

Agenda Report

April 2, 2012

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Bill Crowfoot, Chair
Richard McDonald, Vice Chair
Redistricting Task Force

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING PLAN AND FINAL REPORT FROM REDISTRICTING TASK FORCE

RECOMMENDATION OF REDISTRICTING TASK FORCE:

The Redistricting Task Force recommends that the City Council:

- (a) Receive and review the Redistricting Task Force's recommended redistricting plan ("Redistricting Plan"), map, and related demographic data sheet (Attachment B - "Recommended Redistricting Plan approved March 7, 2012 by the Redistricting Task Force");
- (b) Hold a public hearing to receive public comment on the Redistricting Plan;
- (c) As appropriate, direct the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance for formal adoption of a final redistricting plan; and
- (d) Set a public hearing on Monday, April 30, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. to approve the final redistricting plan and give first reading to the ordinance adopting such plan.

BACKGROUND:

On June 20, 2011, the City Council created a nine-member Redistricting Task Force. The Task Force is comprised of members nominated by each Councilmember, with two nominations made by the Mayor. The City Council designated Bill Crowfoot to serve as the Chair and Richard McDonald to serve as the Vice Chair. Attachment I contains the roster of members. The Task Force held its first meeting on August 30, 2011, and concluded its last meeting on March 7, 2012 with a final vote to unanimously approve the recommended redistricting plan. Attachment J contains a schedule of the Task Force meetings.

Task Force Process

Organizational Meetings/Hiring of Consultant. The Task Force's initial meetings were organizational in nature, and included a review by the City Attorney's Office of the Brown Act and redistricting legal criteria, an overview of the proposed redistricting work plan, and the interviewing and hiring of a redistricting consultant to assist in the technical aspects of redistricting.

With regard to the consultant hiring, a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Professional Redistricting Consultant Services was circulated on July 26, 2011, with a total of five responses received. At the August 30, 2011 meeting, the top three responders-- National Demographics Corporation (NDC), Q2 Data and Research, and Golden State Consulting-- were invited to participate in an interview process conducted by the Task Force. Following presentations and question and answers, the Task Force selected NDC as the Redistricting Consultant to help guide the process.

NDC is comprised of Douglas Johnson, David Ely, and Sara Larsen. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Ely are leading redistricting consultants, with Mr. Ely having guided the City of Pasadena redistricting process following the 1990 and 2000 Census. NDC's founders, working as the Rose Institute, guided the City's original 1982 districting process when Pasadena went from at-large to district-by-district City Councilmember representation.

The City Council approved the contract for NDC's services on September 12, 2011 (NDC is hereafter referred to as the "Consultant").

Discussion of Principles/Examination of Data. The Task Force reviewed the existing City Council District boundaries, and discussed the legal requirements of redistricting and examined census and demographic data provided by the Consultant. Task Force discussions focused on principles to be followed in developing a redistricting plan and the process that would be used to afford the maximum opportunity for public participation. Attachment A is a map of current Council districts and demographic data initially reviewed by the Task Force.

The Task Force further discussed and agreed that the following community interests and legal requirements would be considered when evaluating redistricting proposals:

- Adhere to State and Federal laws, as well as City Charter Section 1201, with the modified boundaries of each district resulting in districts as nearly equal in population as practicable;
- Having all City Council districts either encompass or border Colorado Boulevard; and

- Protect existing neighborhood associations and communities of interest to the greatest extent possible, while also considering the established relationships and advantages for those associations that prefer being split and having more than one representative on the City Council to advocate for neighborhood issues, and recognizing emerging neighborhood associations and communities of interest.

In establishing these decision-making principles, the Task Force placed significant weight on comments made by the public, especially those in favor of protecting current patterns of representation and communities of interest with the least amount of disruption to district populations. It also recognized, however, that population shifts in all districts, with some districts gaining or losing significantly more population than others, would require some movement of boundary lines throughout the City. The Task Force agreed, therefore, that the three stated criteria above should guide the process. As described below, however, following the community meetings held and after reviewing extensive public comment and analysis from the Consultant, the Task Force ultimately decided that each Council District (other than Districts 4 and 6) should not cross Colorado Boulevard, so that it was maintained as a common thread and community of interest amongst all districts.

Development of Conceptual Options. At the October 19, 2011 Task Force meeting, the Consultant presented eight illustrative maps with significantly different configurations for the districts. These maps were intended to stimulate the Task Force's discussion on different ways in which the necessary changes to equalize populations among the seven districts could be accomplished. These maps were only intended to be conceptual discussion-starters for the Task Force and the community. In response to questions raised at the October 19th meeting, on November 2, 2011, the Consultant presented three more illustrative maps for Task Force information and public comment.

