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# 2021 REDISTRICTING PLANS FOR CITY COUNCIL 

## SUMMARY

On October 29, 2021, the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (Commission) submitted its final report with recommendations and proposed plan in conformance with City Charter requirements recommending revisions to the boundaries of the Los Angeles City Council districts (C.F. 20-0668-S7) (Commission Plan). The Commission report was presented to Council on November 2, 2021, and referred to the Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee for further consideration. In addition, 38 Motions were introduced by Councilmembers proposing adjustments to the Commission's proposed plan, as well as alternative plans.

The Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA), in consultation with the City Attorney, has reviewed the plan submitted for consideration. This report provides a summary review of the Commission Plan, an analysis of the adjustments requested by the 38 Motions, and an analysis of alternative plans to be considered.

It should be noted that the Commission provides their recommendations in two parts. The Summary section of their report recommends adoption of the Commission Plan as presented in Appendix H, while the Recommendation section includes a list of recommendations concerning the future conduct of the City's redistricting process. This report recommends that the Council consider the Commission plan included in the Summary and defer discussion of the additional recommendations.

Upon review of the Commission report, we noted an issue with the representation of population and voter data by race. The Commission used a database provided by its consultant, rather than the database historically used by the City. Further, the Commission only used whole-block geographies. This report uses the City's database, which refines population data according to federal Department of Justice criteria.

In all, analysis of the Commission report and the 38 Motions result in the presentation of three Citywide Council District proposals: two Citywide Adjustment, 21 Regional District adjustments; 11 Agreed-Upon adjustments; three Policy adjustments; and one retraction. It is recommended that Council evaluate the three Citywide proposals.

## RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council:

1. Adopt a plan with any necessary adjustments;
2. Refer the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission recommendations concerning future redistricting processes to the Rules and Elections Committee for further consideration;
3. Instruct the Bureau of Engineering to prepare the metes and bounds for the adopted map and submit them to the City Attorney to support the necessary ordinance no later than November 29, 2021; and
4. Request the City Attorney to prepare and transmit the necessary ordinance no later than November 30, 2021.

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Any potential fiscal impacts are undetermined at this time.

## BACKGROUND

Every ten years following the decennial U.S. Census, the Los Angeles City Charter, Section 204, requires that district boundaries for the City Council be redrawn so that each district is substantially equal in population as possible and practicable so that communities have equal access to political representation. As part of this process, a twenty-one member Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (Commission) was formed with members from the public appointed by the City's elected officials. The Commission is required to prepare and present Council District boundaries that conform with state and federal law and, where possible, keep neighborhoods and communities intact, use natural boundaries and streets, and be geographically compact. The Commission has the authority to make recommendations to the City Council on redistricting plans that set boundaries for the Council Districts until the next decennial U.S. Census. The Commission serves in an advisory role with final approval coming from the Council and Mayor.

Redistricting is primarily done using the U.S. Census data, which would have traditionally been released around March 31, 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020 U.S. Census data was delayed until August 12, 2021, five months later than usual. The delay in the release of the U.S. Census data extended the completion deadline for the Commission by approximately two months. The Los Angeles Administrative Code (LAAC) Section 2.21 establishes the deadlines applicable to the Commission, which were extended from August 31, 2021, to October 29, 2021 (Ordinance No. 187190). Per the City Charter, the redistricting process for the City of Los Angeles must be completed no later than December 31, 2021.

The forthcoming redistricting ordinance will contain a detailed metes-and-bounds description of the final Council boundaries. Preparation of this document is a technical process that must be completed by the Bureau of Engineering to ensure that the boundaries as adopted are accurate for use in drawing voter precincts and other relevant program boundaries. Council must adopt a final
map in a timely manner to ensure that the redistricting ordinance can be prepared, considered, and approved by the December 31, 2021 deadline.

## COUNCIL DISTRICT PLANS AND ADJUSTMENTS

The following discussion is divided into three parts:

- Review of Key Issues
- Summary of the Commission Plan
- Summary and Review of the Council Motions, including:
- Citywide Adjustments
- Regional Adjustments
- Agreed-Upon Adjustments
- Policy Adjustments

At the end of this discussion, a summary table is provided that compares the Commission Plan with two alternative Citywide Maps.

## KEY ISSUES

The Commission report provides a discussion of their process in developing the Commission Plan. This included the development of Guiding Values, extensive public outreach, consideration of public testimony, and identification of key issues. Several of these key issues were considered during public testimony on multiple occasions, and again most recently on November 2, 2021, when the Commission report was presented to the Council. The following provides a review of several key issues of particular importance.

## Census Data Impacts

Due first to political issues and then to COVID-19, the Census Bureau was unable to complete the 2020 decennial Census in a timely manner and with the same degree of public outreach and field work conducted in previous Censuses. The Census is never perfect and some degree of undercount is expected, but circumstances in 2020 may have led to results not encountered in previous years. An August 2021 study by the UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge found that in Los Angeles County:

- Predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods are most likely to have the largest undercounts in the census.
- Neighborhoods with the greatest percentage of people living below the poverty line were most likely to have undercounts.
- Neighborhoods with larger percentages of renters, as opposed to homeowners, were more likely to have undercounts.
- Census tracts in which most people are U.S.-born were more likely to be accurately counted than predominantly immigrant neighborhoods.

The Commission made an effort to address the undercount, but as noted above, the late delivery of the Census data limited the ability to fully evaluate this issue. The Advancement Project California submitted a report to the Commission titled "Undercount/Overcount: A Report to the LA City Council Redistricting Commission" that evaluated the 2020 Census in October 2021.

However, the findings of this report were not able to fully inform the Commission process due to time limits imposed by the City Charter that obligated the Commission to complete their work.

## Neighborhood Council Splits

Charter Section 204 states that the following criteria must be considering when drawing Council District boundaries:

All districts shall be drawn in conformance with requirements of state and federal law and, to the extent feasible, shall keep neighborhoods and communities intact, utilize natural boundaries or street lines, and be geographically compact.

The Commission determined that keeping Neighborhood Councils intact within a single Council District was a significant priority in their process. Both the 2001 and 2011 commissions also identified this objective as a critical factor when completing their final, proposed maps.

The Commission report indicates that 39 Neighborhood Councils are currently entirely within a single Council District, while their proposed plan provides that 60 Neighborhood Councils would be entirely within a single Council District. Review of the 2011 redistricting process indicates that, at that time, 64 Neighborhood Councils were entirely within a single Council District. It is not clear how this discrepancy occurred between the 2011 analysis and the 2021 analysis. We requested that the Commission provide an explanation of their methodology to allow for a comparison across all proposed plans in this report, but that information was not available as of this writing.

This report, then, provides an analysis of Neighborhood Council splits based on the following methodology:

Using geographic overlays, determination of a split is based on census blocks that can be clearly assigned to a single Neighborhood Council, and excluding splits with less that 100 people to remove divided roads or sliver blocks around district boundaries

Review of the Commission Plan and Citywide Plans below provides the number of Neighborhood Councils that are entire and split.

## Koreatown

Extensive consideration has been given to keeping the Koreatown community intact within a single Council District. This has been a long-term goal of Koreatown residents, with extensive community input having been received in the 2001 and 2011 redistricting processes. Koreatown continued to receive extensive consideration in the 2021 redistricting process, with the Commission making a concerted effort to achieve this goal. The Commission Plan presented to the City Council does recommend keeping Koreatown intact within Council District 10. Much of Koreatown is currently located within Council District 10 in the existing boundaries.

It should be noted that the definition of Koreatown adopted by the Commission was proposed by the Koreatown Redistricting Task Force, modified by the western border of the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council. It is not inclusive of the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council. The Neighborhood Council analysis conducted for this report indicates
that the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council is split between two Council Districts in the Commission Plan, the Minimum Change Map, and the Hybrid Map.

## San Fernando Valley Cross-Over

An element of the Commission's development of draft maps included the creation of regional committees that would consider redistricting in segments of the full map of Los Angeles. The committees were divided into four regions: West, South, East, and the Valley. The boundaries for these segmented regions were not determined based on specific criteria, but were instead loosely defined by the Commission. The regional committees met privately, without public comment, to determine how boundaries within an assigned region would be drawn. Neither of the Commissioners representing bridge districts were included in the Valley regional group and no focused discussion was held on the question of connecting the Valley and the rest of the City.

At the Commission's meeting on September 13, 2021, the regional committees presented their reports and draft maps. The draft map for the Valley region considered a single district that would bridge the San Fernando Valley with portions of the City, with the remainder of districts in the Valley being contained solely within the Valley. This bridge district would run along the 101 Freeway and connect portions of Hollywood with Studio City and other portions of the Valley.

A commissioner questioned whether the regional committee considered alternative arrangements for a bridge district that could connect the City and Valley in other configurations. The regional committee members noted that they did not consider alternatives, as they felt constrained by the Commission's determined regional boundaries.

At the Commission's meeting on September 20, 2021, a motion was considered to propose a single bridge district in the Commission's final report and draft map. Due to the uncertainty regarding map configurations and data analysis, a commissioner proposed an amendment to said motion, suggesting the Commission add the phrase "if feasible" to the declaration. This amendment failed, and the original motion was passed. The Commission's final map contained the same bridge district connecting Hollywood and Studio City along the 101 Freeway, largely unchanged from the draft map presented by the Valley regional committee at the September 13, 2021 meeting.

Because the Commission did not consider alternate configurations for a single bridge district, or arrangements with multiple bridge districts, and due to the lack of participation by representatives from current bridge districts in the Regional process, this limited the conclusions in their final report. Without analysis of alternate arrangements, the Commission did not determine whether their proposed bridge district was most responsive to public input and communities of interest, or whether the implications elsewhere in the map were significant. The regional procedure, the boundaries of which were determined by no specific metrics or analysis, constrained the Commission's ability to provide a cohesive evaluation of the needs of the Valley or the City as a whole.

## Voter Deferral

One of the consequences of redistricting is that some voters will be moved into new districts that will not hold an election on the same schedule as their previous district. Although sometimes referred to as "voter disenfranchisement" it is better understood as voter deferral. The result is a deferral in the time that these voters would again have an opportunity to vote for a

Councilmember. The courts have recognized that this is an unfortunate result of the redistricting process but does not rise to a Constitutional violation. In 2010, the California Redistricting Commission made a policy decision to address voter deferral by instructing their staff to evaluate and, where possible, limit boundary changes that result in voter deferral.

Voter deferral has consequences in two ways. First, a voter may not have an opportunity to vote for a Councilmember for an extended period of time. Analysis of the Commission's map indicates that a number of voters will have waited seven years between elections, for example. The deferral period is particularly lengthy because of the City's recent change to conform its election dates with the Statewide election cycle -- voters in odd-numbered districts last voted in 2017; voters placed in an even-numbered district would not vote again until 2024. Second, voters who established communities of interest and advanced policy objectives in a past election within a single district may be splintered among multiple districts, impacting the ability of that coalition to achieve their objectives.

The Commission received public testimony concerning voter deferral, requesting that the Commission reduce and limit such impacts. The Commission did not adopt such a policy, nor was analysis of such impacts conducted. The data below provides analysis of Voter Deferral for the Citywide Plans presented for consideration, including the Commission Plan.

