

*Dedicated to Outstanding Customer Service for a Better Community*

**SERVICE SOLUTIONS SUCCESS**



**DISTRICTING COMMISSION**  
Wednesday, April 18, 2012, 5:30 P.M.  
City Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
City Hall Building, 2 Civic Center Plaza

**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Establish Quorum
3. Call for Public Comment
4. Discussion and Action on:
  - a. Approval of Minutes: April 4, 2012 Meeting
  - b. Drafting and selection of Districting Plans
  - c. Call for Public Comment
5. Adjournment

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Districting Commission of the City of El Paso may retire into EXECUTIVE SESSION pursuant to Section 3.5A of the El Paso City Charter and the Texas Government Code, Chapter 551, Subchapter D, to discuss any of the items on this agenda, consistent with the terms of the Open Meetings Act. The Districting Commission will return to open session to take any final action.

Section 551.071

CONSULTATION WITH ATTORNEY

Posted this 12 day of April, 2012 at 8:20 am  
Basement Bulletin Board, City Hall, 2 Civic Center Plaza, by Kevin Smith, Planning and Economic Development

Mayor

John F. Cook

City Council

*District 1*

Ann Morgan Lilly

*District 2*

Susie Byrd

*District 3*

Emma Acosta

*District 4*

Carl L. Robinson

*District 5*

Dr. Michiel R. Noe

*District 6*

Eddie Holguin Jr.

*District 7*

Steve Ortega

*District 8*

Cortney Carlisle Niland

City Manager

Joyce A. Wilson





**DISTRICTING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 2012, 5:30 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR  
CITY HALL BUILDING, 2 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA**

**Members Present: 7**

Chair Gene Finke, John Karlsruher, Vice-Chair Francisco X. Dominguez, David Thackston (7:22 p.m.), Oscar Silva (6:15 p.m.), James L. Graham, Alisa Jorgensen

**Members Absent: 2**

Gilbert A. Mendez, Jr., Rudy Troncoso

**Vacancies: 0**

**Planning and Economic Development Staff:**

David Coronado, Executive Secretary, Lead Planner; Mariano Soto, Planner, GIS; Marissa Monroy, Economic Development Coordinator; Donna Martinez, Senior Secretary

**Others Present:**

Marie Taylor, Assistant City Attorney, City Attorney's Office

**1. Meeting Called to Order**

Chair Finke called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

**2. Establish Quorum**

Quorum established.

**3. Discussion and action on:**

**a. Approval of Minutes: March 7, 2012 Meeting**

Chair Finke asked if Commissioners had any additions/corrections/revisions to the minutes of March 7, 2012.

**CORRECTIONS**

**1. PAGE 3 OF 16, LAST PARAGRAPH**

Commissioner Jorgensen noted Commissioner Karlsruher's name was misspelled.

**2. PAGE 4 OF 16**

**CD-6 – COMMISSIONER THACKSTON**

Chair Finke and Commissioner Jorgensen corrected CD-5 to read CD-6

**PD-11 – MR. ALFREDO LONGORIA**

Chair Finke and Commissioner Jorgensen correct CD-5 to read PD-11

**MOTION:**

*Motion made by Commissioner Graham, seconded by Commissioner Jorgensen AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 7, 2012 MINUTES, AS REVISED.*

**NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE:** *Commissioners Thackston and Silva*

*Motion passed. (5-0)*

**b. Drafting and selection of Districting Plans**

**PRESENTATION OF NEW MAPS**

Mr. Coronado explained that the four new maps had been submitted prior to the March 14, 2012 deadline.

**UPDATE – STATUS OF COUNTY PRECINCT MAP**

Mr. Coronado stated that the County of El Paso, Elections Department provided Planning Staff with the new Voting Precinct boundary line map information in March. The new County Voting Precinct boundary line map reflects modifications in the Northeast; however, the most notable changes appear in the Northwest and Upper Valley regions. These changes will have an impact on maps previously presented to the Commission.

Mr. Coronado suggested Commissioners select up to five maps to be updated with the new Voting Precinct boundary line map information for presentation at the next meeting.

At the time the four new maps were submitted, Planning Staff did not have the new Voting Precinct boundary line map information. However, Staff updated the maps with the new Precinct boundary line map information.

**RECOGNITION – MR. DAVID MARCUS**

At this time, Chair Finke recognized Mr. David Marcus. Chair Finke stated Mr. Marcus was a Commissioner on the last Districting Commission. Chair Finke hoped Mr. Marcus would have some comments during the meeting.

Mr. Marcus thanked the Chair.

**PD-12**

Mr. Coronado explained the PD-12 map was created by Ms. Laurie Cooper. Mr. Coronado elaborated on the boundary line and Precinct changes.

**PD-12 DEVIATION TOTAL**

*Prior to new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 1.6%*

*After new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 2.0%*

**PD-13**



Mr. Coronado explained the PD-13 map was created by Ms. Laurie Cooper.

**PD-13 DEVIATION TOTAL**

*Prior to new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 2.2%*

*After new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 2.5%*

**PD-14**

Mr. Coronado explained the PD-14 map was created by Mr. Ray Mancera. Mr. Coronado elaborated on the boundary line and Precinct changes.

**PD-14 DEVIATION TOTAL**

*Prior to new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 1.2%*

*After new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 1.4%*

**PD-15**

Mr. Coronado explained the PD-15 map was created by Mr. George Ybarra. Mr. Coronado elaborated on the boundary line and Precinct changes.

**PD-15 DEVIATION TOTAL**

*Prior to new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 1.5%*

*After new Voting Precinct boundary line map information – 1.5%*

Chair Finke asked the Commissioners if they would like to follow the same procedure as the previous meeting and allow public comment at this time prior to Commissioner's discussion on the maps.

**MOTION:**

*Motion made by Vice-Chair Dominguez, seconded by Commissioner Graham and*  
**UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO CHANGE THE AGENDA FORMAT.**

**NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE:** Commissioners Thackston and Silva

*Motion passed. (5-0)*

**4. Call for Public Comment**

Mr. Coronado stated there were three individuals who had signed up to speak:

1. Ms. Elvia Hernandez
2. Dr. Carina Ramirez
3. Ms. Alejandra Martinez

Chair Finke asked Staff to set a five minute time limit for each speaker.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

1. Ms. Elvia Hernandez thanked Commissioners for their time and dedication. Her comments will be directed toward Districts 1 and 8, in particular. Ms. Hernandez felt that the PD-14 and PD-15 maps seemed to work very well regarding the demographics and issues pertaining to Districts 1 and 8. She would personally like to put in her vote for the PD-14 and PD-15 maps; they would work very well for Districts 1 and 8. Ms. Hernandez liked that the UTEP area remained in District 1 and that the Willows area would become part of District 1.
2. Dr. Carina Ramirez directed Commissioner's attention to the PD-13 map. Dr. Ramirez explained that Ms. Laurie Cooper drafted the PD-13 map on her behalf as she was teaching at the time and could not cancel her class. Dr. Ramirez asked Commissioners to please note that although the configurations of District 1 and 8 seemed to her to be just a tad strange; out of respect to what we had understood were the wishes of the residents of those areas, their boundaries are not changed in any way. The PD-13 map meets all the stated redistricting criteria set by the City Council, with minimal impact upon existing District boundaries, as well as, upon voters in the Districts. Regarding said criteria, Dr. Ramirez noted:
  - a. All criteria were consistently and evenly applied across the Districts;
  - b. All incumbent constituency relations have been preserved;
  - c. All Districts follow easily identifiable geographic boundaries, such as well-known and easily accessible roads, and are composed of whole voting Precincts;
  - d. All Districts are relatively equal to Total Population according to the 2010 Federal Census and are within the excellent deviation of 2.5%;
  - e. Communities of Interest are maintained within a single District;
  - f. It has been verified with the County that the borderline Precinct 150 preserves the community interests of the Ysleta del Sur population;
  - g. The boundary is also the Congressional District line, which Ysleta del Sur does not object to;
  - h. The Montwood Neighborhood Association consists of Precincts 118, 119 and 121; Precinct 121 was moved from District 6 into District 5 to restore the Neighborhood Association established by the Representative Dr. Noe;
  - i. Additionally, PD-13 is contiguous, as well as, functionally compact in that there are multiple North/South direct thoroughfares in that provide access and easy ability to travel within and throughout the Districts;
  - j. Furthermore, there is a complete absence of evidence that any Representative of a North/South District has failed to respond to concerns raised by constituents within their Districts because of those North/South streets which have not posed an obstacle to travel or to effective representation to either District 6 or District 7 Representatives;
  - k. PD-13 is also based on existing Districts and preserves the core of every District, which as Commissioner Jorgensen stated during the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, is 50%.
  - l. In contrast, the East/West reorientation of Districts 6 and 7, as drawn in other maps, unnecessarily pack 65%, far more than the defined core of District 7 into District 6;
  - m. More importantly, many believe that the East/West reorientation of Districts 6 and 7, as drawn in other maps, reflects an attitude of balkanization and it would cause the

diminution of the representation for voters that the Voter Rights Act was designed to prohibit;

