


EXHIBIT A

Table 1: Racially Polarized Voting Analysis

U.S. President, General Election 2008

African American Candidate = Barack H. Obama

<u>District</u>	<u>% of African American Votes</u>	<u>% of Latino Votes</u>	<u>% of White Votes</u>	<u>% of Other Votes</u>
Previous CD 3	99.2 (98.5 – 98.8)	98.8 (96.4 – 99.5)	29.8 (27.7 – 32.0)	97.7 (86.6 – 99.5)
Current CD 5	99.3 (98.5 – 99.8)	99.1 (98.0 – 99.5)	29.2 (26.1 – 33.0)	94.1 (70.8 – 99.4)



Romo A CD 5	99.9 (99.8 – 99.9)	98.1 (91.3 – 99.4)	25.8 (23.8 – 27.7)	99.3 (98.5 – 99.6)
Romo B CD 5	99.9 (99.9 – 100.0)	99.4 (98.8 – 99.6)	24.5 (22.8 – 26.6)	99.7 (99.6 – 99.8)

Table 2: Racially Polarized Voting Analysis

U.S. President, General Election 2012

African American Candidate = Barack H. Obama

<u>District</u>	<u>% of African American Votes</u>	<u>% of Latino Votes</u>	<u>% of White Votes</u>	<u>% of Other Votes</u>
Previous CD 3	99.7 (99.3 – 99.9)	98.1 (93.4 – 99.4)	27.0 (24.6 – 30.3)	97.8 (86.1 – 99.6)
Current CD 5	99.7 (99.2 – 99.9)	98.7 (97.1 – 99.4)	25.5 (22.8 – 29.0)	96.6 (81.1 – 99.4)



Romo A CD 5	99.9 (99.7 – 99.9)	94.2 (65.1 – 99.2)	25.2 (23.1 – 27.7)	98.9 (97.4 – 99.5)
Romo B CD 5	99.9 (99.9 – 100.0)	99.3 (98.7 – 99.6)	23.3 (21.4 – 25.3)	99.6 (99.5 – 99.7)

Table 3: Racially Polarized Voting Analysis

U.S. Senate, General Election 2010

African American Candidate = Kendrick B. Meek

<u>District</u>	<u>% of African American Votes</u>	<u>% of Latino Votes</u>	<u>% of White Votes</u>	<u>% of Other Votes</u>
Previous CD 3	90.7 (89.7 – 91.5)	65.1 (53.4 – 74.7)	10.4 (9.4 – 11.4)	8.1 (1.2 – 28.3)
Current CD 5	90.3 (89.1 – 91.3)	52.8 (38.4 – 65.3)	9.6 (8.3 – 11.0)	17.4 (2.1 – 42.2)



Romo A CD 5	85.7 (84.1 – 87.3)	36.7 (2.6 – 84.5)	4.7 (2.6 – 6.3)	38.5 (3.3 – 78.7)
Romo B CD 5	86.5 (84.8 – 88.1)	40.8 (2.9 – 85.3)	6.7 (5.5 – 7.9)	17.9 (1.1 – 62.4)

Table 4: Racially Polarized Voting Analysis**Countywide Elections****Vote for African American Candidate**

<u>Election</u>	<u>% of African American Votes</u>	<u>% of Latino Votes</u>	<u>% of White Votes</u>	<u>% of Other Votes</u>
<i>Duval County</i>				
Mayor, First 2011, <i>Brown</i> (D)	86.3 (85.3 – 87.4)	22.2 (3.7 – 57.1)	3.4 (2.5 – 4.0)	6.0 (1.0 – 17.5)
Sheriff, First 2011, <i>Jefferson</i> (D)	98.9 (98.2 – 99.4)	78.5 (50.8 – 90.2)	15.2 (13.9 – 16.5)	36.0 (8.2 – 69.1)
Council, First 2011, <i>Foy</i> (NPA)	65.4 (64.1 – 66.6)	16.9 (6.7 – 37.4)	11.5 (10.4 – 12.4)	19.1 (5.5 – 40.8)
Mayor, General 2011, <i>Brown</i> (D)	99.8 (99.4 – 99.9)	92.5 (50.6 – 98.1)	27.5 (24.3 – 30.5)	24.3 (1.7 – 67.4)
Council, General 2011, <i>Foy</i> (NPA)	90.2 (89.1 – 91.3)	91.5 (71.1 – 97.1)	21.9 (20.4 – 23.1)	15.3 (2.6 – 44.2)
<i>Alachua County</i>				
Appraiser, Dem Pri 2012, <i>Perkins</i>	64.5 (59.5 – 69.4)	65.1 (18.4 – 93.6)	16.2 (14.0 – 18.4)	55.2 (10.9 – 91.6)
Appraiser, Dem Pri 2008, <i>Perkins</i>	81.3 (77.5 – 86.5)	65.3 (50.8 – 85.3)	24.6 (22.9 – 25.8)	70.4 (50.3 – 90.4)

