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December 3, 2021

Jonathan Geiszler
Director, Purchasing & Warehouse
Newport Mesa Unified School District
2985 Bear Street, Building A
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

RE: RFP NO. 100-22 - RFP FOR DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS AND CENSUS MAPPING SERVICES FOR BOARD OF TRUSTEE AREA BOUNDARY REDISTRICTING

Dear Mr. Geiszler:

Please accept this submitted proposal as an indication of our genuine and sincere interest to serve as the consultants for the Newport Mesa Unified School District Board of Trustees redistricting process. As noted in the proposal, I have served in leadership positions on several projects in the past, including the 2001 California State Assembly map, the 2002 Los Angeles City Council and Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education (LAUSD) maps, the 2012 Los Angeles City Council map, the 2012 Central Basin Municipal Water District Board of Directors map, the 2021 LAUSD map, the 2021 City of Bradbury City Council map; and the forthcoming 2022 City of Alhambra, 2022 City of San Bernardino, 2022 City of Carson, 2022 City of Lake Forest, 2022 City of Menifee, 2022 City of Perris, 2022 Chino Basin Water Conservation District, 2022 Mojave Water District, 2022 Palmdale Water District, and 2022 Walnut Valley Water District maps, as well as recent 2020 Census-related litigation.

My colleague David Ely, owner of Compass Demographics, is a key collaborator on this proposal and has worked on redistricting and census-related projects since the 1980s, including the geographic and data sets for the Statewide Database for four decades and too many projects to list here (see Mr. Ely’s Curriculum Vita). In our capacities as the Technical Director, Executive Director, or consultant for previous redistricting efforts, we provided each process with the administrative and technical expertise to draw a transparent, community-based, legally sustainable plan, including a variety of options and scenarios requested by appointed or elected officials as they deliberated on draft maps and a final plan.

We have also partnered with Tizoc DeAztlan, President of DeAztlan Consulting, who has a decades-long practice specializing in public relations and community outreach services,
particularly in multi-ethnic and multi-lingual communities with respect to redistricting. Mr. DeAztlan is available to provide full-service redistricting outreach services to the District, including leading the multi-lingual public community engagement process.

The team’s approach to redistricting is one of collaboration, working with, and taking direction from the Board of Trustees to develop a plan of action that is structured and meets the objectives, criteria, and timeline developed and adopted by the District. This includes satisfying all requirements of local, state, and federal laws, as well as the County Registrar of Voters, at the highest level of excellence. Our key objective is to maximize public participation and legal compliance under the direction of the Board of Trustees, while providing the entire spectrum of possibilities and options to the District within the legal parameters of redistricting – as the Board of Trustees deliberate toward a draft and final map.

Our previous redistricting work history indicates that we are thoughtful and flexible individuals who reliably meet deadlines. Over the last few decades, we have performed the tasks required in less than a four-month period for several jurisdictions including when dictated by a Charter or municipal code. Our consistent ability to complete the task within the time frame allotted by state law, while providing plenty of time for the Registrar of Voters to complete the redrawing of voter precinct boundaries prior to the 2022 Election cycle, will be paramount to meeting the needs of the District under this scope of work. The attentiveness and accountability necessary to produce a trusted and quality map is something our team excels at.

Our understanding of redistricting and the Census over the last four decades, including the importance of outreach and public engagement, will be invaluable to the Board of Trustees in order to provide best practices for maximizing technical expertise, multi-lingual public input, and collaboration built on ethical competence, communities of interest, compactness, contiguity, and local, federal, and state legal requirements – resulting in a transparent, open, non-partisan, and community-based redistricting process conducted by the Board of Trustees for the residents of the District.

We look forward to the opportunity to personally discuss this proposal in more detail with District staff and the Board of Trustees. We are also requesting specific dates for meetings due to our current calendar as outlined in the Project Approach. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need any further information. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully Yours,

Andrew J. Westall
Principal & Owner
Section II – Project Approach

Having served several different jurisdictions in a similar capacity with over 50 years of experience, the team is poised to approach this project with a determined structure and timeline that fully develops the District’s abilities and opportunities to maximize public input, while delivering the expert guidance, technical reports, and tasks necessary to complete the Board of Trustees work in a non-partisan and transparent manner.

General objectives include:

- Collaborating, working with, and taking direction from the Board of Trustees to develop a plan of action that is structured and meets the objectives, criteria, and timeline developed and adopted by the District in coordination with District staff.

- Providing the entire spectrum of technical and geographic possibilities and options to the District within the legal parameters of redistricting.

- Maintaining flexibility, efficiency and nimbleness to ensure all deadlines are met consistently and within budget.

- Continuous and open lines of communication with District staff, the Board of Trustees, and members of the public (at the direction of the District). This can be achieved by email, phone, virtual online meeting, or in-person.

With respect to analytical resources and quantitative capabilities, the project team uses Maptitude for Redistricting by the Caliper Corporation, as well as has expertise in ESRI ArcGIS, Adobe Acrobat, Microsoft Access, Excel, Word, and SQL and OCB database platforms. In terms of database and data processing capabilities, the firm has access to Census data going back to the 1990 Census including all sets of PL 94-171 data, as well as American Community Survey data and historical statewide elections data (1990-) on the Statewide Database hosted by UC Berkeley. For the optional user-friendly online mapping and digital interface tool, our team uses DistrictBuilder by Azavea.

The project team has an excellent track record of managing projects, having the resources and personnel necessary to complete all projects under the Scope of Services by April 17, 2022. As seen in the Proposed Schedule, the turnaround time for the project and each task is very quick, working with District staff to obtain the proper approvals to move forward at each step of the process within the schedule.

