## Agenda Report

FROM: Rachel Fiynn
CITY ADMINISTRATOR
SUBJECT: Supplemental Report Regarding 2013 City Council Redistricting

DATE: September 25, 2013


COUNCIL DISTRICT: City-Wide

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council accept this supplemental report, hear public comment, .and recommend direction on the review of proposed redistricting maps and schedule of future Council hearings.

## REASON FOR SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

The City's Redistricting consultant, Doug Johnson, of National Demographics Corporation is proposing an additional Redistricting proposal: "NDC Test A Plan" (see Attachment 1). This proposed map was not available at the time of the preparation of the October 3, 2013 Rules and Legislation Agenda Report, but is of interest to the Council as it considers additional options for Redistricting. This supplemental report conveys the "NDC Test A Plan" to the Council and the public.

Attachment 1 includes:

- proposed map
- a narrative explanation of the proposals
- demographic table
- detailed map sections shown at the Council District level.


## OUTCOME

> MEETING OF THE OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL OCT 152013

Staff seeks direction from Council on how staff should proceed with the drawing of new City Council district boundaries. Staff recommend that the Council select a redistricting map and direct Staff to return with an ordinance ready for first reading. The selected redistricting map

Item:
could be (1) one of the already-drawn plans; (2) a map that Council directs Staff to develop by combining parts of the already-drawn plans; or (3) an entirely new plan.

## CEQA

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not apply to the 2013 Council redistricting, because the redistricting ordinance is not a "project" under CEQA. Section 15378 (b)(5) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a "project" under CEQA: "does not include...organizational or administrative activities of governments that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment."

For questions regarding this report, please contact Rachel Flynn, Director of Planning and Building, at 510-238-2229.


Prepared by:
Devan Reiff, Planner III
Strategic Planning Division

Attachment 1: National'Demographics Corporation proposed Redistricting map ("NDC Test A Plan")
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The City's extensive public outreach effort successfully generated considerable public engagement and mput for the City's 2013 redistricting effort. The first round of engagement and education Town Hall meetungs led to the creation of 10 proposed redistricting maps generated by members of die Oakland community, along with three plans generated by the City's consultant. Following the second round of Review and Feedback meetings, NDC took the input of the community and developed the "NDC Test A" plan that attempts to put the many different comments and requests together into a plan that draws on the pubhc input and balances the competing nature of some of the requests.

The "NDC Test A" plan is one illustration of how the 'puzzle pieces' from the various plans can be put together in ways diat achieve the goals or suggestions from residents of different parts of the corrmunity.

Step 1: Population Balance the currently over-populated District 1:
A) Move the border between D1 and D3 from MacArthur to I-580;

- Proposed by member of the public in "Cohesive Neighborhoods 1"
- Unites a divided community: Police Beat 9X (united in D4)
- Follows a major road (1-580)
- Makes both D1 and D3 more compact
B) Move the border between D1 and D4 in the hills north of Hwy 13 from its curvy multi-road path to Highway 24;
- Proposed by member of the 1 public in "Cohesive Neighborhoods 1"
- Follows a major road (Hwy 24)
- Unites a divided community (Thornhill Elementary attendance zone)
- Makes both D1 and D4 more compact
C) Balance population of D1 by moving D1/D2 border one block from Oakland Ave to Harrison Street
- Proposed in "NDCDraft 2"

Step 2: Population Balance the currently over-populated District 3:
D) Move the East Lake / China Hill area east of Lake Merritt from D3 to D2

- Proposed in everyplan drawn by members of the public
- Unites a divided community (Cleveland Elementary Attendance Area; Police Beat 15X; East Lake Neighborhood)
- Makes D2 and D3 more compact
- New border: Grand Ave

Step 3: Population Balance District 3:
E) Unite die Tresde Glen neighborhood in D2

