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## Alabama Two Majority-Minority District Plan



## I. Overview

Alabama is apportioned seven seats in the U.S. House of Representatives from the 2020 census, unchanged from the seven seats in the last 2010 census cycle. Alabama's congressional districts are drawn by the Republican-dominated legislature, and are subject to gubernatorial veto. Donald Trump won the popular vote in Alabama for the 2020 presidential election, with $62 \%$ of the votes compared to Biden's $36.6 \%$. Comparatively, the 2021 Alabama map (which will hold for the upcoming May primaries, but is currently in litigation) and 2011 map each have 6 Republican districts and 1 Democrat district for a $17 \%$ Democrat to $83 \%$ Republican ratio, far from reflecting the statewide partisanship split. This paper's map will attempt to improve this proportional representation, making it a 5 Republican and 2 Democrat split for a $29 \%$ Democrat and $71 \%$ Republican split - which although stills far from the presidential election ratios, is a step in the right direction for more fair democracy and representation that accurately reflects the Alabama population.

Historically, there has only been one Black majority-minority district. Following this pattern, this cycle's Republican-drawn map gives Black voters the majority in only one of seven districts, despite the Black population making up $27 \%$ of Alambama's total state population. There is contention on whether or not the map dilutes the power of Black voters by packing areas with high concentrations of Black population into one district, notably the only Democratic district in Alabama, where they are the clear majority. In addition, contenders argue that the Black population outside of District 7 is split up so that they remain a minority in all other districts.
A. 2011 Plan

In the last redistricting cycle, the 2011 map packed Black voters into a single Voting Rights Act district, with Republican-dominated white-majority seats. But, it's important to note the voting power on the state-wide level that the community holds in turning elections. In the 2017 special election for the U.S. Senate, Democrat Doug Jones narrowly upset Republican Roy Moore. Despite losing all six of the Republican-dominated white-majority districts, he was able to win the election with the enormous 57 -point margin in Alabama's 7th congressional district. The district had efficiently concentrated Democrat-leaning, Black voters in one district to the extent at which Jones was able to secure a victory from a win in a single congressional district.

## B. Two Majority-Minority District Plan

This map was created with proportional representation in mind to add another Democrat-leaning district in Alabama to more accurately represent the statewide split represented in the presidential election. It also aims to create two majority-minority seats to better reflect the state's significant Black population, in addition to the traditional principles of maintaining compactness and contiguity. Alabama's Seventh District has traditionally linked Birmingham and Montgomery along the agricultural Black Belt (named for the region's dark topsoil), but I split off Birmingham and Montgomery in this map to create two majority-minority districts, one with $56.48 \%$ Black citizen voting age population and another with $50.71 \%$ Black citizen voting age population ${ }^{1}$.

[^0]

Figure 1. Proposed map, with PlanScore's metrics on partisan lean.
I first started along the north part of Alabama, moving whole counties, and voting precincts when necessary, between Districts 3,4 , and 5 to achieve near population equality. Then, I moved the southeast portion of the existing District 7, which has a Cook Partisan Voting Index rating of $\mathrm{D}+19$, where I moved existing counties from District 7 and extended District 2 to the west to meet them. Compared to the current 6 Republican and 1 Democratic district split on the existing map, this map has 5 Republican and 2 Democratic districts based on the PlanScore ${ }^{2}$ analysis. Looking at the state-wide's current political tilt, as best as it can be calculated, this 5-2 allocation attempts to produce districts that better reflect the underlying partisan division in Alabama and ensure more fair representation.

## II. Compliance with Federal and State Law

## A. One Person, One Vote

To meet equal representation requirements, the ideal population size for a congressional district in Alabama is 717,754 people. The maximum deviation for the proposed plan is just under $0.12 \%$. Still, the map complies with law due to the legitimate objective of consistently preserving voting district boundaries in Tennant v. Jefferson County Commission ${ }^{3}$ and is under the threshold upheld by courts.

