

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

SHANNON PEREZ, et al.)	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
STATE OF TEXAS, et al.)	11-CA-360-OLG-JES-XR
<i>Defendants.</i>)	[Lead case]
<hr/>		
MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE)	
CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE OF)	
REPRESENTATIVES (MALC), et al.)	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
STATE OF TEXAS, et. al.)	SA-11-361-OLG-JES-XR
<i>Defendants.</i>)	[Consolidated case]
<hr/>		
TEXAS LATINO REDISTRICTING TASK)	
FORCE, et. al.)	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
RICK PERRY, et al.)	SA-11-CA-490-OLG-JES-XR
<i>Defendants.</i>)	[Consolidated case]
<hr/>		
MARGARITA V. QUESADA, et. al.)	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
RICK PERRY, et al.)	SA-11-CA-592-OLG-JES-XR
<i>Defendants.</i>)	[Consolidated case]

JOHN T. MORRIS)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.)	SA-11-CA-615-OLG-JES-XR
)	[Consolidated case]
STATE OF TEXAS, et al.)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	

EDDIE RODRIGUEZ, et al.)	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>)	
)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.)	SA-11-CA-635
)	[Consolidated case]
RICK PERRY, et al.)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	

PLAINTIFF MALC’S PROPOSED INTERIM COURT ORDERED PLANS

Pursuant to this Court’s order of October 4, 2011, (Doc. # 391) Plaintiff MALC submits the attached redistricting plans as proposed interim court ordered plans, for this Court’s consideration. MALC Exhibits 1 and 2.¹ As this Court’s Order recognized, under the current circumstances, the parties and the Court are faced with the need to consider the implementation of a court ordered plan in order to secure and protect the upcoming 2012 election process. Plaintiff MALC believes the plans presented here adhere to the strict standards required of a Court Ordered Plan.

Previously the parties submitted briefing on requirements for a Court Ordered Plan. In a nutshell, a court ordered plan is held to a higher standard than legislative plans in adherence to the requirements of one person, one vote. *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U. S. 74, 98 (1997). Although, slight deviations are sometimes allowed, population equality is the paramount objective. *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 98 (1997).

¹ Both plans have been made public and may be viewed online on the web page of the Texas Legislative Council’s District Viewer.

When developing interim court ordered redistricting plans, courts should also comply with the requirements of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. *Abrams*, 521 U.S. at 90. Moreover, court ordered plans should follow the appropriate Section 5 standards, including the body of administrative and judicial precedents developed in Section 5 cases. *McDaniel v. Sanchez*, 452 U.S. 130, 148-49 (1981) (quoting S. REP. NO. 94-295, at 18-19 (1975) on extension of Voting Rights Act); *Abrams*, 521 U.S. at 96. Thus, the court's plan should meet the requirements and standards of Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Finally, when faced with the necessity of drawing district lines by judicial order, a court, as a general rule, should be guided by the legislative policies underlying the existing plan, **to the extent those policies do not lead to violations of the Constitution (e.g. one person, one vote) or the Voting Rights Act.** *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 79 (1997) (citing *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 43 (1982)).

Texas House of Representatives

Plaintiff MALC submits Plan H295 for this Court's consideration as an interim court ordered plan for use in the 2012 Texas elections. (Exhibit No. 1) Plan H295 provides election districts for the Texas House of Representatives that meet this Court's obligations with regard to one person, one vote, Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act and that adheres to the legislative goals of the existing plan, to the extent these goals do not interfere with the requirements of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. The plan was developed by drawing in the protected Voting Rights Act districts, while attempting to equalize population across the plan, drawing districts that are reasonably compact and contiguous. The plan also attempts to be mindful of the requirements for honoring local jurisdiction boundaries, including cities and counties to the degree possible.

A. One Person, One Vote

MALC's plan H295 makes an effort to achieve population equality between districts, while paying due deference to Texas' legislative goals. Plan H295 has a top to bottom deviation from ideal population equality of 6.87%. By contrast, plan H283 has a top to bottom deviation of 9.92%. Plan H295 has an average deviation of only 1.72%, while plan H283 has an average deviation of 2.75%. H295 achieves these deviations by equalizing population within urban counties and by avoiding the use of population distribution for improper reason such as racial advantage. For instance, the average deviation within Hidalgo and Cameron Counties is less than 1% at .66%. In Dallas the average deviation is also below 1% at .9%. In Harris County and in Bexar County the average deviations are 1.72% and 1.79% respectively.

With regard to the use of population variance to advance any racial advantage, a review of the deviations in a similar manner used by Dr. Kousser in his analysis of H283 shows no possible misuse of population variances in Plan 295. Of the 83 Anglo majority districts in H295 40 or 48.2% are overpopulated and 42 or 50.6% are underpopulated and one district is at 0% deviation.² In plan H295 of the 38 majority Latino districts 26 have deviations below 2% and 30 have deviations below 3%. Similarly, of the 83 Anglo majority districts 45 have deviations below 2% and 72 have deviations below 3%. Only one Anglo majority district has a deviation greater than -4%, (HD 71 - which can be accounted for by compliance with the State's whole county rule) and none have deviations above +4%. Among Latino majority districts the average deviation is 1.96% and Anglo majority districts have an average deviation of 1.69%. Of the seven districts with a deviation of more than -4% in the Latino majority districts 5 are in El Paso

² In contrast Dr. Kousser found that H283 underpopulated 57.5 % of Anglo majority districts and overpopulated 59 % of Latino majority districts. (Plaintiff MALC Exhibit 19, p 64)

where the county line is kept intact and in Nueces County where the MALC plan restores a VRA protected majority Latino district (HD 33).

Over the entire map, 111 of the 150 districts have deviations of less than 2%. In order to achieve these deviation ranges plan H295 does cut 31 county lines compared to 16 cut in H283, it does not make wholesale county cuts to achieve zero deviation. Thus, the plan balances the need to advance the State's interest in maintaining county lines whole and allows for slight deviations, yet maintains population equality as the paramount objective of the plan. *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 98 (1997).

B. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

As mentioned above, when developing interim court ordered redistricting plans, courts should also comply with the requirements of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. *Abrams*, 521 U.S. at 90. As detailed in the evidence and post - trial brief presented to this Court, the population growth of the state over the last decade, together with the voting patterns in Texas primary and general elections provide the foundation for additional Section 2 Texas House districts in West Texas, South Texas, Harris County, and El Paso County.

In Plaintiff MALC's post trial brief, plaintiff discussed the standard for evaluating and applying the Section 2 legal standard with regard to the facts of this case. In summary, Plaintiff was able to show that additional reasonably compact majority Latino citizen voting age population districts were possible to draw in West Texas, South Texas, Harris County and El Paso County. Plaintiff also established the existence of racial bloc voting and thus Latino political cohesion and Anglo bloc voting sufficient to defeat the Latino preferred candidates. Finally, in a review of the totality of circumstances, Plaintiffs in this litigation met their burden of establishing that Latino voters of Texas do not have an equal opportunity to participate in the

political process and elect candidates of their choice. Therefore, the plan submitted here by MALC, provides additional Latino majority districts in its proposed interim court ordered plan.

Plan H295, in El Paso provides 5 reasonably compact districts with majority SSVR, majority HVAP, and majority HCVAP districts compared to only 4 in the Defendants' plan H283. Plan H295 also created a new Latino opportunity district, HD 35, in the Hidalgo County/Cameron County area. Plaintiff MALC's exhibit 1. HD 35 in plan H295 is reasonably compact and has an 85.8% HVAP, 76.6% SSVR, and 77.8% HCVAP. Plaintiff MALC's Exhibit 1. District 35 in Plan H295 was created without impacting the other Latino opportunity districts in Hidalgo and Cameron County and no comparable district exists in H283.

H295 also developed a district in west Texas, HD 81. HD 81 is reasonably compact, and has 51% SSVR, 61.4% HVAP, and 51.6% HCVAP. Plaintiff MALC's Exhibit 1. No comparable districts exist in the State's new plan, H283.

In Harris County plan H295 maintains the current Latino opportunity districts, but also enhances the Latino population in district 144 so that it goes from an emerging Latino district to a true Latino opportunity district. Tr. Vol. I, pp. 79-81; Plaintiff MALC's Exhibit No. 1. In MALC's plan H295, Harris County district 144 contains 72% HVAP, 52.5% HCVAP and 51.4 % SSVR. Plaintiff MALC's Exhibit No. 1. In the state's plan H283, no new Latino opportunity districts in Harris County are created. Instead, the Defendants suggest that their obligation under the Voting Rights Act was met when they raised the SSVR numbers of an existing Latino opportunity district HD 145. Tr. Vol. I, pp. 80-81; Plaintiff MALC's Exhibit 19, p. 71 n. 33; Farrar supplemental proffer declaration, Docket # 331-3 (Exhibit C).

Thus no comparable district to MALC's plan H295, district 144, exists in Harris County under H283.

With these added Latino majority districts the court's obligation to meet the requirements of Section 2 are accomplished.

C. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act

In addition the plan restores districts where the State attempted to reduce Latino opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. As mentioned above, the courts are obligated to adhere, when developing interim court ordered redistricting plans, to the requirements of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. *Abrams*, 521 U.S. at 96. In doing so, the court ordered plans should follow the appropriate Section 5 standards, including the body of administrative and judicial precedents developed in Section 5 cases. *McDaniel v. Sanchez*, 452 U.S. 130, 148-49 (1981) (quoting S. REP. NO. 94-295, at 18-19 (1975) on extension of Voting Rights Act); *Abrams*, 521 U.S. at 96.

Plan H295, attempts to do this by restoring district 33 to Nueces County. In MALC's plan H295, district 33 in Nueces County contains 62.2% HVAP, 55.5% SSVR, and 59.4% HCVAP. Exhibit 1. In the state's plan H283 district 33 is removed from Nueces County and transferred to Rockwall County in north Texas and is no longer a Latino opportunity district.

In addition, House districts 117, 78, 35 and 41 were reduced in Latino voting strength in H283 sufficiently to pose Section 5 violations. Therefore H295 restores those districts to their prior Latino voting strength.

The plan submitted by MALC, plan 295 complies with the requirement so Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

D. Legislative Goals

The overarching goal expressed by the State in this case was securing enough votes to pass a plan. Tr. Vol. 7, pp. 1555-6 (Q: What were your priorities for the redistricting in this session? A. Pass maps, pass bills.) This meant making sure the plan favored Republicans. *Id.* With regard to compliance with Article III, Section 26, the so-called whole county rule, the State's redistricting Chairman testified that all other legal obligations were subordinate to this requirement, including compliance with Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Tr. Vol. 7, pp. 1592-3 (Solomons testimony). With regard to one person one vote the goal was to stay below 10% top to bottom, since the drafters of the State House plan operated on the notion that a "safe harbor" of 10% shielded the State from any inquiry regarding population deviations. Tr., Vol. 6, p. 1473, line 18 to page 1474, line 18. (Interiano testimony); Solomons Deposition, pp. 115-117; Tr. Vol. 7, p. 1596, lines 2-6 (Solomons testimony).

This Court's obligations regarding these stated policy choices is that as a general rule, the court should be guided by these legislative policies only **to the extent those policies do not lead to violations of the Constitution (e.g. one person, one vote) or the Voting Rights Act.** *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 79 (1997) (citing *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 43 (1982)). Moreover, with regard to the policy choice of giving the party in power sufficient advantage to insure passing a bill, it would be inappropriate for the court to honor partisan concerns in its interim plan. *Cox v. Larios*, 542 U.S. 947 (2004); *LULAC v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399, 460 (2006).

In addition the court should look to traditional redistricting principles to guide its hand in the development of an interim plan. *Balderas v. Texas*, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25740, (E. D. Tex., 2001). ("Although a court must defer to legislative judgments on reapportionment as much as possible, it is forbidden to do so when the legislative plan **would not meet the special**

standards of population equality and racial fairness that are applicable to court-ordered plans."³ Rather, the court must draw a redistricting plan according to "neutral districting factors," including, *inter alia*, compactness, contiguity, and respecting county and municipal boundaries.)

Plan H295 provides reasonable compact districts, are contiguous and honors city and county boundaries so long as doing so does not violate the Constitution (e.g. one person, one vote rule) or the Voting Rights Act. *See* Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 1. Finally, the plan attempts to avoid splitting voting precincts (vtds) so that election officials may be in a better position to implement the plan under the current circumstances. Thus while the plan H283 splits 422 precincts, MALC's plan H295 splits 294 precincts.

A review of Plan H295 shows that the plan submitted by Plaintiff MALC, meets the standards for an interim court ordered plan, and strikes a balance between the obligations of this Court and the State's goals in redistricting. Plaintiff MALC requests this Court order Plan H295 for use in the upcoming 2012 election.

