A RESOLUTION

NO. _____

SUBMITTING A COUNCIL-PROPOSED REDISTRICTING MAP TO THE REDISTRICTING TASK FORCE

WHEREAS the City Council on August 4, 2020, adopted Resolution No. 5259-08-2020, appointing a Redistricting Task Force (Task Force) and charging the Task Force with responsibility for advising the City Council about the criteria and procedures by which the City Council should redraw its district boundaries after publication of 2020 block-level population data by the U.S. Bureau of the Census; and

WHEREAS the City Council on April 6, 2021, adopted Resolution No. 5375-04-2021, accepting the Task Force's final report and establishing criteria and procedures for redrawing district boundaries; and

WHEREAS the City Council on October 19, 2021, adopted (i) Resolution No. 5487-10-2021, reactivating the Task Force and charging it with certain responsibilities to receive and evaluate redistricting maps and to select an initial map for consideration by the City Council, and (ii) Resolution No. 5488-10-2021, amending Resolution No. 5375-04-2021 to incorporate the work of the reactivated Task Force into the procedures, and referencing the possibility of a City Council-proposed map for evaluation by the Task Force.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT WORTH, TEXAS**, as follows:

1. That the City Council has considered the following maps as the Council-proposed redistricting map to be submitted for evaluation and consideration by the Task Force, all of which are attached hereto in an exhibit as designated below and made a part hereof for all purposes:

   a. *Williams and Moon Bluebonnet Merger Map*, attached as Exhibit "A".

   b. *Williams and Nettles Map*, attached as Exhibit "B".

   c. *Moon5 Mockingbird Map*, attached as Exhibit "C".

   d. *Moon4 Armadillo Map*, attached as Exhibit "D".

2. That the City Council hereby selects Exhibit "____" as the Council-proposed redistricting map to be submitted for evaluation by the Task Force.

Adopted this ___ day of November, 2021.

ATTEST:

By: _____

Ronald P. Gonzales, Interim City Secretary

Exhibit A
Merger of Williams
& Moon Bluebonnet

District

2	5	8
3	6	9
4	7	10
		11

Sources: Esri, HERE, Japan, METI, Esri China, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Prepared 11/05/21 by M. Swindle

Exhibit A Merger of Williams and Moon Bluebonnet from Staff & Council feedback
AKA Staff Plan Combined2

| District	Total Population	White	White %	White VAP%	African American	African American %	African American VAP%	Hispanic	Hispanic %	Hispanic VAP%	Asian	Other	Minority Opportunity?	MMA (>50% Combined) SMMA (>75% Combined Minority)	Number of Split Geographic Units Communities of Interest	Voting Precincts	Census Block Groups	Compactness Score (Polsby-Popper Ratio)
2	90,264	19,397	21.5%	24.3%	8,823	9.8%	9.0%	56,171	62.2%	60.1%	4,032	1,841	TBD	SMMA	1	NA	13	0.19
3	88,351	47,699	54.0%	57.8%	15,272	17.3%	16.2%	18,461	20.9%	18.2%	4,402	2,517	TBD	NO	2	NA	4	0.06
4	90,558	31,691	35.0%	39.0%	15,228	16.8%	16.2%	35,065	38.7%	35.0%	5,996	2,578	TBD	MMA	1	NA	14	0.16
5	92,385	22,060	23.9%	27.0%	36,244	39.2%	38.8%	24,580	26.6%	23.6%	6,785	2,716	TBD	SMMA	1	NA	10	0.1
6	96,121	27,370	28.5%	33.1%	31,916	33.2%	31.6%	29,112	30.3%	27.3%	5,189	2,534	TBD	MMA	1	NA	4	0.15
7	88,972	46,427	52.2%	56.4%	11,629	13.1%	11.9%	24,755	27.8%	24.9%	3,231	2,930	TBD	NO	4	NA	10	0.05
8	93,872	11,814	12.6%	14.8%	32,612	34.7%	36.7%	46,200	49.2%	45.0%	1,581	1,665	TBD	SMMA	1	NA	10	0.08
9	94,941	29,294	30.9%	36.1%	11,323	11.9%	11.6%	48,390	51.0%	46.3%	4,259	1,675	TBD	MMA	1	NA	14	0.26
10	91,227	53,023	58.1%	60.7%	9,278	10.2%	9.5%	16,791	18.4%	16.8%	8,369	3,766	TBD	NO	0	NA	3	0.08
11	92,224	47,848	51.9%	54.9%	12,044	13.1%	12.0%	20,311	22.0%	20.1%	8,730	3,291	TBD	NO	1	NA	8	0.07
															17.3%	16.9%		

Criterion	Fully Met	Partially Met	Unmet	Comments
1. Approximately equal size	X			High/Low deviation <9,189 (7,770)
2. Legal compliance (per outside counsel)				Requires further research
3. Minority opportunity districts				Requires further research
4. Communities of interest	X			<25% Divided (17.3%)
5. Contiguous territory	X			
6. Compactness	X			Polsby Popper ratio ≥ 0.05 (All greater than 0.05)
7. Identifiable geographic boundaries	X			
8. Voting precincts				NA/2020 Values not published
9. Census tracts	X			<25% Divided (16.9%)
10. Places of residence				Not evaluated

