Exhibit I
August 7, 2014

Honorable Will Weatherford
The Florida House of Representatives
420 The Capitol
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300
Will.weatherford@myfloridahouse.gov

Honorable Don Gaetz
The Florida Senate
409 The Capitol
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1110
Gaetz.don.web@flsenate.gov

Honorable Weatherford and Honorable Gaetz:

When you last took on the process to draw congressional districts, legislative leaders repeatedly emphasized that the process would be an open, transparent and apolitical process done in full compliance with Florida’s Constitution as amended by our citizens in 2010. During hearings around the state, and during the redistricting process in Tallahassee, Floridians were assured by both of you, and your colleagues, that the Legislature’s approach complied fully with the requirement that reapportionment be done without the intent to help a political party or an incumbent, and that it would take place in the sunshine so all of Florida could observe the Legislature’s fidelity to our Constitution.

We now know that those assurances were less than accurate. We know that partisan, paid political operatives had fully infected the map drawing process; that maps were regularly being shared with partisan operatives through private emails and private dropboxes; that meetings with partisan operatives and between legislative staff and the leadership of the reapportionment committees were conducted out of the sunshine; and that legislative leaders and political operatives maintained an entirely parallel and secretive process that would have gone undetected had we not been compelled to hire lawyers and expend great resources to reveal these efforts to thwart an honest, open and constitutional reapportionment process.
With that backdrop, and in a spirit of cooperation, we would respectfully suggest approaches to the upcoming Special Session regarding (1) the transparency and document retention rules that the Legislature ought to follow, and (2) issues that the Legislature ought to address that were raised in the recent litigation.

Also, we will be submitting, by separate letter, an alternative map we believe complies with the Court’s Order. We would suggest, most respectfully, that a Member of each reapportionment committee introduce the map for your consideration.

**Document retention and transparency.** We appreciate your recent admonishment to legislators that they not include partisan operatives in the next attempt to reapportion, and your request that legislators preserve their emails. This is especially important because trial court in its recent order found that “the Legislators and the political operatives systematically deleted almost all of their e-mails and other documentation relating to redistricting.”

We would, however, respectfully request the following:

- That legislators and staff are advised to preserve any draft or proposed maps and other documentation relating to the reapportionment process, including their official emails and all emails and text messages sent or received on their private email accounts and cell phones.
- That legislators and staff use their official email accounts to the greatest extent possible and refrain from using private email accounts, cell phones, dropbox accounts, flash drive transmissions, and other private methods of communication in conducting the reapportionment process.
- That all discussions among two or more legislators relating to redistricting and, specifically, any maps be held in a duly noticed meeting open to the public.
- That no discussions regarding the subject of this Special Session be held in areas not open to the public including the Members Lounge and on the floor of either chamber outside the earshot of the public.
- That all drafts of maps, requests sent to bill drafting, and other documentation relating to the reapportionment process (including emails and text messages) be treated as public records available for production upon request.

**Issues raised in the litigation.** The Legislature’s conduct in their last attempt to draw a constitutional congressional map raises many concerns that, frankly, the Legislature itself ought to find troubling. While Floridians were told almost daily how fully compliant the process was, it is clear that there was a methodical attempt to entirely frustrate Florida’s Constitution by legislative leaders and their agents. We would hope that the Legislature,
as a body, would want to know what happened and why. To assist you, we have attached Judge Lewis’s Order in this matter; our initial Closing Argument which, though redacted to keep confidential information the Judge received under seal, lays out our argument; and, finally, a small sampling of the emails that were exhibits in the case that demonstrate the involvement of partisan political consultants throughout the redistricting process. In that regard, we have provided merely a few examples of the over 24 draft maps that were transmitted to a partisan operative by House staff.

The following are some of the issues the Legislature may want to know about:

- Judge Lewis expressed concern that staffers and legislators in leadership positions “systematically deleted” redistricting communications and commented that “you have to wonder why they didn’t” retain their documents.
  - Why were staff and legislators using private, non-official, emails and dropboxes to communicate with political operatives regarding development of maps?
  - Have there been any efforts taken to ensure that emails and other documents from this process are retained?
  - Are members or staffers still communicating with personal email accounts on redistricting matters?

