



Illinois African Americans For Equitable Redistricting

May 23, 2023

Honorable Don Harmon
Senate President
309-G Capitol Building
Springfield, IL 62706

Honorable Emanuel “Chris” Welch
Speaker of the House
300 State House
Springfield, IL 62706

Members of the Illinois House Executive Committee
State Capitol Building
401 S 2nd St.
Springfield, IL 62701-1727

Members of the Illinois Senate
Special Committee on the Chicago Elected
Representative School Board
State Capitol Building
401 S 2nd St.
Springfield, IL 62701-1727

Dear Legislative Leaders:

We, the members of Illinois African Americans For Equitable Redistricting (IAAFER), the Coalition of African American Leaders (COAL), Illinois State Conference NAACP and Chicago Westside Branch NAACP, are writing to summarize the events surrounding our participation in the public discourse on the creation of electoral districts for Chicago’s Elected School Board and to provide our mapping proposal as a solution to a number of issues that were raised during the process.

We were deeply honored to participate in the majority of the public hearings held at the House and Senate levels regarding the very first district boundaries for Chicago’s Elected Representative School Board. The historic significance of the moment is not lost on us, and we do not take it lightly. Indeed, the boundaries and related policies that the Legislature sets today will impact Chicago Public School children and their families, Chicago voters, Chicago Public Schools and stakeholders for many decades, if not centuries, to come. It is imperative that we get this right the first time. Do-overs are not an option.

We are finding the districting process to be an exercise in civic responsibility at its finest. We enjoy watching parents, educators, community activists, business and civic leaders engaging in robust discourse on proposed boundaries, the role of campaign finance in these elections; the need to safeguard our education system from undue influence of any singular stakeholder group; the potential for compensation for members of the Chicago Board of Education; the notion of non-citizens being allowed to vote, given that they make up a significant percent of the population; and the list goes on.

One of the most prevalent themes that continues to play out includes equity for minority groups; especially Latinos and Asian Americans, while the notion of Black representation on the ERSB and the plight of Black children and their families in our schools are placed at a lower priority.

A very strong demand we heard was that the school districts be drawn, taking into account where children live. Implicit in that demand, and sometimes, much more direct, is the idea that there should be greater representation on the Board of Education for those groups of parents who have the most children. Another issue raised was the fact that the enabling legislation that created the Chicago Elected Representative School Board (ERSB) also created a diversity advisory board that focuses solely on the needs of non-citizen children.

We reviewed a number of mapping proposals that were submitted by the State Legislature and other interested parties. Some focused on a particular community area, while others focused on specific regions of the City. The most ambitious of us provided proposals for the whole city for ten (10) districts, twenty (20) districts or both. There seemed to be considerable confusion as to which to draw first; the ten (10) districts for 2024 as prescribed by current law, or for twenty (20) districts, since the State law requires that twenty (20) districts be drawn for 2026. Other sources of confusion stemmed from how to couple districts in the maps of twenty (20) districts, and how to make the transition from ten (10) districts in 2024 to twenty (20) districts in 2026.

We share the following passage retrieved from the May 18, 2023 *Chicago Tribune* article, “Lawmakers Out With New Elected School Board Map After First Draft Prompts Criticism Over Racial Balance”, by Hank Sanders:

State Sen. Robert Martwick, who sponsored the elected school board proposal when it passed the Senate two years ago, said the committee is trying to determine “how we decide which districts are elected and which ones are appointed” in the first round of voting next year “so that we get an even, a fair and an equitable distribution throughout the city.”

The thought of half the districts participating in an election and the other half having their School Board representatives appointed by the Mayor is unsettling. This would seem to fly in the face of the “one man, one vote”, principle implied by the 14th Amendment of our Constitution.

In the process of developing our map, we reflected on some very hard lessons from the last State and City redistricting processes that we wanted to avoid. We did not want to see this process dissolve into a series of redistricting, “Hunger Games” for lack of a better description. Instead, we wanted to use this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to develop a framework that would provide equity to all Chicago voters while encouraging collaboration between members of the Board of Education and City Council. We also wanted to provide opportunities to leverage the resources of the Board of Education and City Council to provide academic and social supports and facilities planning in a manner that increases government efficiencies and yield better outcomes for our CPS children and families.

