

**City of Santa Clara**  
**Discussion of Draft Plans NS 1, WE 1, and WE 2**  
Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.  
**REVISED and UPDATED March 29, 2018**

The City Council of Santa Clara has decided to accept recommendations of the city's Charter Review Committee to:

- Implement by-district election of Council members; each of two Council districts to be represented by three Council members, and to
- Use the Ranked Choice Voting method to elect Council members.

The City Council appointed an Ad-Hoc Advisory Districting Committee to recommend a single draft map providing two districts of equal population. It also will recommend which should be District 1 and which should be District 2. The election sequencing would be:

- In 2018, elect two members to four-year terms in District 1, and
- In 2020, elect one member to a two-year term in District 1 and three members to four-year terms in District 2.

**Draft Districting Plans**

We developed three districting plans for the Advisory Committee's consideration. All districting plans must meet certain legal requirements, and to varying extents, all three draft plans meet them:

1. Balance the 2010 Census total population in each Council district. Each district must have approximately half of the City's total 2010 population (one half of 116,468 = 58,234). Overall plan deviations must not exceed 5,823 (10 percent of the ideal size).<sup>1</sup>
2. Provide groups protected under the Federal Voting Rights Act with the opportunity to elect representatives of their choice. We measure "opportunity to elect" using a protected group's share of those eligible to vote (Citizen Voting Age Population, or CVAP) of the total CVAP. It is our understanding that when the Ranked Choice Voting system is used, if a protected group's share is 25 percent (plus one person) or more of a Council district's CVAP, the protected group is considered to have this opportunity.

We have developed three draft districting plans, which were intended to be the basis for discussion of possible Council district configurations. Maps of these plans are posted on the City's District Elections web page at <http://santaclaraca.gov/government/departments/city-manager/district-elections>.

The first draft plan has northern and southern Council districts (**NS 1**). The second shows western and eastern Council districts (**WE 1**). The third (hybrid) plan (**WE 2**) combines features of the first two plans.

Each Draft Plan was developed using Pieces (shown on each map) as building blocks.<sup>2</sup> The tables at the end of this report provide detailed data for each draft plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> The difference between more- and less-populous districts should not exceed 5,823. The plan deviation percentage is calculated by dividing the total deviation (more populous district's deviation minus less populous district's deviation) by the ideal district size.

<sup>2</sup> There are 31 Pieces, which are aggregations of the City's 1,896 Census 2010 blocks. Pieces were drawn while considering major thoroughfares, neighborhoods, Santa Clara Unified School District elementary attendance areas,

Because some have said that they would like to have Council district boundaries that will not need to be adjusted after Census 2020 population counts are released, we have estimated post-2010 population growth from new housing occupied between 2010 and 2017 and summarized these populations for each Piece (data provided by the City's Planning staff).<sup>3</sup> We estimate the City's total 2017 population to be 123,692. Using these estimates, the ideal Council district size should be approximately 61,846. Overall plan deviations must not exceed 6,185 (10 percent of the ideal size). Draft Plans NS 1 and WE 2 have estimated 2017 deviations of less than 10 percent, while Draft Plan WE 1's estimated 2017 deviation is 14 percent. The reason for this deviation is that the West Council district in this plan had most of the post-2017 housing growth. If Draft Plan WE 1 were adopted, Council district boundaries probably would need to be adjusted in 2021. Note that we do not need to take post-2020 housing growth into account when drafting plans based on Census 2010 data.

### **Characteristics of Draft Plans**

The Summary Table summarizes some important characteristics of each draft plan. All three plans meet the population balance criterion. We estimate that NS 1 and WE 2 would have balanced populations in 2017, while WE 1 would not.

As Table 1 shows, Draft Plan NS 1 has a North district with an estimated Asian CVAP share of 39 percent (well above 25 percent plus one). The plan's South district has an estimated 21 percent Asian CVAP share.