After hearing public comment, and following discussion by the Task Force, the Task Force directed the Consultant to reduce the number of conceptual maps that would be presented to the public and the Task Force for comment and further consideration. The Task Force further directed the Consultant to produce maps that were consistent with the three stated criteria above. Following discussion, the Task Force rejected those maps that economically and politically isolated certain districts, particularly above Colorado Boulevard and north of the 210 freeway, and voted to analyze how Colorado Boulevard could be a boundary (whether touching or encompassing) for all Council Districts. Lastly, the Task Force selected two previously presented illustrative maps to be renamed Sample Plans 1 and 2 (Attachment C) for future Public Forum meetings to elicit public feedback on the approaches the Task Force might consider going forward in the redistricting process.

Sample Plan 1 consisted of minor revisions to the existing districts and continuation of the overall approach to representation, such as each district bordering but not crossing Colorado other than at the extreme east and west ends (City Council Districts 4 and 6). Changes brought the districts into population balance and otherwise complied with the legal requirements and Task Force criteria.

Sample Plan 2 consisted of a more significant shift away from the current district configurations, though the core of each district remained. District 5 lost its northern sections. District 3 and 6 significantly crossed Colorado Boulevard and Districts 2, 5 and 7 crossed Colorado in relatively smaller fashion. District 4 shifted significantly eastward north of Interstate 210 and significantly westward south of Interstate 210, using Martelo Avenue as the 2/4 border and Craig Avenue as the 4/7 border south of Interstate 210.

Public Outreach. Throughout this process, the Task Force repeatedly took steps to engage the community and promote public participation through outreach efforts. Over 300 community organizations, including neighborhood associations, civic, and religious organizations, received direct mailings with flyers and updates on City Council redistricting. The City's In Focus publication was used in the beginning stages of the process to provide general information, publicize the webpage, and highlight the proposed meeting schedule. Email messages were distributed via established lists for each Council District, city-wide staff emails, the Neighborhood Connection distribution, City Commissioner emails, and through community organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce. News releases and publications in the local newspapers were also used (the February 1st and 15th, and March 7th meeting notices were published as public hearings in the Pasadena Star News) to increase the exposure of the Task Force's work in the community.

The City Clerk's staff developed and maintained a webpage for the Redistricting Task Force. It included a roster of members/contact information, schedule of meetings, agendas, staff reports, minutes, and maps and demographic data sheets of all proposals presented and/or considered by the Task Force. The webpage also contained redistricting software to enable resident participation through submittal of individualized redistricting plans. A historical section was created to provide the Task Force and the public access to records and information dating back to redistricting efforts that occurred in the 1980's, 1990's and 2000's. The Task Force's webpage and City Clerk's contact information was publicized in In Focus, as well as in the outreach mailings, fliers, and email distributions. Access to the webpage was available from the City's main webpage, the City Clerk's webpage, and each webpage of the Mayor and City Council.

The City's "On-Hold" recordings that provide information and announcements to members of the public waiting on-hold were also used to publicize the redistricting process. A message directed the public to the webpage or to contact the City Clerk's Office for more information. While translation services were provided at each Task Force meeting to accommodate language needs for the public in attendance, the availability of translation services was further advertised in meeting notices, agendas, flyers, and emails, with instructions provided in Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Armenian on how to obtain translation services at meetings. Agenda materials have been made available on the Redistricting Task Force's webpage and at the public libraries, and were (and remain) available upon request to the City Clerk. Finally, key meetings were video recorded by KPAS and replayed on the public access channel to further increase public awareness and information about the process.

Community Meetings. The Redistricting Task Force held 13 meetings from August 2011 to March 2012. Six regular meetings of the Task Force occurred at City Hall, which were noticed and held pursuant to Brown Act open meeting requirements and publicized through the outreach program. The Task Force conducted seven similarly noticed special meetings in the community, with one meeting located in each of the seven Council Districts. The Task Force was pleased when each Councilmember was invited, and accepted the invitation, to speak briefly at the start of the District's community meeting (the Mayor spoke on behalf of Councilmember Holden who was unable to attend the meeting held in District 3 due to a scheduling conflict). These seven meetings included four meetings designed specifically as public forums with the sole purpose of explaining the redistricting process, presenting the two conceptual plans (Sample Plans 1 and 2), and eliciting public comment on possible approaches to redistricting. The public forum meetings were conducted less formally to permit a more conversational approach to the hearings. That approach allowed for more back and forth discussion between members of the public and Task Force members, and more opportunity for questions and answers in both directions. Each of the four public forums was conducted in essentially the same manner.