In addition, we wanted to promote equity for Black children in Chicago Public Schools by creating a permanent Board of Education committee devoted specifically to the needs of our Black children and their families. This committee would be headed by 2 members of the Board

of Education, with other members coming from Community Action Councils (CAC's), Local School Councils (LSC's), Parent Advisory Councils (PAC's), local community stakeholders, civic and business leaders and a student representative. Black children lag every other group in their academic and social progress, including Latinos, Asians and Whites. This, despite the fact that there are standing board committees that are meant to serve the needs of all children.

We considered a number of methods for establishing building blocks for the ERSB districts, including elementary school attendance boundaries, high school attendance boundaries, elementary school network boundaries, high school network boundaries and Chicago Community Area boundaries. We found that using these building blocks inadvertently pulled some voters away from the center of gravity of their wards. There would be multiple pockets all over the city in which some voters could never have an impact on a school board election because the area in which they live would not make up a significant portion of the district. Moreover, some wards had multiple numbers of districts, and some districts had multiple wards. Some wards would have multiple school board races, while others would have to focus on one.

We considered the notion of drawing lines based on the number of CPS children in communities. This did not work for us, because many children do not attend school in the communities in which they live. Children from lower income families tend to be more likely to move around a lot, and the student count in high-need communities will fluctuate significantly. Drawing districts based on the number of children would tend to inflate the power of the adult voters in districts with more children, while reducing the voting power of adult voters in districts that have fewer children.

Of critical importance is the fact that the matter of how to count non-voting persons was settled in the United States when Congress repealed the 12th Amendment, which called for counting three (3) of every five (5) slaves in the South for taxation and representation purposes. As we mentioned above, the 14th Amendment, which guarantees equal protections under the law, undergirds the principle of "One man, one vote." The idea of counting of children for districting purposes, while very noble, won't stand a legal challenge.

We constructed our mapping proposal using Chicago wards as building blocks and urge you to amend your proposal to do the same. Our map takes into account discussions with leaders from the Black, Latino and Asian communities, as well as public testimony from members of the Jewish communities. Our map is supported by several leaders of the Black community, including Alderman Jason Ervin, the Chairman of the City Council Black Caucus.

We have outlined 10 reasons you should adopt our mapping proposal on the pages that follow.

Ten Reasons You Should Adopt the IAAFER Map

1. Our map mirrors Chicago's population and does not seek to provide undue advantage to any group. Specifically, our map includes three (3) majority Hispanic districts, three (3) Majority Black districts, three (3) majority White districts, and one (1) plurality White district, which is majority-minority. Statistics outlining the specific racial breakout of each district are found in Exhibit 5, on page 12.
2. We were careful to keep wards whole within respective districts. Therefore, residents who naturally work together across a ward on issues such as crime and safety, housing and city services can also work together on school related matters including the election of school board members. Small parts of a ward (community) are not set adrift into another district, where residents would have little to no real impact on their elected school board member.
3. ERSB districts were drawn such that Aldermen have a one-to-one relationship to a school board member, rather than trying to manage multiple school board contacts.
4. Each school board member has a 1:5 relationship with alderpersons.
5. Using city wards as building blocks for our map minimizes confusion of voters.
6. Our map was developed within the parameters outlined in the law that created the Elected Representative School Board (Illinois Public Act 102-0177).
7. We used a comprehensive and innovative approach to developing our map. Rather than focusing on lines and geography to merely create ERSB districts, we used the districting process to create boundaries that facilitate collaboration among multiple stakeholders and streamline government services. While race was a factor, it certainly wasn't the only criterion driving the creation of the map.
8. Our proposal was developed by a nonpartisan team with no underlying political agenda driving the development of the districts.
9. Our map is based on the City Ward Map, which has already passed legal muster, including compactness and contiguity of districts; approximately equal population in each district and providing opportunities for minority groups to elect candidates of choice, pursuant to the Voting Rights Act.
10. In addition, our proposal creates a standing Board of Education Committee that is laser focused on the needs of Black children and their families. The elected school board legislation already has a Diversity Committee that addresses the needs of non-citizen children.

In closing, we thank you for your time and consideration. We ask that you adopt our mapping proposal, found in Exhibit 4 on page 11. If you have any questions regarding our proposed resolution, please feel free to contact Valerie F. Leonard, Chairperson, Illinois African Americans for Equitable Redistricting, at (773) 571-3886 or valeriefleonard@msn.com.

