

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL **FROM:** Redistricting Advisory Commission

SUBJECT: Report and Recommendation for Redistricting Ordinance **DATE:** May 23, 2001

Background

City Charter Section 403 establishes the Redistricting Advisory Commission and provides that the Commission study and make redistricting recommendations concerning the boundaries of City Council Districts to the City Council. On January 30, 2001, the City Council appointed the Redistricting Advisory Commission for the 2000 Census pursuant to the City Charter. The Council appointed one member from each District of the City as recommended by the Councilmember from that District and the Chairperson chosen from the City at large, who was recommended by the Mayor. The Commission was comprised of the following members:

At Large:

Frank Fiscalini, Chair

District 1:
Trixie Johnson

District 6:
Amy Dean

District 2:
Charlotte Powers

District 7:
George Sanchez

District 3:
Terry Christensen

District 8:
Maria Fuentes

District 4:
Jeff Ota

District 9:
Susie Wilson

District 5:
Tony Arreola

District 10:
David Fadness

Redistricting Advisory Commission Process

A. Commission Meetings and Public Hearings

Beginning in early March and through May 2001, the Commission met and deliberated for 9 meetings which included 3 public hearings as required by the Charter. Meetings were conducted on a weekly basis in May in order to provide the Commission with sufficient time to complete its charge. With the assistance of the City's Public Outreach Manager and the City Clerk, the Commission implemented a comprehensive communication plan and public outreach program to ensure that the public and community organizations were notified of the Commission's meetings and public hearings. The public hearings were conducted at City Hall, Silver Creek High School and the Willows Senior Center. Members of the public were given an opportunity to speak at all of the Commission's regular meetings. The Commission heard testimony from over 30 individuals at its meetings and public hearings. Additionally, the Commission received and reviewed numerous documents and correspondence from members of the public concerning redistricting issues.

B. Redistricting Criteria

In addition to population, the Commission also considered and applied other redistricting criteria during its deliberations. To assist in the study and formulation of District boundaries, the Commission adopted criteria as guidelines to follow during its deliberations and development of the redistricting recommendations. The criteria are set out in Attachment A. To the extent possible, the Commission maintained school district boundaries and neighborhood integrity within District boundaries. Additionally, the Commission maintained an awareness of ethnic communities and considered the effect of boundary changes to ethnic populations within each Council District.

C. Redistricting Plans Preparation and Development

Redistricting plans were developed on a weekly basis by Planning staff in direct response to comments provided at meetings of the Redistricting Advisory Commission. Color copies of these plans were generated on poster and tabloid-size paper, and then circulated at Commission meetings and placed on the City's redistricting web site (www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/redistricting). Electronic data files used in the preparation of these plans were also loaded onto a laptop computer and transported to the redistricting meetings.

Summary data tables were provided with each redistricting plan. These tables included several statistical measures that formed a consistent basis for comparison of the various plans. These statistics included the total population of each proposed Council District, variation of these population figures from the District mean, and a detailed breakdown of population by major race groups and Hispanic ethnicity. Staff also created a convenient record-keeping system which included "population transfer areas" to describe geographic areas where boundary changes were being considered during the redistricting process.

Another important process component in 2001 redistricting related to the sequence of boundary changes among City Council Districts. Due to the unique configuration of the City of San Jose, it was found most logical to commence redistricting considerations in those Districts with the greatest geographic constraints to boundary movement. In particular, Council Districts 1 and 4 were identified as good “starting points” given the extent of boundary change limitations imposed by their shape, size, and relative position within the City limits. Decisions relating to boundary changes in Council Districts 1 and 4 were especially critical to the development of 2001 redistricting plans.

