mesa·az

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 29, 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 September 29, 2021, at 5:00 p.m.

COMMISSION PRESENT	COMMISSION PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT
Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo, Chairperson	None	Jessica Gerspach
Elaine Miner, Vice Chair		Dee Ann Mickelsen
Catherine Jiang		Jeff Robbins
Greg Marek		
Jo Martin		

1.   Call meeting to order.

Chairperson Deanna Villanueva-Saucedo conducted a roll call.

2.   Approval of minutes from previous Redistricting Commission meetings.

It was moved by Commission Member Martin, seconded by Vice Chair Miner, that the May 12, May 20, June 16, June 23, August 12, 14, 17, 18, 25, 26, and 28, 2021, Redistricting Commission minutes be approved.

Carried unanimously.

3.   Hear a presentation on and discuss public input received, including input received at community outreach meetings and via online submissions.

Economic Development Project Manager Jeffrey Robbins introduced Kimi Shigitani, Chief Administrative Officer with Redistricting Partners, and displayed a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Robbins highlighted several ways for residents to submit feedback on a district map. He commented that the feedback so far has been very good; however, one of the challenges is that some of the information is not mappable. Mr. Robbins provided an overview of the five takeaways identified on the Staff Summary report. He commented the first takeaway is for Downtown Mesa, which is considered a Community of Interest (COI) as a gathering place that

has distinct needs and interests. He added that the Evergreen Historic District was also a concern since it is currently located in District 1 and has more similarities with other historic districts which are currently in District 4. **(See Attachment 1)**

Mr. Robbins commented on the second takeaway, which is the Riverview Shopping Center at Dobson Road and the 202. He stated many people exercise and play at Riverview Park, which is located in District 1, and directly south of the park is a neighborhood which is in District 3. He noted during times of high activity in the park, if residents have concerns or issues, they have to contact a different Councilmember to address their concerns.

Mr. Robbins highlighted the third takeaway, which includes the area surrounding Westwood High School. He noted that while schools in general are not governed by the City, the concern that was raised is the neighborhood around the high school since that community is in the confluence of Districts 1, 3, and 4.

Mr. Robbins explained the fourth takeaway includes the Fiesta Mall District and Mesa Community College (MCC). He commented many submissions stated there are numerous multi-family developments to the north of MCC and wanted to ensure if there is enough of a connection with MCC that the Redistricting Commission take that into consideration when redrawing boundaries.

Mr. Robbins commented on the final takeaway, which is the Asian District on Dobson Road that extends from Southern to Main. He remarked many submissions expressed concern in keeping the area in one district.

Mr. Robbins commented there were also a large plurality of responses that addressed how important parks are and to consider keeping communities together around parks.

Ms. Shigitani highlighted the Community of Interest Testimony Summary, which was collected from the placemats and comments during the outreach sessions, as well as from the DistrictR online tool. She clarified that some of the feedback was provided as districts and some as COI areas. **(See Attachment 2)**

Ms. Shigitani stated additional feedback on COI included the border of Districts 1 and 4 in northwest Mesa where the current boundary splits a neighborhood based on a canal that is no longer functional and keeping the Hispanic community intact.

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin, Commission Member Marek responded that as the former Historic Preservation Officer for the City, the Evergreen Historic District was one of the first neighborhoods outside the town center boundaries and has historically been tied to the Downtown area. He recalled when the City first went to the district system, Evergreen was in District 4; and in 2011, for various reasons, it was moved to District 1. He said not all historic districts are together because of different historical backgrounds.

4.   Hear a presentation, discuss and take action on draft maps produced by Redistricting Partners.

Ms. Shigitani referred to three sets of draft maps labeled A, B, and C, in addition to a set of cover sheets for each plan. She added that within each packet there is a page that provides a

data breakdown of each district, including citizen voting age population (CVAP), total population, deviations, and statistical and mapping data for each district.

Mr. Robbins indicated that staff has received some responses online about the draft maps and he stressed that these maps are starting points and that the Commission will not be adopting a map tonight.

Ms. Shigitani highlighted Draft Map A, which keeps most of the Hispanic area together that was identified as a COI in District 4 but cautioned that none of the maps can encapsulate all of the Hispanic community. She stated the deviation is 5.1%, well under the 10% recommended limit. **(See Attachment 3)**

In response to a question from Commission Members, Ms. Shigitani explained the deviation is absolute, combining the biggest positive and biggest negative. She added the allowable limit is 10%.

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin, Ms. Shigitani commented this draft does not keep the Asian District intact.

In response to a question from Commission Member Jiang regarding accommodating the huge growth that will continue in District 6, Ms. Shigitani replied that District 6 has a -3.3% population deviation, making it underpopulated to allow for some of that growth.

Discussion ensued relative to the lack of street level detail on the current draft maps; that these maps will assist the Commission in balancing out population, that this set of draft maps will help the Commission focus on a draft that makes the most sense, and that when the Commission returns in one week, maps will include place names, streets, and landmarks to assist with compiling a final version.