- Proposed by the Trestle Glen Neighborhood group
- Unites a divided community (Trestie Glen)
- Follows a major visible feature (canyon belind Tresde Glen homes)
- Makes D2 and D4 a bit more compact
F) Move Garfield Elementary and neighborhood to the south from D2 to D5
- Almost identical to change proposed by a member of the public in "Fair Representation"
- A smaller version of the move proposed by a member of the public in Hope 4 Oakland, and-proposed by Councilmember Brooks, NDC Draft 2 and NDC Draft 3
- Moves Gatfield Elementary, which is on die north side of Foothill Blvd
- Moves from D2 to D5 the area across the street to the south from Garfield Elementary, bordered by Foothill Blvd, $20^{\text {th }}$ Ave, $12^{\text {th }}$ Street, and $23^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue

Step 4: Unite Maxwell Park
G) Unte Maxwell Park in D6 (currendy divided between D4 and D6)

- Proposed by members of the public in Hope 4 Oakland; Socio-Economic Adjusted 1; Socio-Economic Adjusted 2; Fair Representadon and Burton 1
- Unites a community (Maxwell Park; Police Beat 28X)
- Follows major roads (High)

Step 5: Unite Fruitvale Police Beat 27X
H) Unite Fruitvale Pohce Beat 27X in D6 (currendy divnded between D4, D5 and D6

- Proposed by member of the public,in Fair Representation
- Unites a divided cormnunity (Fruitvale Police Beat 27X)
- Follows major roads (High, $14^{\text {th }}$, and Bancroft)
- Together with die Maxwell Park change, makes District 4 significandy more compact

Step 7: Balance Population of D6
I) Unite Melrose Elementary School attendance area in D5

- Unites a divided community (Melrose Elementary)
- Follows major roads (Bancroft, $55^{\text {th }}$ Ave and International)
J) Move remaming D6 territory south of International Blvd into D5
- Follows major roads (International)
- Balances population numbers
- Does not change any part of D7


## Step 8: Balance Population of D4 and D5

K) Move D4/D5 border nordi of I-580 to follow Sausal Creek .

- Unites a divided community (Police Beat 16 Y along Canon Ave)
- Follows a visible feature (Sausai Creek)
L) Move D4/D5 border in area west of Humboldt and east of High
- Unites a divided community (Police Beat 24Y) in D4
- Unites a divided conımumty (Police Beat 24X) in D5
- Follows a major road (Bancroft), except where Bancroft splits Pohce Beat 24Y
M) Move D4/D5 border in area west of Humboldt and east of Sausai Creek)
- Unites m D4 more, but not all, of Fruitvale Elementary attendance area and Police Beat 21Y
- Brings populations of D4 and D5 into balance

Labeled Plan:


Resulting Demographics:

Full deniograplics for the plan are avalable in die accompanying spreadsheet, but here are comparisons of some demograpluc variables that have most often asked about by the pubhe in die town hall meetmgs:

## Overall Population Deviation. 2.7\%

Latuno percentage of Citizens of Voting Age in District 5: 23\% (up from 21\% in existing districts)

African-American percentage of CVAP in District 5:
Asian-American percentage of CVAP in D5:
Non-Hispanic W/lite percentage of CVAP in D5:
-African-American percentage of CVAP in D6:
Launo percentage of CVAP m D6:

29\% (up from 27\%)
$22 \%$ (essentally unchanged from existing $23 \%$ )
$26 \%$ (down from $29 \%$ in existing)
$56 \%$ (essentally unchanged from existung 55\%)
$15 \%$ (essenually unchanged from existung $16 \%$ )

There are no changes to the existing District 7 in this plan.

