18.20%	16.58%	58.45%	46.41%	44.58%
	Chief Financial Officer	D_Ring	62.80%	54.02%	61.48%	81.86%	83.36%	40.97%	52.49%	54.18%
		R_Patronis	37.19%	45.98%	38.52%	18.14%	16.63%	59.03%	47.51%	45.82%
	Agriculture Commissioner	D_Fried	63.83%	55.52%	63.22%	82.12%	83.61%	42.21%	53.96%	56.28%
		R_Caldwell	36.16%	44.48%	36.78%	17.86%	16.38%	57.78%	46.04%	43.73%
	US Senate	D_Nelson	64.78%	53.96%	62.76%	81.94%	83.27%	41.92%	54.00%	55.96%
		R_Scott	35.22%	46.05%	37.24%	18.07%	16.73%	58.08%	46.00%	44.03%
2016	President	D_Clinton	60.92%	54.79%	61.76%	80.18%	82.88%	47.70%	56.76%	58.46%
		R_Trump	36.19%	41.90%	34.88%	18.09%	15.39%	49.90%	40.56%	38.98%
	US Senate	D_Murphy	55.43%	49.67%	55.92%	77.24%	77.67%	37.44%	48.20%	49.24%
		R_Rubio	41.30%	46.03%	40.32%	20.99%	20.18%	60.34%	49.43%	48.63%
2014	Governor	D_Crist	59.33%	47.91%	55.49%	81.52%	84.02%	37.15%	52.07%	51.41%
		R_Scott	37.10%	46.26%	40.09%	16.60%	14.28%	60.11%	45.06%	46.13%
	Attorney General	D_Sheldon	55.70%	43.06%	52.45%	78.03%	81.43%	32.54%	46.83%	47.62%
		R_Bondi	41.85%	54.00%	44.81%	20.66%	17.08%	65.13%	50.81%	50.30%
	Chief Financial Officer	D_Rankin	55.92%	43.89%	50.63%	77.67%	81.51%	33.79%	46.85%	44.48%
		R_Atwater	44.08%	56.11%	49.36%	22.32%	18.49%	66.20%	53.13%	55.52%
	Agriculture Commissioner	D_Hamilton	57.80%	40.71%	50.50%	79.21%	81.92%	33.60%	47.07%	45.47%
		R_Putnam	42.18%	59.29%	49.50%	20.77%	18.07%	66.39%	52.92%	54.53%
2012	President	D_Obama	63.57%	55.67%	60.78%	82.50%	85.78%	44.91%	55.48%	53.07%
		R_Romney	35.62%	43.46%	38.48%	17.12%	13.88%	54.57%	43.97%	46.40%
	US Senate	D_Nelson	67.35%	60.89%	65.14%	83.62%	85.64%	47.11%	57.03%	55.41%
		R_Mack	30.31%	36.34%	33.01%	15.26%	13.24%	50.65%	41.37%	43.23%

EXHIBIT 4


South Florida
Jacksonville Area
Tampa Bay Area
Orlando Area
Florida
Congressional Districts
P000C0109
* * * * *
by J. Alex Kelly
* * * * *
April 13, 2022
Legend
County boundary
Interstate
US Highway
Major road
Sea, lake, or river
District boundary & number
Scale bar for statewide map
Miles
0 5 10 20 30 40 50 60
Scale bar for insets
Miles
0 5 10 20
Map produced by professional staff:
Florida Senate Committee on Reapportionment
404 S. Monroe St., Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100
Office: 2000 The Capitol; Phone: (850) 487-5855;
Website: https://www.floridaredistricting.gov

