

STATEMENT OF CHANGE

Chapter 1 of the Acts of Assembly of 2012 (hereafter Chapter 1) revises Virginia's 11 congressional districts. Virginia's population grew at a rate of 13 percent, from 7,079,030 to 8,001,024, between 2000 and 2010. The pattern of growth was uneven across the Commonwealth, as illustrated in the attached map (Exhibit A) showing percent change in population by locality between 2000 and 2010.

Chapter 1 accommodates these population shifts and takes into account the variety of criteria and factors that traditionally shape the legislature's redistricting decisions. Each congressional district was altered both to bring the district itself into conformity with population criteria and to facilitate necessary changes in adjoining districts.

POPULATION CHANGE BY REGION

Virginia's population increase of 921,994 was concentrated in the outer suburban and exurban rings of Northern Virginia and, secondarily, along the Interstate 64 corridor running from the suburban Hampton Peninsula to the Charlottesville area. These areas account for an increase of 741,158, or 80 percent, of the overall state growth.

The largest increases in population are found in the suburban arc around the older Northern Virginia metropolitan core. Loudoun, Prince William, and Stafford Counties, along with the smaller Cities of Manassas and Manassas Park surrounded by Prince William, experienced an overall 52 percent growth rate. The increase of 307,085 accounts for one-third of the state's total population

growth. The older core of the Northern Virginia region (Arlington County, City of Alexandria, and Fairfax County and the small Cities of Fairfax and Falls Church that it surrounds) continued to gain population (144,866), but its rate of growth, 11 percent, lagged slightly behind the state's overall growth rate.

As population continued to push out from the Northern Virginia core, the next adjoining set of "exurban" localities likewise experienced heavy growth. An overall growth rate of almost 30 percent (28.8 percent) increased the state's population by 103,401 in, from north to south, Frederick, Clarke, Fauquier, Culpeper, Orange, Spotsylvania, Caroline, and King George Counties and including the Cities of Fredericksburg and Winchester.

The corridor along Interstate 64 from the North Hampton Roads suburbs to Charlottesville, skirting the Richmond metropolitan core, with a 21.1 percent overall growth rate, likewise added 84,838 to the state's total growth. (This corridor includes, from east to west, York, James City, New Kent, Hanover, Goochland, Louisa, Fluvanna, and Albemarle Counties and the Cities of Charlottesville and Williamsburg.) One additional area of growth to be noted consists of the two large counties encircling the City of Richmond. Chesterfield and Henrico Counties combined to add 100,968 in population, a growth rate of 19.3 percent.

The situation for the major cities of Hampton Roads is in contrast with the growth of the Northern Virginia and Richmond metropolitan regions. Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Virginia Beach in South Hampton Roads and Hampton and Newport News in North Hampton Roads combined for a

growth rate of only 2.3 percent. Portsmouth and Hampton actually lost population over the last decade. Above average growth in the adjoining suburban jurisdictions (James City and York Counties and the City of Williamsburg in the North and the City of Suffolk and Isle of Wight County in the South) could not offset the overall lag for the entire metropolitan region.

As can be seen on the Exhibit A map, most rural localities and smaller metropolitan areas in the rest of the state grew at rates below the state average, or in some instances actually lost population, over the last decade. The populations of most of the state's 39 cities increased between 2000 and 2010, but only seven experienced growth exceeding the state average. In addition to the smaller cities cited above in the high growth areas, Harrisonburg and Lynchburg had moderately higher growth and the suburban Hampton Roads City of Suffolk grew at a rate of 32.8 percent.

IMPACT OF POPULATION SHIFTS ON DISTRICTS

The ideal population for a congressional district based on the 2010 Census is 727,366. The range of deviations from the ideal for the current, pre-Chapter 1 districts was extensive – from a plus 19.5 percent deviation (Tenth District) to a minus 11.2 percent deviation (Second District). No district is within one percent of ideal, and deviations in seven of the 11 districts exceed five percent. Adjustments were made to each district to eliminate the disparities in populations between the districts. A review of major regions of the Commonwealth illustrates the impact of the 2010 Census population shifts.