In Draft Plan WE 1, both districts have estimated Asian CVAP shares exceeding 25 percent (31 percent and 27 percent, respectively).

In Draft Plan WE 2, the West district has an estimated Asian CVAP share of 38 percent (well above the 25 percent the minimum). In the plan's East district, the group's estimated CVAP share is 22 percent.

### **Description of Plan Boundaries**

Various members of the public have suggested that we might use El Camino Real, San Tomas Expressway, or several other major thoroughfares as the Council district boundary. It turns out the area north of El Camino Real has less population than is needed for a Council district, and that the area east of San Tomas Expressway has too little population. Other roads that were suggested split the city's population unevenly, as well.

The boundary between Council districts follows major thoroughfares, roads, and a major railroad line:

*Draft Plan NS 1:* from west to east: Lawrence Expwy, Benton Street, Kiely Blvd, El Camino Real, Scott Blvd, railroad tracks. The western portion of the boundary was configured to keep most of the Korean business district in the same Council district (along both sides of the westernmost part of El Camino Real), and the eastern portion of the boundary was intended to keep the Old Quad area together.

*Draft Plan WE 1:* from north to south: Great America Pkwy, Mission College Blvd, Montague/San Tomas Expressway, Scott Blvd, El Camino Real, San Tomas Expwy.

*Draft Plan WE 2:* from southwest to northeast: Lawrence Expwy, Benton Street, Scott Blvd, and Montague Expwy.

---

and election precinct boundaries. They do not have equal populations; instead, they are building blocks for Draft Plans. The Draft Plan map labels show Piece numbers, 2010 total populations, and estimated 2017 total populations.

<sup>3</sup> Note that new housing does not account for all population changes in the jurisdiction; however, other factors tend to be minor, and in any event, are not predictable.

Detailed data tables for each of the three plans follow this Summary Table.

**Summary Table**

<b>Plan Summary March 28, 2018 corrected and updated</b>						
	Draft Plan NS 1		Draft Plan WE 1		Draft Plan WE 2	
	North	South	West	East	West	East
Census 2010 total population	58,248	58,220	60,263	56,205	56,978	59,490
overall plan deviation (must not exceed 10%)	0.048%		6.97%		4.3%	
est 2017 total population	61,574	62,118	66,218	57,474	60,301	63,390
overall plan deviation (must not exceed 10%)	0.9%		14.1%		5.0%	
est NH Asian CVAP 2012-16	11,842	7,411	10,329	8,923	11,398	7,854
% NH Asian CVAP	39%	21%	31%	27%	38%	22%
Dividing lines between districts	From west to east: Lawrence Expwy, Benton Street, Kiely Blvd, El Camino Real, Scott Blvd, railroad tracks. The western portion of the boundary was configured to keep most of the Korean business district in the same Council district, and the eastern portion was intended to keep the Old Quad area together.		From north to south: Great America Parkway, Mission College Blvd, Montague/San Tomas Expressway, Scott Blvd, El Camino Real, San Tomas Expwy		From southwest to northeast: Lawrence Expwy, Benton Street, Scott Blvd, and Montague Expwy	
Current Council members with term expiration dates	Kolstad 2018 Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018 Davis 2020 Gillmor 2018 Mahan 2020 O'Neill 2020	Davis 2020 Gillmor 2018 Kolstad 2018 O'Neill 2020	Caserta 2018 Mahan 2020 Watanabe 2020	Kolstad 2018 Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018 Davis 2020 Gillmor 2018 Mahan 2020 O'Neill 2020
more than 25% + 1 approaching 25% *	* These estimated Asian CVAP numbers and percentages are probably low because they were calculated by multiplying the 2010 Asian Voting Age population by the Asian CVAP rate for 2012-16. The Asian Voting Age Population share is probably larger because the Asian share of the population has probably grown since 2010.					

The Asian CVAP percentages in this table have been updated.