Ms. Shigitani highlighted Draft Map B, which has a higher deviation at 7.2%, due to the -3.9% deviation in District 6, and a 3.3% deviation in District 5. She explained this draft keeps the Hispanic community mostly in District 4, and District 2 comes farther west to pick up some of the Hispanic community. She stated this draft does a better job keeping the Asian District in District 3. She compared this plan to Draft Plan A in that the Hispanic CVAP in District 4 is very close at 36-37%. She commented this draft is similar to the existing district lines. **(See Attachment 4)**

In response to a question from Commission Member Jiang regarding the higher Asian population in District 6 than in District 3, Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo explained the Asian District in District 3 reflects an Asian destination, not necessarily where the Asian population resides.

Ms. Shigitani highlighted Draft Map C, which has a total deviation of 6% and explained the Hispanic community is mostly in District 4. She indicated District 6 remains largely the same; however, it does split the Superstition Mall area at the south end of District 2 and is slightly underpopulated to allow for anticipated growth. She commented the deviations provide a balance across districts. **(See Attachment 5)**

In response to a question from Commission Member Jiang regarding how the COI were captured in the three drafts, Mr. Robbins explained the problem with summarizing the five items

in the staff summary is that the data is not mappable. He stated the focus for tonight is to start at a high level and provide feedback, then turn that over to the Commission to adjust the maps.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo commented not all the five staff summary points may require action. She added Council has no jurisdiction over schools and not every house in a neighborhood has a student.

Commission Member Martin requested information on whether the Superstition Springs Mall architecture is governed by the Superstition Springs HOA, since many of the area auto parks are governed by those regulations.

Oscar Mancinas, a Mesa resident and spokesperson for the Washington-Escobedo neighborhood, noted none of the proposed maps maintain the neighborhood in District 4 despite comments requesting that both the Evergreen Historic District and Washington-Escobedo remain in District 4. He explained both areas have a lot in common with Downtown and the neighborhoods to the south of Downtown; that the district includes Martin Luther King (MLK) Drive; as well as the fact that the neighborhood was instrumental in activating the MLK day celebration.

Maria Mancinas, a Mesa resident and Chairperson for the Washington-Escobedo Neighborhood Advisory Committee, stated that five to six years ago the neighborhood organized and created a quality-of-life plan, which identified seven main goals of education, safety, code compliance, housing, and transportation. She expressed appreciation to partnerships with elected officials, staff, non-profits, and businesses for their assistance with the plan and with creating the heritage designation. She noted the Governor's office will be recognizing the neighborhood for the Heritage Preservation Honor Award. She respectfully requested, for these reasons and many others, that the Washington-Escobedo neighborhood remain in District 4.

Bruce Nelson, a Mesa resident, remarked that he is a product of the Washington-Escobedo neighborhood and was the economic team leader for the advisory committee. He commented over the years there have been multiple instances where the community was almost removed, and the neighbors fought back and won to maintain the community. He explained Site 17 was where African American troops lived because they were not allowed to live at Williams Air Force Base. He stated the importance in keeping things where they are and recognized what the community has accomplished. He requested that the Washington-Escobedo neighborhood remain in District 4.

Vic Linoff, a Mesa resident and the President of the Mesa Historical Foundation, stated he was the first Chair of the City's Historic Preservation Board and has a background in preservation. He stated that during his tenure on the board, six historic districts were formed, and he recognizes the challenging effort in redistricting. He stressed the strength of these communities, the need to protect historic communities, and to divide representation is not in their best interest.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo explained the Commission's responsibility is to use testimony to create districts from the base maps. She commented from her perspective, Map C is a logical starting point. She stated Map A creates a pinch point in District 3, and Map C has the Asian District more contained, and the numbers do not show a big decrease in the Hispanic population.

Vice Chair Miner expressed the opinion that Map C has a cleaner look but wants to ensure the Commission has the ability to change some of the lines or even switch map options if that is what is needed.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo clarified the Commission is not voting tonight, and that a common starting point will assist in changing the lines as needed.

Commission Member Marek agreed that a good base to start is Map C as the districts are compact and similar to the current districts. He stated some adjustments can be made to accommodate the concerns on Washington-Escobedo. He expressed concern with Map B as there is an appendage in District 3 which makes no sense. He said Map A essentially bifurcates District 3, creating a north and south area of the district. He expressed the opinion that Map A and Map B will require more adjustments and Map C will require the fewest changes.

Commission Member Jiang agreed that Map C has the most similarities to the current Districts, looks compact, and has the easiest boundaries and numbers to manipulate.

Commission Member Martin remarked that in reviewing the numbers, she wants to ensure minority votes will still have an impact in elections. She agreed that Map C would be the best starting point and allows for the highest percentage of black votes in all the districts.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo stated it was a consensus of the Commission to start with Map C as the base map.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo declared a recess at 6:07 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:15 p.m.