## COMMISSION PROPOSED PLAN

On October 28, 2021, the Commission adopted a final report and plan that describes boundaries for the 15 City Council Districts. The report recommendations address reform to change the way redistricting is conducted in the future. The executive summary to the report recommends adoption of the districts described in Appendix H of their report.

The Commission conducted an extensive public outreach process, which is fully documented in their report.

Table 1 provides key demographic information describing the proposed districts. Maps of the districts are included in the Commission report. Note that the demographic information provided in Table 1 does not match the demographic information provided in the Commission report. The Commission used definitions of race that do not conform to definitions of race used by the federal Department of Justice (DOJ). Further, the Commission did not have the technical capacity to address block-splits and other boundary refinements necessary to complete the map. The data presented in this report, therefore, adjusts the presentation of the data in a manner that is consistent with past City practice and accounts for block splits and other technical corrections. For reference, the Los Angeles Unified School District Redistricting Commission completed its work using the data protocols used in this report.

As noted above, the Commission Plan incorporates all of Koreatown as defined into Council District 10.

Also, as noted, the Commission made the recognition of Neighborhood Council boundaries a priority and made an effort to prevent or limit splits of these geographies among two or more Council Districts. The Commission reports that they keep 60 of 99 Neighborhood Councils whole within a single Council District, 33 are split between two Council Districts, and six are
split between three Council Districts. The methodology used in this report indicates that 67 Neighborhood Councils are entire in a single Council District; 27 Neighborhood Councils are split between two Council Districts; and five Neighborhood Councils are split between three Council Districts.

A total of population of 206,972 people, including 125,249 citizen voting age population, would be considered Deferred Voters under the Commission Plan. This is the highest number of Deferred Voters among the three plans evaluated.

Table 1
Commission Plan: Key Demographics

| District | Population | Deviation | $\%$Deviation | Percent Race Population |  |  |  | Percent Voting Age Population |  |  |  | Percent Citizen Voting Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Latino | White | Black | Asian | Latino | White | Black | Asian | Latino | White | Black | Asian |
| 01 | 253,762 | -7,049 | -2.7\% | 63.8\% | 11.9\% | 5.0\% | 17.6\% | 60.1\% | 13.4\% | 5.4\% | 19.5\% | 50.4\% | 18.6\% | 8.1\% | 21.6\% |
| 03 | 251,355 | -9,456 | -3.6\% | 15.4\% | 64.6\% | 5.7\% | 11.1\% | 14.4\% | 66.3\% | 5.7\% | 10.7\% | 13.5\% | 71.6\% | 5.9\% | 8.2\% |
| 05 | 275,219 | 14,408 | 5.5\% | 13.4\% | 56.4\% | 5.2\% | 22.0\% | 12.9\% | 56.5\% | 5.3\% | 22.4\% | 11.2\% | 62.3\% | 6.1\% | 19.0\% |
| 06 | 258,930 | -1,881 | -0.7\% | 68.2\% | 15.7\% | 3.4\% | 11.0\% | 65.3\% | 17.2\% | 3.7\% | 12.3\% | 58.6\% | 22.1\% | 5.1\% | 13.4\% |
| 07 | 261,923 | 1,112 | 0.4\% | 68.5\% | 20.2\% | 3.2\% | 6.4\% | 65.4\% | 22.5\% | 3.4\% | 7.0\% | 59.5\% | 27.8\% | 4.4\% | 7.3\% |
| 08 | 259,294 | -1,517 | -0.6\% | 55.9\% | 3.7\% | 34.4\% | 3.0\% | 52.9\% | 4.2\% | 36.3\% | 3.5\% | 40.1\% | 4.7\% | 51.2\% | 2.8\% |
| 09 | 255,399 | -5,412 | -2.1\% | 78.3\% | 3.6\% | 13.3\% | 3.2\% | 75.7\% | 4.4\% | 14.2\% | 4.1\% | 65.1\% | 6.5\% | 24.1\% | 3.5\% |
| 10 | 270,153 | 9,342 | 3.6\% | 46.2\% | 12.1\% | 20.1\% | 18.6\% | 42.6\% | 13.2\% | 21.0\% | 20.3\% | 32.6\% | 16.1\% | 31.9\% | 17.5\% |
| 11 | 274,578 | 13,767 | 5.3\% | 17.9\% | 58.0\% | 4.9\% | 15.9\% | 16.7\% | 59.4\% | 4.8\% | 15.9\% | 15.2\% | 64.6\% | 5.7\% | 13.3\% |
| 12 | 256,026 | -4,785 | -1.8\% | 29.1\% | 42.0\% | 4.9\% | 21.4\% | 27.0\% | 44.4\% | 4.9\% | 21.3\% | 23.5\% | 51.0\% | 5.6\% | 18.7\% |
| 13 | 249,939 | -10,872 | -4.2\% | 41.9\% | 33.9\% | 5.0\% | 16.5\% | 38.8\% | 36.3\% | 5.3\% | 17.0\% | 33.8\% | 41.8\% | 6.3\% | 16.4\% |
| 14 | 260,367 | -444 | -0.2\% | 61.0\% | 16.2\% | 6.1\% | 14.5\% | 56.9\% | 18.2\% | 6.8\% | 16.0\% | 54.5\% | 19.6\% | 7.8\% | 16.7\% |
| 15 | 264,907 | 4,096 | 1.6\% | 63.1\% | 13.9\% | 12.6\% | 7.8\% | 59.8\% | 16.4\% | 12.3\% | 8.8\% | 52.6\% | 21.3\% | 15.6\% | 8.9\% |
| 2 or 4 | 265,525 | 4,714 | 1.8\% | 31.0\% | 51.9\% | 5.3\% | 9.0\% | 28.6\% | 54.0\% | 5.5\% | 9.1\% | 23.1\% | 61.9\% | 6.0\% | 7.9\% |
| 4 or 2 | 254,743 | -6,068 | -2.3\% | 53.6\% | 25.6\% | 5.0\% | 13.5\% | 50.4\% | 28.2\% | 5.2\% | 14.2\% | 41.9\% | 36.8\% | 6.0\% | 14.1\% |

## PLAN ADJUSTMENTS

At its meeting on November 2, 2021, the Council heard the Commission's Report and Councilmembers submitted adjustments for review by the Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee. A total of 38 submissions were received. Attachment A provides copies of both the Motions and a map of the proposed change. Some discrepancies were identified in the text of several Motions, so the intent of those Motions were considered in preparing the related maps.

Motions are organized into four categories:

| 1. Citywide Adjustments | These Motions proposed changes to all Council <br> Districts across the City. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. Regional Adjustments | These Motions propose substantial changes to a <br> regional portion of the City, resulting in a significant <br> change to the population balance in the proposed <br> Commission Plan and a restructuring of multiple other <br> Council Districts. |
| 3. Agreed-Upon Adjustments | These Motions address focused areas with minimal <br> population impacts. All of the Council Districts <br> impacted by these adjustments are in agreement. |
| 4. Policy Adjustments | Several Motions have localized population impacts <br> between two districts. These adjustments are policy <br> decisions for the Council to consider. |

Following submission, each motion was reviewed for its impact on population distribution and deviation, impacts on Neighborhood Council boundaries, and conformance with federal, State, and local redistricting requirements. Results of this analysis are provided below. During the review process, the makers of Motion $46-\mathrm{K}$ retracted their request.

## 1. Citywide Adjustments

Two Motions introduced during Council deliberations on November 2, 2021, proposed alternative map configurations that would result in Citywide Adjustments. These proposals would also incorporate changes included in several of the other Motions introduced at that meeting. The following provides an analysis of these Citywide Adjustments, with reference to other Motions that would be included by reference.

## A. Motion 46-M: Voting Rights Act Minimum Change Map

This proposal would revise the boundaries of the existing Council Districts to reflect population changes resulting from the 2020 U.S. Census in a manner that results in a population deviation less than $10 \%$ and compliance with the Voting Rights Act. Maps of each of the 15 Council Districts are provided in Attachment B.

Table 2 provides demographic and voter information for this Minimum Change Map. This map includes all of Koreatown as defined above in Council District 10. This map includes two districts that cross the Santa Monica Mountains.

The methodology used in this report indicates that 67 Neighborhood Councils are entire in a single Council District; 28 Neighborhood Councils are split between two Council Districts; and four Neighborhood Councils are split between three Council Districts.

A total population of 24,403 people, including 13,808 citizen voting age population, would be considered Deferred Voters under the Commission Plan. This is the lowest number of Deferred Voters among the three plans evaluated.

Motion Inclusions
This Map includes boundaries proposed in the following Motions:

| $46-\mathrm{C}$ | $46-\mathrm{D}$ | $46-\mathrm{E}$ | $46-\mathrm{F}$ | $46-\mathrm{G}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $46-\mathrm{I}$ | $46-\mathrm{L}$ | $46-\mathrm{N}$ | $46-\mathrm{O}$ | $46-\mathrm{S}$ |
| $46-\mathrm{T}$ | $46-\mathrm{U}$ (part) | $46-\mathrm{Y}$ | $46-\mathrm{AA}$ |  |


| Table 2 <br> Minimum Change Map Population Demographics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | Population | Deviation | \% Deviation | Percent Race Population |  |  |  | Percent Voting Age Population |  |  |  | Percent Citizen Voting Age |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Latino | White | Black | Asian | Latino | White | Black | Asian | Latino | White | Black | Asian |
| 01 | 246,340 | $(14,471)$ | -5.5\% | 64.2\% | 12.0\% | 4.4\% | 17.6\% | 60.6\% | 13.6\% | 4.7\% | 19.5\% | 51.3\% | 18.7\% | 6.3\% | 22.5\% |
| 02 | 264,999 | 4,188 | 1.6\% | 41.2\% | 42.8\% | 5.2\% | 8.2\% | 38.5\% | 45.0\% | 5.5\% | 8.5\% | 31.1\% | 53.8\% | 6.3\% | 7.7\% |
| 03 | 271,053 | 10,242 | 3.9\% | 38.5\% | 39.3\% | 5.3\% | 14.4\% | 35.7\% | 42.0\% | 5.3\% | 14.7\% | 29.9\% | 50.2\% | 5.8\% | 13.1\% |
| 04 | 245,357 | $(15,454)$ | -5.9\% | 15.5\% | 59.2\% | 6.1\% | 16.0\% | 14.6\% | 60.5\% | 6.1\% | 15.7\% | 13.6\% | 66.1\% | 6.4\% | 12.9\% |
| 05 | 262,648 | 1,837 | 0.7\% | 12.7\% | 61.8\% | 4.6\% | 17.9\% | 12.3\% | 61.9\% | 4.7\% | 18.3\% | 10.8\% | 67.4\% | 5.0\% | 15.5\% |
| 06 | 269,451 | 8,640 | 3.3\% | 67.3\% | 16.6\% | 3.8\% | 10.6\% | 64.3\% | 18.3\% | 4.0\% | 11.7\% | 56.4\% | 24.3\% | 6.0\% | 12.5\% |
| 07 | 266,276 | 5,465 | 2.1\% | 68.1\% | 20.1\% | 3.3\% | 6.9\% | 65.0\% | 22.3\% | 3.5\% | 7.6\% | 59.0\% | 27.5\% | 4.5\% | 8.0\% |
| 08 | 257,549 | $(3,262)$ | -1.3\% | 57.7\% | 3.0\% | 34.0\% | 2.4\% | 54.7\% | 3.3\% | 36.1\% | 2.9\% | 41.5\% | 3.9\% | 51.1\% | 2.3\% |
| 09 | 256,098 | $(4,713)$ | -1.8\% | 78.2\% | 3.7\% | 13.3\% | 3.3\% | 75.6\% | 4.5\% | 14.2\% | 4.2\% | 64.9\% | 6.7\% | 24.0\% | 3.6\% |
| 10 | 269,199 | 8,388 | 3.2\% | 46.1\% | 12.1\% | 20.3\% | 18.4\% | 42.6\% | 13.2\% | 21.2\% | 20.1\% | 32.4\% | 16.1\% | 32.1\% | 17.4\% |
| 11 | 270,697 | 9,886 | 3.8\% | 17.8\% | 57.6\% | 5.6\% | 15.5\% | 16.6\% | 59.1\% | 5.6\% | 15.5\% | 15.2\% | 64.2\% | 6.2\% | 13.1\% |
| 12 | 270,631 | 9,820 | 3.8\% | 30.2\% | 41.2\% | 4.9\% | 21.1\% | 28.1\% | 43.5\% | 4.9\% | 21.1\% | 24.6\% | 50.1\% | 5.6\% | 18.4\% |
| 13 | 245,778 | $(15,033)$ | -5.8\% | 44.4\% | 30.5\% | 4.8\% | 17.8\% | 41.1\% | 32.9\% | 5.0\% | 18.5\% | 35.7\% | 38.3\% | 6.4\% | 18.0\% |
| 14 | 257,735 | $(3,076)$ | -1.2\% | 60.7\% | 16.3\% | 6.8\% | 14.0\% | 56.6\% | 18.3\% | 7.5\% | 15.4\% | 53.8\% | 19.9\% | 9.3\% | 15.5\% |
| 15 | 258,310 | $(2,501)$ | -1.0\% | 62.7\% | 14.3\% | 12.3\% | 8.0\% | 59.5\% | 16.8\% | 12.1\% | 9.0\% | 52.3\% | 21.8\% | 15.2\% | 9.1\% |