- Considering that the political operatives are usually agents of legislators, why were they involved in any way given the clear and contrary mandate of Florida’s Constitution?
  - How far-reaching was the operatives’ involvement?
  - Given that the Legislature destroyed its emails, are there other districts, or maps, that were impacted by the political operatives?

- What, specifically, was the process of drawing the new map after Judge Lewis’s decision?
  - Judge Lewis found that a group of political consultants “did in fact conspire to manipulate and influence the redistricting process.” Judge Lewis said that these consultants “made a mockery of the Legislature’s proclaimed transparent and open process of redistricting.” There was evidence that certain staffers and members in leadership positions provided draft maps to these consultants and met with and exchanged emails with them in private. What steps were taken to make sure that this sort of thing did not happen again?
Did any member or committee staff person engage in discussions with political consultants about the new map?

Did any member or committee staff person engage in discussions with the Republican Party of Florida about the new map?

Was the work product of the House or Senate provided to anyone outside the reapportionment committees?

To the extent the Legislature’s proposed Congressional District 5 is the same as any prior version, isn’t it a product of the same process that Judge Lewis found was tainted?

Judge Lewis indicated in his decision that the District 5 in the enacted map was “visually not compact, bizarrely shaped, and does not follow traditional political boundaries as it winds from Jacksonville to Orlando.” He noted that “[a]t one point, [it] narrows to the width of Highway 17.” He also said that draft versions of District 5 very similar to the version that is being presented here are “not model tier-two compliant districts.”

If the Legislature is proposing to simply remove the appendage into Sanford, does that really address what the Judge said in his decision?

What efforts were taken to draw a more compact version of District 5?

The current version is much less compact than the versions enacted in 1996 and 2002 – before the new amendments were passed. Why couldn’t the Legislature draw the district in a way that better adheres to the amendments?

Why draw a District 5 that breaks up every county it touches, when there is an alternative more compact version that keeps 4 counties whole?

Alex Kelly, the House’s primary map drawer, testified at trial that the sort of east-west configuration proposed by the plaintiffs would maintain minorities’ ability to elect in central Florida. An east-west configuration would be more compact, would improve the compactness of other districts, and would allow for a new minority influence district in central Florida. Why shouldn’t an east-west configuration of District 5 be implemented?

Did someone prepare an analysis determining that the east-west configuration would result in retrogression?

Who?
The Legislature relied on staff’s analysis throughout the initial redistricting process. Why isn’t Mr. Kelly’s analysis on retrogression good enough here?

As Judge Lewis and the Florida Supreme Court have correctly acknowledged, the redistricting process goes to the very core of our representative government. For that reason, we believe that the Legislature should provide the open, transparent, and apolitical process that it promised, but did not provide, during the initial reapportionment effort. We also believe that the public deserves a fulsome and public discussion of the issues pertinent to the redistricting process, including the questions outlined above. We encourage Members of the Legislature to raise and discuss these questions in committee hearings and on the floor of the Legislature during the Special Session.

Thanks for your efforts on this matter,

Deirdre Macnab  
League of Women Voters of Florida

Peter Butzin  
Common Cause

Enclosures.  
cc. Florida Legislature (with enclosures)
August 7, 2014

Honorable Will Weatherford
The Florida House of Representatives
420 The Capitol
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300
Will.weatherford@myfloridahouse.gov

Honorable Don Gaetz
The Florida Senate
409 The Capitol
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1110
Gaetz.don.web@flsenate.gov

Honorable Weatherford and Honorable Gaetz:

Official comments suggest that legislative leaders plan to make only slight alterations to the enacted congressional map (the “Enacted Map”), which the Court recently struck down as unconstitutional. According to the Court’s unchallenged judgment, legislators and paid partisan political operatives, through a “shadow process,” “managed to taint the redistricting process and the resulting map with improper partisan intent.” With that established fact, no slight alteration can fix problem at the heart of the “shadow process” that led to the Court finding the Enacted Map unconstitutional.