Recommendations

On May 23, 2001, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend the District boundaries as follows:

1. The Commission recommends that the City Council adopt a redistricting ordinance in accordance with this report and the redistricting map identified as the Ten Percent No. 4 Plan, attached to this Report as Attachment B.
2. In order to allow future commissions more ample time to complete the redistricting process, the Commission recommends that the City Council consider a Charter amendment that changes the beginning of the 120-day period for the Commission to submit its report to start from the day of receipt of federal census data or from the day of appointment of the Commission, whichever is later.
3. During its deliberations, the Commission recognized that population increases and major shifts in City population would have a dramatic and potentially disorderly effect on the next decennial redistricting process. Therefore, the Commission recommends that following mid-decade population projections, the City Council establish a body such as a Charter Review Committee to study the impact of additional population on Council representation and the possible need for additional Council Districts.

Summary of Census 2000 Population Data

The City Charter requires that the 10 Council Districts be divided as nearly as equal in population as practicable. According to the 2000 Census, the City’s total population was 894,943 persons on April 1, 2000 (see Table 1, attached). This figure represents an increase of 112,695 persons, or 14.4%, over the 1990-2000 time period (1990 population= 782,248 persons). Using this citywide population, the mean population for

San Jose Council Districts can be computed by dividing by the number of Districts (i.e., $894,943/10= 89,494$ persons).

All ten San Jose City Council Districts experienced some increase in population during the past decade; however, growth was not evenly distributed among the Districts. For example, 2000 Census figures indicate that Council Districts 8 and 9, the City's largest and smallest Districts, respectively, registered a population difference of over 20,000 persons, a deviation of 23.6%. In fact, redistributing population in a manner that complies with minimum legal requirements will necessitate boundary changes (either expansion or contraction) among *at least* five Council Districts (see Table 2, attached).

In addition to a count of persons, the decennial Census provides data on major race groups and Hispanic ethnicity that are a key consideration in redistricting efforts. These data indicate that a total of three City Council Districts are comprised of a single non-white race/ethnic group majority (see Tables 3 and 4, attached). Namely, District 3 and District 5 each contain a Hispanic majority (59.1% Hispanic), which represents an approximate 4% increase in the Hispanic makeup of these Districts since the 1990 Census. As well, District 4 became an Asian majority District for the first time (52.9% Asian), with the Asian concentration of the District rising more than 15% since 1990.

Description of Proposed Redistricting Plan ("Ten Percent No. 4" Plan)

A. General Changes

The proposed redistricting plan ("Ten Percent No. 4" Plan) was the seventh and final plan iteration considered by the Commission during the 2001 redistricting process. The chronology of redistricting plan iterations was most notably marked by a gradual increase in the total population variation among City Council Districts. In other words, there was growing agreement among redistricting participants about the desirability of minimizing the extent of boundary changes to existing Districts. The proposed redistricting plan results in a total population variation of 9.5%, and has an average variation from the District mean (89,494 persons) of approximately 3.1% (see Table 5, attached).

The proposed redistricting plan compared favorably to previous plan iterations in maintaining the continuity of existing Council Districts (see Table 6, attached). One measure for determining the degree of change that accompanies a redistricting plan is the "total transfer population". The total transfer population is, in essence, the total number of persons that would be moved from one Council District to another. The proposed redistricting plan limits the total transfer population to 38,754 persons, or just 4.3% of the population of the City of San Jose.

The proposed redistricting plan also compared favorably to other plan iterations in minimizing the decrease in population of non-white race/ethnic groups in existing

Council Districts (see Tables 7 and 8, attached). A Hispanic majority is maintained within District 3 and District 5 (58.1% and 57.7%, respectively), and a large Hispanic concentration within District 7 is virtually unchanged (47.2% proposed versus 47.9% existing). Similarly, an Asian majority is maintained within District 4 (52.3%), and a large Asian concentration within District 8 is virtually unchanged (43.7% proposed versus 44.2% existing).

A detailed description of boundary changes, as shown on the attached proposed redistricting plan ("Ten Percent No. 4" Plan), is included below.

B. Description of District Boundary Changes

District 1

No boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 1. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that no changes to the boundaries of District 1 are required. Nevertheless, the population of District 1 is quite low relative to the District mean. Other plan iterations had explored moving the east side boundary of District 1 east from Winchester Boulevard to Highway 880, in areas south of Highway 280. The Commission, however, preferred to maintain the continuity of existing boundaries. In recognition of the significant impact of a District 1 boundary change on the boundaries of several other Council Districts (especially Districts 6, 9, 10, and 2), the Commission favored keeping the east side boundary of District 1 intact.

