



**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, October 13, 2021

5:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Redistricting Commissioners: Benjie Achtenberg, Amber Blackwell, Daniel Chesmore (Alternate), Gloria Crowell, Lilibeth Gangas, Shirley Gee, Stephanie Goode, Masoud Hamidi, Paul Marshall, Tracy Richmond McKnight, Diana Miller, Tejal Shah, Bharat Singh (Alternate) Jan Stevens, and Mary Velasco.

Commission website: www.oaklandca.gov/redistricting

Pursuant to California Government Code section 54953(e), Redistricting Commissioners, as well as City staff, will participate via phone/video conference, and no physical teleconference locations are required.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Oakland Redistricting Commission encourages public participation in the online board meetings. The public may observe and/or participate in this meeting in several ways.

OBSERVE:

- To observe the meeting by video conference, please click on this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82430200641> at the noticed meeting time.

Instructions on how to join a meeting by video conference are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting”

- To listen to the meeting by phone, please call the numbers below at the noticed meeting time: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

+1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799. For each number, please be patient and when requested, dial the following Webinar ID: 824 3020 0641.

After calling any of these phone numbers, if you are asked for a participant ID or code, press #. Instructions on how to join a meeting by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting By Phone.”

PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT: There are three ways to make public comment within the time allotted for public comment on an eligible Agenda item.

- Comment in advance. To send your comment directly to the Redistricting Commission and staff BEFORE the meeting starts, please send your comment, along with your full name and agenda item number you are commenting on, to Richard Luna at rluna@oaklandca.gov. Please

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Wednesday, October 13, 2021

5:00 PM

Via Teleconference

note that eComment submissions close one (1) hour before posted meeting time. All submitted public comment will be provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

- By Video Conference. To comment by Zoom video conference, click the “Raise Your Hand” button to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on an eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. You will then be unmuted, during your turn, and allowed to participate in public comment. After the allotted time, you will then be re-muted. Instructions on how to “Raise Your Hand” are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205566129>, which is a webpage entitled “Raise Hand In Webinar.”

- By Phone. To comment by phone, please call on one of the above listed phone numbers. You will be prompted to “Raise Your Hand” by pressing STAR-NINE (“*9”) to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on a eligible agenda item at the beginning of the meeting. Once it is your turn, you will be unmuted and allowed to make your comment. After the allotted time, you will be re-muted. Instructions of how to raise your hand by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663>, which is a webpage entitled “Joining a Meeting by Phone.”

If you have any questions about these protocols, please e-mail Richard Luna, at rluna@oaklandca.gov.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Wednesday, October 13, 2021

5:00 PM

Via Teleconference

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

2. Chair and Co-Vice Chair Rotation Announcement

The Commission will recognize Chair Lilibeth Gangas and Co-Vice Chairs Diana Miller and Tejal Shah for starting their three-month terms as the Commission’s leadership team.

3. Open Forum

Speakers will be called on by the facilitator as speakers “raise their hand” through video conference or by telephone. All speakers will be allotted a maximum of two minutes to address the Commission, unless amended by the Chair.

4. Disclosure Requirements by Commissioners

Pursuant to Rule 13 of the Redistricting Commission’s Rules of Procedures, Commissioners shall verbally report any contacts with the purpose of influencing the decision-making authority of the Commission. Contacts shall include, but is not limited to, verbal or written communications from a City Council Member, School Board Member, locally elected official, public entity, partisan lobbyist, or individual speaking on behalf of the aforementioned offices or entities.

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Commission will vote to approve the meeting minutes for the following meeting:

- [September 8, 2021](#)
- [September 29, 2021](#)

6. Resolution to Continue Teleconference Meetings

The Commission will consider re-adoption of a resolution determining that conducting in-person meetings of the Oakland Redistricting Commission and its committees would present imminent risks to attendees’ health, and electing to continue conducting meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e) as amended by California Assembly Bill No. AB-361 (September 16, 2021).

- [Proposed Resolution](#)

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Wednesday, October 13, 2021

5:00 PM

Via Teleconference

7. Outreach Consultant Update & Outreach Strategy

The Commission will hear from their outreach consultants (East Side Arts Alliance and Outreach by Design LLC) on on-going engagement efforts including detailed plans for the consultants' public outreach strategy.

- [Public Outreach Strategy](#)

8. Additional Commission Meetings

The Commission will consider adding dates to its existing meeting schedule or holding additional in-person non-Commission meetings. The Commission's upcoming schedule includes Regular Meetings on November 10, 2021 and December 8, 2021.

Commencing at 6:00 p.m., or as reasonably practical thereafter, the Commission will conduct the following Public Hearing:

9. Redistricting Testimony

The Commission will conduct a public hearing to receive and file testimony from members of the public pursuant to Elections Code 21627.1. The Commission will conduct additional public hearings after this meeting.

- Draft district map proposals
 - [Draft Map A](#) – minimal changes to existing district boundaries with no communities of interest input.
 - [Draft Map B](#) – minimal changes to existing district boundaries with communities of interest input.
 - [Draft Map C](#) – does not maintain existing district boundaries and does not include communities of interest input.
 - [Draft Map D](#) – does not maintain existing district boundaries and includes communities of interest input.
- [Online Survey Responses](#)

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Agenda (Continued)

Wednesday, October 13, 2021

5:00 PM

Via Teleconference

10. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

Commissioners may provide updates and progress working on the following Ad Hoc Committees: Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, Community Outreach, Communications, Community-Based Organizations, Faith-Based Organizations, Government Meetings/Townhalls, Digital Media. By majority vote, the Commission may delegate work or assignments to the Ad Hoc Committees; the Commission may also vote to amend and/or approve draft documents, scopes of work or other items included for consideration.

11. Agenda Requests for Future Meetings

Commissioners may use this opportunity to address new issues for Commission business. New items will be referred to an Ad Hoc Committee for action, outreach, research and deliberation or scheduled to a subsequent Commission meeting.

12. Adjournment

The meeting will adjourn upon the completion of the Commission's business.

Do you need an ASL, Cantonese, Mandarin or Spanish interpreter or other assistance to participate? Please email rluna@oaklandca.gov or call (510) 238-4756 or (510) 238-2007 for TDD/TTY five days in advance.

¿Necesita un intérprete en español, cantonés o mandarín, u otra ayuda para participar? Por favor envíe un correo electrónico a rluna@oaklandca.gov o llame al (510) 238-4756 o al (510) 238-2007 para TDD/TTY por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión. Gracias.

你需要手語, 西班牙語, 粵語或國語翻譯服務嗎? 請在會議前五個工作天電郵 rluna@oaklandca.gov 或 致電 (510) 238-4756 或 (510) 238-2007 TDD/TTY.



**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 8, 2021
Via Teleconference

Redistricting Commissioners: Benjie Achtenberg, Amber Blackwell, Daniel Chesmore (Alternate), Gloria Crowell, Lilibeth Gangas, Shirley Gee, Stephanie Goode, Masoud Hamidi, Paul Marshall, Tracy Richmond McKnight, Diana Miller, Tejal Shah, Bharat Singh (Alternate) Jan Stevens, and Mary Velasco.

Commission website: www.oaklandca.gov/redistricting

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Quorum was determined and the meeting started at 5:07 pm.

Commissioners present: Benjie Achtenberg, Amber Blackwell (arrived at 5:12 pm), Gloria Crowell (arrived at 5:16 pm), Shirley Gee, Stephanie Goode, Masoud Hamidi, Paul Marshall, Tracy Richmond McKnight, Diana Miller, Tejal Shah, Jan Stevens, and Mary Velasco.

Commissioners excused: Lilibeth Gangas.

Commissioners absent: none

Alternate Commissioners present: Daniel Chesmore, Bharat Singh (arrived at 5:24 pm).

Alternate Commissioners absent: none

City staff present: Richard J. Luna, Corey Alvin.

City Attorney staff present: Mitesh Bhakta.

2. Open Forum

Public comments were provided by the following speakers:
Ralph Kanz

3. Disclosure Requirements by Commissioners

There were no disclosures by Commissioners.

There were no public comments on this item.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, September 8, 2021
Via Teleconference

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Commissioners reviewed the draft meeting minutes. A motion was made by Shirley Gee, seconded by Jan Stevens, to approve the minutes for the meeting of August 11, 2021. The motion passed with 11 ayes (Achtenberg, Blackwell, Crowell, Gee, Goode, Hamidi, Marshall, Miller, Shah, Stevens, Velasco), one abstention (McKnight) and one excused (Gangas).

There were no public comments on this item.

5. Online Map Drawing and Outreach Training

Commissioners received a training from Sophia Garcia of Redistricting Partners on DistrictR, the online map drawing software that will be used by the public for submitting district map proposals and submitting boundaries for communities of interest. Commissioners engaged in a question and answer session with the consultants and City staff. Commissioners requested additional data sets be included in the base layers of the online mapping software, such as expanding on the race, ethnicity and demographic data in the existing model and adding publicly accessible data sets through Alameda County and the City of Oakland.

There was no action on this item.

There were no public comments on this item.

Commissioner Diana Miller was excused from the meeting at 6:00 pm.

A motion was made by Stephanie Goode, seconded by Gloria Crowell, to take item 9, Redistricting Testimony, out of order and to open the public hearing. The motion passed with 11 ayes (Achtenberg, Blackwell, Crowell, Gee, Goode, Hamidi, Marshall, McKnight, Shah, Stevens, Velasco) and two excused (Gangas, Miller).

9. Redistricting Testimony

Co-Vice Chair Tejal Shah facilitated the public hearing by calling for testimony.

The following speakers provided public testimony:

Valerie A.
Lanica Garcia
Samuel Cheng

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, September 8, 2021
Via Teleconference

Written comments were submitted by the following individuals or groups:
Myan Duong, on behalf of the Vietnamese American Community Center of the East Bay
Glenview Neighborhood Association
Mary Vail

A motion was made by Gloria Crowell, seconded by Jan Stevens, to close the public hearing. The motion passed with 11 ayes (Achtenberg, Blackwell, Crowell, Gee, Goode, Hamidi, Marshall, McKnight, Shah, Stevens, Velasco) and two excused (Gangas, Miller).

6. Outreach Consultant Selection

City staff member Richard J. Luna provided staff's recommendation to engage with East Side Arts Alliance, and subcontractor Outreach by Design LLC, to serve as the Commission's outreach and engagement consultants for the 2021 redistricting process. The Commissioners engaged in a question and answer session with Elena Serrano of East Side Arts Alliance and Charisma Acey of Outreach by Design LLC.