Sincerely,

Valerie F. Leonard
Chairperson
IAAFER

Craig Wimberly
President
COAL

Teresa Haley, President
President
Illinois State Conference NAACP

Karl Brinson
President
Chicago Westside NAACP

Members of the IAAFER Strategy Committee Include:

Tina Augustus, Founder, Westside Chamber of Commerce
Natasha Dunn, Founder, Black Community Collaborative Illinois
Crystal Overton, Founder, The Overton Group
Dr. Carmen Palmer, PhD, Founder, Educational Village Keepers (EDVK)
Dwayne Truss, Founder, PACE

**cc: Members of the Senate Special Committee On the
Chicago Elected Representative School Board:**


Hon. Mattie Hunter, Senator, 3rd District
Hon. Elgie R. Sims, Jr., Senator, 17th District
Hon. Ram Villivalam, Senator, 8th District
Hon. Celina Villanueva, Senator, 12th District
Hon. Dan McConchie, Senator, 26th District
Hon. Seth Lewis, Senator, 24th District

Members of the House Executive Committee:

Hon. Robert "Bob" Rita, 28th District
Hon. Elizabeth "Lisa" Hernandez, 2nd District
Hon. Ryan Spain, 73rd District
Hon. Kam Buckner, 26th District
Hon. John M. Cabello, 90th District
Hon. Christopher "C.D" Davidsmeyer, 100th District
Hon. Marcus C. Evans, Jr., 33rd District
Hon. Norine K. Hammond, 94th District

Hon. Theresa Mah, 24th District
Hon. Natalie A. Manley, 98th District
Hon. Aaron M. Ortiz, 1st District
Hon. Nicholas K. Smith, 34th District

**Exhibit 1. State Legislature’s Proposed Map of
20 ERSB Districts With Chicago Ward Boundaries Overlaid**



Data Sources: City of Chicago Ward Shape Files;
State Legislature’s proposed map of Chicago ERSB districts May 5, 2023.

**Exhibit 2. Analysis of the
State Legislature’s Proposed
Map of 20 ERSB Districts
Wards Mapped to Proposed Districts**

District	Wards	Number of Wards	Notes
A	45,39,50	3	No wards have 100% land mas in District B.
B	41,38,45,33	4	No wards have 100% land mas in District B.
C	50, 40, 49	3	100% of 49th Ward is in District C. A sliver of District A cuts through the 50th Ward. An area of approximately 20 blocks of District A cuts through the 40th Ward.
D	46,47,48	3	The 46th and 48th Wards have 100% land mass in District D. About 40% of the 47th Ward's land mass is in District D.
E	26, 35, 30, 31	4	None of the wards is fully contained in District E.
F	30, 31,36, 38, 26, 35	6	None of the wards is fully contained in District F.
G	1, 24,27,28, 36, 37, 29	7	Only the 29th and 37th wards are fully contained in District G.
H	24, 28, 27, 1, 36	5	None of the wards is completely contained in District H.
I	32, 43, 44, 2, 1	3	District 44 is the only district that is fully contained in District I.
J	47,32,1, 26	4	None of these wards is fully contained in District J.
K	14,12, 25,34	3	None of these wards is fully contained in District K.
L	22, 24, 25, 28,12,27	6	None of these wards is fully contained in District L.
M	3,11,12,15,28,34,42	7	None of these wards is fully contained in District M.
N	2, 42	3	The 2nd Ward is fully contained in District N.
O	23, 13, 22,18	4	The 13th and 23rd wards are fully contained in District O.
P	17, 18, 19, 21	4	The 19th Ward is fully contained in District P.
Q	3,4, 20, 18, 15	5	None of these wards is fully contained in District Q.
R	16, 17, 21, 9	4	The 9th Ward is the only ward with all of its land mass in District R.
S	4,5,7,10	4	None of these wards is fully contained in District S. However, apparently all of the 7th Ward, with the exception of about 20 blocks is in District S.
T	5, 6, 8, 10	4	Only the 8th Ward is fully contained in District T.

Analysis by Valerie F. Leonard

Data Sources: City of Chicago Ward Shape Files;

State Legislature’s proposed map of Chicago ERSB districts May 5, 2023.