## B. The Voting Rights Act

This plan meets the requirements from Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Based on Thornburg v. Gingles, the Supreme Court interpreted Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to require that the majority-minority district be drawn when three criteria are met. First, a minority group must demonstrate it is large and compact enough to constitute a majority in

[^1]a single-member district. In Alabama, the minority groups in these two areas are large enough to constitute majorities in their respective areas. There is a significant and compact Black population in Alabama to create two majority-minority districts in the previously-grouped communities of Birmingham and Montgomery. Second, a minority group must demonstrate it is politically cohesive. Lastly, the minority group must demonstrate the majority group votes sufficiently as a group to defeat the minority group's preferred candidate. Both of these last two requirements are met in Alabama, a deep South state characterized by voting polarized by race to this day. Therefore, Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act requires that these two majority-minority districts be drawn ${ }^{4}$. Although, this could be the basis of a challenge, as it is now, with how to interpret if these two districts are both required under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, or if only one district would be considered large and compact enough under the first Gingles requirement.

In addition, this plan does not violate Shaw, because race data was used only to create the two majority-minority Black districts to comply with the Voting Rights Act. Race was only used to comply with federal law, and not used as the predominant factor while redistricting. The ultimate goal was to improve the proportional representation in Alabama.

This raises questions - under the law, assuming that the racial minority is proven as politically cohesive, is this sufficient enough to form a majority in two districts? How much should mapmakers rely on previous maps' interpretations of majority-minority districts? There are unanswered questions regarding Alabama's Voting Rights Act requirements. And soon, the gray area around the Voting Rights Act and minority protections will be decided by the Supreme Court, balancing whether incumbency protection, strict compactness measures, and other redistricting principles will be valued over minority opportunity.
C. State Constitutional, Statutory Law

Alabama has no additional state provisions for districts that exceed federal and constitutional law for this redistricting cycle.

[^2]Appendix A: Proposed Plan Images


Map layers
Districts
District




## Map layers

| $\square$ |
| :--- |
| Voting District |
| $\square$ |
| County |
| $\square$ |
| Districts |
| $18+\% \% A P \_B l k ~$ |
| $20.00 \%$ and below (1040) |
| $20.00 \%$ to $40.00 \%(322)$ |
| $40.00 \%$ to $60.00 \%(156)$ |
| $60.00 \%$ to $80.00 \%(159)$ |
| $80.00 \%$ and above (160) |
| $0 \quad 40$ |

## Appendix B: Mapbook.

District: 1


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 1 |
| Population | 71857 |
| Deviation | 817 |
| \% Deviation | $0.11 \%$ |
| Alternate Schwartzerg | 3.26 |
| Polsby Popper | 0.09 |
| Perimeter | $1,087.36$ |
| Reock | 0.24 |
| \% NH18+_Wht | $76.06 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Blk | $14.99 \%$ |
| \% H18+_PPo | $3.89 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Asn | $1.73 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Ind | $3.08 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Hwn | $0.15 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Oth | $3.59 \%$ |
| \% NH White CVAP 19 | $79.37 \%$ |
| \% NH Black CVAP 19 | $15.23 \%$ |
| \% H CVAP 19 | $2.54 \%$ |
| \% NH Asian CVAP 19 | $1.16 \%$ |
| \% D 20_Pres | $23.02 \%$ |
| \% R 20_Pres | $76.98 \%$ |
|  |  |

District: 2


## District: 3



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 3 |
| Population | 717704 |
| Deviation | -50 |
| \% Deviation | $-0.01 \%$ |
| Alternate Schwartzberg | 1.87 |
| Polsby Popper | 0.29 |
| Perimeter | 550.94 |
| Reock | 0.38 |
| \% NH18+_Wht | $71.79 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_BIk | $20.67 \%$ |
| \% H18+_Pop | $3.12 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Asn | $2.13 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Ind | $2.25 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Hwn | $0.11 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Oth | $2.86 \%$ |
| \% NH White CVAP 19 | $75.98 \%$ |
| \% NH Black CVAP 19 | $20.53 \%$ |
| \% H CVAP 19 | $1.72 \%$ |
| \% NH Asian CVAP 19 | $0.78 \%$ |
| \% D 20_Pres | $29.28 \%$ |
| \% R 20_Pres | $70.72 \%$ |
|  |  |