Paul Mitchell, owner of Redistricting Partners, explained if Commission Members identify specific changes, he can take a few moments and adjust the map to ensure population numbers are appropriately distributed among districts. He commented that sometimes areas can look small but have a lot of density and can be misleading. He pointed out if there are landmarks or areas in the City that should be in a particular district, a list can be compiled and discussed at a future meeting to ensure changes are practical and that the deviation is within range.

In response to feedback from Commission Members, Mr. Mitchell proceeded with revisions to Map C.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo stated due to considerable interest in the Evergreen Historic District and Washington-Escobedo, she requested Mr. Mitchell see what we can do with the map to accommodate those concerns.

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that as he selects areas, there are limitations based on census blocks which can have odd shapes and cannot be squared off.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo asked Mr. Robbins to send Redistricting Partners the boundaries of the Evergreen Historic District and Washington-Escobedo. She commented if including those areas leaves the deviations low, that is a win in terms of editing that area.

Commission Member Marek requested District 4 go further north past 9th Place, as that area also includes a historic district.

Mr. Mitchell explained at this location 9th place turns north to Brown Road, which leaves District 4 over by 4.56% and District 3 under by 3.9%, leaving a total deviation of close to 9%. He clarified if the higher deviation is to unify a neighborhood, that is a perfect reason to have a larger deviation to bring a community together.

In response to a question from Commission Member Jiang related to a 10-year growth projection, Mr. Robbins said while there are no future projections, the Commission can look at what has changed since 2010 to see possible trends for the next 10 years. He explained Districts 1-5 have seen growth between 4,000-7,000 people per district, and District 6 has had explosive growth of approximately 30%.

Responding to questions from Commission Members, Mr. Mitchell explained the ability to add population to District 2 is limited and one option is to take the area near the Superstition Freeway, depending on population density and shapes of census blocks.

In response to questions from Commission Members, Mr. Mitchell responded that District 6 should not be expanded; however, Districts 1-5 can increase.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo stated that every historical neighborhood may not be able to be included within District 4, but requested the neighborhoods be mapped, along with a couple of the adjustments at the edges. She requested Redistricting Partners return to a future meeting with those estimates and to provide more refined maps, including landmarks and the identified Asian District.

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin regarding the feedback provided on the Riverview community, Mr. Robbins stated that information is difficult to map since there are events happening at the park that affect the neighborhoods; however, they are not in the same district.

Commission Member Martin requested the major regional parks be added to the map, including Riverview, Pioneer, Eastmark Great Park, and Red Mountain Park, so residents can understand how neighborhoods connect and do not connect to parks.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo confirmed that the items to be added to the map for the next meeting are the four major parks, the Asian District, and the Downtown historic square mile.

Vice Chair Miner commented on concerns from citizens in the Mesa Grande neighborhood regarding the area surrounding Westwood High School (HS), and that they wanted the HS to be a focal point of redistricting. She recognized the difficulty in doing that, but out of respect for the organization's efforts, requested the maps show Westwood HS, Carson Junior High, and some of the other elementary schools to see if there are any accommodations that can be made.

Discussion ensued relative to the cross streets of that community, whether it is a registered community, and the fact that schools are not under the purview of the City Council.

Commission Member Marek indicated the Mesa Grande neighborhood is a very large area that is not defined.

Vice Chair Miner explained the residents of Mesa Grande are at the intersection of three districts which presents a challenge since they cannot elect those who represent them.

In response to a question from Commission Member Martin regarding the boundaries of the Mesa Grande community, Commission Member Marek stated most of Mesa Grande is in District 1, with the southern boundary at 8th Street.

Discussion ensued relative to the population numbers if District 1 went further west on University Drive, and whether that would include all of Mesa Grande.

Mr. Mitchell explained that change would under populate District 3.

In response to comments from Vice Chair Miner regarding declining school enrollment during COVID and the desire of the Mesa Grande community to reverse that trend, Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo commented that this is not a school issue; however, she is trying to be respectful of the neighborhood requests with a policy decision that will work for all residents.

Discussion ensued relative to other modifications that have less of an impact on the overall deviation, that District 3 is land locked and can only take from District 4, moving the eastern edge of District 3 from Extension to Country Club, and the result if the border at University was moved south.

Commission Member Marek explained District 4 will have major changes over the next three to five years because of several large multi-family construction projects which will increase the population.

Mr. Robbins stated Site 17 has Request for Proposals out right now to develop the area which will be built by 2030 and would bring many new residential units.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo reiterated stating District 6 population will remain lower, District 4 remains over, balancing of Districts 1-3, and the complication remains in the upper quadrant where Districts 1, 3, and 4 meet.

5.   Discuss and take action on processes and priorities for next Redistricting Commission meeting.

Chairperson Villanueva-Saucedo provided direction to Redistricting Partners to review the revisions to see how the population and deviation numbers work out and return to the Commission in one week to refine the map.

6.   Scheduling of future meetings.

Wednesday, October 6, 2021 – 5:00 p.m.

Thursday, October 14, 2021 - 5:30 p.m.

7.   Items from citizens present.

        There were no items from citizens present.