A motion was made by Gloria Crowell, seconded by Stephanie Goode, to approve staff's recommendation in contracting with East Side Arts Alliance and Outreach by Design LLC. The motion passed with 11 ayes (Achtenberg, Blackwell, Crowell, Gee, Goode, Hamidi, Marshall, McKnight, Shah, Stevens, Velasco) and two excused (Gangas, Miller).

Public comments were provided by the following speakers:
Merika Regan

7. Budget Update

City staff member Richard J. Luna stated the City is still closing out Fiscal Year 2020-21 finances and once that process is completed then a more precise number can be provided to the Commission on the total funds that could be carryforward to the current Fiscal Year 2021-22. Staff estimated \$23,000 would be eligible for carryforward and would provide an update to the Commission once that information was confirmed.

Chair Tracy Richmond McKnight requested the Commission receive information should additional funds be required to build additional data layers in DistrictR, the online mapping tool.

There was no action on this item.

There were no speakers on this item.

Commissioner Gloria Crowell exited the meeting at 6:30 pm.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, September 8, 2021
Via Teleconference

8. 2020 U.S. Census Report and Consultant Direction on Draft Maps

City staff member Richard J. Luna provided an update to the Commission that based on the initial 2020 U.S. Census data, there would be some shifts to the existing district boundaries based on population growth, primarily in Districts 3 and 7. City staff requested the Commission provide direction to Redistricting Partners, the Commission's technical consultants, on the number of draft maps the consultants should produce, including if the draft map proposals should consider and/or not consider the existing district boundaries.

Commissioners asked questions on the process for developing the new district boundaries, including the process in which the existing input would be factored into the first draft map proposals. Commissioners also questioned if there was enough community input received thus far to factor in testimony and communities of interest input in the initial draft maps that would be produced.

Commissioner Paul Marshall exited the meeting at 7:58 pm.

A motion was made by Stephanie Goode, seconded by Shirley Gee, to extend the meeting until 8:10 pm. The motion passed with nine ayes (Achtenberg, Blackwell, Gee, Goode, Hamidi, McKnight, Shah, Stevens, Velasco), two not present (Crowell, Marshall) and two excused (Gangas, Miller).

Commissioners continued to discuss potential motions, including one recommended by Commissioner Shirley Gee to direct the consultants to develop draft maps that reflect community input up to this point, and additional input that will come forward, and that are based on current existing lines and alternatives that do not factor the existing district boundaries. In the recommendation, all draft maps would consider community input received by the Commission.

An alternative motion was developed by Commissioner Tejal Shah in that the draft maps would factor community input submitted to the Commission and another set would not consider any community input since the Commission had yet to receive communities of interest testimony from the majority of groups in Oakland.

A second motion was made Benjie Achtenberg, seconded by Jan Stevens, to extend the meeting until 8:30 pm. The motion passed with eight ayes (Achtenberg, Blackwell, Goode, Hamidi, McKnight, Shah, Stevens, Velasco), one abstention (Gee), two not present (Crowell, Marshall) and two excused (Gangas, Miller).

A third motion was made by Tejal Shah, seconded by Stephanie Goode, to direct the consultants to draw draft maps that comply with legislation, and that include and do not include existing public comments and communities of interest testimony, and that include and do not include existing district boundaries. The motion passed with eight ayes

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(REGULAR MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, September 8, 2021
Via Teleconference

(Achtenberg, Blackwell, Goode, Hamidi, McKnight, Shah, Stevens, Velasco), one abstention (Gee), two not present (Crowell, Marshall) and two excused (Gangas, Miller).

Co-Vice Chair Tejal Shah exited the meeting at 8:13 pm, at which time the Commission lost quorum and no further items were discussed. The public was awarded time to speak on the remaining items on the agenda.

There were no public comments on this item.

9. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

This item was not discussed due to lack of quorum.

There were no speakers on this item.

10. Agenda Requests for Future Meetings

This item was not discussed due to lack of quorum.

There were no speakers on this item.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 pm due to lack of quorum.



**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 29, 2021
Via Teleconference

Redistricting Commissioners: Benjie Achtenberg, Amber Blackwell, Daniel Chesmore (Alternate), Gloria Crowell, Lilibeth Gangas, Shirley Gee, Stephanie Goode, Masoud Hamidi, Paul Marshall, Tracy Richmond McKnight, Diana Miller, Tejal Shah, Bharat Singh (Alternate) Jan Stevens, and Mary Velasco.

Commission website: www.oaklandca.gov/redistricting

1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Quorum was determined and the meeting started at 5:01 pm.

Commissioners present: Benjie Achtenberg, Gloria Crowell, Lilibeth Gangas (arrived at 5:05 pm), Shirley Gee, Stephanie Goode, Masoud Hamidi, Paul Marshall, Tracy Richmond McKnight, Diana Miller, Tejal Shah, Jan Stevens, and Mary Velasco.

Commissioners excused: none.

Commissioners absent: Amber Blackwell

Alternate Commissioners present: Daniel Chesmore.

Alternate Commissioners excused: Bharat Singh

City staff present: Richard J. Luna, Corey Alvin.

City Attorney staff present: Mitesh Bhakta.

2. Open Forum

Public comments were provided by the following speakers:
Sietse Goffard

3. Disclosure Requirements by Commissioners

Commissioner Masoud Hamidi announced that he accepted a Permit Technician position with the City of Oakland's Planning and Building Department and stated that after consulting with City staff, believed his position would not result in a conflict of interest.

Commissioner Shirley Gee stated Council President Nikki Fortunato Bas requested a meeting with her to discuss redistricting on Wednesday, October 6, 2021.

**CITY OF OAKLAND
REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

Meeting Minutes (Continued)

Wednesday, September 29, 2021
Via Teleconference

Commissioner Stephanie Goode stated she had a direct conversation about redistricting with Mayor Libby Schaaf and members of the public on Saturday, September 25, 2021 at an in-person event.

There were no public comments on this item.

4. Resolution to Continue Teleconference Meetings

Deputy City Attorney Mitesh Bhakta presented amendments to a proposed resolution (*Exhibit A*) that would determine conducting in-person meetings of the Oakland Redistricting Commission and its committees would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and requested the Commission adopt the proposed findings to continue conducting its meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California government code section 54953(e), a provision of Assembly Bill 361. City staff member Richard J. Luna stated that the City Council and all boards and commissions in Oakland were being requested to adopt the similar resolutions.

A motion was made by Tracy Richmond McKnight, seconded by Gloria Crowell, to adopt the resolution as amended. The motion passed with 12 ayes (Achtenberg, Crowell, Gangas, Gee, Goode, Hamidi, Marshall, McKnight, Miller, Shah, Stevens, Velasco) and one absent (Blackwell).

The adopted resolution is included as *Exhibit B*.

There were no public comments on this item.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:19 pm.

Exhibit A

Redlined Amendments to Proposed Resolution

~~APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY~~

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

~~CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE~~

~~CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE~~

OAKLAND REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 21-002

~~**ADOPT A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE OAKLAND REDISTRICTING COMMISSION AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e), A PROVISION OF AB-361, AS AMENDED BY CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL NO. AB-361 (SEPTEMBER 16, 2021).**~~

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded. See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf>; and

WHEREAS, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

WHEREAS, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds, and avoiding spaces that do not offer fresh air from the outdoors, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevention-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that people who live with unvaccinated people avoid activities that make physical distancing ~~hard-difficult~~. See

<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/about-covid-19/caring-for-children/families.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that older adults limit in-person interactions as much as possible, particularly when indoors. See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms stay home. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>; and

WHEREAS, persons without symptoms may be able to spread the COVID-19 virus. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

WHEREAS, fully vaccinated persons who become infected with the COVID-19 Delta variant can spread the virus to others. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated.html>; and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities that ~~are~~ not designed to ensure circulation of fresh / outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather, ~~and were not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; now therefore be it;~~ and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

WHEREAS, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members ~~from different households~~ to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or would live with someone who is at high risk; and

WHEREAS, in-person meetings ~~would tempt~~ will bring community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

WHEREAS, some attendees would use ride-share services ~~and~~ or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; now therefore be it:

RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this Resolution; and be it

Formatted: Font color: Auto
Formatted: Normal, Left, Indent: First line: 0.5"

FURTHER RESOLVED: that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Oakland Redistricting Commission determines that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission firmly believes that the community's health and safety seriously and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Oakland Redistricting Commission finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever is occurs first.

ADOPTED ON THIS ___ DAY OF _____, 2021.

Exhibit B

Adopted Resolution



CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

OAKLAND REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 21-002



RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE OAKLAND REDISTRICTING COMMISSION AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e) AS AMENDED BY CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL NO. AB-361 (SEPTEMBER 16, 2021).

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded, See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf> ; and

WHEREAS, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

WHEREAS, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds, and avoiding spaces that do not offer fresh air from the outdoors, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that people who live with unvaccinated people avoid activities that make physical distancing difficult, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/about-covid-19/caring-for-children/families.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that older adults limit in-person interactions as much as possible, particularly when indoors. See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms stay home, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>; and

WHEREAS, persons without symptoms may be able to spread the COVID-19 virus, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

WHEREAS, fully vaccinated persons who become infected with the COVID-19 Delta variant can spread the virus to others, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated.html>; and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities that are not designed to ensure circulation of fresh / outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather; and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

WHEREAS, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members from different households to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or would live with someone who is at high risk; and

WHEREAS, in-person meetings will bring community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

WHEREAS, some attendees would use ride-share services or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; now therefore be it:

RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this Resolution; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Oakland Redistricting Commission determines that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission firmly believes that the community's health and safety seriously and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Oakland Redistricting Commission finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever is occurs first.

ADOPTED ON THIS 29th DAY OF September, 2021.



CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

OAKLAND REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 21-003

RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT CONDUCTING IN-PERSON MEETINGS OF THE OAKLAND REDISTRICTING COMMISSION AND ITS COMMITTEES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO ATTENDEES' HEALTH, AND ELECTING TO CONTINUE CONDUCTING MEETINGS USING TELECONFERENCING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e) AS AMENDED BY CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL NO. AB-361 (SEPTEMBER 16, 2021).

