

COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MINUTES

October 6, 2021

The Council Redistricting Commission of the City of Mesa met in the lower-level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on October 6, 2021, at 5:02 p.m.

COMMISSION PRESENT	COUNCIL PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT
Deanna Villanueva Saucedo, Chairperson Elaine Miner, Vice Chair Catherine Jiang Greg Marek Jo Martin	None	Dee Ann Mickelsen Jeffrey Robbins Sarah Staudinger

1. Call meeting to order.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo called the meeting to order and welcomed the public present.

2. Discuss public input regarding district lines and draft maps, including public input received via online submissions.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo stated a Community of Interest (COI) map has been submitted from Mesa Grande and invited public comments. **(See Attachment 1)**

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo read a comment submitted online from Jacki Taylor requesting the Washington-Escobedo neighborhood remain within Council District 4.

Tim Boyle, a Mesa resident, stated he is part of the Mesa Grande community group that submitted the map and explained the considerations of the West Mesa boundaries including the school districts and the ongoing communication that happens between the school principals and parents in the area, as well as shared sports teams. He added that currently, many elementary school districts along Main Street are split between districts and his group was mindful of keeping those families and COI together, noting that families across Country Club Road do not fit into the same criteria.

Dea Montague, a Mesa resident, said he has lived in his neighborhood since 1968 and supports the map as presented. He mentioned the considerations for carving out the area west of Country Club Drive were the three elementary school districts and the fact that most teams in

the Western Little League are West of Country Club Drive. He recalled the previous discussions related to historic districts and pointed out the Clark Historic District is west of Country Club Drive, but he felt the pillar families in that district do not necessarily relate to the West 2nd Street or Evergreen Districts and do not need to be kept together.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo announced two members of the public who submitted comment cards in support of this item but did not wish to speak are Mesa residents Stefanie Peters and Chase Oiguattro.

Oscar Mancinas, a Mesa resident, focused on the Washington-Escobedo community and what is currently in District 4 and reported that neighborhood is receiving the 2021 Governor's Heritage Preservation Award for their work. He indicated that this community has had few resources but has continued to promote and advocate for themselves. He informed the Commission that his community has built organic relationships with the historic black community and the Latino Hispanic communities south of where they are presently and declared the significance the Washington-Escobedo Neighborhood has had in shaping and advocating for all communities of District 4 and promoting an image of Mesa that is both honest and diverse.

Derek Brosemann, a Mesa resident, said he is a member of the Steering Committee for Mesa Grande and the Housing and Community Development Advisory Board for the City of Mesa, and has lived in Mesa his whole life so has a good understanding of Mesa. He indicated the same challenges impact the North and South ends of Country Club Drive, so keeping those two areas together retains neighborhoods of impact and COI. He commented that the map also preserves keeping the Washington Park area together, which he feels is beneficial to Mesa.

Bruce Nelson, a Mesa resident, said the Washington-Escobedo community was always underserved and he shared some of the historical events of his community including the city taking away Site 17. He stated his community is growing and now has the Heritage designation, which is a point of pride, and he supports the map boundaries that keep his community with the other historic districts.

Vic Linoff, a Mesa resident, thanked the Commission and consultants for being so responsive to the public's concerns with keeping historic districts together. He recognized that keeping the historic districts together gives them strength, especially during these times of tremendous growth in the city that generally puts pressure on historic districts for other uses. He indicated that Flying Acres is another small historic district and Duke Manor could be added soon as well, so putting Washington-Escobedo back into District 4 is important.

Barbara Bingham, a Mesa resident, said she serves on the City of Mesa Historic Preservation Board and is in support of moving the Evergreen District from District 1 to District 4 to keep all historic neighborhoods together.

Stephanie Wright, a Mesa resident, represents Mesa Grande Community Alliance and spoke of the great relationships with the neighborhoods west of Country Club Drive and with Washington-Escobedo. She noted many things bring these communities together such as school boundaries, faith-based communities, and geographic boundaries. She expressed support for the Mesa Grande map submission.

Lindsay Gonzalez, a Mesa resident, did not wish to speak but submitted a comment card in support of keeping the historic districts in District 4.

Kittim Gastelum, a Mesa resident, did not wish to speak but submitted a comment card in support of keeping the historic districts in District 4.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo thanked the public for their input.

