Memorandum

To: City of Santa Clara Ad Hoc Districting Committee

From: Jeanne Gobalet, PhD, Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.

Date: April 5, 2018

Re: Evaluation of draft plans in terms of legal and optional criteria, considering feedback from the public

This memorandum compares eight draft plans (the original three plus five community proposals). A Plan Comparison Overview is provided on page 2, and detailed data tables with discussions follow in the Detailed Discussion of Plans and Criteria section of this memo.[1]

Plans are contrasted in terms of legal requirements and optional criteria, and this report begins with an overview of these criteria.

Legal Requirements and Optional Criteria

There are two legal requirements, and all eight plans probably meet them (although the extent to which distribution of groups protected by the Federal Voting Rights Act should be considered is subject to some judgment).

Comments by community members at the Ad Hoc Committee meetings and the Open City Hall forum have suggested that some of the criteria are of special interest to some city residents. These include having district boundary follow major thoroughfares; taking the distribution of Asian, Hispanic, Korean, and Filipino populations into account; balancing the districts' populations (using both Census 2010 counts and 2017 estimates that incorporate estimated population from housing built since 2010); taking school attendance areas and neighborhoods into account. The extent to which these criteria are met in each plan is discussed in the Plan Comparison Overview as well as in the more detailed discussions.

<u>**Legal requirements:**</u>
- Population equality using Census 2010 counts
- Provide the opportunity for groups protected under the Federal Voting Rights Act to elect representatives of their choice (25% minimum share or eligible voters needed)

<u>**Optional Criteria**</u> (may be considered when drawing boundaries):
- Use major thoroughfares as boundaries
- Keep neighborhoods intact
- Keep school attendance areas intact
- Keep election Precincts intact
- Consider incumbency.

---

[1] All the information in this memo may be modified or corrected.

Plan Comparison Overview

Plan Name	Plan type	2010 plan deviation	# Asian CVAP* districts	plan deviation 2017*	# split neighbor hoods	# split ESAAs*	# split precincts	Boundaries used	Some noteworthy characteristics (tradeoffs; some things mentioned are in response to public comments)
NS 1	NS		1	ok	4	3	0	Lawrence Expwy, Benton Street, Kiely Blvd, El Camino Real, Scott Blvd, railroad tracks	Distributes both 2010 and post-2010 population growth from new housing well--boundary not likely to need adjusting post-2020; keeps Korean business district together; Scott Blvd. portion splits an area with relatively large Latino share of population; keeps Filipino area intact; no split precincts
WE 1	WE		2	Deviation is too high and would need 2020 adjustment	3	3	2	Great America Pkwy, Mission College Blvd, Montague/San Tomas Expressway, Scott Blvd, El Camino Real, San Tomas Expwy	Two Asian CVAP districts; the only plan that almost certainly will need adjusting after Census 2020; keeps Korean business district together; Scott Blvd. portion splits an area with relatively large Latino share of population; splits area with Filipino concentration
WE 2	hybrid		1	ok	5	6	5	Lawrence Expwy, Benton Street, Scott Blvd, Montague Expwy	Splits the most Nextdoor neighborhoods+ ESAAs+ precincts; keeps Filipino concentration in one district; Scott Blvd. portion splits an area with relatively large Latino population shares
HH 1	NS	All plans meet legal requirement	1	2020 deviation likely to be too high	4	1	0	El Camino Real	Very simple boundary but it might need adjusting after Census 2020 because of uneven population growth; splits the smallest number of ESAAs; splits Korean business district; no split precincts
HH 2	NS		1	ok	4	2	0	Lawrence Expwy, El Camino Real	Most of boundary follows El Camino Real; identical to HH 1 except better 2010 and 2017 population balance; no split precincts; splits Korean business district
KP 1	hybrid		1	ok	2	3	2	Homestead Rd, San Tomas Expwy, Montague Expwy	Simple boundary; splits the smallest number of Nextdoor neighborhoods; splits area with Filipino population concentration
KP 2	hybrid		1	ok	3	3	1	Homestead Rd, El Camino Real, Hwy 101	Similar to KP 1 except that it splits the area north of Hwy 101 and treats the are bounded by El Camino Real, San Tomas Expwy, Homestead Rd, and Kiely Blvd differently
RJ 1	hybrid		1	ok	5	4	5	Relatively simple boundary: Homeastead Rd, Saratoga Creek, Hwy 101	Although boundary is simple, the Saratoga Creek portion splits 5 Nextdoor neighborhoods, 4 ESAAS, and 5 precincts

* Asian Citizen Voting Age Population; plan deviation 2017 = Census 2010 population plus estimated population growth from new housing occupied 2010-17

ESAAs = Santa Clara Unified School District elementary attendance areas

Detailed Discussion of Plans and Criteria

The following plans and their origins are discussed here:

Plan ID	Plan Name	Plan Type	Source
NS 1	North South 1	North South	Demographer
WE 1	West East 1	West East	Demographer
WE 2	West East 2	hybrid	Demographer
HH 1	El Camino Real 1	North South	Hosam Haggag
HH 2	El Camino Real 2	North South	Hosam Haggag
KP 1	Kevin Park 1	hybrid	Kevin Park
KP 2	Kevin Park 2	hybrid	Kevin Park
RJ 1	Rob Jerdonek 1	hybrid	Rob Jerdonek

Required (U.S. Constitution): Population Equality

All plans have deviations less than 10 percent (the maximum permitted), so they all meet this requirement. The deviations range from .05% (NS 1) to 9.0% (HH 1).

Plan deviation using Census 2010 total population counts (needs to be < 10%)							
NS 1	WE 1	WE 2	HH 1	HH 2	KP 1	KP 2	RJ 1
0.05%	7.0%	4.3%	9.0%	1.0%	2.6%	1.0%	0.07%

Required (Federal Voting Rights Act): Provide the opportunity for protected groups to elect representatives of their choice. For Ranked Choice Voting method, this has been defined as *at least* a 25% share of the CVAP (Citizen Voting Age Population; eligible voters).

All eight plans have one Asian CVAP district with 25% or more shares of the total CVAP. Plan WE 1 has a second district, although this configuration means that the Asian CVAP is less concentrated than in the other plans. That is, WE 1 has Asian shares of 31 and 28 percent, while the other plans have one district that is at least 36 percent. Having two Asian CVAP districts above 25 percent means that there is not as strong a concentration of Asians in one district as compared to the other plans. It is not clear what community members would prefer.

Hispanic CVAP: No plan has a district with an Hispanic CVAP share reaching 25%, and it probably is not possible to create one. This is because although there are some parts of the City with concentrations of Hispanic population, the concentrations and total numbers are not large enough to reach the 25% threshold.

Filipino population is not large enough to meet the 25% minimum requirement; however, information about the distribution of the Filipino population in each plan is provided in response to a community member's comment.

Estimated non-Hispanic Asian CVAP share of total CVAP								
City's total ACVAP estimate =			19,252					
District	NS 1	WE 1	WE 2	HH 1	HH 2	KP 1	KP 2	RJ 1
North/West/A	**39%**	**31%**	**38%**	**36%**	**37%**	**38%**	**39%**	**39%**
South/East/B	21%	**27%**	22%	23%	23%	22%	21%	21%
Estimated Hispanic CVAP share of total CVAP (the apparent differences may not be statistically significant)								
City's total HCVAP estimate =			11,086					
District	NS 1	WE 1	WE 2	HH 1	HH 2	KP 1	KP 2	RJ 1
North/West/A	17%	17%	17%	15%	15%	18%	16%	16%
South/East/B	16%	17%	17%	20%	19%	16%	18%	18%
Estimated distribution of Filipino population north of Highway 101								
These data are provided in response to a public comment that Draft Plan WE 2 splits the Filipino population north of Highway 101 (the Montague Expwy boundary, which is used in both WE 2 and KP 1)								
Filipinos are included in Asian population counts								
	NS 1	WE 1	WE 2	HH 1	HH 2	KP 1	KP 2	RJ 1
N of 101 Filipino share	100% in N	nearly 100% in E	66% in W, 34% in E	100% in A	100% in A	66% in W, 34% in E	100% in A	100% in A

Optional: Try to distribute population living in new housing (occupied 2010-17) in a way that minimizes the need to re-draw the boundary line after Census 2020 counts are available

NS 1, WE 2, HH 2, KP 1, KP 2, and RJ 1 do a better job of distributing estimated population growth from new housing than WE 1 and HH 1.

WE 1 puts too much of the new housing in the West district. Also, HH 1 does not distribute post-2010 population growth evenly: too much of it is in District B (south of El Camino Real), and the very simple El Camino boundary might have to be adjusted post-Census 2020.

Plan deviation using Census 2010 total population plus estimated population from new housing							
NS 1	WE 1	WE 2	HH 1	HH 2	KP 1	KP 2	RJ 1
0.9%	14.1%	5.0%	10.0%	2.3%	3.6%	7.0%	5.3%

Optional: Keep neighborhoods intact (to the extent possible)

The geographical locations, names, and boundaries of the City's neighborhoods can be subjective, and the ones used in these comparisons may or may not be generally recognized.[2]

One or more members of the public have said that the Korean business district should not be split in the final districting plan. I have been told that that this business district includes both sides of El Camino Real from Lawrence Expressway to Kiely Boulevard. Others have suggested that Hispanic and Filipino population concentrations should not be split between Council districts.