- n. Moreover PD-13 follows the principle of proportionality, which is central to Representative government, by preserving the opportunity and ability to run an elect candidate of choice whereby everyone is afforded proportional, effective and responsive representation. This is reflected by the fact that PD-13 preserves the existing number of Representatives accountable to the voters in Districts 6 and 7, as well as, the number of opportunities to participate on Boards;
- o. In contrast, as the result of a prior East/West configuration, there has been an egregious lack of parity in the representation of interests particularly in that of zoning, land use, Code Enforcement and investment of our tax dollars in basic infrastructure;
- p. The source of disparity was created by that previous East/West configuration. Thankfully, the present North/South orientation has quite obviously proved successful in providing significant progress in the remediation of this inequity;
- q. Finally, the only justification which has been presented for the East/West reorientation of District 6 and 7, has been the possibility of future annexation growth which is actually impossible because we are right up against Socorro and which, as stated on multiple occasions, is not permissible much less legitimate criteria for redistricting by either this Commission or by City Council.

As footnote, Dr. Ramirez explained, she had heard a comment earlier this evening and would like to clarify. The longtime residents of the Lower Valley have always considered the boundaries of the Lower Valley as being somewhere around Carolina Street and on to the East; not anywhere to the west of Carolina. Dr. Ramirez thanked Commissioners for their kind attention..

- 3. Ms. Alejandra Martinez, resident of District 7, stated her concern is that there are those that assume, because of culture, she would be more comfortable having District 7 redrawn to have the District completely south of I-10. She disagreed with this thought. She has no problem sharing her culture with citizens of the entire city; especially north of the I-10. She strongly urged Commissioners not to allow I-10 to be used as a segregationist tool.
- 4. Mr. Ed Talamantes, resident of District 7, stated it was his opinion that separating the District by I-10 is a big mistake. Mr. Talamantes felt since the District was joined with the North side, it has been good for both sides. Before the two sides joined together, he saw no street improvements; however, Representative Ortega has paved the streets and made improvements in his area. At the previous meeting, Mr. Talamantes was concerned when Commissioners changed the format of the agenda because you wanted our input and as Commissioner Graham stated Commissioners wanted to give the public their attention. However, he felt that at the end of that Public Comment session, a Motion was made and voted on; however, three of the four maps showed District 7 in the North/South orientation separated by I-10; luckily that motion did not pass. He thought it was a big mistake to go with that line of thought. El Paso is predominantly Hispanic, not that much of a difference in culture. He could not speak for the other Districts but he wanted what was best for all Districts and the people of the El Paso. Residents of District 7 have

previously stated we do not favor splitting the District; however, most of these maps show a split District. He wondered if Commissioners were really listening to or caring about what the public was saying. Mr. Talamantes stated that as long as Commissioners follow the laws and voter guidelines, public input should have a lot of pull in this matter.

5. Ms. Laurie Cooper, resident of District 7, explained she did submit the PD-12 map but felt the map did not represent her intentions. Ms. Cooper directed her comments to the PD-13 map and keeping Districts 6 and 7 in a North/South configuration. Regarding voter patterns over the last 10 years, Ms. Cooper stated, both Districts are very cohesive and as far as voting percentages go, everyone has been able to elect the candidate of their choice by significant margins, well over 50%, for the last 10 years. They end up with very, very competitive races because they have a diversity of candidates which they really, really like. Those North of the Interstate, have shown very strong support for Valley candidates and [groups south of I-10] have also shown very, very strong support for very good North of I-10 type of candidates. In 2000, the demographics at that point in District 7 was about 80% Hispanic; currently, the demographics on the eastside is about 88% Hispanic in Districts 3, 5, 6 and 7. Keeping the Districts North/South is more representative of who they are and the people who live on the eastside and it is the only fair map. Ms. Cooper asked the Commission to consider the PD-14 map because she felt that there is a strong concern in the Downtown area and they would like those to also be addressed. However, Ms. Cooper did submit PD-13 because it was their understanding that that was what Commissioners Jorgensen and Karlsruher wanted and Ms. Cooper and others wanted to meet all the criteria, not verge outside of criteria and bring in illegitimate criteria that has been done with this East/West orientation of the eastside. Ms. Cooper strongly, strongly encouraged Commissioners to do what is fair, because the East/West orientation is not. It reeks of other purposes other than what you were mandated to do by the Voter Rights Act.

#### **CLARIFICATION**

Mr. Coronado clarified that Staff did have to adjust Ms. Cooper's PD-13 map due to the newly drawn County Voting Precinct boundary lines. Staff wanted to honor Ms. Cooper's changes as best we could; however, there was a change in the lines on the Westside which forced Staff to adjust two Precincts. If staff had not made that adjustment, the deviation total for the PD-13 map would have been 6%; still below the 10% benchmark, but higher than the current 2.5%.

6. Mr. Jesus Bartholomeu Ochoa, Jr., stated that he has been interested in the redistricting process since the 1980's. Mr. Ochoa explained that he had filed a successful federal lawsuit against EPISD to have single member Districts, which was followed by lawsuits against the college and YISD. Back then, the City on its own did the redistricting without a lawsuit. Last time around, when Mr. Sebastian Martinez had heavy input in the redistricting process, is how South El Paso became merged in a goofy District that is now District 8. The Community of Interest in South El Paso has nothing in common with the Community of Interest in the Upper West Side. That is a moral, moral ugliness that exists today, it needs to be corrected. Adding more Westside Precincts to District 8 will further



dilute whatever voter strength, which is low anyway, lies in South El Paso. Do the right thing, do not add Westside Precincts to District 8. If the Commission must add Precincts to District 8, Mr. Ochoa urged that District 8 move east. The population south of the freeway is much more heavily Mexican-American Latino than it is north of the freeway. The only just manner to acquire legitimate voting equality in the Southside, South El Paso particularly; is to increase its strength by moving east not by adding Westside Precincts.

7. Dr. Richard Teschner stated that he supports the PD-12 and PD-13 maps because they retain the Rim Area neighborhood, Kern Place, Robinson Avenue, the Mission Hills neighborhood in District 1 and that he opposes the PD-14 and PD-15 maps. He thanked Mr. Ochoa, Jr. as Dr. Teschner noticed that the PD-14 and PD-15 maps would have the effect of once again joining large sections of the Westside in putting our three neighborhoods with Downtown El Paso, the Segundo Barrio and the few of the Precincts east of the Segundo, including the Chamizal. Dr. Teschner strongly supports the PD-12 and PD-13 maps and opposes the PD-14 and PD-15 maps because they subtract the identified neighborhoods from District 1 where they have always been and where they want to remain.
8. Mr. David Marcus thanked and applauded Commissioners for their service to the community; however, Mr. Marcus would not give an opinion on any of the maps. The argument is still the same as it was 10 years ago between Districts 1 and 8 when he served on the Commission. It was an impossible task; however, he wished the Commissioners the best of luck.

##### **5. Commissioner's Discussion Post Public Comment**

Chair Finke stated he would like Commissioners to state their top two favorite maps.

**District 1, Commissioner Karlsruher** favors:

1. PD-13; and
2. PD-12

**District 7, Commissioner Graham** favors any map with an East/West Configuration for those eastside Districts; therefore, he favors:

1. CD-5; and
2. CD-4

Commissioner Graham explained he favored the CD-5 map over the CD-4 map due to the orientation of Districts 1 and 8 to one another.