Plan P000C0109

Dist.	Deviation		Voting Age Population:		Area	Perim.	Convex	Polsby-	Reock	Counties:		Cities:		Political and Geographic Boundaries:					
	Total	%	Black	Hisp.	(sq.mi.)	(mi.)	Hull	Popper	Ratio	Whole	Parts	Whole	Parts	City	County	Road	Water	Rail	Non-Pol/Geo
	1	0.00%	15.54%	24.99%	2,550.1	244.0	0.81	0.43	0.47	50	48	396	36	14%	56%	18%	39%	1%	12%
1	0	0.00%	13.54%	6.69%	4,416	341	0.87	0.48	0.54	3	1	16	0	8%	78%	10%	53%	0%	3%
2	0	0.00%	23.09%	6.42%	12,839	578	0.82	0.48	0.46	14	2	50	0	5%	84%	7%	49%	0%	3%
3	0	0.00%	15.88%	10.64%	8,271	456	0.90	0.50	0.57	10	2	42	0	6%	85%	7%	32%	0%	5%
4	0	0.00%	31.66%	7.82%	1,981	280	0.76	0.32	0.38	2	1	8	1	8%	86%	2%	55%	0%	2%
5	0	0.00%	12.80%	10.86%	829	141	0.89	0.52	0.56	0	2	5	1	16%	48%	7%	79%	0%	13%
6	0	0.00%	11.22%	9.78%	3,928	320	0.92	0.48	0.74	2	4	21	0	16%	42%	17%	32%	2%	15%
7	0	0.00%	10.53%	18.97%	1,053	181	0.83	0.40	0.47	1	2	17	0	22%	68%	9%	40%	2%	8%
8	0	0.00%	9.68%	10.05%	2,299	253	0.78	0.45	0.32	2	1	21	0	0%	89%	7%	44%	0%	4%
9	0	0.00%	13.02%	50.04%	1,846	223	0.86	0.47	0.49	1	2	4	1	2%	61%	25%	27%	0%	12%
10	0	0.00%	25.98%	28.63%	273	96	0.75	0.37	0.41	0	1	3	1	13%	26%	35%	2%	1%	37%
11	0	0.00%	12.76%	17.09%	1,836	254	0.82	0.36	0.52	1	3	23	1	14%	49%	27%	26%	2%	13%
12	0	0.00%	5.29%	11.72%	2,538	289	0.75	0.38	0.45	2	2	9	0	7%	84%	13%	63%	0%	8%
13	0	0.00%	7.09%	9.56%	730	125	0.93	0.58	0.51	0	1	23	1	15%	75%	12%	67%	0%	3%
14	0	0.00%	19.13%	25.97%	524	118	0.83	0.47	0.48	0	2	0	2	12%	19%	46%	21%	1%	13%
15	0	0.00%	15.40%	22.74%	675	121	0.88	0.58	0.58	0	3	3	2	3%	1%	61%	4%	0%	32%
16	0	0.00%	11.98%	18.67%	1,500	205	0.73	0.45	0.45	1	1	5	1	1%	73%	21%	32%	1%	2%
17	0	0.00%	5.56%	11.54%	2,149	262	0.77	0.39	0.28	2	1	4	1	9%	84%	5%	39%	0%	6%
18	0	0.00%	13.21%	23.68%	7,085	460	0.82	0.42	0.42	6	2	26	1	6%	77%	8%	21%	0%	9%
19	0	0.00%	6.07%	16.22%	1,897	249	0.78	0.39	0.33	0	2	8	0	11%	65%	12%	59%	0%	10%
20	0	0.00%	50.11%	22.98%	2,397	330	0.77	0.28	0.50	0	2	13	8	28%	37%	15%	13%	3%	22%
21	0	0.00%	12.48%	15.14%	1,888	219	0.82	0.49	0.50	2	1	16	2	9%	68%	7%	48%	0%	16%
22	-1	0.00%	15.88%	24.65%	345	102	0.74	0.42	0.44	0	1	19	1	36%	24%	18%	36%	0%	24%
23	0	0.00%	13.17%	20.51%	254	105	0.79	0.29	0.50	0	2	11	5	29%	28%	16%	38%	9%	20%
24	0	0.00%	42.17%	38.46%	183	69	0.90	0.48	0.48	0	2	18	2	36%	36%	32%	46%	0%	10%
25	0	0.00%	17.52%	42.26%	237	88	0.81	0.38	0.42	0	1	8	3	64%	29%	12%	20%	0%	15%
26	0	0.00%	6.92%	73.22%	2,440	306	0.77	0.33	0.29	0	2	8	1	11%	54%	28%	13%	0%	9%
27	0	0.00%	7.07%	74.18%	281	70	0.95	0.73	0.71	0	1	7	1	10%	18%	34%	59%	0%	7%
28	0	0.00%	10.32%	73.35%	6,710	591	0.55	0.24	0.22	1	1	8	0	1%	88%	8%	86%	0%	1%