8.   Adjournment.

        Without objection, the Council Redistricting Commission meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Council Redistricting Commission meeting held on the 29th day of September 2021. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DEE ANN MICKELSEN, CITY CLERK

dm
(Attachments – 5)

Staff Summary-NLC Grant Redistricting Survey

Mesa received 57 map survey responses and 550 qualitative survey responses (as of 9/27/21) from Mesa residents via a community of interest survey which was supported by a grant from the National League of Cities. The grant was tied to specific outcomes that successfully raised awareness about Mesa's redistricting process but made the collection of actionable data for the purposes of redistricting difficult. The primary challenges are that it is difficult to identify mappable areas and that there is often not enough supplemental information to understand the nature of the community of interest. The survey was also not city-wide and focused exclusively on 2020 Census low-response tracts west of Gilbert Road. Staff reviewed and summarized takeaways from the survey below.

Takeaway with Possible Action Needed

1. **Downtown Mesa** - Generally Country Club to Mesa Drive. Downtown is a cultural and community hub with shared interests and priorities. This area may extend to surrounding historic districts. Downtown is currently in D4. Evergreen Historic district is currently in D1.
2. **Riverview Shopping Center/Dobson & 202** - Exercise and social groups identified this area as an important gathering space and community center. The area was sometimes defined as northwest Mesa north of University and west of Alma School. Riverview Park is currently located in D1 but is split from the residential directly south which is in D3.
3. **Westwood High** - The community surrounding was mentioned frequently. Feedback suggested that there is a community around the school that includes not just those that attend the school. Westwood is currently located in D1. The neighborhood borders D3 and D4.
4. **Fiesta Mall Fiesta District and Mesa community College** – Dobson and Southern to Alma School and Southern. The surrounding area is student occupied apartments. Multi-family on the border of D3 and D4 may be similar to the student multi-family near Dobson and Southern.
5. **Asian District** – Dobson and Southern to Dobson and Main. A cultural gathering space. Solidly in D3 and should remain in one single district. Currently there is one D4 area generally located at the southwest intersection of W. Broadway and S Alma School. This area should be examined closely to determine its cohesiveness with the Asian District.

Takeaway with Likely No Action Needed

1. Communities that surround a park feel ownership for their parks. Some mentions from the community include: Gene Autry Park, Fitch Park, Trovita Park, Princess Park, Reed Park, Countryside park, Chelsea Park, Greenfield Park, Silvergate Park, Red Mountain Park, Kleinman Park, SIlvergate Park, Reed Park, Sheephereders park 24th McDowell
    a. Eagles Park and surrounding neighborhoods – Solidly in D4
2. Dana Park area. Important gathering location. Solidly D2. There is no compelling boundary or particular community of interest
3. Dobson Ranch Library and Park are considered centerpieces of the surrounding community - Solidly in D3

City of Mesa

Community of Interest Testimony Summary

The City of Mesa has received submissions for Communities of Interest through a Community Survey and the online mapping tool DistrictR. There were some common themes that community members submitted in their testimony.

- Keep Eastmark together
  - Cadence and South Eastmark
 - Southeast Superstition Spring
  - Airport expansion

- Evergreen Historic District
  - Currently in District 1, wants to be in District 4 with other historic districts.

- Northwest Mesa should be together
  - Everything northwest of University and Alma School should be included
- District 1 and District 4 boundary is divided by a pass canal that no longer exists, breaking up a neighborhood
  - North Center St & W University Dr.
- Keep the Hispanic community together
  - North of 60

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

mesa
DISTRICTING
2021

8/12/21

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

Mesa Westwood Communi...
COMMUNITY NAME

W. Dee Montague
NAME

wdeamontague@hotmail.com
EMAIL (OPTIONAL)

DESCRIPTION
1. I would recommend that the major District Boundaries follow the 6 MPS High School boundaries.
2. The Westwood community is ... by having boundary down Univers...
3. The Whitford/Carson neighbor... west of Alma School Rd and North... Main is now completely disconnec...

8/14/21

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

COMMUNITY NAME

NAME
Erika Barry

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)
Az_maestra@ Hotmail.com

DESCRIPTION

Handwritten map annotations:

- ASIAN District Shopping Services Community activities
- Religious Center LDS Temple Are
- Historic Downtown - Arts community -
- Homeowners - long time and newcomers
  - Lots of social services in this area - could be broken up to share the burden -
  - impacts potential growth and new people wanting to come to the Area

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

8/14/21

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

COMMUNITY NAME

ROBSON HISTORIC

NAME

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)

