Demographers' Overview City of Santa Clara Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) Public Hearing #1

OCTOBER 23, 2021



Our Qualifications

- **☐** We have provided districting and redistricting services since 1990
- We have helped redistrict dozens of California jurisdictions
- We helped Santa Clara transition from at-large to by-district elections
- We have PhDs in Demography and Sociology from UC Berkeley and Stanford University and have presented academic papers on redistricting topics

LGDR's agenda for this presentation

- What is redistricting?
- Why redistrict?
- Legal requirements
- Timeline

What is Redistricting?

Every 10 years, cities must redistrict (adjust Council District boundaries to equalize total populations) using the new Census counts

Federal and state laws apply

Cities must adopt new boundaries before April 17, 2022

The new council districts will be used until Census 2030 data are released

Incumbents will complete their terms of office even if they no longer live in the district they were elected to represent

History of Santa Clara's Council Districts

The current plan was developed by the Santa Clara Ad-Hoc Advisory Districting Committee in 2018

The Committee listened to public testimony, deliberated, and drafted plans. It followed both legal requirements and best practices.

Later that year, the court ordered that what's now the current plan be used for the 2018 election.

Draft Plan 3 City of Santa Clara Council Districts November 2018 Election (shading indicates seats to be elected) **LEGEND** Draft Plan 3 District Elects in 2018 School Highway/Freeway Major Road - Railroad River/Stream Street Centerline Lapkoff & Gobalet Demiographic Research, Inc., 7/24/18

Court-ordered Plan (current Council districts)

Used Nov. 2018 for the District 2 and 3 elections.

Used again in 2020 for District 1, 4, 5, & 6 elections

Legal guidelines that demographers follow:

- **✓** Federal Law & Supreme Court Decisions:
 - Population equality
 - Voting Rights Act
 - No Racial Gerrymandering
- ✓ California Fair Maps Act (AB 849, 2019), as amended by AB 1276 (2020):
 - Redistricting criteria
 - Public outreach
 - Charter Cities: Elections Code §§ 21620 et seq.

California's FAIR MAPS Act (AB 849, 2019) applies to cities and counties. It requires that cities:

- 1. Encourage residents to participate in the redistricting process by
 - Maintaining a redistricting website for 10 years
 - Providing translation services upon request
 - Offering multiple ways for the public to provide testimony and feedback (in writing and electronically)
 - Public access to demographic/mapping data and software

California's FAIR MAPS Act (AB 849, 2019) - continued The law requires that cities:

- 2. Hold at least 4 public hearings, with specific protocols
 - a) At least one meeting held before the IRC and demographers begin to draft maps
 - b) At least one meeting after 6 pm or on a weekend
 - c) Meetings have definite start times
 - d) 5 day's notice for public hearings; Adopted plan must be published and available 7 days prior to adoption;

FAIR MAPS Act criteria, in order of priority, that should/should not be used during plan drawing.

- 1. Federal Law (population equality, Voting Rights Act)
- 2. Geographical contiguity
- 3. Geographic integrity of communities of interest (especially do not split communities of protected groups)
- 4. Geographic integrity of cities and unincorporated communities
- 5. Easily identifiable and understood boundaries
- 6. Geographic compactness
- 7. No political party considerations

Timeline

| Thursday, Sept. 23, 6pm | Commission Training | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Saturday, Oct. 23, 10 am | Public Hearing - Community of Interest Testimony | | | | |
| Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 pm | Public Hearing - Community of Interest Testimony | | | | |
| Thursday, Jan. 13, 6 pm | Public Hearing - Commissioners review draft plans and begin deliberations | | | | |
| Saturday, Jan. 29, 10 am | Public Hearing - Commissioners continue deliberations and potential adoption of final map | | | | |
| Thursday, Feb. 10, 6 pm | Public Hearing - If needed, Commissioners continue deliberations; potential adoption of final map | | | | |
| Monday, Feb. 28, 6 pm | Public Hearing - Commission must adopt final map by this meeting | | | | |
| March or April, 2022 | Commission Presents to Council; Adoption of Ordinance Amending the District Map | | | | |

Appendix

Definitions

| Redistricting | Adjusting election district boundaries to equalize total populations. Required after each new U.S. Census. Geographical area where people share common social and economic interests and should be in a single District or be considered when drawing boundaries. | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Community of interest | | | | | | | |
| Advisory Redistricting | Appointed group that will recommend a plan to the Board of | | | | | | |
| Commission (ARC) | Supervisors (3 members per Sup. District) in late November | | | | | | |
| Population equality | Districts need to have (almost) equal Census 2020 populations | | | | | | |
| Voting Rights Act | Federal law that protects minority voting rights | | | | | | |
| Gerrymander | To design odd-shaped election districts to achieve a purpose like reducing minority voting power or increasing a political party's representation | | | | | | |
| Deviation/plan deviation | A measure of how equal the Districts' total populations are | | | | | | |
| Redistricting criteria | Legally required things to consider when drawing boundaries | | | | | | |

Draft Plan 3 data (became the 2018 court-ordered plan) using 2010 Census Data - Plan deviation was = 8.8%

| Draft P | lan 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 6 Coun | cil Districts | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Census 2010 | Deviation | 0/ | | | 11: | | NH Native | NH Hawaiian | NIII Oth a r | NUL Oth a r |
| District | total population | (ideal district pop. = 19,411) | % Deviation | NH Asian | NH White | Hispanic origin | NH Black | American AK native | Pacific Islander | NH Other race | NH Other mixed race |
| 1 | 19,271 | -140 | -0.7% | 11,811 | 4,221 | 2,213 | 591 | 41 | 72 | 83 | 239 |
| 2 | 20,070 | 659 | 3.4% | 6,877 | 5,779 | 6,125 | 690 | 89 | 223 | 53 | 234 |
| 3 | 18,614 | -797 | -4.1% | 7,811 | 5,815 | 4,005 | 404 | 99 | 160 | 110 | 210 |
| 4 | 18,649 | -762 | -3.9% | 7,719 | 6,819 | 3,205 | 503 | 87 | 81 | 66 | 169 |
| 5 | 19,535 | 124 | 0.6% | 3,917 | 10,137 | 4,343 | 652 | 119 | 130 | 64 | 173 |
| 6 | 20,329 | 918 | 4.7% | 7,546 | 9,255 | 2,698 | 494 | 57 | 79 | 44 | 156 |
| Total | 116,468 | 1,715 | 8.8% | 45,681 | 42,026 | 22,589 | 3,334 | 492 | 745 | 420 | 1,181 |
| Citizen V | oting Age Popu | lation (CVAP) - 6 | estimated 20 | 012-2016 | | | | | | | |
| | est total | | | est NH Asian | est NH White | est Hispanic | est NH Other | | | | |
| District | CVAP 2012-16 | | | CVAP 2012-16 | CVAP 2012-16 | CVAP 2012-16 | CVAP 2012-16 | Row Total | | | |
| 1 | 9,707 | | | 51% | 35% | 11% | 4% | 100% | | | |
| 2 | 10,823 | | | 27% | 42% | 27% | 4% | 100% | | | |
| 3 | 10,018 | | | 33% | 46% | 19% | 2% | 100% | | | |
| 4 | 10,527 | | | 31% | 51% | 15% | 3% | 100% | | | |
| 5 | 12,980 | | | 14% | 65% | 18% | 3% | 100% | | | |
| 6 | 11,982 | | | 25% | 61% | 11% | 3% | 100% | | | |
| Total | 66,036 | | | 29% | 51% | 17% | 3% | 100% | | | |