## B. Motion 46-W: Hybrid Map

Motion 46-W proposes an alternative Council District plan that incorporates portions of the Commission Plan as well as portions of a map proposed by the Labor Coalition for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA). The LCLAA map was a full-City proposal submitted to the Commission for consideration, but too late for consideration by the Commission. Upon review of the remaining areas to assign to a Council District, it was determined that Council Districts 1,13 , and 14 could be drawn consistent with the Commission proposal as well. The result is that this Hybrid Map focuses changes on Council Districts 3, 4, and 5, incorporating many of the Motions listed as Regional Adjustments later in this report. Maps of each of the 15 Council Districts are provided in Attachment C.

Due to the limited time available, this proposal provides analysis of a configuration of Council Districts where Council District 4 is the single cross-over district between the Valley and the Central City. An alternate configuration is possible that would designate Council District 5 as the single cross-over district. But because time was not available to complete this analysis, only one hybrid is presented in this report. If Council chooses, such analysis could be conducted. For reference, preliminary analysis indicates that this Hybrid Map option incorporates more of the Motions introduced by Council than does an Alternate Hybrid Map.

Table 3 provides demographic and voter information for this Hybrid Map. The population deviation in this map is $7.4 \%$, compared to $9.6 \%$ in the Commission Plan and $9.8 \%$ in the Minimum Change Map. This map includes all of Koreatown as defined above in Council District 10. This map includes a single Council District that crosses the Santa Monica Mountains.

The methodology used in this report indicates that 69 Neighborhood Councils are entire in a single Council District; 27 Neighborhood Councils are split between two Council Districts; and five Neighborhood Councils are split between three Council Districts.

A total of population of 100,632 people, including 67,714 citizen voting age population, would be considered Deferred Voters under the Commission Plan. This is half the number of Deferred Voters compared to the Commission Plan and approximately four times the number in the Minimum Change Map.

Motion Inclusions
This Map includes boundaries proposed in the following Motions:

| $46-\mathrm{C}$ | $46-\mathrm{D}$ | $46-\mathrm{E}$ | $46-\mathrm{F}$ | $46-\mathrm{G}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $46-\mathrm{I}$ | $46-\mathrm{L}$ | $46-\mathrm{N}$ | $46-\mathrm{O}$ | $46-\mathrm{P}$ |
| $46-\mathrm{Q}$ | $46-\mathrm{R}$ (part) | $46-\mathrm{S}$ | $46-\mathrm{T}$ | $46-\mathrm{U}$ |
| $46-\mathrm{Y}$ | $46-\mathrm{AA}$ | $46-\mathrm{BB}$ | $46-\mathrm{FF}$ | $46-\mathrm{KK}$ |

Table 3
Hybrid Map
Population Demographics

|  |  |  | \% | Percent Race Population |  |  |  | Percent Voting Age Population |  |  |  | Percent Citizen Voting Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | Population | Deviation | Deviation | Latino | White | Black | Asian | Latino | White | Black | Asian | Latino | White | Black | Asian |
| 01 | 251,319 | -9,492 | -3.6\% | 63.7\% | 11.9\% | 5.0\% | 17.6\% | 60.0\% | 13.4\% | 5.4\% | 19.6\% | 50.1\% | 18.7\% | 8.2\% | 21.8\% |
| 02 | 263,614 | 2,803 | 1.1\% | 41.8\% | 42.2\% | 5.3\% | 8.1\% | 39.0\% | 44.4\% | 5.7\% | 8.5\% | 31.9\% | 53.1\% | 6.2\% | 7.7\% |
| 03 | 253,237 | -7,574 | -2.9\% | 37.0\% | 40.5\% | 5.4\% | 14.6\% | 34.2\% | 43.2\% | 5.4\% | 14.8\% | 28.2\% | 51.8\% | 6.0\% | 13.1\% |
| 04 | 255,197 | -5,614 | -2.2\% | 20.1\% | 60.9\% | 5.0\% | 11.0\% | 18.8\% | 62.6\% | 5.0\% | 10.8\% | 16.9\% | 67.8\% | 5.0\% | 9.4\% |
| 05 | 266,361 | 5,550 | 2.1\% | 13.1\% | 57.2\% | 5.2\% | 21.4\% | 12.7\% | 57.3\% | 5.4\% | 21.7\% | 11.1\% | 63.0\% | 6.1\% | 18.3\% |
| 06 | 261,156 | 345 | 0.1\% | 67.9\% | 16.0\% | 3.8\% | 10.5\% | 64.9\% | 17.7\% | 4.0\% | 11.7\% | 57.1\% | 23.7\% | 6.0\% | 12.4\% |
| 07 | 266,297 | 5,486 | 2.1\% | 68.1\% | 20.1\% | 3.3\% | 6.9\% | 65.0\% | 22.3\% | 3.5\% | 7.6\% | 59.0\% | 27.5\% | 4.5\% | 8.0\% |
| 08 | 252,180 | -8,631 | -3.3\% | 57.1\% | 3.1\% | 34.4\% | 2.6\% | 54.1\% | 3.5\% | 36.4\% | 3.0\% | 40.8\% | 4.2\% | 51.4\% | 2.4\% |
| 09 | 255,399 | -5,412 | $-2.1 \%$ | 78.3\% | 3.6\% | 13.3\% | 3.2\% | 75.7\% | 4.4\% | 14.2\% | 4.1\% | 65.1\% | 6.5\% | 24.1\% | 3.5\% |
| 10 | 270,153 | 9,342 | 3.6\% | 46.2\% | 12.1\% | 20.1\% | 18.6\% | 42.6\% | 13.2\% | 21.0\% | 20.3\% | 32.6\% | 16.1\% | 31.9\% | 17.5\% |
| 11 | 270,691 | 9,880 | $3.8 \%$ | 17.8\% | 57.6\% | 5.6\% | 15.5\% | 16.6\% | 59.1\% | 5.6\% | 15.5\% | 15.2\% | 64.2\% | 6.2\% | 13.1\% |
| 12 | 259,543 | -1,268 | -0.5\% | 29.3\% | 42.0\% | 4.9\% | 21.2\% | 27.2\% | 44.3\% | 4.9\% | 21.2\% | 23.7\% | 50.9\% | 5.6\% | 18.5\% |
| 13 | 259,229 | -1,582 | -0.6\% | 41.2\% | $33.0 \%$ | 5.0\% | 18.0\% | 38.3\% | 35.4\% | 5.2\% | 18.5\% | 33.3\% | 40.6\% | 6.6\% | 17.8\% |
| 14 | 262,838 | 2,027 | 0.8\% | 61.1\% | 16.1\% | 6.1\% | 14.5\% | 57.0\% | 18.1\% | 6.8\% | 16.0\% | 54.7\% | 19.5\% | 7.7\% | 16.7\% |
| 15 | 264,907 | 4,096 | 1.6\% | 63.1\% | 13.9\% | 12.6\% | 7.8\% | 59.8\% | 16.4\% | 12.3\% | 8.8\% | 52.6\% | 21.3\% | 15.6\% | 8.9\% |

## 2. Regional Adjustments

There are 21 Motions that are categorized as Regional. Each of these Motions proposes amending the Commission Plan by moving a significant population from one Council District to another. Upon review, each of these Regional Motions would result in significant population changes that would require changes to more than two Council Districts.

Because the Citywide Adjustments discussed above include changes to Council Districts across the City, staff overlaid these Regional Motions on those two maps. The result is that many of the proposed Regional Motions are incorporated into either the Minimum Change Map, the Hybrid Map, or both. Since these are adjustments to the Commission Plan, they are by default not currently in the Commision Plan.

Table 4 shows the population of each Regional Adjustment Motion and whether that particular change is incorporated into the Minimum Change Map or the Hybrid Map. There is a significant challenge in making a determination as to whether the Motions are satisfied in these alternative maps as the Commission map does not designate a number for two of the Council Districts. Furthermore, the reconfiguration of Council Districts in the Commission Plan does not allow for comparison to the Minimum Change Map on several of these proposed Regional Adjustments. Since the Hybrid Map provides flexibility in addressing changes within the central region of the City, there is a greater opportunity to incorporate the Regional Adjustments into the Hybrid Map.

## 3. Agreed-Upon Adjustments

The following adjustments to the Commission Plan have been proposed by several Councilmembers. Each of the Councilmembers affected by the adjustments listed here have reviewed and recommended approval of these adjustments. Review of the demographic and geographic characteristics of these changes indicates that they do not create any concerns with the integrity of the overall plan. They do not significantly increase the deviation from ideal equal population as proposed in the Commission Plan. The Agreed-Upon Adjustments refine the Commission Plan.. The Agreed-Upon Adjustments are also incorporated into the Minimum Change Map and Hybrid Map noted above.

## A. Motion 46-D

Move the portion of Riverside Drive between the Golden State Freeway and Stadium Way from Council District 1 to Council District 13.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: The proposed move would split this section from the Elysian Park Riverside Neighborhood Council, which is whole in the Commission Plan.


## B. Motion 46-E

Move the western half of the Census block bounded by Hayworth Avenue, Whitworth Drive, Fairfax Avenue, and Olympic Boulevard from Council District 10 to Council District 5.