Below is a standard methodology for the process that serves as a baseline of the many steps necessary to complete each District’s work with plenty of time for the Registrar of Voters to begin the redrawing of voter precinct boundaries prior to the 2022 Election cycle, essential for the District to satisfy its legal requirements. Our team is available to meet the needs of the District and has the flexibility to meet the proposed timeline regardless of our other current clients and contractual requirements. Needed assistance from District staff is listed below, including translation of documents/language interpretation unless negotiated (see cost options).
December-January 2021

1. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain staff approval of consultant-developed training materials and presentation on the redistricting process.

2. Work with the District staff to identify all scope of work written tasks that shall be translated into any required languages. All written translation will be conducted at the District’s cost unless otherwise negotiated. All materials that require translation shall be submitted to District staff or the requisite vendor at least seven business days in advance of publication.

3. Create a user-friendly digital interface that allows the Board of Trustees, and members of the public to draw their own district boundaries. The DistrictBuilder program will also guide the user in complying with all applicable laws and requirements to the extent practicable.

4. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain staff approval of the digital interface for public distribution and made available as a link on the District’s website.

5. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain staff approval of consultant-developed 2020 Census materials and presentation.

6. Analyze whether the 2020 Census data requires modifications to the Board of Trustees districts and report the findings to the District staff.

7. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain approval of public training workshop materials.

February 2022

8. First Board of Trustees Meeting (February 8 2022) – Train the Board of Trustees during a regular meeting on the redistricting process, federal Voting Rights Act, and all other applicable state and federal election laws; provide an overview of the 2020 Census data, and demographic profile.

9. Provide training via a public workshop to the public (e.g., evening and weekend) on redistricting in an objective, non-partisan informational manner. (February 23, 2022)

10. Evaluate draft maps prepared by the public to determine whether they are population balanced and satisfy all federal, state, and local legal requirements, and share findings with the District staff.

11. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain staff approval of a written summary of all public input submitted at the public input hearings, in writing, as a proposed map, or during other Board of Trustees conducted comment periods prior to the release of the draft maps.
12. Propose district boundaries to the District staff based on feedback provided by the community and criteria set by the Board of Trustees that are population balanced and satisfy the requirements of federal, state, and local laws.

13. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain staff approval of the proposed initial draft maps and accompanying technical report for public release and presentation to the Board of Trustees.

**March 2022**

14. Second Board of Trustees Meeting (March 8, 2022) - Present staff recommended initial draft map and accompanying technical report to the Board of Trustees during a regular meeting, along with public comment and submitted proposed maps analysis. Proposed draft map and technical report will be published seven days in advance.

15. Third Board of Trustees Meeting (March 29, 2022) – Hold a public input hearing to get feedback from residents on the draft map.

16. Make modifications to the initial draft maps based on input from the Board of Trustees and the community in coordination with District staff.

17. Work with the District staff to finalize and gain staff approval of revised final draft map and accompanying technical and written reports summarizing all public input on the proposed initial draft maps.

**April 2022**

18. Fourth Board of Trustees Meeting (Special Meeting prior to April 17, 2022) - Present consultant recommended, and District Counsel and District staff approved, revised final map and accompanying technical report to the Board of Trustees along with public comment and analysis of all available public input. Proposed revised final map and technical report will be published seven days in advance. Adoption of final map and resolution by the Board of Trustees.

19. Assist the Board of Trustees and District staff in all facets of implementing the final district boundary map, including all deliverables needed for the Registrar of Voters to implement new voter precinct boundaries and District archives.

**TBD**

20. Actively participate in all meetings and public hearings scheduled by the Board of Trustees that address the redistricting process.

21. Provide additional Census, PL 94-171, Statewide Database, and American Community Survey demographic data upon request as practicable during the term of the contract.
Section III – Qualifications

FIRM DESCRIPTION

Bear Demographics & Research LLC
10061 Riverside Drive, #144
Toluca Lake, CA 91602
Andrew Westall, Principal & Owner (Management Contact)
323.708.2478
ajwestall@gmail.com

After more than two decades in the public sector, Andrew Westall opened a new firm, Bear Demographics & Research LLC (BDR), in 2021 that specializes in redistricting, demographics, public policy consulting, and local ballot measures. BDR has teamed up with seasoned experts and subcontractors in the fields of redistricting, demography, and outreach, including: David Ely of Compass Demographics who has specialized in redistricting for more than three decades; Tizoc DeAztlan of DeAztlan Consulting who has specialized in public and community outreach for nearly two decades. The offices of BDR are located in the Toluca Lake neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles as indicated. The firm has no current employees. No services are excluded from the Scope of Work. Current redistricting clients include the Los Angeles Unified School District, the City of Los Angeles, the City of Alhambra, the city of Bradbury, the City of Carson, the City of Lake Forest, the City of Menifee, the City of San Bernardino, the Chino Basin Water Conservation District, and the Equal Representation Project.

Organizational Chart and Project Team

Andrew J. Westall
Project Manager/Demographer

David Ely
Technical Director/Demographer

Tizoc DeAztlan
Outreach Director
Mr. Westall has been involved in the redistricting process at the local and state level in the State of California since the late 1990s under the initial tutelage of UCLA’s Dr. Leobardo Estrada, a renowned national expert on ethnic and racial demographic trends, particularly in the Latino/a/x community; and Dr. J. Eugene Grigsby III, a renowned social justice advocate and current President & CEO of the National Healthcare Foundation. During this time, Mr. Westall authored the publication “Reapportionment, Redistricting and the Latino Community: 2000 and Beyond” for the NALEO Educational Fund as his master’s thesis. The publication was distributed to hundreds of Latino/a/x elected and appointed officials from across the United States at the 2000 NALEO Educational Fund National Conference in Denver, Colorado.