**District 2, Vice-Chair Dominguez** stated there are five maps that he would like to see put on the table; however, at this time Vice-Chair Dominguez favors:

1. PD-13; and
2. PD-14

Vice-Chair Dominguez explained part of this process has been to gather as much of a variety of opinions and maps as possible; however, there is not one perfect map. There are aspects of the PD-12, PD-13, PD-14 and PD-15 maps that he really likes and dislikes. Noting the maps other Commissioners are putting on the table and that may be on the table, he felt that some of the key issues represented in the PD-13 and PD-14 maps should be on the table.

**District 8, Commissioner Jorgensen favors:**

1. PD-13; and
2. CD-4

Commissioner Jorgensen can work with the PD-13 map; however, she had the following major concern:

- a. *The Medical Center of America and the Airport are in the same District (District 2). At one of the public meetings, Commissioner Jorgensen remembered City Council Representative Emma Acosta commenting on the lack of representation in District 3; and*
- b. *Commissioner Silva had previously requested that Precinct 130 be located in District 5*

Regarding the CD-4 map, Commissioner Jorgensen would like to:

*Change the eastside Districts to show a North/South configuration*

**District 5, Commissioner Silva favors:**

1. PD-7; and
2. Previously mentioned CD-5 and CD-4

Regarding the PD-7 map, Commissioner Silva would like to:

*Make changes to District 2 and modify the division between Districts 1 and 8.*

Chair Finke suggested Staff prepare a matrix of some kind to keep track of the votes.

At this time, Mr. Coronado clarified the Commissioner's Votes of their favorite maps tally.

**Votes**

	A	B	C	D	E
1			Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
2	PD13		3		
3	CD5		1	1	
4	PD12			1	
5	CD4	(m)		3	1
6	PD14			1	
7	PD7		1		

After the Final Selection tally had been clarified, Chair Finke wanted to discuss the top two favorite maps, PD-13 and CD-4.

Commissioner Silva interjected that that may not be the fairest way to go about this. He explained some Commissioners may not have named their favorite map due to other Commissioners having already named that same map. Commissioner Silva thought perhaps the tally numbers might not be accurate.

Mr. Coronado created an Excel spreadsheet.

Ms. Taylor explained part of this exercise was to narrow down the list of maps so that Staff could go back and make the necessary new Voting Precinct boundary lines adjustments. It was her understanding that Commissioner's would like Staff to make those boundary line adjustments to the CD-5, CD-4 and CD-7 maps. Additionally, Staff will then create a sub-map (modified) for CD-4 with the modifications suggested by Commissioner Jorgensen. Ms. Taylor suggested Commissioners motion to direct Staff to make those adjustments to the CD-4 and PD-13 maps as suggested by Commissioner Jorgensen.

***MOTION:***

Motion made by Commissioner Jorgensen, seconded by Commissioner Karlsruher **AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO DIRECT STAFF TO REDRAW CD-4 WITH THE NORTH/SOUTH ORIENTATION INSTEAD OF THE EAST/WEST AND ALSO THE NEW COUNTY PRECINCTS. LOOK AT PD-13 WITH THE NEW COUNTY PRECINCTS. IF POSSIBLE, MOVE PRECINCT 130 INTO DISTRICT 5, TRUSTING STAFF'S JUDGMENT TO ACCOMMODATE THAT CHANGE IN POPULATION.**

**CLARIFICATION**

Mr. Coronado clarified Commissioners are requesting that Staff:

1. Modify CD-4 to reflect the North/South orientation between Districts 6 and 7;
2. Change PD-13 to show Precinct 130 added into District 5

Commissioner Jorgensen clarified Precinct 130 shows a significant population; Staff will have to make some adjustments.

Mr. Coronado concurred and added staff would make that adjustment.

Commissioner Graham requested Mr. Coronado review the map numbers again.

**Final Selection**

	A	B	C	D
1		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
2	District 1 – J Karlsruher	PD13	CD4 (m)	
3	District 2 – F Dominguez	PD13	PD14	

4	District 5 – O Silva	PD7	CD5	CD4
5	District 7 – J Graham	CD5	CD4	
6	District 8 – A Jorgensen	PD13	CD4 (m)	

Commissioner Karlsruher stated, considering the Commissioner from District 8 comment on the modification of CD-4, he would concede his second choice (PD-12) to CD-4 with modifications.

Commissioner Jorgensen noted the CD-5, PD-7, PD-12 and PD-14 maps would not move forward to City Council as there was no majority.

Chair Finke stated it would be worthwhile to look at PD-13, CD-5, PD-12, CD-4, PD14 and PD-7 again. If after looking at these maps again, Commissioners might amend their map positions. Chair Finke gave commentary on each map's current and proposed boundary lines.

Commissioner Jorgensen explained the PD-14 and PD-7 maps displace two City Council Representatives; if presented to City Council, Commissioner Jorgensen felt these maps would be DOA (Dead on Arrival).

Chair Finke asked Commissioners if they wanted to amend their previous map choices. There was no response from Commissioners. Chair Finke noted the CD-4 map preserves the East/West configuration with modification; however, the PD-13, CD-5, PD-12 show a North/South orientation.

Commissioner Graham concurred with Chair Finke and added the PD-12 map shows a North/South configuration. Commissioner Graham understood the modification requested by Commissioner Jorgensen was regarding Districts 1 and 8.

Commissioner Jorgensen clarified the modification, as unanimously voted on by Commissioners, was to modify the eastside Districts to show a North/South orientation. Basically the CD-4 map would have two versions.

Chair Finke explained Commissioners are not yet to the stage, voting on presenting the select maps to City Council. The Commission is trying to narrow the selection down so that Staff can work up the adjusted plans for Commissioner's to review at the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. He would like to preserve the major concerns of the Commissioners. For example, this Commission understands the concerns of District 1 and District 8 Commissioners; they would like to preserve, as far as possible, the existing configuration of their Districts given that District 1 needs to expand while District 8 must reduce its size. Commissioners Karlsruher and Jorgensen concurred.

Chair Finke continued the other major concern is the eastside District configurations; North/South or East/West. At this time, Chair Finke suggested Commissioners narrow down their choice of maps further by removing the PD-7 and PD-14 maps.



Commissioner Silva clarified the PD-7, PD-12 and PD-14 maps would be eliminated.

Vice-Chair Dominguez interjected he had made the suggestion to include the PD-14 map. Vice-Chair Dominguez urged Commissioners to leave the map on the table, at least until all the Commissioners are present. The Commission needs to make drastic changes in some areas; the PD-14 map achieves that objective specifically regarding Districts 1 and 8. At the time Commissioners debate the final list of maps to be presented to City Council, the conversation will have to be had as to why it might be the time to change the configuration of Districts 1 and 8.

Chair Finke would honor the Vice-Chair's request. He then asked Commissioners if they would like to eliminate the PD-7 map from the list.

Commissioner Silva urged Commissioners to leave the PD-7 map on the list. He explained that, with the modifications, the PD-7 map has features that the other maps do not.

Commissioner Jorgensen stated she would support the Chair's original suggestion to table the PD-7, PD-12 and PD-14 maps. She explained Commissioners have been meeting since October; some Commissioners have met and/or exceeded their duties and responsibilities, others have not. Those who have not will hear from their City Council Representatives at the time the maps are forwarded to the City Council.

Chair Finke then asked if Commissioners would like to eliminate the PD-12 map from the list.

Mr. Coronado interjected Commissioner Karlsruher withdrew his request to have the PD-12 map on the list and requested that his second choice become CD-4 map, with modifications. Mr. Coronado had modified the spreadsheet accordingly removing PD-12 and adding an additional vote for CD-4 [modified]. He noted that the number of pre-selected maps is now five. Regarding the CD-4 map, there are three votes as the number two choice and one vote as the number three choice.

Chair Finke continued the map review commentary with PD-13; then CD-5, CD-4, PD-14 and PD-7. Chair Finke noted Commissioner Graham strongly supports the CD-4 map.

Commissioner Graham stated the CD-4 map, as shown by Staff this evening, is not the CD-4 map Commissioners will consider. He was uncomfortable with that. Commissioner Graham explained the entire eastside will be radically changed from the current East/West configuration for Districts 5, 6 and 7. To the Commission, Commissioner Graham stated he would vote for CD-4 as it stands now

Commissioner Graham reiterated and clarified his concerns; he would like to see a map like the CD-4 map is currently for the following reasons:

- a. It does give a progressive eastside scenario; and

- b. It does not displace two of our current City Council Representatives living outside their Districts. He concurred with Commissioner Jorgensen in that that map would be DOA (dead upon arrival) at the City Council meeting.

