DATE FILED: October 15, 2021 4:08 PM

In re Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission

Exhibit 8

Commission Policy No. 9

Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission

Policy #9

Voting Rights Act Compliance

Draft date	October 5, 2021
Approval date	October 6, 2021
Revision date(s)	
Constitutional authority for this policy	Section 48.1(1)(b)
Requires section 48.2(3) supermajority approval?	☐ Yes ☑ No

The Colorado Constitution requires the Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission (commission) to comply with the Voting Rights Act (VRA) in creating legislative redistricting plans.[1] This policy outlines how the commission's nonpartisan redistricting staff (staff) and the commission's outside counsel will review staff plans, amendments, and additional plans for compliance with the VRA.

Compliance with the VRA

Among other things, the VRA prohibits the drawing of districts that dilute the voting power of members of a racial or language minority group. The Supreme Court established the analysis that is applied to determine if such dilution occurs in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1968). As explained by the U.S. Department of Justice:

> *Analysis begins by considering whether three Gingles preconditions exist. First, the minority group must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority of the voting-age population in a single-member district. Second, the minority group must be politically cohesive. And third, the majority must vote sufficiently as a bloc to enable it — in the absence of special circumstances, such as the minority candidate running unopposed — usually to defeat the minority group's preferred candidate.*
>
> *If all three Gingles preconditions are present, consideration proceeds to an analysis of the totality of circumstances in a jurisdiction.* [2]

The commission analyzed the first prong of this test: whether there were minority groups large enough and compact enough to constitute a majority of the voting age population of a district. The commission's outside counsel retained a VRA expert to assist in the determination of whether the second and third prongs of this test could be satisfied. In other words, whether voting was racially polarized, that is whether minority voters vote cohesively for one candidate and the white majority voters vote cohesively for a different candidate, and whether minority voters were unable to elect their preferred candidates.

---

[1] The Colorado Constitution cites to the "'Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965' at 52 U.S.C. sec 50301, as amended." The citation in the Colorado Constitution is incorrect. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is now 52 U.S.C. 10301, which can be accessed through the following link: https://bit.ly/3f52VWm.

[2] Guidance under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 52 U.S.C. 10301, for redistricting and methods of electing government bodies, U.S. Department of Justice, September 1, 2021.

VRA Expert Analysis

The VRA expert retained by the commission's outside counsel analyzed past elections to identify minority preferred candidates, determine whether there was racially polarized voting, and provide an estimate of the percentage of the minority voting age population that would be necessary in a district to elect the minority preferred candidate.[3]

The VRA expert was not able to identify a suitable recent statewide race that would allow her to analyze the entire state at once. Therefore, the expert analyzed State House and State Senate races from the 2018 and 2020 election cycles that occurred within areas of the state that were identified as potential areas of concern for VRA compliance by the members of the commission.

After the VRA expert conducted her analysis of past elections, staff presented her analysis in two different formats that would assist in applying the analysis in the drafting of staff plans, amendments, and additional plans.

Geographic Overlap

The first format the staff shall use to apply the VRA expert's analysis is a measure of geographic overlap.

Due to population growth across Colorado, the proposed districts in staff plans, amendments, and additional plans cannot align with the existing State House and State Senate districts. Therefore, it is not immediately clear how the existing districts that held elections analyzed by the VRA expert relate to proposed districts. To assist in determining this relationship, staff shall measure the geographic area of certain existing districts contained in proposed districts. This is a measure of geographic overlap.

Along with the measure of geographic overlap, staff shall compare the percentage of minority voting age population in the proposed districts with the percentage of minority voting age population needed for a minority candidate of choice to be elected.[4]

This analysis allows two primary determinations. First, how relevant those elections analyzed by the VRA expert were to the proposed districts: an election in an existing district that does not share any geographic area with a proposed district has limited relevance for that proposed district. Second, whether a proposed district likely has enough of a minority voting age population to allow the minority preferred candidate to be elected. In a proposed district that has a significant geographic overlap with an existing district, if the minority voting age population in the proposed district either meets or exceeds the minority voting age population the VRA expert determined would be necessary for a minority preferred candidate to be elected in past elections, it would be reasonably likely that the minority preferred candidate could be elected in that proposed district.