Northern Virginia

As used here, Northern Virginia consists of an older central core and suburban and exurban rings. Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, and Fairfax County and the Cities of Fairfax and Falls Church are the oldest, "central" part of the greater Northern Virginia region. The components of the rapidly growing grouping of suburban and exurban localities have been listed above (see page 2.) Northern Virginia is home to three congressional districts (Eighth, Tenth, and Eleventh), and the outer suburban-exurban localities also add population to districts that stretch south and southeast to Hampton Roads (First) and the Richmond (Seventh) area.

The current Eighth, Tenth, and Eleventh Districts are, in round numbers, collectively 180,000 over the total population for three districts. Chapter 1 first equalizes population among the three districts and then moves this excess population "downstate" to underpopulated districts centered in the Hampton Roads area and in rural western and southern Virginia. The current Eighth District, primarily an inside-the-Beltway district, was 26,356 below the ideal population in 2010. Population exchanges in Fairfax County, primarily with the current Eleventh District, add the population to bring the Eighth to the ideal number in Chapter 1.

Chapter 1 moves the largest part of the excess 180,000 directly from Prince William into the First District. The Prince William component of the First District increases from 55,000 to 167,000, a net shift of 112,000 population. Most of this population is destined for the Second-Third-Fourth District area

through Hampton and Newport News, primarily to make up the Second District's population deficit.

Chapter 1 completes the downstate transfer of population in the northwest part of Northern Virginia. Warren County moves to the Sixth District and the northwest part of Fauquier County moves to the Fifth District, for a total transfer of 68,000.

Hampton Roads

The urban southeastern corner of the state is the second largest of its metropolitan regions. It includes the South Hampton Roads Cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach and North Hampton Roads Cities of Hampton and Newport News, bordered by several less populous counties and small cities. As noted above, this area for the second straight decade lagged dramatically behind the state's overall growth rate.

The current Second District almost exclusively is contained in this region and is the most underpopulated of the state's districts at 81,182 below the ideal size. Almost 60 percent of the Third District also is in this area. This district, the Virginia district that has an African American majority, is 63,976 below the required population. Hampton Roads also has a share of two additional districts. Almost one-half (45 percent) of the population in the Fourth District is in Hampton Roads. This district stretches west into Southside Virginia and includes African Americans as 34 percent of its population. Its 2010 population was slightly (11,273) above ideal. Finally, the First District stretches from the Northern Virginia suburban area southeast through the rural peninsulas and into North

Hampton Roads, where it picks up approximately a third of the district's population. The First covers areas of above average growth and is 58,871 over the required population. Since Chapter 1 also moves almost 112,000 from the Northern Virginia area into the First District, that district has a significant excess population to be redistributed.

Chapter 1 uses population from the First District in the Newport News-Hampton area to make up the Second District's population deficit. In round numbers, 88,000 in Newport News is shifted from the First to the Second District. Some population is exchanged between First, Second, and Third Districts to add population to the Third District, but Chapter 1 finds most of the population required to erase the Third District deficit at the western end of the district. About 35,000 in Richmond and Henrico County transfer from the Seventh District, and the City of Petersburg (39,000) moves from the Fourth to the Third District. The Fourth District is compensated primarily by the addition of 22,000 of the population of Chesterfield County from the current Seventh District.

Rural Southern and Western Virginia

The predominantly rural Fifth (southern and central Virginia), Sixth (bordering West Virginia), and Ninth (Southwest Virginia) Districts are contiguous and all are underpopulated, the total deficit being almost 136,000. The situation of the Ninth District is most immediate, since its population deficit in 2010 was 71,166 and its geographical location demands that it add population from either the Fifth or Sixth, or both.

As noted in describing Northern Virginia, the western part of that area had excess population of approximately 68,000 that could be transferred downstate. In addition, the First District, overpopulated to begin with and boosted by the initial addition of population from Northern Virginia (Prince William) had excess population available for transfer even after providing the underpopulated Hampton Roads districts the population they required.