Commissioner Graham stated presently, the CD-4 map gets around that problem, between District 1 and 8; additionally, it gives Commissioners an opportunity to move forward with a progressive map. Commissioner Graham strongly suggested that Commissioners carry the CD-4 map forward as it stands.

Mr. Coronado explained the motion made by Commissioner Jorgensen was to move the CD-4 (with modifications) and PD-13 maps forward to the next step. He explained that Commissioners could make a motion to add more maps to the list, as they stand with the new lines, with revisions and with the new lines, etc., for review at the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was Staff's opinion that Commissioners want to have at least a handful of maps to look at for the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. Commissioners have requested the following maps be presented at the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting:

1. The PD-13 map with modifications;
2. The CD-5 map, as it stands, with the new County Precinct boundary lines; (2 votes)
3. The CD-4 map, as it stands, with the new County Precinct boundary lines; (2 votes)
4. The CD-4 map with modifications and with the new County Precinct boundary lines; and (2 votes)
5. The PD-7 map as it stands with the new County Precinct boundary lines; (1 vote)

Mr. Coronado explained that would leave out the PD-14 map from the list.

Chair Finke asked to see the PD-14 map once more. He remembered the PD-14 map being highly objectionable to three of the Commissioners present.

Vice-Chair Dominguez stated he strongly favors the PD-14 map, at least for ongoing discussion purposes, and would like the PD-14 map to remain on the list. Regarding the DOA comment, Vice-Chair Dominguez understood that that was a matter of opinion; however, in the political process, nothing is dead on arrival until the votes have been counted. Vice-Chair Dominguez understood the notion that the likelihood and probability that the PD-14 map may not be voted on and passed by City Council; however, until that time when Commissioners can have a lengthier discussion regarding why this map should be considered the PD-14 map should remain on the list. Vice-Chair Dominguez was mindful and respectful of the many factors to be considered. In his opinion, the most important factor is the people residing in those Districts. Vice-Chair Dominguez was very respectful of maintaining the Kern Place, Rim Area, etc. unity; nothing in the PD-14 map undoes that unity. Vice-Chair Dominguez thought the objective for this meeting was to narrow down the list of maps so that Commissioners can organize their arguments and positions and to allow the community to speak at the next meeting. At that time, Commissioners can/will make the decision which maps to present to City Council. Vice-Chair Dominguez asked Commissioners to be more deliberative about this process so that they can have more discussion. Commissioners are at the stage where they want to narrow the list and at the next meeting, vote. For that reason, Vice-Chair Dominguez strongly, strongly advocates that

the PD-14 map remain on the table and remain open for debate and consideration. If Commissioners decide to kill it, then they kill it. In conclusion, Vice-Chair Dominguez would like to see the community make comments and Commissioners to have a longer, broader discussion on the matter.

Chair Finke understood the Vice-Chair's comments to reflect that, as a result of this meeting, Commissioners refer the following six (6) maps to the Planning Staff:

1. PD-13;
2. CD-5;
3. CD-4;
4. CD-4 (m);
5. PD-14; and
6. PD-7

**MOTION:**

*Motion made by Commissioner Graham, seconded by Vice-Chair Dominguez and CARRIED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE FOLLOWING MAPS:*

1. PD-13;
2. CD-5;
3. CD-4;
4. CD-4 (m);
5. PD-14; and
6. PD-7

**AYES:** Vice-Chair Dominguez and Commissioners Thackson, Silva and Graham

**NAYS:** Commissioners Karlsruher and Jorgensen

**ABSTAIN:** Chair Finke

*Motion passed. (4-2-1)*

Following the vote, Commissioner Jorgensen complimented the Vice-Chair on his very eloquent speech regarding every voice being heard and every possibility being considered; however, as an engineer, Commissioner Jorgensen felt compelled to response. Commissioner Jorgensen noted that since our first meeting in October, it became evident that Commissioners have very strong and varied opinions, both here and at the community meetings. Commissioner Jorgensen apologized to the Vice-Chair if he felt that her comments were too harsh but she emphasized that now is the time to whittle down the list of maps. Commissioners have to make some very hard decisions as to what we will/will not advocate for and what will/will not be discarded.

Chair Finke complimented Commissioners on their ability to whittling down the number of maps for consideration from 27 to six. Prior to the next meeting, Planning Staff will make the necessary adjustments to those six maps for presentation to Commissioners. At the next meeting, Commissioners will have the opportunity to debate, discuss and vote on which maps will be presented to City Council. As suggested by Vice-Chair Dominguez, Commissioners will severely pare down the number of maps at the next meeting.

**c. May 2012 meeting schedule**

Mr. Coronado complimented Commissioners in their making great progress tonight. The next meeting will be held April 18<sup>th</sup>, which could possibly be the last Districting Commission meeting where Commissioners will select two maps to be presented to City Council. If not, Staff will maintain the same every other week meeting schedule for the month of May, three meetings beginning May 2, meetings to be held in Council Chambers.

Chair Finke requested Commissioners make a motion to accept the meeting schedule as stated by Mr. Coronado.

**MOTION:**

*Motion made by Commissioner Graham, seconded by Vice-Chair Dominguez and **UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO ACCEPT THE MAY 2012 MEETING SCHEDULE AS STATED BY MR. CORONADO.***


**6. Adjournment**

**MOTION:**

*Motion made by Commissioner Jorgensen, seconded by Vice-Chair Dominguez and **UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:53 P.M.***



CD4 revised



# City of El Paso Districting Commission

Draft Plan  
CD-4 Revised

April 18, 2012

Alternative Plan - CD-4 Revised				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	81,000	81,140	(140)	(0.2%)
2	80,241	81,140	(899)	(1.1%)
3	82,389	81,140	1,249	1.5%
4	78,232	81,140	(2,908)	(3.6%)
5	81,091	81,140	(49)	(0.1%)
6	82,604	81,140	1,464	1.8%
7	81,682	81,140	542	0.7%
8	81,882	81,140	742	0.9%
Total	649,121	649,121		5.4%

Council District	Alternative Plan - CD-4 Revised		
	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation
1	81,000	81,140	(140) (0.2%)
2	80,241	81,140	(899) (1.1%)
3	82,389	81,140	1,249 1.5%
4	78,232	81,140	(2,908) (3.6%)
5	81,091	81,140	(49) (0.1%)
6	82,604	81,140	1,464 1.8%
7	81,682	81,140	542 0.7%
8	81,882	81,140	742 0.9%
Total	649,121	649,121	0 0.0%

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino								
			One Race									One Race								
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	81,000	54,745	21,834	1,396	124	2,040	64	70	727	58,299	37,411	17,653	1,062	103	1,547	47	48	428		
2	80,241	62,395	12,336	3,276	280	663	234	69	988	57,391	43,948	9,791	2,216	195	567	146	41	487		
3	82,389	69,755	9,678	1,758	172	493	71	84	378	61,794	50,940	8,524	1,387	140	423	64	59	257		
4	78,232	51,242	17,479	6,153	302	1,434	208	87	1,377	54,505	33,253	14,373	4,470	226	1,272	151	60	700		
5	81,091	69,904	7,288	2,445	122	715	68	69	480	52,616	44,364	5,551	1,754	85	547	40	39	236		
6	82,604	79,047	2,487	479	358	45	19	56	113	58,218	55,403	2,022	384	254	42	12	28	73		
7	81,682	69,313	9,238	1,691	132	791	51	37	429	57,751	47,716	7,701	1,262	103	629	42	27	271		
8	81,882	67,320	12,086	957	143	911	22	71	372	59,553	47,217	10,309	794	117	771	21	46	278		
Total	649,121	523,721	92,426	18,155	1,633	7,092	737	543	4,814	460,127	360,252	75,924	13,329	1,223	5,798	523	348	2,730		

