United Hispanic Council Plan 3- Fernando Florez
Citizen Map Z

District	Total Population	White	White %	White VAP%	African American	African American %	African American VAP%	Hispanic	Hispanic %	Hispanic VAP%	Asian	Other	Minority Opportunity?	MMA (>50% Combined) / SMMA (>75% Combined Minority)	VAP MMA (>50% Combined) / VAP SMMA (>75% Combined Minority)	Count	Split	Intact	Voting Precincts	Census Block Groups	Compactness Score (Polsby-Popper Ratio)
2	94,921	16,306	17.2%	20.2%	7,410	7.8%	7.3%	66,642	70.2%	67.5%	2,991	1,572	TBD	SMMA	SMMA	1	29	41,42	NA	15	0.2
3	88,998	49,468	55.6%	60.0%	12,294	13.8%	12.4%	21,222	23.9%	20.9%	3,189	2,825	TBD	NO	NO	0	0	4,5,6,7,10,15,16,27,28,51,67	NA	13	0.05
4	95,867	48,009	50.1%	52.9%	11,098	11.6%	10.7%	21,042	22.0%	20.2%	12,182	3,536	TBD	NO	NO	0	0	17,18,20,21,36,38,39	NA	4	0.44
5	91,592	24,444	26.7%	30.0%	36,565	39.9%	38.7%	20,662	22.6%	20.3%	7,110	2,811	TBD	MMA	MMA	1	57	53,54,55	NA	5	0.15
6	95,127	29,759	31.3%	35.7%	33,274	35.0%	32.9%	24,041	25.3%	22.8%	5,490	2,563	TBD	MMA	MMA	0	0	24,58,59,60,61,68,72,73,75	NA	7	0.06
7	94,187	50,885	54.0%	58.1%	10,707	11.4%	10.2%	24,113	25.6%	22.8%	5,157	3,325	TBD	NO	NO	1	29	12,19,30,37,52,62	NA	17	0.04
8	90,236	8,368	9.3%	11.4%	30,819	34.2%	36.8%	48,541	53.8%	48.9%	1,132	1,376	TBD	SMMA	SMMA	1	57	43,44,45,56,63,64,65,66	NA	9	0.4
9	88,509	42,420	47.9%	52.2%	14,983	16.9%	16.3%	25,098	28.4%	24.7%	3,638	2,370	TBD	MMA	NO	0	0	1,2,3,11,13,14,22,23,40,71,74,76,77	NA	22	0.15
10	88,552	14,880	16.8%	20.3%	17,032	19.2%	19.2%	51,169	57.8%	54.6%	4,036	1,435	TBD	SMMA	SMMA	0	0	25,26,46,47,48,49,50,69,70	NA	11	0.16
1/11	90,926	52,084	57.3%	59.9%	10,187	11.2%	10.3%	17,306	19.0%	17.4%	7,649	3,700	TBD	NO	NO	0	0	8,9,31,32,33,34,35	NA	3	0.05
	918,915																	5.2%		19.9%

Criterion	Fully Met	Partially Met	Unmet	Comments
1. Approximately equal size	X			High/Low deviation <9,189 (7358)
2. Legal compliance (per outside counsel)				Requires further research
3. Minority opportunity districts				Requires further research
4. Communities of interest	X			<25% Divided (5.2%)
5. Contiguous territory	X			
6. Compactness		X		Polsby Popper ratio ≥ 0.05 (District 7 = 0.04)
7. Identifiable geographic boundaries	X			
8. Voting precincts				NA/2020 Values not published
9. Census block groups	X			<25% Divided (19.9%)
10. Places of residence				Not evaluated

Submitter Comments: UHC Plan 3 is based on UHC Plan 2, revised to reduce the number of split residential neighborhood communities of interest that registered with the City.

The previous two UHC plans were the only submitted plans that created three majority Hispanic districts by voting age population. UHC Plan 3 creates two majority Hispanic districts: an opportunity district in the north (District 2) with 67% and a new majority district in the south (District 10) with 55% of voting age population. In addition, the plan creates a near-majority district with 49% of voting age population.

The map drawers proceeded along the principle that the creation of a second viable Hispanic district is the minimum threshold for a successful redistricting map for the City of Fort Worth. UHC's ideal plan would lie between Plans 2 and 3, creating three majority Hispanic districts while minimizing residential community splitting to the extent possible. These plans represent the most likely path to creating a second Hispanic-controlled district out of the eventual ten.

Notably, this has been achieved here while preserving three functional African-American districts.

UHC Plan 3 is submitted under protest of the compactness evaluation, which unfairly penalized districts on the City's western boundary, which are highly irregular in shape, and categorized those plans as either having partially met or not met the criterion. In nearly all plans that were flagged for violation, the compactness test score was dominated by the irregular city limits. In only one of the submitted plans did the test reflect the irregularity of a district's interior boundaries. All compactness tests in the software package are more appropriate to the division of states, whose borders are smoother than those of municipalities, whose city limits can be highly irregular.