In each of the over 24 draft maps that legislative staff secretly shared with a partisan operative, a central feature was a narrow district winding from Jacksonville down to Orlando. The Court found that this district, Congressional District (“CD”) 5, is “visually not compact, bizarrely shaped, and does not follow traditional political boundaries” and that it “connects two far flung urban populations” without legal justification. Every draft map the Legislature published in the last, tainted redistricting process included a similar variant of that district. Various experts and non-partisan groups have rightly identified CD 5 as one of the most gerrymandered districts in the nation. Each of the legislatively proposed north-south configurations of CD 5 from the 2012 redistricting process was far less compact than even the benchmark CD 3, which was the product of an era in which compactness and respect for political boundaries were not constitutional requirements
and partisan concerns were admittedly paramount in redistricting.

Slight alterations will not correct the constitutional defects Judge Lewis identified. The snaking north-south configuration of CD 5 should be abandoned. With this letter, the League of Women Voters and Common Cause propose an exemplar remedial map. The proposed map demonstrates that an east-west configuration of CD 5 can produce a map that complies with the Florida Constitution’s mandates in a manner that cannot be matched by any variation of the snaking north-south district that has been a hallmark of the Legislature’s proposals to date. Most importantly, an east-west configuration allows for the creation of a district with enhanced minority voting strength in Central Florida, while preserving African Americans’ ability to elect in CD 5. The Coalition’s proposal therefore ensures that minorities will have a greater voice in Florida’s politics than under a slightly modified north-south district that continues to wind through Northeastern and Central Florida.

Here is a brief comparison that illustrates just some of the reasons why the Legislature’s proposals to date – typified by the maps numbered H000C9047 and H000C9043 – simply cannot compare in terms of constitutional compliance:

(1) The Coalition’s proposed CD 5, which is the same as in Romo Map A submitted at trial, does not diminish African Americans’ ability to elect. This was confirmed not only by the testimony of Dr. Stephen Ansolabehere, a leading expert in this field, but also by the House’s principal map drawer, Alex Kelly. Mr. Kelly testified that he considered a similar east-west configuration during the initial redistricting process and concluded that it would not diminish African Americans’ ability to elect their chosen candidates, even with a slightly lower African American voting age population than is in the proposed CD 5.

(2) The Coalition’s proposed east-west configuration of CD 5 is not only more compact than the versions of CD 5 in 9047 and 9043, but it is the only configuration offered at trial that respects political boundaries in the common sense of keeping counties whole. Proposed CD 5 contains four whole counties (Baker, Hamilton, Madison, and Gadsden) and significant parts of four counties (Duval, Columbia, Jefferson, and Leon). The north-south version of CD 5 in 9047 contains only parts (including narrow snaking corridors) of eight counties (Duval, Clay, Putnam, Alachua, Marion, Lake, Seminole, and Orange); the counterpart CD 5 in 9043 likewise splits every county it touches, but it does not go into Seminole County like in 9047.

(3) Use of the Coalition’s proposed CD 5 allows for the six districts that would border a north-south configuration of CD 5 (CDs 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, and 11) all to be more compact and to comply with the Florida Constitution in a manner that the alternative versions of those districts in 9047 and 9043 do not:

(a) Proposed CD 3 is a North Central Florida district that includes all of Bradford and Putnam Counties; includes most of Alachua, Clay, and
Marion Counties; splits fewer (three versus four) counties and is more compact by every measure than the versions of CD 3 in 9047 and 9043.

(b) Proposed CD 4 is a Northeast Florida district encircling the urban core of Jacksonville, save only the portion of Duval County taken into CD 5 to avoid minority retrogression. As a consequence, proposed CD 4 is more compact by every measure than the versions of CD 4 in 9047 and 9043, which both include (rural) Baker County.

(c) Proposed CD 6 spans south of Jacksonville; does not split Putnam County as do the versions of CD 6 in 9047 and 9043; and is rounded out by taking in the non-compact northern peninsula of Lake County (above Orange County). As a result, proposed CD 6 is more compact by every measure than the versions of CD6 in both 9047 and 9043.

(d) Proposed CD 7 is a Central Florida district that includes all of Seminole County, unlike the version of CD 7 in 9047. Proposed CD 7 takes in portions of Volusia and Orange Counties in a manner that makes it more compact by every measure than the versions of CD 7 in both 9047 and 9043.