[^3]District: 4


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 4 |
| Population | 717742 |
| Deviation | -12 |
| \% Deviation | -0\% |
| Alternate Schwartzberg | 2.19 |
| Polsby Popper | 0.21 |
| Perimeter | 777.63 |
| Reock | 0.37 |
| \% NH18+_Wht | 83.98\% |
| \% 18+_AP_BIk | 5.73\% |
| \% H18+_Pop | 5.91\% |
| \% 18+_AP_Asn | 0.7\% |
| \% 18+_AP_Ind | 3.71\% |
| \% 18+_AP_Hwn | 0.09\% |
| \% 18+_AP_Oth | 5.17\% |
| \% NH White CVAP 19 | 89.78\% |
| \% NH Black CVAP 19 | 5.45\% |
| \% H CVAP 19 | 2.41\% |
| \% NH Asian CVAP 19 | 0.39\% |
| \% D 20_Pres | 16.08\% |
| \% R 20_Pres | 83.92\% |

District: 5


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| Distrit | 5 |
| Population | 717768 |
| Deviation | 14 |
| \% Deviation | $0 \%$ |
| Alternate Schwartzerg | 1.91 |
| Polsby Popper | 0.27 |
| Perimeter | 383.03 |
| Reock | 0.25 |
| \% NH18+_Wht | $70.24 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Blk | $18.81 \%$ |
| \% H18+_Pop | $5.34 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Asn | $2.57 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_nd | $3.09 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Hwn | $0.18 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Oth | $4.87 \%$ |
| \% NH White CVAP 19 | $75.41 \%$ |
| \% NH Black CVAP 19 | $18.72 \%$ |
| \% H CVAP 19 | $2.51 \%$ |
| \% NH Asian CVAP 19 | $1.61 \%$ |
| \% D 20_Pres | $37.29 \%$ |
| \%R 20_Pres | $62.71 \%$ |

District: 6

©2021 CALIPER

## District: 7



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 7 |
| Population | 717499 |
| Deviation | -255 |
| \% Deviation | $-0.04 \%$ |
| Alternate Schwartzberg | 2.38 |
| Polsby Popper | 0.18 |
| Perimeter | 844.36 |
| Reock | 0.42 |
| \% NH18+_Wht | $38.17 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Blk | $55.31 \%$ |
| \% H18+_Pop | $4.08 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Asn | $1.46 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Ind | $1.32 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Hwn | $0.11 \%$ |
| \% 18+_AP_Oth | $3.59 \%$ |
| \% NH White CVAP 19 | $40.85 \%$ |
| \% NH Black CVAP 19 | $56.48 \%$ |
| \% H CVAP 19 | $1.24 \%$ |
| \% NH Asian CVAP 19 | $0.74 \%$ |
| \% D 20_Pres | $67.69 \%$ |
| \% R 20_Pres | $32.31 \%$ |
|  |  |