DESCRIPTION

- SOCIAL SERVICES SHARED IN OTHER DISTRICTS

- ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ZONES / POTENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

mesa RICTING 2021

8/17/21

8/14/21

esa
RICTING
2021
1
85,970
+4.4%
2
91,188
-1.4%
3
83,207
-0.2%
4
80,993
-3.4%
5
80,435
-2.3%
6
84,030
+3%
N Country Club
N Alma School Rd
Loop 202
N Mesa Dr
N HorNE
N Stapley Dr
N Gilbert Rd
N Val Vista Dr
Mcdowell Rd
E Mckellips Rd
E Brown Rd
N Higley Rd
N Recker Rd
N Bush Highway
N Hawes Rd
N Ellsworth Rd
N Sossaman Rd
University Dr
E Main St
E Broadway
E Southern Ave
Eastern
W Southern Ave
W Baseline Rd
W Guadalupe Rd
S Dobson Rd
E Baseline Rd
E Guadalupe Rd
Loop 202
Apache Trl
S Ellsworth Rd
E Williams Gateway
E Pecos Rd
60
87
89
101
202

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

LEISUR ESTATES

COMMUNITY NAME

WILLIAM CORSARO

NAME

WACORSARO@GMAIL.COM

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)

INDIVIDUALLY OWNED HOMES
WITH RAPID GROWTH OF
NEW HOMES WITH FAMILIES

DESCRIPTION

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

8/17/21

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

COMMUNITY NAME

NAME
Kyle Jones

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)
kylejones@cox.

DESCRIPTION

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

2021

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

COMMUNITY NAME
Eastmark/Cadence

NAME
Matt Law

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)
3amos@Hotmail.com

DESCRIPTION

8/26/21

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

COMMUNITY NAME

NAME Julie Spilsbury

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)

DESCRIPTION

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

2021

CITY OF MESA REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST MAPPING ACTIVITY

INSTRUCTIONS

Please use this map as a way to draw your community of interest. It is important to know about communities so that the district lines can amplify the voices of residents.

Examples of communities can include neighborhoods, areas where many residents speak the same language, or areas where the residents use the same city facilities.

To start, please include a name for your community, your name and email address, and a description of your community. Then draw your community on the map.

COMMUNITY NAME
Southeast Mesa

NAME
Kimberly Miller

EMAIL (OPTIONAL)
KCROWTHERMILLER@GMAIL.COM

DESCRIPTION
_____
_____
_____
_____

Population | Data Layers | Evaluation

Save

▾ **Population Balance**

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

|	
	85,884
	86,741
	86,763
	87,472
	87,874
	86,037

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 211

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 1.2%

Population

Data Layers   Evaluation

Save

▼ **Population Balance**

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

88,968

79,753

86,310

88,774

89,231

87,393

Ideal: 86,830.33

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 8.15%

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 553

https://districtr.org/edit/42808?event=mesaaz

Population

| Save |

Data Layers   Evaluation

**Population**

▼ **Population Balance**

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

86,236

85,691

86,234

87,474

86,682

85,404

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 3,261

**MAX. POPULATION
DEVIATION:**   1.64%

Districtr

https://districtr.org/edit/42620?event=mesaaz

Population | Data Layers | Evaluation

Save

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

▼ **Population Balance**

86,805
85,948
87,877
86,485
87,388
86,268

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 211

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 1.21%

Population

Population

Save	☰

Data Layers | Evaluation

▼ **Population Balance**

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

86,206

90,656

92,618

76,134

85,975

89,182

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 211

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 12.32%

Districtr

https://districtr.org/edit/41658?event=mesaaz

👉

✏️

📐

🔍

Save

☰

Population

Data Layers   Evaluation

◢ **Population Balance**

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

88,904

77,511

86,235

84,631

88,755

89,362

Ideal: 86,830.33

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION:

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 5,584

10.73%

Scottsdale

Tempe

Arizona State University

Alta Mira

Salt River

Amberwood

Amberwood II

Mesa

Chandler

Kingsman

Gilbert

Hacienda Solano Park

CHD

A2A

Population

Data Layers   Evaluation

Save

▼ Population Balance

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

85,003

88,446

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED
POPULATION: 347,533

MAX. POPULATION
DEVIATION: 2.1%

≡   Save

Population   Data Layers   Evaluation

◄ **Population Balance**

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

Population

	86,238
	85,784
	87,393
	87,161
	87,666
	86,225

Ideal: 86,830.33

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 1.21%

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 515

Population

Save

Data Layers   Evaluation

▼ **Population Balance**

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

Ideal: 86,830.33

79,868

87,308

86,580

85,542

83,363

92,841

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 5,480

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 8.02%

https://districtr.org/edit/44446?event=mesaaz

Population

Data Layers   Evaluation   Save   ☰

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

▼ **Population Balance**

	86,283
	85,348
	87,836
	87,350
	88,032
	85,884

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 249

MAX. POPULATION
DEVIATION: 1.71%

≡   Save

Population   Data Layers   Evaluation

▼ **Population Balance**

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

Population

	87,452
	88,668
	83,667
	88,951
	86,355
	85,678

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 211

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 3.64%

Districtr

https://districtr.org/edit/42551?event=mesaaz

Save

Population | Data Layers | Evaluation

▼ Population Balance

�घ Uses **2020 Decennial Census** population with processing by Redistricting Partners on **2020 Blocks**.