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency related to COVID-19, pursuant to Government Code Section 8625, and such declaration has not been lifted or rescinded, See <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.4.20-Coronavirus-SOE-Proclamation.pdf> ; and

WHEREAS, on March 9, 2020, the City Administrator in their capacity as the Director of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), issued a proclamation of local emergency due to the spread of COVID-19 in Oakland, and on March 12, 2020, the City Council passed Resolution No. 88075 C.M.S. ratifying the proclamation of local emergency pursuant to Oakland Municipal Code (O.M.C.) section 8.50.050(C); and

WHEREAS, City Council Resolution No. 88075 remains in full force and effect to date; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends physical distancing of at least six (6) feet whenever possible, avoiding crowds, and avoiding spaces that do not offer fresh air from the outdoors, particularly for people who are not fully vaccinated or who are at higher risk of getting very sick from COVID-19. See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that people who live with unvaccinated people avoid activities that make physical distancing difficult, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/about-covid-19/caring-for-children/families.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC recommends that older adults limit in-person interactions as much as possible, particularly when indoors. See <https://www.cdc.gov/aging/covid19/covid19-older-adults.html>; and

WHEREAS, the CDC, the California Department of Public Health, and the Alameda County Public Health Department all recommend that people experiencing COVID-19 symptoms stay home, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html>; and

WHEREAS, persons without symptoms may be able to spread the COVID-19 virus, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>; and

WHEREAS, fully vaccinated persons who become infected with the COVID-19 Delta variant can spread the virus to others, See <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/fully-vaccinated.html>; and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are indoor facilities that are not designed to ensure circulation of fresh / outdoor air, particularly during periods of cold and/or rainy weather; and

WHEREAS, the City's public-meeting facilities are not designed to ensure that attendees can remain six (6) feet apart; and

WHEREAS, holding in-person meetings would encourage community members from different households to come to City facilities to participate in local government, and some of them would be at high risk of getting very sick from COVID-19 and/or would live with someone who is at high risk; and

WHEREAS, in-person meetings will bring community members who are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms to leave their homes in order to come to City facilities and participate in local government; and

WHEREAS, some attendees would use ride-share services or public transit to travel to in-person meetings, thereby putting them in close and prolonged contact with additional people outside of their households; and

WHEREAS, on September 29, 2021, Commissioners adopted a resolution determining that conducting in-person meetings of the Oakland Redistricting Commission and its committees would present imminent risks to attendees' health, and electing to continue conducting meetings using teleconferencing in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e) as amended by California Assembly Bill No. AB-361 (September 16, 2021); now therefore be it:

RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and hereby adopts and incorporates them into this Resolution; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that, based on these determinations and consistent with federal, state and local health guidance, the Oakland Redistricting Commission renews its determination that conducting in-person meetings would pose imminent risks to the health of attendees; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission firmly believes that the community's health and safety seriously and the community's right to participate in local government, are both critically important, and is committed to balancing the two by continuing to use teleconferencing to conduct public meetings, in accordance with California Government Code Section 54953(e), a provision of AB-361; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Oakland Redistricting Commission will renew these (or similar) findings at least every thirty (30) days in accordance with California Government Code section 54953(e) until the state of emergency related to COVID-19 has been lifted, or the Oakland Redistricting Commission finds that in-person meetings no longer pose imminent risks to the health of attendees, whichever is occurs first.

ADOPTED ON THIS ___ DAY OF _____, 2021.



CITY OF
OAKLAND

Oakland Redistricting Commission

www.oaklandca.gov/redistricting



Public Outreach Strategy

September 30, 2021



Introduction

The purpose of this strategic outreach plan is to outline and describe the roles, responsibilities, tools, and timeline for public outreach and community engagement activities that will inform the City of Oakland's Redistricting process. The goal of the plan is to urge and promote the participation of all Oakland residents. Redistricting is the process of drawing new boundaries for congressional, state, and local districts, and occurs every 10 years after the completion of the U.S. Census. In November 2014, the Oakland electorate approved a ballot measure creating an independent, non-political Redistricting Commission that will redraw district boundary lines for City Council Districts and Oakland Unified Board Member Districts. In 2020, the Oakland Redistricting Commission was formed. As such, this is the first time that the City's districts will be re-drawn and approved by an independent Redistricting Commission. The Redistricting Commission is required to complete and approve the new Oakland District Map by the end of 2021.

Redistricting determines which neighborhoods and communities are grouped together for purposes of City Council and Oakland Unified School District Board elections. Recognizing the importance of redistricting to shape future outcomes for communities, this outreach strategy has been developed centered around equitable representation for all Oakland residents to allow for residents to share their voices and put their communities on the map. This outreach strategy will provide an inclusive framework and key activities and milestones to guide the City of Oakland Redistricting Commission's community engagement objectives and efforts.

In September 2021, the Independent Redistricting Commission authorized the City to enter into an agreement with a consultant team led by EastSide Arts Alliance, to prepare an outreach plan and manage a coordinated outreach effort for the City's redistricting process, broken down into three primary tasks:

- Develop an Outreach Strategy
- Secure Nonprofit and CBO Partnerships
- Support a Multimedia Advertising/Marketing campaign

Section 1: Outreach and Engagement Approach

The outreach strategy in this plan uses an approach to community outreach that centers community and cultural arts, and is defined by core elements that encourage fostering a diversity of perspectives, true partnership vs. token engagement, deep listening, and actionable change. Three Core Principles guide this outreach strategy: racial equity, cultural humility, and





human dignity and respect. This approach requires outreach and engagement activities that are clear, focused, and understandable. Activities will have a clear purpose and use for the input received. The purpose of redistricting and activities, multimedia and marketing materials, and toolkits will be described in language that is clear and easy to understand.

The Project Team – consisting of Redistricting Commissioners, City staff, Volunteers, and the Consultant Team – will proactively reach out and engage a full range of communities and stakeholders across Oakland. The public outreach process will accommodate engagement in a variety of settings, both online and in-person, for both individuals and different size groups. For example, the outreach will include two in-person workshops in areas targeted to reach specific groups, as well as virtual engagement, and a public engagement toolkit that allows Commissioners, staff, and volunteers to attend community meetings and events that engage groups that have been historically marginalized and underserved.

The outreach plan seeks to identify and engage with diverse communities in Oakland by engaging with a network of nonprofits and CBOs to gain a representative understanding of the different views held across multiple Communities of Interest. This includes Asian American residents; Latinx residents; African American residents; LGBTQ+ residents; Native American and Indigenous residents; undocumented residents; unhoused residents, including people with mental health and substance abuse challenges; formerly incarcerated residents; older adults; youth; college/university students; and other communities, prioritizing historically marginalized and underserved people.

Section 2: Goals and Objectives

The approach reflects the overall goal of reaching at least 20% of Oaklanders overall and in each of the seven districts through the following objectives:

1. *Build Relationships with Nonprofits and CBOs.* Create opportunities for Oakland residents to meet and engage with District Commissioners and others interested in equitable representation.
2. *Create Opportunities for Equitable, Inclusive & Accessible Participation.* Generate broad awareness of the redistricting process through broad and targeted multimedia advertising and marketing and provide multiple and varied opportunities for a wide range of diverse community members to provide meaningful input on district boundaries and their Communities of Interest.
3. *Collaborate, Consult and Inform the Redistricting Process.* Collect direct public input that reflects the full geography and diversity of identities, neighborhoods, and lived experience across Oakland's Communities of Interest that informs the work of the Independent Redistricting Commission.





Measures of Success

The public outreach plan will be periodically evaluated based on the criteria and timeframe outlined below:

Objective 1. *Build Relationships with Nonprofits and CBOs.*

- Help the Commission meet multiple new community groups or community leaders, including a variety of multicultural community-based service organizations, faith-based, and environmental, including but not limited to: Just Cities Institute, Black Cultural Zone, Urban Strategies Council, CURYJ, Oakland Asian Cultural Center Association, Malong Arts Residents, The Village, The Unity Council, and others.
- Engage with The *Deeply Rooted in Oakland Partnership* (Deeply Rooted), a unique and innovative collaborative of community-based organizations (CBOs) committed to creating an equitable, sustainable, and culturally thriving Oakland.
- Receive a high response from nonprofit and CBO partner events and activities through the online survey, online mapping tool, in-person and virtual workshops, written comment submissions, and public meetings of the Commission.

Timeframe: Discuss outcomes towards the completion of each major task.

Objective 2. *Create Opportunities for Equitable, Inclusive & Accessible Participation.*

- Hold events at locations or times requested by partner nonprofits, CBOs, and members of the public.
- Maintain a consistent level of participation throughout the process.
- Receive a significant percentage of responses from demographically diverse residents, youth, and seniors.
- Receive data from a range of different demographics and Communities of Interest at outreach activities.

Timeframe: Review progress following each official public outreach event.

Objective 3. *Collaborate, Consult and Inform the Redistricting Process.*

- Periodically present updates to Redistricting Commissioners and City staff throughout the process.
- Keep the public and nonprofit and CBO partners informed throughout the process.



- Provide a progress report summarizing public input each month, outlining next steps that respond to specific ideas and opportunities raised in previous periods.

Timeframe: Review progress following each project meeting with Redistricting Commissioners and City staff

Section 3: Outreach, Engagement, and Activation Strategies & Activities

The overall strategy is to inform Oakland residents of the importance of redistricting and offer multiple ways to participate in the City's redistricting process. In addition to the involvement of the Redistricting Commission, Committees, and City Staff in the outreach and engagement process, we will rely on a diverse set of community members to achieve our goals for achieving far-reaching outreach. This includes the involvement of volunteers who expressed interest on the Redistricting Commission surveys, student and youth teams/interns, CBOs, and more to support focus groups, workshops, pop-up events, and online meetings and webinars.

As part of our commitment to ensuring equitable access and engagement for all Oaklanders, we strive to use jargon-free communications in all Redistricting outreach materials. Oakland residents can currently provide input to the Redistricting Commission by:

- Survey, accessible through the Redistricting Commission website or physically during in-person engagement opportunities
- Interactive map, using the online mapping tool that will be accessible through the Redistricting Commission website in October 2021 or physically during in-person engagement opportunities.
- Redistricting Commission Public Hearing Meetings, accessible via Zoom or phone
- Written comments submitted to the Redistricting Commission via email at rluna@oaklandca.gov.