- Resolves the split of Little Ethiopia to keep that community intact in one District.
- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the P.I.C.O. Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.

Table 4
Regional Adjustment Motions

| Motion | Description | Population | Minimum Change <br> Map? | Hybrid <br> Map? |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $46-\mathrm{B}$ | Harvard Heights | 9,102 | No | No |
| $46-\mathrm{C}$ | East Westchester/Ladera | 7,114 | Yes | Yes |
| $46-\mathrm{G}$ | Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Canoga <br> Park, and Winnetka with a portion <br> of Reseda in CD 3 | 108,302 | Yes | Yes |
| $46-\mathrm{H}$ | Various southwest Valley <br> communities |  |  |  |
| $46-\mathrm{J}$ | Crestview |  |  | No |

## C. Motion 46-F

Move the southern boundary of Council District 7 on Burnet Street from Nordhoff to Rayen to include both sides of Burnet Street, moving the necessary parcels from Council District 6 to Council District 7.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the North Hills East Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.


## D. Motion 46-I

Move the residences bordering Pierce College on the western border of the College at El Rancho Drive, De Soto Avenue, and Oxnard Street and on the southern border of the College along Exhibit Place and Aetna Street, from Council District 4-or-2 to Council District 3.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.


## E. Motion 46-L

Move the area beginning at S. Union Avenue and Beverly Boulevard, heading southeast along Beverly Boulevard, then southwest on Union Place to the alley between Beverly Boulevard and W. 2nd Street, then northwest on the alley between Beverly Boulevard and W. 2nd Street, then northeast on S. Union Avenue to Beverly Boulevard from Council District 1 to Council District 13.

- Resolves the exclusion of Unidad Park and Community Garden from CD13.
- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the Westlake North Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.


## F. Motion 46-N

Move the Sun Valley community of Glen Crest Hills from Council District 6 to Council District 2-or-4.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: This move has the potential to further solidify the Sun Valley Neighborhood Council, which would be split under the Commission Plan.


## G. Motion 46-O

Move the area bounded by 43rd Street, 4th Avenue, 43rd Place, 8th Avenue, Vernon Avenue, and Arlington Avenue from Council District 8 to Council District 10.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: This move would further solidify the Empowerment Congress West Neighborhood Council, which would be further split under the Commission Plan.


## H. Motion 46-T

Move the area beginning at Avenue 49 and heading easterly along the south property line of properties fronting York Boulevard to Avenue 54, south on Avenue 54 to the alley between Buchanan Street and York Boulevard, east on the alley between Buchanan Street and York Boulevard to Aldama Street, then east along the rear property lines of the parcels fronting York Boulevard to Figueroa Street, then south along the western property lines of the parcels fronting Figueroa Street to Piedmont Avenue, then south on Piedmont Avenue to Avenue 61, then east on Avenue 61 to Figueroa Street, then south on Figueroa Street to Avenue 60, from Council District 1 to Council District 14.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the Historic Highland Park Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.


## I. Motion 46-Y

Move the area beginning at Hancock Street and Broadway, heading northerly on Hancock Street to George Street, east on George Street to Eastlake Avenue, northerly along the northern segment of Eastlake Avenue to Minnesota Street, easterly along Minnesota Street to Gates Street, north on Gates Street/Abrigo Avenue to Prewett Street, east on Prewett Street to Two Tree Avenue, east on Two Tree Avenue to Thomas Street, south on Thomas Street to Ashland Avenue, north on Ashland Avenue to Pomona Street, east on Pomona Street to Alta Street, north on Alta Street to Flora Avenue, east on Flora Avenue to Lincoln Park Avenue, north on Lincoln Park Avenue to Gillig Avenue, east on Gillig Avenue to Sierra Street, north on Sierra Street to Mercury Avenue, east on Mercury Avenue to Reynolds Avenue, south on Reynolds Avenue to APN 5209009001, south along the easterly border of APN 5209009001 to Metzler Drive, south on Metzler Drive to Broadway, west on Broadway to Hancock Street, from Council District 1 to Council District 14.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the Lincoln Heights and LA32 Neighborhood Councils would already be split under the Commission Plan.


## J. Motion 46-AA

Move the area bounded by West 110th Street, the Harbor Freeway, Imperial Highway, railroad right-of-way that parallels Lanzit Avenue, Compton Creek, and South San Pedro Street from Council District 15 to Council District 8; and move the area bounded by Compton Creek, Central Avenue, 108th Street, and Wadsworth Avenue from Council District 8 to Council District 15.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the Empowerment Congress Southeast

Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.

## K. Motion 46-LL

Move the area beginning at Melrose Avenue and North Arden Boulevard, then east on Melrose Avenue to North Wilton Place, then south to Beverly Boulevard, then west to North Arden Boulevard, then north to Melrose Avenue, from Council District 5 to Council District 13.

- Impact on Neighborhood Councils: None, as the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council would already be split under the Commission Plan.


## 4. Policy Adjustments

Several Motions have a focused, local impact between two Council Districts and either have larger population impact than Agreed-Upon Adjustments or do not have agreement between the affected Council Districts. These require consideration by Council.

## A. Motion 46-A, USC

Move the area bounded by West Adams Boulevard, Ellendale Place, West 29th Street, Vermont Avenue, Exposition Boulevard, the Harbor Freeway, Jefferson Boulevard, and Hoover Street from Council District 9 to Council District 8. This area includes the USC Campus and USC Village.

The Commission spent considerable time discussing the placement of the USC Campus and USC Village. This area is currently located in Council District 9. An initial Commission vote placed this area in Council District 8, and then a subsequent vote moved this area back to Council District 9. This change would have a population impact of 16,647 people, resulting in a significant population change that would need to be balanced elsewhere in the plan.

## B. Motion 46-V, Exposition Park

Move Exposition Park, bounded by Exposition Boulevard, Vermont Avenue, Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, and the Harbor Freeway, from Council District 8 to Council District 9. This includes all of Exposition Park and commercial and residential uses along Figueroa Street.

The Commission spent considerable time discussing the placement of Exposition Park. This area is currently located in Council District 9. An initial Commission vote placed this area in Council District 8. A subsequent vote confirmed this placement. There are 589 people included in this area, which would not be a significant population shift or affect the population deviation in the map. Both Council District 8 and Council District 9 are underpopulated in each of the three Citywide plans.

## C. Motion 46-X, Vermont Square

Move the area bounded by Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Slauson Avenue, and Normandie Avenue from Council District 8 to Council District 9.

This adjustment would move 25,278 people from Council District 8 to Council District 9 which would significantly change the population balance between these districts and require offsetting population shifts elsewhere in the map.

## COMPARISON OF CITYWIDE PLANS

Table 5 provides a comparison of key factors among the three Citywide plans reviewed in this report, the Commission Plan, the Minimum Change Map, and the Hybrid Map.

Table 5
Comparison of Citywide Plans

| Factor | Commission Plan | Minimum Change | Hybrid |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent Deviation | $9.6 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ |
| Koreatown | A single district | A single district | A single district |
| Valley Cross-Over | One district | Two districts | One district |
| Neighborhood Council: <br> Entire vs. Splits | 60 entire <br> 32 split | 67 entire <br> 32 split | 69 entire <br> 30 split |
| Voter Deferrals: <br> Total, CVAP | 206,972 | 24,403 | 100,632 |
| Percent of Population <br> Unchanged Compared to the <br> Commission Plan | -- | 85,808 | 67,714 |

To approve the Commission Plan, Council would need to:

1. Determine the numbers for all Council Districts on the Commission Plan;
2. Amend the map to include the Agreed-Upon Adjustments;
3. Adopt the Commission Plan as amended.

To approve an alternative proposal, Council would simply need to select a Map for adoption.

Attachments:
Attachment A - Motions Introduced, with Maps
Attachment B - Minimum Change Map: Council District Maps
Attachment C - Hybrid Map: Council District Maps

## Attachment A

## Motions Introduced, with Maps

IMOVE that the mater of the Final Report and Recommeacians of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0658-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area bounded by West Adams Bouleverd, Ellendale Place, West $29^{\text {th }}$ Street, Vermont Avenue, Exposition Boulevard, the Harbor Freeway, Jefierson, and Hoover Street, from Council Districi 9 to Council District 8 .
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## District: 46A



| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46A |
| Population_B20 | 16,647 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 16.29\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 47.02\% |
| \% bevap_D19 | 9.35\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 25.65\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.56\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 75.45\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 14.67\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 7.77\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 2.1\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 8.45\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 24.33\% |
| \% ed_cd | 67.21\% |
| \% oh_rent | 98.06\% |
| \% Ih_english | 57.44\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 12.16\% |
| \% lh_asianlng | 19.93\% |
| \% lh_othing | 10.47\% |
| \% pov_below | 67.82\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 23.6\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 76.4\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

© 2021 CALIPER; ©2020 HERE

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Rccommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area bounded by $11^{\text {lh }}$ Street, Western Avenue, Washington Boulevard, and Normandie Avenue from Council District 10 to Council District 1.


November 2, 2021
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## District: 46B



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 468 |
| Population_B20 | 9,102 |
| \% levap_D19 | $59.27 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $7.27 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $8.42 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $22.18 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $2.73 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $43.78 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $34.27 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $16.28 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $5.67 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $38.95 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.48 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $22.57 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $80.27 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $15.46 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $67.7 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $15.65 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $1.19 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $25.66 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $6.87 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.13 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

```
MOTSON
```

1 MOVE tat the matier of the Fival Repor and Recommenditions of the 2021 Ros Angeles City Councii Redistricting Comraission (LACCKC) (CF 20-0668-S7) EE AMENDED, as follows:

- Niove the East Weschester noighorhood located east of the San Diego Freeway and bounded by West Ceatinela Ave anc La Tijer Boulevard, nand the Ladera neighborhood that stretches along West 64ith Street/Place anc adiacent streets from La Cienega Bozlievard to Nomtid Eren Aveme, from Council Disirict 8 to Council District 11 .
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District: 46C


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 C |
| Population_B20 | 7,114 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $16.81 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $24.53 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $42.47 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $14.69 \%$ |
| \%acvap_D19 | $1.49 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $22.81 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.62 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $30 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $18.58 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $2.51 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $26.83 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $70.66 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $82.38 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $69.42 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $11.92 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $10.67 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $7.99 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $7.16 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.43 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.97 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.6 \%$ |

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0658-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the portion of Riverside Drive between the Golden State Freeway and Stadium Way from Council District i to Council District 13.

PRESENTED BY:


Councilmember, 1st District
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oi

No map provided.

