

## **Public Input and Outreach**

The following attachment provides an overview of the public input received during the districting process. The Committee listened to and considered public input at four public hearings. Approximately 50 different people attended these hearings.

The City also developed 3 Open City Hall Surveys where \_\_\_\_ number of hours of testimony was provided.

### Public Input During the Four Public Hearings

At the final hearing, when the Committee made their recommendation, there were more than thirty people. The minutes of these hearings are attached.

On February 12, 2018 and March 8, 2018, the Committee held public hearings on establishing the composition of two Council districts. Community members provided the following input on criteria that should be considered when drawing the boundary line: evaluate CVAP for protected groups; minimize changes in the proposed district boundary after the 2020 Census; use data on 2016 registered voters; keep ethnic neighborhoods together; use major arterials as boundaries and create districts that keep the north side of the city intact.

The public input at the last two public hearings focused on alternative district plans. At the March 26, 2018 public hearing, Dr. Gobalet presented three preliminary draft Council District maps. By April 2, five additional plans were submitted by members of the public. All eight plans were studied by the Dr. Gobalet and presented at the April 12, 2018 Committee hearing. (See attached Demographer Information and Draft Plans for copies and a comparison of these eight plans)

The eight alternative plans that were submitted and evaluated are:

- NS1- (Demographer) Northern and Southern Districts
- WE1-(Demographer) Western and Eastern Council Districts
- WE2 –(Demographer) Hybrid Western and Eastern Council Districts
- HH 1 (Hosam Haggag El Camino 1) – Northern and Southern Districts using the El Camino as a boundary
- HH 2 (Hosam Haggag El Camino 2) – Northern and Southern Districts using the El Camino as the major boundary with a small section of the Lawrence Expressway
- KP 1 (Kevin Park 1) – Hybrid uses San Tomas Expressway as a boundary
- KP 2 (Kevin Park 2) –Hybrid uses San Tomas Expressway (a bit less) as a boundary
- RJ 1 (Rob Jerdonek 1) – Hybrid uses Saratoga Creek as a boundary

At their April 12, 2018 hearing, Dr. Gobalet did an extensive analysis of all eight plans ( See attached Demographer Information and Draft Plans). Example findings were:

- All eight plans meet the legal requirement that each City Council district shall contain a nearly equal population based on 2010 Census counts
- Some plans (WE1 and HH1) would probably need to adjust the boundaries after the 2020 census because of population growth since 2010.
- All eight plans also contained at least one voting district where the Asian Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) was at least 25 percent.
- In 2016, people with Asian surnames made up more than 25% of the total voters for four plans (WE1, WE2, HH1 and HH2).

The public addressed the Committee on the alternative plans at both hearings. Main comments were:

- Keep the population north of 101 together because of their common interests, including the stadium.
- Object to plans that split up the north east corner of the city where there is a large Asian population concentration.
- The north and west parts of the city have more affinity to one another. There are more new developments in these areas and residents tend to be newer to the area.
- KP1, KP2 and RJ1 break up the fewest neighborhoods and precincts and show the greatest understanding of the local community.
- All 8 plans are not that different from one another. HH1 plan is a little more advantageous to the Latino population, but they are all fairly close.
- If there are only two districts, support plans KP1, KP2 and RJ1.
- WE 1 is imbalanced in population and turnout.
- For WE 2, the line along Montague Expressway seems to divide the Filipino population.
- Use an option that goes down the San Tomas Expressway and more closely follows the Santa Clara Unified School District Elementary School Attendance Area boundaries.
- Three Draft Plans that were presented split geographic areas that have voted for minority candidates in the past.

Several members of the public also addressed the Committee on the topic of which district should be designated as District 1. Main themes included the following:

- The district containing the Old Quad area should go first in 2018 because that area has a higher turnout in gubernatorial elections
- There is a lower Asian turnout in gubernatorial elections, so the district with more Asians should be selected for the presidential election.
- Having the Northern District vote in 2020 increases the chances that three Asian or Hispanic candidates for City Council could win in that district.

#### Open City Hall Input on Draft Maps and Sequencing

The City has been sharing information and taking input from the community on the proposed plans via Open City Hall. Surveys were done on the following three topics to

gather public input. The April 12, 2018 Committee staff report, which can be found online at [www.santaclaraca.gov/districtelections](http://www.santaclaraca.gov/districtelections), contains tables with more detail on the results of these surveys and a complete list of the comments. The survey results are summarized here:

- Open City Hall Topic 1: Criteria for drawing the boundary between two new voting districts which was open since February
  - That survey was posted on February 27, 2018 and remained open for one month until March 27, 2018. Thirty-five people responded to this survey for a total of 3.5 hours of public comment. There was some preference for northern and southern Districts and the El Camino was the preferred boundary.
- Open City Hall Topic 2: Preferences for Draft District Maps (included only the three maps prepared by the Demographer)
  - The second survey was started on March 19, 2018 before we received the five maps from the public, so it only includes the three maps prepared by the demographer. Thirty-six people, providing 1.8 hours of public comment, responded to this survey. Fifty percent of the people who voted preferred draft plan NS1, a plan with northern and southern Council Districts.
- Open City Hall Topic 3: Preferences for which District is Designated as District 1
  - The third survey was started on March 22, 2018. Twenty- four people responded to this to this survey, providing 1.2 hours of public comment. It was difficult to draw any conclusions from the small number of votes received, other than that the respondents did not indicate a strong preference for which District is District 1.