If a minority preferred candidate could be elected in a proposed district, it would be difficult to prove under the *Gingles* analysis that the proposed district violates the VRA and dilutes the voting power of members of a racial or language minority group. Such an argument would not be able to demonstrate that the majority voted in a way that usually defeated the minority's preferred candidate.

---

[3] A more comprehensive explanation of the methods used by the VRA expert can be found here: https://www.ncsl.org/documents/legismgt/vote_dilusion.pdf.

[4] The percentage of minority voting age population needed for a minority candidate of choice to be elected was determined by the VRA expert in those races she analyzed that had racially polarized voting and a numerically adequate or significant number of votes cast by minority voters.

Voter Overlap

As noted above, staff shall consider the VRA expert's analysis in two different formats that would assist in the drafting of staff plans, amendments, and additional plans. The second of these formats is a measure of voter overlap.

Although the geographic overlap of existing districts and proposed districts allows an application of the VRA expert's analysis to proposed districts, there are two principle limitations to this approach. First, geographic overlap between districts does not necessarily mean that those districts share a large number of voters. Put differently, existing and proposed districts could share large amounts of sparsely populated land while not having overlapping population centers and thus have significant geographic overlap while not having many overlapping voters. This is a problem because the VRA is concerned with voters and not land. Secondly, some existing districts share significant geographic area with multiple proposed districts. These existing districts therefore have limited geographic overlap with any particular proposed district. The geographic analysis based on these existing districts would be of limited use.

To address these limitations, staff shall also analyze the voter, rather than just geographic, overlap between existing and proposed districts. Staff shall identify the approximate location of the voters who cast votes in elections analyzed by the VRA expert. This allows staff to determine the proposed districts that would contain the voters who cast votes in such elections and how many such voters exist in a proposed district. As an example, if a proposed district covered three existing districts of equal size, and two of the existing districts had held an election with a minority preferred candidate, two thirds of the votes cast in the proposed district would have been cast in an election with a minority preferred candidate. Next, staff shall use the votes cast for minority preferred candidates in areas covered by proposed districts to determine whether a minority preferred candidate would have won an election. In other words, staff shall determine whether the number of votes cast for minority preferred candidates in an area covered by a proposed district exceed the number of votes cast for the alternative candidates.

This voter overlap analysis allows for both a determination of whether a minority preferred candidate would be reasonably likely to be elected in the proposed district and how relevant this prediction was based on how many votes in a proposed district had been cast in an election with a minority preferred candidate. Again, if a minority preferred candidate could be elected in a proposed district, it would be difficult to prove under the *Gingles* analysis that the proposed district violates the VRA and dilutes the voting power of members of a racial or language minority group.

Comparison of Voting Age Populations

Finally, the staff shall compare the voting age populations of the proposed districts to the voting age population in existing districts. This assists in determining whether current minority voter representation was diluted by a proposed district in a staff plan, amendment, or additional plan.

Application

Attached to this memo is the application of these policies to the third House and Senate Staff Plans.

Attachments A, B, C, D, and E: Application of Voting Rights Act Compliance Policy to the Third Staff House Plan

The table in Attachment A shows the application of the "Geographic Overlap" analysis to the third Staff House Plan. This table shows that it is unlikely there is racially polarized voting in proposed House Districts 5, 7, 23, and 32. Also, as can be seen by comparing the "Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD [X]" column to the "Hispanic Voting Age Population Percentage" column, proposed House Districts 17 and 62 exceed the minority voting age population numbers that must be met for the minority candidate of choice to be elected. This is not the case with proposed House Districts 56, 46, and 47. This can be explained for proposed House District 56 because although current House District 30 shares a large amount of geographic area with House District 56, it does not share a large number of voters. Similarly proposed House Districts 46 and 47 cover a large amount of the geographic area of current House Districts 46 and 47, but do not contain a large number of the voters in current House Districts 46 and 47.

The tables in Attachment B and Attachment C show the application of the "Voter Overlap" analysis to the third Staff House Plan based on 2018 and 2020 State House races. Looking at the "Share of Votes Vast in Elections with Minority Preferred Candidates in the Proposed House District" column, only House Districts 5, 7, 17, 28, 32, 40, 42, 47, 61, and 62 had more than fifty percent of their votes cast in elections with minority preferred candidates. Among these House Districts, looking at the "Share of Votes Received by Minority Candidates in Elections in the Proposed House District" column, minority preferred candidates could reasonably be predicted to be elected in House Districts 5, 7, 17, 28, 32, 40, 42, 61, and 62, but not in House District 47. This can be explained by the fact that proposed House District 47 no longer includes parts of Pueblo, instead proposed House Districts 61 and 62 contain a large amount of the Hispanic voting age population (both are either have a majority minority voting age population or are close to it) in the area and both are likely to elect a minority preferred candidate.