## Appendix C: Compactness Report.

| Plan Name: Xiang Alabama Plan Plan Type: Congress |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measures of Compactness Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunday, April 3, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11:57 PM |
| Number of cut edges: 3,950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reock | Schwartzberg | Alternate Schwartzberg | Polsby- <br> Popper | Population Polygon | Area/Convex Hull | Population Circle | Ehrenburg | Perimeter | Length-Width |
| Sum | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 5,343.21 | N/A |
| Min | 0.21 | 1.72 | 1.87 | 0.09 | 0.39 | 0.53 | 0.24 | 0.18 | N/A | 6.44 |
| Max | 0.45 | 2.91 | 3.26 | 0.29 | 0.90 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.46 | N/A | 92.15 |
| Mean | 0.33 | 2.23 | 2.49 | 0.18 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.47 | 0.34 | N/A | 49.75 |
| Std. Dev. | 0.10 | 0.47 | 0.58 | 0.08 | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.10 | N/A | 31.70 |
| District | Reock | Schwartzberg | Alternate Schwartzberg | PolsbyPopper | Population Polygon | Area/Convex Hull | Population Circle | Ehrenburg | Perimeter | Length-Width |
| 1 | 0.24 | 2.91 | 3.26 | 0.09 | 0.68 | 0.53 | 0.48 | 0.18 | 1,087.36 | 92.15 |
| 2 | 0.21 | 2.84 | 3.25 | 0.09 | 0.65 | 0.53 | 0.35 | 0.24 | 1,081.87 | 58.64 |
| 3 | 0.38 | 1.72 | 1.87 | 0.29 | 0.90 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.43 | 550.94 | 60.41 |
| 4 | 0.37 | 2.02 | 2.19 | 0.21 | 0.39 | 0.70 | 0.24 | 0.39 | 777.63 | 22.54 |
| 5 | 0.25 | 1.81 | 1.91 | 0.27 | 0.88 | 0.76 | 0.71 | 0.34 | 383.03 | 80.38 |
| 6 | 0.45 | 2.22 | 2.58 | 0.15 | 0.56 | 0.69 | 0.42 | 0.34 | 618.02 | 6.44 |
| 7 | 0.42 | 2.12 | 2.38 | 0.18 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.38 | 0.46 | 844.36 | 27.70 |

Measures of Compactness Report

| Measures of Compactness Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact. |
| Reock | The measure is usually greater than or equal to 1, with 1 being the most compact. |
| Schwartzberg | This measure is always greater than or equal to 1, with 1 being the most compact. |
| Alternate Schwartzberg |  |
| Polsby-Popper | The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact. |
| Population Polygon | The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact. |
| Area / Convex Hull | The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact. |
| Pepulation Circle | The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 11 being the most compact. |
| Ehrenburg | The measure is always between 0 and 1 , with 1 being the most compact. |
| Perimeter | The Perimeter test computes one number for the whole plan. If you are comparing several plans, the plan with the smallest total perimeter is the most |
|  | compact. |
| Length-Width | A lower number indicates better length-width compactness. |
| Cut Edges | A smaller number implies a more compact plan. The measure should only be used to compare plans defined on the same base layer. |

## Appendix D: Political Subdivision Splits (County).



Political Subdivision Splits Between Districts
Xiang Alabama Plan

| County | District | Population |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Tallapoosa AL | 6 | 5,895 |
| Tuscaloosa AL | 4 | 60,106 |
| Tuscaloosa AL | 7 | 166,930 |
| Washington AL | 1 | 8,964 |
| Washington AL | 2 | 5,342 |
| Washington AL | 7 | 1,082 |
| Split VTDs: | 7 |  |
| Jefferson AL | 6 | 0 |
| Jefferson AL | 7 | 5,086 |

## Appendix D: Political Subdivision Splits (City/Town).

| Plan Name: Xiang Alabama Plan Plan Type: Congress |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Communities of Interest (Landscape, $11 \times 8.5$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Monday, April 4, 2022 |  |  |  | 12:04 AM |
| City/Town | District | Population | \% |  |
| Adamsville AL | 4 | 34 | 0.8 |  |
| Adamsville AL | 6 | 1 | 0.0 |  |
| Adamsville AL | 7 | 4,331 | 99.2 |  |
| Altoona AL | 3 | 906 | 95.6 |  |
| Altoona AL | 4 | 42 | 4.4 |  |
| Argo AL | 3 | 4,307 | 98.6 |  |
| Argo AL | 6 | 61 | 1.4 |  |
| Bessemer AL | 6 | 2,634 | 10.1 |  |
| Bessemer AL | 7 | 23,385 | 89.9 |  |
| Birmingham AL | 4 | 29 | 0.0 |  |
| Birmingham AL | 6 | 18,232 | 9.1 |  |
| Birmingham AL | 7 | 182,472 | 90.9 |  |
| Boaz AL | 3 | 1,110 | 11.0 |  |
| Boaz AL | 4 | 8,997 | 89.0 |  |
| Brookside AL | 4 | 6 | 0.5 |  |
| Brookside AL | 6 | 1,247 | 99.5 |  |
| Brookside AL | 7 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Clay AL | 6 | 6,058 | 58.9 |  |
| Clay AL | 7 | 4,233 | 41.1 |  |
| Collinsville AL | 3 | 13 | 0.6 |  |
| Collinsville AL | 4 | 2,046 | 99.4 |  |


| Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) |  |  |  | Xiang Alabama Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City/Town | District | Population | \% |  |
| County Line AL | 4 | 217 | 69.8 |  |
| County Line AL | 6 | 94 | 30.2 |  |
| Dothan AL | 1 | 71,069 | 100.0 |  |
| Dothan AL | 2 | 3 | 0.0 |  |
| Fultondale AL | 6 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Fultondale AL | 7 | 9,876 | 100.0 |  |
| Gardendale AL | 6 | 15,865 | 98.9 |  |
| Gardendale AL | 7 | 179 | 1.1 |  |
| Graysville AL | 4 | 1,932 | 99.1 |  |
| Graysville AL | 6 | 8 | 0.4 |  |
| Graysville AL | 7 | 10 | 0.5 |  |
| Grove Hill AL | 2 | 464 | 25.5 |  |
| Grove Hill AL | 7 | 1,354 | 74.5 |  |
| Helena AL | 6 | 20,914 | 100.0 |  |
| Helena AL | 7 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Homewood AL | 6 | 3,587 | 13.6 |  |
| Homewood AL | 7 | 22,827 | 86.4 |  |
| Hoover AL | 6 | 86,300 | 93.2 |  |
| Hoover AL | 7 | 6,306 | 6.8 |  |
| Hueytown AL | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Hueytown AL | 7 | 16,776 | 100.0 |  |
| Irondale AL | 6 | 12,287 | 91.0 |  |
| Irondale AL | 7 | 1,210 | 9.0 |  |
| Kimberly AL | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Kimberly AL | 6 | 3,841 | 100.0 |  |


| Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) |  |  |  | Xiang Alabama Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City/Town | District | Population | \% |  |
| Leeds AL | 3 | 2,060 | 16.7 |  |
| Leeds AL | 6 | 10,264 | 83.3 |  |
| Maytown AL | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Maytown AL | 7 | 316 | 100.0 |  |
| Mobile AL | 1 | 4,087 | 2.2 |  |
| Mobile AL | 2 | 182,954 | 97.8 |  |
| Mountain Brook AL | 6 | 22,400 | 99.7 |  |
| Mountain Brook AL | 7 | 61 | 0.3 |  |
| Northport AL | 4 | 23,381 | 75.1 |  |
| Northport AL | 7 | 7,744 | 24.9 |  |
| Notasulga AL | 2 | 866 | 94.8 |  |
| Notasulga AL | 3 | 48 | 5.3 |  |
| Phenix City AL | 2 | 32,040 | 82.5 |  |
| Phenix City AL | 3 | 6,776 | 17.5 |  |
| Pinson AL | 6 | 5,130 | 71.1 |  |
| Pinson AL | 7 | 2,085 | 28.9 |  |
| Pleasant Grove AL | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Pleasant Grove AL | 7 | 9,544 | 100.0 |  |
| Prichard AL | 1 | 579 | 3.0 |  |
| Prichard AL | 2 | 18,743 | 97.0 |  |
| Sand Rock AL | 3 | 565 | 95.6 |  |
| Sand Rock AL | 4 | 26 | 4.4 |  |
| Saraland AL | 1 | 7,459 | 46.1 |  |
| Saraland AL | 2 | 8,712 | 53.9 |  |
| Sardis City AL | 3 | 1,810 | 99.8 |  |


| Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) |  |  |  | Xiang Alabama Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City/Town | District | Population | \% |  |
| Sardis City AL | 4 | 4 | 0.2 |  |
| Satsuma AL | 1 | 45 | 0.7 |  |
| Satsuma AL | 2 | 6,704 | 99.3 |  |
| Scottsboro AL | 4 | 15,092 | 96.9 |  |
| Scottsboro AL | 5 | 486 | 3.1 |  |
| Semmes AL | 1 | 3,511 | 71.1 |  |
| Semmes AL | 2 | 1,430 | 28.9 |  |
| St. Stephens AL | 1 | 26 | 6.3 |  |
| St. Stephens AL | 2 | 389 | 93.7 |  |
| Stockton AL | 1 | 384 | 68.9 |  |
| Stockton AL | 2 | 173 | 31.1 |  |
| Sylvan Springs AL | 4 | 1,635 | 98.9 |  |
| Sylvan Springs AL | 7 | 18 | 1.1 |  |
| Trafford AL | 4 | 7 | 1.1 |  |
| Trafford AL | 6 | 606 | 98.9 |  |
| Trinity AL | 4 | 2 | 0.1 |  |
| Trinity AL | 5 | 2,524 | 99.9 |  |
| Troy AL | 1 | 30 | 0.2 |  |
| Troy AL | 2 | 17,697 | 99.8 |  |
| Trussville AL | 3 | 1,602 | 6.1 |  |
| Trussville AL | 6 | 24,515 | 93.8 |  |
| Trussville AL | 7 | 6 | 0.0 |  |
| Tuscaloosa AL | 4 | 7,845 | 7.9 |  |
| Tuscaloosa AL | 7 | 91,755 | 92.1 |  |
| Vance AL | 6 | 73 | 3.5 |  |


| City/Town | District | Population | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Vance AL | 7 | 2,019 | 96.5 |
| Vestavia Hills AL | 6 | 39,040 | 99.8 |
| Vestavia Hills AL | 7 | 62 | 0.2 |
| Vincent AL | 3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Vincent AL | 6 | 1,982 | 100.0 |
| Warrior AL | 4 | 3,210 | 99.6 |
| Warrior AL | 6 | 14 | 0.4 |
| Woodstock AL | 6 | 1,343 | 91.2 |
| Woodstock AL | 7 | 129 | 8.8 |


| City/Town | - Listed by District <br> Population |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\%$ |  |
| Mobile AL (part) | 4,087 | 2.2 |
| Prichard AL (part) | 579 | 3.0 |
| Saraland AL (part) | 7,459 | 46.1 |
| Satsuma AL (part) | 45 | 0.7 |
| Semmes AL (part) | 3,511 | 71.1 |
| St. Stephens AL (part) | 26 | 6.3 |
| Stockton AL (part) | 384 | 68.9 |
| Troy AL (part) | 30 | 0.2 |
| District 1 Totals | $\mathbf{3 9 4 , 3 6 4}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| Dothan AL (part) | 3 | 0.0 |
| Grove Hill AL (part) | 464 | 25.5 |
| Mobile AL (part) | 182,954 | 97.8 |
| Notasulga AL (part) | 866 | 94.8 |
| Phenix City AL (part) | 32,040 | 82.5 |
| Prichard AL (part) | 18,743 | 97.0 |
| Saraland AL (part) | 8,712 | 53.9 |
| Satsuma AL (part) | 6,704 | 99.3 |
| Semmes AL (part) | 1,430 | 28.9 |
| St. Stephens AL (part) | 389 | 93.7 |
| Stockton AL (part) | 173 | 31.1 |
| District 2 Totals | $\mathbf{5 6 8 , 1 7 2}$ |  |


| Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) | Population | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 906 | 95.6 |
| Altoona AL (part) | 4,307 | 98.6 |
| Argo AL (part) | 1,110 | 11.0 |
| Boaz AL (part) | 13 | 0.6 |
| Collinsville AL (part) | 2,060 | 16.7 |
| Leeds AL (part) | 48 | 5.3 |
| Notasulga AL (part) | 6,776 | 17.5 |
| Phenix City AL (part) | 565 | 95.6 |
| Sand Rock AL (part) | 1,602 | 6.1 |
| Trussville AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Vincent AL (part) | $\mathbf{4 6 9 , 8 3 7}$ |  |