Overall numbers of county and city splits:

District lines and City and County Boundaries	In Plan P000C0109	
Number of Counties	67	412
Counties with only one district	50	396
Districts with only one county	5	16
Counties split into more than one district	17	396
Counties with all population in a single district	50	36
Aggregate number of county splits	48	36
Aggregate number of splits with population	46	36

Split Counties and Cities

Plan P000C0109

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%
Broward	20	535,322	27.5%	889.4	68.0%
Broward	23	561,713	28.9%	171.5	13.1%
Broward	24	78,119	4.0%	10.9	0.8%
Broward	25	769,221	39.6%	236.7	18.1%
Collier	18	4,861	1.3%	73.8	2.8%
Collier	19	156,767	41.7%	607.9	23.3%
Collier	26	214,124	57.0%	1,923.5	73.8%
Duval	4	460,624	46.3%	611.1	66.5%
Duval	5	534,943	53.7%	307.4	33.5%
Hillsborough	14	579,335	39.7%	391.4	29.4%
Hillsborough	15	510,916	35.0%	404.4	30.4%
Hillsborough	16	369,511	25.3%	536.2	40.3%
Lafayette	2	1,731	21.0%	43.3	7.9%
Lafayette	3	6,495	79.0%	504.6	92.1%
Lake	6	117,124	30.5%	499.6	43.2%
Lake	11	266,832	69.5%	657.2	56.8%
Lee	17	148,368	19.5%	225.9	14.9%
Lee	19	612,454	80.5%	1,288.9	85.1%
Marion	3	206,835	55.0%	655.9	39.5%
Marion	6	169,073	45.0%	1,006.7	60.6%
Marion	12	0	0.0%	0.1	0.0%
Miami-Dade	24	691,102	25.6%	172.0	7.2%
Miami-Dade	26	555,097	20.6%	516.6	21.6%
Miami-Dade	27	769,221	28.5%	280.7	11.8%
Miami-Dade	28	686,347	25.4%	1,420.1	59.4%
Orange	7	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Orange	8	2,821	0.2%	125.2	12.5%
Orange	9	326,695	22.9%	276.6	27.6%
Orange	10	769,221	53.8%	272.5	27.2%
Orange	11	331,171	23.2%	329.1	32.8%
Palm Beach	20	233,899	15.7%	1,507.8	63.3%
Palm Beach	21	281,564	18.9%	447.3	18.8%
Palm Beach	22	769,220	51.6%	345.3	14.5%
Palm Beach	23	207,508	13.9%	82.8	3.5%
Pasco	12	420,863	74.9%	862.1	85.0%
Pasco	15	141,028	25.1%	152.7	15.1%
Pinellas	13	769,221	80.2%	730.2	84.7%
Pinellas	14	189,886	19.8%	132.4	15.4%
Polk	9	53,870	7.4%	63.5	3.2%
Polk	11	41,466	5.7%	270.1	13.4%
Polk	15	117,277	16.2%	117.8	5.9%
Polk	18	512,433	70.7%	1,559.0	77.5%
St. Johns	5	234,278	85.7%	521.6	63.5%
St. Johns	6	39,147	14.3%	299.9	36.5%
Volusia	6	255,178	46.1%	724.4	50.6%
Volusia	7	298,365	53.9%	708.1	49.4%
Walton	1	47,648	63.3%	821.5	58.3%
Walton	2	27,657	36.7%	587.9	41.7%