Ward	Districts	Number of Districts	Notes
1	G, H, I, J	4	A small pocket of the 1st Ward is in District H. A sliver of the Ward is in District I. Approximately 20% of the Ward is in District G, with the remaining 40% being in District J.
2	N, I	1	The 2nd Ward is fully contained in District N.
3	Q, M, N	3	Most of the Ward is in District Q, with a sliver located in District M and a pocket in District N.
4	S, Q, N	3	The majority of the 4th Ward's land mass is in District Q, with a pocket in District S, and about a third of the land mass in District N.
5	S, T	2	About 60% of the 5th Ward's land mass is in District S, with about 40% in District T.
6	R, Q, T	3	Approximately 8 blocks in the 6th Ward are in District Q. A pocket of about 30 blocks within the 6th Ward are in District R. The majority of the land mass is in District T.
7	S, T	2	All but about 20 blocks total from the 7th Ward are in District S. There are 2 pockets on the western border that are in District T.
8	T	1	The 8th Ward is fully contained in District T.
9	R	1	The 9th Ward is fully contained in District R.
10	S, T	2	About half of the 10th Ward land mass is in District S, with the other half being in District T.
11	M, K	2	Essentially all of the 11th Ward is in District M, with the exception of about 4 blocks. Those blocks are in District K.
12	K, L, M	3	About 75% of the 12th Ward is in District K, with about 20% in District L and 5% in District M.
13	L	1	All of the 13th Ward is within the District L boundaries.
14	K	1	All of the 14th Ward is within the District K boundaries.
15	M, Q, R	3	Approximately 75% of the 15th Ward's land mass is within the District M boundaries. About 22% of the land mass is within the District Q boundaries, with the remaining few blocks left in District R.
16	M, Q, R, T	4	Most of the Ward is in Districts Q and R, with a pocket in District T and very few blocks in District M.
17	L, P, R, T	4	The majority of the 17th Ward's land mass is in District R, with a few blocks in 2 pockets in District T, and a pocket in District L.
18	P, L	2	About 60% of the 18th Ward's land mass is in District P, with 40% in District L.
19	P	1	The entire 19th Ward is in District P.
20	M, Q, T	3	The 20th Ward has the majority of its land mass in District Q, with pockets in Districts M and T.
21	P, R	2	The 21st Ward's land mass is about evenly split between Districts P and R.
22	H, L	2	About 95% of the 22nd Ward's land mass is in District L, with about 5% in District H.
23	L	1	All of the 23rd Ward is within the District L boundaries.
24	G, H, L	3	About 70% of the 24th Ward's land mass is in District 8 with the remaining 30% split between G and L.
25	L, K	2	The 25th Ward's land mass is split about a 70%-30% between Districts L and K, respectively.

Ward	Districts	Number of Districts	Notes
26	E, J, I, G	4	The predominant District is District E, with very small land areas contained in Districts J, I and G.
27	K, H, G	3	The 27th Ward has land mass in Districts K, H, G and E, with the largest portion being in District H.
28	H,L, K,M	4	Most of the 28th Ward's land mass is in Districts H and M, with pockets in K and L
29	G	1	The 29th Ward is fully contained in District G.
30	A,B,E	3	About 20% of the land mass of te 30th Ward is in District E, 30% in District B and 50% in District A
31	E, F	2	Approximately 80% of the 31st Ward land mass is in District F; 20% in District E.
32	I, J	2	About 1/3 of the 32nd Ward's land mass is in District J, with 2/3 in District I.
33	B, E, J	3	The predominant District is District B, with very small land areas contained in Districts E and J.
34	K,L	2	The majority of the 34th Ward's land mass is in District K, with a pocket in L.
35	B, E, J	3	The predominant District is District E, with very small land areas contained in Districts J and B.
36	E, F, G, H	4	No ward has 100% land mass in the 36th Ward
37	G	1	The 37th Ward is fully contained in District G.
38	A, B	2	About 95% of the 38th Ward land mass is in District B, with about 5% in District A
39	A,J, B	3	Approximately 8 Blocks in 39th Ward are in B. Approximately 24 Blocks in 39th Ward are in J. Number of blocks is an estimate, not verified.
40	A, C	2	About 95% of the 40th Ward's land mass is in District C, with the remaining 5% in District A.
41	A, B	2	About 10% of the 41st Ward land mass is in District
42	M, N	2	About half of the 42nd Ward land mass is in District M, with the other half being in District N.
43	I, H, N	3	Most of the 43rd Ward is in District I, with pockets of the Ward in Districts H and N.
44	I	1	The 44th Ward is totally contained in District I.
45	A, B	2	Approximately 33% of the 45th Ward is in District B, with 66% in District A , and 90% in District B.
46	D	1	100% of the 46th Ward land mass is in District D.
47	D,J	2	About 40% of the 47th Ward land mass is in District D, with 60% in District J.
48	D	1	100% of the 48th Ward land mass is in District D.
49	C	1	100% of the 49th Ward land mass is in District C.
50	A, C	2	A strip of District A goes through the 50th Ward. There are 2 somewhat isolated pockets of District C on the east and south borders of a few blocks each.

