

PERALTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Board of Trustees Agenda Report
For the Trustee Meeting Date of 14 February, 2012

ITEM # 13

ITEM TITLE: *(Please define the subject; e.g., change order – Berkeley City College)*

Final Approval of Redistricting Alternative Based on 2010 Census Data and Drawn in Compliance with California and Federal Law.

SPECIFIC BOARD ACTION REQUESTED:

The Board of Trustees reviews, takes public comment on the draft redistricting alternatives and votes on a redistricting alternative.

ITEM SUMMARY: *(PLEASE DISCUSS THIS ITEM. IF A VENDOR IS INVOLVED, PLEASE INCLUDE THE COMPANY NAME AS WELL AS THE INDIVIDUAL.)*

The Peralta Community College District is required to perform post 2010 Census decennial adjustments to its Trustee Areas to comply with federal and state requirements for compact, contiguous districts of near equal population.

The first four of the proposed alternatives were presented, discussed and public input was invited at the Board of Trustees May 10, 2011 and at public hearings held at each of the colleges during the month of May. The fifth alternative, developed in response to comments from the original four alternatives, was presented and public input was invited at the September 27th 2011 Board of Trustees meeting. The Board approved the fifth alternative, which was subsequently submitted to the Registrar of Voters in November 2011.

Marstel-Day has worked with the Alameda County Registrar of Voters office to incorporate the Board of Trustees approved redistricting plan into the Registrar's overall adjustment of legislative, municipal and special district boundaries in the wake of the decennial census. In working with the Registrar's office, the staff there ascertained that per the County Assessors records there are a small number of census blocks within the City of Oakland that the Appraiser's records show are not within the Peralta Community College District. The small population number changes in two Trustee Areas resulting from the removal of these few blocks make no material difference to the redistricting plan adopted by the Trustees, or to any of the other redistricting plans that were prepared for the District and reviewed by the public and the District. The marginal result is that the several Oakland census blocks not within the Peralta have been removed from the reconciled map and data information we have prepared with the Registrar.

SOURCE OF FUNDS (AND FISCAL/BUDGETARY IMPACT):

THERE IS NO ADDITIONAL COST TO THE DISTRICT.

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS:

These changes only affect two Trustee Areas, as set out below.

To provide the conforming census block data and map descriptions to the Registrar, we needed to:

- Trustee Area 2– remove 26 census blocks with a total of 918 residents, reducing the population of approved Trustee Area 5 by 1.05%; and,
- Trustee Area 5 – remove one census block with nine residents, reducing the population of approved Trustee Area 2 by 0.01%.

These small changes have the beneficial effect of further reducing the population variance among the Trustee Areas in the adopted plan – reducing the variance among Areas to no more than 0.30%.

In addition, these small changes make no meaningful change in the relative balance of ethnic and racial groups within the two Areas:

- Trustee Area 2 shows a range of variation of 0.01% to 0.52% among represented groups between the adopted version and the changed version; and,
- Trustee Area 5 shows a variation of 0.01% or less among represented groups between the adopted version and the changed version.

In both cases, the census blocks are located on the edge of the Oakland City boundaries and are actually within the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District.

Attachment A displays the census blocks (by number) that have been removed from each Trustee Area and each block’s population and the population total of removed residents from each Area. The Attachment B shows the population variance between the adopted plan and this revision. The Attachment C displays the demographic change information between the adopted plan and this revision.

DELIVERABLES AND SCOPE OF WORK: N/A

ANTICIPATED COMPLETION DATE: N/A

ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS: N/A

EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDED ACTION: N/A

OTHER DEPARTMENTS IMPACTED BY THIS ACTION (E.G. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY):

YES _____ NO X

COMMENTS:

WHO WILL BE PRESENTING THIS ITEM AT THE BOARD MEETING? (VICE CHANCELLOR)

Chancellor Wise E. Allen

(*****Board contract approval is subject to negotiation and execution by the Chancellor.)

DOCUMENT PREPARED BY:

Prepared by: Charles Bradshaw
[Charles Bradshaw, Marstel-Day, LLC]

Date: 2-8-12

DOCUMENT PRESENTED AND APPROVED BY:

Presented and approved by: Wise E. Allen
[Wise E. Allen, Chancellor]

Date: 2-8-12

FINANCE DEPARTMENT REVIEW

Finance review required Finance review *not* required

If Finance review is required, determination is: Approved Not Approved

If not approved, please give reason: _____

Signature: Ron Gerhard
Ron Gerhard, Vice Chancellor of Finance

Date: 2-9-12

GENERAL COUNSEL (Legality and Format/adherence to Education Codes):

Legal review required Legal review *not* required

If Legal review is required, determination is: Approved Not Approved

Signature: _____
General Counsel

Date: _____

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE APPROVAL

Approved, and Place on Agenda Not Approved, but Place on Agenda

Signature: Wise E. Allen
Wise E. Allen, Chancellor

Date: 2-8-12