SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

At the October 27, 2021, Advisory Redistricting Commission (Commission) meeting, Item No. 4, the Commission discussed the four maps for remaining consideration: Y2 Revised, Pham, X3 and Equal & Equitable 2.0 (EE 2.0).

Given the delayed release of the 2020 Census data, the Commission had a limited timeframe to develop maps; their recommendations include considerations for how maps could be adjusted if the Board would like to review a map further. To provide context on how the 2020 Census data has shifted the population in Santa Clara County, an overview is provided below.

2020 Census Data
When the current Supervisorial Districts are reviewed with the 2020 Census data, the County’s population increased by 8.9%. By Supervisorial District, District 1 saw the most growth at 10%, and District 2 saw the least growth at 3.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010 Census</th>
<th>2020 Census</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>339,883</td>
<td>374,003</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>337,215</td>
<td>349,806</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>365,144</td>
<td>416,348</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>367,344</td>
<td>396,079</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>372,145</td>
<td>404,018</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>1,781,731</td>
<td>1,940,254</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With a countywide population of 1,940,254, the ideal population for any district is 388,050.8. Total plan deviation is determined by the sum of the absolute values of the highest and lowest district deviations. District 3 currently has highest deviation at 416,348 (+7.3%); the district with the lowest deviation is District 2 at 349,806 (-9.9%), placing the county at a total of 17.2% deviation, which is outside of the recognized 10% deviation range limit. The ethnic composition of the county has also shifted significantly, with the most significant changes in the current Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP), with the information separated by district below:

### Current Citizen Voting Age Population (Current ACS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total CVAP</th>
<th>CVAP Asian</th>
<th>CVAP Black</th>
<th>CVAP Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>240,841</td>
<td>42,446</td>
<td>6,184</td>
<td>54,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>207,328</td>
<td>67,655</td>
<td>7,447</td>
<td>84,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>242,977</td>
<td>127,158</td>
<td>7,328</td>
<td>44,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>244,693</td>
<td>52,236</td>
<td>8,114</td>
<td>42,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>234,316</td>
<td>83,511</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>15,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to reviewing 2020 Census data, the Commission heard from experts and former members of the State’s redistricting commission. Based on this guidance, and significant public testimony, the Commission was able to identify guiding principles to be incorporated in draft maps.

### Draft Maps

Throughout the process, the review of maps was iterative, but the final outcomes of maps are outlined below. Many of the maps discussed by the Commission were revised and were captured in newer versions that were either “Considered” or “Recommended.” Static images of maps that were either Considered or Recommended are attached to this report and are summarized below. For maps that were developed by the consultant in response to public testimony and/or Commission discussion, demographic information is also included in the attachments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th># Of Maps</th>
<th>Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Red, Yellow, Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pham, X3, EE 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>X, Y, Z, Commissioner, X2, Maptitude Unity, Y2, EEF, X2a, Unity Table, COI 43, COI 57, COI 59, COI 102, COI 103, COI 113, COI 114, COI 116, COI 125, COI 161, COI 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>DistrictR submissions*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To view draft maps submitted to DistrictR, please visit [www.sccgov.org/2021redistricting/COI](http://www.sccgov.org/2021redistricting/COI).*

### 2021 Advisory Redistricting Commission’s Overall Framework

In addition to training on legal requirements and redistricting principles, the Commission received a presentation on historical redlining in Santa Clara County, that was provided by
the County’s Public Health Department. The request for this presentation came from the Commission, which expressed a commitment to ensure their work was grounded in equity and that it would acknowledge the continued impacts of structural racism. Early into the process, the Commission demonstrated a commitment to focusing on not just data, but the people who make up communities of interest throughout Santa Clara County. This included special attention to preserving cultural and historical communities that embody the county’s diversity.

Based on these ideals, and the framework included in the previous report, the Commission took the actions outlined below during their final Commission meeting.