The following table provides the date and meeting location for the seven meetings held in the community:

Meeting Date	Meeting Location
October 19, 2011	John Muir High School – Student Commons 1905 Lincoln Avenue Council District 1
November 2, 2011	Marshall High School – Student Commons 990 North Allen Avenue Council District 2
November 16, 2011*	Norma Coombs Elementary School - Auditorium 2600 Paloma Street Council District 4

November 19, 2011*	Jackie Robinson Center - Auditorium 1020 North Fair Oaks Avenue Council District 3
December 7, 2011*	Westridge School – Student Commons 324 Madeline Drive Council District 6
December 10, 2011*	Caltech Institute of Technology – Hameetman Auditorium Cahill Astrophysics Building 1216 East California Boulevard Council District 7
January 18, 2012	Villa Parke Community Center – Auditorium 363 East Villa Street Council District 5

* Public Forum meeting

A portion of each meeting in the community, whether a regular business meeting of the Task Force or a public forum “listening” meeting, was used to inform the public on why the City Council District lines were being redrawn and to present demographic changes that have occurred over the last decade.

The number of community participants attending each meeting increased over time. During the public forum meetings, between 15 and 25 members of the public attended each meeting. At each meeting, a significant proportion of the persons in attendance and speaking appeared to be representatives of community or neighborhood associations. Public comments from the community meetings are reflected in the Task Force minutes, with a complete set of minutes included as Attachment K. Also, a complete set of written correspondence received to date has been included as Attachment H.

Refinement of Options/Selection of Plan. On January 18, 2012, the Task Force met to review the results from the community meetings, which included the four public forum meetings. It also considered a revised redistricting map created by the Consultant (Attachment D – “Endorsed Redistricting Plan” for February 1, 2012 Public Hearing) that sought to address issues and concerns raised by the public and the Task Force.

The following issues were repeatedly raised by the public at the community meetings:

- Consolidation of the El Rio Lake Neighborhood Association into Council District 5;
- Consolidation of the “Downtown Neighborhood Association” into one or two Council Districts and the need for better representation for Central District residents (which included submission of a formal redistricting proposal);
- Minimizing changes to the current patterns of representation and communities of interest;

- Comments from members of Armenian community organizations on their numbers in both Districts 2 and 4 (and whether they could or should be consolidated into a single district);
- Comments from the Councilmember for District 4 and District 4 residents expressing concerns regarding the number of people shifted into and out of District 4; and
- Concerns from the public and from Task Force members about divisions of the Victory, North Pasadena Heights, and Loma Vista neighborhood associations between Districts 2 and 4.

Proposed Downtown City Council District

The proposed Downtown City Council District represented a significant change in the borders and constituents of every district in the City. Task Force members commented that the boundaries of the key community or communities of interest located in the downtown area are still developing (the neighborhood association remains in the formative stage). Task Force members believed it was not yet possible to know at this point how the communities of interest in downtown will actually develop and whether the current districting might not work well for its neighbors once their political influence is more fully developed. Moreover, the Task Force concluded that time will bring better definition to the community or communities of interest in the downtown area, and without that clear understanding it was not possible to justify disrupting the entire pattern and history of representation citywide as proposed by the downtown group.

Armenian Representation

Given the significant disagreement between representatives of different Armenian community organizations over whether members of that community preferred concentration in one Council district or a strong voice in two Council districts, on this issue the Task Force selected the plans that most closely maintained the current pattern of representation and which was favored by a long-standing Armenian community organization. Lastly, the Task Force was not presented with any evidence of discrimination or historical disenfranchisement that would require consideration in the redistricting process.

Proposed Redistricting Plan Impacts on Districts 2 and 4

On March 7th, 2012, the Task Force held its final meeting in the Council Chamber. The Task Force focused its attention on addressing the concerns that had been expressed about the effects of the "Modified Redistricting Plan" endorsed for the February 15, 2012 meeting (Attachment E) on City Council Districts 2 and 4. The Consultant presented the results of their analysis and suggested changes to the proposed modified plan (Attachment B), uniting the Victory and North Pasadena Heights neighborhood associations and reducing the division of the Loma Vista Neighbors association.

The Task Force also discussed how its decisions to maintain Colorado Boulevard as a borderline for all the City Council districts and the related decision to maintain the existing patters of representation as much as possible led to a shift of roughly 2,000 people into and out of District 4.

At the March 7th meeting, a member of the Task Force submitted an alternative plan for the Task Force's consideration (Attachment F – "District 4 Alternative Plan") that would have minimized the boundary shifts and impacts to District 4, and would have brought District 2 south of Colorado to Del Mar between Roosevelt on the west and Altadena on the east. Comments from Task Force members expressed concerns that this was a significant departure from both the current 'Colorado border' pattern of representation and a significant change in the types of communities that make up District 2, with the area south of Colorado much more commercial and multi-unit residential than the rest of District 2. Comments included that while the number of people shifted into and out of District 2 in this plan roughly matched the shift into and out of District 4 in the Consultant's suggested plan, the District 4 shifts united neighborhood associations and reinforced the general nature of District 4 (for example, most of the population shifted into District 4 comes from the unification of the Lamanda Park Merchants & Resident's Neighborhood Association, the majority of which is already in District 4). In contrast, the area between Colorado and Del Mar has very little community of interest with the rest of District 2. Following discussion, the alternative plan in question was withdrawn.