As a staff member to then-Speaker of the Assembly Robert M. Hertzberg, Andrew Westall worked with Assembly consultants (including Mr. David Ely) out of Caltech to build the data sets for the Statewide Database and the 2001 redistricting process, prior to the drafting of plans. He drew 43 of the 80 State Assembly seats in the adopted 2001 California State Assembly map, as well as several draft plans for State Senate and Congressional District maps. Mr. Westall’s state experience also includes expert affidavits and testimony during the successful State Supreme Court litigation process with respect to the State Senate district boundaries after the plan was approved. Throughout his tenure with the California State Assembly, Mr. Westall also participated in the technical development and creation of the 2000, 2002, 2003, and 2004 State Elections data sets that also reside on the Statewide Database website.

In 2001-02, Andrew Westall served as the Technical Director for both of the appointed Commissions that recommended the LAUSD and City Council maps to the Los Angeles City Council. During this time, Mr. Westall built the data sets used by each Commission, as well as worked with Commissioners on several draft plans, the final recommended plan, and all associated technical reports.

In 2011-12, Andrew Westall served as the Executive Director for the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. During this time, Mr. Westall was also the line drawer for the Central Basin Municipal Water District (as a subcontractor to DeAztlan Consulting), as well as provided pro-bono line drawing and analysis for the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor with respect to the 2011 California Citizens Redistricting Commission process.

From 2018 to the present, Mr. Westall has provided expert testimony and affidavits on behalf of the City of Los Angeles and the State of California with respect to the 2020 Census in successful litigation, including on the issue of adding a question regarding citizenship and the attempt to remove non-citizens from the PL 94-171 database that will be forthcoming by the U.S. Census Bureau on September. Bear Demographics & Research LLC serve as redistricting consultants to the LAUSD, Equal Representation Project, City of Los Angeles, City of Alhambra, City of Bradbury, City of Carson, City of Lake Forest, City of Menifee, City of San Bernardino, and the Chino Basin Water Conservation District. Mr. Westall’s resume is attached.
DAVID ELY

Mr. Ely is the Founder and President of Compass Demographics, a consulting and database management firm specializing in projects involving Census and Election Data. Mr. Ely has extensive experience in the management of redistricting projects, the analysis of voting behavior, and demographic analysis.

David Ely has served as an expert and testified on behalf of numerous jurisdictions in the United States as well as private plaintiffs in numerous cases involving voting rights and districting issues, and his opinions have been cited and relied on in multiple legal opinions. He has also served as a consultant and expert on behalf of defendant jurisdictions in voting rights litigation challenging election systems or districts. Mr. Ely has also served as a consultant to construct databases, draw district lines or prepare presentation maps and reports for the many jurisdictions in conducting their normal redistricting. These have included statewide congressional and legislative redistricting in California, as well as a variety of County Boards, City Councils, School Boards, Water Districts, Regional Transit Boards and others following the 1990, 2000, and 2010 Census.

Mr. Ely’s most recent clients in the State of California include the City of Fullerton, the City of Garden Grove, the City of Carson, the City of Coalinga, the City of Richmond, and the City of Malibu. Mr. Ely’s Curriculum Vitae is attached.

TIZOC DEAZTLAN

Tizoc DeAztlan is the President of DeAztlan Consulting, LLC., and has spent most of his career consulting and advising Southern California government, non-profit, private, and corporate agencies. He has consulted and managed public relations, community outreach, and media campaigns at the federal, state, and local levels.

Mr. DeAztlan specializes in Latino/Spanish speaking media markets and community affairs spearheading programs on issues of water, land use, culture, health, wellness, redistricting, and education. A go-to-person for coalition building and partnership creation, Tizoc maintains a consistent and measured community-centered approach. His adeptness at understanding all angles and creating the best option forward has led to a long track record of success for his clients. Mr. DeAztlan understands that while there are traditional outreach methods that must be utilized, each community is unique and as such his multi-lingual team must be adaptive to provide access to each resident regardless of language and technical capabilities.

Tizoc has consulted on redistricting for the California Latino Legislative Caucus and has worked alongside municipalities and commissions to maximize community involvement to meet and or exceed all obligations established under the California Voting Rights Act and the California FAIR MAPS Act.

Most recently, Mr. DeAztlan has led efforts to increase census participation through multi-layered public education and outreach by producing and implementing culturally competent collateral in English, Spanish, and Tagalog. Mr. DeAztlan’s resume is attached.
Andrew Westall
Los Angeles, California, United States

Email: ajwestall@gmail.com
LinkedIn: linkedin.com/in/andrewwestall

Summary
Current and Recent Clients - LAUSD, the City of Los Angeles, the Equal Representation Project, the UCBA, the City of Alhambra, the City of Bradbury, the City of Carson, the City of Menifee, the City of Perris, the City of Lake Forest, the City of San Bernardino, the Chino Basin Water Conservation District, the Mojave Water Agency, the Palmdale Water District, and the Walnut Valley Water District.

Goal: To help government and residents navigate the complexities of laws and regulations, in order to find consensus on difficult issues for the betterment of society and quality-of-life.

Expertise: Redistricting, Demographics, GIS (Maptitude and ArcGIS), Political Campaigns, and Elections/Redistricting Law; Cannabis Regulations, Taxation, Enforcement, and Social Equity; Local Ballot Measures (e.g., Taxation, Bonds, Charter Amendments, Housing, Elections Reform, Cannabis, etc.); City Management; Planning, Land Use, Housing, Homelessness, Environment, Economic Development, Community Development, Neighborhood Services, Recreation, and Transportation policy, financing and development; Public Finance, Budgeting, Labor Relations, and Grant Funding; and Community Outreach, Diversity, Inclusion, Equity, and Intergovernmental Relations

Experience

**Principal & Owner**
Bear Demographics & Research
Jan 2021 - Present (11 months +)
Specializing in redistricting, demographics, GIS (Maptitude and ArcGIS), political consulting, cannabis regulations, local ballot measures, land use/city planning, and city/county management consulting.
Current and recent clients include LAUSD, the City of Los Angeles, the Equal Representation Project, the UCBA, the City of Alhambra, the City of Bradbury, the City of Carson, the City of Menifee, the City of Perris, the City of Lake Forest, the City of San Bernardino, the Chino Basin Water Conservation District, the Mojave Water Agency, the Palmdale Water District, and the Walnut Valley Water District.