Finally, the Voting Age Population tables for the current districts in Attachment D shows that there are currently seven majority minority voting age population House Districts, including one majority Hispanic voting age population district. The Voting Age Population table for the third House Staff Plan in Attachment E shows that there are ten majority minority House Districts in the third Staff House Plan.

Attachments F, G, H, and I: Application of Voting Rights Act Compliance Policy to the Third Staff Senate Plan

The table in Attachment F shows first attached table shows the application of the "Geographic Overlap" analysis to the third Staff Senate Plan. This table shows that it is unlikely there is racially polarized voting in proposed Senate District 3. Also, as can be seen by comparing the "Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in SD [X]" column to the "Hispanic Voting Age Population Percentage" column, proposed Senate District 21 exceeds the minority voting age population numbers that must be met for the minority candidate of choice to be elected. This is not the case with proposed Senate Districts 23, 24, 25, and 35. This can be explained for proposed Senate District 23 because in order to have sufficiently high Hispanic voting age population this proposed district would need to gain approximately thirty-two percent Hispanic voting age population, which suggests that the first *Gingles* factor could not be satisfied in this district. Proposed Senate Districts 24 and 25 each only cover approximately half of the geographic area of current Senate District 24. A large number of the voters in proposed Senate Districts 24 and 25 are majority voters who are likely to vote for the minority candidate of choice. Thus, the minority candidate of choice is reasonably likely to be elected in proposed Senate Districts 24 and 25. Finally, although current Senate District 35 shares a relatively large amount of area with proposed Senate District 35, it does not share a large number of voters.

The table in Attachment G shows the application of the "Voter Overlap" analysis to the third Staff Senate Plan based on 2018 and 2020 House Senate races. Looking at the "Share of Votes Cast in Elections with Minority Preferred Candidates in the Proposed Senate District" column, only Senate Districts 3, 21, 23, 24, and 25 had more than fifty percent of their votes cast in elections with minority preferred candidates. Among these Senate Districts, looking at the "Share of Votes Received by Minority Candidates in Elections in the Proposed Senate District" column, minority preferred candidates could reasonably be predicted to be elected in Senate Districts 3, 21, 24, and 25, but not in the Senate District 23. Senate District 23 was discussed above.

Finally, the Voting Age Population tables for the current districts in Attachment H shows there are currently four majority minority voting age population Senate Districts. The Voting Age Population table for the third Senate Staff Plan in Attachment I shows that there are four majority minority Senate Districts in the third Staff Senate Plan.

Attachment A

Proposed House District #	Hispanic Voting Age Population Percentage	Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population Percentage	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 5 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in HD 5 in 2018	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in HD 5 in 2020	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 7 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in HD 7	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 17 in Proposed District	Percent minority VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in HD 17 in 2018	Percent minority VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in HD 17 in 2020	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 28 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in HD 28	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 30 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 30	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 32 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 32	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 46 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 46 in 2018	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 46 in 2020	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 47 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 47 in 2018	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 47 in 2020	% of Geographic Area of Current HD 62 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 62 in 2018	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to win in HD 62 in 2020
5	28.63%	29.32%	84.42%	NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	5860.00%		4230.00%	5160.00%
7	44.19%	33.80%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED	88.02%	NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	5860.00%		4230.00%	5160.00%
17	*52.97%	24.22%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED	89.68%	63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	5860.00%		4230.00%	5160.00%
23	13.49%	12.79%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%	52.59%	NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	5860.00%		4230.00%	5160.00%
32	48.90%	41.06%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%	89.45%	NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	58.60%		42.30%	41.90%
46	10.02%	11.57%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED	56.98%		43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	58.60%		42.30%	41.90%
47	29.61%	28.89%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%	82.81%	49.60%	58.60%		42.30%	41.90%
58	12.66%	8.63%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED	77.63%	30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	58.60%		42.30%	41.90%
62	46.56%	46.27%		NOT POLARIZED	NOT POLARIZED		NOT POLARIZED		63.20%	46.00%		NOT POLARIZED		30.70%		NOT POLARIZED			43.80%	51.60%		49.60%	58.60%	99.84%	42.30%	41.90%