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Counties included in more than one district					
County	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Plan P000C0109

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%
Deerfield Beach	20	27,968	32.2%	3.8	23.5%
Deerfield Beach	23	58,891	67.8%	12.4	76.5%
Fort Lauderdale	20	55,428	30.3%	12.4	34.1%
Fort Lauderdale	23	105,601	57.8%	18.6	51.2%
Fort Lauderdale	25	21,731	11.9%	5.3	14.7%
Jacksonville	4	459,228	48.4%	609.1	69.7%
Jacksonville	5	490,383	51.6%	265.4	30.4%
Lakeland	15	49,933	44.3%	33.7	44.9%
Lakeland	18	62,708	55.7%	41.4	55.1%
Longboat Key	16	2,746	36.6%	8.3	51.7%
Longboat Key	17	4,759	63.4%	7.7	48.3%
Margate	20	11,080	18.9%	1.6	17.8%
Margate	23	47,632	81.1%	7.4	82.2%
Miami	24	86,644	19.6%	14.1	25.1%
Miami	26	66,430	15.0%	5.7	10.1%
Miami	27	289,167	65.4%	36.3	64.8%
Miramar	24	56,729	42.1%	6.9	22.3%
Miramar	25	77,992	57.9%	24.2	77.7%
Oakland Park	20	15,037	34.0%	3.5	43.0%
Oakland Park	23	29,192	66.0%	4.7	57.0%
Orlando	9	81,845	26.6%	62.8	52.8%
Orlando	10	225,262	73.2%	56.0	47.1%
Orlando	11	466	0.2%	0.1	0.1%
Plantation	20	44,325	48.3%	9.3	42.0%
Plantation	25	47,425	51.7%	12.8	58.0%
Pompano Beach	20	49,811	44.5%	10.9	44.1%
Pompano Beach	23	62,235	55.5%	13.8	55.9%
Riviera Beach	20	29,204	77.7%	6.8	70.7%
Riviera Beach	21	8,400	22.3%	2.8	29.3%
St. Petersburg	13	82,168	31.8%	33.6	25.6%
St. Petersburg	14	176,140	68.2%	97.8	74.4%
Tampa	14	287,435	74.7%	137.9	78.4%
Tampa	15	97,524	25.3%	38.0	21.6%
West Palm Beach	20	59,919	51.0%	15.1	26.0%
West Palm Beach	21	21,937	18.7%	34.9	60.2%
West Palm Beach	22	35,559	30.3%	8.0	13.8%

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Cities included in more than one district					
City	Dist.	Total Pop	Pop%	Total Area	Area%

Functional Analysis - Summary

Plan P000C0109

Dist.	2020 Census		2020 General Election Registered Voters																	
	VAP who are:		RV who are:			RV who are:		Black Voters who are:			Hisp. Voters who are:			DEM who are:		REP who are:		NPAOth who are:	
	Black	Hisp	DEM	REP	OTH	Black	Hisp	DEM	REP	NPAOth	DEM	REP	NPAOth	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.
9	13.02%	50.04%	41.93%	23.25%	34.81%	9.42%	44.21%	72.15%	3.99%	23.83%	46.62%	13.42%	39.97%	16.21%	49.15%	1.62%	25.50%	6.45%	50.75%
20	50.11%	22.98%	61.33%	13.79%	24.88%	46.82%	15.27%	81.47%	2.53%	15.98%	46.07%	17.38%	36.51%	62.20%	11.47%	8.57%	19.25%	30.08%	22.41%
24	42.17%	38.46%	60.04%	12.59%	27.37%	44.01%	27.28%	82.62%	2.44%	14.94%	42.23%	20.67%	37.09%	60.56%	19.19%	8.52%	44.78%	24.03%	36.98%
26	6.92%	73.22%	29.79%	37.92%	32.29%	5.19%	60.87%	76.51%	4.41%	18.86%	28.91%	36.07%	35.00%	13.33%	59.08%	0.60%	57.90%	3.03%	65.98%
27	7.07%	74.18%	34.57%	33.39%	32.04%	6.14%	62.79%	78.63%	3.69%	17.62%	28.03%	38.96%	33.00%	13.97%	50.91%	0.68%	73.27%	3.38%	64.68%
28	10.32%	73.35%	33.92%	32.58%	33.51%	8.68%	63.92%	77.57%	3.44%	18.87%	28.78%	35.48%	35.75%	19.84%	54.23%	0.92%	69.60%	4.89%	68.19%