Texas Congressional Districts

Plaintiff MALC submits Plan C211 for this Court's consideration as an interim court ordered plan for use in the 2012 Texas elections. (Exhibit No. 1) Plan C211 provides election districts for the Texas Congressional Districts that meet this Court's obligations with regard to one person, one vote, Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act and that adheres to the legislative goals of the existing plan, to the extent these goals do not interfere with the requirements of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. The plan was developed by drawing in the protected Voting Rights Act districts, while attempting to equalize population across the plan, drawing districts that are reasonably compact and contiguous. The plan also attempts to be

³ *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 39, 71 L. Ed. 2d 725, 102 S. Ct. 1518 (1982) (per curiam).

mindful of the requirements for honoring local jurisdiction boundaries, including cities and counties to the degree possible.

A. One Person, One Vote

MALC plan C211 is a zero deviation plan that incorporates four new districts into a state-wide congressional redistricting plan, for a total of 36 districts. No district varies from the ideal by more than one or two people. Of the 36 districts 26 have no deviation from the ideal population at all. Exhibit No. 2. Only one district varies from the ideal by two people and nine districts vary from the ideal by only one person. Plan C211 comports with the court's obligations to adhere to strict population equality when drawing an interim court ordered congressional redistricting plan.

B. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

As described above, when developing interim court ordered redistricting plans, courts should also comply with the requirements of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. *Abrams*, 521 U.S. at 90. As detailed in the evidence presented at the trial of this cause and Plaintiffs' post-trial briefs presented to this Court, the population growth of the state over the last decade, together with the voting patterns in Texas primary and general elections, provide the foundation for additional Section 2 Texas Congressional districts in Central Texas, South Texas, and Dallas County.

In Plaintiff MALC's post trial brief, plaintiff discussed the standard for evaluating and applying the Section 2 legal standard with regard to the facts of this case. In summary, Plaintiff was able to show that additional reasonably compact majority Latino citizen voting age population districts were possible to draw in Central Texas, South Texas and Dallas County. Plaintiff also established the existence of racial bloc voting and thus Latino political cohesion

and Anglo bloc voting sufficient to defeat the Latino preferred candidates. Finally, in a review of the totality of circumstances, Plaintiffs in this litigation met their burden of establishing that Latino voters of Texas do not have an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice. Therefore, the plan submitted here by MALC, C211 provides additional Latino majority districts in its proposed interim court ordered plan.

In general Plan C211 provides more minority opportunity districts than do the State’s plans, C100 or C185, with 9 Spanish Surnamed Voter Registration (SSVR) majority districts, two more than the newly adopted plan, C185, or the current plan C100. Plan C211 also provides 9 districts with majority Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population (HCVAP) again more than either C100 or C185.

The development of plan C211 started with creating districts for the current three African American opportunity districts and the seven Latino opportunity districts that maintained minority populations at effective levels and insuring that they remain viable African American and Latino opportunity districts by reviewing election outcomes. The following describes one indicator of effectiveness for each of these districts:

African American Opportunity Districts

District	C100	C185	C211
9	74.3%BHVAP ⁴	72.4%BHVAP ⁵	72.4%BHVAP ⁶
18	76.2%BHVAP ⁷	71.7%BHVAP ⁸	71.7%BHVAP ⁹
30	76.7%BHVAP ¹⁰	81.5%BHVAP ¹¹	69.2%BHVAP ¹²

⁴ 36.3%BVAP

⁵ 37.6%BVAP

⁶ 37.6%BVAP

⁷ 37.9%BVAP

⁸ 40.5%BVAP

⁹ 40.5%BVAP

¹⁰ 42.5%BVAP

¹¹ 46.5%BVAP

Latino Opportunity Districts

15	71.3%SSVR	66.8%SSVR	70.9%SSVR
16	69.3%SSVR	67.4%SSVR	61.9%SSVR
20	59.2%SSVR	56.3%SSVR	53.4%SSVR
23	52.6%SSVR	54.8%SSVR	59.8%SSVR
27	61.1%SSVR	36.7%SSVR ¹³	68.0%SSVR
28	66.0%SSVR	64.1%SSVR	51.1%SSVR
29	52.6%SSVR	53.0%SSVR	53.0%SSVR

In Plaintiff MALC's post trial brief, plaintiff discussed the standard for evaluating and applying the Section 2 legal standard with regard to the facts of this case. In summary, Plaintiff was able to show that additional reasonably compact majority Latino citizen voting age population districts were possible to draw in Central Texas, South Texas, and Dallas County. Plaintiff also established the existence of racial bloc voting and thus Latino political cohesion and Anglo bloc voting sufficient to defeat the Latino preferred candidates. In addition, the evidence established that African Americans and Latinos were politically cohesive in the Texas general elections. Finally, in a review of the totality of circumstances, Plaintiffs in this litigation met their burden of establishing that Latino voters of Texas do not have an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice. Therefore, the plan submitted here by MALC, provides additional Latino and African American majority districts in its proposed interim court ordered plan.

In South Texas Plaintiff MALC has developed an additional opportunity district anchored in Hidalgo County. CD 33 in plan C211 provides Latinos a new opportunity to elect a candidate

¹² 40.4%BVAP

¹³ The state created a replacement district with a majority SSVR of 71.9% in CD 34.

of choice. CD 33 has a Latino voting age population of 60.4%; a SSVR of 50.0% and a Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population of 52.9%. The district runs north and south and is similar in shape and length to existing CD 15.

In Central Texas Plaintiff MALC has developed an additional opportunity district anchored in Bexar County and runs into Travis County. CD 34 in plan C211 provides Latinos a new opportunity to elect a candidate of choice. CD 34 has a Latino voting age population of 61.5%; a SSVR of 51% and a Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population of 56.5%. The district runs north and south and is more compact and about the same in length and better performing than CD 35 in the State's new plan C185.

In the Dallas/Tarrant County metroplex, Plaintiff MALC has developed two additional minority opportunity districts. CD 35 has a Black and Hispanic voting age population of 59.5% and a Black and Hispanic citizen voting age population of about 51%. CD 32 has a HVAP of 66.1%, a BHVAP of 77% and a Black and Hispanic citizen voting age population of 57.0% of which at least 45.5% is HCVAP.

The Defendant State of Texas has no comparable districts in C100 or C185. District 35 in plan C185 is the closest to being a comparable district to CD 34 in plan MALC plan C211, but fails to provide a SSVR majority.

With these added Latino majority districts the court's obligation to meet the requirements of Section 2 are accomplished.

C. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act

MALC plan C211 avoids the Section 5 retrogression contained in the State's C185 by making sure that the performance of CD 23 is not reduced but rather enhanced and by insuring that the Latino population of Nueces County remains in CD 27. In addition by adding the

Section 2 districts described above MALC plan C211 fully complies with both Section 2 and Section 5.

D. Legislative Goals

MALC's plan C211 attempts to comply with the State's goals for achieving population equality and maintaining reasonably compact and contiguous congressional districts. The plan submitted by Plaintiff MALC is as more compact overall than the plan adopted by the State, plan C185. In addition as with C185, the MALC plan achieves population equality.

In addition, because Texas congressional delegation grew by four, MALC looked to the *Balderas* court decision for guidance in placing the new districts. *Balderas v. Texas*, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25740, (E. D. Tex., 2001). Therefore, as was done in *Balderas*, after the development of the existing VRA protected districts, MALC placed the new districts where the population growth of Texas merited the new districts. As testimony established at trial, almost 90% of the population growth in Texas was minority population growth. Therefore, it made sense to put the new districts in South Texas, Central Texas and the Metroplex, since minority population growth and concentrations were heaviest in these areas.

Once the VRA districts were drawn and the new districts were placed, the rest of the map was drawn to insure compactness, contiguity and communities of interest.

A review of Plan C211 shows that the plan submitted by Plaintiff MALC, meets the standards for an interim court ordered plan, and strikes a balance between the obligations of this Court and the State's goals in redistricting. Plaintiff MALC requests this Court order Plan C211 for use in the upcoming 2012 election.

DATED: October 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jose Garza
JOSE GARZA

Texas Bar No. 07731950
Law Office of Jose Garza
7414 Robin Rest Dr.
San Antonio, Texas 78209
(210) 392-2856
garzpalm@aol.com

JOAQUIN G. AVILA
LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 33687
Seattle, Washington 98133
Texas State Bar # 01456150
(206) 724-3731
(206) 398-4261 (fax)
jgavotingrights@gmail.com

Ricardo G. Cedillo
State Bar No. 04043600
Mark W. Kiehne
State Bar No. 24032627
DAVIS, CEDILLO & MENDOZA, INC.
McCombs Plaza, Suite 500
755 E. Mulberry Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212
Tel.: (210) 822-6666
Fax: (210) 822-1151
rcedillo@lawdcm.com
mkiehne@lawdcm.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR MEXICAN AMERICAN
LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS, TEXAS HOUSE
OF REP. (MALC)
CAUSE NO. 5:11-CV-361-OLG-JES-XR**


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been sent by the Court's electronic notification system October 17, 2011, to counsel of record registered with the court to receive same and to those not so registered the foregoing document has been sent by email as agreed by the parties for each of the cases referenced above.

_____/s/ Jose Garza_____
Jose Garza

EXHIBIT #2

PLANC211 & Redistricting Reports




BEXAR COUNTY



U.S. Congressional Districts Proposed Plan PLANC211

COUNTIES
PLANC211



Map ID 5900
10/17/11 12:23:47
17522
2010 Census
PLANC211
2011-10-17 12:15:02
Texas Legislative Council






Map ID 5900
10/17/11 12:33:47
Texas Legislative Council

17522
2010 Census
PLANC211 2011-10-17 12:15:02

DALLAS COUNTY

U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan
PLANC211


 COUNTRIES
PLANC211




EL PASO COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLANC211

 **COUNTIES**
PLANC211



Map ID: 5900
 10/27/11 12:23:47
 17532
 2010 Census
 PLANC211 2011-10-17 12:15:02


FORT BEND COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLANC211

COUNTIES
PLANC211



17532
 2010 Census
 PLANC211 2011-10-17 12:15:02






HAYS COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLANC211

COUNTIES
PLANC211



17322
 2010 Census
 PLANC211 2011-10-17 12:15:02

Map ID 5950
 10/17/11 12:53:47
 Texas Legislative Council




HIDALGO COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLAN C211

COUNTIES
PLAN C211



Map ID: 5500
 10/17/11 12:23:47
 1752
 2010 Census
 PLAN C211
 2011-10-17 12:13:02

 State of Texas
 County of Hidalgo




NUECES COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLANC211

COUNTIES
 PLANC211



17522
 2010 Census
 PLANC211 2011-10-17 12:15:02
 Map ID 5900
 10/17/11 12:23:47
 Texas Legislative Council




SAN PATRICIO COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLANC211

COUNTIES
 PLANC211



17522
 2010 Census
 PLAN211 2011-10-17 12:15:02
 Map ID 5900
 10/7/11 12:23:47



TARRANT COUNTY

U.S. Congressional Districts Proposed Plan PLANC211

COUNTIES


 PLANC211



17522
 2010 Census
 PLANC211 2011-10-17 12:15:02



Map ID 5890
 10/17/11 12:23:47
 Texas Legislative Council



TRAVIS COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
 Proposed Plan
PLAN C211


 COUNTIES
PLAN C211



17922
 2010 Census
 PLAN C211 2011-10-17 12:15:02



Map ID 5900
 10/17/11 12:23:47
 Travis Legislative Council

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

Total State Population	25,145,561
Total Districts Required	36
Ideal District Population	698,488
Unassigned Population	0
Districts in Plan	36
Unassigned Geography	No
Districts Contiguous	Yes

	Population	-----Deviation-----	
		Total	Percent
Plan Overall Range		3	0.00%
Smallest District (10)	698,486	-2	0.00%
Largest District (22)	698,489	1	0.00%
Average (mean)	698,488	0	0.00%