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino								
			One Race									One Race								
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	100%	67.59%	26.96%	1.77%	0.15%	2.52%	0.08%	0.09%	0.90%	100%	64.17%	30.28%	1.82%	0.18%	2.65%	0.08%	0.08%	0.73%		
2	100%	77.76%	15.37%	4.08%	0.35%	0.83%	0.29%	0.09%	1.23%	100%	76.58%	17.06%	3.86%	0.34%	0.99%	0.25%	0.07%	0.85%		
3	100%	84.67%	11.75%	2.13%	0.21%	0.60%	0.09%	0.10%	0.46%	100%	82.44%	13.79%	2.24%	0.23%	0.68%	0.10%	0.10%	0.42%		
4	100%	65.50%	22.34%	7.87%	0.39%	1.83%	0.27%	0.11%	1.70%	100%	61.01%	26.37%	8.20%	0.41%	2.33%	0.28%	0.11%	1.28%		
5	100%	86.20%	8.99%	3.07%	0.15%	0.88%	0.08%	0.09%	0.59%	100%	84.32%	10.55%	3.33%	0.16%	1.04%	0.08%	0.07%	0.45%		
6	100%	95.69%	3.01%	0.58%	0.43%	0.05%	0.02%	0.07%	0.14%	100%	95.16%	3.47%	0.66%	0.44%	0.07%	0.02%	0.05%	0.13%		
7	100%	84.86%	11.31%	2.07%	0.16%	0.97%	0.06%	0.05%	0.53%	100%	82.62%	13.33%	2.19%	0.18%	1.09%	0.07%	0.05%	0.47%		
8	100%	82.22%	14.76%	1.17%	0.17%	1.11%	0.03%	0.09%	0.45%	100%	79.29%	17.31%	1.33%	0.20%	1.29%	0.04%	0.08%	0.47%		
Total	100%	80.68%	14.24%	2.80%	0.25%	1.09%	0.11%	0.08%	0.78%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.29%	0.11%	0.08%	0.59%		

City	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	76.6%	18.3%	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
CD-4 (R)	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%

D1	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.5%	38.5%	1.5%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2010	67.9%	26.8%	1.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
CD-4 (R)	67.6%	27.0%	1.7%	0.2%	2.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%

D2	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	81.6%	13.1%	3.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	79.6%	13.9%	3.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%
CD-4 (R)	77.8%	15.4%	4.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%

D3	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	86.0%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
2010	88.6%	8.3%	2.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
CD-4 (R)	84.7%	11.7%	2.1%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%

D4	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.1%	30.1%	9.0%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.8%
2010	64.6%	23.2%	7.8%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%
CD-4 (R)	65.5%	22.3%	7.9%	0.4%	1.8%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%

D5	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	78.3%	17.1%	2.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	84.5%	11.0%	2.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
CD-4 (R)	86.2%	9.0%	3.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%


D6	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	89.4%	7.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	91.1%	6.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
CD-4 (R)	95.7%	3.0%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%

D7	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	85.5%	12.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	89.0%	8.8%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
CD-4 (R)	84.9%	11.3%	2.1%	0.2%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%

D8	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	80.6%	16.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
2010	83.3%	13.7%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
CD-4 (R)	82.2%	14.8%	1.2%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%



CD4 revised




Commissioner Draft 4 revised

Current Representative District Boundaries



CD4 revised with modifications



Commissioner Draft 4 revised with modifications

☐ Current Representative District Boundaries

CD-4 revised with modifications



## City of El Paso Districting Commission

Draft Plan  
CD-4 revised with modifications

April 18, 2012

Alternative Plan - CD-4 revised with modifications				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	81,000	81,140	(140)	(0.2%)
2	80,241	81,140	(899)	(1.1%)
3	83,410	81,140	2,270	2.8%
4	78,232	81,140	(2,908)	(3.6%)
5	80,622	81,140	(518)	(0.6%)
6	80,750	81,140	(390)	(0.5%)
7	82,984	81,140	1,844	2.3%
8	81,882	81,140	742	0.9%
Total	649,121	649,121		6.4%

Alternative Plan - CD-4 revised with modifications				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	81,000	81,140	(140)	(0.2%)
2	80,241	81,140	(899)	(1.1%)
3	83,410	81,140	2,270	2.8%
4	78,232	81,140	(2,908)	(3.6%)
5	80,622	81,140	(518)	(0.6%)
6	80,750	81,140	(390)	(0.5%)
7	82,984	81,140	1,844	2.3%
8	81,882	81,140	742	0.9%
Total	649,121	649,121		6.4%

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Not Hispanic/Latino					Hispanic/Latino					Not Hispanic/Latino					Hispanic/Latino				
	One Race					Two or More					One Race					Two or More				
	White	Black/African American	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Hispanic/Latino	Two or More	Age Population	Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/Latino	White	Black/African American	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Hispanic/Latino	Two or More	Age Population	Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/Latino
1	21,834	1,396	124	2,040	64	70	727	58,299	37,411	17,653	1,062	103	1,547	47	48	428				
2	12,336	3,276	280	663	234	69	988	57,391	43,948	9,791	2,216	195	567	146	41	487				
3	8,691	1,844	167	434	64	98	342	62,369	52,445	7,620	1,457	133	373	57	64	220				
4	17,479	6,153	302	1,434	208	87	1,327	54,505	33,253	14,373	4,470	226	1,272	151	60	700				
5	7,283	2,365	122	702	68	71	477	52,206	44,035	5,540	1,706	85	528	40	39	233				
6	4,706	913	337	337	39	39	256	55,536	50,319	3,714	660	238	392	32	24	157				
7	8,011	1,271	158	411	38	38	325	60,268	51,624	6,924	964	126	348	29	26	227				
8	12,086	957	143	911	22	71	372	59,553	47,217	10,309	794	117	771	21	46	278				
Total	92,426	18,155	1,633	7,092	737	543	4,814	460,127	360,252	75,924	13,329	1,223	5,798	523	348	2,730				

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Not Hispanic/Latino					Hispanic/Latino					Not Hispanic/Latino					Hispanic/Latino				
	One Race					Two or More					One Race					Two or More				
	White	Black/African American	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Hispanic/Latino	Two or More	Age Population	Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/Latino	White	Black/African American	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Hispanic/Latino	Two or More	Age Population	Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/Latino
1	26,96%	1.7%	0.15%	2.52%	0.08%	0.09%	0.90%	100%	64.17%	30.28%	18.2%	0.18%	2.65%	0.08%	0.08%	64.17%	0.73%			
2	15.37%	4.08%	0.35%	0.83%	0.29%	0.09%	1.23%	100%	76.58%	17.06%	3.86%	0.34%	0.99%	0.25%	0.07%	76.58%	0.85%			
3	10.42%	2.19%	0.20%	0.52%	0.08%	0.12%	0.41%	100%	84.09%	12.22%	2.34%	0.21%	0.60%	0.09%	0.10%	84.09%	0.35%			
4	22.34%	7.87%	0.39%	1.83%	0.27%	0.11%	1.70%	100%	61.01%	26.37%	8.20%	0.41%	2.33%	0.28%	0.11%	61.01%	1.28%			
5	9.03%	2.93%	0.15%	0.87%	0.08%	0.09%	0.59%	100%	84.35%	10.61%	3.27%	0.10%	1.01%	0.08%	0.07%	84.35%	0.45%			
6	5.83%	1.13%	0.42%	0.62%	0.05%	0.05%	0.32%	100%	90.61%	6.69%	1.19%	0.43%	0.71%	0.06%	0.04%	90.61%	0.28%			
7	9.65%	1.53%	0.19%	0.50%	0.05%	0.05%	0.39%	100%	85.66%	11.49%	1.60%	0.21%	0.58%	0.05%	0.04%	85.66%	0.38%			
8	14.76%	1.17%	0.17%	1.11%	0.03%	0.08%	0.45%	100%	79.29%	17.31%	1.33%	0.20%	1.29%	0.04%	0.08%	79.29%	0.47%			
Total	14.26%	2.80%	0.25%	1.09%	0.11%	0.08%	0.76%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.26%	0.11%	0.08%	78.29%	0.59%			

CD-4 revised with modifications



City	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	76.6%	18.3%	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
CD-4 (RM)	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%

D1	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.5%	38.5%	1.5%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2010	67.9%	26.8%	1.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
CD-4 (RM)	67.6%	27.0%	1.7%	0.2%	2.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%

D2	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	81.6%	13.1%	3.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	79.6%	13.9%	3.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%
CD-4 (RM)	77.8%	15.4%	4.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%

D3	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	86.0%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
2010	88.6%	8.3%	2.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
CD-4 (RM)	86.1%	10.4%	2.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%