Strategy 1: Weekly Community Events and Meetings

We plan to engage Oakland residents through weekly events and community meetings happening, both in-person and online. We will engage nonprofit and CBO partners in identifying opportunities to host Commissioners and interest in sponsoring online events and in-person (outdoor) events. We will be coordinating with Commissioners, members of the public who expressed interest in volunteering for the Commission, and Consultant Team interns to attend events, staff tables, handout materials, and engage with the public.





While the plan is to engage all residents, we will build on the Commission's outreach activities with a targeted effort to reach hard-to-reach populations by working with partner nonprofits and CBOs.

- We will plan to host a kickoff meeting with a core group of Eastside Arts Alliance CBO partners to spread the word about redistricting in a timely manner and identify key events and opportunities to engage their community members.
- We will additionally reach out to potential CBO partners to spread the word about ways to engage in the redistricting process and identify key events and opportunities to engage their community members.
- We will coordinate with the Commissioners, volunteers, and interns to ensure that there are people to engage with the public, staff tables, and handout materials on redistricting at all scheduled events.

To accomplish this strategy we are also developing a Master List of upcoming engagement opportunities that build on the Commission's planned presentation schedule, expanding it to include additional opportunities for Commissioners to engage with diverse communities at scheduled events, including: East Oakland Collective Resource Fair and General Body Meetings, AKOMA Market, First Fridays, Rockridge Rock N Stroll, Unity Council Día de Los Muertos, Grand Lake Farmers Market, Asian Health Services COVID-19 Vaccination and Testing Event, Grand Lake Farmers Market, Temescal Freedom Farmer's Market, Hoover Foster Resident Action Council Meeting, and other upcoming events as we add they are added to the calendar.

In addition to Deeply Rooted, we are developing a list of potential community-based partners to expand outreach and engagement activities, including opportunities to participate in scheduled events, host Commission specific events, and disseminate toolkit materials to further encourage public engagement in the Redistricting process.

Strategy 2. Targeted Workshops and Events

We will plan, manage logistics, and implement in-person and virtual community engagement events, including:

- At least 2 in-person community engagement events, both pre-organized and pop-up/intercept events.
- At least 2 virtual events with partner organizations.

We have identified two opportunities to host targeted in-person engagement with Redistricting Commissioners at the Akoma Market in October and November at the AKOMA Market, and Lincoln Summer Nights in Lincoln Park through October 21 in Oakland's Chinatown District.





Each in-person engagement offers opportunities to discuss why getting involved in Redistricting is important, learn about new Communities of Interest, and demonstrate the four ways that Oakland residents can provide input to the Commission. In addition to hosting a table with posters, flyers, and sign-up information, we will provide demonstrations of the Redistricting Commission online mapping tool, provide opportunities for residents to submit maps at the events using digital tablets, and hand out flyers and postcards to engage with residents.

In addition to the network of partner organizations part of Deeply Rooted, we are developing a list of additional potential nonprofit and CBO partners:

Draft List of Potential Community Based Partners

Geography	CBO
DISTRICT 1	Temescal/Telegraph Business Improvement District Association
	Destiny Arts Center
	Piedmont Ave Neighborhood Improvement League
	Golden Gate Community Association
DISTRICT 2	San Antonio Community Development Corporation
	Grandlake Neighbors
	East Oakland Youth Development Center
	Congress of Neighborhoods
DISTRICT 3	Strategic Urban Development Alliance, Regina Davis
	City Slicker Farms
	West Oakland Neighbors
	Hoover Foster Resident Action Council
	Coalition for West Oakland Revitalization/Alliance for West Oakland Development
	West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project
	East Bay Permanent Real Estate Cooperative
St Mary's Center	
DISTRICT 4	Maxwell Park Neighborhood Association
	Montclair Village Business Improvement District
	Laurel Village Association
	Mills College
	Allendale/Brookdale Neighbors
	Redwood Heights Neighborhood Association





	Dimond Improvement Association
	Friends of Dimond Park
	Friends of the Dimond Library
	Friends of Sausal Creek
	Sing Thing Family Singing
DISTRICT 5	Native American Health Center
	Peralta - Laney College
	Unity Council
	Diamond Improvement District
DISTRICT 6	Black Cultural Zone
	East Oakland Collective
	East Oakland Neighborhood Initiative
	Healthy Havenscourt
	Havenscourt Neighborhood Association
	David Glover Center
DISTRICT 7	East Oakland Collective
	Acta Non Verba
	Planting Justice
	Sobrante Park Resident Action Council
	Block by Block Neighborhood Organizing Network
	Allen Temple Baptist Church
	Castlemont Sustainable Urban Design Studio
	Delta Sigma Theta Sorority
	Black Women Organized for Political Action
	Homies Empowerment
OTHER	The Oakland Climate Action Coalition
	East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
	Planting Justice
	Sogorea Te land trust
	East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
	Equity and Climate Action Plan
	Center for Elders Independence
	Youth Spirit Artworks





	Studio One (Parks Recs)
	Spirit Art
	HOPE (Health for Oakland's People and Environment) Collaborative
	The Village
	Building Occupancy for Self Sufficiency
	Communities for a Better Environment
	Causa Justa: Just Cause
	Just Cities
	California Environmental Justice Alliance
	Ecocity Builders
	Othering & Belonging Institute, UC Berkeley
	Civic Design Studio
	Attitudinal Healing Connection

Strategy 3: Enhanced Toolkit

We will design additional outreach materials and messaging for the communications and media toolkit using creative arts and cultural design elements for increased accessibility. Design materials include, but are not limited to printed posters and flyers, social media graphics, presentation slides, radio or audio script, and short videos offered in multiple languages and other, artistic, creative, and clear messaging inspiring public engagement and clearly communicating the four ways Oakland residents can provide input.

We plan to develop a complementary landing page linking directly to the Redistricting Commission website, continuously adding creative media and messaging, resources, and announcements. We will develop enhanced media for online dissemination, including digital assets such as short video, creative graphics, and print materials including signage such as posters and flyers. We will support the Redistricting Commission's web, radio, TV, social media advertising and marketing campaign by including ethnic print and online media, and developing email and e-newsletter templates to engage partner CBOs to disseminate the four ways for the public to provide input, as well as Redistricting Commission announcements and updates through organizational newsletters and communications.

Targeted Strategy

All public outreach and engagement strategies will aim to achieve the four targets outlined below: Accessibility, Reach, Diversity, and Impact.





Accessibility - *The process should serve multigenerational and diverse ability needs.*

- In-person workshops will be held in ADA-accessible locations near public transit lines.
- When feasible, in-person and online workshops and events will be scheduled at varying times to allow participation by people who have diverse work schedules.
- In-person will be held in a variety of locations and formats to accommodate hard-to-reach groups such as youth, seniors, immigrant communities, low-income families, and people with disabilities.
- Commissioners will attend other community sponsored meetings and events to engage the community. These meetings will be held in a variety of locations and formats.
- Accessibility considerations include but are not limited to:
 - Language translations
 - Multiple modes of engagement (survey, mapping tool, public comment, etc.)

 - Usage of non-technical language in redistricting outreach materials
 - Multiple sites of engagement
 - In-person events and meetings
 - Online events and meetings
 - Signage, flyers, and posters in public spaces
 - Multimedia (Radio, TV, email, etc.)

Reach - *The process should involve and inform as many residents of Oakland as possible.*

- The Redistricting Commission's engagement opportunities will be publicized broadly using an array of multimedia advertising and marketing channels.
- Total number of persons engaged and participants will be tracked, tracking participation across all outreach activities.
- Reach and engagement goals will be set for the following individual methods for each task of the project:
 - Written comments submitted to the Commission
 - Public comments at Commission meetings
 - Public hearing testimony
 - Community event intercept activity responses
 - Online survey responses
 - Online mapping responses
 - Targeted workshops attendance
 - Online event attendance
 - Print (Publications, Posters), Radio, TV, Text, Phone Banking, Social media (Messages, Images, Video) dissemination





Diversity - *The process should engage a range of people that reflects the diversity of interests, ethnicities, incomes, and needs of Oakland's diverse residents.*

- Outreach activities will routinely collect demographic data where practical to help assess how well we are reaching the full racial, ethnic, and socioeconomically diverse population of Oakland.
- We will adjust the engagement plan if engagement activities are not resulting in diverse participation.
- Priority populations include historically marginalized and underserved populations and communities, and populations that include Indigenous residents; undocumented residents; unhoused residents, including people with mental health and substance abuse challenges; formerly incarcerated residents; youth; and residents who speak a language other than English at home.

Impact - *The public outreach process should inform the Redistricting process for the City of Oakland.*

- Major themes, Communities of Interest, and preferences identified through the public engagement efforts will be reflected in the Commission's deliberations and throughout the Redistricting process.

Audiences

The Redistricting process is an opportunity for the City of Oakland to further build a network of an increasingly diverse engaged public audience to collectively contribute to the quality of life in Oakland. To this end, the following groups have been identified as target audiences for public outreach and engagement:

- Oakland residents
- Black, Latinx, Indigenous, Native American, and Asian communities
- Non-English speakers
- Low-income households
- Families with one parent as head of household
- Unhoused populations
- Immigrants
- Youth and students
- Residents with limited internet access
- LGBTQ+
- People with mental health and substance abuse challenges



- Formerly incarcerated residents
- Seniors and older residents
- People with disabilities and their advocates
- Residents living in rental units
- Nonprofit and Community-based organizations (CBOs)
- Neighborhood associations
- Arts and cultural organizations
- Arts advocates including local artists, musicians, and performers

Section 4: Timeline & Schedule of Events

Timing	Purpose
September 30 - October 13, 2021	<p>Outreach to partner CBOs in Deeply Rooted, organizations with upcoming activities, and the draft list of potential partner CBOs to engage in outreach process and promote written comments, online map submission (once the Redistricting online mapping tool goes live), and public comment at Redistricting Commission Public Hearings.</p> <p>Disseminate information on Oakland Redistricting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target East Oakland Collective Resource Fair (October 9) <p>Plan Enhanced Communications Toolkit and Landing Page linking to Redistricting Commission website.</p>
October 1, 2021	Submit outreach progress report to City and Commission
October 13, 2021	Redistricting Commission Public Hearing
October 14 - November 10, 2021	<p>Review progress following each Commission meeting with Redistricting Commissioners and City staff</p> <p>Encourage the public to continue to participate through submitting public comment and maps on COIs and proposed Redistricting Plans for consideration:</p> <p>Kickoff meeting with Deeply Rooted CBOs to engage with outreach and engagement messaging and dissemination, and to discuss potential hosting of additional public engagement activities with the Commission.</p>





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outline of CBO/NP Roles in partnership. <p>Develop Enhanced Communications Toolkit and Landing Page linking to Redistricting Commission website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop new posters, flyers, digital assets - Translate print and digital assets. <p>Disseminate information on Oakland Redistricting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop mailing list of partner organizations - Share official Commission Communications Toolkit and enhanced toolkit with partner CBOs. - 1 weekly post on all social media accounts; encourage partners to share on social media weekly. - Email/texting campaign (text with survey links, text for commission meeting links, text to review map link). - Weekly disseminate print flyers, posters, postcards to partner organizations and agencies. - Begin running radio ads. <p>Community information sessions and mapping with Project Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning at least 1 in-person outreach engagement event at AKOMA Market and Lincoln Summer Nights in Lincoln Park (through October 21). - Plan to host at least 1 online outreach engagement event with partner CBOs. - Begin targeting weekly events promoting online mapping tools, survey, written comments, and attendance at November Redistricting Commission Public Hearing. - <p>Review progress following each official public outreach event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Track outreach and engagement in terms of reach, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility.
November 1, 2021	Submit outreach report to the City and Commission.
November 10, 2021	Redistricting Commission Public Hearing
November 11 - December 8, 2021	Review progress following each Commission meeting with Redistricting Commissioners and City Staff.