**Executive Director**
Los Angeles Unified School District Redistricting Commission
Mar 2021 - Nov 2021 (9 months)
Chief Executive and Financial Officer for the LAUSD Board of Education redistricting process, the largest independently elected school district in the United States.

**Deputy Chief of Staff (2012-16) and Co-Chief of Staff (2016-20)**
Office of Los Angeles City Council President Herb J. Wesson, Jr.
Apr 2012 - Dec 2020 (8 years 9 months)
Co-manager and supervisor for the City Council President's personal staff of 27 employees with oversight of Council District 10 (pop. 275,000); administrator and supervisor of all discretionary funds,
contracts, city planning, and public improvement approvals/projects for Council District 10; lead staff member for the Councilmember’s legislative portfolio; and chief strategist for community and media response.

Lead staff member and strategist for the City Council for eight years with oversight of the management, organization, and publication of the City Council agendas three times a week, while managing teams of up to 50 employees across multiple departments on the issues of budget, revenue strategies, ballot measures, pensions, recreation and parks, environment and utilities, intergovernmental relations, public safety, cultural arts, labor, housing, planning, economic development, infrastructure, cannabis, and transportation in the City of Los Angeles.

Lead staff member for the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2028 Olympics and Paralympic Games, the Ad Hoc Committee on Police Reform, the Board of Referred Powers, and the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee chaired by the Council President; staff member for the Ad Hoc Committee on COVID-19 Recovery and Neighborhood Investment, and the Southern California Association of Governments.

Executive Director
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
Nov 2011 - Mar 2012 (5 months)
Chief Executive and Financial Officer for the City of Los Angeles’ City Council redistricting process with oversight of six staff members employed and monitored twenty-seven contractors during the Commission’s work; organized twenty-two public testimony hearings at various city and non-city facilities, as well as comprehensive citywide outreach with more than 5,000 attendees and 6,551 written public comments; organized 11 additional regular and special Commission meetings; and issued a 950-page report to the City Council on time and under budget.

Senior Deputy
Office of Los Angeles City Councilmember Herb J. Wesson, Jr.
Nov 2005 - Nov 2011 (6 years 1 month)
Chief strategist and manager of all planning, economic development, transportation, and housing policy recommendations, funding acquisition, and projects for Council District 10; and staff member for the Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority.

Lead staff member for the Housing, Community, and Economic Development Committee chaired by the Councilmember for six years with oversight of $2 billion yearly in operational budgets, contracts, and construction projects by the Housing Department, Housing Authority, Community Development Department, and the Community Redevelopment Agency, including development and implementation of the Housing Element of the City’s General Plan; and staff member for the Transportation Committee.

Adjunct Professor
Pasadena City College
Jan 2003 - May 2010 (7 years 5 months)
Part-time professor teaching Political Science and American Institutions with instruction to over 2,000 students. Classes taught at PCC, John Muir, Blair, Pasadena, Temple City, and San Marino High Schools.
Assistant to the Speaker
California State Assembly
Jan 2001 - Nov 2005 (4 years 11 months)
Legislative staff member for Speakers of the Assembly Robert M. Hertzberg, Herb J. Wesson, Jr., and Fabian Nuñez in the areas of electoral strategy, GIS mapping, demographics, statistics, and redistricting; demographer and analyst for State 2001 redistricting process; chief line drawer for 43 of the 80 State Assembly districts in California in 2001; drafter of alternative plans for the Board of Equalization, State Senate, and House of Representatives; provided guidance and negotiated between various state legislators and legislative caucuses with respect to final district boundaries. Participated in the technical development and creation of the 2000, 2002, 2003, and 2004 State Elections data sets, as well as the 2001 State Redistricting data set, that reside on the Statewide Database website.

Technical Director
City of Los Angeles Redistricting Commission for the LAUSD
Nov 2001 - Apr 2002 (6 months)
Chief line drawer for the 7 LAUSD Board of Education districts, the largest independently elected school district in the United States. Submitted technical reports and developed, maintained, and updated website.

Technical Director
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
Nov 2001 - Apr 2002 (6 months)
Chief line drawer for the 15 City Council districts; organized 16 public testimony hearings in every region of the City with more than 3,000 attendees and over 5,000 written public comments; submitted technical reports and developed, maintained, and updated website.

Field Representative
Office of Speaker of the Assembly Robert M. Hertzberg
Feb 1999 - Dec 2000 (1 year 11 months)
Staff member and Speaker representative at community events, forums, meetings, and other policy discussions in the areas I staffed – transportation, the environment, water, health care, land use, and other issues affecting the San Fernando Valley; lead staffer for the summer intern program overseeing twenty-plus interns in each of two consecutive summers; database programmer and developer of filing systems, phone logs, and phone books for the Speaker.

Consultant
NALEO Educational Fund
Sep 1997 - Jun 2000 (2 years 10 months)
Chief researcher and author of publication on reapportionment and redistricting of legislative and congressional districts after the 2000 Census, emphasizing the Latino/a/x community in seven states; Presenter of publication at the 2000 National Conference in Denver, Colorado distributed to hundreds of elected and appointed officials.

President
Graduate Students Association (GSA), UCLA
May 1997 - Jun 1998 (1 year 2 months)
Chief Executive and Financial Officer for the Graduate Students Association, the official student
government of approximately 10,000 graduate and professional students; elected position; author of
numerous editorials (see publications); successfully advocated for the construction of new graduate
student housing near campus and free ridership for students on the Santa Monica Big Blue Bus
(implemented one year after graduation).