D4	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.1%	30.1%	9.0%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.8%
2010	64.6%	23.2%	7.8%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%
CD-4 (RM)	65.5%	22.3%	7.9%	0.4%	1.8%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%

D5	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	78.3%	17.1%	2.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	84.5%	11.0%	2.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
CD-4 (RM)	86.2%	9.0%	2.9%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%


D6	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	89.4%	7.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	91.1%	6.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
CD-4 (RM)	91.6%	5.8%	1.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%

D7	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	85.5%	12.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	89.0%	8.8%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
CD-4 (RM)	87.6%	9.7%	1.5%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%

D8	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	80.6%	16.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
2010	83.3%	13.7%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
CD-4 (RM)	82.2%	14.8%	1.2%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%




## CD4 revised with modifications





CD5 revised



Commissioner Draft 5 revised

☐ Current Representative District Boundaries

CD-5 Revised



# City of El Paso Districting Commission

Draft Plan  
CD-5 Revised

April 18, 2012

Council District	Alternative Plan - CD-5 Revised			Deviation
	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal		
1	80,001	81,140	(1,139)	(1.4%)
2	81,143	81,140	3	0.0%
3	82,389	81,140	1,249	1.5%
4	78,232	81,140	(2,908)	(3.6%)
5	81,091	81,140	(49)	(0.1%)
6	82,604	81,140	1,464	1.8%
7	81,682	81,140	542	0.7%
8	81,979	81,140	839	1.0%
Total	649,121	649,121		5.4%

Council District	Alternative Plan - CD-5 Revised			
	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	80,001	81,140	(1,139)	(1.4%)
2	81,143	81,140	3	0.0%
3	82,389	81,140	1,249	1.5%
4	78,232	81,140	(2,908)	(3.6%)
5	81,091	81,140	(49)	(0.1%)
6	82,604	81,140	1,464	1.8%
7	81,682	81,140	542	0.7%
8	81,979	81,140	839	1.0%
Total	649,121	649,121		5.4%

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Two or More	
			One Race									One Race								
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	80,001	60,921	15,604	1,196	140	1,518	34	76	512	58,754	43,116	12,982	960	117	1,173	25	51	330		
2	81,143	63,277	12,350	3,278	281	664	234	69	990	58,038	44,577	9,803	2,218	196	568	146	41	489		
3	82,389	69,755	9,678	1,758	172	493	71	84	378	61,794	50,940	8,524	1,387	240	423	64	59	257		
4	78,232	51,242	17,479	6,153	302	1,434	208	87	1,327	54,505	33,253	14,373	4,470	226	1,272	151	60	700		
5	81,091	69,904	7,288	2,445	122	715	68	69	480	52,616	44,364	5,551	1,754	85	547	40	39	236		
6	82,604	79,047	2,487	479	358	45	19	56	113	58,218	55,403	2,022	384	254	42	12	28	73		
7	81,682	69,313	9,238	1,691	132	791	51	37	429	57,751	47,716	7,701	1,262	103	629	42	27	271		
8	81,979	60,262	18,302	1,155	126	1,432	52	65	585	58,451	40,883	14,968	894	102	1,144	43	43	374		
Total	649,121	523,721	92,426	18,155	1,633	7,092	737	543	4,814	460,127	360,252	75,924	13,329	1,223	5,798	523	348	2,730		

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Two or More	
			One Race									One Race								
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race			
1	100%	76.15%	19.50%	1.49%	0.17%	1.90%	0.04%	0.09%	0.64%	100%	73.38%	22.10%	1.63%	0.20%	2.00%	0.04%	0.09%	0.56%		
2	100%	77.98%	15.22%	4.04%	0.35%	0.82%	0.29%	0.09%	1.22%	100%	76.81%	16.89%	3.82%	0.34%	0.98%	0.25%	0.07%	0.84%		
3	100%	84.67%	11.75%	2.13%	0.21%	0.60%	0.09%	0.10%	0.46%	100%	82.44%	13.79%	2.24%	0.23%	0.68%	0.10%	0.10%	0.42%		
4	100%	65.50%	22.34%	1.83%	0.39%	1.83%	0.27%	0.11%	1.70%	100%	61.01%	26.37%	8.20%	0.41%	2.33%	0.28%	0.11%	1.28%		
5	100%	86.20%	8.99%	3.02%	0.15%	0.88%	0.08%	0.09%	0.59%	100%	84.32%	10.55%	3.33%	0.16%	1.04%	0.08%	0.07%	0.45%		
6	100%	95.69%	3.01%	0.58%	0.43%	0.05%	0.02%	0.07%	0.14%	100%	95.16%	3.47%	0.66%	0.44%	0.07%	0.02%	0.05%	0.13%		
7	100%	84.86%	11.31%	2.07%	0.16%	0.97%	0.06%	0.05%	0.53%	100%	82.62%	13.33%	2.19%	0.18%	1.09%	0.07%	0.05%	0.47%		
8	100%	73.51%	22.33%	1.41%	0.15%	1.75%	0.06%	0.08%	0.71%	100%	69.94%	25.61%	1.53%	0.17%	1.96%	0.07%	0.07%	0.64%		
Total	100%	80.68%	14.24%	2.80%	0.25%	1.09%	0.11%	0.08%	0.74%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.26%	0.11%	0.08%	0.59%		



City	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	76.6%	18.3%	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
CD-5 (R)	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%

D1	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.5%	38.5%	1.5%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2010	67.9%	26.8%	1.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
CD-5 (R)	76.2%	19.5%	1.5%	0.2%	1.9%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%

D2	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	81.6%	13.1%	3.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	79.6%	13.9%	3.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%
CD-5 (R)	78.0%	15.2%	4.0%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%

D3	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	86.0%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
2010	88.6%	8.3%	2.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
CD-5 (R)	84.7%	11.7%	2.1%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%

D4	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.1%	30.1%	9.0%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.8%
2010	64.6%	23.2%	7.8%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%
CD-5 (R)	65.5%	22.3%	7.9%	0.4%	1.8%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%

D5	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	78.3%	17.1%	2.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	84.5%	11.0%	2.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
CD-5 (R)	86.2%	9.0%	3.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%


D6	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	89.4%	7.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	91.1%	6.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
CD-5 (R)	95.7%	3.0%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%

D7	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	85.5%	12.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	89.0%	8.8%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
CD-5 (R)	84.9%	11.3%	2.1%	0.2%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%

D8	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	80.6%	16.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
2010	83.3%	13.7%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
CD-5 (R)	73.5%	22.3%	1.4%	0.2%	1.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%



CD5 revised




Commissioner Draft 5 revised

 Current Representative District Boundaries



PD7 revised



Public Draft 7 revised

☐ Current Representative District Boundaries

PD-7 Revised



# City of El Paso Districting Commission

Draft Plan  
PD-7 Revised

April 18, 2012

Council District	Alternative Plan - PD-7 Revised			Deviation
	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal		
1	80,543	81,140	(597)	(0.7%)
2	81,089	81,140	(51)	(0.1%)
3	80,454	81,140	(686)	(0.8%)
4	81,470	81,140	330	0.4%
5	81,091	81,140	(49)	(0.1%)
6	81,355	81,140	215	0.3%
7	81,682	81,140	542	0.7%
8	81,437	81,140	297	0.4%
Total	649,121	649,121		1.5%

1 of 2

Council District	Alternative Plan - PD-7 Revised		
	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation
1	80,543	81,140	(597) (0.7%)
2	81,089	81,140	(51) (0.1%)
3	80,454	81,140	(686) (0.8%)
4	81,470	81,140	330 0.4%
5	81,091	81,140	(49) (0.1%)
6	81,355	81,140	215 0.3%
7	81,682	81,140	542 0.7%
8	81,437	81,140	297 0.4%
Total	649,121	649,121	1.5%