**Detailed Data: Draft Plan NS 1 – 3/29/18**

Draft Plan NS 1	Council District			Percentages		Total Plan Deviation
	North	South	Total	North	South	
Census 2010 total population	58,248	58,220	116,468			
Deviation (ideal district pop. = 58,234)	14	-14	28			
% Deviation	0.02%	-0.02%				0.05%
est post-2010 pop growth	3,326	3,898	7,224	46%	54%	
est 2017 total population (Total may seem incorrect because of rounding)	61,574	62,118	123,692			
est Deviation (ideal district pop. = 61,846)	-272	272	543			
est % Deviation	-0.44%	0.44%				0.88%
NH Asian	28,067	17,614	45,681	48%	30%	
NH White	15,950	26,076	42,026	27%	45%	
Hispanic origin	11,061	11,528	22,589	19%	20%	
NH Black	1,570	1,764	3,334	3%	3%	
NH Native American AK native	213	279	492	0%	0%	
NH Hawaiian Pacific Islander	442	303	745	1%	1%	
NH Other race	246	174	420	0%	0%	
NH Other mixed race	699	482	1,181	1%	1%	
Population 18+	44,977	46,717	91,694			
NH Asian 18+	21,609	13,523	35,132	48%	29%	
NH White 18+	13,636	22,705	36,341	30%	49%	
Hispanic 18+	7,471	8,247	15,718	17%	18%	
NH Black 18+	1,141	1,324	2,465	3%	3%	
NH Native American AK native 18+	160	215	375	0%	0%	
NH Hawaiian Pacific Islander 18+	316	235	551	1%	1%	
NH Other race 18+	181	119	300	0%	0%	
NH Other mixed race 18+	463	349	812	1%	1%	
est total CVAP 2012-16	30,686	35,351	66,036			
est NH Asian CVAP 2012-16	11,842	7,411	19,252	39%	21%	
est NH White CVAP 2012-16	12,624	21,020	33,644	41%	59%	
est Hispanic CVAP 2012-16	5,269	5,817	11,086	17%	16%	
est NH Black CVAP 2012-16	951	1,103	2,054	3%	3%	
est NH Other CVAP 2012-16	2,644	665	3,309	9%	2%	
Total registered to vote Nov 2010	21,345	25,668	47,013			
est Spanish surname registered Nov 2010	3,428	3,480	6,908	16%	14%	
Total voters Nov 2010	12,805	16,444	29,249			
est Spanish surname voters Nov 2010	1,851	2,030	3,881	14%	12%	

Note that this version of the table shows the population shares for specific groups within each Council district. These are more useful than the percentages provided in the March 19 version of this report.

**Detailed Data: Draft Plan WE 1 – 3/29/18**

Draft Plan WE 1	Council District			Percentages		Total Plan Deviation
	West	East	Total	West	East	
Census 2010 total population	60,263	56,205	116,468			
Deviation (ideal district pop. = 58,234)	2,029	-2,029	4,058			
% Deviation	3.48%	-3.48%				6.97%
est post-2010 pop growth	5,955	1,269	7,224	82%	18%	
est 2017 total population (Total may seem incorrect because of rounding)	66,218	57,474	123,692			
est Deviation (ideal district pop. = 61,846)	4,372	-4,372	-8,744			
est % Deviation	7.07%	-7.07%				14.14%
NH Asian	24,841	20,840	45,681	41%	37%	
NH White	21,141	20,885	42,026	35%	37%	
Hispanic origin	11,418	11,171	22,589	19%	20%	
NH Black	1,423	1,911	3,334	2%	3%	
NH Native American AK native	239	253	492	0%	0%	
NH Hawaiian Pacific Islander	400	345	745	1%	1%	
NH Other race	229	191	420	0%	0%	
NH Other mixed race	572	609	1,181	1%	1%	
Population 18+	46,676	45,018	91,694			
NH Asian 18+	18,849	16,283	35,132	40%	36%	
NH White 18+	17,965	18,376	36,341	38%	41%	
Hispanic 18+	7,836	7,882	15,718	17%	18%	
NH Black 18+	1,015	1,450	2,465	2%	3%	
NH Native American AK native 18+	175	200	375	0%	0%	
NH Hawaiian Pacific Islander 18+	286	265	551	1%	1%	
NH Other race 18+	161	139	300	0%	0%	
NH Other mixed race 18+	389	423	812	1%	1%	
est total CVAP 2012-16	33,334	32,703	66,036			
est NH Asian CVAP 2012-16	10,329	8,923	19,252	31%	27%	
est NH White CVAP 2012-16	16,632	17,013	33,644	50%	52%	
est Hispanic CVAP 2012-16	5,527	5,559	11,086	17%	17%	
est NH Black CVAP 2012-16	846	1,208	2,054	3%	4%	
est NH Other CVAP 2012-16	1,697	1,611	3,309	5%	5%	
Total registered to vote Nov 2010	25,429	21,584	47,013			
est Spanish surname registered Nov 2010	3,559	3,349	6,908	14%	16%	
Total voters Nov 2010	16,243	13,006	29,249			
est Spanish surname voters Nov 2010	2,075	1,806	3,881	13%	14%	

