



# Legislative Study Group

## Texas House of Representatives

Chair Rep. Garnet Coleman    Vice Chair Rep. Lon Burnam    Vice Chair Rep. Donna Howard  
Treasurer Rep. Elliott Naishtat    Secretary Rep. Rafael Anchia    Legal Counsel Rep. Ana Hernandez Luna

Representative

Desk

### LSG Floor Report for Major State Calendar, April 27, 2011

#### **Bill Analysis and Evaluation for Committee Substitute for House Bill 150**

**Author: Rep. Solomons**

**Committee: Redistricting**

**Recommendation: Unfavorable**

CSHB 150 Evaluated By:

Joe Madden & Phillip Martin

[Joe@TexasLSG.org](mailto:Joe@TexasLSG.org); [Phillip@TexasLSG.org](mailto:Phillip@TexasLSG.org); 512-827-8756

## **CSHB 150: Texas House Redistricting**

The 2010 census found that 25,145,561 people currently live in Texas. The state's population grew by approximately 4.3 million people over the last decade. In a perfectly drawn map, each House district would have a population of 167,637 Texans. In order to maintain communities of interest and create continuity among representation, deviation from the ideal is normal. Current law requires that the "largest" and "smallest" House districts cannot deviate by more than 10 percent.

Overall, 89% of Texas' population growth was non-Anglo; yet, CSHB 150 would reduce the number of effective districts where Hispanic, African-American, and Asian voters can elect the candidate of their choice from 56 to 51.

**The statewide retrogression proposed by CSHB 150 would likely violate the Voting Rights Act and fail to meet legal review. For example, Latinos are responsible for 65% of the state's population growth; however, CSHB 150 reduces the number of effective Latino districts from 35 to 34.**

Additionally, CSHB 150 systematically packs minority voters in minority opportunity districts, while effectively ending minority coalition districts. In the last decade, many minorities have moved into suburban areas. As a result, they can vote together to elect their candidates of choice in these coalition districts. CSHB 150 eliminates five existing effective coalition districts.

### **CSHB 150 Does NOT Create a New Latino District**

Chairman Solomons has claimed that CSHB 150 creates a new Latino district. His analysis is based solely on Spanish surname voter registration, a metric that does not determine the effectiveness of a minority opportunity district and would be very unlikely to pass before a court. To quote the 2011 Department of Justice redistricting guidelines (emphasis added):

*"In determining whether the ability to elect exists in the benchmark plan and whether it continues in the proposed plan, the Attorney General does not rely on any predetermined or fixed demographic percentages at any point in the assessment. Rather, in the Department's view, this determination requires a functional analysis of the electoral behavior within the particular jurisdiction or election district. For example, census population data may not reflect significant differences in group voting behavior. Therefore, election history and voting patterns within the jurisdiction, voter registration and turnout information, and other similar information are very important to an assessment of the actual effect of a redistricting plan."*

CSHB 150, as it has been brought to the floor, does not create a new Latino district. Instead, it packs minority voters into existing minority districts while reducing five minority coalition districts.


**CSHB 150 –Examples of Statewide Impact**

The following is a brief analysis of the impact CSHB 150 would have on various areas of the state.

**FT. BEND COUNTY**


2000 Population - 354,452      2010 Population - 585,375      Change: 65.1%

The rapid growth in Ft. Bend County is being driven by the minority population and is now only 36.2% Anglo. However, in this plan, only one of the 3.5 districts in Ft. Bend County provides an electoral voice for African American, Hispanic and Asian voters. There is sufficient minority population in Ft. Bend County to create an effective coalition district that provides those voters responsible for the county's population growth an opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice. The green district to the right (HD 26) represents the only minority opportunity district in Ft. Bend County under CSHB 150.




The maps of Ft. Bend County below show high minority populations in the county that are **not** in minority opportunity districts. The highlighted portion of the map on the left shows high Black and Hispanic population precincts that are split between HDs 28 and 85. The highlighted portion of the map on the right shows certain precincts with populations of "Other", predominately Asian, over 70% located in HD 26. **All of these districts split the minority populations of Ft. Bend County to dilute their voting strength.** This is a clear example of a chance to draw a coalition district to allow these populations to elect the candidate of their choice.

*Black + Hispanic Concentrations*



*"Other" Concentrations*



**SOUTH TEXAS**


Located along the rural areas around IH-37 south of San Antonio before Corpus Christi, House District 35 currently has 56.4% Hispanic Voting Age population (HVAP) and has not consistently elected the Hispanic candidate of choice. CSHB150 dilutes HD 35's HVAP by 1.5 percentage points to 54.9%.