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Not Hispanic/ Latino										Not Hispanic/ Latino									
	One Race										One Race									
	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More	Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			
1	80,543	53,845	22,573	1,182	1,990	118	60	65	710	57,223	36,236	18,059	864	95	1,484	43	40	402		
2	81,089	67,938	8,939	2,512	260	430	181	63	766	57,144	47,709	6,799	1,619	177	352	107	40	341		
3	80,454	65,550	11,086	2,404	177	580	93	89	475	60,902	48,047	9,797	1,926	146	508	84	60	334		
4	81,470	51,785	19,555	6,443	318	1,583	238	90	1,458	57,184	33,695	16,160	4,684	239	1,405	169	61	771		
5	81,091	69,904	7,288	2,445	132	715	68	69	480	52,616	44,364	5,551	1,754	85	547	40	39	236		
6	81,355	78,048	2,414	309	358	43	20	54	109	57,325	54,722	1,966	230	254	40	13	27	73		
7	81,682	69,313	9,238	1,691	132	791	51	37	429	57,751	47,716	7,701	1,262	103	629	42	27	271		
8	81,437	67,338	11,333	1,169	148	960	26	76	387	59,982	47,763	9,891	990	124	833	25	54	302		
Total	649,121	523,721	92,426	18,155	1,633	7,092	737	543	4,814	460,127	360,252	75,924	13,329	1,223	5,798	523	348	2,730		

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total	Hispanic/Latino	Not Hispanic/Latino							Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/Latino	Not Hispanic/Latino								
			One Race									One Race								
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	100%	66.85%	28.03%	1.47%	0.15%	2.47%	0.07%	0.08%	0.88%	100%	63.32%	31.56%	1.51%	0.17%	2.59%	0.08%	0.07%	0.70%		
2	100%	83.78%	11.02%	3.10%	0.32%	0.53%	0.22%	0.08%	0.94%	100%	83.49%	11.90%	2.83%	0.31%	0.62%	0.19%	0.07%	0.60%		
3	100%	81.48%	13.78%	2.95%	0.22%	0.72%	0.12%	0.11%	0.59%	100%	78.89%	16.09%	3.16%	0.24%	0.83%	0.14%	0.10%	0.55%		
4	100%	83.56%	24.00%	7.91%	0.39%	1.94%	0.29%	0.11%	1.79%	100%	58.92%	28.26%	8.19%	0.42%	2.46%	0.30%	0.11%	1.35%		
5	100%	86.20%	8.99%	3.02%	0.15%	0.88%	0.08%	0.09%	0.59%	100%	84.32%	10.55%	3.33%	0.16%	1.04%	0.08%	0.07%	0.45%		
6	100%	95.94%	2.97%	0.38%	0.44%	0.05%	0.02%	0.07%	0.13%	100%	95.46%	3.43%	0.40%	0.44%	0.07%	0.02%	0.05%	0.13%		
7	100%	84.86%	11.31%	2.07%	0.16%	0.97%	0.06%	0.05%	0.53%	100%	82.62%	13.33%	2.19%	0.18%	1.09%	0.07%	0.05%	0.47%		
8	100%	82.69%	13.92%	1.48%	0.18%	1.18%	0.03%	0.09%	0.48%	100%	79.63%	16.49%	1.65%	0.21%	1.39%	0.04%	0.09%	0.50%		
Total	100%	80.68%	14.24%	2.80%	0.25%	1.09%	0.11%	0.08%	0.74%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.26%	0.11%	0.08%	0.59%		

City	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	76.6%	18.3%	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
PD-7 (R)	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%

D1	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.5%	38.5%	1.5%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2010	67.9%	26.8%	1.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
PD-7 (R)	66.9%	28.0%	1.5%	0.1%	2.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%

D2	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	81.6%	13.1%	3.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	79.6%	13.9%	3.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%
PD-7 (R)	83.8%	11.0%	3.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.9%

D3	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	86.0%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
2010	88.6%	8.3%	2.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
PD-7 (R)	81.5%	13.8%	3.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%

D4	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.1%	30.1%	9.0%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.8%
2010	64.6%	23.2%	7.8%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%
PD-7 (R)	63.6%	24.0%	7.9%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.8%

D5	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	78.3%	17.1%	2.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	84.5%	11.0%	2.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
PD-7 (R)	86.2%	9.0%	3.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%


D6	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	89.4%	7.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	91.1%	6.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
PD-7 (R)	95.9%	3.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%

D7	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	85.5%	12.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	89.0%	8.8%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
PD-7 (R)	84.9%	11.3%	2.1%	0.2%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%


D8	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	80.6%	16.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
2010	83.3%	13.7%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
PD-7 (R)	82.7%	13.9%	1.4%	0.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%



PD7 revised




Public Draft 7 revised

 Current Representative District Boundaries



PD13 with modifications



Public Draft 13 with modifications

Current Representative District Boundaries

PD-13 with modifications



# City of El Paso Districting Commission

Draft Plan  
PD-13 with modifications

April 18, 2012

Alternative Plan - PD-13 with modifications				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	81,000	81,140	(140)	(0.2%)
2	80,370	81,140	(770)	(0.9%)
3	81,078	81,140	(62)	(0.1%)
4	81,470	81,140	330	0.4%
5	80,622	81,140	(518)	(0.6%)
6	80,750	81,140	(390)	(0.5%)
7	82,413	81,140	1,273	1.6%
8	81,418	81,140	278	0.3%
Total	649,121	649,121		2.5%

Alternative Plan - PD-13 with modifications				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	81,000	81,140	(140)	(0.2%)
2	80,370	81,140	(770)	(0.9%)
3	81,078	81,140	(62)	(0.1%)
4	81,470	81,140	330	0.4%
5	80,622	81,140	(518)	(0.6%)
6	80,750	81,140	(390)	(0.5%)
7	82,413	81,140	1,273	1.6%
8	81,418	81,140	278	0.3%
Total	649,121	649,121		2.5%

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino					Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino										
			One Race							One Race										
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander			Some Other Race	Two or More	White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	81,000	54,745	21,834	1,396	124	2,040	64	70	727	58,299	37,411	17,653	1,062	103	1,547	47	48	428		
2	80,370	65,244	10,237	2,979	273	509	204	65	859	56,933	45,763	7,973	1,995	187	430	128	39	418		
3	81,078	68,312	9,716	1,827	166	515	69	84	389	60,796	49,882	8,514	1,435	136	446	62	59	262		
4	81,470	51,785	19,555	6,443	318	1,583	238	90	1,458	57,184	33,695	16,160	4,684	239	1,405	169	61	771		
5	80,622	69,534	7,283	2,365	122	702	68	71	477	52,206	44,035	5,540	1,706	85	528	40	39	233		
6	80,750	73,963	4,706	913	337	497	39	39	256	55,536	50,319	3,714	660	238	392	32	24	157		
7	82,413	73,389	6,918	1,261	155	328	52	52	277	59,805	52,219	5,973	980	120	273	24	31	185		
8	81,418	66,749	12,177	971	138	918	22	72	371	59,368	46,928	10,397	115	115	777	21	47	276		
Total	649,121	523,721	92,426	18,155	1,633	7,092	737	543	460,127	360,252	75,924	13,329	1,223	1,223	5,798	523	348	2,730		

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population															
	Total	Hispanic/ Latino					Not Hispanic/ Latino					Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino					Not Hispanic/ Latino								
		One Race					Two or More						One Race					Two or More								
		White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	100%	67.59%	26.96%	1.72%	0.15%	2.52%	0.08%	0.09%	100%	64.17%	30.28%	1.82%	0.18%	2.65%	0.08%	0.08%	0.73%	100%	64.17%	30.28%	1.82%	0.18%	2.65%	0.08%	0.08%	0.73%
2	100%	81.18%	12.74%	3.71%	0.34%	0.63%	0.25%	0.08%	100%	80.38%	14.00%	3.50%	0.33%	0.76%	0.22%	0.07%	0.73%	100%	80.38%	14.00%	3.50%	0.33%	0.76%	0.22%	0.07%	0.73%
3	100%	84.25%	11.98%	2.25%	0.20%	0.64%	0.09%	0.48%	100%	82.05%	14.00%	2.36%	0.22%	0.73%	0.10%	0.10%	0.43%	100%	82.05%	14.00%	2.36%	0.22%	0.73%	0.10%	0.10%	0.43%
4	100%	63.56%	24.00%	7.91%	0.39%	1.94%	0.29%	1.11%	100%	58.92%	28.26%	8.19%	0.42%	2.46%	0.30%	0.11%	1.35%	100%	58.92%	28.26%	8.19%	0.42%	2.46%	0.30%	0.11%	1.35%
5	100%	86.25%	9.03%	2.93%	0.15%	0.87%	0.08%	0.09%	100%	84.35%	10.61%	3.27%	0.16%	1.01%	0.08%	0.07%	0.45%	100%	84.35%	10.61%	3.27%	0.16%	1.01%	0.08%	0.07%	0.45%
6	100%	91.60%	5.83%	1.13%	0.42%	0.62%	0.05%	0.32%	100%	90.61%	6.69%	1.19%	0.43%	0.71%	0.06%	0.04%	0.28%	100%	90.61%	6.69%	1.19%	0.43%	0.71%	0.06%	0.04%	0.28%
7	100%	89.05%	8.39%	1.53%	0.19%	0.40%	0.04%	0.06%	100%	87.32%	9.99%	1.64%	0.20%	0.46%	0.04%	0.05%	0.31%	100%	87.32%	9.99%	1.64%	0.20%	0.46%	0.04%	0.05%	0.31%
8	100%	81.98%	14.96%	1.19%	0.17%	1.13%	0.03%	0.09%	100%	79.05%	17.51%	1.36%	0.19%	1.31%	0.04%	0.08%	0.46%	100%	79.05%	17.51%	1.36%	0.19%	1.31%	0.04%	0.08%	0.46%
Total	100%	80.68%	14.24%	2.80%	0.22%	1.09%	0.11%	0.78%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.16%	0.11%	0.08%	0.59%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.16%	0.11%	0.08%	0.59%