*total VAP excluding Nonhispanic Whites

Attachment B

Proposed House District	Share of Votes Received by Minority Candidates in Elections in the Proposed House District	Share of Votes Cast in Elections with Minority Preferred Candidates in the Proposed House District
1	74.0%	9.8%
3	63.8%	1.4%
4	76.6%	4.3%
5	79.4%	85.9%
6	75.0%	1.5%
7	83.5%	100.0%
8	84.4%	29.8%
17	59.2%	85.4%
18	54.2%	4.2%
22	50.4%	4.0%
23	56.5%	34.2%
28	61.0%	57.2%
30	68.1%	0.0%
37	64.0%	0.7%
40	62.8%	87.8%
41	71.6%	10.6%
42	73.3%	83.6%
46	37.0%	23.7%
47	44.6%	55.5%
61	61.7%	100.0%
62	60.4%	100.0%

Attachment C

Proposed House District	Share of Votes Received by Minority Candidates in Elections in the Proposed House District	Share of Votes Cast in Elections with Minority Preferred Candidates in the Proposed House District
1	72.5%	10.0%
3	61.5%	1.9%
4	78.1%	4.7%
5	79.6%	85.9%
6	76.4%	1.8%
8	82.2%	3.7%
17	57.3%	85.6%
18	50.2%	4.8%
22	51.1%	4.2%
23	56.1%	34.9%
24	63.1%	3.8%
28	59.1%	58.5%
31	54.0%	24.2%
32	56.0%	95.1%
34	48.0%	9.5%
35	67.9%	31.3%
36	72.3%	35.9%
37	61.6%	1.1%
40	58.9%	87.0%
41	62.0%	4.1%
46	41.2%	18.4%
47	71.4%	31.8%
48	32.8%	0.6%
56	42.0%	5.2%
61	71.0%	80.7%
62	60.2%	100.0%

Attachment D

District No.	Hispanic VAP	Non-Hispanic Black VAP	Minority VAP
1	43.51%	1.59%	51.89%
2	9.42%	2.94%	17.39%
3	13.19%	2.01%	21.02%
4	46.43%	1.95%	52.21%
5	44.39%	4.85%	54.56%
6	9.41%	9.88%	25.33%
7	36.43%	28.30%	70.85%
8	15.69%	20.16%	40.28%
9	13.41%	8.92%	29.26%
10	8.26%	1.24%	16.89%
11	15.53%	0.76%	20.57%
12	15.08%	0.88%	20.91%
13	4.37%	0.64%	8.45%
14	8.19%	3.81%	18.98%
15	12.22%	6.79%	26.08%
16	11.72%	4.45%	20.93%
17	28.06%	14.65%	49.66%
18	11.69%	4.26%	20.27%
19	5.77%	1.71%	11.20%
20	8.65%	3.47%	17.90%
21	14.86%	10.21%	31.93%
22	7.98%	0.77%	12.66%
23	15.58%	1.48%	21.34%
24	13.06%	1.06%	18.33%
25	4.50%	0.48%	7.32%
26	19.30%	0.56%	21.79%
27	8.64%	0.71%	12.37%
28	20.54%	1.59%	27.92%
29	13.80%	1.15%	20.50%
30	35.50%	9.26%	50.90%
31	30.01%	1.75%	37.15%
32	50.88%	1.86%	56.77%
33	8.64%	1.01%	18.26%
34	29.00%	1.93%	36.99%
35	25.90%	1.49%	34.25%
36	18.74%	15.90%	43.96%
37	7.45%	5.31%	22.08%
38	5.86%	1.09%	10.16%
39	4.82%	0.73%	9.96%
40	13.30%	11.51%	33.69%
41	16.00%	15.55%	39.32%
42	36.82%	19.80%	63.47%
43	6.49%	1.28%	14.04%
44	7.04%	1.75%	14.79%
45	6.87%	1.18%	11.48%
46	35.78%	1.76%	39.75%
47	30.35%	1.77%	35.01%
48	17.85%	0.50%	20.65%
49	6.63%	0.42%	9.18%
50	38.22%	1.85%	43.10%
51	8.86%	0.51%	11.72%
52	10.59%	0.93%	15.88%
53	8.34%	1.48%	14.71%
54	11.90%	0.64%	14.90%
55	11.26%	0.74%	14.73%
56	19.98%	2.25%	26.77%
57	20.18%	0.53%	22.91%
58	12.37%	0.30%	18.00%
59	10.35%	0.45%	16.24%
60	9.66%	3.26%	15.69%
61	10.78%	0.57%	13.47%
62	46.38%	0.78%	49.72%
63	19.15%	0.69%	23.64%
64	19.87%	2.81%	24.99%
65	19.28%	2.73%	23.67%