District 2

Two boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 2. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that no changes to the boundaries of District 2 are required; however, District 2 boundary changes are necessary to help increase the low population of District 10 and decrease the high population of District 7. As such, a contraction is proposed along the boundary of Districts 2 and 10 in the area bounded by Blossom Hill Road to the north, Snell Avenue to the east, Calero Avenue to the south, and Blossom Avenue to the west. Also, an expansion is proposed along the boundary of Districts 2 and 7, encompassing the area south of Hellyer Avenue between Senter Road and Highway 101.

District 3

Two boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 3. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that a modest expansion of District 3 is required. This expansion was accomplished along the boundary of Districts 3, 4, and 5 in the area generally surrounded by Highway 101 to the west, Mabury Road to the north, Educational Park Drive to the east, and Alum Rock Avenue to the south (specifically

excluding the commercial properties on the north side of Alum Rock Avenue, which are part of the Alum Rock Neighborhood Business District and which would remain in District 5). The addition of the Ann Darling and Little Portugal North neighborhoods is designed to address the identity of this area with this Council District. The second proposed boundary change is a contraction along the boundary of Districts 3 and 6 in the area westerly of Highway 880 and southerly of Campbell Avenue. This boundary change improves contiguity of the population in this area.

District 4

A number of boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 4. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that a substantial contraction of District 4 is required (District 4 is the second largest Council District). A great deal of interest, however, was expressed during the redistricting process in maintaining the integrity of the Berryessa Union School District boundary to the greatest extent possible, which boundary closely follows the existing boundary between Districts 4 and 5. In response, the required contraction occurs outside the school district boundary, in an area located north of McKee Road between Jackson Avenue to the west and Rough and Ready Road to the east. Similarly, two other minor boundary expansions are proposed which relate to schools, which locate Independence High School and Toyon Elementary School in District 4. One additional expansion is proposed further east along the boundary of Districts 4 and 5 to address the identity of this area (Rock Canyon neighborhood) with Berryessa (District 4).

District 5

A number of boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 5. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that no changes to the boundaries of District 5 are required. Nevertheless, the population of District 5 is quite high relative to the District mean. More importantly, District 5 is situated between the City's two largest Districts, District 8 and District 4. As a result, one of the more challenging tasks involved in the 2001 redistricting effort was to minimize the extent of boundary changes imposed on District 5.

The proposed redistricting plan minimizes change in District 5. One proposed boundary expansion is necessary to help decrease the high population of District 4 in the area north of McKee Road between Jackson Avenue to the west and Rough and Ready Road to the east. Two more proposed boundary expansions are necessary to help decrease the high population of District 8. These boundary changes between Districts 5 and 8 are located in the area immediately north of Lake Cunningham Park (Ocala and Bluewater neighborhoods) and in the area north of Clayton Road. Finally, a proposed contraction is necessary to increase the low population of District 3. This contraction is

located in the area generally surrounded by Highway 101 to the west, Mabury Road to the north, Educational Park Drive to the east, and Alum Rock Avenue to the south (specifically excluding the commercial properties on the north side of Alum Rock Avenue, which are part of the Alum Rock Neighborhood Business District and which would remain in District 5). Several other minor contractions are proposed along the boundary of Districts 4 and 5 (see the discussion of District 4 boundary changes above).

District 6

One boundary change is proposed to occur in Council District 6. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that no changes to the boundaries of District 6 are required. Nevertheless, the population of District 6 is quite low relative to the District mean. One expansion is proposed along the boundary of Districts 3 and 6 in the area westerly of Highway 880 and southerly of Campbell Avenue. This boundary change improves contiguity of the population in this area.

District 7

Three boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 7. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that a modest contraction of District 7 is required. District 7 is uniquely situated in the "center" of San Jose, sharing boundaries with a total of seven other Council Districts (including District 8, the City's largest District). As a result, one of the more challenging tasks involved in the 2001 redistricting effort was to minimize the extent of boundary changes imposed on District 7.

