UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

FLORIDA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE (NAACP), as an organization and representative of its members; et al.,

Civil No. 4:07cv402 SPM/WCS

VS.

KURT S. BROWNING, in his official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of Florida,

Defendant.

APPENDIX 1

[SUMMARY OF DATA PRODUCED BY DEFENDANT ON UNMATCHED APPLICANTS] TO

PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENTIARY SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

> GLENN T. BURHANS, JR. FLA. BAR No. 605867 101 EAST COLLEGE AVENUE TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301 TEL. (850) 222-6891 Fax (850) 681-0207

Table 1¹ Percentages of Total Applicants and Un-matched Applicants By Race

	Total applicants since 1/1/06	Un-matched since 1/1/06	Timely Applied and Un-matched as of 2006 Election	Still Un- matched*
White	66%	29%	16%	25%
Hispanic	15%	34%	41%	43%
Black	13%	22%	25%	18%
Asian	2%	3%	2%	3%
Am. Indian	0.3%	1%	1%	1%
Other	2%	2%	2%	4%
Unknown	2%	10%	13%	7%

Table 2 Percentages of Total Applicants and Un-matched Applicants By County

	Total applicants since 1/1/06	Un-matched since 1/1/06	Timely Applied and Un-matched as of 2006 Election	Still Un- matched*
Miami-Dade	9%	30%	32%	0%*
Broward	8%	12%	15%	17%
Orange	5%	10%	13%	35%
Hillsborough	2%	8%	12%	0%*

The summary tables contained in this Appendix were compiled from data produced by the Secretary of State on October 31, and November 9, 2007. That data contained 31,506 non-duplicate voter IDs, representing 31,506 distinct applicants whom the State was unable to match immediately through DHSMV.

Table 3
Percentages of Un-matched Applicants
By Number Submitted on Application

	Un- matched since 1/1/06	Timely Applied and Un-matched as of 2006 Election	Still Un- matched*
Submitted Social Security digits	68%	86%	81%
Submitted driver's license number	27%	11%	15%
Both SSN and DL number on record	5%	2%	3%
Claimed to have neither number	1%	1%	1%
Gave no number and no explanation	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%

^{*} The State data files on applicants who remain un-matched appear to understate the number of un-matched applicants in certain counties. For example, they include only eight un-matched applicants in Miami-Dade County and three in Hillsborough County. On their face, those figures are suspect given the size of those counties and prior county records. In fact, Miami-Dade County produced a list containing thousands of currently unmatched applicants. See Sola Dep. Tr. 50:9-51:10. Plaintiffs were unable to obtain clarification of the data because Defendant first produced the data concerning currently un-matched applicants on November 9, 2007, the final day allotted for depositions.