**October 27, 2021 Commission Discussion and Action**

- Y2 Revised: Passed 10-5
  - Motion: Commissioner Zoglin from District 5
  - Second: Commissioner Nguyen from District 4
- EE 2.0: Failed 7-8
  - Motion: Commissioner Malone from District 5
  - Second: Commissioner Pineda from District 1
- Pham: Failed 4-11
  - Motion: Commissioner Pham from District 2
  - Second: Commissioner Smith from District 3
- X3: Failed 0-15
  - Motion: Commissioner Pham from District 2
  - Second: Commissioner Cooper from District 1

The three maps moving forward as recommended by the Commission to the Board in random, neutrally assigned names and order are:

1. Red (formerly Y2 Revised)
2. Yellow (formerly Unity)
3. Purple (formerly Nguyen)

**Analysis of Commission’s Recommended Maps**

Administration has compiled a high-level comparison of the current Supervisorial Districts to the three maps recommended by the Commission, which is attached to this supplemental report as *Draft Maps Comparison*. Based on Commission discussions of draft maps and the submission of public testimony, central themes or considerations have been identified as reoccurring, and the additional neighborhoods of Communications Hill, Reid-Hillview, Seven Trees, and Willow Glen were added after the October 27, 2021 Commission meeting:

- **Total Plan Deviation** districts that are as close to equal as technologically possible
  - Current boundaries with 2020 Census data have a deviation of 17.2%
• Establishing a Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) majority-minority Asian-Pacific Islander (API) district
• Maintaining a Latino Influence district with a majority percentage of total population
• Keeping cities together to the extent possible, especially small cities
• Identifying the number of supervisorial districts San José is split into
• Unifying cities in the western portions of the county
  o Palo Alto, Mountain View, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos
  o Alternatively, unifying West Valley are of Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Saratoga, Cupertino, and Campbell
• Almaden Valley- locating with the community they identify with
• Alum Rock & East Foothills- considering keeping together with unincorporated areas
• Communications Hill- highlight which district it is in
• Diridon Station- keeping the neighborhood together around the transportation hub
• Maintaining neighborhoods in the current District 4
  o Part of San José, Campbell, Cambrian Park, Burbank, Willow Glen, Rose Garden, Shasta Hanchett, City of Santa Clara
• Evergreen- locating with the community they identify with
• Los Gatos- determining the area of the county with most similarities
• Reid-Hillview- highlight potential movement or unification
• Seven Trees- highlight which district it is in
• Sunnyvale- whether to remain in one or two districts

There were also communities of interest discussions regarding the communities below, but they are not included in the comparison since they maintain the current district area in all three recommended maps:
• Alviso- District 3
• Campbell- District 4
• KoreaTown- split along city boundaries in the cities of Santa Clara and Sunnyvale
• Mayfair- District 2

Red
The Draft Red Plan represents a significant change to the current districts, establishing compact districts with easily defined boundaries, such as along transit corridors. This map was recommended based on its general contiguity and ease of understanding. The Draft Red Plan originated from Redistricting Partners in recognition of the distinct communities within the “Asian” Census category, as outlined in the Korean and Vietnamese American communities of interest testimony. It has the highest percentage for a majority-minority CVAP API (55.6%) district and the highest plan deviation at 8.8%. Key highlights include:

• Most compact option.
  o Avoids the upside-down “u” shape seen in maps joining Milpitas and Sunnyvale
• Achieves 55.6% API CVAP in D3 without Milpitas reaching over Santa Clara to Sunnyvale. Hispanic population of 47% in D2.
  o Recognizes the diverse ethnicities and cultures encompassed within the “Asian” Census category and distinct communities
• D5 focuses on north county cities compared to most maps that extend south to include Cupertino, Saratoga, and Los Gatos.
• Includes Los Gatos/Monte Sereno with Saratoga while keeping more of the rural area to the west of Los Gatos in D1.
• D4 focuses on the central area between San José and Palo Alto.
• Reflects COI testimony that Sunnyvale should be included in D5 given the strong ties among Palo Alto, Mountain View, Los Altos, and Sunnyvale. The ties include but are not limited to the fact that many live in one city and work in the other, and El Camino Real is a transit corridor that ties the communities together.
• Reflects the view that the north county cities have close ties to one another and do not see themselves as having close ties with cities such as Los Gatos or see the west side of the county as reflecting a common community of interest with north county cities.
• Includes public testimony that both Mountain View and Sunnyvale are facing similar environmental issues due to their border on the bay and dealing with development issues north of 101.

