

# REDISTRICTING AND REAPPORTIONMENT OF REGENT DISTRICTS

**Board of Regents  
of the Nevada System of Higher Education**

---

Joe Reynolds  
Chief General Counsel  
Nevada System of Higher Education

September 9-10, 2021, Board of Regents Meeting



# LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS IN REDISTRICTING



# SUMMARY OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES FOR REDISTRICTING

---

- ▶ Districts must have substantially equal population:
  - Redistricting plan must have a maximum population deviation among districts of under 10%.
  - No district greater or less than 5% deviation from the ideal district population (Jt. Rules).

# MEASURING POPULATION EQUALITY - TERMINOLOGY

---

- ▶ **Ideal population** – the ideal district population is equal to the total state population divided by the total number of districts.
- ▶ **Deviation** - is the degree or percentage by which a single district's population varies from the ideal population.
- ▶ **Overall range or maximum population deviation** – the difference in population of the largest district and the smallest district.



# SUMMARY OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES FOR REDISTRICTING

---

- ▶ A redistricting plan must not violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. That is, a redistricting plan must not be discriminatory against any person or group of persons on account of race, color or status as a member of a language minority group.

# SUMMARY OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES FOR REDISTRICTING

---

- ▶ A redistricting plan must avoid racial gerrymandering.
- ▶ Racial gerrymandering exists when:
  - Race is the dominant and controlling rationale in drawing district lines; and
  - Traditional race-neutral districting principles become subordinate to racial considerations.

# TRADITIONAL DISTRICTING PRINCIPLES

---

- ▶ Compactness
- ▶ Contiguity
- ▶ Preservation of (counties and other) political subdivisions
- ▶ Preservation of communities of interest
- ▶ Preservation of cores of prior districts
- ▶ Avoiding pairing incumbents (continuation of representation)

# JOINT RULES OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE



# 2021 JOINT RULES (ACR 1) OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE

---

- ▶ The redistricting committees will not consider a plan that it determines violates section 2 of the Voting Rights Act or is racially packing or cracking.
- ▶ Public participation and input is encouraged in all aspects of reapportionment and redistricting.

# **ADDITIONAL JOINT RULES LIKELY TO BE ADOPTED**

---

- ▶ Equality of population in accordance with the standard for state legislative districts is the goal of redistricting for the Board of Regents.
- ▶ Required plans not to exceed overall range of population deviation of 10%; no district to exceed plus or minus 5% from the ideal district population.



# **ADDITIONAL JOINT RULES LIKELY TO BE ADOPTED**

- ▶ Federal decennial census as validated by LCB must be the exclusive database for redistricting.
- ▶ All district boundaries created by a redistricting plan must follow the census geography.

# Redistricting Timeline

## Participated in 2020 legislative Interim Committee meetings:

- **January 27, 2020:** Attended first meeting of the Committee to Conduct an Interim Study of the Requirements for Reapportionment and Redistricting.
- **May 27, 2020:** Attended second Interim Committee meeting and provided brief introduction and overview of existing Regent districts.
- **August 27, 2020:** Attended third Interim Committee meeting - coordinated with LCB to purchase necessary computer software license for redistricting.
- **October 20, 2020:** Attended last Interim Committee meetings where recommendations were adopted for submittal to the 2021 Legislature.

Monitored public input at each of the Committee hearings.

## Redistricting Timeline

- **February 1, 2021:** 81st Legislative Session began, and Nevada Legislature adopted Joint Rules addressing the redistricting process and reserved rule numbers for additional Joint Rules to be adopted addressing the redistricting process.
- **March 4-5, 2021:** NSHE General Counsel provided detailed presentation at Board of Regents meeting on redistricting law and process; provided overview of 2019 population estimates and their impact on existing Board of Regents districts; invited public comment on the process.
- **August 12, 2021:** Redistricting level census data was statutorily required to be delivered to the states by the U.S. Census Bureau on or before April 1, 2020. However, citing Covid-19, hurricanes and wildfires, civil unrest and numerous legal challenges, the Census Bureau announced that there would be a delay in the census process and a delay in providing the redistricting data to the states. Ultimately, the Bureau delivered redistricting data to the states on **August 12, 2021**.