The proposed redistricting plan minimizes change in District 7. One proposed boundary expansion is necessary to help decrease the high population of District 8 in the area west of Highway 101 (Ramblewood neighborhood), and is nonetheless desirable from the standpoint that it follows street lines and increases the geographic compactness of District 7. The other two proposed changes are contractions located along the boundary of Districts 7 and 10 and along the boundary of Districts 2 and 7. Along the boundary of Districts 7 and 10, District 7 is contracted in the area between Old Hillsdale Avenue and Capitol Expressway (Waterford neighborhood). Along the boundary of Districts 2 and 7, District 7 is contracted in the area south of Hellyer Avenue between Senter Road and Highway 101.

District 8

Three boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 8. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that District 8 is the largest Council District, and that a very substantial contraction of the District is required. Thus, all three proposed boundary changes are contractions necessary to decrease the high population of the District. One contraction is proposed along the boundary of Districts 7 and 8 in the area west of Highway 101 (Ramblewood neighborhood). Two more contractions are proposed along

the boundary of Districts 5 and 8 in the area immediately north of Lake Cunningham Park (Ocala and Bluewater neighborhoods) and in the area north of Clayton Road.

District 9

One boundary change is proposed to occur in Council District 9. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that District 9 is the smallest Council District, and that a very substantial expansion of the District is required. This expansion was accomplished along the boundary of Districts 9 and 10 in the area of District 10 located north of Highway 85 and west of Highway 87. This proposed boundary change is desirable from the standpoint that it follows street lines, increases the geographic compactness of District 9, and avoids fragmentation of the Willow Glen neighborhood (in District 6) that would otherwise result from a boundary change between Districts 6 and 9.

District 10

Three boundary changes are proposed to occur in Council District 10. Population data from Census 2000 indicate that no changes to the boundaries of District 10 are required; however, District 10 boundary changes are necessary to help increase the low population of District 9 and decrease the high population of District 7. As such, a contraction is proposed along the boundary of Districts 9 and 10 in the area located north of Highway 85 and west of Highway 87. The other two proposed changes are expansions located along the boundary of Districts 7 and 10 and the boundary of Districts 2 and 10. Along the boundary of Districts 7 and 10, an expansion is proposed to encompass the area between Old Hillsdale Avenue and Capitol Expressway (Waterford neighborhood). Along the boundary of Districts 2 and 10, an expansion is proposed in the area bounded by Blossom Hill Road to the north, Snell Avenue to the east, Calero Avenue to the south, and Blossom Avenue to the west (this expansion is necessary to help offset the District 10 contraction along the boundary of Districts 9 and 10).

HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

May 23, 2001

Subject: Redistricting Report

Page 9

Conclusion

The Redistricting Advisory Commission recommends that the City Council approve the recommendations in this report and adopt an ordinance which implements the boundaries in the redistricting plan identified as the "Ten Percent No. 4 Plan."

Frank Fiscalini, Chair

Cc: City Manager
City Attorney
City Clerk

**Table 1:
2000 Population Variation Among Existing Council Districts**

Council District	1990 Population	2000 Population	Population Change (1990-2000)	Variation From District Mean (Persons)	Variation From District Mean (Percent)
1	77,842	85,180	7,338	-4,314	-4.8%
2	79,185	87,176	7,991	-2,318	-2.6%
3	76,277	83,256	6,979	-6,238	-7.0%
4	79,716	97,515	17,799	8,021	9.0%
5	79,804	93,776	13,972	4,282	4.8%
6	76,986	85,760	8,774	-3,734	-4.2%
7	80,135	95,528	15,393	6,034	6.7%
8	77,649	100,596	22,947	11,102	12.4%
9	76,616	79,496	2,880	-9,998	-11.2%
10	78,038	86,660	8,622	-2,834	-3.2%
Totals	782,248	894,943	112,695		
District Mean Population (2000)=		89,494			
10% Total Deviation from Mean= (plus or minus 5.0%)		85,020 to 93,969			