CSHB150 also radically changes Hidalgo County districts in an effort to squeeze a partisan performing district out of the existing population. The incumbent in HD 40 would only represent 1.5 % of his current district, and the incumbent in HD 41 would only represent 1.1 % of her district.

Percentage of Previous Districts in New HD 40 & 41 Districts			
Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
40			173,493
	36	34.9 %	60,594
	39	21.7 %	37,693
	40	41.9 %	72,646
41	41	1.5 %	2,560
			160,238
	36	26.2 %	41,927
	40	1.1 %	1,730
	41	72.8 %	116,581

\*Note: Districts are renumbered, so the incumbent in HD 40 now lives in HD 41 and the incumbent in HD 41 now lives in HD 40

The gerrymandered map in Hidalgo County takes great pains to draw the incumbents in HD 40 and 41 into almost entirely new districts, narrowing down to one city block at times.



**HARRIS COUNTY**

2000 Population – 3,400,578. 2010 Population – 4,092,459. Change: 20.3%

Over 100% of the population growth in Harris County is attributable to growth in the minority population, because the Anglo population decreased by over 82,000 in the last decade. Despite the fact that 67% of the population of Harris County is minority, only 46% of the districts in CSHB 150 could be considered minority opportunity districts.

Additionally, the bill decreases the representation in Harris County from 25 to 24. Under strict formulas, Harris County is entitled to 24.41 seats. CSHB 150 chooses to “round down” to 24 members, in order to pair two incumbents – Rep. Scott Hochberg and Rep. Hubert Vo – against one another. In 1972, 1982, 1992, and 2002 – when the final redistricting maps were drawn – Harris County was always allowed to “round up” in order to allow for strong representation in the largest county in the state. Similar precedents exist across the state, in other large counties. The Harris County delegation – Republicans and Democrats – benefits from having more members, not fewer. Choosing to decrease Harris County’s representation for the first time in decades is irresponsible.

By pairing Districts 137 and 149, CSHB 150 eliminates an effective minority district. In these districts, minority voters make up an overwhelming majority of the electorate and have consistently voted cohesively to elect their candidate of choice. District 149, which is moved to Central Texas, currently has a 73.4% non-Anglo voting age population. There is retrogression in the Hispanic population in District 137. District 137 is currently 63.8% Hispanic and 59.1% HVAP, which is reduced by 4% to 59.8% Hispanic and 55.5% HVAP.

**DALLAS COUNTY**

2000 Population – 2,218,899. 2010 Population – 2,368,139. Change: 6.7%

Over 100% of the population growth in Dallas County is attributable to growth among the minority population, because the Anglo population decreased by over 198,000 in the last decade. Despite the fact that 67% of the population of Dallas County is minority, only 42% of the districts in CSHB 150 could be considered minority opportunity districts. In addition to the six existing minority opportunity districts in Dallas County, the current Dallas County map provides a cohesive minority population the opportunity to elect their candidate of choice in three additional districts (HDs 101, 102, 107). This plan eliminates every coalition district in Dallas County without attempting to use this minority population to draw additional effective districts.

## **TARRANT COUNTY**

**2000 Population – 1,446,219. 2010 Population – 1,809,034. Change: 25.1%**

CSHB 150 enhances the existing HD 93 Coalition District, now making it the new District 101. Although Tarrant County is majority Anglo (51.8%), under this plan, 72% of the 11 Tarrant county districts effectively shut out the voice of minority voters, even though an addition district (HD 96) has functioned as an effective coalition district in a recent election and could be drawn as a majority minority district.

## **EL PASO COUNTY**

**2000 Population - 679,622. 2010 Population - 800,647. Change: 17.8%**

Four of the Districts in El Paso currently range between 73% and 92% HVAP, while HD78, only elected the Hispanic candidate of choice once in the last decade. CSHB150 makes no effort to increase Spanish surname in HD78 like it does in other urban districts.

### **Redistricting Timeline**

Twelve days ago, on April 15, CSHB 150 was first heard in a public hearing on a Friday. Two days later, on Sunday, April 17, the bill received a second public hearing. Two days after that, on Tuesday, April 19, the bill was approved by the committee and sent to the Calendars committee for a hearing. The rapid pace of the bill drew serious concerns on the floor of the Texas House. Though the author of the bill publicly stated that CSHB 150 was a member-driven map, many members – including State Rep. Sylvester Turner, Chair of the Texas Legislative Black Caucus – contended that the districts presented in CSHB 150 were unlike any he had seen in any map up to that point.

Should the Texas House pass CSHB 150, the bill would go through the normal legislative process. If, for some reason, no redistricting bill passes the Legislature, the Legislative Redistricting Board (LRB) would be charged with drawing lines for the Texas House. Once the Legislature or LRB has finished drawing the map, they will be submitted to either the Department of Justice or a three judge panel in Washington, D.C. There will almost certainly be a court challenge – especially given the serious legal concerns presented by CSHB 150.