	86,238
	85,784
	87,393
	87,161
	87,666
	86,225

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 515

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 1.21%

Redistricting Commission
September 29, 2021
Attachment 2
Page 23 of 31

Districtr

1 of 1

https://districtr.org/edit/41635?event=mesaaz

≡ Save

Population   Data Layers   Evaluation

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

▼ **Population Balance**

84,840

83,426

81,781

86,560

86,018

85,061

Ideal: 86,830.33

MAX. POPULATION
DEVIATION: 5.82%

UNASSIGNED
POPULATION: 13,296

Districtr

https://districtr.org/edit/42534?event=mesaaz

Population

Data Layers | Evaluation

Save

▼ **Population Balance**

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

Ideal: 86,830.33

87,951

85,154

79,027

78,798

86,339

99,686

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 4,027

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 14.81%

Districtr

https://districtr.org/edit/41872?event=mesaaz

Population   Data Layers   Evaluation

Save

▼ **Population Balance**

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

Ideal: 86,830.33

86,653

60,464

UNASSIGNED
POPULATION: 373,865

MAX. POPULATION
DEVIATION: 30.37%

≡   Save

Population   Data Layers   Evaluation

▼ **Population Balance**

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

90,161

85,525

91,849

93,871

Ideal: 86,830.33

81,565

75,752

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 12.76%

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 2,259

https://districtr.org/edit/43634?event=mesaaz

Population   Data Layers   Evaluation

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

◀ **Population Balance**

	87,236
	86,103
	87,035
	87,076
	86,009
	87,294

Ideal: 86,830.33

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 229

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 0.95%

District

https://districtr.org/edit/50914?event=mesaaz

Save

Population | Data Layers | Evaluation

▼ **Population Balance**

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

82,635
84,244
86,068
84,355
82,542
84,456

Ideal: 84,050

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 0

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 2.4%

Districtr

https://districtr.org/edit/51318?event=mesaaz

👉 🖊 📐 🔍 Save ☰

Population

| Data Layers | Evaluation |

▼ **Population Balance**

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

81,201

83,722

87,446

86,878

83,141

81,912

Ideal: 84,050

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 0

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 4.04%

Population

Data Layers	Evaluation

Save

▼ **Population Balance**

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

88,661

Ideal: 84,050

UNASSIGNED
POPULATION: 415,639

MAX. POPULATION
DEVIATION: 5.49%

Population

Data Layers   Evaluation

Save

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

▼ **Population Balance**

86,234

Ideal: 84,050

UNASSIGNED POPULATION: 418,066

MAX. POPULATION DEVIATION: 2.6%

https://districtr.org/edit/52250?event=mesaaz

Districtr

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

Census

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	84,023	84,257	85,328	85,580	83,856	81,273
Deviation	-30	204	1,275	1,527	-197	-2,780
Deviation %	-0.0%	0.2%	1.5%	1.8%	-0.2%	-3.3%
Other	59,042	63,622	50,692	34,080	65,523	61,300
Other %	70.3%	75.5%	59.4%	39.8%	78.1%	75.4%
Latino	20,742	16,091	26,468	45,701	14,166	14,343
Latino %	24.7%	19.1%	31.0%	53.4%	16.9%	17.6%
Asian	1,585	2,042	2,843	1,460	1,807	2,988
Asian %	1.9%	2.4%	3.3%	1.7%	2.2%	3.7%
Black	2,654	2,502	5,325	4,339	2,360	2,642
Black %	3.2%	3.0%	6.2%	5.1%	2.8%	3.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	58,855	63,735	57,850	48,630	61,335	42,877
Other CVAP	46,741	52,443	41,928	26,912	52,015	35,192
Other CVAP %	79.4%	82.3%	72.5%	55.3%	84.8%	82.1%
Latino CVAP	9,234	8,618	11,483	18,320	7,116	5,812
Latino CVAP %	15.7%	13.5%	19.9%	37.7%	11.6%	13.6%
Asian CVAP	773	708	1,253	924	846	1,180
Asian CVAP %	1.3%	1.1%	2.2%	1.9%	1.4%	2.8%
Black CVAP	2,107	1,966	3,186	2,474	1,359	693
Black CVAP %	3.6%	3.1%	5.5%	5.1%	2.2%	1.6%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

...ct 1

MESA

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
84,023	-30	-0.0%	59,042	70.3%	20,742	24.7%	1,585	1.9%	2,654	3.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
58,855	46,741	79.4%	9,234	15.7%	773	1.3%	2,107	3.6%

2020 Census

Other % 70%
Latino % 24%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 79%
Latino % 15%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

...ct 2

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
84,257	204	0.2%	63,622	75.5%	16,091	19.1%	2,042	2.4%	2,502	3.0%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
63,735	52,443	82.3%	8,618	13.5%	708	1.1%	1,966	3.1%

2020 Census

Other % 75%
Latino % 19%
Asian % 2%
Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 82%
Latino % 13%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

ct 3

2020 Census

Other %		59%
Latino %		31%
Asian %	3%	
Black %	6%	

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other %		72%
Latino %		19%
Asian %	2%	
Black %	5%	

