

Peralta Community College District Redistricting Process Summary of Comments Received from Public

Four meetings were held, one meeting was held at each of the colleges. Attendance at all of the meetings was low. Most of the attendees were faculty, students or staff of the District.

- Similar to 10 years ago, the public and interest groups were not focused on Peralta redistricting process, which may indicate a comfort with – and certainly no controversy about – the status quo of districts. This supports a view that radical changes should be avoided.
- A community of interest can be found among Albany, Emeryville and Berkeley.
- Otherwise, public response to the alternatives seemed to suggest that we generally are on the right path and there was no other oral or written disapproval.
- There is a desire by some to factor economics demographics more explicitly into the process, but our view is that the community of interest factor we are utilizing, including the use of geophysical boundaries such as freeways and major thoroughfares is a sufficient surrogate for this factor.
- We received one written comment, from the Berkeley League of Women’s Voters. They favored alternatives 2 and 4.

The fifth Alternative was introduced at the September 27th, 2011 Board of Trustee meeting. No comments were received during the September 27, 2011 and October 27, 2011 comment period.

Weights (Metrics) and Measures Analysis:

- **Metric 1: Achieve as near population parity as practicable (the most important metric)**
 - **Goal:** All trustee area population counts should be as close as possible to the ideal number – 88,057. The best plans will be closest to parity.
 - **Rationale:** Population parity is a well recognized principal in meeting the one-person-one-vote paradigm established in court precedents. While perfect parity is not required (less so for a community college district than for a congressional redistricting), it is none the less the key driver in validating the adequacy of a redistricting effort.
- **Metric 2: Maintain each small city within one trustee area (this is the second most important metric)**
 - **Goal:** Keep Alameda, Albany, Emeryville and Piedmont each within a single trustee Area.
 - **Rationale:** Cities are strong indicators of “communities of interest” and plans should keep cities intact as much as possible. The best plans will not divide small cities.
- **Metric 3: Align identifiable communities of interest in a single district to the extent practicable**
 - **Goal:** Keep areas of common interest intact.
 - **Rationale:** Do not divide areas that establish the core of each district. Each trustee area has a community or two communities that make up its core. The best plans should keep these areas of common interest whole.
- **Significant communities of interest:**
 - Elmhurst (East Oakland)
 - Fruitvale
 - Dimond District
 - San Antonio
 - Grand Lake District
 - Montclair
 - Chabot Park (East Oakland Hills)
 - “Chinatown”
 - West Oakland
 - North Oakland
 - Claremont/Elmwood/Rockridge

- West Berkeley
- South Berkeley
- Central Berkeley
- Thousand Oaks
- Berkeley Hills

Qualifying restraints on communities of interest identification:

Definitions and boundaries for neighborhoods were used that are generally accepted and used by local communities and should not be viewed as legally or formally established boundaries. These communities are dynamic and their boundaries can change over time, and are based on varying stakeholder perspectives. Ascribing boundaries to these communities of interest considers the areas in the context of major physical features such as roads, geological features and topography.

DRAFT

Measuring Alignment against Metrics

Metric 1: Achieve population parity	Goal: Achieve as near population parity as practicable – 88,057	
Excellent	Less than 0.75% variance from ideal number	Alternatives 1,3 and5
Significant	Less than 1.00 % variance from ideal number	Alternatives 2 and 4
Adequate	Less than 2.00 % variance from ideal number	N/A
Metric 2: Maintain small cities within a single trustee area	Goal: Keep Alameda, Alameda, Albany, Emeryville and Piedmont each within a single trustee area	
Excellent	Each city on one Trustee Area	Alternatives 1, 2, 4 and 5
Significant	One city in more than one trustee area	Alternative 3
Adequate	Two cities in more than one area	N/A
Metric 3: Maintain Areas of common interest within a single trustee area	Goal: Keep areas of common interest intact. Do not divide areas that establish core of each district.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ East Oakland (Elmhurst) ▪ Fruitvale ▪ Dimond District ▪ San Antonio ▪ Grand Lake District ▪ Montclair ▪ (East Oakland Hills) ▪ Chabot Park ▪ Chinatown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Claremont-Elmwood/Rockridge ▪ West Berkeley ▪ South Berkeley ▪ Central Berkeley ▪ Thousand Oaks ▪ Berkeley Hills ▪ West Oakland ▪ North Oakland
Excellent	All areas are maintained within a single district	
Significant	No more than one area is divided between two districts	Alternative 5
Good	No more than two areas are divided between two districts	Alternatives 1, 2, and 4
Adequate	No more than three areas are divided between two districts	Alternative 3

Metric 3: Maintain areas of common interest within a single trustee area

Goal: Keep areas of common interest intact. Do not divide areas that establish core of each district.

Alternative	Rating	Berkeley Hills	Central Berkeley	Claremont-Elmwood/Rockridge	Dimond District	"Chinatown"	East Oakland (Elmhurst)	East Oakland Hills (Chabot Park)	Fruitvale	Grand Lake District	Montclair	North Oakland	San Antonio	South Berkeley	Thousand Oaks	West Berkeley	West Oakland	Description
1	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fruitvale divided between Areas 3 and 5 North Oakland divided between Areas 6 and 7
2	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fruitvale divided between Areas 3 and 5 North Oakland divided between Areas 4 and 7
3	Adequate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fruitvale divided between Areas 3 and 5 North Oakland divided between Areas 4, 6 and 7 Grand Lake District divided between Areas 5 and 7
4	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fruitvale divided between Areas 3 and 5 North Oakland divided between Areas 4 and 7
5	Significant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Oakland divided between Areas 4 and 7

Alternatives in comparison with the established evaluation criteria:

Alternative	Maintaining population parity	Maintaining small cities within one trustee area	Maintaining areas of common interest within one district
1	Excellent – Less than 0.75% variance from ideal number	Excellent - Each small city in only one Trustee Area	Good - No more than two areas are divided between two or more districts
2	Significant - Less than 1.00 % variance from ideal number	Excellent - Each small city in only one Trustee Area	Good - No more than two areas are divided between two or more districts
3	Excellent – Less than 0.75% variance from ideal number	Adequate - One small city in more than one trustee area	Adequate - Three areas are divided between two or more districts
4	Significant - Less than 1.00 % variance from ideal number	Excellent - Each small city in only one Trustee Area	Good - No more than two areas are divided between two or more districts
5	Excellent – Less than 0.75% variance from ideal number	Excellent - Each small city in only one Trustee Area	Significant-No more than one area is divided between two or more districts

Conclusion:

Alternatives 1, 3 and 5 have a low amount of population variance and are rated Excellent in Criterion 1.

Alternatives 1, 2, 4 and 5 do not divide any small city and are rated Excellent in that Criterion 2.

Only Alternatives 1 and 5 are rated Excellent in both Criteria 1 and 2.

Alternative 5 divides only one area of common interest and is the only alternative rated Significant in Criterion 3, whereas Alternative 1 divides two areas of common interest and is only rated Good in Criterion 3.

Therefore, Alternative 5 best meets the overall three, established evaluation criteria.