One of the main challenges expected to the Texas House redistricting map is how CSHB 150, in its present form, dilutes minority voting strength. Several amendments to CSHB 150 are intended to compare and contrast how the districts could have been drawn to maintain and enhance minority voting strength, both to ensure fair and equal representation for Texas citizens, and to create a legal argument for the courts.



# Legislative Study Group

## Texas House of Representatives

Chair Rep. Garnet Coleman    Vice Chair Rep. Lon Burnam    Vice Chair Rep. Donna Howard  
Treasurer Rep. Elliott Naishtat    Secretary Rep. Rafael Anchia    Legal Counsel Rep. Ana Hernandez Luna

Representative		Desk	
Committee Substitute House Bill 150 – Amendment Analysis			
Plan #	Author	Analysis	Recommendation
120	Veasey	This plan is a countywide substitute for Tarrant County, and increases the number of minority opportunity districts from 4, instead of 3. Provided that local members of the Tarrant County delegation are favorable with this amendment, LSG is favorable on the plan.	Favorable
123	Rodriguez	This is a local plan that swaps out several precincts in Travis County. Provided that members of the Travis County delegation agree, Plan 123 would be favorable.	Favorable
145	Deshotel	This is a local plan that makes changes to HD 21 and HD 22.	Will of the House
146	Alonzo	This is a statewide plan that puts forth the MALDEF changes to the statewide map, while including changes to Dallas County put forth by Plan 232 by Rep. Coleman.	Will of the House
154	Smithee	Makes changes to West Texas, pairing Rep. Chisum and Rep. Landtroop. There are no changes to El Paso County.	Will of the House
155	Hilderbran	This plan is a statewide plan. Rep. Hilderbran voted against CSHB 150 in committee because of changes it made to the Hill Country, including not putting Burnet County in his district. While his amendment does make local changes for his district, it also makes significant changes to other major counties, including Harris, Dallas, and Travis counties.	Unfavorable
158	Craddick	Makes changes to West Texas, pairing Rep. Chisum and Rep. Hardcastle. There are no changes to El Paso County.	Will of the House
159	Bohac	This plan is a local plan that makes very small changes in Harris County. Provided that both local members agree, Plan 159 would be favorable.	Favorable
160	Menendez	This is a local plan that swaps one precinct from Rep. Castro’s district and puts it into Rep. Menendez’s district. If local members agree, Plan 160 would be favorable.	Favorable
161	T. King	This is a local plan that affects southwest Texas counties in HD 80 and HD 35. Provided that both local members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
162	Gonzales	Restores and improves traditionally core Democratic House Districts in Hidalgo County.	Favorable

OK For Distribution - Rep. Garnet Coleman



163	T. King	Local plan that affects south and west Texas counties in HD 80 and HD 74. Provided that both local members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
164	Alonzo	Plan 164 challenges the county line rule on the basis of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. However, we wish the map had been drawn without including the pairing of Rep. Johnson and Rep. Mallory Caraway, which appears to be an unnecessary pairing in the map. Despite this concern, the LSG is favorable on the principle of challenging the county line rule which is represented in Plan 164, as part of our efforts to ensure the continued protection of minority districts both now and in the future.	Favorable W/ Concerns
166	Kleinschmidt	This is a statewide plan that denies minority opportunity districts and, like CSHB 150, fails to recognize the significant growth in the Latino population across the state.	Unfavorable
171	Perry	This is a local plan that makes changes to districts in West Texas and the panhandle, and would pair Rep. Chisum and Rep. Hardcastle. Provided that all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
172	Walle	This is a local plan that makes changes to districts in and around Fort Bend County.	Favorable
177	Landtroop	Local plan for NW Texas & Panhandle that pairs Rep. Chisum and Landtroop. Provided that all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
178	Hunter	This is a local plan for Nueces County that fails to enhance Latino representation in HD 34.	Unfavorable
179	Woolley	This is a Harris County plan that makes significant changes to six House Districts in the county. LSG is Will of the House on this amendment, unless there is consensus from the Harris County delegation.	Will of the House
180	Morrison	This is a local plan that affects a handful of counties east of I-35 and I-37 from Austin to Corpus Christi. If all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
181	Oliveira	This is a local plan that swaps two precincts from Rep. Oliveira's district and puts them into Rep. Lucio III's district. Provide that both local members agree, then Plan 181 would be favorable.	Favorable
182	Farias	This is a local plan that attempts to retain more of the current makeup of HD 118. Currently, only 63.4% of HD 118 is in the newly drawn HB 118, as presented in CSHB 150.	Favorable
183	Gallego	This is a plan that makes changes to most rural districts throughout the state, except for East Texas. Provided that all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
186	Gallego	This is a local plan for two West Texas House Districts. Provided that all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Favorable
187	Gonzales	Similar to Plan 187, this plan restores traditionally core Democratic House Districts in Hidalgo County.	Favorable
188	Alonzo	This is a local plan that adds one additional precinct for HD 104 from HD 103. Provided that local members agree, this amendment is favorable.	Favorable