Sheriff, Dem Pri 2008, <i>Scott</i>	87.7 (84.0 – 92.5)	57.4 (10.3 – 86.0)	29.9 (27.8 – 32.2)	40.5 (5.9 – 79.5)
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Bradford County

Superintendent, Dem Pri, 2012 <i>Kittles</i>	46.7 (32.6 – 50.8)	10.7* (8.1 – 13.0)
--	-----------------------	-----------------------

* This estimate is for non-African Americans. There were only 10 Hispanics and 27 Others receiving ballots for this primary, and they have been added to the 2,420 whites receiving ballots.

Table 5: Diminishment Analysis
U.S. President 2008 General Election

<u>District</u>	Af Amn <u>% Turnout</u>	Diff. in Turnout <u>White% - Af Amn%</u>	Af Amn Cand. <u>% of 2-Party Vote</u>
<i>Previous CD 3</i>	49.7*	-10.3	72.0
<i>Current CD 5</i>	49.2*	-9.9	71.0




<i>RomoA CD5</i>	45.5	1.6*	64.0
<i>RomoB CD5</i>	47.6*	-2.2	65.8

*Indicates in column 2 that African Americans constitute a plurality but not a majority of the turnout, in column 3 that whites constitute a plurality but not a majority.

#Indicates in column 3 that whites constitute a majority of the turnout.

Table 6: Diminishment Analysis**U.S. President 2012 General Election**

<u>District</u>	Af Amn <u>% Turnout</u>	Diff. in Turnout <u>White% -Af Amn%</u>	Af Amn Cand. <u>% of 2-PartyVote</u>
<i>Previous CD 3</i>	50.3	-11.6	71.6
<i>Current CD 5</i>	50.6.	-12.9	71.4



<i>RomoA CD5</i>	46.6*	-0.5	64.3
<i>RomoB CD5</i>	48.5*	-4.0	65.7

*Indicates in column 2 that African Americans constitute a plurality but not a majority of the turnout.

#Indicates in column 3 that whites constitute a majority of the turnout.

Table 7: Diminishment Analysis

U.S. Senate 2010 General Election

<u>District</u>	<u>Af Amn % Turnout</u>	<u>Diff. in Turnout White% - Af Amn%</u>	<u>Af Amn Cand. % of Votes</u>	<u>% Pt Margin to Rubio</u>
<i>Prev CD 3</i>	46.7*	-1.1	49.1*	17.5
<i>Curr CD 5</i>	46.3*	-0.7	48.2*	15.4



<i>RomoA CD5</i>	42.0	10.7#	40.4*	4.9
<i>RomoB CD5</i>	44.1	6.9#	43.0*	8.8

*Indicates in column 2 that African Americans constitute a plurality but not a majority of the turnout, in column 4 that Meek wins a plurality of the vote, and column 5 that Rubio wins a plurality of the vote.

#Indicates in column 3 that whites constitute a majority of the turnout.

**Table 8: Analysis of the 2010 Gubernatorial
Vote within Romo CD 10**

	<u>% of African American Votes</u>	<u>% of Latino Votes</u>	<u>% of White Votes</u>	<u>% of Other Votes</u>
MEEK	88.3 (86.8 – 89.9)	62.0 (55.7 – 66.8)	8.4 (7.1 – 10.0)	23.8 (7.6 – 40.0)
RUBIO	0.4 (0.2 – 0.7)	0.6 (0.4 – 0.9)	71.6 (68.4 – 74.4)	20.1 (1.8 – 46.9)
CRIST	10.8 (9.1 – 12.4)	36.3 (31.3 – 42.9)	19.4 (17.0 – 21.7)	52.7 (29.4 – 74.0)
OTHERS	0.5 (0.3 - 0.7)	1.1 (0.8 – 1.5)	0.7 (0.4 – 0.8)	3.4 (2.3 – 5.2)