	<p>Disseminate information on Oakland Redistricting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 weekly post on all social media accounts; encourage partners to share on social media weekly. - Disseminate press releases; target ethnic media print and online outlets. - Email/texting campaign (text with survey links, text for commission meeting links, text to review map link). - Weekly disseminate print flyers, posters, postcards to partner organizations and agencies. - Support Commission with weekly TV (KTOP), radio ads and/or segments. <p>Community information sessions and mapping with Project Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning at least 1 in-person outreach engagement event at AKOMA Market. - Plan to host at least 1 online outreach engagement event with partner CBOs. - Develop a mailing list of partner organizations and share official Communications Toolkit and enhanced toolkit. - Continue targeting weekly events promoting online mapping tool, survey, written comments, and attendance at November Commission Public Hearing. - Partner with Deeply Rooted Community Engagement events between November 6-21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oakland Asian Cultural Center - Fruitvale Village - AKOMA Market <p>Review progress following each official public outreach event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Track outreach and engagement in terms of reach, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility.
December 8, 2021	Redistricting Commission Public Hearing
December 9 - 31	<p>Review progress following Commission meeting with Redistricting Commissioners and City staff</p> <p>Continue to disseminate information on Oakland Redistricting*</p>






	Prepare and submit Final Engagement Report detailing metrics on target goal of 20% of Oaklanders
--	--

* During the period the Commission is continuing to receive public comments and submissions.






2020 Census

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Population	62,533	64,174	64,612	63,538	61,775	62,621	62,638
Deviation	-594	1,047	1,485	411	-1,352	-506	-489
Deviation %	-0.9%	1.7%	2.4%	0.7%	-2.1%	-0.8%	-0.8%
Other	38,259	21,808	25,985	35,390	11,377	11,488	8,122
Other %	61.2%	34.0%	40.2%	55.7%	18.4%	18.3%	13.0%
Latino	7,392	11,115	10,908	9,404	28,967	27,197	32,040
Latino %	11.8%	17.3%	16.9%	14.8%	46.9%	43.4%	51.2%
Asian	7,061	22,272	10,256	11,258	10,786	4,644	3,643
Asian %	11.3%	34.7%	15.9%	17.7%	17.5%	7.4%	5.8%
Black	9,821	8,979	17,463	7,486	10,645	19,292	18,833
Black %	15.7%	14.0%	27.0%	11.8%	17.2%	30.8%	30.1%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Total CVAP	48,182	43,100	42,736	46,091	33,321	34,630	32,704
Other CVAP	30,898	16,949	18,429	27,916	7,545	8,023	6,023
Other CVAP %	64.1%	39.3%	43.1%	60.6%	22.6%	23.2%	18.4%
Latino CVAP	3,926	4,795	4,520	4,154	9,371	7,720	8,674
Latino CVAP %	8.1%	11.1%	10.6%	9.0%	28.1%	22.3%	26.5%
Asian CVAP	5,389	13,922	5,809	8,506	7,356	3,310	1,883
Asian CVAP %	11.2%	32.3%	13.6%	18.5%	22.1%	9.6%	5.8%
Black CVAP	7,969	7,435	13,978	5,515	9,048	15,578	16,124
Black CVAP %	16.5%	17.2%	32.7%	12.0%	27.2%	45.0%	49.3%


District A




2020 Census







Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,533	-594	-0.9%	38,259	61.2%	7,392	11.8%	7,061	11.3%	9,821	15.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
48,182	30,898	64.1%	3,926	8.1%	5,389	11.2%	7,969	16.5%		




District B
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
64,174	1,047	1.7%	21,808	34.0%	11,115	17.3%	22,272	34.7%	8,979	14.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
43,100	16,949	39.3%	4,795	11.1%	13,922	32.3%	7,435	17.2%		


District C




2020 Census







Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
64,612	1,485	2.4%	25,985	40.2%	10,908	16.9%	10,256	15.9%	17,463	27.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
42,736	18,429	43.1%	4,520	10.6%	5,809	13.6%	13,978	32.7%		




District D
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
63,538	411	0.7%	35,390	55.7%	9,404	14.8%	11,258	17.7%	7,486	11.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
46,091	27,916	60.6%	4,154	9.0%	8,506	18.5%	5,515	12.0%		

District E





2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
61,775	-1,352	-2.1%	11,377	18.4%	28,967	46.9%	10,786	17.5%	10,645	17.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
33,321	7,545	22.6%	9,371	28.1%	7,356	22.1%	9,048	27.2%		


District F
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,621	-506	-0.8%	11,488	18.3%	27,197	43.4%	4,644	7.4%	19,292	30.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
34,630	8,023	23.2%	7,720	22.3%	3,310	9.6%	15,578	45.0%		


District G




2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,638	-489	-0.8%	8,122	13.0%	32,040	51.2%	3,643	5.8%	18,833	30.1%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
32,704	6,023	18.4%	8,674	26.5%	1,883	5.8%	16,124	49.3%		





2020 Census


	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Population	62,533	64,405	61,916	64,430	63,655	62,314	62,638
Deviation	-594	1,278	-1,211	1,303	528	-813	-489
Deviation %	-0.9%	2.0%	-1.9%	2.1%	0.8%	-1.3%	-0.8%
Other	38,259	21,446	24,550	38,426	10,592	11,034	8,122
Other %	61.2%	33.3%	39.7%	59.6%	16.6%	17.7%	13.0%
Latino	7,392	11,247	10,582	7,486	30,443	27,833	32,040
Latino %	11.8%	17.5%	17.1%	11.6%	47.8%	44.7%	51.2%
Asian	7,061	22,586	9,679	10,936	12,295	3,720	3,643
Asian %	11.3%	35.1%	15.6%	17.0%	19.3%	6.0%	5.8%
Black	9,821	9,126	17,105	7,582	10,325	19,727	18,833
Black %	15.7%	14.2%	27.6%	11.8%	16.2%	31.7%	30.1%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)




	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Total CVAP	48,182	42,654	41,421	47,686	33,943	34,175	32,704
Other CVAP	30,898	16,331	17,766	29,994	7,670	7,101	6,023
Other CVAP %	64.1%	38.3%	42.9%	62.9%	22.6%	20.8%	18.4%
Latino CVAP	3,926	4,844	4,412	3,840	9,656	7,808	8,674
Latino CVAP %	8.1%	11.4%	10.7%	8.1%	28.4%	22.8%	26.5%
Asian CVAP	5,389	14,212	5,386	8,059	8,330	2,916	1,883
Asian CVAP %	11.2%	33.3%	13.0%	16.9%	24.5%	8.5%	5.8%
Black CVAP	7,969	7,266	13,858	5,792	8,286	16,351	16,124
Black CVAP %	16.5%	17.0%	33.5%	12.1%	24.4%	47.8%	49.3%

District A





2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,533	-594	-0.9%	38,259	61.2%	7,392	11.8%	7,061	11.3%	9,821	15.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
48,182	30,898	64.1%	3,926	8.1%	5,389	11.2%	7,969	16.5%		

District B
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
64,405	1,278	2.0%	21,446	33.3%	11,247	17.5%	22,586	35.1%	9,126	14.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
42,654	16,331	38.3%	4,844	11.4%	14,212	33.3%	7,266	17.0%		

District C

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population






Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
61,916	-1,211	-1.9%	24,550	39.7%	10,582	17.1%	9,679	15.6%	17,105	27.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
41,421	17,766	42.9%	4,412	10.7%	5,386	13.0%	13,858	33.5%		

District D

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population






Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
64,430	1,303	2.1%	38,426	59.6%	7,486	11.6%	10,936	17.0%	7,582	11.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
47,686	29,994	62.9%	3,840	8.1%	8,059	16.9%	5,792	12.1%		

District E

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population






Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
63,655	528	0.8%	10,592	16.6%	30,443	47.8%	12,295	19.3%	10,325	16.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
33,943	7,670	22.6%	9,656	28.4%	8,330	24.5%	8,286	24.4%		

District F

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,314	-813	-1.3%	11,034	17.7%	27,833	44.7%	3,720	6.0%	19,727	31.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
34,175	7,101	20.8%	7,808	22.8%	2,916	8.5%	16,351	47.8%		


District G




2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,638	-489	-0.8%	8,122	13.0%	32,040	51.2%	3,643	5.8%	18,833	30.1%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
32,704	6,023	18.4%	8,674	26.5%	1,883	5.8%	16,124	49.3%		





2020 Census


	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Population	64,887	63,467	64,234	61,621	63,983	60,878	62,821
Deviation	1,760	340	1,107	-1,506	856	-2,249	-306
Deviation %	2.8%	0.5%	1.8%	-2.4%	1.4%	-3.6%	-0.5%
Other	31,261	32,877	15,619	39,357	16,562	9,575	7,178
Other %	48.2%	51.8%	24.3%	63.9%	25.9%	15.7%	11.4%
Latino	10,335	7,609	14,539	6,388	25,727	28,469	33,956
Latino %	15.9%	12.0%	22.6%	10.4%	40.2%	46.8%	54.1%
Asian	7,164	12,694	22,090	8,562	12,139	3,839	3,432
Asian %	11.0%	20.0%	34.4%	13.9%	19.0%	6.3%	5.5%
Black	16,127	10,287	11,986	7,314	9,555	18,995	18,255
Black %	24.9%	16.2%	18.7%	11.9%	14.9%	31.2%	29.1%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)