3. Hear a presentation and discuss draft maps produced by Redistricting Partners, including discussion of and reaching consensus on adjustments to district lines and revisions to the draft maps.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo provided a recap from the previous meeting when the Commission agreed to move forward with Map C to use as the starting point and requested Redistricting Partners return with three options based on the feedback, which included keeping Washington-Escobedo Park in District 4.

Chris Chaffee with Redistricting Partners displayed a PowerPoint presentation of the three proposed maps and census data. **(See Attachment 2)** He suggested they begin by reviewing the similarities between the maps labeled C2, C3, and C4 as follows:

- In District 4, all three versions are similar on the west side and encompass the historic districts as discussed.
- District 6 is very similar in almost every map and the same in C2 and C4. Map C3 extends the NW border to include all of the Superstition Springs Homeowners Association (HOA) communities.

Mr. Chaffee highlighted the differences between the maps beginning with C4. He pointed out District 2 extends north above Brown Road to unify Citrus Greens, Park Avenue and the Falcon Estates HOAs. He noted that District 5 comes south to the city border and Alta Mesa stays together. He advised if the Commission wants to adjust maps C2 and C3 to keep Alta Mesa together that it would create an island in the NE edge of District 2, and they would need to figure out a population swap in Districts 2 and 5.

Mr. Chaffee discussed the Mesa Grande map and the boundaries of District 3 extending north to include Riverview. He recognized C2 being the simplest map to change and said it would require a 3-way swap between Districts 1, 3 and 4. He added that a secondary check of the City Charter would be required after the population rebalancing of those three districts.

Mr. Chaffee explained after providing descriptions of the map variations, he informed the Commission that he had an aptitude ready for shifting boundaries and he opened the floor for questions.

Vice-Chair Miner referred to the community-driven map from Mesa Grande saying it appears to resolve the reported issues and concerns for District 4. She requested using a very clear street map that includes the natural boundaries, as well as the community boundaries, so the Commission can make necessary adjustments. She pointed out that the Mesa Grande map alleviates the separation in Alta Mesa and realizes that Districts 5 and 6 will also need

adjustments. She believed that District 6 has a low enough population to anticipate the growth in the next 10 years.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo commented she is not in favor of using the Mesa Grande map as the starting point due the radical change it creates in Districts 3 and 4 in both race and population. She explained the Mesa Grande map drops the Hispanic-Latino citizen voting age population (CVAP) down considerably in District 4 and bumps it up considerably in District 2, which she cannot support. She expressed preference for Map C3 or C4 but asked Commission members for opinions on which map provides the best starting point.

Commission Member Marek acknowledged Map C4 is the only map that keeps the Alta Mesa development in its entirety in District 5 which supports that COI. He expressed the opinion that Riverview should be part of District 3 to keep the area cohesive. He mentioned the increased population anticipated in District 6 and suggested possibly adjusting the border down to Baseline Road to accommodate future growth. He identified a small historic district west of Country Club Drive, between Pepper Street and 2nd Place, as having a strong tie to the downtown area. Based on his comments, he felt it best to focus on the C4 map as the starting point for adjustments.

Commission Member Jiang agreed and asked staff to display the Mesa Grande map so Commission Members can view the changes in the Latino CVAP in District 4. (See Page 2 of Attachment 1)

Economic Development Project Manager Jeffrey Robbins explained the numbers listed on the map calculations are color coded based on the order in which the districts were drawn and do not correlate with the actual district numbers. He declared the numbers colored on the map as 1=District 3, 2=District 4, 3=District 1, 4=District 2, 5=District 5, and 6=District 6.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo thanked Mr. Robbins for clarifying and alleviating the concern with the Latino CVAP. She added the underlying issue is school districts and boundaries and that is not something everyone in the city identifies with or something heard consistently at the public outreach meetings. She pointed out City Council has no oversight or legal jurisdiction over school operations, so she is uncomfortable using such criteria as the starting point and would recommend using Map C3 or C4.

Commission Member Jiang stated her concern with the Mesa Grande map submission and the deviation of 9% between District 6 being the smallest at 78,875 and the largest being District 4 at 85,934. She proposed using Map C4 as the starting point.

Mr. Robbins illustrated that the Mesa Grande map shows a deviation of 6.16% and clarified that deviation is from the ideal population of 84,050.