PLANC211

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

	Deviation	Total	Anglo	Black	Hisp	B+H	Other	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O	
DISTRICT 1	-1 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,487 523,323	448,214 356,004	130,963 93,898	107,794 64,397	236,606 157,334	13,667 9,985	64.2 68.0	18.7 17.9	15.4 12.3	33.9 30.1	2.0 1.9
Angelina (100%)			86,771	54,889	13,563	17,145	30,393	1,489	63.3	15.6	19.8	35.0	1.7
Gregg (100%)			121,730	74,005	25,549	20,018	45,034	2,691	60.8	21.0	16.4	37.0	2.2
Harrison (100%)			65,631	42,654	14,844	7,254	21,948	1,029	65.0	22.6	11.1	33.4	1.6
Marion (100%)			10,546	7,564	2,418	328	2,737	245	71.7	22.9	3.1	26.0	2.3
Nacogdoches (100%)			64,524	39,699	12,222	11,356	23,359	1,466	61.5	18.9	17.6	36.2	2.3
Panola (100%)			23,796	17,521	4,008	1,970	5,949	326	73.6	16.8	8.3	25.0	1.4
Rusk (100%)			53,330	35,237	9,833	7,609	17,310	783	66.1	18.4	14.3	32.5	1.5
Sabine (100%)			10,834	9,484	848	344	1,183	167	87.5	7.8	3.2	10.9	1.5
San Augustine (100%)			8,865	6,183	2,061	532	2,586	96	69.7	23.2	6.0	29.2	1.1
Shelby (100%)			25,448	16,535	4,569	4,164	8,670	243	65.0	18.0	16.4	34.1	1.0
Smith (90%)			187,703	112,186	37,332	34,461	71,156	4,361	59.8	19.9	18.4	37.9	2.3
Upshur (100%)			39,309	32,257	3,716	2,613	6,281	771	82.1	9.5	6.6	16.0	2.0
DISTRICT 2	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 508,081	339,103 268,095	98,196 65,594	214,632 139,320	308,273 202,738	51,112 37,248	48.5 52.8	14.1 12.9	30.7 27.4	44.1 39.9	7.3 7.3
Harris (17%)			698,488	339,103	98,196	214,632	308,273	51,112	48.5	14.1	30.7	44.1	7.3
DISTRICT 3	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 498,074	432,899 322,957	68,257 44,875	101,609 64,191	167,242 107,851	98,347 67,266	62.0 64.8	9.8 9.0	14.5 12.9	23.9 21.7	14.1 13.5
Collin (89%)			698,488	432,899	68,257	101,609	167,242	98,347	62.0	9.8	14.5	23.9	14.1
DISTRICT 4	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 519,882	513,116 399,292	78,082 53,652	89,721 53,549	165,947 106,400	19,425 13,890	73.5 76.8	11.2 10.3	12.8 10.3	23.8 20.5	2.8 2.7
Bowie (100%)			92,565	61,343	23,354	6,062	29,095	2,127	66.3	25.2	6.5	31.4	2.3
Camp (100%)			12,401	7,298	2,299	2,648	4,899	204	58.9	18.5	21.4	39.5	1.6
Cass (100%)			30,464	23,522	5,498	1,053	6,515	427	77.2	18.0	3.5	21.4	1.4
Collin (9%)			73,968	55,038	3,861	13,121	16,755	2,175	74.4	5.2	17.7	22.7	2.9
Delta (100%)			5,231	4,351	431	288	706	174	83.2	8.2	5.5	13.5	3.3
Fannin (100%)			33,915	27,433	2,509	3,226	5,674	808	80.9	7.4	9.5	16.7	2.4
Franklin (100%)			10,605	8,601	479	1,333	1,804	200	81.1	4.5	12.6	17.0	1.9
Grayson (100%)			120,877	95,103	8,066	13,688	21,474	4,300	78.7	6.7	11.3	17.8	3.6
Hopkins (100%)			35,161	26,501	2,750	5,368	8,056	604	75.4	7.8	15.3	22.9	1.7
Hunt (100%)			86,129	64,393	7,711	11,751	19,211	2,525	74.8	9.0	13.6	22.3	2.9
Lamar (100%)			49,793	37,891	7,181	3,223	10,289	1,613	76.1	14.4	6.5	20.7	3.2
Morris (100%)			12,934	8,636	3,108	1,003	4,083	215	66.8	24.0	7.8	31.6	1.7
Rains (100%)			10,914	9,553	291	839	1,122	239	87.5	2.7	7.7	10.3	2.2
Red River (100%)			12,860	9,503	2,313	849	3,132	225	73.9	18.0	6.6	24.4	1.7
Rockwall (100%)			78,337	58,046	4,968	12,470	17,218	3,073	74.1	6.3	15.9	22.0	3.9
Titus (100%)			32,334	15,904	3,263	12,799	15,914	516	49.2	10.1	39.6	49.2	1.6
DISTRICT 5	-1 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,487 524,035	378,385 308,872	82,034 56,047	180,473 115,102	259,482 169,690	60,620 45,473	54.2 58.9	11.7 10.7	25.8 22.0	37.1 32.4	8.7 8.7
Collin (1%)			9,885	5,555	633	624	1,224	3,106	56.2	6.4	6.3	12.4	31.4
Dallas (29%)			688,602	372,830	81,401	179,849	258,258	57,514	54.1	11.8	26.1	37.5	8.4
DISTRICT 6	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 512,976	507,459 391,797	62,183 41,673	111,761 66,945	171,995 107,884	19,034 13,295	72.7 76.4	8.9 8.1	16.0 13.1	24.6 21.0	2.7 2.6
Ellis (100%)			149,610	97,987	14,298	35,161	48,943	2,680	65.5	9.6	23.5	32.7	1.8
Henderson (100%)			78,532	63,494	5,301	8,490	13,642	1,396	80.9	6.8	10.8	17.4	1.8
Johnson (43%)			64,491	50,931	1,788	10,318	11,998	1,562	79.0	2.8	16.0	18.6	2.4
Kaufman (100%)			103,350	72,328	11,505	17,548	28,744	2,278	70.0	11.1	17.0	27.8	2.2
Navarro (100%)			47,735	28,587	6,958	11,345	18,088	1,060	59.9	14.6	23.8	37.9	2.2
Smith (10%)			22,011	18,060	1,925	1,627	3,512	439	82.0	8.7	7.4	16.0	2.0
Tarrant (8%)			138,216	95,357	16,590	18,874	34,942	7,917	69.0	12.0	13.7	25.3	5.7
Van Zandt (100%)			52,579	45,087	1,661	4,847	6,453	1,039	85.8	3.2	9.2	12.3	2.0
Wood (100%)			41,964	35,628	2,157	3,551	5,673	663	84.9	5.1	8.5	13.5	1.6
DISTRICT 7	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 518,945	343,875 275,569	81,976 56,071	202,206 133,505	279,257 187,023	75,356 56,353	49.2 53.1	11.7 10.8	28.9 25.7	40.0 36.0	10.8 10.9
Harris (17%)			698,488	343,875	81,976	202,206	279,257	75,356	49.2	11.7	28.9	40.0	10.8
DISTRICT 8	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 516,241	476,703 368,957	62,781 45,391	137,582 86,592	198,153 130,889	23,632 16,395	68.2 71.5	9.0 8.8	19.7 16.8	28.4 25.4	3.4 3.2
Cherokee (14%)			7,037	5,061	1,088	817	1,901	75	71.9	15.5	11.6	27.0	1.1
Grimes (100%)			26,604	16,133	4,559	5,652	10,118	353	60.6	17.1	21.2	38.0	1.3
Harris (2%)			62,875	36,363	6,197	15,977	21,884	4,628	57.8	9.9	25.4	34.8	7.4
Houston (100%)			23,732	14,811	6,309	2,364	8,616	305	62.4	26.6	10.0	36.3	1.3
Madison (100%)			13,664	8,030	2,814	2,688	5,449	185	58.8	20.6	19.7	39.9	1.4
Montgomery (100%)			455,746	324,611	21,731	94,698	115,065	16,070	71.2	4.8	20.8	25.2	3.5
San Jacinto (100%)			26,384	20,204	2,893	2,880	5,677	503	76.6	11.0	10.9	21.5	1.9
Trinity (100%)			14,585	11,819	1,431	1,117	2,547	219	81.0	9.8	7.7	17.5	1.5
Walker (100%)			67,861	39,671	15,759	11,389	26,896	1,294	58.5	23.2	16.8	39.6	1.9
DISTRICT 9	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 498,416	77,211 65,555	267,466 187,186	271,030 178,387	530,075 360,764	91,202 72,097	11.1 13.2	38.3 37.6	38.8 35.8	75.9 72.4	13.1 14.5
Fort Bend (32%)			189,931	25,382	84,764	55,169	137,758	26,791	13.4	44.6	29.0	72.5	14.1

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

	Deviation	Total	Anglo	Black	Hisp	B+H	Other	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O	
DISTRICT 9	0	Total:	698,488	77,211	267,466	271,030	530,075	91,202	11.1	38.3	38.8	75.9	13.1
	0.00 %	VAP:	498,416	65,555	187,186	178,387	360,764	72,097	13.2	37.6	35.8	72.4	14.5
Harris (12%)			508,557	51,829	182,702	215,861	392,317	64,411	10.2	35.9	42.4	77.1	12.7
DISTRICT 10	-2	Total:	698,488	416,401	71,159	189,712	257,234	24,851	59.6	10.2	27.2	36.8	3.6
	0.00 %	VAP:	511,354	326,808	48,776	119,639	166,937	17,609	63.9	9.5	23.4	32.6	3.4
Aransas (100%)			23,158	16,350	397	5,690	6,014	794	70.6	1.7	24.6	26.0	3.4
Austin (100%)			28,417	18,657	2,886	6,641	9,404	356	65.7	10.2	23.4	33.1	1.3
Burleson (100%)			17,187	11,696	2,202	3,166	5,316	175	68.1	12.8	18.4	30.9	1.0
Calhoun (36%)			7,696	4,872	90	2,221	2,293	531	63.3	1.2	28.9	29.8	6.9
Colorado (100%)			20,874	12,496	2,909	5,452	8,173	205	59.9	13.9	26.1	39.2	1.0
Fayette (58%)			14,198	10,655	1,089	2,374	3,415	128	75.0	7.7	16.7	24.1	0.9
Harris (6%)			248,348	146,556	24,864	62,941	86,440	15,352	59.0	10.0	25.3	34.8	6.2
Jackson (100%)			14,075	8,855	1,072	4,079	5,063	157	62.9	7.6	29.0	36.0	1.1
Lavaca (100%)			19,263	14,674	1,416	3,077	4,398	191	76.2	7.4	16.0	22.8	1.0
Lee (62%)			10,275	7,130	1,191	1,844	3,005	140	69.4	11.6	17.9	29.2	1.4
Matagorda (100%)			36,702	17,400	4,431	14,074	18,291	1,011	47.4	12.1	38.3	49.8	2.8
Nueces (17%)			56,684	34,813	1,793	18,225	19,745	2,126	61.4	3.2	32.2	34.8	3.8
San Patricio (53%)			34,102	19,638	838	12,826	13,526	938	57.6	2.5	37.6	39.7	2.8
Victoria (57%)			49,304	31,274	2,655	14,480	16,894	1,136	63.4	5.4	29.4	34.3	2.3
Waller (100%)			43,205	19,260	11,103	12,536	23,354	591	44.6	25.7	29.0	54.1	1.4
Washington (100%)			33,718	22,394	6,173	4,641	10,660	664	66.4	18.3	13.8	31.6	2.0
Wharton (100%)			41,280	19,681	6,050	15,445	21,243	356	47.7	14.7	37.4	51.5	0.9
DISTRICT 11	0	Total:	698,488	436,771	28,789	222,495	248,268	13,449	62.5	4.1	31.9	35.5	1.9
	0.00 %	VAP:	526,756	353,742	19,471	144,546	162,851	10,163	67.2	3.7	27.4	30.9	1.9
Andrews (100%)			14,786	7,083	285	7,195	7,436	267	47.9	1.9	48.7	50.3	1.8
Blanco (100%)			10,497	8,336	109	1,909	1,994	167	79.4	1.0	18.2	19.0	1.6
Brown (100%)			38,106	28,478	1,615	7,453	8,960	668	74.7	4.2	19.6	23.5	1.8
Burnet (100%)			42,750	32,530	917	8,652	9,471	749	76.1	2.1	20.2	22.2	1.8
Coke (100%)			3,320	2,651	12	602	612	57	79.8	0.4	18.1	18.4	1.7
Coleman (100%)			8,895	7,123	246	1,419	1,637	135	80.1	2.8	16.0	18.4	1.5
Comanche (100%)			13,974	10,145	88	3,605	3,648	181	72.6	0.6	25.8	26.1	1.3
Concho (100%)			4,087	1,810	106	2,173	2,231	46	44.3	2.6	53.2	54.6	1.1
Crane (100%)			4,375	1,761	150	2,409	2,538	76	40.3	3.4	55.1	58.0	1.7
Crockett (100%)			3,719	1,312	37	2,352	2,366	41	35.3	1.0	63.2	63.6	1.1
Dawson (100%)			13,833	5,402	992	7,387	8,305	126	39.1	7.2	53.4	60.0	0.9
Ector (57%)			77,828	42,194	3,307	30,836	33,766	1,868	54.2	4.2	39.6	43.4	2.4
Edwards (100%)			2,002	947	12	1,027	1,037	18	47.3	0.6	51.3	51.8	0.9
Erath (100%)			37,890	29,382	548	7,279	7,783	725	77.5	1.4	19.2	20.5	1.9
Gillespie (100%)			24,837	19,472	123	4,969	5,043	322	78.4	0.5	20.0	20.3	1.3
Glasscock (100%)			1,226	825	17	378	395	6	67.3	1.4	30.8	32.2	0.5
Hamilton (100%)			8,517	7,495	61	863	913	109	88.0	0.7	10.1	10.7	1.3
Iron (100%)			1,599	1,153	12	407	419	27	72.1	0.8	25.5	26.2	1.7
Kimble (100%)			4,607	3,450	21	1,077	1,096	61	74.9	0.5	23.4	23.8	1.3
Lampasas (100%)			19,677	14,836	785	3,443	4,145	696	75.4	4.0	17.5	21.1	3.5
Llano (100%)			19,301	17,303	163	1,542	1,680	318	89.6	0.8	8.0	8.7	1.6
Martin (100%)			4,799	2,578	101	2,086	2,169	52	53.7	2.1	43.5	45.2	1.1
Mason (100%)			4,012	3,092	25	864	885	35	77.1	0.6	21.5	22.1	0.9
McCulloch (100%)			8,283	5,568	187	2,476	2,624	91	67.2	2.3	29.9	31.7	1.1
Menard (100%)			2,242	1,425	16	790	801	16	63.6	0.7	35.2	35.7	0.7
Midland (100%)			136,872	72,822	9,991	51,600	60,824	3,226	53.2	7.3	37.7	44.4	2.4
Mills (100%)			4,936	4,024	36	818	854	58	81.5	0.7	16.6	17.3	1.2
Mitchell (100%)			9,403	4,753	1,088	3,481	4,541	109	50.5	11.6	37.0	48.3	1.2
Nolan (85%)			12,884	7,199	805	4,808	5,532	153	55.9	6.2	37.3	42.9	1.2
Reagan (100%)			3,367	1,219	94	2,051	2,125	23	36.2	2.8	60.9	63.1	0.7
Runnels (100%)			10,501	6,841	231	3,361	3,548	112	65.1	2.2	32.0	33.8	1.1
San Saba (100%)			6,131	4,135	214	1,715	1,915	81	67.4	3.5	28.0	31.2	1.3
Schleicher (100%)			3,461	1,872	55	1,536	1,572	17	54.1	1.6	44.4	45.4	0.5
Scurry (100%)			16,921	9,773	906	6,149	6,975	173	57.8	5.4	36.3	41.2	1.0
Sterling (100%)			1,143	733	22	365	386	24	64.1	1.9	31.9	33.8	2.1
Sutton (100%)			4,128	1,639	38	2,459	2,470	19	39.7	0.9	59.6	59.8	0.5
Tom Green (100%)			110,224	63,799	5,300	39,315	43,876	2,549	57.9	4.8	35.7	39.8	2.3
Upton (100%)			3,355	1,611	74	1,644	1,696	48	48.0	2.2	49.0	50.6	1.4
DISTRICT 12	0	Total:	698,488	481,505	49,513	135,549	182,562	34,421	68.9	7.1	19.4	26.1	4.9
	0.00 %	VAP:	515,761	375,537	32,732	83,854	115,526	24,698	72.8	6.3	16.3	22.4	4.8
Parker (100%)			116,927	99,698	2,354	12,410	14,637	2,592	85.3	2.0	10.6	12.5	2.2
Tarrant (32%)			581,561	381,807	47,159	123,139	167,925	31,829	65.7	8.1	21.2	28.9	5.5
DISTRICT 13	0	Total:	698,488	470,818	45,599	162,834	205,517	22,153	67.4	6.5	23.3	29.4	3.2
	0.00 %	VAP:	522,173	373,873	31,456	101,796	132,239	16,061	71.6	6.0	19.5	25.3	3.1
Archer (60%)			5,413	4,932	47	360	404	77	91.1	0.9	6.7	7.5	1.4
Armstrong (100%)			1,901	1,725	15	124	139	37	90.7	0.8	6.5	7.3	1.9
Baylor (100%)			3,726	3,147	99	455	542	37	84.5	2.7	12.2	14.5	1.0
Briscoe (100%)			1,637	1,163	49	411	453	21	71.0	3.0	25.1	27.7	1.3