Education

University of California, Los Angeles
Master of Arts - MA, Urban Planning
1996 - 1999
Emphasis in environmental, transportation, and recreational public policy, municipal finance, city
planning, demographics, GIS mapping, and redistricting.

Chief Executive and Financial Officer for the Graduate Students Association, the official student
government of approximately 10,000 graduate and professional students; elected position; author of
numerous editorials (e.g. civic participation/voting, public transit, pedestrian safety, etc.) and Winter
1997 Viewpoint columnist for The Daily Bruin; successfully advocated for the construction of new
graduate student housing near campus and free ridership for students on the Santa Monica Big Blue
Bus.

University of California, Davis
Bachelor of Arts - BA, Political Science-Public Service
1993 - 1996
Emphasis in urban, environmental, transportation, economic, and social public policy, as well as various
ethnic studies disciplines (e.g. African-American, Chicana/Chicano, and Asian-American studies).

Served in leadership positions for two years as ritual officer and President of the Sigma Delta chapter of
the Chi Phi Fraternity. Published an opinion-editorial in The California Aggie on racial justice.

Skills
Economic Development • Project Planning • Policy Analysis • Community Outreach • Non-profits •
Public Policy • Public Speaking • Research • Policy • Redistricting

Honors & Awards

Award of Merit: Comprehensive Plan Award: Large Jurisdiction - APA California
2017
West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan and Implementing Ordinances
City of Los Angeles

Social Change and Diversity Award - APA Los Angeles
2018
Cannabis Social Equity Program
City of Los Angeles
Employment:

2007 to present
David Ely is the president and founder of Compass Demographics, a consulting and database management firm specializing in projects involving census and election data, redistricting projects, demographic analysis, and analysis of voting behavior.

1986 to 2007
Director of Research for the Redistricting and Reapportionment practice of Pactech Data and Research, Pasadena, California. As Director of Research, Mr. Ely testified or consulted to counsel in a variety of litigation involving the configuration of election districts as well as providing database construction and redistricting consulting for numerous jurisdictions.

Education:
California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, CA with a B.S. in Social Sciences and Mechanical Engineering in 1987.

Redistricting Consulting
Activities include database construction, demographic and voter analysis, development of districting plans, public hearings and presentation of plans, technical assistance, and analysis of alternative redistricting plans.

2020  Malibu City Council District Analysis
2020  Mission Springs Water District Board District Formation
2020  Richmond City Council District Formation
2019  Compton Unified School District Trustee District Formation
2019  Carson City Council District Formation
2018  Coalinga City Council District Formation
2018  Coalinga-Huron Recreation & Parks Board Member District Formation
2017  San Marcos Unified School District Trustee Area Formation
2016  Upland City Council District Formation
2016  Costa Mesa City Council District Formation
(Redistricting Consulting, cont.)

2015   Garden Grove City Council District Formation
2015   Fullerton City Council District Formation
2014   Saugus Union School District Trustee Area Formation
2014   Whittier City Council District Formation
2014   Sulphur Springs School District Trustee Area Formation
2014   Lancaster Elementary School District Trustee Area Formation
2012   Los Angeles Unified School District Redistricting
2012   Los Angeles City Council Redistricting
2012   Pasadena Unified School Board Districting
2012   Pasadena City Council Redistricting
2011   Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Board Redistricting
2011   California Legislative Redistricting
2011   Los Angeles County Redistricting
2008   Ceres Unified School District Redistricting
2008   Madera Unified School District Redistricting
2008   Merced Elementary School District Redistricting
2008   Merced High School District Redistricting
2005   Hanford Joint Union High School District Redistricting
2003   Oakland City Council and Oakland Unified School Board Redistricting
2002   Los Angeles City Council Redistricting
2002   Los Angeles Unified School District Board Member Redistricting
2002   Pasadena, California, City Council Redistricting
2001   California Legislative Redistricting (Senate, Assembly, and Congressional)
2001   Los Angeles County Supervisorial Redistricting
2001   Bay Area Rapid Transit Board Member Districts Redistricting
1992   Rancho Mirage, California, City Council Redistricting
(Redistricting Consulting, cont.)

1992   Three Valleys Municipal Water District Redistricting
1992   Los Angeles Unified School Board Member Redistricting
1992   Los Angeles City Council Redistricting
1992   Pasadena, California, City Council Redistricting
1991   California Congressional Redistricting
1991   California State Assembly Redistricting
1991   Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Redistricting
1987   City of Boston, Massachusetts Redistricting
1986   Los Angeles City Council Redistricting
1987 to 2012, California State Legislature, Redistricting Database construction

Litigation Analysis

Activities include database construction, demographic analysis, expert witness testimony, surname matching, geocoding of registered and actual voter lists, and construction of illustrative districting plans.

2000-Present Provided analysis on numerous voting rights investigations not listed.

*Vaughan v. Lewisville Independent School District* (2020), expert witness (Texas)
*Kumar v. Frisco Independent School District* (2020), expert witness (Texas)
*Terrebonne Parish NAACP et al vs. Governor of Louisiana et al* (2019), Special Master
*Tyson v. Richardson Independent School District* (2018), expert witness (Texas)
*Yumori-Kaku v. City of Santa Clara* (2018), expert witness (California)
*Loya v. City of Santa Monica* (2018), expert witness (California)
*Luna v. Kern County* (2017), expert witness (California)
*Patino v. City of Pasadena* (2015), expert witness (Texas)
*Garrett v. City of Highland* (2015), expert witness (California)
*Rodriguez v. City of Grand Prairie* (2015), expert witness (Texas)
(Litigation Analysis, cont.)