Exhibit B
Williams/Nettles

District

2	5	8
3	6	9
4	7	10
		11

Sources: Esri, HERE,
Japan, METI, Esri Chin
OpenStreetMap contrib

Prepared 11/05/21 by M. Swindle

**Exhibit B Williams/Nettles- from CM Nettles & CM Williams**
AKA Williams & Nettles Amended Map

District	Total Population	White	White %	White VAP%	African American	African American %	African American VAP%	Hispanic	Hispanic %	Hispanic VAP%	Asian	Other	Minority Opportunity?	MMA (>50% Combined) SMMA (>75% Combined Minority)	Number of Split Geographic Units Communities of Interest	Voting Precincts	Census Block Groups	Compactness Score (Polsby-Popper Ratio)
2	88,594	19,516	22.0%	24.7%	8,646	9.8%	9.1%	55,391	62.5%	60.5%	3,280	1,761	TBD	SMMA	2	NA	12	0.24
3	93,467	48,628	52.0%	56.2%	17,601	18.8%	17.4%	20,209	21.6%	18.9%	321	6,708	TBD	NO	2	NA	3	0.07
4	89,794	29,324	32.7%	36.9%	17,089	19.0%	18.3%	35,796	39.9%	36.0%	5,094	2,491	TBD	MMA	2	NA	17	0.18
5	96,400	21,280	22.1%	25.1%	39,091	40.6%	40.6%	26,595	27.6%	24.3%	6,767	2,667	TBD	SMMA	2	NA	6	0.11
6	94,087	28,507	30.3%	34.9%	30,894	32.8%	31.1%	27,074	28.8%	25.9%	5,144	2,468	TBD	MMA	0	NA	1	0.17
7	90,413	49,609	54.9%	59.0%	8,701	9.6%	8.7%	25,106	27.8%	24.6%	4,004	2,993	TBD	NO	4	NA	10	0.04
8	96,726	12,972	13.4%	16.0%	32,245	33.3%	34.6%	46,471	48.0%	44.4%	3,241	1,797	TBD	SMMA	3	NA	14	0.08
9	88,847	28,645	32.2%	37.4%	9,019	10.2%	10.2%	46,756	52.6%	47.4%	2,850	1,577	TBD	MMA	3	NA	14	0.31
10	90,687	51,786	57.1%	59.6%	9,303	10.3%	9.6%	16,786	18.5%	16.9%	9,077	3,735	TBD	NO	1	NA	4	0.1
11	89,900	46,356	51.6%	54.2%	11,780	13.1%	12.2%	19,652	21.9%	20.2%	8,796	3,316	TBD	NO	2	NA	8	0.05
															28.00%		16.70%	

Criterion	Fully Met	Partially Met	Unmet	Comments
1. Approximately equal size	X			High/Low deviation <9,189 (8,132)
2. Legal compliance (per outside counsel)				Requires further research
3. Minority opportunity districts				Requires further research
4. Communities of interest		X		<25% Divided (28.0%)
5. Contiguous territory	X			
6. Compactness		X		Polsby Popper ratio ≥ 0.05 (District 7 = 0.04)
7. Identifiable geographic boundaries	X			
8. Voting precincts				NA/2020 Values not published
9. Census tracts	X			<25% Divided (16.7%)
10. Places of residence				Not evaluated

Exhibit C
Moon 5 Mockingbird

District

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

Sources: Esri, HERE,
Japan, METI, Esri China,
OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Prepared 11/05/21 by M. Swindle

ExhibitC_Moon5_Mockingbird from CM Moon

AKA Moon5 Map

District	Total Population	White	White %	White VAP%	African American	African American %	African American VAP%	Hispanic	Hispanic %	Hispanic VAP%	Asian	Other	Minority Opportunity?	MMA (>50% Combined) SMMA (>75% Combined Minority)	Number of Split Geographic Units Communities of Interest	Voting Precincts	Census Block Groups	Compactness Score (Polsby-Popper Ratio)
2	96,240	14,405	15.0%	18.2%	13,355	13.9%	14.0%	64,940	67.5%	63.9%	1,982	1,558	TBD	SMMA	2	NA	16	0.27
3	87,551	46,777	53.4%	57.3%	14,653	16.7%	15.6%	19,455	22.2%	19.5%	4,226	2,440	TBD	NO	2	NA	14	0.05
4	87,892	46,130	52.4%	55.3%	9,814	11.2%	10.3%	18,836	21.4%	19.6%	9,799	3,313	TBD	NO	0	NA	0	0.43
5	95,364	23,176	24.3%	27.5%	36,131	37.9%	37.6%	26,341	27.6%	24.4%	6,897	2,819	TBD	SMMA	1	NA	6	0.12
6	96,380	27,465	28.5%	33.0%	32,883	34.1%	32.5%	28,101	29.2%	26.2%	5,365	2,566	TBD	MMA	2	NA	9	0.08
7	87,471	43,466	49.7%	54.4%	11,267	12.9%	11.5%	27,547	31.5%	28.1%	2,464	2,727	TBD	MMA	3	NA	13	0.04
8	96,584	9,447	9.8%	11.7%	34,574	35.8%	37.7%	48,230	49.9%	46.3%	2,851	1,482	TBD	SMMA	1	NA	7	0.14
9	93,504	33,896	36.3%	41.4%	9,136	9.8%	9.8%	46,518	48.7%	43.6%	3,031	923	TBD	MMA	3	NA	9	0.43
10	90,418	52,188	57.7%	60.3%	10,384	11.5%	10.6%	16,930	1872.0%	17.1%	7,230	3,686	TBD	NO	1	NA	3	0.05
11	87,541	39,673	45.3%	48.9%	12,172	13.9%	12.9%	23,938	27.3%	24.8%	8,729	3,029	TBD	MMA	1	NA	12	0.09
															21.3%		16.7%	