## Redistricting Timeline (Continued)

- **September 1, 2021: Redistricting Data as Certified by the Legislative Counsel Bureau provided to NSHE.** On September 1, 2021, the Legislative Counsel Bureau provided the 2020 Census redistricting data to NSHE as provided to the states by the United States Census Bureau and that also included the reallocation of inmates to their last known residential address prior to incarceration as required by AB450 of 2019. This LCB certified data is the data set that must be used in the redistricting process.
- **September 9-10, 2021:** Obtain public and all interested parties' input on redistricting of the Board of Regents at the September 9-10, 2021, Board of Regents meeting and work with the Board toward approving a redistricting proposal for recommendation to the Nevada Legislature.

## Redistricting Timeline (Continued)

- **September/October 2021: Legislative Interim Committee and Special Legislative Session to address redistricting.** An Interim Committee of the Legislature has been appointed to address redistricting matters as a result of the Census delay. It is anticipated the interim committee will hold hearings in September and/or October. It is also anticipated that a Special Legislative Session to address redistricting will be convened later this year after the Interim Committee meetings conclude. Any redistricting proposal approved by the Board of Regents will be presented by NSHE to the Interim Committee and the Nevada Legislature for the Legislature's consideration.

# 2020 U.S. Census Triggers Redistricting

(Nevada Constitution requires that representation be apportioned  
according to population)



2010  
Census  
Data

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION REGENT DISTRICTS  
STATE OF NEVADA  
POPULATION REPORT\*

District	Location	Current Member Representing District	2010 Population	Ideal Population	Percent Deviation from Ideal	Actual Deviation from Ideal
1	Clark (part)	Perkins	207,610	207,735	-0.06%	-125
2	Clark (part)	Tarkanian	207,784	207,735	0.02%	49
3	Clark (part)	Brooks	208,064	207,735	0.16%	329
4	Clark (part)	McMichael	207,762	207,735	0.01%	27
5	Clark (part)	Boylan	207,498	207,735	-0.11%	-237
6	Clark (part)	Carter	208,126	207,735	0.19%	391
7	Clark (part)	Doubrava	207,941	207,735	0.10%	206
8	Churchill, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, White Pine	McAdoo	207,521	207,735	-0.10%	-214
9	Carson City, Douglas, Lyon, Storey, Washoe (part)	Del Carlo	207,283	207,735	-0.22%	-452
10	Washoe (part)	Arrascada	207,430	207,735	-0.15%	-305
11	Washoe (part)	Geddes	207,915	207,735	0.09%	180
12	Clark (part)	Carvalho	207,865	207,735	0.06%	130
13	Clark (part)	Moran	207,752	207,735	0.01%	17
Total			2,700,551			

Largest Positive Deviation is: 391 0.19%  
Largest Negative Deviation is: -452 -0.22%  
Overall Range of Deviation is: 843 0.41%

\*Note: The population database is derived from the 2010 Census Public Law 94-171 Redistricting Data as provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and validated by the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Updated: February 3, 2021