	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Total CVAP	44,809	49,571	38,507	48,416	36,647	31,376	31,439
Other CVAP	22,882	27,043	11,172	32,369	12,015	5,246	5,055
Other CVAP %	51.1%	54.6%	29.0%	66.9%	32.8%	16.7%	16.1%
Latino CVAP	3,958	4,956	5,176	3,466	8,685	7,926	8,992
Latino CVAP %	8.8%	10.0%	13.4%	7.2%	23.7%	25.3%	28.6%
Asian CVAP	4,593	8,406	13,364	6,514	8,771	2,743	1,785
Asian CVAP %	10.3%	17.0%	34.7%	13.5%	23.9%	8.7%	5.7%
Black CVAP	13,376	9,167	8,795	6,067	7,176	15,461	15,606
Black CVAP %	29.9%	18.5%	22.8%	12.5%	19.6%	49.3%	49.6%

District A





2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
64,887	1,760	2.8%	31,261	48.2%	10,335	15.9%	7,164	11.0%	16,127	24.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
44,809	22,882	51.1%	3,958	8.8%	4,593	10.3%	13,376	29.9%		

District B
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
63,467	340	0.5%	32,877	51.8%	7,609	12.0%	12,694	20.0%	10,287	16.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
49,571	27,043	54.6%	4,956	10.0%	8,406	17.0%	9,167	18.5%		

District C





2020 Census







Citizen Voting Age Population







Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
64,234	1,107	1.8%	15,619	24.3%	14,539	22.6%	22,090	34.4%	11,986	18.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
38,507	11,172	29.0%	5,176	13.4%	13,364	34.7%	8,795	22.8%		

District D
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
61,621	-1,506	-2.4%	39,357	63.9%	6,388	10.4%	8,562	13.9%	7,314	11.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
48,416	32,369	66.9%	3,466	7.2%	6,514	13.5%	6,067	12.5%		

District E
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
63,983	856	1.4%	16,562	25.9%	25,727	40.2%	12,139	19.0%	9,555	14.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
36,647	12,015	32.8%	8,685	23.7%	8,771	23.9%	7,176	19.6%		

District F
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
60,878	-2,249	-3.6%	9,575	15.7%	28,469	46.8%	3,839	6.3%	18,995	31.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
31,376	5,246	16.7%	7,926	25.3%	2,743	8.7%	15,461	49.3%		

District G


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,821	-306	-0.5%	7,178	11.4%	33,956	54.1%	3,432	5.5%	18,255	29.1%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
31,439	5,055	16.1%	8,992	28.6%	1,785	5.7%	15,606	49.6%		



2020 Census


	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Population	66,869	62,090	62,252	61,912	63,965	61,982	62,821
Deviation	3,742	-1,037	-875	-1,215	838	-1,145	-306
Deviation %	5.9%	-1.6%	-1.4%	-1.9%	1.3%	-1.8%	-0.5%
Other	31,824	32,740	15,056	39,032	16,553	10,046	7,178
Other %	47.6%	52.7%	24.2%	63.0%	25.9%	16.2%	11.4%
Latino	10,572	7,431	14,302	6,391	25,721	28,650	33,956
Latino %	15.8%	12.0%	23.0%	10.3%	40.2%	46.2%	54.1%
Asian	7,538	12,401	21,716	8,750	12,139	3,944	3,432
Asian %	11.3%	20.0%	34.9%	14.1%	19.0%	6.4%	5.5%
Black	16,935	9,518	11,178	7,739	9,552	19,342	18,255
Black %	25.3%	15.3%	18.0%	12.5%	14.9%	31.2%	29.1%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)




	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Total CVAP	46,313	47,911	37,003	49,313	36,603	32,183	31,439
Other CVAP	23,328	26,355	10,726	32,805	11,992	5,522	5,055
Other CVAP %	50.4%	55.0%	29.0%	66.5%	32.8%	17.2%	16.1%
Latino CVAP	4,096	4,830	5,038	3,518	8,679	8,007	8,992
Latino CVAP %	8.8%	10.1%	13.6%	7.1%	23.7%	24.9%	28.6%
Asian CVAP	4,866	7,970	13,091	6,818	8,763	2,883	1,785
Asian CVAP %	10.5%	16.6%	35.4%	13.8%	23.9%	9.0%	5.7%
Black CVAP	14,022	8,756	8,149	6,173	7,170	15,772	15,606
Black CVAP %	30.3%	18.3%	22.0%	12.5%	19.6%	49.0%	49.6%

District A





2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
66,869	3,742	5.9%	31,824	47.6%	10,572	15.8%	7,538	11.3%	16,935	25.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
46,313	23,328	50.4%	4,096	8.8%	4,866	10.5%	14,022	30.3%		

District B
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,090	-1,037	-1.6%	32,740	52.7%	7,431	12.0%	12,401	20.0%	9,518	15.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
47,911	26,355	55.0%	4,830	10.1%	7,970	16.6%	8,756	18.3%		

District C





2020 Census







Citizen Voting Age Population







Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,252	-875	-1.4%	15,056	24.2%	14,302	23.0%	21,716	34.9%	11,178	18.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
37,003	10,726	29.0%	5,038	13.6%	13,091	35.4%	8,149	22.0%		

District D

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
61,912	-1,215	-1.9%	39,032	63.0%	6,391	10.3%	8,750	14.1%	7,739	12.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
49,313	32,805	66.5%	3,518	7.1%	6,818	13.8%	6,173	12.5%		


District E
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
63,965	838	1.3%	16,553	25.9%	25,721	40.2%	12,139	19.0%	9,552	14.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
36,603	11,992	32.8%	8,679	23.7%	8,763	23.9%	7,170	19.6%		


District F
2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
61,982	-1,145	-1.8%	10,046	16.2%	28,650	46.2%	3,944	6.4%	19,342	31.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
32,183	5,522	17.2%	8,007	24.9%	2,883	9.0%	15,772	49.0%		



District G



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
62,821	-306	-0.5%	7,178	11.4%	33,956	54.1%	3,432	5.5%	18,255	29.1%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
31,439	5,055	16.1%	8,992	28.6%	1,785	5.7%	15,606	49.6%		

DISTRICT 1 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest /Comments & Questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Judith Huarte	No comments	Yes
Debra Israel	Advocate for Tenant & homeless Rights and Racial Justice	No
C Leonard	Concerned with Gentrification/What are the goals of Redistricting?	Yes
Ahmed Ali Bob	Interested in Geography, Landmarks, Sense of Belonging/Wanrs Equitable Distribution of Resources	Yes
Jeremy Gormley	How do school boundries separate Students by Wealth and <i>Race</i> ?	Yes
Gracie Osborne	Definition: A community of Interest is a population with at least one commonality in their demographic. I think districts should include populations with different views, so splitting with no bias towards constitutes' political beliefs.	No
Owen	Bushels/Santa Fe, North/West Oakland/How will Oakland population growth modify the map?	Yes
Kevin	My community of interest is the community that wants to end the distribution of drugs to minors.	No
eren	The County of Alameda redistricting currently occurring is it should stay the same and should not change. Or it should change and be a bit more organized. Since I do not live in Oakland I still do think that it a necessity to redistrict the areas as it might affect a community in that area .	No
Kent Ly	My interest in my community is that I want all the districts to be equally represented and all the districts to be eveny populated.	No
River Tuason	My COI would be environmental issues.	Yes
Escher Pearce	I believe we should add a community of interest that is a equal mix of different ethnicity that share the same democratic interest.	No
Donovan	I think my Community of Interest is by location in the City of Oakland.	No
Barry Fong	I believe that my community of interest in the county would be location and the have an even population split.	No
Becky Scribner	Piedmont Ave / Rockridge / Temescal... the area bordered by 580/Telegraph/13/Piedmont. All share common characteristics of having thriving business districts that draw visitors from within and beyond the neighborhood. And these neighborhoods have high walkability, which drives a shared need for public transportation and safety. Within our district, there is huge variability in school quality. How can we ensure equity across the public schools in our district when it comes to programming, facilities, teachers, and outside (PTA) funding? Can we require all PTA funds go into a shared pool equally distributed across the district?	No
Mai Dinh	I believe my community, the city of Oakland should be equality divided by their location.	No
Matthew Kaplan	What is the commission looking to value/prioritize with redistricting?	No
Josh Shinoff	Claremont Hills/The district should be drawn to group the areas with common interests together, not arbitrary geographies	
Nigel Feng	I think my Community of Interest is by location in the City of Oakland.	No
Denise Dang	Can we please make the North and Eastern parts of District 1 above Hwy 24 part of Berkeley? Our area is neglected by Oakland given that it is so far away from the communities and would be better served by Berkeley given the proximity.	
Brooke A Levin	Interested in having Lake Merritt defined as a Community of Interest. Now its in D-2 and D-3. With the population of D-3 exceeding the level for a district it should shift the boundry to D-2 and encompass the Lake.	Yes

DISTRICT 1 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest /Comments & Questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Alice butler	5882 margarido dr was in the Hillcrest school district when we purchased this house in 1976. We sent our youngest child to Hillcrest. This area must be zoned for Hillcrest.	Yes
Jody London	I was on the School Board for 12 years (2009-2020). It is important that districts represent diverse socioeconomic groups. We inherited the redlined housing system that currently comprises our city. Can we use the redistricting process to address historic injustice and disproportionality?	No