Red-100
Data: 2010 Census
PLANC211 10/17/2011 12:15:02 PM

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals

Texas Legislative Council
10/17/11 12:23 PM
Page 4 of 7

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

	Deviation	Total	Anglo	Black	Hisp	B+H	Other	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O	
DISTRICT 13	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 522,173	470,818 373,873	45,599 31,456	162,834 101,796	205,517 132,239	22,153 16,061	67.4 71.6	6.5 6.0	23.3 19.5	29.4 25.3	3.2 3.1
Carson (100%)			6,182	5,473	56	525	581	128	88.5	0.9	8.5	9.4	2.1
Childress (100%)			7,041	4,327	723	1,885	2,586	128	61.5	10.3	26.8	36.7	1.8
Clay (100%)			10,752	9,941	79	467	539	272	92.5	0.7	4.3	5.0	2.5
Collingsworth (100%)			3,057	1,937	168	916	1,047	73	63.4	5.5	30.0	34.2	2.4
Cooke (95%)			36,534	28,489	1,281	5,905	7,121	924	78.0	3.5	16.2	19.5	2.5
Cottle (100%)			1,505	1,043	142	316	450	12	69.3	9.4	21.0	29.9	0.8
Crosby (100%)			6,059	2,625	243	3,171	3,388	46	43.3	4.0	52.3	55.9	0.8
Dallam (100%)			6,703	3,726	114	2,717	2,814	163	55.6	1.7	40.5	42.0	2.4
Dickens (100%)			2,444	1,590	107	708	801	53	65.1	4.4	29.0	32.8	2.2
Donley (100%)			3,677	3,136	182	309	488	53	85.3	4.9	8.4	13.3	1.4
Foard (100%)			1,336	1,087	54	187	241	8	81.4	4.0	14.0	18.0	0.6
Gray (100%)			22,535	15,564	1,218	5,365	6,521	450	69.1	5.4	23.8	28.9	2.0
Hall (100%)			3,353	1,998	254	1,087	1,329	26	59.6	7.6	32.4	39.6	0.8
Hansford (100%)			5,613	3,088	53	2,430	2,469	56	55.0	0.9	43.3	44.0	1.0
Hardeman (100%)			4,139	2,938	271	889	1,131	70	71.0	6.5	21.5	27.3	1.7
Hartley (100%)			6,062	4,111	429	1,448	1,871	80	67.8	7.1	23.9	30.9	1.3
Haskell (100%)			5,899	4,148	261	1,414	1,648	103	70.3	4.4	24.0	27.9	1.7
Hemphill (100%)			3,807	2,656	14	1,086	1,095	56	69.8	0.4	28.5	28.8	1.5
Hutchinson (100%)			22,150	16,482	682	4,386	5,001	667	74.4	3.1	19.8	22.6	3.0
Jack (100%)			9,044	7,289	364	1,283	1,642	113	80.6	4.0	14.2	18.2	1.2
Jones (100%)			20,202	12,549	2,447	5,009	7,384	269	62.1	12.1	24.8	36.6	1.3
King (100%)			286	242	0	39	39	5	84.6	0.0	13.6	13.6	1.7
Knox (100%)			3,719	2,347	247	1,101	1,331	41	63.1	6.6	29.6	35.8	1.1
Lipscomb (100%)			3,302	2,213	32	1,007	1,020	69	67.0	1.0	30.5	30.9	2.1
Montague (100%)			19,719	17,347	111	1,930	2,010	362	88.0	0.6	9.8	10.2	1.8
Moore (100%)			21,904	8,370	388	11,542	11,856	1,678	38.2	1.8	52.7	54.1	7.7
Motley (100%)			1,210	1,013	24	163	187	10	83.7	2.0	13.5	15.5	0.8
Ochiltree (100%)			10,223	5,062	67	4,982	5,015	146	49.5	0.7	48.7	49.1	1.4
Oldham (100%)			2,052	1,699	71	243	311	42	82.8	3.5	11.8	15.2	2.0
Palo Pinto (100%)			28,111	21,958	746	4,985	5,678	475	78.1	2.7	17.7	20.2	1.7
Potter (100%)			121,073	59,322	13,672	42,692	55,447	6,304	49.0	11.3	35.3	45.8	5.2
Randall (100%)			120,725	94,361	3,644	19,775	23,068	3,296	78.2	3.0	16.4	19.1	2.7
Roberts (100%)			929	841	4	74	74	14	90.5	0.4	8.0	8.0	1.5
Sherman (100%)			3,034	1,762	15	1,227	1,240	32	58.1	0.5	40.4	40.9	1.1
Stonewall (100%)			1,490	1,206	48	209	255	29	80.9	3.2	14.0	17.1	1.9
Swisher (100%)			7,854	4,025	630	3,149	3,740	89	51.2	8.0	40.1	47.6	1.1
Throckmorton (100%)			1,641	1,453	12	152	162	26	88.5	0.7	9.3	9.9	1.6
Wheeler (100%)			5,410	3,847	149	1,344	1,481	82	71.1	2.8	24.8	27.4	1.5
Wichita (100%)			131,500	90,001	15,204	21,859	36,284	5,215	68.4	11.6	16.6	27.6	4.0
Wilbarger (100%)			13,535	8,585	1,183	3,508	4,634	316	63.4	8.7	25.9	34.2	2.3
DISTRICT 14	-1 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,487 522,774	367,382 294,984	146,279 104,462	161,968 105,361	304,595 208,249	26,510 19,541	52.6 56.4	20.9 20.0	23.2 20.2	43.6 39.8	3.8 3.7
Brazoria (62%)			194,507	112,248	18,189	59,378	76,650	5,609	57.7	9.4	30.5	39.4	2.9
Chambers (0%)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Galveston (86%)			251,707	142,631	40,715	59,691	98,926	10,150	56.7	16.2	23.7	39.3	4.0
Jefferson (100%)			252,273	112,503	87,375	42,899	129,019	10,751	44.6	34.6	17.0	51.1	4.3
DISTRICT 15	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 470,214	106,587 89,475	14,051 9,972	575,198 367,971	586,398 376,763	5,503 3,976	15.3 19.0	2.0 2.1	82.3 78.3	84.0 80.1	0.8 0.8
Bee (100%)			31,861	10,967	2,716	17,906	20,490	404	34.4	8.5	56.2	64.3	1.3
Brooks (100%)			7,223	573	48	6,590	6,612	38	7.9	0.7	91.2	91.5	0.5
Calhoun (64%)			13,685	4,922	565	7,701	8,191	572	36.0	4.1	56.3	59.9	4.2
Cameron (11%)			45,882	10,384	496	34,496	34,798	700	22.6	1.1	75.2	75.8	1.5
De Witt (100%)			20,097	11,482	2,030	6,502	8,366	249	57.1	10.1	32.4	41.6	1.2
Goliad (100%)			7,210	4,337	385	2,462	2,794	79	60.2	5.3	34.1	38.8	1.1
Hidalgo (59%)			453,484	32,548	2,953	417,188	418,585	2,351	7.2	0.7	92.0	92.3	0.5
Jim Wells (100%)			40,838	8,062	306	32,254	32,431	345	19.7	0.7	79.0	79.4	0.8
Live Oak (23%)			2,634	1,993	26	557	581	60	75.7	1.0	21.1	22.1	2.3
Refugio (100%)			7,383	3,337	534	3,487	3,957	89	45.2	7.2	47.2	53.6	1.2
San Patricio (47%)			30,702	7,692	524	22,422	22,800	210	25.1	1.7	73.0	74.3	0.7
Victoria (43%)			37,489	10,290	3,468	23,633	26,793	406	27.4	9.3	63.0	71.5	1.1
DISTRICT 16	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 488,962	122,651 100,016	32,236 20,992	535,920 360,018	561,819 378,266	14,018 10,680	17.6 20.5	4.6 4.3	76.7 73.6	80.4 77.4	2.0 2.2
Culberson (3%)			80	36	1	42	42	2	45.0	1.3	52.5	52.5	2.5
Ector (43%)			59,302	14,112	3,540	41,495	44,612	578	23.8	6.0	70.0	75.2	1.0
El Paso (77%)			619,580	100,052	27,852	484,277	506,377	13,151	16.1	4.5	78.2	81.7	2.1
Hudspeth (25%)			884	355	27	502	519	10	40.2	3.1	56.8	58.7	1.1
Loving (100%)			82	60	0	18	18	4	73.2	0.0	22.0	22.0	4.9
Reeves (6%)			792	90	12	688	694	8	11.4	1.5	86.9	87.6	1.0
Ward (100%)			10,658	4,922	613	5,074	5,590	146	46.2	5.8	47.6	52.4	1.4
Winkler (100%)			7,110	3,024	191	3,824	3,967	119	42.5	2.7	53.8	55.8	1.7