## Full Plan Map:



| District | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tota! Population | 56,195 | 56,113 | 56,549 | 55,020 | 55,630 | 55,937 | 55,280 | 390,724 |
| Devia aon from dvean Population | 377 | 295 | 731 | -798 | -188 | 119 | -538 | 1,529 |
| \% Deviation from Mean Population | 0.68\% | 0 53\% | 1.31\% | -1.43\% | -034\% | 0.21\% | -0.96\% | $27 \%$ |
| Percentage of Total Population (2010 US Census data) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic . | 9.3\% | 13.9\% | 135\% | $142 \%$ | 482\% | 33.5\% | $453 \%$ | 25\% |
| Non-Hispance (NH) White | 527\% | 268\% | 26.1\% | 43.5\% | 132\% | 12.9\% | 63\% | 26\% |
| NH Black/African American | 23.8\% | 16.9\% | 385\% | 168\% | 17.7\% | 42 2\% | 40.9\% | 28\% |
| NH Nativè American | 0.6\% | $05 \%$ | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 04\% | 0.3\% | 1\% |
| NH1 Asian American | $114 \%$ | 39.9\% | 18.8\% | $228 \%$ | 18.8\% | $79 \%$ | $46 \%$ | 18\% |
| NH Pacific Islander | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0 5\% | 0.4\% | 12\% | 1.3\% | 1\% |
| NH Other | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | $04 \%$, | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | $02 \%$ | 0.2\% | 0\% |
| NH Mult-Race | 14\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 13\% | 1.0\% | $17 \%$ | 1.2\% | 1\% |
| Percentage of Voting Age Population (2010 US Census data) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Voteng Age Population ( ${ }^{\prime}$ AP) | 47,588 | 46,421 | 48,186 | 43,240 | 41,090 | 41,654 | 39,425 | 307,604 |
| Hispanic VAP | 8.5\% | 12.1\% | 12.2\% | 12.4\% | $444 \%$, | 29.3\% | 40.2\% | 22\% |
| NH White VIAP | 55.1\% | $287 \%$ | 29.0\% | $464 \%$ | 15 5\% | $152 \%$ | $77 \%$ | 29\% |
| NH Black/Afican American VAP | 22.8\% | 16.8\% | 36.3\% | 161\% | 178\% | 43.6\% | $442 \%$ | 28\% |
| NH Native American V'AP | $06 \%$ | 0.5\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 1\% |
| Ni-I Astan American VAP | 11.1\% | 40.1\% | 19.5\% | 22.6\% | 20.3\% | 87\% | 5.0\% | 19\% |
| NH Pacific Islander VAP | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | $03 \%$ | 0.4\% | $04 \%$ | 1.0\% | 1.2\% | 1\% |
| NH Other VAP | 0.5\% | $04 \%$ | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | $02 \%$ | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0\% |
| NH Multi-Race VAP | 12\% | 1.1\% | 15\% | 1.0\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 11\% | 1\% |
| Percentage of Citizen Voting Age Pópulation 2007-2011 Special Tabulationdata) $\quad \therefore \quad$, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Citizens of Voting Age (CVAP) | 43,557 | 38,204 | 38,503 | 38,359 | 26,573 | 33,632 | 30,283 | 249,110 |
| Hispame CVAP | 7\% | 10\% | 8\% | 7\% | 23\% | 15\% | 19\% | 12\% |
| NH Whate CVAP | 57\% | 36\% | 34\% | 53\% | 23\% | 18\% | 12\% | 35\% |
| NH Black/African American CVAP | 24\% | 21\% | 38\% | 17\% | 29\% | 56\% | 60\% | 34\% |
| NH Native American CVAP | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| NH Astan American CVAP | 8\% | 30\% | 16\% | 19\% | 22\% | 8\% | 5\% | 16\% |
| NlI Pacific Islander CVAP | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| NH Other CVAP | 3\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Percentage of Registration and Ternout by Surname (California Statewide Database Nov2010 data) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regrstered V'oters | 39,930 | 28,989 | 30,160 | 34,181 | 20,153 | 27,536 | 23,139 | 204,088 |
| Spanish-Surnamed \% of Registration | - $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ | 6\% | 8\% | 23\% | 11\% | 13\% | 10\% |
| Asian-Sumamed \% of Registration | 5\% | 20\% | 9\% | 11\% | 11\% | 4\% | 2\% | 9\% |
| Filimino-Surnamed \% of Registration | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | , 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Voters Casting Ballots | 26,717 | 17,696 | 16,498 | 23,802 | 10,626 | 15,391 | 12,053 | 122,783 |
| Spamsh-Sunamed \% of Voters Casting Ballots | 4\% | 7\% | 6\% | 7\% | $22 \%$ | 10\% | 12\% | 9\% |
| Asian-Surnamed \% of Voteıs Casting Ballots | 5\% | 17\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 4\% | 2\% | 8\% |
| Filipino-Surnamed \% of Voters Casting Ballots | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |




Changes A, B and C


## Change D




## Change F



Changes G and H


Changes I and J