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
85,328	1,275	1.5%	50,692	59.4%	26,468	31.0%	2,843	3.3%	5,325	6.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
57,850	41,928	72.5%	11,483	19.9%	1,253	2.2%	3,186	5.5%

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

ct 4

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
85,580	1,527	1.8%	34,080	39.8%	45,701	53.4%	1,460	1.7%	4,339	5.1%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
48,630	26,912	55.3%	18,320	37.7%	924	1.9%	2,474	5.1%

2020 Census

- Other %: 39%
- Latino %: 53%
- Asian %: 1%
- Black %: 5%

Citizen Voting Age Population

- Other %: 55%
- Latino %: 37%
- Asian %: 1%
- Black %: 5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

ct 5

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
83,856	-197	-0.2%	65,523	78.1%	14,166	16.9%	1,807	2.2%	2,360	2.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
61,335	52,015	84.8%	7,116	11.6%	846	1.4%	1,359	2.2%

2020 Census

Other % 78%
Latino % 16%
Asian % 2%
Black % 2%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 84%
Latino % 11%
Asian % 1%
Black % 2%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map A

ct 6

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
81,273	-2,780	-3.3%	61,300	75.4%	14,343	17.6%	2,988	3.7%	2,642	3.3%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
42,877	35,192	82.1%	5,812	13.6%	1,180	2.8%	693	1.6%

2020 Census

Other % 75%
Latino % 17%
Asian % 3%
Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 82%
Latino % 13%
Asian % 2%
Black % 1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

Census

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	84,269	84,937	84,159	83,374	86,813	80,765
Deviation	216	884	106	-679	2,760	-3,288
Deviation %	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	-0.8%	3.3%	-3.9%
Other	57,148	61,910	48,845	34,095	70,277	61,984
Other %	67.8%	72.9%	58.0%	40.9%	81.0%	76.7%
Latino	22,459	17,923	26,943	44,212	12,731	13,243
Latino %	26.7%	21.1%	32.0%	53.0%	14.7%	16.4%
Asian	1,538	2,039	2,942	1,290	2,027	2,889
Asian %	1.8%	2.4%	3.5%	1.5%	2.3%	3.6%
Black	3,124	3,065	5,429	3,777	1,778	2,649
Black %	3.7%	3.6%	6.5%	4.5%	2.0%	3.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	58,083	65,422	57,238	46,752	63,132	42,656
Other CVAP	45,749	52,087	40,838	26,397	54,507	35,652
Other CVAP %	78.8%	79.6%	71.3%	56.5%	86.3%	83.6%
Latino CVAP	9,460	10,227	12,032	17,162	6,547	5,154
Latino CVAP %	16.3%	15.6%	21.0%	36.7%	10.4%	12.1%
Asian CVAP	712	685	1,374	708	1,085	1,120
Asian CVAP %	1.2%	1.0%	2.4%	1.5%	1.7%	2.6%
Black CVAP	2,162	2,424	2,994	2,485	992	729
Black CVAP %	3.7%	3.7%	5.2%	5.3%	1.6%	1.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

District 1

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
84,269	216	0.3%	57,148	67.8%	22,459	26.7%	1,538	1.8%	3,124	3.7%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
58,083	45,749	78.8%	9,460	16.3%	712	1.2%	2,162	3.7%

MESA

2020 Census

Other % 67%
Latino % 26%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 78%
Latino % 16%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

District 2

Population	Deviation	Deviation %		
84,937	884	1.1%		

	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
Population	61,910	72.9%	17,923	21.1%	2,039	2.4%	3,065	3.6%

	Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
	65,422	52,087	79.6%	10,227	15.6%	685	1.0%	2,424	3.7%

2020 Census

Other % 72%
Latino % 21%
Asian % 2%
Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 79%
Latino % 15%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

District 3

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
84,159	106	0.1%	48,845	58.0%	26,943	32.0%	2,942	3.5%	5,429	6.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
57,238	40,838	71.3%	12,032	21.0%	1,374	2.4%	2,994	5.2%

2020 Census

Other % 58%
Latino % 32%
Asian % 3%
Black % 6%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 71%
Latino % 21%
Asian % 2%
Black % 5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

District 4

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
83,374	-679	-0.8%	34,095	40.9%	44,212	53.0%	1,290	1.5%	3,777	4.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
46,752	26,397	56.5%	17,162	36.7%	708	1.5%	2,485	5.3%

2020 Census

Other % 40%
Latino % 53%
Asian % 1%
Black % 4%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 56%
Latino % 36%
Asian % 1%
Black % 5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

District 5

Population	86,813
Deviation	2,760
Deviation %	3.3%

Other	70,277
Other %	81.0%
Latino	12,731
Latino %	14.7%
Asian	2,027
Asian %	2.3%
Black	1,778
Black %	2.0%