Red-100
Data: 2010 Census
PLANC211 10/17/2011 12:15:02 PM

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals

Texas Legislative Council
10/17/11 12:23 PM
Page 5 of 7

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

	Deviation	Total	Anglo	Black	Hisp	B+H	Other	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O	
DISTRICT 17	0 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,488 537,228	444,241 362,979	89,953 64,189	145,718 93,857	232,775 17,397	21,472	63.6 67.6	12.9 11.9	20.9 17.5	33.3 29.2	3.1 3.2
Anderson (100%)			58,458	35,792	12,682	9,287	21,807	859	61.2	21.7	15.9	37.3	1.5
Bosque (100%)			18,212	14,701	394	2,926	3,285	226	80.7	2.2	16.1	18.0	1.2
Brazos (100%)			194,851	115,252	22,656	45,405	67,174	12,425	59.1	11.6	23.3	34.5	6.4
Cherokee (86%)			43,808	26,831	6,828	9,682	16,351	626	61.2	15.6	22.1	37.3	1.4
Falls (56%)			9,920	4,169	3,712	2,021	5,671	80	42.0	37.4	20.4	57.2	0.8
Freestone (100%)			19,816	13,656	3,280	2,694	5,918	242	68.9	16.6	13.6	29.9	1.2
Hill (100%)			35,089	25,836	2,487	6,427	8,796	457	73.6	7.1	18.3	25.1	1.3
Hood (100%)			51,182	44,588	374	5,234	5,566	1,028	87.1	0.7	10.2	10.9	2.0
Johnson (57%)			86,443	64,614	2,951	17,001	19,745	2,084	74.7	3.4	19.7	22.8	2.4
Leon (100%)			16,801	13,078	1,266	2,260	3,493	230	77.8	7.5	13.5	20.8	1.4
Limestone (100%)			23,384	14,433	4,307	4,465	8,665	286	61.7	18.4	19.1	37.1	1.2
McLennan (49%)			115,412	54,875	25,228	33,700	58,037	2,500	47.5	21.9	29.2	50.3	2.2
Robertson (100%)			16,622	9,821	3,704	2,990	6,569	232	59.1	22.3	18.0	39.5	1.4
Somervell (100%)			8,490	6,595	84	1,626	1,698	197	77.7	1.0	19.2	20.0	2.3
DISTRICT 18	0 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,488 516,880	427,393 314,154	284,314 209,251	253,915 165,072	531,871 370,835	39,224 31,891	18.2 22.1	40.7 40.5	36.4 31.9	76.1 71.7	5.6 6.2
Harris (17%)			698,488	427,393	284,314	253,915	531,871	39,224	18.2	40.7	36.4	76.1	5.6
DISTRICT 19	0 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,488 520,468	405,139 327,050	44,551 29,600	236,077 152,296	276,748 180,496	16,601 12,922	58.0 62.8	6.4 5.7	33.8 29.3	39.6 34.7	2.4 2.8
Archer (40%)			3,641	3,250	20	315	326	65	89.3	0.5	8.7	9.0	1.8
Bailey (100%)			7,165	2,745	104	4,283	4,354	66	38.3	1.5	59.8	60.8	0.9
Borden (100%)			641	539	0	95	95	7	84.1	0.0	14.8	14.8	1.1
Callahan (100%)			13,544	12,065	209	1,025	1,221	258	89.1	1.5	7.6	9.0	1.9
Castro (100%)			8,062	3,004	173	4,828	4,982	76	37.3	2.1	59.9	61.8	0.9
Cochran (100%)			3,127	1,329	139	1,654	1,770	28	42.5	4.4	52.9	56.6	0.9
Deaf Smith (100%)			19,372	5,939	296	13,039	13,234	199	30.7	1.5	67.3	68.3	1.0
Eastland (100%)			18,583	15,271	403	2,673	3,041	271	82.2	2.2	14.4	16.4	1.5
Fisher (100%)			3,974	2,797	155	999	1,132	45	70.4	3.9	25.1	28.5	1.1
Floyd (100%)			6,446	2,777	249	3,410	3,631	38	43.1	3.9	52.9	56.3	0.6
Gaines (100%)			17,526	10,628	346	6,413	6,704	194	60.6	2.0	36.6	38.3	1.1
Garza (100%)			6,461	2,962	443	3,046	3,452	47	45.8	6.9	47.1	53.4	0.7
Hale (100%)			36,273	13,647	2,156	20,269	22,199	427	37.6	5.9	55.9	61.2	1.2
Hockley (100%)			22,935	11,795	941	9,993	10,860	280	51.4	4.1	43.6	47.4	1.2
Howard (100%)			35,012	18,801	2,414	13,255	15,471	740	53.7	6.9	37.9	44.2	2.1
Kent (100%)			808	669	12	120	128	11	82.8	1.5	14.9	15.8	1.4
Lamb (100%)			13,977	6,020	672	7,231	7,828	129	43.1	4.8	51.7	56.0	0.9
Lubbock (100%)			278,831	159,815	22,834	88,924	110,078	8,938	57.3	8.2	31.9	39.5	3.2
Lynn (100%)			5,915	2,984	145	2,743	2,868	63	50.4	2.5	46.4	48.5	1.1
Nolan (15%)			2,332	1,992	33	295	322	18	85.4	1.4	12.7	13.8	0.8
Parmer (100%)			10,269	3,943	146	6,164	6,266	60	38.4	1.4	60.0	61.0	0.6
Shackelford (100%)			3,378	2,961	56	340	374	43	87.7	1.7	10.1	11.1	1.3
Stephens (100%)			9,630	7,289	225	2,011	2,228	113	75.7	2.3	20.9	23.1	1.2
Taylor (100%)			131,506	88,121	11,313	29,074	39,358	4,027	67.0	8.6	22.1	29.9	3.1
Terry (100%)			12,651	5,747	659	6,211	6,810	94	45.4	5.2	49.1	53.8	0.7
Yoakum (100%)			7,879	3,090	103	4,622	4,697	92	39.2	1.3	58.7	59.6	1.2
Young (100%)			18,550	14,959	305	3,045	3,319	272	80.6	1.6	16.4	17.9	1.5
DISTRICT 20	0 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,488 508,749	465,846 338,189	47,433 32,656	466,225 320,803	506,678 350,450	25,964 20,110	23.7 27.2	6.8 6.4	66.7 63.1	72.5 68.9	3.7 4.0
Bexar (41%)			698,488	465,846	47,433	466,225	506,678	25,964	23.7	6.8	66.7	72.5	3.7
DISTRICT 21	0 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,488 525,420	465,826 368,667	30,712 20,465	177,274 117,780	204,723 136,869	27,939 19,884	66.7 70.2	4.4 3.9	23.4 22.4	29.3 26.0	4.0 3.8
Bandera (100%)			20,485	16,576	139	3,415	3,537	372	80.9	0.7	16.7	17.3	1.8
Bexar (20%)			344,368	199,564	19,864	109,383	127,058	17,746	58.0	5.8	31.8	36.9	5.2
Comal (76%)			82,128	65,035	1,474	14,008	15,319	1,774	79.2	1.8	17.1	18.7	2.2
Guadalupe (41%)			54,117	31,803	6,190	14,061	19,789	2,525	58.8	11.4	26.0	36.6	4.7
Hays (43%)			67,347	52,704	1,145	11,852	12,873	1,770	78.3	1.7	17.6	19.1	2.6
Kendall (100%)			33,410	25,746	243	6,829	7,016	648	77.1	0.7	20.4	21.0	1.9
Kerr (100%)			49,625	35,851	1,082	11,895	12,771	1,003	72.2	2.2	24.0	25.7	2.0
Real (100%)			3,309	2,398	29	814	840	71	72.5	0.9	24.6	25.4	2.1
Travis (4%)			43,699	36,149	546	5,017	5,520	2,030	82.7	1.2	11.5	12.6	4.6
DISTRICT 22	1 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,489 499,643	343,031 260,258	85,875 57,897	154,269 99,659	236,830 156,094	118,628 83,291	49.1 52.1	12.3 11.6	22.1 19.9	33.9 31.2	17.0 16.7
Brazoria (38%)			118,659	54,426	22,101	27,265	48,755	15,478	45.9	18.6	23.0	41.1	13.0
Fort Bend (68%)			395,444	186,298	46,020	83,798	128,050	81,096	47.1	11.6	21.2	32.4	20.5
Galveston (14%)			39,602	30,021	1,565	5,579	7,086	2,495	75.8	4.0	14.1	17.9	6.3
Harris (4%)			144,784	72,286	16,189	37,627	52,939	19,559	49.9	11.2	26.0	36.6	13.5
DISTRICT 23	1 0.00%	Total: VAP:	698,487 503,169	443,366 319,902	53,152 37,443	492,193 336,598	539,802 371,527	15,319 11,740	20.5 23.8	7.6 7.4	70.5 66.9	77.3 73.8	2.2 2.3
Bexar (14%)			245,600	77,043	46,300	115,349	158,033	10,524	31.4	18.9	47.0	64.3	4.3