## This Agreed-Upon Adjustment is included in all proposed maps.

INOVE that the maiter of the Final Report and Recommendaions of the 2021 Los Angeles Cidy Cowncil Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CE 20-0668-S7) BE AMERDED,
as follows:

- Fove the western half of the Census blcck bounced by zayworth Avemet, Mitwortion Drive, Fairfak Avenue, and Olympic Boulevard from CounciE Disarict 10 to Councii
District 5 to keep Limle Bthita intect. District 5 to keep Litule Ethiopia intact.
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District: 46E


| Fieid | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 E |
| Population_B20 | 39 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $31 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $56.87 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $8.81 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $3.32 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $0 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $30.2 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $33.89 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $35.91 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $0.38 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $34.6 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $65.02 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $59.73 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $65.2 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $14.69 \%$ |
| \% In_asianling | $4.69 \%$ |
| \% lh_othIng | $15.42 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $4.09 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.21 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.79 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommerations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0658-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:
8. Move the southern bouncary of Council Districi 7 on Burnet Street from Nordhof to Rayen io include both sides of Burnet Street, moving the necessary parcels from Council Districi 6 to Council District 7.
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1 MOVE that the ratter of tize Final Report and Mecommeadations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricking Commission (EACCRC) (CR 20-0653-S7) BE AMENDED,
as follows:

- Instruct the Chie Legisiarive Andyst to nalyza ajustments to proposed Counci? Districi 3 boundaries io retsin the communities of Wcodland Kiills, Tarzane, Canioga Park, 然d Winnetra entirely within Comanil Districe 3 and with as much of Reseria as possible to maintain population taiance, wink adjustments to surrounding Councii Districts as needed.
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## District: 46G



MOTION

IMOVE that the mater of the Finai Report man Kecommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Cormmission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0658-S") BE AMENDED, as iollows:

- Instruct the Chief Legislative Analyst to anaiyge adjustments to proposed Council Disirict 3 boundaries to iralude arias from the western sity limits to the San Diego Freeway, inclucing the entirety of Wcocland Hilis, Wamer Center, Tazzina, and Encino, ged portions of Canog2 Park and Winncika needed to achieve population balaze, with other adyustrents to suroundiag Council Disticts as necled such as West Hitls to remain in Councii District 22 and keeping abe curreat Council Districa 12 border as Vietory Blve to Shoup,
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District: 03


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 03 |
| Population_B20 | 256,324 |
| Deviation | $-4,487$ |
| \% Deviation | $-1.72 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $23.09 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $58.3 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.62 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $12.18 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.83 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $22.79 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $25.07 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.9 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $23.23 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $13.41 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $37.65 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $48.94 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $50.01 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $47.67 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $26.56 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $7.13 \%$ |
| \% lh_othlng | $18.64 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $11.7 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.7 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.29 \%$ |
| $\%$ emp_military | $0.01 \%$ |

©2020 HERE

District: 4OR2


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | $40 R 2$ |
| Population_B20 | 249,774 |
| Deviation | $-11,037$ |
| \% Deviation | $-4.23 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $30.06 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $52.88 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.21 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $9.78 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.03 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $23.83 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.19 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.9 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $19.08 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $15.28 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.22 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $46.5 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $59.21 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $47.29 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $33.49 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianing | $5.81 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othling | $13.41 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $12.34 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.87 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $94.04 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.1 \%$ |



MOTION

THOVE that the mater of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeies City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the residences bordering Pierce College on the westerin border of the College at El Raacho Drive, De Soio Avenue, and Oxnard Street and on the southern border of the College along Exhibit llace and Aetna Street, from Council District 4-or-2 to Council Disitict 3.
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I MOVE that the ratter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0658-57) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area bounded by West $18^{\text {th }}$ Street, Robertson Boulevard, Caciliac Avenue, and La Cienseg Boulevard from Council District 10 io Council District 5.
 Coynailmember, $2^{\text {nd }}$ District

SECONDED BY


November 2, 2621
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District: 46J


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 J |
| Population_B20 | 6,117 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $33.56 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $29.11 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $28.17 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $5.8 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $2.94 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $28.46 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $36.93 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $26.41 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $8.2 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $18.53 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $44.5 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $36.97 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $86.25 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $47.53 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $43.14 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $0.76 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $8.56 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $15.03 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $4.17 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $95.83 \%$ |
| \%emp_military | $0 \%$ |

I MOVE that the matter of the Finai Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redisiricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as foliows:
( Move the boundary between Council District 4 and Council District 13 in the Atwater Village area from the Golden State Freeway to the center of the Los Angeles River.
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## District: 46K



| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46K |
| Population_B20 | 18 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% bevap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 200\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% inc_It35k | -- |
| \% inc_35_75K | -- |
| \% inc_ 75 _150k | - |
| \% inc_150plus | - |
| \% ed_nhd | -- |
| \% ed_ned | - |
| \% ed_cd | - |
| \% oh_rent | -- |
| \% lt_english | - |
| \% litspanish | - |
| \% Ih_asianing | - |
| \% ih_othlng | -- |
| \% pov_below | - |
| \% emp_unemp | -- |
| \% emp_civ_emp | -- |
| \% emp_military | -- |

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Les Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area beginning at S. Union Avenae and Beverly Boulevard, heading southeast along Beverily Boulevard, then southwest on Union Place io the aliey between Beverly Boulevard and W. 2nd Street, then northwest on the ailey between Beverly Boulevard and W. 2nd Steet, thear northeast on S. Union Avenue to Beverly Eoulevard, known as Unidad Park and Community Garden, from Council District 1 to Councii District 13.


SECONDED BY
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District: 46L

©2021 CALIPER; ©2020 HERE

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-6668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Instruct the CLA to prepare a Voting Rights Act Minimum Change Map that revises the boundaries to balance for population changes reported in the 2020 US Census to remain within a 10 percent deviation and compliance with the Voting Rights Act.


November 2, 2021
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Y MOVE that the matter of the Finail Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeies City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CR 20-0668-S7) BE ANENDED,
as follows:

Nove the Sun Valley community of Gien Crest Tilils from Council District 6 to
Council District 2-or-4.


November 2, 2021
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## District: 46N



| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46 N |
| Population_B20 | 6,024 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | 15.37\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 71.94\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 2.44\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 8.3\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.95\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 16.23\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 29.92\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 36.05\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 17.8\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 8.52\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 43.48\% |
| \% ed_cd | 47.99\% |
| \% oh_rent | 27.78\% |
| \% Ih_english | 41.48\% |
| \% Ih_spanish | 8.72\% |
| \% Ih_asianing | 9.17\% |
| \% lh_othing | 40.63\% |
| \% pov_below | 9.69\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 9.49\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 90.51\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

INOVE that the mater of the Final Report and Recommencations of the 202: Los Angeies City Couacil Redismicting Commission (LACCRC) (CR 20-0558-S7) BE AMENDED,
as follows:

- Move the area bounded by $43^{\text {rd }}$ Street, $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, $43^{\text {rd }}$ Piace, $8^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Vernon A venue, and Arlingion Avemue from Council Districic 8 to Council District 10.
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District: 460


## MOTION

INOVE that the mater of the Finai Repert and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE ANENDED, as follows:

* Move the Van Nuys neighborhoods of Katherine Circle and Katherine Square from Council Districi 6 to Council District 2-or-4.
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## District: 46P



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 P |
| Population_B20 | 15,079 |
| \% levap_D19 | $45.22 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $35.77 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.9 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 6 4 \%}$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.48 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $36.63 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $33.3 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $24.66 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $5.41 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $26.88 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $45.26 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $27.86 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $72.3 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $25.53 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $55.19 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $5.76 \%$ |
| \% lh_othing | $13.52 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $21.33 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $6.91 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.09 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |



## MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Ccuncil Reaistricting Comaission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0568-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area boundec by Roscoe Boulevard, Whitsett Avenue, the zairoad track, and Laurel Canyon Boulevard from Council District 6 to Council District 2-cr-4.


Councilmember, $2^{\text {nd }}$ District
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## District: 46Q


© 2021 CALIPER; ©2020 HERE

| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 Q |
| Population_B20 | 6,781 |
| \% levap_D19 | $30.19 \%$ |
| \% wevap_D19 | $40.28 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $2.24 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $26.86 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.34 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $27.54 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.41 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $26.67 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $13.38 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $23.44 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $42.44 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $34.12 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $45.04 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $23.7 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $47.89 \%$ |
| \% ln_asianing | $12.61 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $15.79 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $15.04 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $6.56 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.44 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommencations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AVENDED, as foliows:

* Nove the foilowing Neighborhood Councils from Ccuncil Districi 4-or-2 to Council District 3: Winnetka, Canoga Park, and Wocdland Hilis; and
- Nove the Sherman Oaks Neighborbood Ccuncil, including the POSA neighborincod, from Council District 3 to Council District 4-or-2; and
- Move the Valiey Village Neighbornood Councii from Council Districî 3 to
Council District 2-oi-4.


November 2, 2021
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District: 20R4


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 20R4 |
| Population_B20 | 292,698 |
| Deviation | 31,887 |
| \% Deviation | 12.23\% |
| \% Icvap_D19 | 22.75\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 62.24\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 6.21\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 7.64\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.11\% |
| \% inc_It35k | 26.66\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 24.83\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 26.85\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 21.65\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 12\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 33.47\% |
| \% ed_cd | 54.54\% |
| \% oh_rent | 64.67\% |
| \% Ih_english | 55.91\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 24.9\% |
| \% Ih_ asianing | 4.59\% |
| \% lh_othing | 14.6\% |
| \% pov below | 13.27\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 6.46\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 93.48\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.06\% |

## District: 03


© 2020 HERE

District: 4OR2


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 40 R 2 |
| Population_B20 | 222,601 |
| Deviation | $-38,210$ |
| \% Deviation | $-14.65 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $31.53 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $51.09 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $10.37 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.97 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $23.31 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.77 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.7 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $19.21 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $16.23 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.81 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $44.95 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $57.37 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $45.13 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $35.64 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $6.07 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $13.16 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $12.61 \%$ |
| \%emp_unemp | $5.74 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $94.15 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.11 \%$ |

©2020 HERE

IMOVE thas the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CR 20.0668-\$7) BE ANENDED, as follows:

- Establish the boundaries of Councii District 2-0i-A, Council District Council District 7 with the boundaries of Counail District 2, Council District 6, and Council District 7 as they currently exist.
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## District: 02



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 02 |
| Population_B20 | 264,999 |
| Deviation | 4,188 |
| \% Deviation | $1.61 \%$ |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $31.07 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $53.85 \%$ |
| \% bevap_D19 | $6.27 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $7.7 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.07 \%$ |
| \% inc_lt35k | $30.53 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75k | $27.93 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $25.71 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $15.83 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $17.52 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.05 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $44.43 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $66.72 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $44.26 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $35.71 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $4.77 \%$ |
| \% In_othing | $15.27 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $15.93 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $6.33 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.63 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.03 \%$ |
| em_ |  |

[^0]
## District: 06



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 06 |
| Population_B20 | 261,114 |
| Deviation | 303 |
| \% Deviation | $0.12 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $57.08 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $23.75 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.99 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $12.39 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.84 \%$ |
| \% inc_lt35k | $33.28 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.98 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $24.96 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $8.78 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $32.76 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $42.69 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $24.55 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $63.55 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $22.84 \%$ |
| $\%$ Ih_spanish | $63.47 \%$ |
| $\%$ lh_asianing | $7.46 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $6.24 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $19.2 \%$ |
| $\%$ emp_unemp | $7.28 \%$ |
| $\%$ emp_civ_emp | $92.69 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.04 \%$ |

## District: 07



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 07 |
| Population_B20 | 266,276 |
| Deviation | 5,465 |
| \% Deviation | $2.1 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $59.01 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $27.54 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $4.47 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $8.03 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.96 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $26.33 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $27.95 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $32.14 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $13.58 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $29.32 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $45.23 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $25.46 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $39.29 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $29.41 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $59.05 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $4.8 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $6.75 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $15.02 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $4.98 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $94.99 \%$ |
| \%emp_military | $0.03 \%$ |

© 2020 HERE

WOVE that the natiter of the Final Report ned Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Couacil Redistricting CoIamisioa (LACCRC) (CF $20-0653-37$ ) EE ANENDED,
as follows:

- Move the area begiming at Avenus 40 anci heading easierly alcigg the south propery line of properies fonting Yori Bouisyard is Avenue 54, zouth on Averue 54 to the ailey beaween Duchirsan Stwest gani Yosk Boulevard, eest on the alley betweon Ruchinan Sireet and York Boulevaed to Aldsuna Street, then east along the rear property fines of the pareais fronting York Boulevard to Figueroa Strest, then south along the western property lines of the percels frontiag Figusoo Street to Piecimont Avenue, then south on Pivinonî Averus to Aveauz 51, then cast on Avenue 61 to Figuewa Street, then soxith on Figuezoa Street to Avenue 60 , fom Council District 1 to Ceuncil Disiriot 1A.
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No map provided.
This Agreed-Upon Adjustment is included in all proposed maps.

MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0663 S7) BEAMENDED,
as follows:

- Move the area beginning at Cssar Chavez Avenue and Main Street, herding aorth on Mair Street to Alhambra Avenue, then east on Athmbra Avenue to College Strees, thea south on College Street to the Union Station raitroed tracks inchusive of the track, then south on the Union Station raitroad tack to Vignes Street, then east on Vigaes Street io Cesaz Chevea Averue, thas west on Cesur Chayez Aynme to Main Street, from Council Discice 1 to Council Distriet It


Novernber 2, 2021
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District: 46U


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46 U |
| Population_B20 | 35 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 100\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 61.02\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 10.76\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 25.96\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 2.26\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 40.77\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 27.28\% |
| \% ed_cd | 31.95\% |
| \% oh_rent | 97.29\% |
| \% Ih_english | 24.01\% |
| \% th_spanish | 19.55\% |
| \% lh_asianlng | 55.37\% |
| \% th_othlng | 1.08\% |
| \% pov_below | 32.91\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 11.3\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 88.7\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

## MOTION

I MOVE that the mater of the Fizal Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Argeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Viove Exposition Park, bounded by Exposition Boulevard, Vermont Avenue, Maitin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, and the Harbor Freeway, from Council Districः 8 to Council District 9 .


November 2, 2021
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## District: 46V



1 MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles Ciry Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0568-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Instruct the Chief Legislative Analyst to provide analysis of an alienative man that incorporates:
- Councii Districis 8, 9, 10, 11, and 15 from the LACCRC zroposed map;
- Council Districis 2, 6, 7, and 12 from the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; and
- Options for addressing the remaining Council Districts.

November 2, 2021
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MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Miove the area bounded by Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, Van Ness Avenue, Slauson Avenue, and Normandie Avenue from Council District 8 to Council District 9 .
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## District: 46X



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | $46 \times$ |
| Population_B20 | 25,278 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $44.45 \%$ |
| \% wevap_D19 | $2.2 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $49.6 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $2.95 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.92 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $35.47 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $30.55 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $26.28 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $7.71 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $34.97 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $46.5 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $18.53 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $50.08 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $38.07 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $59.09 \%$ |
| \% ih_asianing | $1.23 \%$ |
| \% lh_othing | $1.6 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $19.99 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $4.53 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $95.47 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

```
MOTION
```

$I$ MOVE that the matier of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE ANENDED, as follows:

- Move the are begining at Hancock Street and Rroadway, heachng northexly on Hancock Street so George Street, east on George Sireet to Eastlake Avenue, northerly along the northera segment of Eastlike Avenue to Minnesota Street, easterly along Minnesota Street to Gaves St, north on Gaies SV/Abrigo Avenue io Preweit Street, east on Prewét Strest to Two Tree Averue, east on Two Tree Avenue to Thomas Street, south on Thomas Street to Ashland Ayenue, north on - Ashland Avenue to Pemona Street, east on Pomona Street to Aita Street, rivelh on Aita Sireet to Flora Avenue, east on Flora Avenue io Lincoin Paxk Avenue, north on Lincoln Park Avenue to Gillig Avenue, east on Ghilig Avenue to Sierra Street, north on Sierra Street to Meecury Avanwe, asst on Mercury avenue to Reynolds Avenue, scuth on Reynolds Aveaise to APN 5203009001 , south along the easieriy border of APN 5209009001 to Mêzges Drive, south on Mietzger Drive io Broadiway, wesi on Broadway so Hiancock Street, from Councii District 1 to Council District 14 .


November 2, 2021


## District: 46Y



I MOVE that the master of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Couacil Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) RE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the community of Limcoln Heights, bouded by fie Los Angeles River on the west, Mission Road on the solith, Soto Street on the east, and the Pasadena Freeway with varyiag hillsides in alignment with the Lincola Heights Neighbortood Counciil boundary on the north from Council District 1 to Council District 14, to the extent that population allows.

November 2, 2021

District: $46 Z$


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 462 |
| Population_B20 | 18,702 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $61.09 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $8.21 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $0.99 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $29.18 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.53 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $41.17 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $29.36 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150k | $22.52 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $6.95 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $40.63 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $33.2 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $26.17 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $74.2 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $20.58 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $57.6 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $20.81 \%$ |
| \% in_othing | $1 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $19.33 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $8.12 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $91.74 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.15 \%$ |

© 2021 CALIPER; ©2020 HERE

MOTION

1 MOVE that the matuer of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as folilows:

- Move the area bounded by West $110^{\text {th }}$ Street, the Harbor Freeway, Imperial Highway, railroad right-of-way that parallels Lanzit \&venue, Compton Creek, and South San Pedso Streê from Council District 15 to Council District 8; and
- Move the area bounded by Compton Creek, Central Avenue, $108^{\text {th }}$ Street, and Wadsworth Avenue from Council Districe 8 to Council District 15.
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## District: 46AA1



| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46AA1 |
| Population_B20 | 6,617 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | 63.97\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 0.96\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 34.26\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 0.71\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% inc_It35k | 46.13\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 29.63\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 21.02\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 3.23\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 46.06\% |
| $\%$ ed_ncd | 42.38\% |
| $\%$ ed_cd | 11.56\% |
| \% oh_rent | 64.05\% |
| \% Ih_english | 25.91\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 72.62\% |
| \% lh_asianling | 0.57\% |
| \% it othing | 0.9\% |
| \% pov_below | 27.51\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 6.39\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 93.61\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

District: 46AA2


## $46-B B$

MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE ANENDED, as follows:
e Move the area beginning at Oxnard Street and the San Diego Freeway, then south on the San Diego Freeway to Nulholland Drive, then west to the proposed eastern boundary of CD3, then north at a direct angle to the eastern end of Blairwood Drive, then east to Longridge Avenue, then north to Ventura Boulevard, then west to Fulton Avenue, then north to Valleyheart Drive North, then east to Ethel Avenue, then north to Sarah Street, then east to Van Noord Avenue, then north to King Street, then east to Coldwater Canyon Avenue, then north to the Ventura Freeway, then east to the Los Angeles River, then west and north along the Los Angeles River to Burbank Boulevard, then west to Hazeltine Avenue, then north to Oxnard Street, and then west to the San Diego Freeway, from Council District 5 to Council District 2-or-4.

PRESENTED BY:


SECONDED BY
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## District: 46BB



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 BB |
| Population_B20 | 77,939 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $14.76 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $69.53 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.44 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $8.34 \%$ |
| \% accvap_D19 | $0.9 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $18.2 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $24.36 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $30.24 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $27.2 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $4.43 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $29.7 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $65.87 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $59.17 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $68.65 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $11.3 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianing | $3.77 \%$ |
| \% lh_othing | $16.29 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $8.66 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.8 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.15 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.05 \%$ |

## District: 46BBX



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 468 B |
| Population_B20 | 25,394 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $19.93 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $64.56 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $8 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $6.07 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.37 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $27.26 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $24.17 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $30.68 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $17.89 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $7.63 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $33.95 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $58.42 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $70.9 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $64.92 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $15.99 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $3.6 \%$ |
| \% lh_othlng | $15.49 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $10.37 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.15 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $92.85 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

## MOTION

1 MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:
\& Move the area beginning at Beverly Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue, then east on Beverly Boulevard to South Gardner Street, then south to West $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street, then east to South La Brea Avenue, then south to West Olympic Boulevard, then west to South Cochran Avenue, then south to San Vicente Boulevard, then west to West Olympic Boulevard, then west to Fairfax Avenue, and then north to Beverly Boulevard, from Council Disirict 5 to Council District 2-or-4.
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## District: 46CC



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 CC |
| Population_B20 | 22,861 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $10.91 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $62.12 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $10.25 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $15.73 \%$ |
| \% accvap_D19 | $1.01 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $22.05 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.94 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.53 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $20.49 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $1.64 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $21.24 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $77.13 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $93.8 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $58.56 \%$ |
| \% in_spanish | $8.63 \%$ |
| \% ilh_asianlng | $18.72 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $14.09 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $11.07 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $4.55 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $95.45 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area beginning at Franklin Avenue and Western Avenue, then east on Western Avenue to North New Hampshire Avenue, then south to Hollywood Boulevard, then west to North Normandie Avenue, then north to the edge of the commercial buildings along Hollywood Boulevard, then west along the back side of the commercial buildings along Hollywood Boulevard to Western Avenue, and then north to Franklin Avenue and Western Avenue, from Council District 13 to Council District 2-or-4.