(e) Proposed CD 10 comprises a centralized area in only two counties, including the western half of Orange County and a compact area within Lake County just north of the Orange County border. Proposed CD 10 is more compact than the CD 10 version in 9047, is no less compact on average than CD 10 version in 9043, as the versions of CD 10 in 9047 and 9043 split and include parts of four counties (Lake, Orange, Osceola, and Polk). Most importantly, in addition to the African American performing district created by the east-west configuration of proposed CD 5 in North Florida, proposed CD 10 would create a district with enhanced minority voting strength in Central Florida, with about 26% African American and about 19% Hispanic voting age populations. Both 9047 and 9043, and every other map that incorporates a similar north-south version of CD 5, cuts down on the number of minority opportunity districts, and thus dilutes minority influence in Florida politics.

(f) Proposed CD 11 includes all of Citrus, Hernando, and Sumter Counties, plus the lower (compact, rectangular) half of Lake County, and only enough of Marion county to comply with the equal population requirement. As a consequence, with the same number of county splits as the versions of CD 11 in 9047 and 9043, proposed CD 11 is a much more compact district by every measure.

(4) To the extent the Coalition’s proposed map is less compact, it is limited to two districts and with good reason. Proposed CD 2 is less compact as a result of having to follow the boundaries of proposed CD 5 to avoid retrogression, having
to follow state-line boundaries, having a large sparsely populated area, and having to comply with the equal population requirement. Proposed CD 2, however, does not break a county boundary or deviate from compactness for any other reason. Specifically, proposed CD 2 keeps the same western boundary with CD 1 as all prior draft maps of the Legislature to comply with the equal population rule; takes up the rest of three counties (Leon, Jefferson, and Columbia) which CD 5 split to prevent minority retrogression; keeps 15 counties whole; and only splits Alachua county to the extent required to comply with the equal population requirement.

(5) Proposed CD 9 is marginally less compact than the version in 9047. This is a result of proposed CD 9 keeping Osceola County whole as the Legislature wanted, taking in the portion of Polk County that was included in the 9047’s invalidated version of CD 10, and avoiding any alterations to surrounding districts (to the east, west, and south) that the Court did not find invalid. As a result, proposed CD 9 has the benefit of limiting map alterations and making proposed CDs 10 and 11 both more compact than in 9047 and 9043.

In sum, the Coalition’s proposed map demonstrates that there is no constitutional justification for a snaking north-south configuration of CD 5, and we urge the Legislature to reject any such proposal in the Special Session. An east-west configuration produces a map that better respects tier-two criteria while enhancing the voting strength of minorities statewide. Slightly modifying a north-south configuration that was the product of a tainted redistricting process cannot match these benefits and does a disservice to the voters who have waited too long for constitutional districts.

Please upload our proposed remedial map so that the public may view it alongside other maps available on the House and Senate redistricting websites.

Thanks for your efforts on this matter,

Deirdre Macnab
League of Women Voters of Florida

Peter Butzin
Common Cause

Enclosures.
cc. Florida Legislature (with enclosures)
From: GAETZ.DON.WEB <GAETZ.DON.WEB@flsenate.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 12:43 PM
To: don@dongaetz.com; LEVESQUE.GEORGE
Cc: BETTA.KATHERINE; EDWARDS.ERIC
Subject: FW: Attachment from League of Women Voters of FL and Common Cause