Red-100
Data: 2010 Census
PLANC211 10/17/2011 12:15:02 PM

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

Texas Legislative Council
10/17/11 12:23 PM
Page 6 of 7

	Deviation	Total	Anglo	Black	Hisp	B+H	Other	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O	
DISTRICT 23	-1 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,487 503,169	143,366 119,902	53,152 37,443	492,193 336,598	539,802 371,527	15,319 11,740	20.5 23.8	7.6 7.4	70.5 66.9	77.3 73.8	2.2 2.3
Brewster (100%)			9,232	5,011	149	3,918	4,024	197	54.3	1.6	42.4	43.6	2.1
Culberson (97%)			2,318	468	23	1,785	1,798	52	20.2	1.0	77.0	77.6	2.2
Dimmit (100%)			9,996	1,217	122	8,616	8,700	79	12.2	1.2	86.2	87.0	0.8
El Paso (23%)			181,067	5,194	1,694	173,857	174,757	1,116	2.9	0.9	96.0	96.5	0.6
Frio (100%)			17,217	2,796	633	13,401	13,944	477	16.2	3.7	77.8	81.0	2.8
Hudspeth (75%)			2,592	273	35	2,266	2,289	30	10.5	1.4	87.4	88.3	1.2
Jeff Davis (100%)			2,342	1,490	43	790	816	36	63.6	1.8	33.7	34.8	1.5
Kinney (100%)			3,598	1,496	70	2,004	2,048	54	41.6	1.9	55.7	56.9	1.5
Maverick (100%)			54,258	1,552	200	51,914	52,004	702	2.9	0.4	95.7	95.8	1.3
Medina (100%)			46,006	21,408	1,214	22,871	23,888	710	46.5	2.6	49.7	51.9	1.5
Pecos (100%)			15,507	4,326	624	10,430	10,979	202	27.9	4.0	67.3	70.8	1.3
Presidio (100%)			7,818	1,136	69	6,521	6,563	119	14.5	0.9	83.4	83.9	1.5
Reeves (94%)			12,991	2,600	701	9,545	10,224	167	20.0	5.4	73.5	78.7	1.3
Terrell (100%)			984	495	9	467	475	14	50.3	0.9	47.5	48.3	1.4
Uvalde (100%)			26,405	7,666	224	18,299	18,434	305	29.0	0.8	69.3	69.8	1.2
Val Verde (100%)			48,879	8,548	924	39,199	39,824	507	17.5	1.9	80.2	81.5	1.0
Zavala (100%)			11,677	647	118	10,961	11,002	28	5.5	1.0	93.9	94.2	0.2
DISTRICT 24	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 528,138	385,261 312,257	78,372 55,128	148,072 96,523	223,075 149,940	90,152 65,941	55.2 59.1	11.2 10.4	21.2 18.3	31.9 28.4	12.9 12.5
Dallas (13%)			298,878	135,107	37,348	81,079	116,793	46,978	45.2	12.5	27.1	39.1	15.7
Denton (21%)			138,958	69,742	20,637	28,560	48,446	20,770	50.2	14.9	20.6	34.9	14.9
Tarrant (14%)			260,652	180,412	20,387	38,433	57,836	22,404	69.2	7.8	14.7	22.2	8.6
DISTRICT 25	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 532,043	461,393 367,611	39,267 26,659	140,476 94,557	176,382 119,667	60,713 44,765	66.1 69.1	5.6 5.0	20.1 17.8	25.3 22.5	8.7 8.4
Travis (43%)			436,480	303,179	18,592	76,681	93,669	39,632	69.5	4.3	17.6	21.5	9.1
Williamson (62%)			262,008	158,214	20,675	63,795	82,713	21,081	60.4	7.9	24.3	31.6	8.0
DISTRICT 26	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 498,751	492,341 366,707	47,800 31,356	117,488 72,242	162,848 102,535	43,299 29,509	70.5 73.5	6.8 6.3	16.8 14.5	23.3 20.6	6.2 5.9
Cooke (5%)			1,903	1,766	15	92	107	30	92.8	0.8	4.8	5.6	1.6
Denton (79%)			523,656	357,145	40,971	92,276	131,311	35,200	68.2	7.8	17.6	25.1	6.7
Tarrant (6%)			113,802	86,308	6,036	15,008	20,609	6,885	75.8	5.3	13.2	18.1	6.0
Wise (100%)			59,127	47,122	778	10,112	10,821	1,184	79.7	1.3	17.1	18.3	2.0
DISTRICT 27	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 489,628	119,900 100,313	17,865 12,183	553,430 370,270	567,701 380,966	10,887 8,349	17.2 20.5	2.6 2.5	79.2 75.6	81.3 77.8	1.6 1.7
Cameron (89%)			360,338	33,043	2,266	323,251	324,317	2,978	9.2	0.6	89.7	90.0	0.8
Kenedy (100%)			416	86	8	319	321	9	20.7	1.9	76.7	77.2	2.2
Kleberg (100%)			32,061	7,479	1,388	22,495	23,637	945	23.3	4.3	70.2	73.7	2.9
Nueces (83%)			283,539	77,057	13,671	188,068	199,727	6,755	27.2	4.8	66.3	70.4	2.4
Willacy (100%)			22,134	2,235	532	19,297	19,699	200	10.1	2.4	87.2	89.0	0.9
DISTRICT 28	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 489,021	158,948 132,714	48,055 34,261	482,681 313,866	526,120 345,555	13,420 10,782	22.8 27.1	6.9 7.0	69.1 64.1	75.3 70.7	1.9 2.2
Atascosa (100%)			44,911	16,295	480	27,785	28,090	526	36.3	1.1	61.9	62.5	1.2
Bastrop (35%)			26,162	13,509	1,867	10,345	12,060	593	51.6	7.1	39.5	46.1	2.3
Caldwell (84%)			31,820	14,639	2,482	14,493	16,766	415	46.0	7.8	45.5	52.7	1.3
Guadalupe (27%)			35,102	17,653	2,206	15,036	16,951	498	50.3	6.3	42.8	48.3	1.4
La Salle (100%)			6,886	894	45	5,920	5,944	48	13.0	0.7	86.0	86.3	0.7
McMullen (93%)			658	404	8	241	249	5	61.4	1.2	36.6	37.8	0.8
Travis (24%)			245,709	61,162	38,659	139,712	175,608	8,939	24.9	15.7	56.9	71.5	3.6
Webb (100%)			250,304	8,345	1,442	239,653	240,207	1,752	3.3	0.6	95.7	96.0	0.7
Wilson (100%)			42,918	25,186	840	16,412	17,148	584	58.7	2.0	38.2	40.0	1.4
Zapata (100%)			14,018	861	26	13,084	13,097	60	6.1	0.2	93.3	93.4	0.4
DISTRICT 29	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 474,490	75,894 65,330	85,885 58,974	525,996 340,423	605,971 396,348	16,623 12,812	10.9 13.8	12.3 12.4	75.3 71.7	86.8 83.5	2.4 2.7
Harris (17%)			698,488	75,894	85,885	525,996	605,971	16,623	10.9	12.3	75.3	86.8	2.4
DISTRICT 30	-1 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,487 501,090	160,102 138,603	284,793 202,376	238,123 146,606	517,732 346,556	20,653 15,931	22.9 27.7	40.8 40.4	34.1 29.3	74.1 69.2	3.0 3.2
Dallas (29%)			698,487	160,102	284,793	238,123	517,732	20,653	22.9	40.8	34.1	74.1	3.0
DISTRICT 31	-1 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,487 598,725	420,176 325,914	112,947 73,067	142,468 88,373	247,804 158,215	30,507 21,896	60.2 64.4	16.2 14.4	20.4 17.5	35.5 31.3	4.4 4.3
Bell (100%)			310,235	157,289	74,401	67,010	136,167	16,779	50.7	24.0	21.6	43.9	5.4
Coryell (100%)			75,388	46,776	13,806	11,973	24,847	3,765	62.0	18.3	15.9	33.0	5.0
Falls (44%)			7,946	5,212	921	1,695	2,583	151	65.6	11.6	21.3	32.5	1.9
McLennan (51%)			119,494	83,420	11,666	21,771	32,911	3,163	69.8	9.8	18.2	27.5	2.6
Milam (100%)			24,757	16,216	2,609	5,780	8,255	286	65.5	10.5	23.3	33.3	1.2
Williamson (38%)			160,667	111,263	9,544	34,239	43,041	6,363	69.3	5.9	21.3	26.8	4.0
DISTRICT 32	0 0.00 %	Total: VAP:	698,488 474,766	109,081 95,983	77,541 54,572	500,241 313,591	572,732 365,646	16,675 13,137	15.6 20.2	11.1 11.5	71.6 66.1	82.0 77.0	2.4 2.8
Dallas (21%)			508,156	76,085	58,686	365,231	420,160	11,911	15.0	11.5	71.9	82.7	2.3

Red-100
Data: 2010 Census
PLANC211 10/17/2011 12:15:02 PM

District Population Analysis with County Subtotals
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

Texas Legislative Council
10/17/11 12:23 PM
Page 7 of 7

	Deviation		Total	Anglo	Black	Hisp	B+H	Other	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O
DISTRICT 32	0	Total:	698,488	109,081	77,541	500,241	572,732	16,675	15.6	11.1	71.6	82.0	2.4
	0.00 %	VAP:	474,766	95,983	54,572	313,591	365,046	13,137	20.2	11.5	66.1	77.0	2.8
Tarrant (11%)			190,332	32,996	18,855	135,010	152,572	4,764	17.3	9.9	70.9	80.2	2.5
DISTRICT 33	0	Total:	698,488	178,150	42,132	451,753	490,332	30,006	25.5	6.0	64.7	70.2	4.3
	0.00 %	VAP:	490,065	144,979	28,346	296,062	322,840	22,246	29.6	5.8	60.4	65.9	4.5
Bastrop (65%)			48,009	28,937	4,580	13,845	18,132	940	60.3	9.5	28.8	37.8	2.0
Duval (100%)			11,782	1,206	124	10,424	10,512	64	10.2	1.1	88.5	89.2	0.5
Fayette (42%)			10,356	7,383	673	2,211	2,859	114	71.3	6.5	21.3	27.6	1.1
Gonzales (100%)			19,807	8,836	1,589	9,353	10,767	204	44.6	8.0	47.2	54.4	1.0
Hidalgo (41%)			321,285	28,005	2,710	285,018	286,695	6,585	8.7	0.8	88.7	89.2	2.0
Jim Hogg (100%)			5,300	334	31	4,907	4,928	38	6.3	0.6	92.6	93.0	0.7
Karnes (100%)			14,824	5,956	1,422	7,376	8,747	121	40.2	9.6	49.8	59.0	0.8
Lee (38%)			6,337	3,668	757	1,880	2,609	60	57.9	11.9	29.7	41.2	0.9
Live Oak (77%)			8,897	4,812	507	3,503	3,955	130	54.1	5.7	39.4	44.5	1.5
McMullen (7%)			49	28	0	20	20	1	57.1	0.0	40.8	40.8	2.0
Starr (100%)			60,968	2,449	88	58,337	58,358	161	4.0	0.1	95.7	95.7	0.3
Travis (19%)			190,870	86,532	29,651	54,879	82,750	21,588	45.3	15.5	28.8	43.4	11.3
Williamson (0%)			4	4	0	0	0	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
DISTRICT 34	1	Total:	698,489	183,834	48,115	460,229	501,534	13,121	26.3	6.9	65.9	71.8	1.9
	0.00 %	VAP:	502,853	153,989	32,385	309,097	338,455	10,409	30.6	6.4	61.5	67.3	2.1
Bexar (25%)			426,317	76,670	31,466	316,001	343,072	6,575	18.0	7.4	74.1	80.5	1.5
Caldwell (16%)			6,246	2,202	378	3,429	3,766	278	35.3	6.1	54.9	60.3	4.5
Comal (24%)			26,344	12,352	687	12,981	13,551	441	46.9	2.6	49.3	51.4	1.7
Guadalupe (32%)			42,314	22,630	1,359	17,792	18,966	718	53.5	3.2	42.0	44.8	1.7
Hays (57%)			89,760	39,358	5,438	43,549	48,167	2,235	43.8	6.1	48.5	53.7	2.5
Travis (10%)			107,508	30,622	8,787	66,477	74,012	2,874	28.5	8.2	61.8	68.8	2.7
DISTRICT 35	-1	Total:	698,487	200,824	263,262	194,171	450,972	46,691	28.8	37.7	27.8	64.6	6.7
	0.00 %	VAP:	492,117	165,331	176,623	118,855	292,680	34,106	33.6	35.9	24.2	59.5	6.9
Dallas (7%)			174,016	40,569	85,913	41,658	126,015	7,432	23.3	49.4	23.9	72.4	4.3
Tarrant (29%)			524,471	160,255	177,349	152,513	324,957	39,259	30.6	33.8	29.1	62.0	7.5
DISTRICT 36	0	Total:	698,488	437,519	66,881	179,638	244,186	16,783	62.6	9.6	25.7	35.0	2.4
	0.00 %	VAP:	511,826	342,221	46,580	111,741	157,262	12,343	66.9	9.1	21.8	30.7	2.4
Chambers (100%)			35,096	24,767	3,092	6,635	9,609	720	70.6	8.8	18.9	27.4	2.1
Hardin (100%)			54,635	48,088	3,367	2,384	5,723	824	88.0	6.2	4.4	10.5	1.5
Harris (8%)			333,943	156,347	27,306	142,385	167,933	9,663	46.8	8.2	42.6	50.3	2.9
Jasper (100%)			35,710	26,939	6,225	2,017	8,188	583	75.4	17.4	5.6	22.9	1.6
Liberty (100%)			75,643	52,321	8,656	13,602	22,073	1,249	69.2	11.4	18.0	29.2	1.7
Newton (100%)			14,445	10,825	2,988	403	3,379	241	74.9	20.7	2.8	23.4	1.7
Orange (100%)			81,837	67,895	7,298	4,766	11,991	1,951	83.0	8.9	5.8	14.7	2.4
Polk (100%)			45,413	32,830	5,448	5,959	11,321	1,262	72.3	12.0	13.1	24.9	2.8
Tyler (100%)			21,766	17,507	2,501	1,487	3,969	290	80.4	11.5	6.8	18.2	1.3

Population and Voter Data
with Voter Registration Comparison
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