Chapter 1 brings the three districts under discussion up to population equality initially by extending the Fifth and Sixth Districts north to the upper Piedmont and outer Northern Virginia area for additional population, contracting the Seventh District southeast in the process. The Fifth District adds 71,000 by picking up Madison and Rappahannock Counties from the Seventh District and most (50,000) of Fauquier County from the Tenth and First Districts. The Sixth District adds Page (Seventh) and Warren (Tenth) Counties for a gain of almost 62,000. The two districts then have enough combined excess population to bring the Ninth District to the required population count. The Fifth District provides almost 33,000 by transferring the City of Martinsville and a greater part of Henry County to the Ninth. The Sixth District provides almost 37,000 by transferring the City of Salem, a larger part of Roanoke County, and the part of Alleghany County now in the Sixth to the Ninth District.

A series of smaller adjustments along the First District-Seventh District boundary from Fauquier County to New Kent County result in a net shift of population to the Seventh and reduce the First to the ideal population.

Richmond Area

The City of Richmond and surrounding Chesterfield, Hanover, and Henrico Counties have a combined population of more than 900,000. Almost 60 percent of that population currently is in the Seventh District, with significant components included in the Third District (25 percent) and Fourth District (17 percent). Chapter 1 reduces the Seventh District component by 56,000, although the Richmond area retains a slim majority (52 percent) of the district. As described above, the population taken from the Richmond area Seventh District was used to help bring the Third District and Fourth District populations up to the required district total. Approximately 34,000 of the population in Richmond City and Henrico County is shifted to the Third District; almost 22,000 of the population of Chesterfield County is moved to the Fourth District.

APPLICATION OF TRADITIONAL REDISTRICTING CRITERIA

The Privileges and Elections Committee of the Senate (the Committee) on March 25, 2011, adopted criteria that identify the standards applied in drawing new congressional districts.

Population Equality

The Committee emphasized adherence to population equality among congressional districts. Its first redistricting criterion mirrors the Virginia Constitution's statement on population equality among districts and provides:

I. Population Equality

The population of legislative districts shall be determined solely according to the enumeration established by the 2010 federal census. The population of each district shall be as nearly equal to the population of every other district as practicable. (Senate Privileges and Elections Committee, Committee Resolution No. 2. Adopted March 25, 2011).

Chapter 1 congressional districts all are at 0.00 percent deviation. Nine of the 11 districts have exactly the ideal population; two districts have an absolute deviation of one (1) person.

Equal Protection Clause and Voting Rights Act Considerations

The Committee adopted the following criterion on compliance with the United States Constitution and Voting Rights Act:

II. Voting Rights Act

Districts shall be drawn in accordance with the laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia including compliance with protections against the unwarranted retrogression or dilution of racial or ethnic minority voting strength. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed to require or permit any districting policy or action that is contrary to the United States Constitution or the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Committee Resolution No. 2 Adopted March 25, 2011).

The impact of Chapter 1 on racial minority groups is discussed in detail in Attachment 5. There is one district with African American total and voting age majorities in the current plan and Chapter 1 likewise includes one majority-minority district, the Third District in both cases.

Contiguity and Compactness

The third criterion adopted by the Committee incorporated Virginia's constitutional requirement for contiguity and compactness with reference to the

1992 and 2002 cases in which the Virginia Supreme Court interpreted these constitutional standards.

III. Contiguity and Compactness

Districts shall be based on legislative consideration of the varied factors that can create or contribute to communities of interest. These factors may include, among others, economic factors, social factors, cultural factors, geographic features, governmental jurisdictions and service delivery areas, political beliefs, voting trends, and incumbency considerations. Public comment has been invited, has been and continues to be received, and will be considered. It is inevitable that some interests will be advanced more than others by the choice of particular district configurations. The discernment, weighing, and balancing of the varied factors that contribute to communities of interest is an intensely political process best carried out by elected representatives of the people. Local government jurisdiction and precinct lines may reflect communities of interest to be balanced, but they are entitled to no greater weight as a matter of state policy than other identifiable communities of interest. (Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Committee Resolution No. 2. Adopted March 25, 2011).

