

Option 2 Leadership FW Group 2- Sandy Martinez, Maria Mason Natalia Dominguez, Daniel Anderson, Rhonda, Kevin, Natalie, Myeshia Smith, Eddrick
 Citizen Map G

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)	VAP MMA (>50% Combined)	Number of Split Geographic Units					Compactness Score (Polsby-Popper Ratio)
																Communities of Interest			Voting Precincts	Census Block Groups	
																Count	Split	Intact			
2	89,812	52,001	57.9%	60.6%	10,020	11.2%	10.3%	17,031	19.0%	17.3%	7,036	3,724	TBD	NO	NO	1	12	8,9,31,32,33,34,35,37	NA	7	0.05
3	90,110	52,176	57.9%	61.2%	10,788	12.0%	11.3%	20,412	22.7%	20.1%	3,863	2,871	TBD	NO	NO	3	4, 22, 23	1,2,3,6, 10,16,27, 28,30,52, 62,67,77	NA	11	0.07
4	96,673	43,121	44.6%	49.5%	22,482	23.3%	21.3%	23,636	24.5%	21.4%	4,619	2,815	TBD	MMA	MMA	1	71	7,24,51,59,60,61,68,72	NA	14	0.04
5	91,853	41,097	44.7%	48.5%	12,697	13.8%	12.5%	26,695	29.1%	26.6%	8,275	3,089	TBD	MMA	MMA	2	12,42	17,18,19,29	NA	15	0.07
6	90,232	46,967	52.1%	54.8%	10,499	11.6%	10.7%	19,226	21.3%	19.6%	10,230	3,310	TBD	NO	NO	0	0	20,21,36,38,39	NA	11	0.51
7	88,419	29,093	32.9%	37.2%	9,388	10.6%	10.8%	45,125	51.0%	46.6%	3,110	1,703	TBD	MMA	MMA	3	4, 22, 23	5,11,13, 14,15,26, 46,47, 48,49,50, 74,76	NA	5	0.42
8	92,949	18,566	20.0%	24.1%	7,082	7.6%	8.1%	63,653	68.5%	63.7%	2,171	1,477	TBD	SMMA	SMMA	1	42	40,41	NA	12	0.21
9	94,685	19,955	21.1%	24.9%	33,920	35.8%	35.1%	34,827	36.8%	33.5%	3,675	2,308	TBD	SMMA	SMMA	1	71	25,58,69,73,75	NA	10	0.08
10	89,390	7,400	8.3%	10.3%	32,269	36.1%	38.2%	46,081	51.6%	47.5%	2,348	1,292	TBD	SMMA	SMMA	1	57	43,44,45, 53,55,56, 63,64,65, 66,70	NA	9	0.25
1	94,792	26,247	27.7%	31.2%	35,224	37.2%	36.0%	23,150	24.4%	21.8%	7,247	2,924	TBD	MMA	MMA	1	57	54	NA	10	0.19

918,915

18.2%

19.5%

Criterion	Fully Met	Partially Met	Unmet	Comments
1. Approximately equal size	X			High/Low deviation <9,189 (8,254)
2. Legal compliance (per outside counsel)				Requires further research
3. Minority opportunity districts				Requires further research
4. Communities of interest	X			<25% Divided (18.2%)
5. Contiguous territory	X			
6. Compactness		X		Polsby Popper ratio ≥ 0.05 (District 4 = 0.04)
7. Identifiable geographic boundaries	X			
8. Voting precincts				NA/2020 Values not published
9. Census block groups	X			<25% Divided (19.5%)
10. Places of residence				Not evaluated

Submitter Comments: We wanted to keep the communities of interests together because that is the voice of the people. We tried really hard to meet the compactness score in district 4 but when we changed it, we ran into issues with the other check marks. We worked many hours on this. We hope you consider our map as a proposal. We have no political affiliations and wanted to create a map that is representative of the community. We also feel that this map is equitable in representation of our diverse Fort Worth.