

Explanation of maps and methodology

Only four of the trustee districts are seriously imbalanced. District one is within 65 persons of the ideal population and needs no changes unless otherwise desired by the board.

District two has a significant minority population and must gain +/- 1,291 persons and must do so without any unnecessary negative impact on that profile.

District three, the only district with a minority majority population, must increase by +/- 2,656, also without any unnecessary negative impact on that profile.

As can be seen in Maps 1 and 1 A, there are only two areas of significant concentrations of minority residents outside the current boundaries of district three: one South of and adjacent to district three and another in district four. District three's population can be balanced in a number of ways but its minority majority can only be protected by adding the area from district two.

Next, district two must add population to replenish that ceded to district three while districts four and five must be reduced by +/- 2,714 and +/- 1,297, respectively. This was accomplished by extending district two into four and five.

While there are potentially different ways to balance two, four and five, the cramped geography of the existing lines East of the lake limits the possibilities.

- Map A shows the distribution of those of Hispanic origin,
- Map A 1 shows the distribution of those who identified as non-Hispanic Black,
- Map B adds street names to Map A and removes population distribution symbols
- Map C same as Map B focused on census enumeration blocks but without streets
- Map D same as Map C showing only the trustee district lines of the draft plan
- Map E same as Map D with existing trustee district lines overlaid (in broad blue) on the draft plan
- Map F same as Map E with existing district lines overlaid (in broad blue) showing the entire ISD