Mr. Chaffee explained the DistrictR software does not calculate the absolute value total deviation but rather the maximum deviation; in other words, it uses the district that is furthest from the ideal, which is District 6 in all the maps presented, and this map shows District 6 is below the ideal population by 6.16%. He said the 9% calculated deviation was correct between the smallest and the largest districts and still falls within the range of the deviation tool discussed, however it is at the upper end. He alerted the Commission that they would want to have very precise records clarifying the reasoning for a higher deviation.

Commission Member Martin expressed the desire of keeping HOAs intact. She stated concern in ensuring the minority vote is not split. She requested keeping Superstition Springs together and Alta Mesa together, whether that is using Map C3 or C4.

Commission Member Marek suggested that an HOA with two different council members can make things more difficult, especially with master planned communities that have a stronger voice when kept intact. He agreed it would be nice to keep both the Superstition Springs development and Alta Mesa intact and within the same district boundaries.

Vice-Chair Miner emphasized that she is trying to help the two different groups present that feel passionately about their communities. She said her discussions with Mesa Grande was about a community that has worked together for many years to accomplish many things and wants a City Councilmember that will represent those interests. She also heard the same from District 4 and honors those concerns. She agreed that the HOAs should stay intact and the percentage of each of the districts be similar, although District 6 needs to have less numbers to prepare for its tremendous growth in the next 10 years.

Commission Member Marek said the Mesa Grande map should not be ignored but recognized that the Commission needs to focus on one map that provides the best boundaries as a starting point and work from there to adjust.

Vice-Chair Miner agreed with that as well and appreciated the clarification.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo declared that Map C4 was the best starting point for the Commission and asked Redistricting Partners to start with the Superstition Springs area.

Mr. Chaffee recommended using the unified Superstition Springs area shown on map C3 as the eastern boundary of District 6, which puts the deviation over by 1.5%, and bring down the north boundary to Baseline Road to under deviate the numbers by 2-3%. He also suggested dropping down the boundary of District 5 just east of the Loop 202 down to Baseline Road and using the HOAs as a guiding line to create a new border between Districts 5 and 6.

Mr. Robbins offered to hear Commission's feedback and then take a break to allow Redistricting Partners to reconfigure the maps to accomplish as much progress tonight as possible.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo and Commission Member Marek discussed keeping the portion of West Clark Street, about a quarter mile west of Country Club Drive between Main Street and West 2nd Place, in District 4.

Commission Member Jiang inquired about the growth comparison of districts from 2010 to 2020 and Mr. Chaffee agreed to provide those numbers after the break.

Commission Member Marek stated interest in seeing District 4 borders as presented by Mesa Grande adjusting up from Main Street to University Drive and how that would skew the population.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo declared a recess at 6:09 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:22 p.m.

Mr. Chaffee referenced a portion from the Mesa Grande map that he used to extend District 3 up to the north end of the city and the swap is extending a portion of District 4 into District 3, which creates a deviation balance with District 3 at .09% and District 4 at 1.9%. He clarified the adjustment retains the Community Area New Development Organization (C.A.N.D.O.) Historic District in District 4.

Mr. Chaffee continued to adjust the map online extending blocks of District 2 north and blocks of District 5 south, which keeps Alta Mesa intact in District 5 and balances those districts. He recalled the Superstition Springs area was already made whole in District 6, so to over-populate District 5 and under-populate District 6, he dropped District 5 down to Baseline Road creating a -3% deviation in District 6 and rebalanced the numbers.

Mr. Chaffee pointed out that District 1 is at -4.4% deviation and needs to gain more population. He proposed the possibility of pulling a block from District 4 between University Drive and Main Street.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo inquired about picking up a small amount of population from District 5 to add to District 1 that might also assist the over-population created in District 5. Mr. Chaffee confirmed that adjustment would create an overage in District 5 of 4.7% and 3% under in District 1 for a total deviation of 7.96%.

Commission Member Marek stated the rationale for the deviation is to accommodate for the expected growth in District 6.

Mr. Chaffee followed up by adding the slow growth in District 5 over the past decade also applies to the rationale.