**Table 2:
Redistricting Implications of 2000 Population Data**

Council District	2000 Population	Comparison to 10% Deviation from Mean	Redistricting Implication	Population Change Required (min.) to Meet 10% Deviation
1	85,180	Within	None	0
2	87,176	Within	None	0
3	83,256	Below	Expansion	1,764
4	97,515	Above	Contraction	-3,546
5	93,776	Within	None	0
6	85,760	Within	None	0
7	95,528	Above	Contraction	-1,559
8	100,596	Above	Contraction	-6,627
9	79,496	Below	Expansion	5,524
10	86,660	Within	None	0
District Mean Population (2000)=		89,494		
10% Total Deviation from Mean= (plus or minus 5.0%)		85,020 to 93,969		

**Table 3:
2000 Population by Race and Ethnicity (Hispanic Inclusive)
By Existing Council District**

Council District	Total Population	Race										Ethnicity					
		White	% of District	African American	% of District	American Indian	% of District	Asian	% of District	Pacific Islander	% of District	Other	% of District	Multi-racial	% of District	Hispanic (any race)	% of District
1	85,180	46,945	55.1%	2,439	2.9%	404	0.5%	25,680	30.1%	269	0.3%	5,334	6.3%	4,109	4.8%	12,057	14.2%
2	87,176	50,379	57.8%	3,793	4.4%	699	0.8%	17,219	19.8%	411	0.5%	9,650	11.1%	5,025	5.8%	21,344	24.5%
3	83,256	34,886	41.9%	3,029	3.6%	1,180	1.4%	10,934	13.1%	304	0.4%	28,235	33.9%	4,688	5.6%	49,205	59.1%
4	97,515	30,224	31.0%	3,479	3.6%	511	0.5%	51,548	52.9%	490	0.5%	7,223	7.4%	4,040	4.1%	15,309	15.7%
5	93,776	28,640	30.5%	3,276	3.5%	1,065	1.1%	24,055	25.7%	530	0.6%	31,199	33.3%	5,011	5.3%	55,452	59.1%
6	85,760	57,118	66.6%	3,314	3.9%	656	0.8%	9,246	10.8%	262	0.3%	10,651	12.4%	4,513	5.3%	22,322	26.0%
7	95,528	25,932	27.1%	3,381	3.5%	874	0.9%	31,920	33.4%	454	0.5%	28,268	29.6%	4,699	4.9%	45,796	47.9%
8	100,596	33,548	33.3%	4,338	4.3%	589	0.6%	44,497	44.2%	470	0.5%	12,611	12.5%	4,543	4.5%	25,081	24.9%
9	79,496	61,101	76.9%	1,860	2.3%	452	0.6%	7,468	9.4%	152	0.2%	4,468	5.6%	3,995	5.0%	11,433	14.4%
10	86,660	56,244	64.9%	2,440	2.8%	435	0.5%	17,808	20.5%	242	0.3%	5,052	5.8%	4,439	5.1%	11,990	13.8%
Totals	894,943	425,017	47.5%	31,349	3.5%	6,865	0.8%	240,375	26.9%	3,584	0.4%	142,691	15.9%	45,062	5.0%	269,989	30.2%