Functional Analysis - Summary

Plan P000C0109

Dist.	2020 Census		Average Primary Election Turnout				Average General Election Turnout															General Election Performance in Statewide Elections 2012-2020						
	VAP who are:		DEM who are:		REP who are:		Voters who are:			DEM who are:		REP who are:		NPAOth who are:		Black Voters who are:			Hisp. Voters who are:			Avg. Perf.		Wins		Margins		
	Black	Hisp	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	DEM	REP	NPAOth	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	Black	Hisp.	DEM	REP	NPAOth	DEM	REP	NPAOth	DEM	REP	DEM	REP	MAX	MIN	AVG
9	13.02%	50.04%	18.43%	33.46%	0.91%	12.47%	43.53%	29.36%	27.10%	17.53%	42.62%	1.25%	18.03%	6.02%	41.13%	79.20%	3.78%	16.96%	53.12%	15.00%	31.85%	57.0%	41.3%	12	2	D +34.2%	D +0.1%	D +15.7%
20	50.11%	22.98%	64.90%	4.45%	6.38%	10.02%	66.49%	14.54%	18.97%	62.40%	8.78%	6.96%	14.88%	28.23%	19.00%	86.64%	2.11%	11.19%	49.92%	18.74%	31.05%	78.5%	20.7%	14	0	D +65.2%	D +51%	D +57.8%
24	42.17%	38.46%	68.02%	10.67%	6.87%	49.03%	66.57%	12.25%	21.17%	63.27%	15.70%	7.45%	43.92%	24.06%	34.66%	87.54%	1.89%	10.54%	44.74%	23.56%	31.66%	80.3%	18.9%	14	0	D +68%	D +48.9%	D +61.5%
26	6.92%	73.22%	18.16%	44.54%	0.34%	54.72%	30.40%	43.16%	26.44%	15.56%	53.37%	0.47%	54.98%	2.82%	61.53%	82.86%	3.57%	13.25%	28.79%	42.28%	28.90%	43.1%	55.7%	2	12	R +25.6%	R +1.8%	R +12.6%
27	7.07%	74.18%	17.88%	36.73%	0.39%	75.67%	35.72%	38.10%	26.18%	15.24%	45.37%	0.53%	72.01%	3.20%	63.12%	83.84%	3.12%	12.96%	26.84%	45.71%	27.44%	50.9%	48.1%	9	5	D +17.4%	R +0.6%	D +2.7%
28	10.32%	73.35%	22.56%	36.22%	0.54%	65.41%	35.69%	36.75%	27.56%	21.17%	47.57%	0.76%	66.17%	4.66%	64.29%	82.78%	3.06%	14.07%	28.65%	41.33%	30.00%	50.9%	47.9%	9	5	D +15.7%	R +2.2%	D +3%