PRESENTED BY:


NITHYA RAMA
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District: 46DD


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 DD |
| Population_B20 | 8,040 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $15.37 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $68.55 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $4.14 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $10.47 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.27 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $43.51 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.57 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $22.8 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $5.12 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $11.12 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $32.61 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $56.27 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $97.32 \%$ |
| \% ih_english | $47.97 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $16.45 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianing | $8.78 \%$ |
| \% lh_othing | $26.8 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $18.02 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $6.62 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.38 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

## MOTION

1 MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:
c Move the area beginning at Fountain Avenue and Hyperion Avenue, then easi on Landa Street to Redescale Avenue, and then northeast across the Silver Lake Reservoir at a direct angle to the corner of Armsitong Avenue and Silverlake Boulevard, from Council District 13 to Council Districi 2-or-4.
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District: 46EE


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46EE |
| Population_B20 | 3,006 |
| \% Icyap_D19 | 11.53\% |
| \% wevap_D19 | 61.18\% |
| \% bevap_D19 | 1.02\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 24.05\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.7\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 12.48\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 19.77\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 25\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 42.75\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 3.24\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 17.54\% |
| \% ed_cd | 79.22\% |
| \% oh_rent | 27.12\% |
| \% Ih_english | 75.17\% |
| \% In_spanish | 13.05\% |
| \% lh_asianing | 3.77\% |
| \% Ih_othing | 8\% |
| \% pov_below | 3.19\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 4.86\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 95.14\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area begiming at Roscoe Boulevard and Corbin Avenue, then east on Roscoe Boulevard to Yolanda Avenue, then south to Strathern Street, then east to Etiwanda Avenue, then south to Saticoy Street, then east to White Oak Avenue, then south to the Los Angeles River, then west to Victory Boulevard, then west to Corbin Avenue, and then north to Roscoe Boulevard from Council District 3 to Council District 2-or-4; and
- Move the area beginning at Victory Boulevard and White Oak Avenue, then east to Balboa Boulevard, then southwest on the Orange Line Busway to the Los Angeles River, then southeast to Balboa Boulevard, then south to Burbank Boulevard, then west to the corner of the Balboa Sports Center, then north to Oxnard Street, then west to the edge of the Sepulveda Easin Farm Fields, then north to the directional line of Delano Street, then west to White Oak Avenue, and then north to Victory Boulevard, from Council District 4-or-2 to Council District 2-or-4; and
- Move the area begiming at Eurbank Boulevard and Louise Avenue, then east on Burbarik Boulevard to Hayvenhurst Avenue, then south to the Ventura Freeway, then west to Louise Averue, then not th to Burbank Boulevard, from Council District 3 to Council District 2-or-4; and
- Move the area beginning at Burbank Boulevard and Hayvenhurst Avenue, then east on Burbank Boulevard to the Los Angeles River, then southeast to the San Diego Freeway, then south to the Ventura Freeway, then west to Hayvenhurst Avenue, then north to Burbank Boulevard, from Council District 4-or-2 Council District 2-or-4.
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District: 46FF


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 FF |
| Population_B20 | 62,229 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $44.75 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $34.75 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.25 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $14.09 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.12 \%$ |
| \% inc_lt35k | $26.98 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.34 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $27.81 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $12.88 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $23.6 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $44.69 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $31.71 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $53.67 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $30.93 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $47.57 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianlng | $8.67 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $12.83 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $14.18 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.62 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.19 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.2 \%$ |

## MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:
c Move the area beginning at Camino Palmero Street and Franklin Avenue, then south on Camino Palmero Street, then south on North Martel Avenue, then east on West Sunset Boulevard, then south on North La Area Avenue, then west on Fountain Avenue, then north on North Fairfax Avenue, and then west just prior to West Sunset Boulevard to account for the businesses fronting the south side of West Sunset Boulevard to North Laurel Avenue, from Council District 13 to Council District 2-or-4.
PRESENTED BY:

NITHYA RAMA
Counclemember, $4^{\text {th }}$ District
SECONDED BY
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## District: 46GG



| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46GG |
| Population_B20 | 16,379 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 11.09\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 74.64\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 5.38\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 7.71\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.26\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 29.72\% |
| \% inc_35_75k | 26.94\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 26.32\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 17.02\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 3.11\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 26.66\% |
| \% ed_cd | 70.23\% |
| \% oh_rent | 84.96\% |
| \% In_english | 63.79\% |
| \% Jh_spanish | 9.83\% |
| \% li_asianing | 4.3\% |
| \% ih_othing | 22.08\% |
| \% pov_below | 14.92\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 8.08\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 91.65\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.27\% |

## MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricling Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area beginning at North La Brea Avenue and Franklin Avenue, then south on North La Brea Avenue, then east on West Sunset Boulevard, then south on North Highland Avenue, then east on De Longpre Avenue, then south on Ivar Avenue, then northwest on North Cahuenga Boulevard, then west and south on Cole Avenue, then west on Fountain Avenue, then south on Wilcox Avenue, then west on Lexington Avenue, then south on Seward Street, then west on Willoughby Avenue, then north on North La Brea Avenue, then east on Romaine Street to the entrance of the alley between North La Brea and North Sycamore Avenue, then north along the line of the alley between North La Brea and North Sycamore to Fountain Averue, from Council District 13 to Council District 2-or4.
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District: 46HH


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46 HH |
| Population_B20 | 6,819 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 28.54\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 53.89\% |
| \% bevap_D19 | 10.68\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 4.15\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 2.68\% |
| \% inc_lt 35 k | 29.77\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 36.88\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 25.61\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 7.74\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 12.65\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 32.13\% |
| \% ed_cd | 55.23\% |
| \% oh_rent | 92.11\% |
| \% ih_english | 60.83\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 20.74\% |
| \% th_asianing | 4.54\% |
| \% Ih othing | 13.88\% |
| \% pov_below | 17.88\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 7.37\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 92.63\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

MOTION

I MOVE that the matier of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Councii Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:
c Move the area beginning at De Longpre Avenue and North La Brea Avenue, then east on De Longpre Avenue to Īvar Avenue, then south to Canuenga Boulevard, then northwest to Cole Avenue, then west and curving south to Fcuntain Avenue, then west to North Las Palmas Avenue, then south to Willoughby Avenue, then west to North La Brea Avenue, then north to Romaine Street, then west to the entrance of the alley between North La Brea and North Sycamore Avenue, then north along the line of the alley between Nerth La Brea and North Sycamore to Fountain Avenue, and then west to North La Brea Avenue, from Council District 13 to Council District 2-or-4.
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## See map for Motion 46-HH

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:
c Move the area beginning ait Mielrose Avenue and North Arden Boulevard, then east on Mielrose Avenue to North Wilton Place, then south to Beverly Boulevard, then east to South Manhattan Place, the south to West $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, then west to South Wilton Place, then south to West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street, then east to South Manhattan Place, then south to West Olympic Boulevard, then west to North La Brea Avenue, then north to Wilshire Boulevard, then east to North Arden Boulevard, and then north to Mehose Avenue, from Council District 5 so Council District 2-or-4; and

F9. Move the area beginning at Nieirose Avenue and North Wilton Place, then east on Melrose Avenue to North Manhattan Place, then south to Clinton Street, then east to Western Ave, then south to Beverly Boulevara, then west to Wilton Place, and then aorth to Melrose Avenue, from Council District 13 to Council District 2-or4; and

- Move the area beginning at Willoughby Avenue and North Highland Avenue, then south on Highland Avenue to Melrose Avenue, then west to North El Centro Avenue, then north to Waring Avenue, then west to Wilcox Avenue, then north to Willoughby Avenue, and then west to North Highland Avenue, from Council District 13 to Council District 2-or-4; and

4 Move the area beginning at Willoughby Avenue and North La Brea Avenue, then east on Willoughby Avenue to North Highland Avenue, and then south to Mielrose Avenue, from Council District 13 to Council District 5.
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## District: 46JJ


© 2021 CALIPER; ©2020 HERE

```
MOTICN
```

I MiOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistriciing Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AiVIENDED, as follows:

- Move the area beginning at Beverly Boulevard and South Arden Boulevard, then east on Beverly Boulevard to Western Avenue, then south to the alley south of Western Avenue, then west on the alley south of Westem Avenue, then south on down the alley west of Western Avenue, then west on the aliey south of West $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street, then south on South Manhattan Place, then east on West $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street, then south on Western Avenue, then west on $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, then south on South Wilton Place, then west on Wilshire Boulevard, and then north on South Arden Boulevard to Beverly Boulevard, from Council District 5 to Council District 13.
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## District: 46KK



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 46 KK |
| Population_B20 | 13,155 |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $17.75 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $33.17 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $9.55 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $38.57 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.06 \%$ |
| \% inc_lt35k | $28.23 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $31.59 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150k | $22.42 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $17.76 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $12.69 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $34.31 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $53 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $72.39 \%$ |
| \% ih_english | $39.25 \%$ |
| \% ih_spanish | $20.17 \%$ |
| \% ih_asianlng | $36.7 \%$ |
| \% in_othlng | $3.88 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $12.08 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.09 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.91 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0 \%$ |

## MOTION

I MOVE that the matter of the Final Report and Recommendations of the 2021 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) (CF 20-0668-S7) BE AMENDED, as follows:

- Move the area beginning at Melrose Avenue and North Arden Boulevard, then east on Melrose Avenue to North Wilton Place, then south to Beverly Boulevard, then west to North Arden Boulevard, then north to Melrose Avenue, from Council District 5 to Council District 13.
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District: 46LL


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 46LL |
| Population_B20 | 4,202 |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 17.08\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 52.17\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 6.52\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 23.91\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 0\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 24.9\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 24.11\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 26.04\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 24.95\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 6.15\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 23.28\% |
| \% ed_cd | 70.57\% |
| \% oh_rent | 60.28\% |
| \% th_english | 60.8\% |
| \% Ih_spanish | 15.52\% |
| \% lh asianing | 18.37\% |
| \% lh_othing | 5.31\% |
| \% pov_below | 11.5\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 4.79\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 95.21\% |
| \% emp_military | 0\% |

## Attachment B

## Minimum Change Map: Council District Maps

## District: 01



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 01 |
| Population_B20 | 246340.33 |
| Deviation | $-14,470.67$ |
| \% Deviation | $-5.55 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $51.31 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $18.7 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.32 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $22.51 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.13 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $42.08 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $29.93 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $20.24 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $7.75 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $37.44 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $32.83 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $29.73 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $81.25 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $23.35 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $59.46 \%$ |
| \% In_asianing | $15 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $2.19 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $25.62 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.49 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $92.46 \%$ |
| \%emp_military | $0.06 \%$ |

District: 02

©2019 HERE

## District: 03



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 03 |
| Population_B20 | 271052.57 |
| Deviation | $10,241.57$ |
| \% Deviation | $3.93 \%$ |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $29.87 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $50.25 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.81 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $13.12 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.95 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $24.3 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $27.42 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.7 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $19.57 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $17.01 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $40.31 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $42.67 \%$ |
| \% on_rent | $52.66 \%$ |
| \% ln_english | $42.7 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $33.36 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $8 \%$ |
| \% lh_othing | $15.93 \%$ |
| $\%$ pov_below | $12.65 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.79 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.16 \%$ |
| \%emp_military | $0.06 \%$ |

## District: 04



| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 04 |
| Population_B20 | 245357.04 |
| Deviation | -15,453.96 |
| \% Deviation | -5.93\% |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 13.58\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 66.06\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 6.38\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 12.9\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.07\% |
| \% inc_It35k | 20.9\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 24.15\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 28.47\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 26.47\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 5.16\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 27.59\% |
| \% ed_cd | 67.25\% |
| \% oh_rent | 64.6\% |
| \% lh_english | 65.06\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 12.05\% |
| \% Ih_asianing | 9.88\% |
| \% in othing | 13\% |
| \% pov_below | 10.04\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 6.07\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 93.86\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.08\% |
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## District: 05



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 05 |
| Population_B20 | 262647.63 |
| Deviation | $1,836.63$ |
| \% Deviation | $0.7 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $10.76 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $67.42 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.01 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $15.51 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.32 \%$ |
| \% inc_lit35k | $20.71 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75k | $21.29 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150k | $28.77 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $29.23 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $4.46 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $24.46 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $71.07 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $60.78 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $61.33 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $8.81 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $8.99 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $20.87 \%$ |
| \% pov_beiow | $11.93 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.5 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.48 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.02 \%$ |

[^1]District: 06

© 2019 HERE

## District: 07



| Field |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | Value |
| Population_B20 | 07 |
| Deviation | 266275.53 |
| \% Deviation | $5,464.53$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $2.1 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $59.01 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $27.54 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $4.47 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $8.03 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $0.96 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $26.33 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $27.95 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $32.14 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $13.58 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $29.32 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $45.23 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $25.46 \%$ |
| \% In_english | $39.29 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $29.41 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianlng | $59.05 \%$ |
| \% ih_othlng | $4.8 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $6.75 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $15.02 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $4.98 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $94.99 \%$ |
|  | $0.03 \%$ |