Mr. Robbins displayed a map of the registered HOAs in the area that was extended from the Superstition Freeway to Baseline Road and pointed out that no neighborhoods were separated. He informed the Commission that the map was fully accessible by the public on the website, and he would also send the link to the Commission after the meeting.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo announced that the new adjustments proposed seemed to alleviate the following:

- Historic district concerns
- Alta Mesa concerns
- Superstition Springs concerns
- District 6 is slightly under populated to allow for growth
- District 5 has the slowest growth
- No HOAs were divided between Districts 5 and 6

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin related to any input from Council, Mr. Robbins said he met with the Mayor and Councilmembers Heredia and Freeman and reported some of the feedback has already been addressed at this meeting. He added that Councilmember Freeman had comments about Evergreen and Councilmember Heredia thought it made sense to pick up Riverview in District 3.

Commission Member Martin indicated that Superstition Springs is part of the Gilbert School District.

Commission Member Jiang mentioned the subject of school districts has come up often during the public meetings and recommended the redistricting website inform the public that the school district is not part of the redistricting process.

Mr. Chaffee presented the overview map to be titled C5 as redrawn with Commission input and reported a 7.7% total deviation. He highlighted the CVAP for District 4 is Latino 36.1%, Asian 1.5%, and African American 4.4%, which is better than the current lines for District 4. **(See Attachment 3)**

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo highlighted the goals met by the adjustments are as follows: all of the historic districts are in District 4; the CVAP for Latino is in the 30's; the Superstition Springs and Alta Mesa areas are good; District 3 goes north as requested by public input; and District 6 is under populated by 2.6%.

In response to a request from Commission Member Martin, Mr. Chaffee listed the CVAP for each district, according to the C5 map adjustments made so far:

- District 1: Latino 16.3%; Asian 1.6%; Black 4.3%
- District 2: Latino 13.7%; Asian 0.9%; Black 3.7%
- District 3: Latino 21.8%; Asian 2.5%; Black 5.7%
- District 4: Latino 36.1%; Asian 1.5%; Black 4.4%
- District 5: Latino 10.6%; Asian 1.3%; Black 1.5%
- District 6: Latino 13.6%; Asian 2.8%; Black 1.6%

Commission Member Marek asked Mr. Chaffee to recite the specific street boundaries adjusted on his map during this meeting. Mr. Chaffee described the eastern border of District 3 is Country Club Drive and the NW corner of District 4 would include the cultural area bordered by Country Club Drive, Brown Road, Mesa Drive, and University Drive. He added District 4 was extended west along University Drive to Alma School Road and drops down to Broadway Road, then follows Extension Road down the remaining western border to Baseline Road. He described District 6 boundaries from Superstition Springs at the canal up to the non-annexed island, and then to the Loop 202 on the eastern boundary down to Baseline Road.

Mr. Chaffee continued describing the extension of District 1 from the current eastern boundary of Val Vista Drive now to Greenfield Road and then down to McKellips Road.

Mr. Robbins mentioned the possibility of moving the line for District 1 further east to the Loop 202 which would then encompass Falcon Field and lower District 5; however, he added that area would not add much population.

Commission Member Jiang commented that District 1 is quite small with a lower deviation of 3%.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo stated since the lines are allowable and the entire map has a 7.7% deviation, the community member concerns have been met, and CVAP numbers are satisfactory, then she feels good about this map.

Commission Member Marek and Vice-Chair Miner stated their support for the revised map.

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin, Mr. Chaffee listed the standard deviation for each district as follows: District 1 = -3%; District 2 = 1.6%; District 3 = 0; District 4 = 2.1%; District 5 = 5.1%; and District 6 = -2.6%.

Mr. Chaffee said he would email the new Map C5 that includes street names to the Commission after the meeting.

4. Take action on district map to recommend to the Mesa City Council.

It was moved by Commission Member Martin, seconded by Commission Member Jiang to accept Map C5 as the proposed map to be forwarded to the City Council.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Villanueva Saucedo-Miner-Jiang-Marek-Martin
NAYS – None
ABSENT – None

Carried unanimously.

5. Discuss, consider, and take action on authorizing Chair Villanueva-Saucedo to review and approve Redistricting Commission minutes, which will be forwarded to the Mesa City Council for consideration.

It was moved by Commission Member Marek, seconded by Commission Member Martin, to authorize Commission Chair Villanueva-Saucedo to review and approve the Redistricting Commission minutes to be forwarded to the Mesa City Council for consideration.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Villanueva Saucedo-Miner-Jiang-Marek-Martin
NAYS – None
ABSENT – None

Carried unanimously.