*Navajo Nation v. San Juan County* (2014), expert witness (Utah)

*Solis v. City of Santa Clarita* (2014), expert witness (California)

*Jauregui v. City of Palmdale* (2013), expert witness (California)

*Gonzalez v. City of Compton* (2012), expert witness (California)

*Fabela v. City of Farmers Branch* (2011), expert witness (Texas)


*Benavidez v. City of Irving* (2008), expert witness (Texas)

*Avitia v. Tulare Local Health Care District* (2008), expert witness (California)

*U.S. v. City of Euclid* (2007), election data consultant (Ohio)

Bexar Metropolitan Water District (2007), election data consultant (Texas)


*Sanchez v. City of Modesto*, (2004), California

*Governor Gray Davis v. Kevin Shelley*, (2003) data analysis and declaration (California)

*U.S. v. Alamosa County*, (2002), expert witness (Colorado)

*Cano v. Davis*, (2002), election data consultant, (California)

*U.S. v. City of Lawrence*, (2000), expert witness (Massachusetts)

*U.S. v. City of Santa Paula*, (2000) voting rights litigation (California)


*U.S. v. City of Lawrence*, (1999) voting rights litigation (Massachusetts)
(Litigation Analysis, cont.)


*Ruiz v. City of Santa Maria*, (1992-1998), expert witness (California)

*Garza v. County of Los Angeles*, (1988-90), Constructed databases and designed remedial plans for Los Angeles County Supervisorial Districts
TIZOC DE AZTLAN

78115 Calle Estado #206, La Quinta, CA 92253
Tizoc@DeAztlanConsulting.com
310-699-3201

EXPERIENCE HIGHLIGHTS

DEAZTLAN CONSULTING La Quinta, CA
President 2010 – Present
Responsible for setting and directing the strategy and vision for a full-service public relations, research, and governmental affairs firm. The use of community centered collaborations, culturally competent digital media tools, and sophisticated messaging are critical to the firm’s approach. Under his direction, the firm has built and managed effective communications strategies combining traditional field operations with the most up-to-date media platforms. His bilingual team conducts surveys, public advocacy, and designs collateral including direct mail, posters, booklets, banners, as well as offers full video services from scripting to production. Maximizing the use of social media channels, Tizoc’s expertise and assembled team routinely builds a new online community or grows an already existing social channel. This extended client identity is reached across multiple platforms through custom content, engagement strategies, and advertising campaigns. The team has created effective virtual meeting strategies as well as developed COVID-19 safe protocols for in-person meetings.

LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY Los Angeles, CA
Research Project Manager/Grant Acquisition and Management Specialist 2009-2010
Generate and implement media and community outreach efforts for The Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles “LCSLA.” Effectively promote and foster positive relationships with City, County, State, and National government, corporate, and community organizations. Advocate LCSLA’s capabilities to Legislators and their staff; cultivate constructive partnerships. Develop and produce televised weekly seminars that attract elected officials and leaders. Expand the presence of LCSLA through representation at public events. Conduct Research for an integrative study on leadership and community in Los Angeles. Track and analyze public policy and legislation for studies on local health, government, transportation, education, economy, and governance. Implement existing grants including hiring and overseeing of field staff, creation of project literature, reporting to grant representative,
and write reports on expectation and progress for existing grants. Lead and manage compliance effort for grant proposals.

**FORDHAM UNIVERSITY** New York, NY  
*Development Services Coordinator* 2006-2009  
Served as advocate and liaison between Communications, Alumni Relations, IT and Stewardship departments; develop strategic tactical plans to improve efficiency and data integrity of University database and record systems. Directed donor acknowledgements and produced progress reports to support the $400 million Excelsior capital campaign.  
In earlier role, directed diverse marketing projects to support annual fundraising efforts; coordinated market research, monitored web site, and developed promotional material and direct mail campaigns. Spearheaded launch and execution of key marketing projects that led to notable increases in gift contributions.

**NEW HORIZONS FAMILY CENTER** Glendale, CA  
*Government Program Administrator* 2004-2006  
Served integral role for a progressive non-profit Development and Management team responsible for the expansion of community services to the under privileged community of Glendale; conducted prospect research and gift solicitation. Member of Grant writing and acquisition team that was successfully awarded grants from the City of Los Angeles, The County of Los Angeles, The State of California Prepared and administered budgets for city, county and state contracts. Tracked and monitored Youth Program goals to meet or exceed government grant guidelines. Tracked legislation pertinent to children and mental health organizations. Key representative for all public relations events such as galas and forums. Collaborated with local Fire, Police Departments, and School Districts to plan festivals, child health days, and other community events. Booked health and human services leadership to speak at community events, and piloted centers Higher Education for Me program. Coordinated fundraising efforts with Glendale and Los Angeles City Councils, California State Assembly, Senate Members and County Supervisors. Championed multimedia events and gained PR exposure via press releases, television, print and Internet campaigns.

**RAND CORP** Santa Monica, CA  
*Field Researcher* 2000-2002  
Initial group of researchers to work on the Los Angeles Family and Neighbor Study. Field research was conducted in randomly selected homes through-
out Los Angeles County to study the effects neighborhood has on a family’s health, religion, economics, education, culture, and inter-family cohesiveness. Specialized in impoverished, and Spanish speaking communities. This study’s data has been used for the creation of Los Angeles County health and human services public policy.

EDUCATION BACKGROUND

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY  New York, NY
Bachelor of Arts, Communications and Media Studies

EXTRA CURRICULAR

RUN WITH LOS MUERTOS
Founder/Race Director
This annual day of the dead celebration was created to promote health and wellness in the Latino Community. Through varied programming including a 5k run, art show, clinics, and block party, the festivities bring together organizations, teams, and thousands of participants from around the country.