Plan	# split	Split Neighborhoods
NS 1	4	Central Santa Clara, Hampton Place, Newhall, Warburton & Los Padres
WE 1	3	Oakmead, Santa Clara, Warburton & Los Padres
WE 2	5	Central Park West, Central Santa Clara, Fremont Park Vicinity, Oakmead, Warburton & Los Padres
HH 1	4	Fremont Park Vicinity, Hampton Place, Lawrence and El Camino, Santa Clara Old Quad
HH 2	4	Fremont Park Vicinity, Hampton Place, Lawrence and El Camino, Santa Clara Old Quad
KP 1	2	Central Santa Clara, Oakmead
KP 2	3	Central Santa Clara, Hampton Place, Oakmead
RJ 1	5	Bowers/Monroe, Central Santa Clara, Hampton Place, North of Robinson, Oakmead

---

[2] Nextdoor provided geographic boundaries for City of Santa Clara neighborhoods (2017). Of the 73 the organization identified, 6 are split by the City's outer boundary: Forest – Pruneridge, Lawrence Station, Newhall, Oakmead, Rose Garden West, Sunnyvale Birdland.

Optional: Keep elementary school attendance areas intact (to the extent possible)

School attendance areas may be considered to be communities of interest, and some members of the public have said that they should be considered when drawing the Council district line. Since the City Council is not responsible for the schools' governance, this criterion may not be as important as others.

The Santa Clara Unified School District supplied an electronic map of 16 Elementary Attendance Areas (ESAAs). Of these, eight are split by the City's outer boundary and the southwestern part of the City is served by the Cupertino Union (elementary) School District, and the southeastern part is served by the Campbell Union (elementary) School District.

ESAAs are sometimes considered communities of interest that can be considered when drawing election district boundaries, especially for school district trustee area election boundaries.

Plan	Split ESAAs	# split inside City	# partly outside city
NS 1	Laurelwood, Pomeroy, Scott Lane	3	2
WE 1	Hughes, Mayne, Scott Lane	3	2
WE 2	Central Park, Haman, Laurelwood, Montague, Pomeroy, Scott Lane	6	3
HH 1	Laurelwood	1	1
HH 2	Laurelwood, Pomeroy	2	1
KP 1	Bowers, Laurelwood, Montague	3	2
KP 2	Bowers, Central Park, Laurelwood	3	1
RJ 1	Bowers, Bracher, Central Park, Laurelwood	4	2

Optional: Keep the County's election precincts intact (to the extent possible)

These pieces of geography are not necessarily important to members of the public, but County Registrars of Voters would prefer not to spend a lot of time reconfiguring precincts to match election district boundaries. (However, we must draw Council district boundaries using Census block geography, not precincts, which are not based on Census geography.)

The Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters has defined 124 precincts in the City of Santa Clara (as of 2018).

NS 1, HH1, and HH 2 keep all precincts intact. The other plans split precincts, but the share of the City's registered voters affected by the splits are relatively small.

Plan	# of split precincts	Nov. 2016 # registered voters	Share of all registered voters
NS 1	0	-	
WE 1	2	630	1%
WE 2	5	1,662	3%
HH 1	0	-	
HH 2	0	-	
KP 1	2	631	1%
KP 2	1	3	0%
RJ 1	5	1,869	4%
	City of Santa Clara precincts	Nov. 2016 registered voters	
Total	124	51,063	

2018 vintage precinct boundaries supplied by the Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters

Optional: Consider Incumbency

Although no one has suggested that locations of current Council members' residences should be considered when choosing an election district plan, it is legally permitted, all else being equal. The distribution of current incumbents between the proposed Council districts is shown below.

Although no one has suggested that locations of current Council members' residences should be considered when choosing an election district plan, it is legally permitted, all else being equal. Almost all the plans have Kolstad and Watanabe in one district, and the other five in the second district; WE 1 is the only plan that balances the incumbents more evenly. The distribution of current incumbents between the proposed Council districts is shown below.

The distribution of incumbents may be of interest when deciding which should be District 1 and which should be District 2 when making a recommendation to the City Council. However, it may not be possible to consider all incumbents when deciding which district should be District 1 (Nov. 2018 election) and which should be District 2 (2020 election).

Incumbency	District	
Plan	North/West/A	South/East/B
NS 1	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020
WE 1	Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Kolstad 2018, O'Neill 2020	Caserta 2018 Mahan 2020, Watanabe 2020
WE 2	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020
HH 1	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020
HH 2	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020
KP 1	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020
KP 2	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020
RJ 1	Kolstad 2018, Watanabe 2020	Caserta 2018, Davis 2020, Gillmor 2018, Mahan 2020, O'Neill 2020