191	Woolley	This is a Harris County plan that makes significant changes to seven House Districts in the county. LSG is Will of the House on this amendment, unless there is consensus from the Harris County delegation.	Will of the House
192	Turner	This is a plan for Harris County that enhances African-American opportunity districts.	Favorable
193	Turner	This is a statewide plan that enhances African-American opportunity districts.	Favorable
194	Turner	Harris County plan that makes changes to four House Districts in the county. Provided that all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
195	Martinez-Fischer	This plan, offered by the Mexican American Legislative Caucus, is one in a series of statewide substitute maps that would increase the Latino representation in Texas. CSHB 150 reduces the number of effective Latino districts from 35 to 34, even though the 2010 census found that 65% of Texas' population growth in the past decade came from Latinos. This bill seeks to improve Latino representation in the Texas House.	Favorable
196	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
197	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
198	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
199	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
200	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
201	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
202	Turner	This plan, offered by the Texas Legislative Black Caucus, preserves African-American districts in Texas.	Favorable
203	Burnam	This plan is a local plan that makes changes to Tarrant County.	Favorable
205	Martinez-Fischer	Similar to Plan 195.	Favorable
206	Perry	This is a local plan that makes changes to HD 83 and HD 84, surrounding Lubbock. If all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House

207	Perry	This is a local plan that makes changes to HD 83 and HD 84, surrounding Lubbock. If all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
208	Perry	This is a local plan that makes changes to HD 83, HD 84, HD 68 and HD 88, starting in Lubbock and stretching north, into the panhandle, and east to the western edge of the Metroplex region.	Will of the House
209	Perry	This is a local plan that makes changes to HD 83 and HD 84, surrounding Lubbock. If all affected members agree, plan would be favorable.	Will of the House
210	Burkett	This is a local plan that makes changes in Eastern Dallas County.	Will of the House
211	Alonzo	This is a local plan that adds one additional precinct to HD 104 (Rep. Alonzo) from HD 103 (Rep. Anchia), and adds one precinct to HD 100 (Rep. Johnson) from HD 104 (Rep. Alonzo). Provided that local members agree, this amendment is favorable.	Favorable
212	Cain	This plan makes similar changes to CSHB 150 as Rep. Kleinschmidt's Plan 166, only with different maps for Dallas and Collin counties.	Unfavorable
213	Driver	This plan makes significant changes to all 14 House Districts in Dallas County.	Will of the House
214	Turner	This plan, offered by the Texas Legislative Black Caucus, preserves African-American districts in Texas.	Favorable
215	Christian	This plan, which contains the same districts lines as Plan 213 by Rep. Driver, is intended to be an amendment to the HB 155 amendment.	Will of the House
216	Driver	This plan is identical to Plan 213, except that it renames HD 107 as HD 106.	Will of the House
217	Flynn	This is a local plan that makes changes to East Texas.	Will of the House
219	Harper-Brown	This plan makes changes to all of west and southern Dallas County.	Will of the House
220	R. Anderson	This plan eliminates two African-American opportunity districts and adds no new minority districts.	Unfavorable
222	Villarreal	This is a local plan that makes changes to Bexar County.	Will of the House
223	Villarreal	This is a local plan that makes changes to Bexar County.	Will of the House
224	Villarreal	This is a local plan that makes changes to Bexar County.	Will of the House
226	Alvarado	This plan is a statewide substitute that creates more minority opportunity districts in the state and creates 25 House Districts in Harris County.	Favorable
227	Turner	This is a local plan that preserves HD 100, currently represented by Rep. Eric Johnson.	Favorable
228	Turner	This is a local plan that preserves HD 100, currently represented by Rep. Eric Johnson.	Favorable