PD-13 with modifications



City	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	76.6%	18.3%	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
PD-13 (M)	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%

D1	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.5%	38.5%	1.5%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2010	67.9%	26.8%	1.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
PD-13 (M)	67.6%	27.0%	1.7%	0.2%	2.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%

D2	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	81.6%	13.1%	3.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	79.6%	13.9%	3.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%
PD-13 (M)	81.2%	12.7%	3.7%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%	1.1%

D3	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	86.0%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
2010	88.6%	8.3%	2.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
PD-13 (M)	84.3%	12.0%	2.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%

D4	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.1%	30.1%	9.0%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.8%
2010	64.6%	23.2%	7.8%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%
PD-13 (M)	63.6%	24.0%	7.9%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.8%

D5	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	78.3%	17.1%	2.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	84.5%	11.0%	2.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
PD-13 (M)	86.2%	9.0%	2.9%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%


D6	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	89.4%	7.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	91.1%	6.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
PD-13 (M)	91.6%	5.8%	1.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%

D7	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	85.5%	12.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	89.0%	8.8%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
PD-13 (M)	89.1%	8.4%	1.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%

D8	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	80.6%	16.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
2010	83.3%	13.7%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
PD-13 (M)	82.0%	15.0%	1.2%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%




PD13 with modifications





PD14



# City of El Paso Districting Commission

Draft Plan  
PD-14

April 18, 2012

Alternative Plan - PD-14				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting		Deviation
		Optimal		
1	80,543	81,140	(597)	(0.7%)
2	81,089	81,140	(51)	(0.1%)
3	81,716	81,140	576	0.7%
4	81,470	81,140	330	0.4%
5	80,622	81,140	(518)	(0.6%)
6	80,750	81,140	(390)	(0.5%)
7	81,494	81,140	354	0.4%
8	81,437	81,140	297	0.4%
Total	649,121	649,121		1.4%

Alternative Plan - PD-14				
Council District	2010 Population	2011 Redistricting Optimal	Deviation	
1	80,543	81,140	(597)	(0.7%)
2	81,089	81,140	576	0.7%
3	81,716	81,140	330	0.4%
4	81,470	81,140	(318)	(0.6%)
5	80,622	81,140	(390)	(0.5%)
6	80,750	81,140	354	0.4%
7	81,494	81,140	297	0.4%
8	81,437	81,140	297	0.4%
Total	649,121	649,121		1.4%

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino						Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino									
			One Race								One Race									
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	80,543	53,845	22,573	1,182	1,182	1,990	60	65	710	57,223	36,236	18,059	864	95	1,484	43	40	402		
2	81,089	67,938	8,939	2,512	260	430	181	63	766	57,144	47,709	6,799	1,619	177	352	107	40	341		
3	81,716	67,408	10,547	2,354	371	586	90	84	476	61,260	49,023	9,244	1,859	143	521	81	56	333		
4	81,470	51,785	19,555	6,443	318	1,583	238	90	1,458	57,184	33,695	16,160	4,684	239	1,405	169	61	771		
5	80,622	69,534	7,283	2,365	122	702	68	71	477	52,206	44,035	5,540	1,706	85	528	40	39	233		
6	80,750	73,963	4,706	913	337	497	39	39	256	55,536	50,319	3,714	660	238	392	32	24	157		
7	81,494	71,910	7,490	1,217	159	344	35	55	284	59,592	51,472	6,517	947	122	283	26	34	191		
8	81,437	67,338	11,333	1,169	148	960	26	76	387	59,982	47,763	9,891	990	124	833	25	54	302		
Total	649,121	573,721	92,426	18,155	1,633	7,092	737	543	4,814	460,127	360,252	75,924	13,329	1,223	5,798	523	348	2,730		

Council District	2010 Total Population										2010 Voting Age Population									
	Total	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino							Total Voting Age Population	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Latino								
			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More			White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More		
1	100%	66.85%	28.03%	1.47%	0.15%	2.47%	0.07%	0.08%	0.88%	100%	63.32%	31.56%	1.51%	0.17%	2.59%	0.08%	0.07%	0.70%		
2	100%	83.78%	11.02%	3.10%	0.32%	0.53%	0.22%	0.08%	0.94%	100%	83.49%	11.90%	2.83%	0.31%	0.62%	0.19%	0.07%	0.60%		
3	100%	82.49%	12.91%	2.88%	0.21%	0.72%	0.11%	0.10%	0.58%	100%	80.02%	15.09%	3.03%	0.23%	0.85%	0.13%	0.09%	0.54%		
4	100%	63.56%	24.00%	7.91%	0.39%	1.94%	0.29%	0.11%	1.79%	100%	59.92%	28.26%	8.19%	0.47%	2.46%	0.30%	0.11%	1.35%		
5	100%	86.25%	9.03%	2.93%	0.15%	0.87%	0.08%	0.09%	0.59%	100%	84.35%	10.61%	3.27%	0.16%	0.71%	0.08%	0.07%	0.45%		
6	100%	91.60%	5.83%	1.13%	0.42%	0.62%	0.05%	0.05%	0.32%	100%	90.61%	6.69%	1.19%	0.43%	0.71%	0.06%	0.04%	0.28%		
7	100%	88.24%	9.19%	1.49%	0.20%	0.42%	0.04%	0.07%	0.35%	100%	86.37%	10.94%	1.59%	0.20%	0.47%	0.04%	0.06%	0.32%		
8	100%	82.69%	13.92%	1.44%	0.18%	1.18%	0.03%	0.09%	0.48%	100%	79.63%	16.49%	1.65%	0.21%	1.39%	0.04%	0.09%	0.50%		
Total	100%	80.68%	14.24%	2.80%	0.22%	1.09%	0.11%	0.08%	0.48%	100%	78.29%	16.50%	2.90%	0.27%	1.26%	0.11%	0.08%	0.59%		



City	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	76.6%	18.3%	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
PD-14	80.7%	14.2%	2.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%

D1	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.5%	38.5%	1.5%	0.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2010	67.9%	26.8%	1.7%	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
PD-14	66.9%	28.0%	1.5%	0.1%	2.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%

D2	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	81.6%	13.1%	3.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	79.6%	13.9%	3.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2%
PD-14	83.8%	11.0%	3.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.9%

D3	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	86.0%	10.7%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
2010	88.6%	8.3%	2.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
PD-14	82.5%	12.9%	2.9%	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%

D4	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	56.1%	30.1%	9.0%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.8%
2010	64.6%	23.2%	7.8%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%
PD-14	63.6%	24.0%	7.9%	0.4%	1.9%	0.3%	0.1%	1.8%


D5	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	78.3%	17.1%	2.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%
2010	84.5%	11.0%	2.8%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
PD-14	86.2%	9.0%	2.9%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%

D6	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	89.4%	7.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	91.1%	6.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
PD-14	91.6%	5.8%	1.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%

D7	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	85.5%	12.1%	1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
2010	89.0%	8.8%	1.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
PD-14	88.2%	9.2%	1.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%

D8	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
2000	80.6%	16.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
2010	83.3%	13.7%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
PD-14	82.7%	13.9%	1.4%	0.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%





Public Draft 14

 Current Representative District Boundaries