Analysis by Valerie F. Leonard

Data Sources: City of Chicago Ward Shape Files;

State Legislature's proposed map of Chicago ERSB districts, May 5, 2023.

Exhibit 3. Proposed Chicago Board of Education Structure

Proposed Chicago Board of Education Structure




Exhibit 4. IAAFER Mapping Proposal



Illinois African Americans For Equitable Redistricting

Proposed Elected School Board Boundaries for Chicago Public Schools



Author: Craig Wimberly, President COAL Chicago.
Data Sources: City of Chicago, U.S. Census Bureau

This map was drawn to align CPS Elected School Board districts with specific wards for greater accountability and coordination with members of the City Council while maintaining racial equity and balance. Ward boundaries were vetted for compliance with the VRA during the most recent redistricting process.

Exhibit 5. Racial Breakdown for IAAFER Mapping Proposal

Chicago Electoral School Board Districts - Race and Ethnicity
Breakdown using 2020 Census

	Ward	Name	Target	Deviation	Total Pop	NH White	NH Black	NH Asian	Hispanic
			Population						
DISTRICT 1	33	District 33	54,928	2,648 (4.82%)	57,576	17,892	2,513	6,006	29,010
	38	District 38	54,928	2,721 (4.95%)	57,649	32,749	984	2,979	19,378
	39	District 39	54,928	2,017 (3.67%)	56,945	28,177	1,913	-18.29%	13,836
	41	District 41	54,928	872 (1.59%)	55,800	41,106	748	4,177	7,942
	45	District 45	54,928	1,447 (2.63%)	56,375	33,479	1,089	5,041	14,581
						284,345	153,403	7,247	18,203
						53.9%	2.5%	6.4%	29.8%
DISTRICT 2	40	District 40	54,928	2,644 (4.81%)	57,572	27,519	5,080	9,771	12,594
	47	District 47	54,928	2,447 (4.45%)	57,375	41,502	1,505	3,836	7,510
	48	District 48	54,928	1,130 (2.06%)	56,058	30,412	7,725	7,871	7,367
	49	District 49	54,928	2,728 (4.97%)	57,656	22,731	14,664	4,034	13,022
	50	District 50	54,928	1,635 (2.98%)	56,563	22,946	6,667	14,647	9,896
						285,224	145,110	35,641	40,159
						50.9%	12.5%	14.1%	17.7%
DISTRICT 3	26	District 26	54,928	2,721 (4.95%)	57,649	12,088	4,651	1,039	38,366
	30	District 30	54,928	2,651 (4.83%)	57,579	18,687	1,478	2,729	33,217
	31	District 31	54,928	2,662 (4.85%)	57,590	9,267	1,699	1,157	44,484
	35	District 35	54,928	2,519 (4.59%)	57,447	20,444	2,191	2,337	30,507
	36	District 36	54,928	2,688 (4.89%)	57,616	18,841	3,419	1,727	32,038
						287,881	79,327	13,438	8,989
						27.6%	4.7%	3.1%	62.0%
DISTRICT 4	1	District 1	54,928	2,667 (4.86%)	57,595	36,292	2,312	3,597	12,842
	32	District 32	54,928	2,706 (4.93%)	57,634	42,784	1,468	4,002	6,474
	43	District 43	54,928	2,692 (4.9%)	57,620	45,677	1,756	3,970	3,727
	44	District 44	54,928	2,597 (4.73%)	57,525	44,004	1,817	4,288	4,716
	46	District 46	54,928	2,688 (4.89%)	57,616	32,311	10,089	5,613	6,919
						287,990	201,068	17,442	21,470
						69.8%	6.1%	7.5%	12.0%
DISTRICT 5	24	District 24	54,928	-2,723 (-4.96%)	52,205	1,695	39,782	139	9,645
	27	District 27	54,928	2,540 (4.62%)	57,468	17,122	26,446	2,933	8,822
	28	District 28	54,928	-2,314 (-4.21%)	52,614	4,948	37,505	3,006	5,670
	29	District 29	54,928	-1,293 (-2.35%)	53,635	6,672	33,624	560	11,641
	37	District 37	54,928	-1,402 (-2.55%)	53,526	852	34,140	149	17,500
						269,448	31,289	171,497	6,787
						11.6%	63.6%	2.5%	19.8%