THE MOBIUS CONFERENCE
Founder/Executive Director
A conference for thought leaders, artists, and scholars to engage, connect and share evolving topics in art, politics, and culture. The core mission of Mobius is to create spaces for dialogue amongst varied disciplines. Past conference participants have included civil rights icon Dolores Huerta, Actor Emilio Rivera, and internationally renowned Burkinabè architect Francis Kéré.

SELECT CLIENT LIST

BUILDING HEALTHY COMMUNITIES
Riverside County, CA
CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
Sacramento, CA
CENTRAL BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
Commerce, CA
CHELSEA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Carlsbad, CA
CITY OF COACHELLA
Coachella, CA
CITY OF PALM SPRINGS
Palm Springs, CA
COACHELLA STAKEHOLDERS ASSOCIATION
Coachella, CA
COACHELLA VALLEY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
Palm Desert, CA

COLLEGE OF THE DESSERT FOUNDATION
Palm Desert, CA

FIELD WORKS
Washington, DC

GOLDENVOICE
Los Angeles, CA

IMAGINE SCHOOLS
Riverside, CA

LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

LEAVEY CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LOS ANGELES
Los Angeles, CA

SANDSTONE PROPERTIES
Los Angeles, CA

SOUTHWEST VOTER REGISTRATION AND EDUCATION PROJECT
Los Angeles, CA
Section IV – References

CURRENT REDISTRICTING CLIENTS

Chino Basin Water Conservation District (2021-22)

Toyasha Sebbag
Administrative Services Manager
Chino Basin Water Conservation District
4594 San Bernardino Street
Montclair, CA 91763
909.667.4573
tsebbag@cbwcd.org
https://www.cbwcdredistricting.org/

City of Alhambra (2021-22)

The Honorable Lauren Myles
City Clerk
City of Alhambra
111 South First Street
Alhambra, CA 91801
626.570.5090
lmyles@cityofalhambra.org
https://www.cityofalhambra.org/553/City-of-Alhambra-Redistricting-Process

City of Carson (2021-22)

John Raymond
Assistant City Manager – Economic Development
City of Carson
701 E. Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
310.952.1773
jraymond@carsonca.gov

City of Menifee (2021-22)

The Honorable Sara Manwaring
City Clerk
City of Menifee
29844 Haun Road
Menifee, CA 92586
951.723.3708
smanwaring@cityofmenifee.us
https://www.cityofmenifee.us/721/Redistricting-20212022
City of San Bernardino (2021)

The Honorable Genoveva Rocha
City Clerk
City of San Bernardino
201 North “D” Street
San Bernardino, CA 92401
909.384.5002 x3212
rocha_ge@sbcity.org
https://www.sbcityredistricting.org/

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

ANDREW J. WESTALL

City of Los Angeles Redistricting Commission for the LAUSD/City of Los Angeles (2001-02)

The Honorable David Tokofsky
Board of Education Member (ret.), 5th District (1995-2007)
Los Angeles Unified School District
333 South Beaudry Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.392.3846
davidtokofsky@gmail.com
https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2002/02-0800.PDF

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission/City of Los Angeles (2011-12)

The Honorable Herb J. Wesson, Jr.
Los Angeles City Council President Emeritus
City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
323.828.8590
wessonhj10@gmail.com

Los Angeles Unified School District Redistricting Commission (March-November 2021)

Luis Sanchez
Chair
LAUSD Redistricting Commission
City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring Street, Room 285
Los Angeles, CA 90012
323.376.9370
luis@powercalifornia.org
DAVID ELY

City of Garden Grove (2015-16)

Supervised Council District Formation process, including building database; creating educational and informational presentation materials for community meetings, Public Hearings, and online access; processing public input, producing draft maps, and creating standardized maps and reports for draft maps as well as publicly submitted district plans; and assisting City staff in the transmission of adopted plans to County election officials for implementation.

Maria Stipe
Deputy City Manager
City of Garden Grove
11222 Acacia Parkway
Garden Grove, CA 92842
714.741.5106
marias@ci.garden-grove.ca.us

https://ggcity.org/maps/council-districts/

City of Costa Mesa (2016)

Supervised Council District Formation process, including building database; creating educational and informational presentation materials for community meetings, Public Hearings, and online access; processing public input, producing draft maps, and creating standardized maps and reports for draft maps as well as publicly submitted district plans; and assisting City staff in the transmission of adopted plans to County election officials for implementation.

Brenda Green City Clerk
City of Costa Mesa
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
714.754.5221
brenda.green@coastamesaca.gov

http://apps.costamesaca.gov/maps/VotingDistrict.html

City of Los Angeles Demographic Analysis, 2020 Census, and Redistricting (2016-Present)

Sharon Tso
Chief Legislative Analyst City of Los Angeles
200 N Spring Street, Room 255
Los Angeles CA 90012
213.359.8867
sharon.tso@lacity.org
Compton Unified School District Board District Formation (2019)

Barrett Green
Attorney, Compton Unified School District
Littler Law Firm
2049 Century Park East, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3107
310.772.7264
bgreen@littler.com

https://www.compton.k12.ca.us/board/establishment-of-board-districts/establishment-of-board-districts

TIZOC DEAHTLAN

Central Basin Municipal Water District Redistricting (2012)

Sharon Kumar
Deputy Board Secretary
Central Basin Municipal Water District
6252 Telegraph Road
Commerce, CA 90040
323.201.5500
sharonk@centralbasin.org


Worked with the City Council, Staff, and Voting Rights Commission to assure that residents had access to redistricting information and the ability to participate. Planned, promoted, and managed bilingual community input events that provided background and training in map creation. Produced bilingual informational material and provided in field distribution. The outreach efforts resulted in a significant increase in meeting participation as well as map and survey submittals from the Latino/a/x community.