# 2010 Census Data

## NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION REGENT DISTRICTS STATE OF NEVADA RACIAL DATA REPORT

District	Location	Current Member Representing District	2010 Population	White alone		Black or African American, Including Black or African American With Another Race(s)		American Indian and Alaskan Native, Including American Indian and Alaskan Native With Another Race(s)		Asian, Including Asian With Another Race(s)		Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, Including Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander With Another Race(s)		Some Other Race alone		Two or More Races		Hispanic or Latino (of any race)*	
				Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total	Population	Percent of Total
1	Clark (part)	Perkins	207,610	96,347	46.41%	37,014	27.46%	3,362	1.62%	19,141	9.22%	3,691	1.78%	29,114	14.02%	12,164	5.86%	61,198	29.48%
2	Clark (part)	Tarkanian	207,784	131,005	63.05%	25,547	12.29%	3,535	1.70%	13,902	6.69%	2,484	1.20%	30,742	14.80%	10,589	5.10%	66,132	31.83%
3	Clark (part)	Brooks	208,064	136,905	65.80%	18,348	8.82%	3,005	1.44%	28,535	13.71%	3,986	1.92%	18,015	8.66%	11,410	5.48%	43,487	20.90%
4	Clark (part)	McMichael	207,762	101,342	48.78%	26,761	12.88%	3,462	1.67%	11,810	5.68%	2,303	1.11%	60,279	29.01%	10,325	4.97%	112,434	54.12%
5	Clark (part)	Boylan	207,498	99,101	47.76%	23,373	11.26%	3,408	1.64%	14,877	7.17%	2,091	1.01%	62,024	29.89%	9,525	4.59%	120,414	58.03%
6	Clark (part)	Carter	208,126	131,191	63.03%	18,921	9.09%	3,114	1.50%	34,466	16.56%	2,862	1.38%	18,089	8.69%	10,995	5.28%	43,022	20.67%
7	Clark (part)	Doubrava	207,941	146,572	70.49%	20,091	9.66%	2,637	1.28%	24,805	11.93%	2,588	1.24%	11,722	5.64%	9,538	4.59%	33,552	16.14%
8	Churchill, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, White Pine	McAdoo	207,521	158,528	76.39%	9,815	4.73%	7,741	3.73%	13,366	6.44%	1,749	0.84%	15,940	7.68%	7,974	3.84%	38,463	18.53%
9	Carson City, Douglas, Lyon, Storey, Washoe (part)	Del Carlo	207,283	175,601	84.72%	3,507	1.69%	8,524	4.11%	5,531	2.67%	983	0.47%	12,673	6.11%	6,824	3.29%	31,375	15.14%
10	Washoe (part)	Arrascada	207,430	160,480	77.37%	6,372	3.07%	4,462	2.15%	15,019	7.24%	2,038	0.98%	18,480	8.91%	7,619	3.67%	43,587	21.01%
11	Washoe (part)	Geddes	207,913	157,694	75.85%	7,136	3.43%	6,602	3.18%	12,486	6.01%	2,118	1.02%	21,248	10.22%	8,260	3.97%	49,836	23.97%
12	Clark (part)	Carvalho	207,865	153,898	74.04%	15,039	7.23%	3,335	1.60%	17,089	8.22%	2,957	1.42%	15,713	7.56%	10,163	4.89%	41,333	19.88%
13	Clark (part)	Moran	207,752	138,024	66.44%	22,528	10.84%	2,738	1.32%	31,889	15.35%	2,998	1.44%	10,754	5.18%	10,689	5.15%	31,668	15.24%
Total			2,700,551	1,786,688	66.16%	254,452	9.42%	55,945	2.07%	242,916	9.00%	32,848	1.22%	324,793	12.03%	126,075	4.67%	716,501	26.53%

\*Hispanic or Latino is reported by the Census Bureau as a language group, separately.

Note: The population database is derived from the 2010 Census Public Law 94-171 Redistricting Data as provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and validated by the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Racial population data is based on self-identification. Respondents have the option of selecting one or more races.

Courtesy of the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Division

# Current Regent Districts **prior to redistricting**

2020 Census as validated by LCB after inmate reallocation pursuant to AB450 (2019)

Active Matrix				
	Total Population Tabulation 2020 Census			
DISTRICT	All Persons	Target	Dev.	Difference
1	251,940	238,816	▼5.5%	13,124
2	218,636	238,816	-8.5%▲	-20,180
3	227,862	238,816	-4.59%✓	-10,954
4	218,546	238,816	-8.5%▲	-20,270
5	212,434	238,816	-11.0%▲	-26,382
6	288,653	238,816	▼20.9%	49,837
7	217,248	238,816	-9.0%▲	-21,568
8	248,409	238,816	4.02%✓	9,593
9	221,377	238,816	-7.3%▲	-17,439
10	239,300	238,816	0.20%✓	484
11	239,853	238,816	0.43%✓	1,037
12	237,483	238,816	-0.56%✓	-1,333
13	282,873	238,816	▼18.4%	44,057
Assigned	3104614			
Total Pop	3104614			
Unassigned	0			

Without  
redistricting:  
Overall  
Population  
Deviation  
Of 31.92%

## Statewide Distribution: Board Of Regents Districts 2010 Population (2010 Census Data)

- ▶ Clark County: 1,951,269 = **72.25%** of the state's population.  
**72.25%** of 13 districts = **9.39 districts in Clark County.**
- ▶ Rest of the state: 749,282 = **27.75%** of the state's population.  
**27.75%** of 13 districts = **3.61 districts in the rest of the state.**

## Statewide Distribution: Board Of Regents Districts 2020 Population (2020 Census Data)


- ▶ Clark County: 2,265,461 = **72.97%** of the state's population.  
**72.97%** of 13 districts = **9.49 districts in Clark County.**
- ▶ Rest of the state: 839,153 = **27.03%** of the state's population.  
**27.03%** of 13 districts = **3.51 districts in the rest of the state.**



# Current Regent Districts

## Statewide Districts

Please note: Large size printed maps of all existing Board of Regents Districts and of the proposed Districts will be made available for review at the Reno and Las Vegas NSHE Offices, at Great Basin College in Elko, and at the September 9-10, 2021, Board of Regents meeting.