Another FYI

From: Jessica Lowe-Minor [lwvexecutivedirector@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 3:37 PM
To: will.weatherford@myfloridahouse.gov; GAETZ.DON.WEB
Cc: Eisnaugle, Eric; Clelland, Mike; Nunez, Jeanette; Porter, Elizabeth; Schenck, Robert; VanZant, Charles; Hill, Mike; Murphy, Amanda; Zimmermann, Carl; Holder, Doug; Hudson, Matt; Jones, Mia; McKeel, Seth; Thurston, Perry; Adkins, Janet; Ahern, Larry; Artiles, Frank; Baxley, Dennis; Bileca, Michael; Boyd, Jim; Brodeur, Jason; Caldwell, Matt; Campbell, Daphne; Coley, Marty; Corcoran, Richard; Crisaulli, Steve; Davis, Daniel; Diaz, Jose; Fresen, Erik; Fullwood, Reggie; Gaetz, Matt; Gibbons, Joe; Gonzalez, Eddy; Goodson, Tom; Grant, James; Hager, Bill; Harrell, Gayle; Hooper, Ed; Ingram, Clay; Mayfield, Debbie; McBurney, Charles; Metz, Larry; Moraitis, George; Nelson, Bryan; O’Toole, Marlene; Passidomo, Kathleen; Patronis, Jimmy; Pilon, Ray; Ray, Lake; Reed, Betty; Renuart, Ronald; Roberson, Ken; Rogers, Hazel; Rooney, Pat; Rouson, Darryl; Schwartz, Elaine; Slosberg, Irving; Smith, Jimmie; Stafford, Cynthia; Steube, Greg; Taylor. Dwayne; Tobia John; Trujillo, Carlos; Waldman, Jim; Wood, John; Workman. Ritch; Young, Dana; Clarke-Reed, Gwyn; Albritton, Ben; Antone, Bruce; Beshears, Halsey; Bracy, Randolph; Broxson, Doug; Castor Dentel, Karen; Combee, Neil; Cummings, Travis; Danish, Mark; Diaz, Manny; Dudley, Dwight; Eagle, Dane; Edwards, Katie; Fitzhenagen, Heather; Hood, Dave; Hutson, Travis; Jones, Shevin; La Rosa, Mike; Lee, Larry; Magar, MaryLynn; McGhee, Kionne; Moskowitz, Jared; Oliva, Jose; Perry, Keith; Peters, Kathleen; Pignan, Cary; Powell, Bobby; Pritchett, Sharon; Raburn, Jake; Rader, Kevin; Rangel, Ricardo; Raschein, Holly; Raulerson, Dan; Richardson, David; Rodrigues, Ray; Rodriguez, Jose; Santiago, David; Saunders, Joe; Spano, Ross; Stark, Richard; Stewart, Linda; Stone, Charlie; Torres, Victor; Watson, Barbara; Watson, Clovis; Berman, Lori; Kerner, Dave; Pafford, Mark; Rehwinkel. Michelle; Williams, Alan; Cruz, Janet; BENACQUISTO.LIZBETH.WEB; PORTILLA.MIGUEL.WEB; EVERS.GREG.WEB; FLORES.ANITERE.WEB; GARCIA.RENE.WEB; HAYS.ALAN.WEB; LATVALA.JACK.WEB; MARGOLIS.GWEN.WEB; MONTFORD.BILL.WEB; SACHS.MARIA.WEB; SIMMONS.DAVID.WEB; SOBEL.ELEANOR.WEB; ABRUZZO.JOSEPH.WEB; BEAN.AARON.WEB; BRADLEY.ROB.WEB; BRANDES.JEFF.WEB; BRAYNON.OSCAR.WEB; BULLARD.DWIGHT.WEB; CLEMENS.JEFF.WEB; GALVANO.BILL.WEB; GIBSON.AUDREY.WEB; GRIMSLEY.DENISE.WEB; HUKILL.DOROTHY.WEB; LEE.TOM.WEB; LEGG.JOHN.WEB; SIMPSON.WILTON.WEB; SOTO.DARREN.WEB; STARTEL.KELLI.WEB; THOMPSON.GERALDINE.WEB; ALTMAN.THAD.WEB; DEAN.CHARLES.WEB; DETERT.NANCY.WEB; GARDINER.ANDY.WEB; JOYNER.ARTHENIA.WEB; NEGRON.JOE.WEB; RICHTER.GARRETT.WEB; RING.JEREMY.WEB; SMITH.CHRIS.WEB; THRASHER.JOHN.WEB
Subject: Re: Attachment from League of Women Voters of FL and Common Cause

To Whom It May Concern:

Here is a link to the file in Dropbox, in case the attachment did not come through via email.

https://www.dropbox.com/s/1f6h9q4hg9ualtc/CoalitionExemplarRemedialMap.doj

Sincerely,
Jessica Lowe-Minor
Executive Director
League of Women Voters of Florida
540 Beverly Court
On Thu, Aug 7, 2014 at 2:54 PM, Jessica Lowe-Minor
<lwvexecutivedirector@gmail.com<mailto:lwvexecutivedirector@gmail.com>> wrote:
Here, please find the attachment referenced in my earlier message.