Criterion	Fully Met	Partially Met	Unmet	Comments
1. Approximately equal size	X			High/Low deviation <9,189 (9,113)
2. Legal compliance (per outside counsel)				Requires further research
3. Minority opportunity districts				Requires further research
4. Communities of interest	X			<25% Divided (21.3%)
5. Contiguous territory	X			
6. Compactness		X		Polsby Popper ratio ≥ 0.05 (District 7 = 0.04)
7. Identifiable geographic boundaries	X			
8. Voting precincts				NA/2020 Values not published
9. Census tracts	X			<25% Divided (16.7%)
10. Places of residence				Not evaluated

Exhibit D
Moon 4 Armadillo

District

	2		5		8
	3		6		9
	4		7		10
					11

Sources: Esri, HERE, Japan, METI, Esri China, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Prepared 11/05/21 by M. Swindle

Exhibit D Moon4 Armadillo from CM Moon

AKA Moon4 Map 2020 Armadillo_Revised

District	Total Population	White	White %	White VAP%	African American	African American %	African American VAP%	Hispanic	Hispanic %	Hispanic VAP%	Asian	Other	Minority Opportunity?	MMA (>50% Combined) SMMA (>75% Combined Minority)	Number of Split Geographic Units — Communities of Interest	Voting Precincts	Census Block Groups	Compactness Score (Polsby-Popper Ratio)
2	91,749	16,380	17.9%	20.5%	1,594	15.9%	15.8%	57,284	62.4%	59.8%	1,854	14,637	TBD	SMMA	6	NA	21	0.16
3	93,431	48,595	52.0%	56.0%	16,960	18.2%	16.8%	20,919	22.4%	19.6%	4,337	2,620	TBD	NO	1	NA	7	0.05
4	87,531	45,942	52.5%	55.3%	9,748	11.1%	10.3%	18,770	21.4%	19.6%	9,775	3,296	TBD	NO	X	NA	1	0.43
5	96,128	23,287	24.2%	27.5%	36,844	38.3%	38.0%	26,228	27.3%	24.1%	6,961	2,808	TBD	SMMA	2	NA	7	0.11
6	94,319	27,709	29.4%	33.8%	31,972	33.9%	32.3%	27,114	28.8%	25.8%	4,988	2,536	TBD	MMA	1	NA	10	0.08
7	87,785	47,767	54.4%	59.0%	8,949	10.2%	9.1%	25,387	28.9%	25.5%	2,769	2,913	TBD	NO	5	NA	13	0.04
8	96,121	8,278	8.6%	10.5%	34,789	36.2%	38.2%	48,642	50.6%	46.9%	3,006	1,406	TBD	SMMA	X	NA	11	0.13
9	96,244	34,768	36.1%	41.3%	9,852	10.2%	10.1%	46,318	48.1%	43.2%	3,262	2,044	TBD	MMA	4	NA	9	0.38
10	87,789	51,170	58.3%	60.9%	9,937	11.3%	10.4%	16,190	18.4%	16.8%	6,908	3,584	TBD	NO	X	NA	5	0.05
11	87,838	32,727	37.3%	40.7%	10,724	12.2%	11.4%	32,984	37.6%	34.7%	8,714	2,689	TBD	MMA	2	NA	11	0.09
															28.0%		17.8%	

Criterion	Fully Met	Partially Met	Unmet	Comments
1. Approximately equal size	X			High/Low deviation <9,189 (8,713)
2. Legal compliance (per outside counsel)				Requires further research
3. Minority opportunity districts				Requires further research
4. Communities of interest		X		<25% Divided (28.0%)
5. Contiguous territory	X			
6. Compactness		X		Polsby Popper ratio ≥ 0.05 (District 7 = 0.04)
7. Identifiable geographic boundaries	X			
8. Voting precincts				NA/2020 Values not published
9. Census tracts	X			<25% Divided (17.8%)
10. Places of residence				Not evaluated