# Current District 1

District 1 - Regent Perkins


Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 1

District 1 - Regent Perkins

Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 2


District 2 - Regent Tarkanian

Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 2

District 2 - Regent Tarkanian  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 3


District 3 - Regent Brooks

Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 3

District 3 - Regent Brooks  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 4


District 4 - Regent McMichael

Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 4


District 4 - Regent McMichael  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 5

District 5 –  
Regent Boylan  
Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 5


District 5 –  
Regent Boylan  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 6

## District 6 - Regent Carter Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 6


District 6 - Regent Carter  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 7

District 7 - Regent Doubrava  
Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 7

District 7 - Regent Doubrava  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 8

## District 8 - Regent McAdoo


# Clark (part), Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lincoln, Nye, White Pine Counties



# Proposed Regent District 8

District 8 - Regent McAdoo

Clark (part), Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka,  
Lincoln, Nye, White Pine Counties






# Current Regent District 9

District 9 - Regent Del Carlo


Carson City, Churchill, Douglas,  
Esmeralda, Lander, Lyon, Mineral, Storey,  
Washoe (part) Counties



# Proposed District 9

District 9 - Regent Del Carlo

Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Lander,  
Lyon, Mineral, Storey, Washoe (part)  
Counties






# Current Regent District 10


District 10 - Regent Arrascada

Washoe County (part)



# Proposed District 10


District 10 - Regent Arrascada  
Washoe County (part)



# Current Regent District 11

District 11 - Regent Geddes

Pershing, Washoe (part) Counties






# Proposed District 11

District 11 - Regent Geddes

Humboldt, Pershing, Washoe (part)  
Counties



**Nevada System of Higher Education**

**Regent Districts**

**District 12**

0 0.5 1 1.5 2 Miles


Districts are effective January 1, 2012 for the purpose of filing for office and for nominating and electing members, and for all other purposes on January 1, 2013.

Map of District 12, Nevada, showing the Boulder City Municipal Airport, Lake Mead, and surrounding areas. The map includes a legend for Nevada System of Higher Education, Regent Districts, and District 12. A scale bar indicates 0 to 2 miles. The map also shows the boundaries of Districts 3, 5, 6, and 12, and the location of the Boulder City Municipal Airport.



# Proposed District 12


District 12 -  
Regent Carvalho  
Clark County (part)






# Current Regent District 13

District 13 -  
Regent Moran  
Clark County (part)



# Proposed District 13

District 13 -  
Regent Moran  
Clark County (part)



# Population of Proposed Regent Districts

## 2020 Census population

as validated by LCB after inmate reallocation pursuant to AB450 (2019)

Active Matrix				
DISTRICT	Total Population Tabulation 2020 Census			
	All Persons	Target	Dev.	Difference
1	239,297	238,816	0.20%✓	481
2	238,314	238,816	-0.21%✓	-502
3	239,377	238,816	0.23%✓	561
4	238,750	238,816	-0.03%✓	-66
5	239,072	238,816	0.11%✓	256
6	238,218	238,816	-0.25%✓	-598
7	238,312	238,816	-0.21%✓	-504
8	238,674	238,816	-0.06%✓	-142
9	238,684	238,816	-0.06%✓	-132
10	239,302	238,816	0.20%✓	486
11	239,081	238,816	0.11%✓	265
12	239,263	238,816	0.19%✓	447
13	238,270	238,816	-0.23%✓	-546
Assigned	3104614			
Total Pop	3104614			
Unassigned	0			

After proposed  
redistricting:  
Overall Population  
Deviation less than ½  
of 1%



# Draft Proposed Regent Districts 2020 Census Population Tabulation and Racial Demographics

\*2020 Census as validated by LCB after inmate reallocation pursuant to AB450 (2019)