Thank you,
Jessica Lowe-Minor
Executive Director
League of Women Voters of Florida
540 Beverly Court
Tallahassee, FL 32301-2506
Office Phone: 850.224.2545<tel:850.224.2545> Cell Phone: 850.228.3646<tel:850.228.3646>
Fax: 850.222.4485<tel:850.222.4485>
Email: LWVExecutiveDirector@gmail.com<mailto:LWVExecutiveDirector@gmail.com>
August 8, 2014

Honorable Will Weatherford
The Florida House of Representatives
420 The Capitol
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300
Will.weatherford@myfloridahouse.gov

Honorable Don Gaetz
The Florida Senate
409 The Capitol
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1110
Gaetz.don.web@flsenate.gov

Honorable Weatherford and Honorable Gaetz:

On August 7, 2014, the Legislature published Map H000C9057 ("Map 9057") as a proposed remedial congressional map. We have had an opportunity to review Map 9057 and remain concerned that it fails to address the constitutional defects in the original enacted map for the reasons outlined in our letter of August 7, 2014.

Consistent with the Legislature’s commentary before the Special Session, Map 9057 makes only minor changes to the enacted map by eliminating the incursion into Seminole County by Congressional District ("CD") 5 and the finger-shaped appendage in CD 10.

Of greatest concern is that Map 9057 continues to use a minority-marginalizing relic of an era in which political gerrymandering was acceptable – now it is not. That is, CD 5 in Map 9057 packs an excessive number of African Americans into a district marked by hooks, tentacles and appendages as it snakes through and splits every county from Jacksonville down to Orlando. By packing minorities into such a north-south district, CD 5 in Map 9057 destroys the ability to create an additional district with significant minority voting strength in Central Florida.

It is disappointing that the Legislature has decided to consume taxpayer resources and valuable time by producing slides apparently meant to lampoon the length of the alternative version of CD 5 presented at trial, rather than engage in legitimate discussion about this very serious matter. As you know, the length of a district, standing alone,
has very little bearing on the constitutional analysis when rural populations are involved and the applicable district will necessarily cover more territory. The Coalition offers the following more serious comparison of Map 9057 and the Coalition’s proposed map:

(1) The Coalition’s proposed CD 5 maintains African Americans’ ability to elect. This was confirmed not only by the testimony of Dr. Stephen Ansolabehere, a leading expert in this field, but also by the House’s principal map drawer, Alex Kelly. Mr. Kelly testified that he considered a similar east-west configuration during the initial redistricting process and concluded that it would not diminish African Americans’ ability to elect their chosen candidates, even with a slightly lower African American voting age population than is in the proposed CD 5.

(2) An east-west configuration of CD 5 remains the only proposed configuration that keeps counties whole, and is more compact by most measures than CD 5 in Map 9057. Proposed CD 5 contains four whole counties (Baker, Hamilton, Madison, and Gadsden) and significant parts of four counties (Duval, Columbia, Jefferson, and Leon). The north-south version of CD 5 in Map 9057 remains a snaking district that splits and contains only parts of the seven counties it touches (Duval, Clay, Putnam, Alachua, Marion, Lake, and Orange), narrowing to the width of Highway 17 at one point. The Legislature’s most notable change to CD 5 in Map 9057 was to swap concentrated population in Sanford and Orlando for dispersed population in Putnam County – thus geographically “fattening” CD 5 in Putnam County – in an apparent superficial effort to increase CD 5’s Reock compactness score with no positive effect for minorities within CD 5. The Coalition’s proposed CD 5 remains superior to the version of CD 5 in Map 9057 based on a majority of accepted compactness measures, including the Convex-Hull and Polsby-Popper methodologies.