Functional Analysis - Returns

			9	20	24	26	27	28
Plan P000C0109		BVAP	13.02%	50.11%	42.17%	6.92%	7.07%	10.32%
Primary Elections		HVAP	50.04%	22.98%	38.46%	73.22%	74.18%	73.35%
2018	Governor (REP)	R_Baldauf	0.83%	1.45%	1.93%	1.77%	1.52%	1.82%
		R_DeSantis	52.20%	62.28%	66.81%	68.79%	67.70%	67.72%
		R_Devine	1.87%	2.05%	3.26%	2.74%	3.13%	3.31%
		R_Langford	1.44%	1.80%	1.93%	1.37%	1.56%	1.70%
		R_Mercadante	1.19%	1.53%	2.21%	1.76%	2.18%	2.03%
		R_Nathan	0.95%	1.52%	2.71%	1.07%	1.41%	1.41%
		R_Putnam	38.82%	25.44%	16.79%	19.55%	18.87%	18.11%
		R_White	2.47%	2.84%	3.90%	2.55%	3.49%	3.51%
	Governor (DEM)	D_Gillum	28.49%	53.43%	50.66%	27.71%	28.97%	31.80%
		D_Graham	30.30%	13.31%	11.07%	21.85%	22.66%	21.12%
		D_Greene	14.18%	10.21%	9.33%	9.82%	7.98%	10.56%
		D_King	4.30%	0.91%	0.76%	2.55%	1.56%	2.11%
		D_Levine	19.74%	21.28%	27.38%	34.73%	37.17%	32.26%
		D_Lundmark	1.17%	0.29%	0.38%	1.32%	0.79%	0.90%
		D_Wetherbee	1.70%	0.37%	0.32%	1.12%	0.70%	0.96%
	Attorney General (REP)	R_Moody	54.39%	55.46%	53.14%	51.15%	54.81%	54.83%
		R_White	45.57%	44.16%	46.91%	48.88%	45.20%	45.11%
	Attorney General (DEM)	D_Shaw	60.65%	81.41%	82.21%	65.79%	74.10%	69.58%
		D_Torrens	39.34%	18.58%	17.77%	34.06%	25.90%	30.43%
	Agriculture Commissioner (REP)	R_Caldwell	35.51%	43.02%	39.87%	42.26%	40.18%	42.06%
		R_Grimsley	31.86%	26.45%	31.49%	27.34%	32.68%	31.53%
		R_McCalister	16.13%	20.87%	16.88%	13.25%	16.76%	16.54%
		R_Troutman	16.38%	8.59%	11.33%	16.96%	10.38%	9.57%
	Agriculture Commissioner (DEM)	D_Fried	54.90%	63.96%	59.13%	51.59%	59.89%	53.25%
		D_Porter	18.84%	16.09%	17.30%	19.35%	15.15%	20.42%
		D_Walker	26.24%	19.91%	23.59%	28.75%	24.89%	26.19%
	US Senate (REP)	R_De La Fuente	10.05%	15.12%	15.72%	9.35%	12.64%	12.23%
		R_Scott	89.87%	84.46%	84.02%	90.52%	87.34%	87.65%
2016	US Senate (REP)	R_Beruff	17.67%	14.86%	8.38%	9.70%	5.63%	6.40%
		R_Rivera	2.99%	4.55%	3.20%	2.21%	1.92%	2.93%
		R_Rubio	71.79%	70.37%	80.78%	84.05%	88.89%	85.70%
		R_Young	7.42%	9.04%	7.31%	3.83%	3.50%	4.84%
	US Senate (DEM)	D_De La Fuente	14.71%	3.13%	5.63%	19.79%	12.21%	13.69%
		D_Grayson	45.09%	10.08%	10.80%	11.60%	11.26%	11.07%
		D_Keith	9.55%	14.72%	13.76%	13.93%	17.89%	15.57%
		D_Luster	1.27%	2.22%	2.70%	1.82%	1.55%	1.65%
		D_Murphy	29.23%	69.53%	66.98%	51.93%	56.90%	57.52%
2014	Governor (REP)	R_Adeshina	1.67%	2.51%	2.89%	1.38%	1.82%	1.75%
		R_Cuevas-Neunder	11.64%	14.70%	16.26%	9.74%	13.29%	15.11%
		R_Scott	86.55%	81.70%	80.61%	88.59%	84.85%	82.94%
	Governor (DEM)	D_Crist	75.49%	82.85%	84.36%	78.07%	73.98%	78.45%
		D_Rich	24.46%	16.99%	15.62%	21.35%	25.94%	21.39%
	Attorney General (DEM)	D_Sheldon	60.42%	38.39%	46.60%	62.01%	65.55%	61.36%
		D_Thurston	39.47%	61.50%	53.40%	37.34%	34.43%	38.41%
2012	US Senate (REP)	R_Mack	49.47%	65.27%	71.88%	73.24%	77.15%	73.63%
		R_McCalister	11.65%	12.41%	6.67%	8.45%	5.22%	7.31%
		R_Stuart	6.47%	6.66%	13.36%	11.47%	13.00%	13.19%
		R_Weldon	32.18%	13.82%	7.69%	6.45%	4.50%	5.63%
	US Senate (DEM)	D_Burkett	19.90%	13.92%	14.22%	18.63%	14.82%	18.34%
		D_Nelson	80.01%	85.94%	85.75%	80.92%	85.13%	81.50%