<b>229</b>	<b>R. Anderson</b>	Eliminates two African-American opportunity districts and adds no new minority districts.	<b>Unfavorable</b>
<b>230</b>	<b>R. Anderson</b>	Eliminates two African-American opportunity districts and adds no new minority districts.	<b>Unfavorable</b>
<b>232</b>	<b>Coleman</b>	This is a statewide plan that increases the number of effective opportunity and coalition districts where Hispanic, African-American and Asian voters can elect their candidate of their choice from 56 to 59. CSHB 150, by comparison, reduced the number of those districts to 51. This substitute maintains all the core communities in all existing minority opportunity districts, and the number of Latino opportunity districts grows from 35 to 36.	<b>Favorable</b>
<b>234</b>	<b>Coleman</b>	Restores the core of existing districts in Harris County.	<b>Favorable</b>
<b>235</b>	<b>Coleman</b>	Restores the core of existing districts in Harris County.	<b>Favorable</b>
<b>236</b>	<b>Burnam</b>	This plan is a local plan that makes changes to Tarrant County.	<b>Favorable</b>

\*Note: List shows what percentage of a member's current district is located in their new district under CSHB 150. Source=Lege Council

Percentage of Previous Districts in New CSHB 150 Districts			
Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
1			165,823
	1	55.8 %	92,565
	3	44.2 %	73,258
2			173,869
	2	79.8 %	138,708
	3	20.2 %	35,161
3			164,795
	15	33.5 %	55,156
	16	40.3 %	66,434
	28	26.2 %	43,205
4			168,429
	4	100.0 %	168,429
5			160,253
	1	8.1 %	12,934
	2	6.8 %	10,914
	3	20.2 %	32,334
	5	33.9 %	54,365
	6	7.6 %	12,167
	7	23.4 %	37,539
6			160,008
	6	98.7 %	158,001
	7	1.3 %	2,007
7			161,039
	5	24.4 %	39,309
	7	75.6 %	121,730
8			161,098
	8	78.2 %	126,009
	10	21.8 %	35,089

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
9			166,719
	1	24.6 %	41,010
	5	39.4 %	65,631
	9	21.8 %	36,282
	11	14.3 %	23,796
10			163,063
	4	8.3 %	13,453
	10	91.7 %	149,610
11			168,699
	9	38.2 %	64,524
	11	61.8 %	104,175
12			160,573
	8	14.6 %	23,384
	14	17.6 %	28,225
	17	2.1 %	3,439
	56	13.1 %	21,048
	57	52.6 %	84,477
13			170,617
	13	52.0 %	88,739
	17	36.7 %	62,615
	30	11.3 %	19,263
14			163,187
	14	94.3 %	153,853
	17	5.7 %	9,334
15			167,349
	15	100.0 %	167,349
16			166,807
	16	82.0 %	136,865
	18	18.0 %	29,942
17			168,753
	17	53.8 %	90,783
	30	11.9 %	20,097
	44	11.7 %	19,807
	45	22.6 %	38,066

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
18			169,888
	12	15.5 %	26,384
	13	39.9 %	67,861
	18	44.5 %	75,643
19			171,969
	9	20.8 %	35,710
	12	12.7 %	21,766
	18	26.4 %	45,413
	19	40.2 %	69,080
20			159,816
	20	64.3 %	102,733
	52	9.0 %	14,333
	54	26.7 %	42,750
21			174,622
	19	40.6 %	70,868
	21	44.5 %	77,758
	22	14.9 %	25,996
22			159,488
	21	37.2 %	59,300
	22	62.8 %	100,188
23			163,720
	23	88.4 %	144,810
	24	11.6 %	18,910
24			162,685
	23	0.1 %	123
	24	99.9 %	162,562
25			174,168
	25	72.4 %	126,013
	29	27.6 %	48,155
26			160,091
	26	73.5 %	117,681
	27	15.1 %	24,177
	28	11.4 %	18,233

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
27			160,084
	26	24.2 %	38,672
	27	75.8 %	121,412
28			160,373
	26	7.4 %	11,821
	28	92.6 %	148,552
29			175,700
	25	8.9 %	15,691
	29	91.1 %	160,009
30			160,749
	30	58.6 %	94,176
	32	27.7 %	44,539
	35	13.7 %	22,034
31			168,636
	31	44.5 %	74,986
	36	0.1 %	195
	39	4.3 %	7,196
	40	45.2 %	76,269
	41	5.9 %	9,990
32			167,742
	32	28.1 %	47,176
	33	49.2 %	82,573
	34	22.6 %	37,993
33			172,135
	66	0.0 %	0
	70	42.5 %	73,087
	89	57.5 %	99,048
34			172,481
	32	0.3 %	536
	33	38.5 %	66,356
	34	61.2 %	105,589