District	Deviation	Population										Total Voter Registration				Non-Suspense Voter Registration			
		Total	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O	General Election	Turnout	Total	SSVR	TO/VR	Total	SSVR	TO/VR				
1	-1 0.00%	Total: 698,487 VAP: 523,323	64.2	18.7	15.4	33.9	2.0	2010 2008	163,252 238,261	403,664 423,412	4.4% 4.2%	40.4% 61.0%	351,277 361,566	4.3% 4.1%	46.5% 73.4%				
2	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 508,081	48.5	14.1	30.7	44.1	7.3	2010 2008	167,139 236,658	366,529 366,650	14.1% 13.2%	45.6% 64.5%	320,348 370,487	14.0% 13.9%	52.2% 73.8%				
3	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 498,074	62.0	9.8	14.5	23.9	14.1	2010 2008	139,979 267,873	379,612 380,226	6.0% 6.0%	36.9% 70.5%	329,370 338,457	5.8% 5.9%	42.5% 81.6%				
4	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 519,582	73.5	11.2	12.8	23.8	2.8	2010 2008	159,866 258,557	408,302 419,981	4.0% 3.8%	39.2% 61.6%	356,006 363,244	4.0% 3.8%	44.9% 71.2%				
5	-1 0.00%	Total: 698,487 VAP: 524,835	84.2	11.7	25.8	37.1	8.7	2010 2008	167,236 276,197	394,060 412,401	9.0% 8.9%	42.4% 67.0%	341,109 355,359	8.9% 8.8%	49.0% 77.7%				
6	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 512,976	72.7	8.9	16.0	24.6	2.7	2010 2008	162,094 266,951	416,831 422,729	6.7% 6.6%	38.9% 63.1%	367,895 372,628	6.8% 6.5%	44.1% 71.6%				
7	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 518,945	49.2	11.7	28.9	40.0	10.8	2010 2008	175,166 247,587	365,876 368,487	11.9% 11.0%	47.9% 67.2%	316,848 321,028	11.6% 11.4%	55.3% 77.1%				
8	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 516,241	68.2	9.0	19.7	28.4	3.4	2010 2008	170,735 234,765	375,491 372,686	7.3% 7.0%	45.5% 63.0%	325,614 326,136	7.2% 7.1%	52.4% 72.0%				
9	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 498,416	11.1	38.3	38.8	75.9	13.1	2010 2008	106,599 173,291	298,147 300,744	14.6% 13.9%	35.8% 57.6%	249,788 259,333	14.8% 14.8%	42.7% 66.8%				
10	-2 0.00%	Total: 698,486 VAP: 511,354	59.6	10.2	27.2	36.8	3.6	2010 2008	182,320 258,333	415,518 415,134	14.6% 14.3%	43.9% 62.2%	361,194 366,011	14.3% 14.2%	50.5% 70.6%				
11	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 526,756	62.5	4.1	31.9	35.5	1.9	2010 2008	167,156 256,759	407,699 421,030	18.9% 18.8%	41.0% 61.0%	354,206 367,572	18.6% 18.5%	47.2% 69.9%				
12	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 515,761	68.9	7.1	19.4	26.1	4.9	2010 2008	148,597 255,408	383,783 386,536	9.0% 8.9%	38.7% 66.1%	327,204 334,141	8.7% 8.8%	45.4% 76.4%				
13	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 522,173	67.4	6.5	23.3	29.4	3.2	2010 2008	148,781 247,834	402,250 419,368	11.6% 11.3%	37.0% 59.1%	343,718 359,267	11.3% 10.9%	43.3% 69.0%				
14	-1 0.00%	Total: 698,487 VAP: 522,774	52.6	20.9	23.2	43.6	3.8	2010 2008	159,966 241,652	408,958 426,581	12.0% 11.7%	39.1% 56.6%	347,290 363,691	12.0% 11.7%	46.1% 66.4%				
15	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 470,214	15.3	2.0	82.3	84.0	0.8	2010 2008	85,454 145,038	311,744 320,517	70.4% 70.8%	27.4% 45.3%	273,156 279,415	71.1% 70.9%	31.3% 51.9%				
16	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 488,962	17.6	4.6	76.7	80.4	2.0	2010 2008	82,223 165,287	325,304 333,414	60.6% 60.7%	25.3% 49.6%	302,562 290,729	61.2% 61.9%	27.2% 56.9%				
17	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 537,228	63.6	12.9	20.9	33.3	3.1	2010 2008	151,240 227,214	365,510 382,069	8.8% 8.6%	41.4% 59.5%	309,592 323,208	8.6% 8.4%	48.9% 70.3%				
18	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 516,880	18.2	40.7	36.4	76.1	5.6	2010 2008	131,624 209,730	353,997 362,820	13.6% 12.6%	37.2% 57.8%	297,660 310,466	14.0% 13.9%	44.2% 67.6%				
19	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 520,468	58.0	6.4	33.8	39.6	2.4	2010 2008	138,838 240,451	385,105 408,804	22.7% 22.5%	36.1% 58.8%	330,119 342,718	22.4% 22.0%	42.1% 70.2%				
20	0 0.00%	Total: 698,488 VAP: 508,749	23.7	6.8	66.7	72.5	3.7	2010 2008	103,981 193,776	346,625 358,645	52.8% 53.7%	30.0% 54.0%	286,040 298,282	53.4% 54.4%	36.4% 65.0%				

Texas Legislative Council reports prior to 2008 generally do not include results for third-party, independent, or write-in candidates. Beginning in 2008, results for all third-party and independent candidates are included, and the results for write-in candidates are summed and included as "write-in". Complete official results for all years are maintained by the office of the secretary of state.
SSVR = Spanish surname voter registration

Population and Voter Data
with Voter Registration Comparison
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

District	Deviation	Population					General Election	Turnout	Total Voter Registration			Non-Suspense Voter Registration			
		Total	%A	%B	%H	%BH			%O	Total	SSVR	TO/VR	Total	SSVR	TO/VR
21	0	698,488	66.7	4.4	25.4	29.3	4.0	2010	222,578	465,122	14.7%	47.9%	403,005	14.4%	55.9%
	0.00%	VAP: 525,420	70.2	3.9	22.4	26.0	3.8	2008	319,605	459,891	14.6%	69.3%	401,637	14.3%	79.9%
22	1	698,489	49.1	12.3	22.1	33.9	17.0	2010	179,691	386,148	13.1%	46.5%	339,640	12.9%	53.1%
	0.00%	VAP: 499,643	52.1	11.6	19.9	31.2	16.7	2008	256,003	380,107	13.0%	67.4%	339,640	13.0%	75.4%
23	-1	698,487	20.5	7.6	70.5	77.3	2.2	2010	110,583	374,054	37.9%	29.6%	326,734	59.8%	33.8%
	0.00%	VAP: 503,169	23.8	7.4	66.9	73.8	2.3	2008	190,577	384,192	57.9%	49.6%	331,084	59.3%	57.6%
24	0	698,488	55.2	11.2	21.2	31.9	12.9	2010	147,066	383,395	8.3%	38.4%	310,722	7.9%	47.3%
	0.00%	VAP: 528,138	59.1	10.4	18.3	28.4	12.5	2008	263,724	401,370	8.4%	65.7%	332,848	8.1%	79.2%
25	0	698,488	66.1	5.6	20.1	25.3	8.7	2010	194,324	458,179	10.9%	42.4%	375,477	10.6%	51.8%
	0.00%	VAP: 522,043	69.1	5.0	17.8	22.5	8.4	2008	313,795	459,357	11.2%	68.3%	395,955	11.0%	79.3%
26	0	698,488	70.5	6.8	16.8	23.3	6.2	2010	147,184	396,436	7.0%	37.1%	336,719	6.8%	43.7%
	0.00%	VAP: 498,751	73.5	6.3	14.5	20.6	5.9	2008	265,996	396,636	7.0%	67.1%	344,227	6.9%	77.3%
27	0	698,488	17.2	2.6	79.2	81.3	1.6	2010	92,212	338,223	66.5%	27.3%	291,071	68.0%	31.7%
	0.00%	VAP: 489,628	20.5	2.5	75.6	77.8	1.7	2008	163,276	346,871	66.9%	47.1%	306,235	68.2%	53.3%
28	0	698,488	22.8	6.9	69.1	75.3	1.9	2010	106,376	327,560	49.6%	32.5%	283,787	51.1%	37.5%
	0.00%	VAP: 489,021	27.1	7.0	64.1	70.7	2.2	2008	171,846	330,972	49.9%	51.9%	292,499	51.2%	58.8%
29	0	698,488	10.9	12.3	75.3	86.8	2.4	2010	70,665	245,681	51.6%	28.8%	214,876	53.0%	37.9%
	0.00%	VAP: 474,490	13.8	12.4	71.7	83.5	2.7	2008	113,634	250,852	49.9%	45.3%	217,863	53.6%	52.2%
30	-1	698,487	22.9	40.8	34.1	74.1	3.0	2010	116,382	340,302	10.6%	34.2%	285,797	10.9%	40.7%
	0.00%	VAP: 501,090	27.7	40.4	29.3	69.2	3.2	2008	211,100	361,714	10.3%	58.4%	305,729	10.4%	69.0%
31	-1	698,487	60.2	16.2	20.4	35.5	4.4	2010	145,833	377,846	10.7%	38.6%	310,954	10.3%	46.9%
	0.00%	VAP: 505,725	64.4	14.4	17.5	31.3	4.3	2008	233,812	385,959	10.9%	60.6%	325,029	10.6%	71.9%
32	0	698,488	15.6	11.1	71.6	82.0	2.4	2010	59,197	227,168	39.7%	26.1%	192,656	41.6%	30.7%
	0.00%	VAP: 474,766	20.2	11.5	66.1	77.0	2.8	2008	119,977	241,652	39.2%	49.6%	203,649	40.7%	58.9%
33	0	698,488	25.5	6.0	64.7	70.2	4.3	2010	103,196	332,942	49.2%	31.0%	283,379	50.0%	36.4%
	0.00%	VAP: 490,065	29.6	5.8	60.4	65.9	4.5	2008	179,266	337,367	49.5%	53.1%	290,146	50.0%	61.8%
34	1	698,489	26.3	6.9	65.9	71.8	1.9	2010	98,739	350,205	49.5%	28.2%	287,237	50.9%	34.4%
	0.00%	VAP: 502,853	30.6	6.4	61.5	67.3	2.1	2008	181,411	361,032	50.1%	50.2%	301,324	51.1%	60.2%
35	-1	698,487	38.8	37.7	27.8	64.6	6.7	2010	128,524	352,626	11.4%	36.4%	290,181	11.5%	44.3%
	0.00%	VAP: 492,117	33.6	35.9	24.2	59.5	6.9	2008	238,014	368,016	11.3%	64.7%	312,250	11.3%	76.2%
36	0	698,488	62.6	9.6	25.7	35.0	2.4	2010	152,818	391,864	11.1%	39.0%	342,275	11.0%	44.6%
	0.00%	VAP: 511,826	66.9	9.1	21.8	30.7	2.4	2008	224,700	405,519	10.3%	55.4%	350,883	10.6%	64.0%

Texas Legislative Council reports prior to 2008 generally do not include results for third-party, independent, or write-in candidates. Beginning in 2008, results for all third-party and independent candidates are included, and the results for write-in candidates are summed and included as "write-in". Complete official results for all years are maintained by the office of the secretary of state.
SSVR = Spanish surname voter registration

Incumbents by District

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

District	Incumbents
1	Gohmert - R
2	Poe - R
3	Johnson, S. - R
4	Hall - R
5	Sessions - R
6	Barton - R
7	Culberson - R
8	Brady - R
9	Green, A. - D
10	N/A
11	Conaway - R
12	Granger - R
13	Thornberry - R
14	Paul - R
15	Hinojosa - D
16	Reyes - D
17	Flores - R
18	Jackson Lee - D
19	Neugebauer - R
20	Gonzalez - D
21	Smith - R
22	Olson - R
23	Canseco - R
24	Marchant - R
25	*Doggett - D *McCaul - R
26	Burgess - R
27	Farenthold - R
28	Cuellar - D
29	Green, G. - D
30	Johnson, E.B. - D
31	Carter - R
32	Hensarling - R
33	N/A
34	N/A
35	N/A
36	N/A

American Community Survey Special Tabulation
Using Census and American Community Survey Data
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