DISTRICT 2 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest /Comments & Questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Tom Coleman	Admas Point, Asian American Community, LGBTQ	Yes
Anna	Rancho Antonio Neighborhood, Concerned with Homeless Ecampments and Crime	Yes
Angela Crone	Values Essential Needs Businesses	Yes
Jason La	My COI should be divided by the location and have a even population split	No
Rebecca Dean	Lake Merritt/How will you ensure equal access to representation for communities in Oakland when we are such a diverse city?	Yes
Hydeh Ghaffari	I live along Lake Merritt. We would like to be able to walk safely to and from these areas without fear of being mugged. Without passing blatant drug dealers. And we would like to be able to drive on Grand, Bellevue and Perkins Avenues without blowing tires on potholes. While we want to see the homeless fed and safely sheltered, and the violence citywide reduced, we would like our immediate community concerns represented fairly, as well.	No
Mason Sam	Community of interests are defined as communities that share the same historic values. The district lines in Oakland feel natural and are split well. However, I believe that the district lines should still be split by wealth and population. For example, I would have the Oakland hills be divided into two separate districts and mold the three other districts in Oakland based on population.	No
Hanna Bliss	I live in Chinatown. So my only community is the commercial center. I am a huge fan of safe bike lanes. I especially like the ones where there is a clear barrier between the car traffic and bikes.	No
Anthony Rodriguez	I am not sure, I don't know what COIs are	
Ryan Lester	Clinton, East Lake/District 4 seems like the oddest district to me... Primarily representing the Oakland Hills but them coming down and representing the "Fairfax" neighborhood in East Oakland (I used to live on Fairfax Ave). If CM Thao's budget priorities are any indication, her office is most focused on capital improvement projects to Oakland Hills Parks and restrooms vs. the more dire needs of her constituents in the "flats". I think such a lopsided district (mainly hills and a tiny bit of the "flats" does not ensure equitable representation to those flatland residents since the hills residents have more political capital). Are unhoused/homeless residents counted as "residents" of a certain district? I'd imagine 4-10k unhoused residents who primarily live in East and West Oakland would increase the weight of the districts those people live in. Separately, most of the population, population growth, jobs, transit and resources are in West and East Oakland vs. North Oakland and the Oakland Hills. I'd advocate for trying to divide the districts in a way that centers most of the districts in the "flats" while equitably distributing representation of the hills amongst the 7 districts. Also, the city should eliminate the at-large city council seat, at large seats are shown to be discriminatory and typically result in electing officials that are not representative of the places they serve.	
Matt Matusiewicz	I would love to engage with my community more and become more actively involved with community development in Oakland.	
Mary Bowman	Lakeshore Homeowners Association/no gerrymandering	

DISTRICT 3 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest /Comments & Questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Karen Streichr	Advocate for Housing Rights. Living Wages, Public Safety	No
Daniel Tischler	Downtown Oakland/No Council District is Focused Downtown, Little Representation, Downtown is carved up between West Oakland and San Antonio Eastlake	Yes
MARIO PALESTINI	Lake Merritt/ Need More Policing Crime is Driving People Out Oakland	No
Penny Righthand	Lake Merritt/Public Safety is not being Addressed or Terepresented Fairly	Yes
Liz Brisson	Uptown Neighborhood/ no further comments or questions	No
Jay Toulouse	Community Volunteer, Scientist, Lesbian/ N Redistricting Comments	Yes
Mavin Carter Griffin	Arts culture and racial equity we are the. Largest UNHOUSED community living both curb and deeply interested in our future our identity our story's. The City needs to recognize The Wood Street People's Collective as a Campus sovereign of west Oakland s UNHOUSED Panther and burner community and know we are voters and interested in something different than ANYTHING yet produced See Mavin Carter Griffin for more VITAL information. Repaiations Recovery and New innovation is our Community of random citizens proudly of Oakland.We want to be considered as neighbors and relivently a emerging cultural voice eminated from 15 years or more of homelessness. We are a voice and we are humans in interest without REAL INCLUSIVE NEWS OR ENTRY TO BE COUNTED AS THE HOUSED ARE.	Yes
Larry Platt, MD	Adams Morgan Lake Merritt/Please stop allowing the amplified music that is happening two or three times a week at the Boathouse. It is inappropriate and unhealthy and is enjoyed by only a few dozen people at the expense of hundreds of residents in my COI's.	Yes
Pedro Mendoza	I would define my community of interest as a public safety community	No
hussein omar	My community needs a lot of work but i would say we focus on drug abuse and speeding in my area	No
Adam	You can define them by their similar living qualities and their needs as a place of worship, groceries stores, liquor stores, schools, parks, and many others/Are there updates that can change the placement of the district we currently have today?	No
Susan Fox	Lake Merritt resident who values access to a city park for all Oakland residents/	No
Carol Wyatt	My community of interest is both economic and crime prevention oriented. Seeing more economic opportunities for our businesses and residents is imperative for poverty intervention. Seeing small incubator businesses in our corridors that allow us to hire locally and keep resources and dollars in our community is essential.	No
YaVette Holts	Black owned businesses/We are interested to keep our business members aware of the process of how and why redistricting happens and how district boundaries affect their bottom line	Yes
Ay'Anna Moody	I consider neighborhood and schools my COI. I want to make sure the next school bond measure passed goes to remodeling and supporting McClymonds HS. The school has needed these financial resources for quite some time	Yes
Steve Sims	Would you consider multi-member constituencies elected via proportional, ranked lists?	Yes
Cameron Robertson	My idea of a COI is a community where people share the same interests.	No
Tom Dapice	District 3 should be split into West Oakland and downtown / Lake Merritt so that West Oakland gets better representation.	Yes

DISTRICT 3 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest /Comments & Questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
		No
Reisa Jaffe	<p>My community of interest are people who are working to eliminate white supremacy and raise the quality of life of those most in need. Housing as a human right. Paying a living wage. People who understand public safety goes beyond policing. "As a new Commission, we want the community to know of the work we are doing and will strive to make the redistricting process as open and transparent as possible." - What specific things will you be doing to accomplish this goal?</p>	
	<p>This is all new to me. I would need to do more research and get a better understanding of COI. I would like to know why the Commission is seeking redistricting. What made the City decide that it should be redistricted. How will redistricting change my neighborhood? What changes are going to be made in District 3 where I live. I would like to compare the current District 3 with the new proposed District 3.</p>	No
Mercedes S. Rodriguez	<p>I suggest you consider using school attendance boundaries as COIs. The current attendance boundaries are here: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=e2d956e81eaf4a45b24b705e76b7871e&extent=-122.4784,37.7048,-121.9901,37.8847</p>	No
Helen Hutchison		
Julia Epstein	<p>Jack London Square/Please ensure that people of color, people who work multiple jobs, people with disabilities, and immigrants are able to vote.</p>	

DISTRICT 4 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Santiago Rascon	A community of intrest is a community who has similar ideals and morals, thus they lead themselves in a headstrong way inorder to maintain such ideals and morals.	No
Mason Sam	The district lines in Oakland feel natural and are split well. However, I believe that the district lines should still be split by wealth and population. For example, I would have the Oakland hills be divided into two separate districts and mold the three other districts in Oakland based on population.	No
Cameron Robertson	My idea of a COI is a community where people share the same interests	No
Cesar Ramirez	Economic Interest /try to have an even split of people.	No
Ed Gerber	Montclair & adjacent hill areas/I believe the Commission should have an in-depth presentation of the conceptual alternatives open to it. For example a continuation of the current system with a number of districts which go flats to hills vs a system which would focus more on community of interest. No attention should be given to the effect on incumbent CMs.	Yes
Rory Brown	Community defined neighborhoods make a community not marketing defined neighborhoods	Yes
Kimberly Hudson	How will Oakland's African-American homeless and under-housed be considered or counted in the redistricting efforts?	No
Tara	My communities are queer and trans people, BIPOC (I am Filipinx), artists, lower middle class, children of immigrants. I'm originally from the Sacramento area and moved to Oakland in 2014.	No
Joseph Karwat	My COIS are not related to any ethnic or economic grouping that would be district centric. Can you be a bit more transparent as to your priorities and methodology. Are we rebalacing the districts based on population, income,	Yes
James Wood	I live in a rich, diverse community near Dimond Park. I attend church in the Fruitvale, shop in the Fruitvale and go to many businesses in the Laurel. Giving voting patterns I believe that those living in the hills have a power beyond their numbers in determining outcome of elections. Representation should begin with a diversity of population	Yes
Christopher Gulli	Montclair, Oakland Hills/What is the timeline for producing the districts?	Yes
Susan Sache	How can our districts help bring our various neighborhoods and people together?	No
Lauren	How are you advertising these meetings? How are you getting feedback from people? How are you bundling outreach about them with other services people are already receiving? What are the goals, and are they the same as the last redistricting process?	Yes
Sandra More	Sing Thing Family Singing, Friends of Sausal Creek, Regional Parks, Friends ofDimond Park, Friends of the Dimond Library. Just a hope that you will be fair and you will take racial barriers into consideration	No
Philip La Barbera	Oakland hills, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone/The district lines seem to encompass communities/areas of the city which do not have common priorities. Indeed, there sometimes seems to be animosity between these communities which results in the council member having to 'choose sides' rather than represent constituents equitably.	Yes
Christine Rall	My neighbors are working class people from diverse cultures. The housing is mixed and we only have a few community meeting places; Melrose library and various churches. No banks or major grocery chains. What are your goals that will matter to the community?	No
Lisa Orta	My COI is racially and ethnically diverse, LGBTQ identified, and professional. How will redistricting foster equity and inclusion with respect to the distribution of city resources?	No

DISTRICT 4 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Deb	First generation Asian-American; PD supporters. Asians against violence/	No
Lisa Ruhland	Middle class homeowner. Oakland native Patriotic American	

DISTRICT 5 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Mixtli	Our religious heritage, sexual orientation, and gender should not be used to divide us people	No
Luz	My community of interest in Oakland is that we should be equally split. This means that we should not be divided categories based on our skin color, gender, or sexual orientation.	No
Maria Longinos	I would define community of interest as poeple that share the same values. I think Oakland should be splitt according to which part of Oakland they live in. For example grouping Oakland hills together rather than grouping East Oakland with the hills.	No
Hellen Martin	In my community of interest of the City of Oakland, people that live in the same community should be grouped together.	No
Christopher Nguyen	I define my community of interest as ethnic, racial, and religious groups. I believe a few community of interest's that should be implemented into the City of Oakland is primarily location, racial groups, and religious belief groups.	No
Ximena Sanchez	For my community of interest I would think that districts should be divided by location and equally spacing districts.	No
Xavier Alonga-Piring	A community of interest should be grouped by the location and population of the area.	No
Edward McNichols	Dimond/Laurel . Walkable from the neighborhood. Nearly all commercial, community, and social activities in my neighborhood are conducted there but we are not in the district. Neighborhoods should be districted with the community of interest nearest to them	Yes
Kathleen Archambeau	Glenview Neighborhood; LGBTQ/Survey residents before making decisions — Bravo!	Yes
Catherine Barale	Glenview/A major concern for us is dealing with crime in Oakland overall and our area in particular. One thing we discuss is moving out of Oakland to a lower crime city. Recent City Council decisions have made this issue even more significant.	No
Joanna Alvarez	What does the Oakland Redirecting Commission? Might volunteer if I know what it is I would be doing	Yes
Bob Feinbaum	This poorly defined concept leads to balkanized representation rather than representation that benefits the entire community. That is why Oakland's current city council is perhaps the worst governing body in California. We need smart, fair, responsible leaders not politically correct hacks who are only concerned with "their people" and not anyone else. The districts are currently drawn to favor incumbents. Draw fair districts that encompass all types of voters	No
Harriet C Hutchinson	I am VERY concerned that no OUSD board member or administrative staff member knows that this committee is meeting! Also, ALL of the public meetings are the same day and time as the OUSD school board meetings!	Yes