Functional Analysis - Returns

			9	20	24	26	27	28
Plan P000C0109		BVAP	13.02%	50.11%	42.17%	6.92%	7.07%	10.32%
General Elections		HVAP	50.04%	22.98%	38.46%	73.22%	74.18%	73.35%
2020	President	D_Biden	58.24%	75.89%	74.18%	40.49%	49.45%	46.42%
		R_Trump	40.80%	23.52%	25.28%	58.98%	50.01%	52.99%
2018	Governor	D_Gillum	60.99%	79.93%	81.45%	44.44%	53.18%	52.49%
		R_DeSantis	37.66%	19.45%	17.83%	54.26%	45.75%	46.31%
	Attorney General	D_Shaw	57.74%	78.44%	80.05%	42.63%	51.99%	50.86%
		R_Moody	40.31%	20.26%	18.39%	55.44%	46.10%	46.94%
	Chief Financial Officer	D_Ring	60.15%	79.79%	81.53%	44.03%	52.59%	51.92%
		R_Patronis	39.85%	20.20%	18.46%	55.96%	47.41%	48.07%
	Agriculture Commissioner	D_Fried	61.55%	80.09%	82.00%	45.29%	54.63%	53.44%
		R_Caldwell	38.45%	19.89%	18.00%	54.70%	45.38%	46.56%
	US Senate	D_Nelson	59.82%	80.00%	81.36%	44.81%	54.47%	53.46%
		R_Scott	40.18%	20.00%	18.64%	55.19%	45.52%	46.55%
2016	President	D_Clinton	61.62%	77.83%	81.05%	50.61%	57.42%	56.46%
		R_Trump	35.03%	20.39%	17.28%	47.09%	40.05%	40.81%
	US Senate	D_Murphy	54.93%	75.64%	75.93%	40.61%	47.78%	47.69%
		R_Rubio	41.01%	22.42%	21.99%	57.17%	50.17%	49.92%
2014	Governor	D_Crist	52.25%	79.92%	82.18%	40.53%	50.00%	51.20%
		R_Scott	42.62%	17.97%	16.24%	56.88%	47.55%	45.89%
	Attorney General	D_Sheldon	48.62%	76.13%	79.80%	36.07%	46.03%	45.82%
		R_Bondi	48.53%	22.42%	18.77%	61.63%	51.96%	51.75%
	Chief Financial Officer	D_Rankin	48.45%	75.48%	79.06%	37.37%	43.49%	45.87%
		R_Atwater	51.55%	24.50%	20.93%	62.62%	56.52%	54.11%
	Agriculture Commissioner	D_Hamilton	47.07%	77.02%	79.78%	37.30%	44.30%	46.04%
		R_Putnam	52.94%	22.99%	20.21%	62.69%	55.69%	53.95%
2012	President	D_Obama	61.22%	80.52%	82.82%	48.85%	52.22%	54.83%
		R_Romney	37.97%	19.06%	16.83%	50.67%	47.27%	44.61%
	US Senate	D_Nelson	65.83%	81.97%	83.46%	50.74%	54.47%	56.33%
		R_Mack	31.67%	16.82%	15.49%	47.10%	44.15%	42.03%