Attachment E

District No.	Hispanic VAP	Non-Hispanic Black VAP	Minority VAP
1	43.39%	2.77%	55.19%
2	7.63%	2.08%	17.02%
3	16.66%	7.00%	32.84%
4	35.36%	2.78%	44.45%
5	28.63%	4.85%	41.05%
6	11.26%	6.99%	26.36%
7	44.19%	23.04%	77.92%
8	16.67%	16.29%	40.25%
9	16.08%	14.03%	38.92%
10	9.03%	1.70%	21.87%
11	7.31%	0.99%	16.46%
12	10.96%	1.23%	20.96%
13	22.10%	1.27%	30.36%
14	8.04%	2.90%	20.16%
15	13.48%	6.04%	29.26%
16	16.16%	6.39%	31.34%
17	30.57%	13.13%	52.97%
18	14.75%	5.14%	27.29%
19	11.61%	4.50%	25.36%
20	10.36%	3.96%	22.57%
21	19.72%	11.27%	41.04%
22	10.69%	1.17%	19.42%
23	13.49%	1.91%	23.84%
24	15.10%	1.42%	23.20%
25	5.30%	0.74%	12.26%
26	17.71%	0.77%	22.78%
27	12.36%	1.10%	20.07%
28	26.14%	2.40%	36.75%
29	15.11%	1.86%	26.95%
30	10.88%	8.13%	33.98%
31	42.55%	2.39%	53.71%
32	48.90%	3.57%	58.89%
33	11.07%	1.65%	25.02%
34	25.71%	2.17%	37.94%
35	47.19%	1.86%	57.05%
36	35.16%	14.23%	60.67%
37	8.00%	3.60%	24.38%
38	9.86%	1.55%	17.86%
39	7.21%	1.74%	19.21%
40	17.35%	12.56%	42.69%
41	21.28%	17.63%	49.50%
42	39.39%	21.06%	69.99%
43	8.01%	1.54%	19.96%
44	9.01%	2.31%	22.49%
45	9.22%	1.74%	17.65%
46	10.02%	2.75%	18.83%
47	29.61%	2.13%	36.94%
48	34.98%	1.29%	41.60%
49	8.73%	0.69%	15.01%
50	44.08%	3.16%	52.75%
51	10.69%	1.00%	17.28%
52	9.99%	1.56%	19.64%
53	12.69%	2.07%	22.67%
54	12.78%	0.75%	19.14%
55	12.93%	0.99%	20.32%
56	12.66%	2.65%	21.27%
57	24.05%	0.71%	29.48%
58	12.38%	0.55%	18.13%
59	11.28%	0.52%	22.63%
60	11.80%	1.02%	17.85%
61	38.38%	2.50%	46.13%
62	46.56%	1.55%	52.89%
63	21.41%	2.18%	27.29%
64	17.49%	0.90%	25.07%
65	17.69%	1.08%	23.79%

Attachment F

Proposed Senate District #	Hispanic Voting Age Population Percentage	Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population Percentage	% of Geographic Area of Current SD 3 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hipsanic preferred candidate to win in SD 3	% of Geographic Area of Current SD 21 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic preferred candidate to win in SD 21	% of Geographic Area of Current SD 23 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to Win in SD 23	% of Geographic Area of Current SD 24 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to Win in SD 24	% of Geographic Area of Current SD 35 in Proposed District	Percent Hispanic VAP must exceed for Hispanic Preferred Candidate to Win in SD 35
3	37.98%	38.77%	100.00%	NOT POLARIZED		9.00%		45.20%		37.40%		60.40%
21	45.55%	38.39%		NOT POLARIZED	94.50%	9.00%		45.20%		37.40%		60.40%
23	13.07%	10.91%		NOT POLARIZED		9.00%	70.10%	45.20%		37.40%		60.40%
24	34.40%	26.33%		NOT POLARIZED		9.00%		45.20%	52.50%	37.40%		60.40%
25	18.57%	15.47%		NOT POLARIZED		9.00%		45.20%	47.50%	37.40%		60.40%
35	18.70%	17.99%		NOT POLARIZED		9.00%		45.20%		37.40%	59.40%	60.40%