6. Scheduling of future meetings.

Mr. Robbins announced after City Manager review, staff and Redistricting Partners will be taking Map C5 and the presentation to City Council on November 15, 2021. He said the map will be added on the redistricting webpage to view until then and any comments may be emailed to redistricting@mesaaz.gov.

In response to a question from Commission Member Marek, Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo replied that staff could create a shell of the presentation for Council and let the Commission members weigh in with comments directly to staff.

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin, City Clerk DeeAnn Mickelsen reported the final Council approval of the map must be no later than December 1, 2021.

Mr. Robbins reminded the Commission that a calendar date of November 17, 2021, was previously reserved as a placeholder in case Council does not approve the map and the Commission needs to reconvene.

7. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.


8. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Council Redistricting Commission adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Council Redistricting Commission of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 6th day of October 2021. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DEE ANN MICKELSEN, CITY CLERK

la/hm
(Attachments – 3)




Save

Population Data Layers Evaluation

Population Balance

① Uses 2020 Decennial Census population with processing by Redistricting Partners on 2020 Blocks.



UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 32
 MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 6.16%
 Highlight unassigned units

Population Data Layers Evaluation

Population by Race

Citizen Voting Age Population by Race

COMPARE Hispanic population

WITH Black population

AND Asian population

	Hispanic	Black	Asian
1	21.1%	5.1%	2.4%
2	36%	5.6%	1.2%
3	11.8%	2.5%	1.6%
4	17.1%	4.1%	1.2%
5	13.1%	2.1%	1.3%
6	12.2%	1.8%	2.7%
Overall	18.2%	3.5%	1.7%

Population Data Layers Evaluation

Population by Race


Citizen Voting Age Population by Race

COMPARE Hispanic population

WITH Asian population

AND Black population

	Hispanic	Asian	Black
1	31.6%	3.5%	6.5%
2	52.9%	1.4%	4.7%
3	19.5%	2.3%	2.3%
4	24.1%	2.2%	4%
5	18.2%	2.3%	2.9%
6	16.4%	3.6%	3.2%
Overall	27.3%	2.5%	3.9%




Census

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	80,801	85,928	81,899	87,883	85,894	81,912
Deviation	-3,252	1,875	-2,154	3,830	1,841	-2,141
Deviation %	-3.9%	2.2%	-2.6%	4.6%	2.2%	-2.5%
Other	54,453	62,965	46,603	38,696	69,458	62,084
Other %	67.4%	73.3%	56.9%	44.0%	80.9%	75.8%
Latino	21,932	17,660	26,583	44,274	12,776	14,286
Latino %	27.1%	20.6%	32.5%	50.4%	14.9%	17.4%
Asian	1,560	2,158	2,994	1,218	1,876	2,919
Asian %	1.9%	2.5%	3.7%	1.4%	2.2%	3.6%
Black	2,856	3,145	5,719	3,695	1,784	2,623
Black %	3.5%	3.7%	7.0%	4.2%	2.1%	3.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	54,270	63,989	55,330	52,511	64,273	42,910
Other CVAP	42,264	51,488	37,998	32,084	55,906	35,490
Other CVAP %	77.9%	80.5%	68.7%	61.1%	87.0%	82.7%
Latino CVAP	9,094	9,293	12,656	17,324	6,666	5,550
Latino CVAP %	16.8%	14.5%	22.9%	33.0%	10.4%	12.9%
Asian CVAP	872	789	1,358	777	758	1,131
Asian CVAP %	1.6%	1.2%	2.5%	1.5%	1.2%	2.6%
Black CVAP	2,040	2,419	3,317	2,326	944	739
Black CVAP %	3.8%	3.8%	6.0%	4.4%	1.5%	1.7%