**Table 4:
2000 Population by Race and Ethnicity (Hispanic Exclusive)
By Existing Council District**

Council District	Total Population	NH		NH		NH		NH		NH		NH		NH		NH	
		NH	White	African American	% of District	American Indian	% of District	Asian	% of District	Pacific Islander	% of District	Other	% of District	Multi-racial	% of District	Hispanic	% of District
1	85,180	41,524	48.7%	2,307	2.7%	227	0.3%	25,582	30.0%	248	0.3%	195	0.2%	3,040	3.6%	12,057	14.2%
2	87,176	41,161	47.2%	3,601	4.1%	405	0.5%	16,997	19.5%	331	0.4%	182	0.2%	3,155	3.6%	21,344	24.5%
3	83,256	17,879	21.5%	2,775	3.3%	370	0.4%	10,773	12.9%	217	0.3%	144	0.2%	1,893	2.3%	49,205	59.1%
4	97,515	23,881	24.5%	3,344	3.4%	272	0.3%	51,318	52.6%	433	0.4%	177	0.2%	2,781	2.9%	15,309	15.7%
5	93,776	8,784	9.4%	2,977	3.2%	269	0.3%	23,796	25.4%	471	0.5%	150	0.2%	1,877	2.0%	55,452	59.1%
6	85,760	47,782	55.7%	3,153	3.7%	297	0.3%	9,097	10.6%	240	0.3%	160	0.2%	2,709	3.2%	22,322	26.0%
7	95,528	12,009	12.6%	3,113	3.3%	317	0.3%	31,652	33.1%	387	0.4%	157	0.2%	2,097	2.2%	45,796	47.9%
8	100,596	23,428	23.3%	4,165	4.1%	237	0.2%	44,171	43.9%	410	0.4%	180	0.2%	2,924	2.9%	25,081	24.9%
9	79,496	55,397	69.7%	1,748	2.2%	297	0.4%	7,356	9.3%	138	0.2%	169	0.2%	2,958	3.7%	11,433	14.4%
10	86,660	50,689	58.5%	2,312	2.7%	268	0.3%	17,636	20.4%	218	0.3%	185	0.2%	3,362	3.9%	11,990	13.8%
Totals	894,943	322,534	36.0%	29,495	3.3%	2,959	0.3%	238,378	26.6%	3,093	0.3%	1,699	0.2%	26,796	3.0%	269,989	30.2%

NH= Non-Hispanic

**Table 5:
Proposed 2001 Redistricting Plan ("Ten Percent No. 4" Plan)
2000 Population Variation Among Proposed Council Districts**

Council District	Proposed Plan Total Population	Variation From District Mean (Persons)	Variation From District Mean (Percent)	Proposed Plan Voting Age Population
1	85,180	-4,314	-4.8%	64,356
2	89,413	-81	-0.1%	63,837
3	91,442	1,948	2.2%	68,087
4	93,694	4,200	4.7%	70,880
5	92,187	2,693	3.0%	63,851
6	86,937	-2,557	-2.9%	68,467
7	91,892	2,398	2.7%	64,274
8	92,294	2,800	3.1%	66,440
9	85,619	-3,875	-4.3%	64,584
10	86,285	-3,209	-3.6%	64,043
Totals	894,943			658,819
District Mean Population (2000)=	89,494			
10% Total Deviation from Mean= (plus or minus 5.0%)	85,020 to 93,969			

**Table 6:
2001 Redistricting Plan Chronology and Summary Data**

Plan Name	Date Introduced	Total Variation (From District Mean)	Race/Ethnic Dilution*	Total Transfer Population
"Starting Point"	4/18/2001	4.1%	Yes ¹	118,849
"Ten Percent"	4/25/2001	6.0%	No	88,554
"Ten Percent No.2"	5/2/2001	7.3%	Yes ²	98,201
"Ten Percent No.3"	5/9/2001	9.5%	No	45,332
"Ten Percent No.3A"	5/16/2001	9.5%	No	40,273
"Ten Percent No.3B"	5/16/2001	9.5%	No	41,135
"Ten Percent No. 4"	5/23/2001	9.5%	No	38,754

*NOTE: The term "dilution" used here describes a reduction of 4% or greater in the concentration of a non-white race/ethnic group when compared to the race/ethnic group concentrations of existing City Council Districts, per the 2000 Census.

¹Hispanic population of District 7 diluted 7.4% (from 47.9% to 40.5%); Asian population of District 8 diluted 5.5% (from 44.2% to 38.7%).

²Hispanic population of District 3 diluted 5.0% (from 59.1% to 54.1%).