Total CVAP	63,132
Other CVAP	54,507
Other CVAP %	86.3%
Latino CVAP	6,547
Latino CVAP %	10.4%
Asian CVAP	1,085
Asian CVAP %	1.7%
Black CVAP	992
Black CVAP %	1.6%

2020 Census

Other % 81%
Latino % 14%
Asian % 2%
Black % 2%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 86%
Latino % 10%
Asian % 1%
Black % 1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map B

District 6

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
80,765	-3,288	-3.9%	61,984	76.7%	13,243	16.4%	2,889	3.6%	2,649	3.3%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
42,656	35,652	83.6%	5,154	12.1%	1,120	2.6%	729	1.7%

2020 Census

- Other % 76%
- Latino % 16%
- Asian % 3%
- Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

- Other % 83%
- Latino % 12%
- Asian % 2%
- Black % 1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	85,121	86,883	81,899	83,563	84,939	81,912
Deviation	1,068	2,830	-2,154	-490	886	-2,141
Deviation %	1.3%	3.4%	-2.6%	-0.6%	1.1%	-2.5%
Other	57,140	63,760	46,603	36,009	68,663	62,084
Other %	67.1%	73.4%	56.9%	43.1%	80.8%	75.8%
Latino	23,264	17,803	26,583	42,942	12,633	14,286
Latino %	27.3%	20.5%	32.5%	51.4%	14.9%	17.4%
Asian	1,603	2,165	2,994	1,175	1,869	2,919
Asian %	1.9%	2.5%	3.7%	1.4%	2.2%	3.6%
Black	3,114	3,155	5,719	3,437	1,774	2,623
Black %	3.7%	3.6%	7.0%	4.1%	2.1%	3.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	57,218	64,825	55,330	49,563	63,438	42,910
Other CVAP	44,445	52,186	37,998	29,903	55,208	35,490
Other CVAP %	77.7%	80.5%	68.7%	60.3%	87.0%	82.7%
Latino CVAP	9,664	9,431	12,656	16,754	6,528	5,550
Latino CVAP %	16.9%	14.5%	22.9%	33.8%	10.3%	12.9%
Asian CVAP	880	789	1,358	769	758	1,131
Asian CVAP %	1.5%	1.2%	2.5%	1.6%	1.2%	2.6%
Black CVAP	2,229	2,419	3,317	2,137	944	739
Black CVAP %	3.9%	3.7%	6.0%	4.3%	1.5%	1.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

District 1

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %	
85,121	1,068	1.3%	57,140	67.1%	23,264	27.3%	1,603	1.9%	3,114	3.7%	

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
57,218	44,445	77.7%	9,664	16.9%	880	1.5%	2,229	3.9%

MESA

2020 Census

- Other %: 67%
- Latino %: 27%
- Asian %: 1%
- Black %: 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

- Other %: 77%
- Latino %: 16%
- Asian %: 1%
- Black %: 3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

District 2

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
86,883	2,830	3.4%	63,760	73.4%	17,803	20.5%	2,165	2.5%	3,155	3.6%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
64,825	52,186	80.5%	9,431	14.5%	789	1.2%	2,419	3.7%

2020 Census

Other % 73%
Latino % 20%
Asian % 2%
Black % 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 80%
Latino % 14%
Asian % 1%
Black % 3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

District 3

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
81,899	-2,154	-2.6%	46,603	56.9%	26,583	32.5%	2,994	3.7%	5,719	7.0%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
55,330	37,998	68.7%	12,656	22.9%	1,358	2.5%	3,317	6.0%

2020 Census
Other %: 56% | Latino %: 32% | Asian %: 3% | Black %: 7%

Citizen Voting Age Population
Other %: 68% | Latino %: 22% | Asian %: 2% | Black %: 6%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

District 4

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian
83,563	-490	-0.6%	36,009	43.1%	42,942	51.4%	1,175

Asian %	Black	Black %	Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
1.4%	3,437	4.1%	49,563	29,903	60.3%	16,754	33.8%	769	1.6%	2,137	4.3%

2020 Census

Other % 43%
Latino % 51%
Asian % 1%
Black % 4%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 60%
Latino % 33%
Asian % 1%
Black % 4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

District 5

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
84,939	886	1.1%	68,663	80.8%	12,633	14.9%	1,869	2.2%	1,774	2.1%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
63,438	55,208	87.0%	6,528	10.3%	758	1.2%	944	1.5%

2020 Census

Other % 80%
Latino % 14%
Asian % 2%
Black % 2%

Citizen Voting Age Population

Other % 87%
Latino % 10%
Asian % 1%
Black % 1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of Mesa
Draft Map C

District 6

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
81,912	-2,141	-2.5%	62,084	75.8%	14,286	17.4%	2,919	3.6%	2,623	3.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
42,910	35,490	82.7%	5,550	12.9%	1,131	2.6%	739	1.7%

2020 Census

- Other %: 75%
- Latino %: 17%
- Asian %: 3%
- Black %: 3%

Citizen Voting Age Population

- Other %: 82%
- Latino %: 12%
- Asian %: 2%
- Black %: 1%