District	Total	2010 Census		Special Tabulation of Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey with Margins of Error												
		VAP	CVAP	Hispanic CVAP		Not Hispanic or Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)										
				% Hispanic	% Black + White	% Black + Indian	% White Alone	% Indian Alone	% Asian Alone	% Hawaiian Alone	% Indian + White	% Asian + White	% Remainder 2 or More			
1	698,487	523,323	467,260 (+6,109)	5.2 (+0.4)	18.5 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	74.6 (+0.5)	0.3 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.5 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)
2	698,488	508,081	403,335 (+5,104)	16.7 (+0.6)	11.7 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	66.0 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.5)	4.3 (+0.4)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.3 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
3	698,488	498,074	416,735 (+4,584)	8.0 (+0.4)	7.7 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	75.8 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.4)	6.9 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.4)	0.3 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)
4	698,488	519,582	467,050 (+5,448)	5.1 (+0.4)	10.5 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	82.0 (+0.4)	0.7 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.7 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
5	698,487	524,035	440,755 (+5,173)	12.6 (+0.6)	9.9 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.7)	0.3 (+0.7)	70.7 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.6)	5.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.6 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
6	698,488	512,976	464,770 (+5,678)	8.2 (+0.4)	8.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	81.2 (+0.2)	0.6 (+0.4)	0.9 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
7	698,488	518,945	408,045 (+5,014)	14.5 (+0.6)	10.0 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	68.3 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.5)	6.2 (+0.4)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.3 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
8	698,488	516,241	426,975 (+6,178)	8.8 (+0.5)	9.5 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	79.3 (+0.4)	0.3 (+0.4)	1.1 (+0.4)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.6 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
9	698,488	498,416	332,695 (+6,315)	18.3 (+0.8)	47.5 (+0.9)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	22.6 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.6)	10.7 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
10	698,486	511,354	430,955 (+5,370)	17.4 (+0.6)	9.3 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	70.8 (+0.4)	0.2 (+0.6)	1.5 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.5 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
11	698,488	526,756	473,735 (+5,459)	22.1 (+0.6)	3.6 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	79.5 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.6)	0.5 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.5 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)
12	698,488	515,761	434,610 (+5,210)	10.7 (+0.5)	6.0 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	72.7 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.6)	2.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.5 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
13	698,488	522,173	473,740 (+4,867)	14.1 (+0.5)	6.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	71.0 (+0.4)	0.7 (+0.6)	0.9 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.8 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
14	698,487	522,774	463,165 (+5,974)	13.7 (+0.5)	21.3 (+0.8)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	62.4 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.6)	1.5 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)
15	698,488	470,214	341,325 (+5,408)	70.0 (+0.9)	3.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	26.1 (+0.6)	0.4 (+0.7)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)
16	698,488	488,962	350,459 (+4,816)	67.4 (+0.7)	4.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	74.7 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.7)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.4 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)
17	698,488	537,228	464,285 (+6,192)	10.5 (+0.5)	12.7 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	26.1 (+0.6)	0.4 (+0.7)	1.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.4 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)
18	698,488	516,880	402,540 (+6,805)	17.4 (+0.6)	48.6 (+0.8)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	29.4 (+0.8)	0.2 (+0.6)	3.8 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
19	698,488	520,468	463,235 (+5,503)	24.8 (+0.6)	5.3 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	67.9 (+0.4)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.6 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.5 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
20	698,488	508,749	415,705 (+6,214)	60.0 (+0.8)	6.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	31.1 (+0.8)	0.5 (+0.6)	1.4 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
21	698,488	525,420	454,308 (+5,081)	19.2 (+0.6)	2.9 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	74.8 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.4)	1.5 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.4)	0.2 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.4)
22	698,489	499,643	402,510 (+4,955)	15.3 (+0.6)	11.0 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	62.1 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.4)	10.6 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
23	698,487	503,169	395,970 (+5,374)	60.1 (+0.7)	7.8 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	30.1 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.7)	1.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.3 (+0.7)	0.3 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)
24	698,488	528,138	442,280 (+5,074)	11.1 (+0.5)	8.7 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	73.0 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.5)	5.5 (+0.5)	0.3 (+0.5)	0.3 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
25	698,488	532,043	455,030 (+5,724)	14.7 (+0.5)	4.8 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	75.5 (+0.5)	0.3 (+0.5)	3.5 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.5)
26	698,488	498,751	416,610 (+5,554)	8.5 (+0.5)	5.4 (+0.5)	0.1 (+0.4)	0.2 (+0.4)	0.2 (+0.4)	82.1 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.3)	1.9 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.4)	0.8 (+0.3)	0.2 (+0.4)	0.1 (+0.4)
27	698,488	489,628	382,360 (+5,227)	70.5 (+0.8)	8.8 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	25.8 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.7)	0.6 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)
28	698,488	489,021	353,765 (+5,324)	52.2 (+0.8)	16.3 (+0.9)	0.0 (+0.8)	0.0 (+0.8)	0.0 (+0.8)	37.0 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.6)	2.2 (+0.7)	0.0 (+0.8)	0.0 (+0.8)	0.4 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)
29	698,488	474,490	309,350 (+5,236)	36.3 (+1.0)	45.3 (+0.8)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.7)	24.6 (+0.8)	0.3 (+0.8)	1.7 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.2 (+0.8)	0.0 (+0.8)	0.0 (+0.8)
30	698,487	501,090	404,600 (+5,760)	14.7 (+0.7)	14.5 (+0.7)	0.3 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	0.0 (+0.5)	37.2 (+0.7)	0.5 (+0.5)	1.5 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.4 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)	0.1 (+0.7)
31	698,487	505,225	426,595 (+5,876)	13.6 (+0.5)	16.5 (+0.9)	0.1 (+1.0)	0.1 (+1.0)	0.1 (+1.0)	68.2 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.5)	1.7 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.5)	0.5 (+0.5)	0.4 (+0.5)	0.2 (+0.5)
32	698,488	474,766	296,045 (+4,938)	45.5 (+1.0)	5.9 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	35.0 (+0.8)	0.4 (+0.9)	1.6 (+0.9)	0.1 (+1.0)	0.1 (+1.0)	0.5 (+1.0)	0.1 (+1.0)	0.1 (+1.0)
33	698,488	490,065	362,550 (+5,732)	32.9 (+0.9)	6.3 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	37.7 (+0.7)	0.3 (+0.6)	2.4 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)
34	698,489	502,853	405,920 (+6,075)	56.5 (+0.9)	6.3 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	0.0 (+0.6)	35.2 (+0.7)	0.3 (+0.6)	0.9 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)	0.3 (+0.6)	0.2 (+0.6)	0.1 (+0.6)

The American Community Survey provided estimated citizen voting age population (CVAP) data at the block group level in a Special Tabulation. All block groups with more than 50% of the population in a district are included in the analysis. The percent for each CVAP population category is that group's CVAP divided by the CVAP total. Numbers in parentheses are margins of error at 90% confidence level. Black = Non-Hispanic Black

American Community Survey Special Tabulation
Using Census and American Community Survey Data
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

2010 Census		Special Tabulation of Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey with Margins of Error											
District	Total	VAP	Hispanic CVAP		Not Hispanic or Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)					Not Hispanic or Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)			
			CVAP	% Hispanic	% Black Alone	% Black + White	% Black + American Indian	% White Alone	% American Indian Alone	% Asian Alone	% Native Hawaiian Alone	% American Indian + White	% Asian + White
35	698,487	492,117	396,560	15.2	35.6	0.2	0.2	0.4	4.1	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.1
36	698,488	511,826	444,815	12.9	9.6	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.8	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.1

The American Community Survey provided estimated citizen voting age population (CVAP) data at the block group level in a Special Tabulation. All block groups with more than 50% of the population in a district are included in the analysis. The percent for each CVAP population category is that group's CVAP divided by the CVAP total. Numbers in parentheses are margins of error at 90% confidence level. Black = Non-Hispanic Black

Hispanic Population Profile
Using Census, American Community Survey, and Voter Registration Data
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

District	2010 Census				2005-2009 ACS Special Tabulation				2010 General Election				
	Total	VAP	% HVAP	MOE	Citizen VAP	MOE	% HCVP	MOE	Total	% SSVR	Non-Suspense	Registration	% SSVR
1	698,487	523,323	12.3	(±6,109)	467,260	(±6,109)	5.2	(±0.4%)	403,664	4.4	351,277	4.3	4.3
2	698,488	508,081	27.4	(±5,104)	403,335	(±5,104)	16.7	(±0.6%)	366,529	14.1	320,348	14.0	14.0
3	698,488	498,074	12.9	(±4,584)	416,735	(±4,584)	8.0	(±0.4%)	379,612	6.0	329,370	5.8	5.8
4	698,488	519,582	10.3	(±5,448)	467,050	(±5,448)	5.1	(±0.4%)	408,302	4.0	356,006	4.0	4.0
5	698,487	524,035	22.0	(±5,173)	440,755	(±5,173)	12.6	(±0.6%)	394,060	9.0	341,109	8.9	8.9
6	698,488	512,976	13.1	(±5,678)	464,770	(±5,678)	8.2	(±0.4%)	416,831	6.7	367,895	6.8	6.8
7	698,488	518,945	25.7	(±5,014)	403,045	(±5,014)	14.5	(±0.6%)	366,876	11.9	316,848	11.6	11.6
8	698,488	516,241	16.8	(±6,178)	426,975	(±6,178)	8.8	(±0.5%)	375,491	7.3	325,614	7.2	7.2
9	698,488	498,416	35.8	(±5,315)	332,695	(±5,315)	18.3	(±0.8%)	298,147	14.6	249,788	14.8	14.8
10	698,488	511,354	23.4	(±5,370)	430,955	(±5,370)	17.4	(±0.6%)	415,518	14.6	361,194	14.3	14.3
11	698,488	526,756	27.4	(±5,439)	473,735	(±5,439)	22.1	(±0.8%)	407,699	18.9	354,206	18.6	18.6
12	698,488	515,761	16.3	(±5,210)	434,610	(±5,210)	10.7	(±0.5%)	383,783	9.0	327,204	8.7	8.7
13	698,488	522,173	19.5	(±4,867)	473,740	(±4,867)	14.1	(±0.5%)	402,250	11.6	343,718	11.3	11.3
14	698,487	522,774	20.2	(±5,974)	463,165	(±5,974)	13.7	(±0.5%)	408,958	12.0	347,290	12.0	12.0
15	698,488	470,214	78.3	(±5,408)	341,375	(±5,408)	70.0	(±0.9%)	311,744	70.4	273,156	71.1	71.1
16	698,488	488,962	73.6	(±4,816)	350,459	(±4,816)	67.4	(±0.7%)	325,504	60.6	302,562	61.2	61.2
17	698,488	537,228	17.5	(±6,192)	484,285	(±6,192)	10.5	(±0.5%)	365,510	8.8	309,592	8.6	8.6
18	698,488	516,880	31.9	(±5,503)	463,255	(±5,503)	24.8	(±0.6%)	353,997	13.6	297,660	14.0	14.0
19	698,488	520,468	29.3	(±5,003)	463,255	(±5,003)	24.8	(±0.6%)	385,105	22.7	330,119	22.4	22.4
20	698,488	508,749	63.1	(±6,214)	415,705	(±6,214)	60.0	(±0.8%)	346,625	52.8	286,040	53.4	53.4
21	698,488	525,426	22.4	(±5,081)	454,305	(±5,081)	19.2	(±0.6%)	465,122	14.7	403,005	14.4	14.4
22	698,489	495,643	19.9	(±4,955)	402,510	(±4,955)	15.3	(±0.6%)	386,148	13.1	338,656	12.9	12.9
23	698,487	503,169	66.9	(±5,374)	395,978	(±5,374)	60.1	(±0.7%)	374,054	57.9	326,734	59.8	59.8
24	698,488	528,138	18.3	(±5,074)	442,280	(±5,074)	11.1	(±0.5%)	383,395	8.3	310,722	7.9	7.9
25	698,488	533,043	17.8	(±5,724)	455,030	(±5,724)	14.7	(±0.5%)	458,179	10.9	375,477	10.6	10.6
26	698,488	498,751	14.5	(±5,554)	416,610	(±5,554)	8.5	(±0.5%)	396,436	7.0	336,719	6.8	6.8
27	698,488	489,628	75.6	(±5,227)	382,360	(±5,227)	70.5	(±0.8%)	338,223	66.5	291,071	68.0	68.0
28	698,488	489,021	64.1	(±5,324)	353,765	(±5,324)	52.2	(±0.8%)	327,560	49.6	283,787	51.1	51.1
29	698,488	474,490	71.7	(±5,236)	309,330	(±5,236)	56.3	(±1.0%)	245,681	51.6	214,876	53.0	53.0
30	698,487	501,090	29.3	(±5,760)	404,600	(±5,760)	14.7	(±0.7%)	340,302	10.6	285,797	10.9	10.9
31	698,487	505,725	17.5	(±5,576)	436,595	(±5,576)	13.6	(±0.5%)	377,846	10.7	310,954	10.3	10.3
32	698,488	474,766	66.1	(±4,938)	296,045	(±4,938)	45.5	(±1.0%)	227,168	39.7	192,656	41.6	41.6
33	698,488	490,065	60.4	(±5,732)	362,550	(±5,732)	52.9	(±0.9%)	332,942	49.2	283,379	50.0	50.0
34	698,489	502,853	61.5	(±6,075)	405,920	(±6,075)	56.5	(±0.9%)	350,205	49.5	287,237	50.9	50.9
35	698,487	492,117	24.2	(±4,924)	396,560	(±4,924)	15.2	(±0.6%)	352,626	11.4	290,181	11.5	11.5
36	698,488	511,826	21.8	(±5,337)	444,815	(±5,337)	12.9	(±0.5%)	391,864	11.4	342,275	11.0	11.0

The American Community Survey provided estimated citizen voting age population (CVAP) data at the block group level in a Special Tabulation. All block groups with more than 50% of the population in a district are included in the analysis.
 MOE = Margin of error at 90% confidence level
 % HVAP = Hispanic voting age population / voting age population
 % HCVP = Hispanic citizen voting age population / citizen voting age population
 SSVR = Spanish surname voter registration

Compactness Analysis - Area Based Measures
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLANC211

District	Area Rubber Band	Perimeter to Area
1	0.818	0.312
2	0.497	0.131
3	0.910	0.392
4	0.805	0.230
5	0.702	0.140
6	0.766	0.275
7	0.645	0.170
8	0.787	0.211
9	0.538	0.104
10	0.585	0.113
11	0.720	0.238
12	0.882	0.256
13	0.622	0.188
14	0.581	0.167
15	0.493	0.090
16	0.745	0.199
17	0.613	0.177
18	0.493	0.064
19	0.565	0.155
20	0.852	0.350
21	0.681	0.210
22	0.677	0.142
23	0.647	0.144
24	0.666	0.179
25	0.627	0.152
26	0.774	0.395
27	0.812	0.241
28	0.513	0.143
29	0.646	0.082
30	0.661	0.114
31	0.868	0.376
32	0.332	0.041
33	0.423	0.090
34	0.541	0.097
35	0.571	0.100
36	0.782	0.209

* Compactness measures: Each measure is reported on a scale from 0 to 1, with numbers closer to 1 being more compact. A score of N/A indicates the measure could not be calculated.

1. "Area Rubber Band" is the ratio of the area of the district to the area of the smallest convex polygon enclosing the district.
2. "Perimeter to Area" is the ratio of the area of a circle with the same perimeter as the district to the area of the district.