The Court in *Jamerson* gave "proper deference to the wide discretion accorded the General Assembly in its value judgment of the relative degree of compactness required when reconciling the multiple concerns of apportionment." (*Jamerson v. Womack*, 244 Va. 506, 517 (1992)). Statistical measures of compactness thus are not determinative in the Virginia context; Chapter 1 compactness scores by standard measures are nearly identical to those of the current set of districts.

Average Compactness Scores

| <u>Measure</u> | <u>Current Plan</u> | <u>Chapter 1</u> |
|----------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Roeck | 0.21 | 0.21 |
| Polsby-Popper | 0.17 | 0.15 |

Schwartzberg

0.66

0.66

Localities, Precincts, and Communities of Interest

Chapter 1 splits 14 localities to meet the criteria adopted by the Committee, a reduction from the 19 localities split by the current congressional plan. (These totals exclude three localities in each plan that technically are split but in which the entire locality population is in one district while one or more water blocks without population are in another district.) All of the localities split by Chapter 1 are already split in the current plan, including eight large localities with populations exceeding 100,000 (Chesterfield, Henrico, Fairfax and Prince William Counties and the Cities of Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, and Richmond). Chapter 1 reunites four smaller localities (Alleghany, Brunswick, and Caroline Counties and the City of Covington) and York County, which were split in the current plan.

Chapter 1 splits 10 precincts across the state to meet the criteria adopted by the Committee, a significant reduction` from the 26 split precincts in the current plan. (As in the case of split localities, these numbers exclude technically split precincts where all of the precinct's population is in one district and there is no population in the other district.)

The General Assembly heard, considered, and balanced many points of view on communities of interest beyond those reflected in the communities contained in localities and precincts. Testimony and debates point out the wide variety of competing communities of interest, including those defined by

geographic features such as mountain ranges and valleys, by economic character, by social and cultural attributes, and by services.

Partisan and Incumbency Considerations

As the 2011 and 2012 committee and floor transcripts reflect, respect for incumbency was taken into account in the development of Chapter 1 districts. No incumbents were placed in the same district and, with two exceptions, Chapter 1 retains 80 percent or more of the current district's core constituency population (see Tables 1 and 2). The exceptions are the Eleventh District with 29 percent new population and the First District with 24 percent new population.

The election history reports for the current plan and Chapter 1 show that the vote in Virginia's congressional districts aligns strongly with one or the other major political party (See Table 3). Chapter 1 alterations to the districts caused little or no change in the projected vote in about half the districts. Where the vote projects do change at least somewhat measurably, notable is the reduced Republican vote in the Eleventh (by five to six percent) and Third (by three percent) Districts. On the other hand, the Republican vote is projected to increase by one to two percent in Fourth, Seventh, and Tenth Districts and one percent in the Eighth District.

Chapter 1 was reported from the Privileges and Elections Committee by a 19 to 3 vote. All 14 Republicans, joined by an Independent who caucuses with the Republicans, voted to report. The votes of the seven Democratic members were split, four voting for and three against reporting HB 251. The ensuing floor

vote on passage of the bill showed the same pattern. All 64 Republicans who voted favored passage, as did the lone Independent member. Democrats were divided. Nine voted in favor of passage, while a majority (twenty-one members) of the caucus voted against the bill. Two Democrats did not vote.

Votes in the Senate followed party lines. Eight Republicans voted in favor and seven Democrats opposed the motion to report the bill from the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee. The floor vote on final passage showed all 20 Republicans in favor, all 19 Democrats who voted were opposed, and one Democrat did not vote.