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
35			172,482
	31	6.8 %	11,782
	32	37.6 %	64,804
	35	51.6 %	89,010
	80	4.0 %	6,886
36			172,005
	36	57.2 %	98,461
	40	9.8 %	16,783
	41	33.0 %	56,761
37			169,364
	37	81.1 %	137,316
	38	9.9 %	16,838
	43	9.0 %	15,210
38			167,793
	37	3.2 %	5,305
	38	95.9 %	160,852
	43	1.0 %	1,636
39			175,383
	39	72.6 %	127,399
	40	27.4 %	47,984
40			173,493
	36	34.9 %	60,594
	39	21.7 %	37,693
	40	41.9 %	72,646
	41	1.5 %	2,560
41			160,238
	36	26.2 %	41,927
	40	1.1 %	1,730
	41	72.8 %	116,581
42			160,806
	31	21.7 %	34,908
	42	78.3 %	125,898

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
43			171,735
	35	23.8 %	40,838
	38	2.7 %	4,673
	43	73.5 %	126,224
44			174,451
	44	100.0 %	174,451
45			167,604
	45	100.0 %	167,604
46			172,417
	46	92.5 %	159,489
	50	7.5 %	12,928
47			175,314
	47	62.3 %	109,211
	48	30.9 %	54,204
	50	6.8 %	11,899
48			173,008
	47	51.5 %	89,100
	48	39.7 %	68,662
	49	6.1 %	10,609
	50	2.7 %	4,637
49			167,309
	48	23.3 %	38,951
	49	74.3 %	124,318
	50	2.4 %	4,040
50			171,227
	46	7.6 %	12,975
	50	92.4 %	158,252
51			164,991
	49	3.8 %	6,217
	51	96.2 %	158,774
52			165,994
	20	10.7 %	17,838
	52	89.3 %	148,156

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
53			160,655
	53	57.4 %	92,162
	73	12.8 %	20,485
	74	1.2 %	2,002
	80	28.6 %	46,006
54			167,736
	54	72.0 %	120,799
	55	28.0 %	46,937
55			162,176
	54	20.3 %	32,903
	55	79.7 %	129,273
56			163,869
	56	81.9 %	134,250
	57	18.1 %	29,619
57			164,418
	9	5.4 %	8,865
	11	14.4 %	23,732
	12	61.6 %	101,356
	57	18.5 %	30,465
58			169,146
	58	100.0 %	169,146
59			163,609
	53	8.8 %	14,414
	59	91.2 %	149,195
60			160,599
	53	24.5 %	39,269
	60	60.9 %	97,808
	72	2.1 %	3,320
	85	12.6 %	20,202
61			168,109
	60	30.4 %	51,182
	61	69.6 %	116,927
62			160,023
	3	3.3 %	5,231
	62	96.7 %	154,792

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
63			167,337
	63	92.9 %	155,466
	65	7.1 %	11,871
64			167,588
	63	11.7 %	19,620
	64	88.3 %	147,968
65			165,742
	63	3.7 %	6,197
	64	0.0 %	0
	65	96.3 %	159,545
66			172,129
	66	73.0 %	125,713
	67	27.0 %	46,416
67			172,141
	66	20.2 %	34,830
	67	57.4 %	98,864
	70	22.3 %	38,373
	89	0.0 %	74
68			164,954
	68	19.3 %	31,900
	83	6.7 %	11,006
	85	7.6 %	12,505
	88	66.4 %	109,543
69			171,025
	68	17.8 %	30,471
	69	82.2 %	140,554
70			172,135
	70	83.3 %	143,401
	89	16.7 %	28,734
71			167,617
	71	87.5 %	146,722
	72	10.1 %	16,921
	85	2.4 %	3,974
72			161,974
	72	73.9 %	119,627
	85	26.1 %	42,347

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
73			166,719
	73	100.0 %	166,719
74			170,005
	74	61.4 %	104,419
	80	34.0 %	57,856
	82	4.5 %	7,730
75			159,691
	75	97.9 %	156,396
	76	2.1 %	3,295
76			159,760
	75	1.6 %	2,605
	76	81.0 %	129,420
	77	12.8 %	20,378
	79	4.6 %	7,357
77			159,949
	77	69.0 %	110,443
	78	18.6 %	29,683
	79	12.4 %	19,823
78			160,589
	77	1.1 %	1,746
	78	86.6 %	139,102
	79	12.3 %	19,741
79			160,658
	75	37.6 %	60,407
	79	62.4 %	100,251
80			160,093
	31	27.1 %	43,445
	42	28.8 %	46,053
	43	3.3 %	5,300
	74	16.5 %	26,405
	80	24.3 %	38,890
81			169,766
	74	6.3 %	10,740
	81	93.7 %	159,026