(3) Moreover, use of the Coalition’s proposed CD 5 allows for the six other districts to comply with the Florida Constitution in a manner that the alternative versions of those districts in Map 9057 do not:

(a) The coalition’s proposed CD 3 is a North Central Florida district that includes all of Bradford and Putnam Counties; includes most of Alachua, Clay, and Marion Counties; splits fewer (three versus four) counties and is more compact by every measure than the version of CD 3 in Map 9057.

(b) The coalition’s proposed CD 4 is a Northeast Florida district encircling the urban core of Jacksonville, save only the portion of Duval County taken into CD 5 to avoid minority retrogression. As a consequence, proposed CD 4 is more compact by every measure than the version of CD 4 in Map 9057, which includes (rural) Baker County.

(c) The coalition’s proposed CD 6 spans south of Jacksonville; does not split Putnam County as does the version of CD 6 in Map 9057; and is rounded out by taking in the non-compact northern peninsula of Lake County.
(above Orange County). As a result, proposed CD 6 is more compact by most measures than the version of CD 6 in Map 9057.

(d) The coalition’s proposed CD 7 is a Central Florida district that includes all of Seminole County, and takes in portions of Volusia and Orange Counties in a manner that makes it more compact by every measure than the version of CD 7 in Map 9057.

(e) The coalition’s proposed CD 10 comprises a centralized area in only two counties, including the western half of Orange County and a compact area within Lake County just north of the Orange County border. CD 10 in Map 9057, by contrast, is a much larger, less compact district that splits and includes parts of four counties (Lake, Orange, Osceola, and Polk). The Coalition’s proposed CD 10 is more compact by most numeric measures, obviously is more visually compact, and keeps a discrete Central Florida African American community whole and influential. Thus, in addition to the African American performing district the Coalition’s proposed CD 5 creates in North Florida, proposed CD 10 creates a district with enhanced minority voting strength in Central Florida, with about 26% African American and about 19% Hispanic voting age populations. The proposed configuration in Map 9057, like every other map that incorporates a similar north-south version of CD 5, reduces the number of minority opportunity districts, and dilutes minority influence in Florida politics.

(f) The coalition’s proposed CD 11 includes all of Citrus, Hernando, and Sumter Counties, plus the lower (compact, rectangular) half of Lake County, and only enough of Marion county to comply with the equal population requirement. As a consequence, with the same number of county splits (2) as the version of CD 11 in Map 9057, proposed CD 11 is a more compact district by every measure and visually.

(4) To the extent the Coalition’s proposed map is less compact, the reduced compactness is limited to two districts and with good reason. Proposed CD 2 is less compact as a result of having to follow the boundaries of proposed CD 5 to avoid retrogression, having to follow state-line boundaries, having a large sparsely populated area, and having to comply with the equal population requirement. Proposed CD 2, however, does not break a county boundary or deviate from compactness for any other reason. Specifically, proposed CD 2 keeps the same western boundary with CD 1 as all prior draft maps of the Legislature to comply with the equal population rule; takes up the rest of three counties (Leon, Jefferson, and Columbia) which CD 5 split to prevent minority retrogression; keeps 15 counties whole; and only splits Alachua County to the extent required to comply with the equal population requirement.
The coalition’s proposed CD 9 is marginally less compact than the version in Map 9057, because the Coalition’s proposed CD 9 keeps Osceola County whole as the Legislature previously claimed was important. Proposed CD 9 avoids any alterations to surrounding districts (to the east, west, and south) that the Court did not find invalid. As a result, proposed CD 9 has the benefit of limiting map alterations and making proposed CDs 10 and 11 both more compact than in Map 9057. Alternatively, if Osceola County is split in the same manner as Map 9057, the compactness scores of the Coalition’s proposed CD 9 can be increased.

For these reasons, the Coalition’s map demonstrates that Map 9057 continues to fall short of the mandates of the Florida Constitution by maintaining a snaking north-south configuration of CD 5. We continue to urge the Legislature to adopt an east-west approach to CD 5 that better respects tier-two criteria, while also allowing for the creation of a district with increased minority voting strength in Central Florida.

Thanks for your efforts on this matter,

Deirdre Macnab
League of Women Voters of Florida

Peter Butzin
Common Cause

Enclosures,
cc. Florida Legislature (with enclosures)