| Comm unities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Population | $\%$ |
| Adamsville AL (part) | 34 | 0.8 |
| Altoona AL (part) | 42 | 4.4 |
| Birmingham AL (part) | 29 | 0.0 |
| Boaz AL (part) | 8,997 | 89.0 |
| Brookside AL (part) | 6 | 0.5 |
| Collinsville AL (part) | 2,046 | 99.4 |
| County Line AL (part) | 217 | 69.8 |
| Graysville AL (part) | 1,932 | 99.1 |
| Hueytown AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kimberly AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Maytown AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Northport AL (part) | 23,381 | 75.1 |
| Pleasant Grove AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Sand Rock AL (part) | 26 | 4.4 |
| Sardis City AL (part) | 4 | 0.2 |
| Scottsboro AL (part) | 15,092 | 96.9 |
| Sylvan Springs AL (part) | 1,635 | 98.9 |
| Trafford AL (part) | 7 | 1.1 |
| Trinity AL (part) | 2 | 0.1 |
| Tuscaloosa AL (part) | 7,845 | 7.9 |
| District 4 Totals | $\mathbf{3 2 1 , 2 6 8}$ |  |
| Scottsboro AL (part) | 4886 | 3.1 |
| District 5 Totals |  |  |


| Comminities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Population | $\%$ |
| Adamsville AL (part) | 1 | 0.0 |
| Argo AL (part) | 61 | 1.4 |
| Bessemer AL (part) | 2,634 | 10.1 |
| Birmingham AL (part) | 18,232 | 9.1 |
| Clay AL (part) | 6,058 | 58.9 |
| County Line AL (part) | 94 | 30.2 |
| Fultondale AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Gardendale AL (part) | 15,865 | 98.9 |
| Graysville AL (part) | 8 | 0.4 |
| Homewood AL (part) | 3,587 | 13.6 |
| Hoover AL (part) | 86,300 | 93.2 |
| Irondale AL (part) | 12,287 | 91.0 |
| Leeds AL (part) | 10,264 | 83.3 |
| Pinson AL (part) | 5,130 | 71.1 |
| Trafford AL (part) | 606 | 98.9 |
| Trussville AL (part) | 24,515 | 93.8 |
| Vance AL (part) | 73 | 3.5 |
| Warrior AL (part) | 14 | 0.4 |
| Woodstock AL (part) | 1,343 | 91.2 |


| Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Population | $\%$ |
| Adamsville AL (part) | 4,331 | 99.2 |
| Bessemer AL (part) | 23,385 | 89.9 |
| Birmingham AL (part) | 182,472 | 90.9 |
| Brookside AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Clay AL (part) | 4,233 | 41.1 |
| Gardendale AL (part) | 179 | 1.1 |
| Graysville AL (part) | 10 | 0.5 |
| Grove Hill AL (part) | 1,354 | 74.5 |
| Helena AL (part) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Homewood AL (part) | 22,827 | 86.4 |
| Hoover AL (part) | 6,306 | 6.8 |
| Irondale AL (part) | 1,210 | 9.0 |
| Mountain Brook AL (part) | 61 | 0.3 |
| Northport AL (part) | 7,744 | 24.9 |
| Pinson AL (part) | 2,085 | 28.9 |
| Sylvan Springs AL (part) | 18 | 1.1 |
| Trussville AL (part) | 6 | 0.0 |
| Tuscaloosa AL (part) | 91,755 | 92.1 |
| Vance AL (part) | 2,019 | 96.5 |
| Vestavia Hills AL (part) | 62 | 0.2 |
| Woodstock AL (part) | 129 | 8.8 |

District 7 Totals
556,222

## Summary Statistics

Number of City/Town not split 541

Number of City/Town split 51
Number of City/Town split in $2 \quad 46$
Number of City/Town split in $3 \quad 5$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Total number of splits } & 107\end{array}$