DISTRICT	Total Population Tabulation 2020 Census				Racial Demographics as a Percent of Total 2020 Census Population								
	All Persons	Target	Dev.	Difference	White	Black	AI/AN	Asian	NHOPI	Other	≥ Two	Total Minority	Hispanic
1	239,297	238,816	0.20%✓	481	32.09%	29.06%	2.87%	10.18%	2.21%	17.01%	15.65%	67.91%	33.72%
2	238,314	238,816	-0.21%✓	-502	42.75%	15.90%	3.24%	9.06%	1.77%	19.55%	15.48%	57.25%	37.09%
3	239,377	238,816	0.23%✓	561	47.38%	14.03%	2.64%	17.61%	2.92%	10.80%	14.18%	52.62%	24.04%
4	238,750	238,816	-0.03%✓	-66	29.54%	15.47%	3.41%	8.21%	1.48%	30.35%	17.83%	70.46%	54.35%
5	239,072	238,816	0.11%✓	256	25.17%	18.80%	3.29%	6.36%	1.15%	34.08%	16.59%	74.83%	56.80%
6	238,218	238,816	-0.25%✓	-598	51.75%	11.10%	2.53%	21.61%	2.24%	6.91%	13.10%	48.25%	18.53%
7	238,312	238,816	-0.21%✓	-504	55.79%	11.93%	2.46%	14.72%	1.62%	8.43%	12.86%	44.21%	20.29%
8	238,674	238,816	-0.06%✓	-142	66.28%	8.10%	4.50%	8.30%	1.41%	8.63%	11.51%	33.72%	19.84%
9	238,684	238,816	-0.06%✓	-132	75.57%	2.12%	5.58%	3.70%	0.73%	7.18%	11.29%	24.43%	16.97%
10	239,302	238,816	0.20%✓	486	65.01%	4.31%	3.43%	9.43%	1.24%	10.51%	12.36%	34.99%	22.74%
11	239,081	238,816	0.11%✓	265	61.37%	3.62%	5.22%	6.62%	1.39%	14.50%	13.73%	38.63%	29.42%
12	239,263	238,816	0.19%✓	447	60.55%	9.93%	2.90%	10.80%	1.85%	8.47%	13.93%	39.45%	21.90%
13	238,270	238,816	-0.23%✓	-546	51.91%	12.70%	2.23%	21.51%	1.98%	5.99%	13.21%	48.09%	17.04%
Assigned	3104614												
Total Pop	3104614												



# Draft Proposed Regent Districts 2020 Census Racial Demographics Tabulation

\*2020 Census as validated by LCB after inmate reallocation pursuant to AB450 (2019)

DISTRICT	2020	White alone		Black Combined		AI/AN Combined		Asian Combined		NHOPI Combined		Some Other Race aln		Two or More Races		Total		Hispanic or Latino	
	Total Population	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Minority %	Minority %	Population	% of Total
1	239,297	76,781	32.09%	69,548	29.06%	6,875	2.87%	24,363	10.18%	5,297	2.21%	40,701	17.01%	37,439	15.65%	162,516	67.91%	80,689	33.72%
2	238,314	101,875	42.75%	37,885	15.90%	7,710	3.24%	21,603	9.06%	4,228	1.77%	46,600	19.55%	36,894	15.48%	136,439	57.25%	88,387	37.09%
3	239,377	113,423	47.38%	33,595	14.03%	6,316	2.64%	42,145	17.61%	6,995	2.92%	25,848	10.80%	33,943	14.18%	125,954	52.62%	57,553	24.04%
4	238,750	70,518	29.54%	36,946	15.47%	8,153	3.41%	19,606	8.21%	3,531	1.48%	72,467	30.35%	42,581	17.83%	168,232	70.46%	129,755	54.35%
5	239,072	60,185	25.17%	44,953	18.80%	7,870	3.29%	15,211	6.36%	2,753	1.15%	81,468	34.08%	39,667	16.59%	178,887	74.83%	135,789	56.80%
6	238,218	123,280	51.75%	26,443	11.10%	6,035	2.53%	51,474	21.61%	5,326	2.24%	16,472	6.91%	31,207	13.10%	114,938	48.25%	44,131	18.53%
7	238,312	132,950	55.79%	28,433	11.93%	5,851	2.46%	35,089	14.72%	3,863	1.62%	20,087	8.43%	30,657	12.86%	105,362	44.21%	48,343	20.29%
8	238,674	158,204	66.28%	19,328	8.10%	10,731	4.50%	19,818	8.30%	3,369	1.41%	20,602	8.63%	27,480	11.51%	80,470	33.72%	47,362	19.84%
9	238,684	180,380	75.57%	5,051	2.12%	13,317	5.58%	8,825	3.70%	1,740	0.73%	17,148	7.18%	26,942	11.29%	58,304	24.43%	40,508	16.97%
10	239,302	155,578	65.01%	10,325	4.31%	8,198	3.43%	22,565	9.43%	2,956	1.24%	25,153	10.51%	29,575	12.36%	83,724	34.99%	54,409	22.74%
11	239,081	146,728	61.37%	8,665	3.62%	12,479	5.22%	15,819	6.62%	3,328	1.39%	34,676	14.50%	32,819	13.73%	92,353	38.63%	70,337	29.42%
12	239,263	144,873	60.55%	23,756	9.93%	6,944	2.90%	25,829	10.80%	4,418	1.85%	20,257	8.47%	33,324	13.93%	94,390	39.45%	52,388	21.90%
13	238,270	123,688	51.91%	30,270	12.70%	5,311	2.23%	51,246	21.51%	4,728	1.98%	14,278	5.99%	31,481	13.21%	114,582	48.09%	40,606	17.04%

