

PARR BROWN GEE & LOVELESS

David C. Reymann (Utah Bar No. 8495)
 Cheylynn Hayman (Utah Bar No. 9793)
 Kade N. Olsen (Utah Bar No. 17775)
 101 South 200 East, Suite 700
 Salt Lake City, UT 84111
 (801) 532-7840
 dreymann@parrbrown.com
 chayman@parrbrown.com
 kolsen@parrbrown.com

ZIMMERMAN BOOHER

Troy L. Booher (Utah Bar No. 9419)
 J. Frederic Voros, Jr. (Utah Bar No. 3340)
 Caroline Olsen (Utah Bar No. 18070)
 341 South Main Street
 Salt Lake City, UT 84111
 (801) 924-0200
 tbooher@zbappeals.com
 fvoros@zbappeals.com
 colsen@zbappeals.com

CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER

Mark P. Gaber*
 Aseem Mulji*
 Benjamin Phillips*
 Isaac DeSanto*
 1101 14th Street NW, Ste. 400
 Washington, DC 20005
 (202) 736-2200
 mgaber@campaignlegalcenter.org
 amulji@campaignlegalcenter.org
 bphillips@campaignlegalcenter.org
 idesanto@campaignlegalcenter.org

Annabelle Harless*
 55 W. Monroe Street, Ste. 1925
 Chicago, IL 60603
 aharless@campaignlegalcenter.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
 IN AND FOR SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
 UTAH, MORMON WOMEN FOR
 ETHICAL GOVERNMENT, STEFANIE
 CONDIE, MALCOLM REID, VICTORIA
 REID, WENDY MARTIN, ELEANOR
 SUNDWALL, and JACK MARKMAN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE et al.,

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MAP
 SUBMISSION**

Case No. 220901712

Honorable Dianna Gibson


Pursuant to this Court’s September 6, 2025 Order adopting the parties’ stipulated remedial schedule, Plaintiffs respectfully submit two maps for consideration by the Court. These maps are submitted because the map enacted by the Legislature on October 6, 2025 fails to abide by and conform to Proposition 4’s requirements. Plaintiffs will submit their supporting brief and expert reports on October 17 per the scheduling order, but briefly describe the features of their proposed maps.

Plaintiffs’ **Map 1** is derived from an ensemble of 10,000 maps generated by a computer algorithm designed to comply with Proposition 4’s priority-ordered redistricting criteria in a partisan-blind manner. Map 1, which splits only one municipality, was selected because minimizing municipal splits is the highest priority criterion in Proposition 4 after population equality and compliance with federal law. Notably, Map 1 has substantial population overlap with the Commission’s Orange and Purple Maps, with an average of 84.6% population overlap with the Orange Map’s districts and 80.6% population overlap with the Purple Map’s districts.


Plaintiffs’ **Map 2** is based on the Legislature’s adopted remedial map and is intended to be a “least change” map while also correcting the enacted map’s failure to abide by and conform to Proposition 4’s requirements. In particular, it corrects the enacted map’s failure to minimize municipal and county splits to the greatest extent practicable and the enacted map’s failure to comply with Proposition 4’s prohibition against purposefully or unduly favoring or disfavoring political parties. Map 2 has an average of 84.1% population overlap with the Legislature’s enacted map. Map 2 also has substantial population overlap with the Commission’s Purple (82.0%) and Orange (77.8%) maps.

Plaintiffs’ maps and corresponding geographic files can be accessed at: <https://campaignlegal.org/document/plaintiffs-map-submission>. Map images and summary comparison data are presented below.

PLAINTIFFS' MAP 1



PLAINTIFFS' MAP 2



Map Submission Comparison Chart

	Plaintiffs’ Map 1	Plaintiffs’ Map 2	Legislature’s Map C
Population Deviation	0	0	0
Municipal Splits	1 municipality into 2 pieces	1 municipality into 2 pieces	3 municipalities into 11 pieces
Municipal Splits (Pieces)			
Midvale	2	0	0
Millcreek	0	0	6
North Salt Lake	0	0	2
Pleasant Grove	0	2	3
County Splits	3 counties into 6 pieces	3 counties into 6 pieces	3 counties into 7 pieces
County Splits (Pieces)			
Salt Lake	2	2	2
Utah	2	2	3
Weber	2	2	2
Compactness (Reock/Polsby-Popper)	Mean: .49/.44	Mean: .49/.37	Mean: .49/.40
District 1	.53/.41	.45/.42	.45/.43
District 2	.45/.42	.52/.43	.55/.52
District 3	.44/.36	.36/.23	.36/.22
District 4	.55/.56	.61/.41	.61/.41
Boundary Agreement*			
State House	56	54	51
State Senate	13	13	12
State School Board	3	2	3
Map C Core Retention**	N/A	84.1%	N/A
UIRC Core Retention**			
Orange	84.6%	77.8%	65.7%
Purple	80.6%	82.0%	66.2%

* Boundary agreement with existing state legislative and school board boundaries is measured by the number of districts in those plans kept whole in the congressional map.

**Core retention with the Legislature’s submission (Map C) and any Utah Independent Redistricting Commission maps is not a requirement of Proposition 4 and is provided for informational purposes only.

In addition to adhering to the Proposition 4 criteria noted in the chart above, Plaintiffs' Maps 1 and 2 are contiguous, preserve communities of interest, and follow natural and geographic boundaries as required by Proposition 4. Neither map purposefully nor unduly favors or disfavors any political party, as Plaintiffs will demonstrate in their forthcoming brief and expert reports.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th day of October 2025.

/s/ David C. Reymann

PARR BROWN GEE & LOVELESS

David C. Reymann
Cheylynn Hayman
Kade N. Olsen

CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER

Mark P. Gaber
Anabelle Harless
Aseem Mulji
Benjamin Phillips
Isaac DeSanto

ZIMMERMAN BOOHER

Troy L. Booher
J. Frederic Voros, Jr.
Caroline Olsen

Attorneys for Plaintiffs