Note that this version of the table shows the population shares for specific groups within each Council district. These are more useful than the percentages provided in the March 19 version of this report.

**Detailed Data: Draft Plan WE 2 – 3/28/18**

Draft Plan WE 2	Council District			Percentages		Total Plan Deviation
	West	East	Total	West	East	
Census 2010 total population	56,978	59,490	116,468			
Deviation (ideal district pop. = 58,234)	-1,256	1,256	-2,512			
% Deviation	-2.16%	2.16%				4.31%
est post-2010 pop growth	3,323	3,900	7,224	46%	54%	
est 2017 total population (Total may seem incorrect because of rounding)	60,301	63,390	123,692			
est Deviation (ideal district pop. = 61,846)	-1,545	1,545	3,089			
est % Deviation	-2.50%	2.50%				5.00%
NH Asian	27,089	18,592	45,681	48%	31%	
NH White	16,347	25,679	42,026	29%	43%	
Hispanic origin	10,568	12,021	22,589	19%	20%	
NH Black	1,476	1,858	3,334	3%	3%	
NH Native American AK native	203	289	492	0%	0%	
NH Hawaiian Pacific Islander	398	347	745	1%	1%	
NH Other race	254	166	420	0%	0%	
NH Other mixed race	643	538	1,181	1%	1%	
Population 18+	44,036	47,658	91,694			
NH Asian 18+	20,800	14,332	35,132	47%	30%	
NH White 18+	13,962	22,379	36,341	32%	47%	
Hispanic 18+	7,167	8,551	15,718	16%	18%	
NH Black 18+	1,062	1,403	2,465	2%	3%	
NH Native American AK native 18+	156	219	375	0%	0%	
NH Hawaiian Pacific Islander 18+	284	267	551	1%	1%	
NH Other race 18+	184	116	300	0%	0%	
NH Other mixed race 18+	421	391	812	1%	1%	
est total CVAP 2012-16	30,264	35,772	66,036			
est NH Asian CVAP 2012-16	11,398	7,854	19,252	38%	22%	
est NH White CVAP 2012-16	12,926	20,718	33,644	43%	58%	
est Hispanic CVAP 2012-16	5,055	6,031	11,086	17%	17%	
est NH Black CVAP 2012-16	885	1,169	2,054	3%	3%	
est NH Other CVAP 2012-16	2,467	842	3,309	8%	2%	
Total registered to vote Nov 2010	21,172	25,841	47,013			
est Spanish surname registered Nov 2010	3,277	3,631	6,908	15%	14%	
Total voters Nov 2010	12,894	16,355	29,249			
est Spanish surname voters Nov 2010	1,831	2,050	3,881	14%	13%	

Note that this version of the table shows the population shares for specific groups within each Council district. These are more useful than the percentages provided in the March 19 version of this report.