## District: 08



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 08 |
| Population_B20 | 257549.44 |
| Deviation | $-3,261.56$ |
| \% Deviation | $-1.25 \%$ |
| \% levap_D19 | $41.48 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $3.89 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $51.12 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $2.32 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.24 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $42.84 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.36 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $22.38 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $6.42 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $33.36 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $47.01 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $19.64 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $60.57 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $42.23 \%$ |
| \% In_spanish | $54.03 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianlng | $1.84 \%$ |
| \% In_othing | $1.9 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $25.13 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.81 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $92.16 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.03 \%$ |

© 2019 HERE

District: 09


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 09 |
| Population_B20 | 256098.00 |
| Deviation | -4.713 |
| \% Deviation | $-1.81 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $64.87 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $6.68 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $23.98 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $3.59 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.81 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $46.75 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.12 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $17.69 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $3.45 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $51.44 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $37.79 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $10.77 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $74.23 \%$ |
| \% ih_english | $20.31 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $76.9 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $1.71 \%$ |
| \% ih_othlng | $1.08 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $32.3 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $8.78 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $91.2 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.02 \%$ |

## District: 10



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 10 |
| Population_B20 | 269199.18 |
| Deviation | $8,388.18$ |
| \% Deviation | $3.22 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $32.45 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $16.14 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $32.12 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $17.37 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.87 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $38.23 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.37 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $20.59 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $8.82 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $24.99 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.9 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $36.1 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $77.69 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $37.11 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $44.07 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $14.73 \%$ |
| \% lh_othing | $4.09 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $19.42 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.66 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $94.31 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.03 \%$ |

District: 11


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 11 |
| Population_B20 | 270697.00 |
| Deviation | 9,886 |
| \% Deviation | $3.79 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $15.19 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $64.23 \%$ |
| \% bevap_D19 | $6.21 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $13.08 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.3 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $18.85 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $18.83 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.37 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $33.95 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $6.37 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $23.86 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $69.76 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $56.85 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $68.73 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $14.66 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianing | $6.79 \%$ |
| \% ih_othlng | $9.82 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $9.94 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $4.49 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $95.38 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.13 \%$ |
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District: 12


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 12 |
| Population_B20 | 270631.00 |
| Deviation | 9,820 |
| \% Deviation | $3.77 \%$ |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $24.63 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $50.1 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.61 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $18.45 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.23 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $17.69 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $21.81 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $33.53 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $26.96 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $10.11 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $39.29 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $50.59 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $32 \%$ |
| \% In_english | $52.34 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $21.05 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianlng | $12.47 \%$ |
| \% lh_othlng | $14.15 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $8.52 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.08 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $94.83 \%$ |
| \%emp_military | $0.09 \%$ |

District: 13


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 13 |
| Population_B20 | 245778.17 |
| Deviation | -15,032.83 |
| \% Deviation | -5.76\% |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 35.66\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 38.28\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 6.4\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 18.03\% |
| \% aocvap D19 | 1.56\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 35.41\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 30.24\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 23.92\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 10.44\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 21.34\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 35.36\% |
| \% ed_cd | 43.3\% |
| \% oh_rent | 83.75\% |
| \% Ih_english | 35.93\% |
| \% Ih_spanish | 42.84\% |
| \% Ih_asianing | 13.58\% |
| \% lh_othlng | 7.65\% |
| \% pov_below | 19.48\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 6.39\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 93.6\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.01\% |

## District: 14



District: 15


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 15 |
| Population_B20 | 258310.00 |
| Deviation | $-2,501$ |
| \% Deviation | $-0.96 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $52.27 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $21.77 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $15.2 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $9.08 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $1.65 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $34.31 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $29.96 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $23.98 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $11.74 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $29.54 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $45.08 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $25.38 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $60 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $38.22 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $53.51 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $5.66 \%$ |
| \% In_othing | $2.62 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $21.69 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.49 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $92.21 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.3 \%$ |

## Attachment C

## Hybrid Map: <br> Council District Maps

## District: 01
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District: 02


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 02 |
| Population_B20 | 263,614 |
| Deviation | 2,803 |
| \% Deviation | $1.07 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $31.94 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $53.14 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.21 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $7.66 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.01 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $31.16 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $28.55 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $25.96 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $14.33 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $18.01 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.79 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $43.21 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $67.85 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $43.62 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $36.59 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $4.75 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othling | $15.04 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $16.31 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $6.29 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $93.68 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.03 \%$ |

## District: 03



District: 04


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 04 |
| Population_B20 | 255,197 |
| Deviation | -5,614 |
| \% Deviation | -2.15\% |
| \% lcvap_D19 | 16.88\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 67.77\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 4.96\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 9.38\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 0.98\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 20.22\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 22.69\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 28.92\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 28.17\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 7.23\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 30.38\% |
| \% ed_cd | 62.39\% |
| \% oh_rent | 54.84\% |
| \% Ih_english | 61.4\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 16.52\% |
| \% Ih_asianing | 4.92\% |
| \% lh_othing | 17.17\% |
| \% pov_below | 9.47\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 6.05\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 93.89\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.06\% |

District: 05


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 05 |
| Population_B20 | 266,361 |
| Deviation | 5.550 |
| \% Deviation | $2.13 \%$ |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $11.08 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $63.02 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.15 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $18.35 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.43 \%$ |
| \% inc_lt35k | $21.54 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $22.57 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.36 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $27.53 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $4.58 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $23.31 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $72.11 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $68.21 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $60.54 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $9.6 \%$ |
| \% In_asianlng | $12.85 \%$ |
| \% lh_othlng | $17.01 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $12.78 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.28 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $94.7 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.02 \%$ |

District: 06


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 06 |
| Population_B20 | 261,156 |
| Deviation | 345 |
| \% Deviation | $0.13 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $57.09 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $23.75 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $5.99 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $12.38 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $0.84 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $33.28 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.98 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $24.95 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $8.78 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $32.76 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $42.69 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $24.55 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $63.56 \%$ |
| \% lh_english | $22.83 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $63.47 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $7.46 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $6.23 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $19.2 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.28 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $92.69 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.04 \%$ |

District: 07


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 07 |
| Population_B20 | 266,297 |
| Deviation | 5,486 |
| \% Deviation | 2.1\% |
| \% Icvap_D19 | 59.01\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 27.54\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 4.47\% |
| \% acvap_..D19 | 8.04\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 0.96\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 26.33\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 27.95\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 32.14\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 13.58\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 29.32\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 45.23\% |
| \% ed_cd | 25.46\% |
| \% oh_rent | 39.29\% |
| \% th_english | 29.41\% |
| \% lh_spanish | 59.04\% |
| \% lh_asianlng | 4.8\% |
| \% th_othing | 6.75\% |
| \% pov_below | 15.02\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 4.98\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 94.99\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.03\% |

## District: 08



| Field |
| ---: |
| District |$r$| Value |
| ---: |
| Population_B20 |
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District: 09


## District: 10



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 10 |
| Population_B20 | 270,153 |
| Deviation | 9,342 |
| \% Deviation | $3.58 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $32.58 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $16.1 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $31.87 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $17.55 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.86 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $38.24 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $32.38 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $20.57 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $8.81 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $24.98 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $38.88 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $36.14 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $77.86 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $36.94 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $44.02 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $14.95 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $4.09 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $19.41 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $5.67 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $94.31 \%$ |
| \%emp_military | $0.03 \%$ |

District: 11


| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 11 |
| Population_B20 | 270,691 |
| Deviation | 9,880 |
| \% Deviation | $3.79 \%$ |
| \% Icvap_D19 | $15.19 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $64.23 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $6.21 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $13.08 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.3 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $18.85 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $18.83 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $28.37 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $33.95 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $6.37 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $23.86 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $69.76 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $56.85 \%$ |
| \% In_english | $68.73 \%$ |
| \% Ih_spanish | $14.66 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianlng | $6.79 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othlng | $9.82 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $9.94 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $4.49 \%$ |
| \%emp_civ_emp | $95.38 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.13 \%$ |

District: 12


| Field | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| District | 12 |
| Population_B20 | 259,543 |
| Deviation | -1,268 |
| \% Deviation | -0.49\% |
| \% Icvap_D19 | 23.73\% |
| \% wcvap_D19 | 50.93\% |
| \% bcvap_D19 | 5.62\% |
| \% acvap_D19 | 18.51\% |
| \% aocvap_D19 | 1.24\% |
| \% inc_lt35k | 17.51\% |
| \% inc_35_75K | 21.47\% |
| \% inc_75_150K | 33.55\% |
| \% inc_150plus | 27.47\% |
| \% ed_nhd | 9.75\% |
| \% ed_ncd | 39.09\% |
| \% ed_cd | 51.17\% |
| \% oh_rent | 31.56\% |
| \% th_english | 53.31\% |
| \% Ih_spanish | 19.98\% |
| \% th_asianing | 12.47\% |
| \% Ih_othing | 14.24\% |
| \% pov below | 8.42\% |
| \% emp_unemp | 5.09\% |
| \% emp_civ_emp | 94.81\% |
| \% emp_military | 0.1\% |

District: 13


## District: 14



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 14 |
| Population_B20 | 262,838 |
| Deviation | 2,027 |
| \% Deviation | $0.78 \%$ |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $54.69 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $19.55 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $7.69 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $16.65 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.39 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $37.5 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $25.33 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $23.49 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $13.69 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $29.66 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $36.11 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $34.23 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $69.92 \%$ |
| \% ih_english | $31.98 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $55.05 \%$ |
| \% lh_asianing | $10.57 \%$ |
| \% Ih_othing | $2.39 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $23.32 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.01 \%$ |
| \% emp_civ_emp | $92.94 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.05 \%$ |

## District: 15



| Field | Value |
| ---: | ---: |
| District | 15 |
| Population_B20 | 264,907 |
| Deviation | 4,096 |
| \% Deviation | $1.57 \%$ |
| \% lcvap_D19 | $52.57 \%$ |
| \% wcvap_D19 | $21.28 \%$ |
| \% bcvap_D19 | $15.62 \%$ |
| \% acvap_D19 | $8.88 \%$ |
| \% aocvap_D19 | $1.61 \%$ |
| \% inc_It35k | $34.57 \%$ |
| \% inc_35_75K | $29.94 \%$ |
| \% inc_75_150K | $23.93 \%$ |
| \% inc_150plus | $11.57 \%$ |
| \% ed_nhd | $29.93 \%$ |
| \% ed_ncd | $45.02 \%$ |
| \% ed_cd | $25.05 \%$ |
| \% oh_rent | $60.1 \%$ |
| \% Ih_english | $37.91 \%$ |
| \% lh_spanish | $53.99 \%$ |
| \% Ih_asianlng | $5.53 \%$ |
| \% In_othing | $2.57 \%$ |
| \% pov_below | $21.84 \%$ |
| \% emp_unemp | $7.46 \%$ |
| emp_civ_emp | $92.24 \%$ |
| \% emp_military | $0.3 \%$ |


[^0]:    ©2020 HERE

[^1]:    C2019 HERE