## Appendix E: Core Constituencies Report.

Plan Name: Xiang Alabama Plan
Plan Type: Congress

## Core Constituencies

Monday, April 4, 2022

From Plan: Enacted Congress B-V-C

Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 1 -- 718,571 Total Population

|  | Population | [NH White CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Black CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Asian CVAP <br> 19] | [H CVAP 19] |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 2 -- 717,235 Total Population

|  | Population | [NH White CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Black CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Asian CVAP <br> 19] | [H CVAP 19] |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 3 -- 717,704 Total Population

|  | Population | [NH White CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Black CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Asian CVAP <br> 19] | [H CVAP 19] |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |

Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 4 -- $\quad \mathbf{7 1 7 , 7 4 2}$ Total Population

|  | Population | [NH White CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Black CVAP <br> 19] | [NH Asian CVAP <br> 19] | [H CVAP 19] |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 5 -- 717,768 Total Population

|  | Population | [NH White CVAP 19] | [NH Black CVAP 19] | [NH Asian CVAP 19] | [H CVAP 19] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dist. 5 | $\begin{gathered} 717,768(100.00 \% \\ ) \end{gathered}$ | 379,959 (100.00\%) | 90,906 (100.00\%) | 5,840 (100.00\%) | 9,152 (100.00\%) |
| Total and \% Population |  | 379,959 (52.94\%) | 90,906 (12.67\%) | 5,840 (0.81\%) | 9,152 (1.28\%) |
| Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 6 -- |  |  | 717,760 Total Population |  |  |


| From Plan: | Enacted Congress B-V-C |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population | [NH White CVAP 19] | [NH Black CVAP 19] | [NH Asian CVAP 19] | [H CVAP 19] |
| Dist. 2 | 146,782 (20.45\%) | 77,535 (19.45\%) | 19,908 (27.30\%) | 524 (10.41\%) | 1,258 (19.16\%) |
| Dist. 3 | 5,895 (0.82\%) | 3,282 (0.82\%) | 1,011 (1.39\%) | (0.00\%) | 3 (0.05\%) |
| Dist. 6 | 563,274 (78.48\%) | 317,133 (79.54\%) | 51,770 (70.99\%) | 4,446 (88.34\%) | 5,298 (80.70\%) |
| Dist. 7 | 1,809 (0.25\%) | 775 (0.19\%) | 237 (0.32\%) | 63 (1.25\%) | 6 (0.09\%) |
| Total and \% Popu |  | 398,725 (55.55\%) | 72,926 (10.16\%) | 5,033 (0.70\%) | 6,565 (0.91\%) |

Plan: Xiang Alabama Plan, District 7 --
717,499 Total Population

|  | Population | [NH White CVAP | [NH Black CVAP | [NH Asian CVAP | [H CVAP 19] |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19] | 19] | 19] |  |
| Dist. 1 | $4,607(0.64 \%)$ | $2,282(1.07 \%)$ | $1,273(0.43 \%)$ | $4(0.13 \%)$ | $(0.00 \%)$ |
| Dist. 4 | $11,396(1.59 \%)$ | $7,468(3.49 \%)$ | $820(0.28 \%)$ | $94(3.15 \%)$ | $22(0.48 \%)$ |
| Dist. 6 | $96,346(13.43 \%)$ | $41,175(19.25 \%)$ | $23,853(8.01 \%)$ | $698(23.41 \%)$ | $719(15.68 \%)$ |
| Dist. 7 | $605,150(84.34 \%)$ | $163,010(76.20 \%)$ | $271,895(91.29 \%)$ | $2,186(73.31 \%)$ | $3,843(83.84 \%)$ |
| Total and \% Population |  | $213,935(29.82 \%)$ | $297,841(41.51 \%)$ | $2,982(0.42 \%)$ | $4,584(0.64 \%)$ |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Appendix B for additional demographics.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ PlanScore is a project of the nonpartisan Campaign Legal Center (CLC), a national nonprofit organization that advocates for fair maps and often serves as a resource to understand how the redistricting cycle affects communities of interest.
    ${ }^{3}$ Even though a plan could be drawn with a smaller population disparity, this plan sought to keep voting districts enacted, justified as "necessary to achieve some legitimate state objective".

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ See Appendix A for detailed demographic maps.

[^3]:    © 2021 CALIPER