Census

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	80,029	86,031	82,671	87,498	82,515	85,573
Deviation	-4,024	1,978	-1,382	3,445	-1,538	1,520
Deviation %	-4.8%	2.4%	-1.6%	4.1%	-1.8%	1.8%
Other	53,938	63,799	47,118	37,907	66,959	64,538
Other %	67.4%	74.2%	57.0%	43.3%	81.1%	75.4%
Latino	21,741	17,253	26,774	44,709	12,000	15,034
Latino %	27.2%	20.1%	32.4%	51.1%	14.5%	17.6%
Asian	1,539	1,953	3,015	1,224	1,836	3,158
Asian %	1.9%	2.3%	3.6%	1.4%	2.2%	3.7%
Black	2,811	3,026	5,764	3,658	1,720	2,843
Black %	3.5%	3.5%	7.0%	4.2%	2.1%	3.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	53,760	65,263	55,840	51,256	61,360	45,804
Other CVAP	41,778	53,162	38,484	30,674	53,425	37,706
Other CVAP %	77.7%	81.5%	68.9%	59.8%	87.1%	82.3%
Latino CVAP	9,074	9,100	12,676	17,374	6,284	6,074
Latino CVAP %	16.9%	13.9%	22.7%	33.9%	10.2%	13.3%
Asian CVAP	872	696	1,358	792	751	1,215
Asian CVAP %	1.6%	1.1%	2.4%	1.5%	1.2%	2.7%
Black CVAP	2,036	2,304	3,321	2,416	899	809
Black CVAP %	3.8%	3.5%	5.9%	4.7%	1.5%	1.8%



Census


	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	82,426	86,373	82,671	85,101	85,834	81,912
Deviation	-1,627	2,320	-1,382	1,048	1,781	-2,141
Deviation %	-1.9%	2.8%	-1.6%	1.2%	2.1%	-2.5%
Other	55,876	63,720	47,118	35,969	69,492	62,084
Other %	67.8%	73.8%	57.0%	42.3%	81.0%	75.8%
Latino	22,033	17,273	26,774	44,417	12,728	14,286
Latino %	26.7%	20.0%	32.4%	52.2%	14.8%	17.4%
Asian	1,567	2,228	3,015	1,196	1,800	2,919
Asian %	1.9%	2.6%	3.6%	1.4%	2.1%	3.6%
Black	2,950	3,152	5,764	3,519	1,814	2,623
Black %	3.6%	3.6%	7.0%	4.1%	2.1%	3.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	55,815	65,179	55,840	49,201	64,364	42,884
Other CVAP	43,488	53,110	38,484	28,964	55,713	35,471
Other CVAP %	77.9%	81.5%	68.9%	58.9%	86.6%	82.7%
Latino CVAP	9,284	9,076	12,676	17,164	6,838	5,544
Latino CVAP %	16.6%	13.9%	22.7%	34.9%	10.6%	12.9%
Asian CVAP	882	645	1,358	782	887	1,130
Asian CVAP %	1.6%	1.0%	2.4%	1.6%	1.4%	2.6%
Black CVAP	2,161	2,348	3,321	2,291	926	739
Black CVAP %	3.9%	3.6%	5.9%	4.7%	1.4%	1.7%


REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa Plan C5



City of Mesa

Draft Plan C5 with Current Lines





Census

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	81,494	82,712	84,024	85,829	88,351	81,907
Deviation	-2,559	-1,341	-29	1,776	4,298	-2,146
Deviation %	-3.0%	-1.6%	-0.0%	2.1%	5.1%	-2.6%
Other	55,270	61,266	49,578	35,089	71,322	61,734
Other %	67.8%	74.1%	59.0%	40.9%	80.7%	75.4%
Latino	21,761	16,525	25,887	45,681	13,215	14,442
Latino %	26.7%	20.0%	30.8%	53.2%	15.0%	17.6%
Asian	1,589	1,989	2,999	1,252	1,868	3,028
Asian %	1.9%	2.4%	3.6%	1.5%	2.1%	3.7%
Black	2,874	2,932	5,560	3,807	1,946	2,703
Black %	3.5%	3.5%	6.6%	4.4%	2.2%	3.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	55,750	62,259	57,335	48,656	65,895	43,388
Other CVAP	43,368	50,875	40,126	28,233	57,046	35,582
Other CVAP %	77.8%	81.7%	70.0%	58.0%	86.6%	82.0%
Latino CVAP	9,113	8,546	12,500	17,551	6,966	5,906
Latino CVAP %	16.3%	13.7%	21.8%	36.1%	10.6%	13.6%
Asian CVAP	892	560	1,453	717	867	1,195
Asian CVAP %	1.6%	0.9%	2.5%	1.5%	1.3%	2.8%
Black CVAP	2,377	2,278	3,256	2,155	1,015	705
Black CVAP %	4.3%	3.7%	5.7%	4.4%	1.5%	1.6%