



## REPORT TO

6

### City of Sacramento Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2671  
[www. CityofSacramento.org](http://www.CityofSacramento.org)

#### Staff Presentation/Information June 6, 2011

#### Members of the Sacramento Redistricting Citizens Advisory Committee

**Title:** Summary Matrix for Redistricting Plans

**Location/Council District:** Citywide

**Recommendation:** Receive and file

**Contact:** Maria MacGunigal, IT Manager, (916) 808-7998

**Presenters:** Maria MacGunigal, IT Manager, (916) 808-7998

**Department:** Information Technology

**Organization No:** 07001031

**Background:** In January 2011 the City of Sacramento Council approved a participatory process that included Community outreach, education, and the development tools and data to engage the community in the redistricting process.

May 16<sup>th</sup> was the deadline for submittal of redistricting plans from the community. The City of Sacramento has received 37 plans from the community and interested parties. The plans are available at the City of Sacramento's 2011 Redistricting Website [www.CityofSacramento.org/redistricting](http://www.CityofSacramento.org/redistricting).

At the May 23, 2011 SRCAC meeting, seven of the 37 plans were removed from further consideration by the committee due to very high deviations (substantively over 10%) from the target mean population:

1. SR005 [74.29% deviation]
2. SR010 [292.85% deviation]
3. SR020 [Latino Communities of Interest only; 101.67% deviation]
4. SR023 [Latino Communities of Interest; 65.16% deviation]
5. SR026 [77.09% deviation]
6. SR036 [54.58% deviation]
7. SR037 [114.58% deviation]

and one plan (SR033) was removed because it was corrected and resubmitted as SR034, and one plan .

Staff has developed a matrix (attachment A) of key criteria to assist in evaluating the remaining 29 plan submissions. Included in the Matrix are the following elements:

**Plan #:** Sequential number assigned to uniquely identify each plan.

**Overall Range Deviation %:** The overall range in deviation from the target mean population of 58,311 persons as a percentage among all eight districts.

**Continuity and Integrity:** This measures the connectedness of districts. Some plans have what appear to be unintentional or minor issues and have been indicated in the matrix.

**Compactness of Territory:** There are many compactness measures. Staff used the Polsby-Popper method that compares the district shape to a circle. The most compact, a circle, would have a value of one.

**Population Stability:** Expressed as a percent of the population that does not change districts.

**Existing Neighborhoods (# split):** The number of neighborhoods that are split by districts. (Note that this measure does not differentiate between neighborhoods with strong identity and those neighborhoods which are defined on paper but lack strong identity.)

**Communities of Interest:** This indicates if a Community of interest area identified through public testimony to the committee is split by districts.

Valley View acres w/ North Natomas: Defined by public testimony.

Latino North: Defined by plan submission SR020.

Latino South: Defined by plan submission SR020.

Central City: Defined by Community Plan Area.

Meadowview: Defined by Neighborhood(excluding Delta Shores).

Del Paso Heights: Defined by Neighborhood.

Oak Park: Defined by Neighborhood.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Maria MacGunigal, IT Manager

**Table of Contents:**

Pg	1	Report
Pg	2	Attachment A: Plan Matrix

City of Sacramento 2011 Redistricting Plan Matrix

Attachment A

Plan #	Overall Range Deviation %	Continuity & Integrity*	Compactness of Territory(Polsby-Popper Test)**	Population Stability	Existing Neighborhoods (#split)	Valley View Acres w/ N. Natomas	Does plan keep these Communities of Interest intact?						
							Latino North***	Latino South***	Central City	Meadowview	Del Paso Heights	Oak Park	
SR001	7.07	Y*	0.15 - 0.63	55.9%	7	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
SR002	2.14	Y	0.33 - 0.43	61.6%	4	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	
SR003	1.96	Y	0.26 - 0.52	60.4%	11	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	
SR004	2.62	Y	0.17 - 0.37	72.5%	11	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
SR006	0.76	Y*	0.18 - 0.44	58.0%	6	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	
SR007	1.24	Y	0.18 - 0.45	61.6%	11	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
SR008	3.4	N	0.24 - 0.42	54.4%	7	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
SR009	0.27	Y	0.15 - 0.44	67.3%	7	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
SR011	0.18	Y*	0.18 - 0.42	63.7%	11	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	
SR012	6.45	Y	0.19 - 0.41	67.5%	9	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	
SR013	6.21	Y	0.21 - 0.49	56.7%	15	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
SR014	0.07	Y	0.16 - 0.47	47.3%	9	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	<i>*Continuity issues appear to be accidental and/or minor</i>
SR015	10.7	N	0.15 - 0.41	65.8%	8	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	<i>**Polsby-Popper score between 0-1, 1 is most compact score</i>
SR016	8.52	N	0.19 - 0.34	73.4%	5	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	<i>***Plan contains a district that encompasses the majority of area</i>
SR017	7.15	Y*	0.15 - 0.63	55.9%	8	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
SR018	0.92	Y	0.22 - 0.41	59.3%	8	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	
SR019	1.05	Y*	0.17 - 0.28	61.9%	13	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	
SR021	0.75	Y*	0.14 - 0.38	70.4%	16	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	
SR022	7.21	Y*	0.16 - 0.45	58.8%	4	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	
SR024	10.83	N	0.17 - 0.50	66.9%	7	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
SR025	7.15	N	0.10 - 0.20	73.5%	19	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	
SR027	8.42	N	0.19 - 0.42	62.6%	3	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	
SR028	9.56	Y*	0.17 - 0.34	51.5%	13	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	
SR029	0.03	Y	0.32 - 0.48	62.2%	9	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	
SR030	2.48	N	0.13 - 0.34	76.5%	12	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
SR031	5.55	Y*	0.19 - 0.37	68.9%	9	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	
SR032	0.91	Y	0.21 - 0.45	38.4%	6	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	
SR034	0.8	Y	0.26 - 0.53	53.7%	8	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	
SR035	1.52	N	0.2 - 0.59	N/A	9	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	