**Table 7:
2000 Population by Race and Ethnicity (Hispanic Inclusive)
Proposed 2001 Redistricting Plan vs. Existing Council Districts**

Council District	Race														Ethnicity	
	White		African American		American Indian		Asian		Pacific Islander		Other		Multi-racial		Hispanic (any race)	
	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District
1	55.1%	55.1%	2.9%	2.9%	0.5%	0.5%	30.1%	30.1%	0.3%	0.3%	6.3%	6.3%	4.8%	4.8%	14.2%	14.2%
2	56.1%	57.8%	4.3%	4.4%	0.8%	0.8%	19.9%	19.8%	0.5%	0.5%	12.5%	11.1%	5.8%	5.8%	26.4%	24.5%
3	40.6%	41.9%	3.5%	3.6%	1.4%	1.4%	15.6%	13.1%	0.4%	0.4%	32.9%	33.9%	5.6%	5.6%	58.1%	59.1%
4	31.6%	31.0%	3.5%	3.6%	0.5%	0.5%	52.3%	52.9%	0.5%	0.5%	7.3%	7.4%	4.2%	4.1%	15.6%	15.7%
5	30.0%	30.5%	3.7%	3.5%	1.1%	1.1%	26.7%	25.7%	0.6%	0.6%	32.7%	33.3%	5.2%	5.3%	57.7%	59.1%
6	66.6%	66.6%	3.8%	3.9%	0.8%	0.8%	10.7%	10.8%	0.3%	0.3%	12.4%	12.4%	5.3%	5.3%	26.1%	26.0%
7	25.2%	27.1%	3.6%	3.5%	0.9%	0.9%	35.8%	33.4%	0.5%	0.5%	29.2%	29.6%	4.8%	4.9%	47.2%	47.9%
8	33.9%	33.3%	4.3%	4.3%	0.6%	0.6%	43.7%	44.2%	0.4%	0.5%	12.5%	12.5%	4.5%	4.5%	25.0%	24.9%
9	76.4%	76.9%	2.4%	2.3%	0.6%	0.6%	9.7%	9.4%	0.2%	0.2%	5.7%	5.6%	5.0%	5.0%	14.5%	14.4%
10	64.6%	64.9%	2.7%	2.8%	0.5%	0.5%	21.0%	20.5%	0.2%	0.3%	5.8%	5.8%	5.2%	5.1%	13.9%	13.8%

**Table 8:
2000 Population by Race and Ethnicity (Hispanic Exclusive)
Proposed 2001 Redistricting Plan vs. Existing Council Districts**

Council District	NH White		NH African American		NH American Indian		NH Asian		NH Pacific Islander		NH Other		NH Multi-racial		Hispanic	
	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District	Proposed Plan	Existing District
1	48.7%	48.7%	2.7%	2.7%	0.3%	0.3%	30.0%	30.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	3.6%	3.6%	14.2%	14.2%
2	45.2%	47.2%	4.1%	4.1%	0.5%	0.5%	19.6%	19.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	3.6%	3.6%	26.4%	24.5%
3	20.1%	21.5%	3.2%	3.3%	0.4%	0.4%	15.4%	12.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	2.3%	2.3%	58.1%	59.1%
4	25.2%	24.5%	3.4%	3.4%	0.3%	0.3%	52.1%	52.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	2.9%	2.9%	15.6%	15.7%
5	9.7%	9.4%	3.3%	3.2%	0.3%	0.3%	26.4%	25.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	1.9%	2.0%	57.7%	59.1%
6	55.7%	55.7%	3.7%	3.7%	0.4%	0.3%	10.6%	10.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	3.2%	3.2%	26.1%	26.0%
7	10.9%	12.6%	3.4%	3.3%	0.3%	0.3%	35.5%	33.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	2.2%	2.2%	47.2%	47.9%
8	23.8%	23.3%	4.2%	4.1%	0.2%	0.2%	43.4%	43.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	2.9%	2.9%	25.0%	24.9%
9	69.2%	69.7%	2.3%	2.2%	0.4%	0.4%	9.6%	9.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	3.7%	3.7%	14.5%	14.4%
10	58.1%	58.5%	2.6%	2.7%	0.3%	0.3%	20.8%	20.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	3.9%	3.9%	13.9%	13.8%

NH= Non-Hispanic