Future recommended enhancements include lowering the total plan deviation and considering adding the Lexington Hills, or rural Los Gatos area to District 1.

Yellow

The Draft Yellow Plan originated from the Unity Mapping Table, who assembled a coalition of organizations and submitted a letter (COI No. 51) and presented to the Commission on October 20, 2021 (COI No. 108). The Coalition provided information and met with Redistricting Partners to have their proposal developed in Maptitude for continued analysis and adjustments. The Commission recommended this map to the Board based on the minority-representation organizations that contributed to the map’s development. The recommended Draft Yellow Plan has a plan deviation of 7.2% and the highest Latino Influence district in District 2 at 49.7%. Other highlights of the recommended Draft Yellow Plan include:

• Limits the splits of all cities, with only San José split
• Creates the largest Latino influence district (District 2)
• Creates a majority-minority API district (District 3)
• Unites Almaden Valley and Los Gatos, up to Palo Alto in District 5 (D5)

The Commission recommends further refinement to the Draft Yellow Plan to reduce the Plan’s deviation.
Purple

The Draft Purple Plan originated from maps developed by Commissioners after the first few communities of interest testimony. Additional versions were submitted and refined after subsequent presentations. Members of the community also began to create adaptations based on the original submissions. The Draft Purple Plan has the lowest Latino Influence district in District 2 (D2) at 44.5% and the lowest plan deviation at 2.6%. Highlights of the plan include:

- Achieves 50% API CVAP in District 3 (D3) and 44% Hispanic population in D2
- D3 has Milpitas reaching over Santa Clara to Sunnyvale for 50% API CVAP
- All neighborhoods (including San José’s) are kept intact
  - all but one single-city COI is kept intact
- Includes Los Gatos/Monte Sereno with Saratoga in D5 and keeps Almaden Valley in D1
  - Puts all rural areas in northeast county in D1
- All districts are contiguous
- All cities (except San José) and Census- Designated Places (CDPs) kept intact
- District boundaries are easily identifiable and understandable
- Districts are compact
- San José neighborhood boundaries were the ones used on DistrictR’s website for San José’s redistricting (https://districtr.org/tag/san_jose)
- Map evolved from Commissioner and community submissions on DistrictR

The Commission identified two potential changes that could be incorporated into future iterations of the Draft Purple Plan to increase the API CVAP.

Conclusion

The maps recommended by the Commission embody significant change and strive to capture the public testimony received throughout the process. Of the public input received, the Commission identified a majority opinion to locate Sunnyvale in one district, move Los Gatos out of District 1, and include a neighborhood with demographic factors closer to the other cities in south county. Given additional opportunities to adjust the maps, the Commission would have continued efforts to reduce the deviation for recommended plans, while maintaining identified communities of interest. While these draft maps capture the essence of public testimony, they also identify a path forward for the Board to finalize a new supervisorial map that preserves communities of interest and balances the shifts in population that have occurred over the last ten years.
ATTACHMENTS:

- Considered Maps (PDF)
- Current Supervisorial Districts Enlargeable (HTML)
- Discussed Maps (PDF)
- Draft Maps Comparison (PDF)
- Draft Red Atlas Enlargeable (HTML)
- Draft Red Atlas Analysis (PDF)
- Draft Yellow Atlas Enlargeable (HTML)
- Draft Yellow Atlas Analysis (PDF)
- Draft Purple Atlas Enlargeable (HTML)
- Draft Purple Atlas Analysis (PDF)