DISTRICT 5 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Caleb Smith	I live in the Glenview. I consider myself to be part of the "foothills" community of interest. I define this community of interest as being all the neighborhoods below Highway 13 and above Highway 580. This would be Glenview, Diamond, Laurel, etc. This is a natural community of interest because we all go to the same neighborhood retail (Glenview or Diamond), all access the same public library (Diamond) and have a somewhat similar set of concerns (traffic safety and property crime, though more concern about violent crime than those above Highway 13 and less concern about illegal dumping than those below Highway 580). We have a distinct voice, vote distinctively, and our schools are some of the most integrated in Oakland. Please put Glenview in the same council district as the Diamond and Oakmore neighborhoods (and ideally the Laurel). Whether this means expanding District 5 or simply moving Glenview into District 4, this would give the foothills a strong voice instead of leaving them awkwardly split between two districts	No
Michael Gabriel	Glenview District/Glenview should be in one District. It is currently split between 2 districts.	Yes
Chris Harper	Dimond and Glenview/I am particularly interested in Districts 4 and 5. I have lived in what is currently District 5 for 27 years. My community service takes place in District 4 (Dimond). The last 4 District 4 council members know my face and name. Through no fault (as far as I know) no District 5 representative knows my name. The gerrymandered districts create inefficiencies and hamper the effectiveness of representative government. Please consider adding *all* of the Glenview neighborhood to District 4. This will benefit both District 5 and 4 residents.	Yes
Jody Silver	How many districts are being considered? How are people who are usually underrepresented going to be better considered in the redistricting process?	No
Josh frank	Not a concept I've ever considered. Maybe sharing socioeconomic disposition, geographic location? What criteria will you use to redistrict ?	Yes
Corinne DeLuca	Diversity, opportunities for diverse populations to own in our neighborhood, school excellence, community crime watch, school yard access during off school hours.	No
Lisa Zemelman	District 4 and 5 are ridiculous shapes—I do not believe the councilperson for either area addresses issues on the side of 580 that is separate from the bulk of their district. I used to be in district 4 (represented by Jean Quan) and was at some point moved into district 5, now represented by Noel Gallo. I notice all of Gallo's efforts are aimed at the area around International Blvd. and Sheng Thao's efforts are focused on the hills.	No

DISTRICT 5 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Mailisha Chesney	I spend the most time in the Dimond District. I also connect with Glenview, Montclair, Piedmont Ave., Temescal, and Rockridge. I like the Laurel District too, but it's kinda scuzzy these days. My concern is that Oakland is a very segregated city - there are little pockets of "like-kind people," but there isn't as much true integration as there should be in a city this diverse. And nowhere is it as evident as in our schools. For example, you will see that schools with a lot of black children will often NOT have hardly any white children. The kids at Chabot Elementary look very, very different from the kids at Manzanita, as an example. There are many complicated reasons for this - mostly outright racism and anti-black bias. True, meaningful integration should be our top priority. It is the only way we can move forward and truly educate everyone in a more equitable way. Plus, we ALL need that integration for our betterment.	No
Ilene Philipson	I think District 5 is divided up in such a way that our Council Member represents the majority of the district which lives below 580 rather than the smaller number of residents living above 580. The Glenview seems to be gerrymandered into District 5 whereas I think we should be in District 1 or 4.	No
Elisha Greenwell	Black Women Homeowners Artists Organizers Entrepreneurs Dancers/How can we ensure every district has access to similar level of resources including public transport, green space, retail, nightlife, etc.	No
Cynthia Elliott	Maintain the Latinx culture in D5. Keep D5 affordable for working class, artists & multigenerational families.	No
Audrey	Black Oaklanders, working class/Who is on the commission, how are communities actively recruited?	No
Ismael Plasencia	Equity and inclusivity	No
Feleciai Favroth	Concerned about lack of businesses in East Oakland	Yes
Ometha Harris	Does doing this help or f further alienate the poor and the black population of Oakland Jingletown neighborhood (geographic). The arts/ culture/ design community (shared interest and skills across the city).	Yes
Annie Ledbury	Community organizing and creative resident engagement. Im a third generation Fruitvale resident . my COI is wide...the Creative communities; marginalized groups; women; seniors etc.../what are the criteria you are using to redraw districts or create new ones? How will the demographics of the city be represented in an equitable way on city council responsibilities and distribution of funds etc	Yes
Diane Sanchez Mixtli		No

DISTRICT 6 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Yarely	I would define my community of interest as being segregated by even numbers and communities we have self-segregated.	No
Mai Dinh	My interest in my community is have equality for all. I believe my community, the city of Oakland should be equality divided by their location.	No
mario gilberto monterroso	my community interest in low-income and there is a mix of Latin Americans and Americans. A strict should have opposite demographic so they can how completion between each other.	No
Alisson Herrera	I define my community as a good place where neighbors share same cultures and get along even if it is dangerous. I would say that the cops should always be checking the area to reduce crime	No
jeremiah	You can define them by similar living qualitys and the need of them like places or worship, lique stores, schools and many more.I feel like we could use ethnicity and should be taken into account because peidmont have a better education then west oakland.	No
Amy Tharpe Peterson	African-American, low-to moderate income renters and homeowners, local businesses, and the homeless. I would like to ensure that Oaklands districts represent the economic and social diversity that is unique to the City. We should not homogenous districts.	Yes
Ruben Briones	My community of interest includes the Seminary area. It is usually cut off at 57th but it's really 55th. We also belong to the International Blvd corridor since we are only 2 blocks away. Lastly, we are bounded by the NCPC 27Y. Splitting up the Bancroft or Foothill Blvd does not work. For example, we have a tremendous problem with speeding along that corridor. Having to coordinate with 2 council members is a challenge because they are not political allies.	No
Jasmine Gonzalez	The deep east Oakland community is a community plagued by inequitable and racist practices. We have been dealing with illegal dumping for over a decade. Lawlessness prevails. We are afraid of walking in our own communities. We are disproportionately affected by environmental toxins and pollution coming from racist city permitting processes. The relationship with city officials appears to be most present around election time. The mayor and Loren Taylor cross picket lines to make partner up with mass polluters such as AB&I Foundry plant. How can redistricting improve living conditions for the deep east Oakland community?	No
Maxine Visaya	Maxwell Park/Strive to be inclusive and equitable in this process	No Yes
Prescott	Located between seminary and 73rd st and between MacArthur and the MLK shoreline./How can our district boundaries build more power and connect for our communities and especially those who are burdened by financial and housing issues?	
Yolanda Scott	How will redistributing positively impact d6 and d7?	No

DISTRICT 7 - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Jose Isido	My interest in the community is a better way of dividing the districts in a more balanced way regardless of economic status.	No
Alexandra Sandoval	I think the City of Oakland is split well but should be split based on wealth and population.	No
Alvaro Esquivel	My definition of COI is people who have similar demographics like wealth and political views. Districts should be unbiased and evenly split in demographics to create competition and create motivation to vote.	No
Hugo Zelada	My community of interest is low income and majority African American. I think the community should be split by population and opposing demographics.	No
Taliyah Jones	A community of interest that I have is that ethnicities should be divided into certain locations.	No
Frank	My community of interest is one that values its neighborhood and wants to see changes in the streets and one that cares for its community. I think that the lines should be drawn by populations.	No
Natalie	The City of Oakland should be grouped by location.	No
Erika Quintero	I think Oakland should be divided by even numbers.	Yes
Alicia Herrera	I define communities of interest by the locations they are in, and the resources that are accessible to them. I believe the city should provide at least two resources, (if needed) for each community. These resources can be helpful for any necessities (ex. food, clothes).	Yes
Joselyn	In the City of Oakland, my community of interest would be dividing people by location.	No
Kidist	The name of the community and its shared culture or characteristics. how can I help the districts	Yes
Eve Delfin	What's the purpose of redistricting? What is the goal of redistricting?	No
Merika Reagan	Deep East Oakland	Yes
Dian J. Harrison	Resident of the City of Oakland (District 7), and involved in several community based organizations, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Black Women Organized for Political Action, where I live (Black community). There needs to be transparent communications with the community to ensure that citizens know when the meetings are and where they can get information.	Yes
Allie Whitehurst	I'll try to attend meetings to get a better understanding of how the commission will make decisions.	Yes
TJ Shah	East Oakland resident, Brookfield Village, person of color.	No
sylvia	I'd like to know about the public hearing dates. Have those been scheduled?	No
	My community is Cox (District 7) is very diverse and of various income levels. There very few successful business in the community and few that are not hispanic the stores seem to be for them only Lots of room for improvement. There needs to be	Yes
Michael McDaniel	efforts to improve the business community between 73rd and 98th	
David Banks	How do I become a representative?	Yes

NO DISTRICT ID - Comments from the Public Survey

<u>Name</u>	<u>Community of Interest/comments and questions</u>	<u>Willing to Volunteer</u>
Genesis	My definition of a community of interest is when a group of people share the same need or want among them. My specific COI is one that is concerned about housing and social injustice in Oakland.	No
Phillip Ta	I define my community of interest as morals	No
Christina Ferracane	City staff person [this question seems esoteric]	No
Jonathan Fong	Oakland Chinatown, Jack London neighborhood/Please keep in mind the racial equity disparities that are so acute still for Oakland, such that redistricting supports political power for those that need it the most to address their needs.	No
Doug		No
Olga Crowe	I work for the City of Oakland and am interested in all of it.	No
Brittani Rudick	Electric Vehicle Manufacturer	No