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
82			173,030
	82	89.9 %	155,504
	83	10.1 %	17,526
83			170,069
	83	74.9 %	127,388
	84	3.8 %	6,408
	85	21.3 %	36,273
84			167,970
	83	10.3 %	17,310
	84	89.7 %	150,660
85			160,182
	26	7.8 %	12,555
	27	49.9 %	79,860
	28	33.5 %	53,692
	30	8.8 %	14,075
86			165,183
	86	93.8 %	154,914
	88	6.2 %	10,269
87			174,343
	87	87.3 %	152,193
	88	12.7 %	22,150
88			160,664
	61	36.8 %	59,127
	68	45.8 %	73,571
	85	17.4 %	27,966
89			172,138
	67	0.0 %	78
	70	26.7 %	45,940
	89	73.3 %	126,120
90			159,428
	90	73.9 %	117,779
	95	18.5 %	29,542
	97	4.5 %	7,139
	99	3.1 %	4,968

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
91			162,838
	91	80.9 %	131,759
	92	0.0 %	0
	98	19.1 %	31,079
92			162,326
	91	4.1 %	6,708
	92	91.3 %	148,234
	93	4.5 %	7,384
93			162,161
	90	2.9 %	4,724
	91	9.8 %	15,865
	92	0.2 %	271
	93	19.9 %	32,243
	94	11.8 %	19,182
	95	0.0 %	0
	98	27.9 %	45,212
	99	27.5 %	44,664
94			167,374
	93	3.7 %	6,177
	94	74.3 %	124,327
	96	22.0 %	36,870
95			161,634
	90	4.5 %	7,278
	91	6.3 %	10,152
	95	77.9 %	125,969
	96	2.8 %	4,604
	97	8.4 %	13,631
96			164,930
	93	17.6 %	28,997
	96	75.0 %	123,744
	97	7.4 %	12,189

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
97			168,901
	90	1.7 %	2,952
	96	7.3 %	12,367
	97	80.0 %	135,086
	99	11.0 %	18,496
98			164,081
	92	0.0 %	0
	98	99.4 %	163,052
	99	0.6 %	1,029
99			170,697
	90	5.0 %	8,616
	99	95.0 %	162,081
100			161,143
	100	56.6 %	91,179
	101	6.0 %	9,613
	103	0.2 %	317
	107	24.1 %	38,761
	108	0.8 %	1,287
	110	9.9 %	16,015
	111	2.5 %	3,971
101			164,664
	92	3.8 %	6,244
	93	63.3 %	104,223
	96	32.9 %	54,197
102			161,136
	102	47.1 %	75,952
	112	36.1 %	58,209
	114	2.5 %	3,987
	115	14.3 %	22,988

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
103			176,016
	100	7.7 %	13,590
	103	57.3 %	100,898
	104	13.9 %	24,523
	105	7.0 %	12,322
	106	8.2 %	14,488
	108	2.1 %	3,759
	115	3.7 %	6,436
104			172,784
	100	0.7 %	1,153
	103	2.3 %	3,927
	104	62.1 %	107,377
	106	27.4 %	47,276
	111	7.6 %	13,051
105			175,728
	103	1.0 %	1,822
	105	52.0 %	91,348
	106	47.0 %	82,551
	111	0.0 %	7
106			161,947
	63	22.9 %	37,103
	64	44.1 %	71,377
	65	33.0 %	53,467
107			171,872
	101	51.0 %	87,656
	102	3.6 %	6,215
	107	38.5 %	66,175
	113	6.9 %	11,826
108			163,233
	100	0.6 %	1,004
	107	4.4 %	7,110
	108	84.8 %	138,485
	114	10.2 %	16,634

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
109			174,176
	109	88.4 %	153,926
	110	10.4 %	18,079
	111	1.2 %	2,171
110			167,547
	100	25.1 %	42,107
	101	14.4 %	24,143
	109	8.3 %	13,925
	110	52.1 %	87,372
111			166,979
	106	9.2 %	15,401
	109	4.4 %	7,404
	111	86.3 %	144,174
112			167,051
	102	16.1 %	26,856
	112	51.6 %	86,174
	113	32.3 %	54,021
113			171,410
	101	24.6 %	42,189
	110	17.1 %	29,237
	112	2.6 %	4,528
	113	55.7 %	95,456
114			172,330
	102	12.9 %	22,304
	103	1.1 %	1,889
	107	16.5 %	28,411
	114	61.3 %	105,626
	115	8.2 %	14,100
115			166,734
	103	5.1 %	8,493
	105	36.3 %	60,568
	114	0.2 %	329
	115	58.4 %	97,344