The 2012 voting patterns followed those on congressional measures during the 2011 Special Session of the General Assembly. House Bill 251 in 2012 was identical to the version of House Bill 5004 that passed the House of Delegates at the 2011 Special Session. (The bill as passed by the House was identical to the introduced version except for a minor adjustment to unsplit one voting precinct.) The House Privileges and Elections Committee reported House Bill 5004 by a 17 to 2 vote, with three members not voting. All 11 Republicans who voted favored the bill; two did not vote. Five Democrats voted in the affirmative, while two were opposed and one did not vote. The floor vote on passage, 71 to 23 with six members not voting, reflected a similar pattern. All but four Republicans voted to pass the bill; two voted against passage and two did not vote. The two Independents, who caucused with the Republicans, also voted in favor of the bill. A majority (21) of Democrats opposed the bill, while 14 voted in the affirmative and four did not vote.

The Senate Privileges and Elections Committee replaced the House redistricting plan with the plan of Senate Bill 5004 (Locke) by removing the House language in House Bill 5004 and inserting the Locke bill's language in its place. The bill was reported from committee, rereferred to committee from the floor, and reported again by the committee as a substitute with some additional changes. All nine Democrats voted to report the bill on both votes. No Republicans supported either version: All six voted against on the first vote; two did not vote on the second occasion while the other four were recorded in opposition. The floor vote on the Senate version of House Bill 5004 was divided by party. All 22 Democrats voted in favor of passage, while, among Republicans, 15 opposed it and three did not vote. The House of Delegates rejected the Senate version of the bill, effectively ending 2011 consideration of redistricting. No House Republican supported the Senate version; 51 voted against and eight did not vote. One of the two Independents likewise opposed the measure and one did not vote. Among Democrats, 30 voted for the Senate version, four opposed it, and five did not vote.

F:\SPROJECT\REDIST\2011\Submission # 3 Congress 2012.doc

1/21/12 3:00

Table 1
Chapter One Districts
Components of Population Adjustments

| District | 2010 Total | Retained | % | Transferred | Added | Ch. 1 Total |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 786,327 | 556,094 | 76% | 230,143 | 171,272 | 727,366 |
| 2 | 646,184 | 618,267 | 85% | 27,917 | 109,099 | 727,366 |
| 3 | 663,390 | 604,608 | 83% | 58,782 | 122,758 | 727,366 |
| 4 | 738,639 | 699,949 | 96% | 38,690 | 22,417 | 727,366 |
| 5 | 685,859 | 652,915 | 90% | 32,944 | 74,450 | 727,365 |
| 6 | 704,056 | 665,671 | 92% | 38,385 | 61,695 | 727,366 |
| 7 | 757,917 | 640,903 | 88% | 117,014 | 86,463 | 727,366 |
| 8 | 701,010 | 621,050 | 85% | 79,960 | 106,316 | 727,366 |
| 9 | 656,200 | 656,122 | 90% | 78 | 71,244 | 727,366 |
| 10 | 869,437 | 648,661 | 89% | 220,776 | 78,704 | 727,366 |
| 11 | 792,095 | 518,160 | 71% | 273,935 | 209,206 | 727,365 |

Table 2
Chapter One Districts
Core Constituency Report

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 1 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 543,139 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 1 | 556,094 | | 422,033 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 556,094 | | 422,033 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 3 | 7,351 | | 5,106 |
| Population from District | 7 | 14,481 | | 10,797 |
| Population from District | 10 | 38,187 | | 28,023 |
| Population from District | 11 | 111,253 | | 77,180 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 171,272 | | 121,106 |
| Total for District: | 1 | 727,366 | | 543,139 |
| | | | | |
| District: 2 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 565,464 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 2 | 618,267 | | 479,697 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 618,267 | | 479,697 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 1 | 83,598 | | 65,718 |
| Population from District | 3 | 25,501 | | 20,049 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 109,099 | | 85,767 |
| Total for District: | 2 | 727,366 | | 565,464 |
| | | | | |
| District: 3 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 560,158 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 3 | 604,608 | | 466,232 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 604,608 | | 466,232 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 1 | 23,288 | | 17,805 |
| Population from District | 2 | 27,917 | | 20,543 |
| Population from District | 4 | 35,447 | | 27,835 |
| Population from District | 7 | 36,106 | | 27,743 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 122,758 | | 93,926 |
| Total for District: | 3 | 727,366 | | 560,158 |
| | | | | |
| District: 4 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 547,486 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 4 | 699,949 | | 527,298 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 699,949 | | 527,298 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 3 | 5,713 | | 4,176 |
| Population from District | 7 | 21,704 | | 16,012 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 27,417 | | 20,188 |
| Total for District: | 4 | 727,366 | | 547,486 |