Chicago Electoral School Board Districts - Race and Ethnicity
Breakdown using 2020 Census

DISTRICT 6	Ward	Name	Target Population	Deviation	Total Pop	NH White	NH Black	NH Asian	Hispanic
	2	District 2	54,928	2,059 (3.75%)	56,987	41,522	2,816	6,789	3,717
3	District 3	54,928	1,048 (1.91%)	55,976	12,653	32,291	5,710	3,011	
4	District 4	54,928	-1,504 (-2.74%)	53,424	10,842	32,229	5,378	2,562	
34	District 34	54,928	-2,697 (-4.91%)	52,231	29,935	3,953	11,708	4,140	
42	District 42	54,928	-1,452 (-2.64%)	53,476	37,227	2,373	8,035	3,491	
					272,094	132,179	73,662	37,620	16,921
						48.6%	27.1%	13.8%	6.2%
DISTRICT 7	Ward	Name	Target Population	Deviation	Total Pop	NH White	NH Black	NH Asian	Hispanic
	12	District 12	54,928	-1,804 (-3.28%)	53,124	4,032	863	7,483	40,224
11	District 11	54,928	-2,432 (-4.43%)	52,496	13,318	1,446	26,286	10,256	
15	District 15	54,928	-2,536 (-4.62%)	52,392	3,537	8,449	745	39,006	
22	District 22	54,928	-2,563 (-4.67%)	52,365	1,510	3,415	235	46,777	
25	District 25	54,928	-2,290 (-4.17%)	52,638	8,678	2,708	1,930	38,092	
					263,015	31,075	16,881	36,679	174,355
						11.8%	6.4%	13.9%	66.3%
DISTRICT 8	Ward	Name	Target Population	Deviation	Total Pop	NH White	NH Black	NH Asian	Hispanic
	13	District 13	54,928	-658 (-1.2%)	54,270	16,721	808	500	35,559
14	District 14	54,928	-1,650 (-3%)	53,278	3,075	1,824	799	47,091	
23	District 23	54,928	-2,653 (-4.83%)	52,275	9,848	908	713	40,263	
18	District 18	54,928	1,117 (2.03%)	56,045	3,914	28,747	243	22,194	
19	District 19	54,928	-2,712 (-4.94%)	52,216	32,044	14,240	340	3,906	
					268,084	65,602	46,527	2,595	149,013
						24.5%	17.4%	1.0%	55.6%
DISTRICT 9	Ward	Name	Target Population	Deviation	Total Pop	NH White	NH Black	NH Asian	Hispanic
	5	District 5	54,928	-586 (-1.07%)	54,342	12,225	31,116	5,398	2,950
6	District 6	54,928	-2,669 (-4.86%)	52,259	304	49,315	46	1,154	
16	District 16	54,928	-2,413 (-4.39%)	52,515	676	34,193	86	16,503	
17	District 17	54,928	-2,196 (-4%)	52,732	447	44,251	86	6,803	
20	District 20	54,928	-2,721 (-4.95%)	52,207	2,313	37,700	894	9,827	
					264,055	15,965	196,575	6,510	37,237
						6.0%	74.4%	2.5%	14.1%
DISTRICT 10	Ward	Name	Target Population	Deviation	Total Pop	NH White	NH Black	NH Asian	Hispanic
	21	District 21	54,928	-118 (-0.21%)	54,810	-0.57%	51,612	62	1,475
7	District 7	54,928	-2,429 (-4.42%)	52,499	753	46,952	97	3,262	
8	District 8	54,928	-2,615 (-4.76%)	52,313	347	49,559	70	1,025	
9	District 9	54,928	-2,669 (-4.86%)	52,259	728	47,759	52	2,462	
10	District 10	54,928	-2,557 (-4.66%)	52,371	6,464	12,759	150	32,064	
					264,252	8,292	208,641	431	40,288
						3.1%	79.0%	0.2%	15.2%