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
116			171,463
	116	73.9 %	126,785
	117	8.2 %	14,032
	123	3.8 %	6,507
	125	14.1 %	24,139
117			171,249
	117	79.8 %	136,634
	118	15.4 %	26,328
	122	0.9 %	1,521
	124	4.0 %	6,766
118			161,851
	117	19.7 %	31,922
	118	63.4 %	102,628
	119	7.1 %	11,533
	121	7.9 %	12,722
	124	1.9 %	3,046
119			159,981
	118	14.9 %	23,853
	119	73.5 %	117,555
	120	8.0 %	12,871
	121	0.2 %	311
	123	0.2 %	270
	124	3.2 %	5,121
120			175,132
	119	4.9 %	8,555
	120	83.9 %	146,907
	121	11.2 %	19,667
	123	0.0 %	3
121			174,867
	120	0.4 %	672
	121	69.1 %	120,916
	122	28.3 %	49,516
	123	2.2 %	3,763
122			175,184
	117	1.7 %	3,044
	122	98.3 %	172,140

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
123			175,674
	116	4.3 %	7,472
	119	8.3 %	14,640
	120	1.6 %	2,737
	121	3.0 %	5,257
	122	13.5 %	23,669
	123	69.4 %	121,899
	124	0.0 %	0
124			174,823
	117	10.4 %	18,127
	124	85.4 %	149,274
	125	4.2 %	7,422
125			174,549
	116	5.0 %	8,687
	117	9.5 %	16,601
	119	2.8 %	4,823
	124	7.9 %	13,837
	125	74.8 %	130,601
126			170,749
	126	73.6 %	125,713
	130	6.8 %	11,575
	135	16.1 %	27,431
	139	3.5 %	6,030
127			163,724
	127	70.7 %	115,805
	141	8.0 %	13,116
	142	6.4 %	10,413
	150	14.9 %	24,390
128			172,869
	127	20.5 %	35,407
	128	79.3 %	137,064
	142	0.2 %	398
129			171,751
	129	82.9 %	142,319
	144	17.1 %	29,432

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
130			175,532
	130	100.0 %	175,532
131			173,797
	131	68.6 %	119,280
	133	4.4 %	7,590
	144	0.5 %	791
	146	3.4 %	5,852
	147	3.0 %	5,196
	149	20.2 %	35,088
132			172,973
	130	0.1 %	126
	132	99.9 %	172,847
133			173,041
	132	4.0 %	6,875
	133	22.9 %	39,693
	136	12.7 %	21,926
	149	60.4 %	104,547
134			171,703
	134	85.7 %	147,146
	136	3.7 %	6,278
	137	0.4 %	758
	146	6.7 %	11,459
	148	3.5 %	6,062
135			172,422
	130	37.8 %	65,153
	132	18.8 %	32,406
	135	43.4 %	74,863
136			172,943
	133	29.4 %	50,801
	136	54.6 %	94,458
	137	16.0 %	27,684

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
137			172,840
	133	26.8 %	46,302
	137	55.7 %	96,337
	149	17.5 %	30,201
138			173,044
	132	30.2 %	52,298
	135	23.8 %	41,157
	136	6.4 %	11,059
	138	39.6 %	68,530
139			171,986
	126	17.8 %	30,535
	135	13.7 %	23,486
	138	18.8 %	32,281
	139	49.8 %	85,684
140			172,794
	126	2.1 %	3,590
	139	22.2 %	38,410
	140	66.8 %	115,432
	141	8.9 %	15,362
141			166,369
	126	7.5 %	12,436
	139	12.5 %	20,795
	140	0.0 %	0
	141	66.3 %	110,366
	142	0.5 %	823
	150	13.2 %	21,949
142			161,243
	127	0.9 %	1,390
	140	1.0 %	1,535
	141	28.5 %	45,876
	142	62.9 %	101,386
	148	6.9 %	11,056

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
143			165,808
	127	1.3 %	2,224
	142	24.9 %	41,360
	143	66.6 %	110,393
	145	7.1 %	11,831
144			161,878
	127	19.9 %	32,276
	128	7.3 %	11,753
	129	5.2 %	8,479
	143	3.3 %	5,397
	144	64.2 %	103,973
145			173,161
	144	7.3 %	12,588
	145	69.8 %	120,899
	147	7.5 %	12,961
	148	15.4 %	26,713
146			174,240
	131	19.3 %	33,609
	133	6.3 %	10,910
	137	7.5 %	13,097
	146	66.9 %	116,624
147			170,617
	144	13.4 %	22,931
	146	5.4 %	9,185
	147	75.1 %	128,104
	148	6.1 %	10,397
148			170,830
	136	7.7 %	13,133
	138	21.1 %	36,070
	140	13.1 %	22,308
	142	0.2 %	414
	143	6.8 %	11,591
	147	0.3 %	596
	148	50.8 %	86,718

Proposed PLANH153	Current PLANH100	Total Population	
District	Districts		
149			164,376
	20	65.4 %	107,520
	52	34.6 %	56,856
150			166,145
	150	100.0 %	166,145

Source: Lege Council