Attachment 3

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 5 | Total Population: | 727,365 | Voting Age Population: | 574,341 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 5 | 652,915 | | 517,503 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 652,915 | | 517,503 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 1 | 19,595 | | 14,600 |
| Population from District | 4 | 3,243 | | 2,609 |
| Population from District | 6 | 85 | | 56 |
| Population from District | 7 | 20,681 | | 16,246 |
| Population from District | 10 | 30,846 | | 23,327 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 74,450 | | 56,838 |
| Total for District: | 5 | 727,365 | | 574,341 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 6 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 572,702 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 6 | 665,671 | | 525,297 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 665,671 | | 525,297 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 5 | 0 | | 0 |
| Population from District | 7 | 24,042 | | 18,849 |
| Population from District | 9 | 78 | | 61 |
| Population from District | 10 | 37,575 | | 28,495 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 61,695 | | 47,405 |
| Total for District: | 6 | 727,366 | | 572,702 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 7 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 549,562 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 7 | 640,903 | | 486,679 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 640,903 | | 486,679 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 1 | 66,246 | | 46,887 |
| Population from District | 3 | 20,217 | | 15,996 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 86,463 | | 62,883 |
| Total for District: | 7 | 727,366 | | 549,562 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 8 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 580,212 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 8 | 621,050 | | 502,331 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 621,050 | | 502,331 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 10 | 22,338 | | 16,217 |
| Population from District | 11 | 83,978 | | 61,664 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 106,316 | | 77,881 |
| Total for District: | 8 | 727,366 | | 580,212 |

Attachment 3

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 9 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 584,877 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 9 | 656,122 | | 528,070 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 656,122 | | 528,070 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 5 | 32,944 | | 26,093 |
| Population from District | 6 | 38,300 | | 30,714 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 71,244 | | 56,807 |
| Total for District: | 9 | 727,366 | | 584,877 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 10 | Total Population: | 727,365 | Voting Age Population: | 520,811 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 10 | 648,661 | | 463,505 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 648,661 | | 463,505 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 8 | 0 | | 0 |
| Population from District | 11 | 78,704 | | 57,306 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 78,704 | | 57,306 |
| Total for District: | 10 | 727,365 | | 520,811 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| District: 11 | Total Population: | 727,366 | Voting Age Population: | 548,595 |
| Unchanged Area | | | | |
| Population from District | 11 | 518,160 | | 390,215 |
| Total Unchanged Area | | 518,160 | | 390,215 |
| From Other Districts | | | | |
| Population from District | 1 | 37,416 | | 25,897 |
| Population from District | 8 | 79,960 | | 62,763 |
| Population from District | 10 | 91,830 | | 69,720 |
| Total From Other Districts | | 209,206 | | 158,380 |
| Total for District: | 11 | 727,366 | | 548,595 |

Table 3
Chapter One Districts
Projected Republican Vote

| District | Current Districts | | Chapter 1 Districts | |
|----------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | 2009 Governor | 2008 President | 2009 Governor | 2008 President |
| 1 | 65% | 53% | 66% | 53% |
| 2 | 62% | 50% | 62% | 50% |
| 3 | 34% | 25% | 31% | 22% |
| 4 | 61% | 50% | 63% | 51% |
| 5 | 61% | 52% | 62% | 52% |
| 6 | 67% | 58% | 67% | 58% |
| 7 | 66% | 54% | 68% | 56% |
| 8 | 39% | 32% | 40% | 33% |
| 9 | 67% | 59% | 66% | 59% |
| 10 | 61% | 48% | 63% | 50% |
| 11 | 55% | 44% | 50% | 38% |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

The vote by census block first was estimated from known precinct election returns. The values for each census block in a district then were summed to produce an estimated district vote for each candidate.

