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Among Section 5 cities in the 2000-2007 period when federal oversight was required, Black population share in 2007 is still statistically significantly and negatively associated with annexation. Moreover, minority population shares in 2007 in Section 5 cities are statistically significantly and negatively associated with annexation, while white population share is positively associated with it. This means that 6 to 13 years prior to when *Shelby* removed federal oversight requirements for Section 5 cities, when anticipation was less likely than 0 to 6 years before, racial composition of cities was nevertheless significantly associated with annexation activity. Furthermore, moving to the bottom left block of Table 6, Black and minority racial composition in non-Section 5 cities is also negatively associated with annexation, while white racial composition is positively associated with annexation.

Across Table 5 and Table 6, results consistently show that white population share is negatively associated with annexation after Shelby, while non-Black minority population is positively associated with annexation after Shelby, regardless of previous Section 5 coverage. A simple fixed effects linear regression of periphery racial composition on period suggests that one possible explanation for this surprising finding is the relative decrease in white population share and relative increase in Black and minority population shares at cities’ peripheries (Table X, Appendix). Even if cities intend to discriminate during annexation, demographic realities may limit the extent to which white population share can be positively associated with annexation.
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