# Draft Proposed Regent Districts 2020 Census Voting Age Racial Demographics Tabulation

\*2020 Census as validated by LCB after inmate reallocation pursuant to AB450 (2019)

DISTRICT	2020 18+	White alone		Black Combined		AI/AN Combined		Asian Combined		NHOPI Combined		Some Other Race aln		Two or More Races		Total		Hispanic or Latino	
	Total Population	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Population	% of Total	Minority	% Minority	Population	% of Total
1	177,032	61,812	34.92%	48,898	27.62%	5,004	2.83%	18,396	10.39%	3,536	2.00%	28,349	16.01%	23,722	13.40%	115,220	65.08%	53,924	30.46%
2	183,021	84,748	46.31%	26,687	14.58%	5,835	3.19%	17,030	9.30%	2,836	1.55%	32,785	17.91%	24,666	13.48%	98,273	53.69%	60,621	33.12%
3	192,107	95,983	49.96%	24,729	12.87%	4,821	2.51%	33,169	17.27%	4,705	2.45%	19,589	10.20%	23,196	12.07%	96,124	50.04%	41,595	21.65%
4	174,059	56,947	32.72%	24,410	14.02%	5,964	3.43%	15,611	8.97%	2,389	1.37%	49,430	28.40%	28,897	16.60%	117,112	67.28%	87,416	50.22%
5	175,970	50,093	28.47%	31,912	18.13%	5,882	3.34%	12,405	7.05%	1,763	1.00%	55,578	31.58%	27,270	15.50%	125,877	71.53%	92,421	52.52%
6	186,632	101,981	54.64%	17,691	9.48%	4,492	2.41%	39,365	21.09%	3,471	1.86%	12,309	6.60%	19,814	10.62%	84,651	45.36%	30,241	16.20%
7	193,703	113,711	58.70%	20,534	10.60%	4,403	2.27%	28,005	14.46%	2,594	1.34%	15,147	7.82%	20,789	10.73%	79,992	41.30%	34,736	17.93%
8	187,031	126,044	67.39%	13,737	7.34%	7,615	4.07%	14,631	7.82%	2,070	1.11%	15,237	8.15%	17,067	9.13%	60,987	32.61%	31,655	16.93%
9	191,859	149,886	78.12%	3,395	1.77%	9,700	5.06%	6,340	3.30%	1,169	0.61%	12,196	6.36%	17,981	9.37%	41,973	21.88%	27,173	14.16%
10	192,930	131,736	68.28%	7,223	3.74%	6,278	3.25%	17,420	9.03%	2,007	1.04%	17,877	9.27%	20,156	10.45%	61,194	31.72%	37,806	19.60%
11	183,149	118,411	64.65%	5,714	3.12%	8,836	4.82%	11,893	6.49%	2,112	1.15%	23,943	13.07%	21,232	11.59%	64,738	35.35%	46,494	25.39%
12	191,127	120,655	63.13%	17,037	8.91%	5,315	2.78%	19,811	10.37%	3,097	1.62%	15,340	8.03%	22,502	11.77%	70,472	36.87%	37,272	19.50%
13	184,706	99,975	54.13%	20,863	11.30%	3,934	2.13%	39,250	21.25%	3,072	1.66%	10,806	5.85%	19,487	10.55%	84,731	45.87%	28,042	15.18%



# Draft Proposal employs all Traditional Redistricting Principles

---

- ▶ Contiguity
- ▶ Compactness
- ▶ Preservation of (counties and other) political subdivisions
- ▶ Preservation of communities of interest
- ▶ Preservation of cores of prior districts
- ▶ Avoiding pairing incumbents (continuation of representation)

# Draft Proposal Complies with all Legal Requirements for Redistricting

---

- ▶ Districts have substantially equal population – overall population deviation of less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1%
- ▶ Proposed plan complies with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act



# Questions?