Lastly, it should be noted that as shown in Attachment G ("Table Showing District by District Population Changes"), District 4 did not experience the largest change among the existing districts. The percentage of people in the recommended districts who are new (meaning they were not in the existing district) is greater in Districts 2 and 5 than it is in District 4 (see "Pct of final pop that is new" in the attachment). The total of people added and removed is greater in Districts 5 and 7 than it is in District 4 (see "Total Change" in the attachment). While the population deviations in existing Districts 2 and 5 are significantly larger than in existing District 4, the population deviation in existing District 7 is smaller than the population deviation in existing District 4.

At the conclusion of the March 7th meeting, the Task Force agreed with the Consultant's suggested changes, and unanimously approved the Recommended Redistricting Plan (Attachment B) to be forwarded for consideration by the City Council.

Process for Formal Adoption of Redistricting Plan

The requirements for formal adoption of the redistricting plan by the City Council have not changed since the previous redistricting process and review of boundaries in 2002. At that time, and as is recommended in this instance, the City Attorney advised that Section 21620.1 of the California Elections Code requires the City Council to hold at least one public hearing on any proposal to adjust the boundaries of a district prior to a second separate public hearing at which the Council may take a vote to approve or

defeat the proposal. Thus, the City Council must hold a minimum of two public hearings (with this April 2, 2012 hearing being the first). The next public hearing is recommended to occur on April 30, 2012, which will tentatively also include first reading of the ordinance to formally adopt the boundaries. The redistricting process culminates with City Council's first and second reading of the ordinance that establishes the seven newly redrawn City Council districts. The City Clerk's Office will follow formal adoption by publishing the ordinance in the Pasadena Star News and codifying the District boundaries in the Pasadena Municipal Code.

Task Force's Recommended Redistricting Plan

The recommended plan balances the district populations using a counterclockwise rotation (District 6 gives up population to District 7, District 7 gives up population to District 4, District 4 gives up population to District 2, Districts 2, 3 and 5 exchange different pockets of population, while District 1 picks up population from District 3 and gives up population to District 5.).

The main principles or objectives considered by the Task Force in developing the recommended plan are as follows:


- **One Person, One Vote:** Equal population standard established pursuant to the City Charter, the California Elections Code, and the equal protection requirement of the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution. The recommended plan has a maximum population deviation of less than 1% from the most populous and least populous districts. The largest individual district deviation from the "ideal" population of 19,589 is +0.6% (District 4). The individual district with the smallest total population is District 2, which has a -0.22% deviation from the ideal. The resulting total plan deviation (measured as the difference between the smallest and largest districts) is only 161 people, or 0.82%.
- **Voting Rights Act Compliance:** The recommended plan does not result in the dilution or diminution of voting power of any demographic or ethnic population in the City.
- **Communities of Interest:** The recommended plan protects existing and emerging communities of interest based upon demographic data which included age, ethnicity, and family type; socioeconomic data which included homeownership, poverty levels, educational attainment, and income patterns; information on neighborhood association areas, and public input on communities and neighborhoods.
- **Continuity of Representation:** The recommended plan minimizes the number of people who would have their representation changed by the new boundaries.
- **Recognizable Boundaries:** The recommended plan maintains the major boundaries of the Arroyo Seco and Colorado Boulevard and, where possible, improves the compactness and recognition of district boundaries to avoid any concerns of gerrymandering.

In its motion adopting the recommended plan, the Task Force found that the recommended plan meets all requirements of the City Charter, state and federal statutes and constitutions, as these requirements were explained to the Task Force by the City Attorney's Office.

Respectfully submitted,



Bill Crowfoot, Chair



Richard McDonald, Vice Chair

Attachment A – Map and Data Sheet for Current Council District Boundaries

Attachment B – Map and Data Sheet for Recommended Redistricting Plan Approved on March 7, 2012

Attachment C – Maps of Sample Plans 1 and 2 Discussed During Public Forum Meetings

Attachment D – Map and Data Sheet for Endorsed Redistricting Plan (February 1, 2012)

Attachment E – Map and Data Sheet for Modified Redistricting Plan (February 15, 2012)

Attachment F – Map and Data Sheet for District 4 Alternative Plan (March 7, 2012)

Attachment G – Table Showing District by District Population Changes (Based on the Recommended Redistricting Plan)

Attachment H – New Correspondence and Correspondence Received Over the Course of the Redistricting Process

Attachment I – Redistricting Task Force Roster

Attachment J – Redistricting Task Force Meeting Schedule

Attachment K – Redistricting Task Force Meeting Minutes