Attachment G

Proposed Senate District	Share of Votes Received by Minority Candidates in Elections in the Proposed Senate District	Share of Votes Cast in Elections with Minority Preferred Candidates in the Proposed Senate District
3	66.77%	100.00%
19	66.61%	2.00%
21	62.85%	78.48%
25	57.28%	100.00%
24	52.27%	57.09%
14	49.32%	2.80%
6	46.41%	29.87%
17	46.00%	0.78%
23	38.03%	82.16%
35	37.77%	40.52%
13	30.47%	0.09%
4	29.22%	3.52%
1	27.79%	8.65%

Attachment H

District No.	Hispanic VAP	Non-Hispanic Black VAP	Minority VAP
D1	18.71%	1.79%	24.75%
D2	11.27%	4.01%	22.30%
D3	40.20%	2.41%	47.87%
D4	8.61%	1.86%	18.42%
D5	17.03%	0.85%	22.59%
D6	12.55%	0.52%	21.62%
D7	12.77%	0.91%	19.76%
D8	17.12%	0.76%	22.62%
D9	9.01%	3.28%	21.10%
D10	13.90%	5.39%	28.09%
D11	23.65%	9.67%	41.65%
D12	16.15%	7.99%	33.82%
D13	36.36%	2.16%	43.73%
D14	11.22%	1.89%	21.23%
D15	10.14%	0.86%	16.52%
D16	10.14%	1.21%	19.17%
D17	17.32%	1.31%	26.81%
D18	8.17%	1.41%	19.35%
D19	13.99%	1.44%	22.88%
D20	12.38%	1.36%	21.12%
D21	48.41%	2.71%	58.37%
D22	19.82%	2.00%	30.05%
D23	12.77%	1.13%	21.94%
D24	25.17%	2.07%	36.93%
D25	39.10%	5.52%	53.03%
D26	14.23%	7.38%	30.64%
D27	9.12%	4.66%	26.21%
D28	18.63%	13.98%	45.10%
D29	30.05%	16.83%	57.07%
D30	8.02%	1.81%	21.36%
D31	13.13%	9.01%	30.47%
D32	24.63%	2.77%	35.43%
D33	29.19%	19.43%	57.67%
D34	30.84%	4.25%	42.14%
D35	32.34%	1.54%	38.77%

Attachment I

District No.	Hispanic VAP	Non-Hispanic Black VAP	Minority VAP
D1	21.24%	1.64%	27.12%
D2	9.32%	2.04%	19.45%
D3	37.98%	2.20%	45.37%
D4	8.61%	1.91%	16.31%
D5	19.00%	0.64%	24.63%
D6	19.04%	0.65%	28.10%
D7	12.51%	0.88%	19.44%
D8	15.41%	0.78%	20.73%
D9	8.96%	3.33%	21.50%
D10	14.07%	5.73%	28.91%
D11	25.63%	11.20%	46.10%
D12	14.89%	6.96%	30.46%
D13	41.18%	2.41%	49.09%
D14	11.83%	1.85%	21.76%
D15	9.95%	0.98%	16.60%
D16	9.42%	1.41%	17.72%
D17	17.29%	1.29%	26.56%
D18	8.31%	1.41%	20.12%
D19	13.78%	1.38%	22.57%
D20	10.43%	1.18%	19.10%
D21	45.55%	2.57%	54.71%
D22	20.32%	2.15%	30.24%
D23	13.07%	0.83%	20.49%
D24	34.40%	2.30%	45.81%
D25	18.57%	1.88%	31.27%
D26	15.43%	7.63%	33.03%
D27	11.74%	8.08%	34.50%
D28	37.15%	16.66%	64.62%
D29	22.82%	17.72%	51.20%
D30	7.82%	1.77%	21.27%
D31	10.68%	5.84%	24.02%
D32	26.39%	6.36%	41.45%
D33	31.30%	20.40%	60.76%
D34	34.09%	3.54%	44.50%
D35	18.70%	2.19%	26.74%