The Honorable Grace Garner
City Councilmember
City of Palm Springs
760-323-8299
grace.garner@palmspringsca.gov
https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=d5a5a0d3eebc4dbdbf73325c3f0d61e1

City of Palm Springs Spanish Social Media and 2020 Census (2020-2021)

Amy Blaisdell
Communications Director
City of Palm Springs
3200 E. Tahquitz Canyon Way
Palm Springs, CA 92262 760.323.8250
amy.blaisdell@palmspringsca.gov
# Section V - Project Schedule

## 2021-22 Board of Trustees Redistricting
Newport Mesa Unified School District

Bear Demographics and Research LLC  
Andrew J. Westall - Project Manager

Project Start Date: December 22, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Training &amp; Presentation Materials</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Translation Methods &amp; Documents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Online Mapping Tool</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Public Workshop Materials Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of 2020 Census materials and presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Workshop</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Publicly Submitted Draft Maps</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Written Summary of Public Input</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Draft Map and Technical Report</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Final Draft Map and Technical Report</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables to County Registrar of Voters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart shows the planned milestones and their corresponding hours, scheduled from December 2021 to April 2022.
Section VI – Fee Schedule

The Fee Schedule listed below is all-inclusive of the work and costs that the project team will undertake. The only exception to this proposal is the translation of documents into any required languages, and the team would be happy to work with District staff to ensure such translation occurs in a timely manner as outlined in the proposal. Typically, this can be accomplished quickly by piggybacking on an existing County or District contract. The project team can provide several options as well, including an online mapping tool and developing and maintaining the District’s redistricting website as a separate site from the District’s current website.

We look forward to discussing this proposal further with you. This fee schedule is the same whether working with the entire Board or with a Committee of the Board. Once again, thank you for your time and consideration.

Cost of Scope of Work

| $45,000 | Demographer, Technical, Mapping Consulting |
| $ 7,500 | User-friendly online Mapping Tool ([DistrictBuilder](#)) |
| $20,000 | Full-Service Outreach Services |

======

$72,500 Total Cost of Bid Proposal (not to exceed)

Optional Services

$ 7,500 Website Development and Maintenance (if separate from District website)

Additional Services

$250 per hour for additional demographic/mapping/technical services not within the scope of the contract.

$175 per hour for additional outreach services not within the scope of the contract.

$300 per hour for redistricting/demographic legal expert witness analysis/testimony after the expiration of the contract.

Hourly Rates by Classification

- Project Manager $250 per hour
- Technical Director $250 per hour
- Outreach Director $175 per hour
APPENDIX
Date: October 6, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

From: Genoveva Rocha, City Clerk

Subject: Public Hearing on Summary of Redistricting Law, Criteria, 2020 Census, and Process (All Wards)

Recommendation
It is recommended that the Mayor and City Council of the City of San Bernardino, California take the following actions:

1. Receive and file the staff report and presentation;

2. Conduct a Public Hearing to obtain public input and provide direction on the criteria to be considered while drafting district maps including identifying communities of interest; and

3. Authorize staff to conduct a portion of the twenty-one public input workshops virtually

Background
There are several federal, state, and local laws that govern the redistricting process that include: the City of San Bernardino City Charter and Municipal Code, the U.S. Constitution, the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, the State of California Elections Code, the State of California Constitution, as well as federal and state case law.

San Bernardino City Charter and Municipal Code
Several sections of the City Charter relate to the redistricting process, including the following:

- **City Charter Article III: City Council and Mayor**
  Section 301. Composition, Eligibility, and Terms

- **City Charter Article VIII: Elections**
  Section 801. Elective Officers; Terms
  Section 802. Number of Wards
  Section 803. Adjustment of Ward Boundaries

The section of the San Bernardino Municipal Code that will be amended to adopt the new Ward boundary descriptions in what is referred to as the “metes and bounds”
format, otherwise known as the legal description, is found here:

- **Municipal Code Chapter 1.16 Boundaries of the Wards**

Federal and State Laws
Several important federal and state legal criteria govern the redistricting process:

- **Equal Population Principle** - Wards must contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City of San Bernardino. This principle is established in the State of California Elections Code, as well as in the United States Supreme Court’s “One-Person, One-Vote” decisions. The City Council must make a good faith effort to draw wards with equal population.

Exact equality is not required for local wards if the deviation is justified by legitimate state purposes. For local jurisdictions like the City of San Bernardino, an overall deviation of less than 10 percent is presumptively valid. Deviations should be explained on traditional redistricting criteria as explained below. Deviations should also not seek to disadvantage any particular group and show a good faith effort.

In order to measure population equality and deviation, start with the City’s total population and divide by seven to determine the ideal equal population of the seven Council Wards, which is 31,884 residents per ward. Next, determine the deviation percentage of each ward from the ideal population. And last, determine total percent deviation, that is the difference between the district with the greatest positive and negative percent deviations which should total less than 10 percent. Under the current Ward map, the total percent deviation is 18.3 percent and will require changes (see Attachment 2).

Legal Authorities - U.S. Constitution, Supreme Court Case law including *Reynolds v. Sims*, *Gaffney V. Cummings*, *Larios v. Cox*, and *Harris v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*

- **Traditional Redistricting Criteria** - Federal, state and city law have established several traditional redistricting criteria all of which shall be considered to the extent feasible when drawing ward lines:
  
  o **Contiguity** - all parts of a ward should connect

  o **Compactness** - wards should be geographically compact. There are many ways to measure compactness, and the Council should be aware of appearance, shape, and border lines when creating wards

  o **Existing Boundaries** - wards should utilize boundaries such as geographic, street, and political boundaries

  o **Communities of Interest** - wards should preserve neighborhoods and communities of people sharing common interests. The concept of
protecting communities of interest is to draw boundaries in a manner that
preserves communities that share common interests and that should be
included within a single ward for purposes of their effective and fair
representation. There are many types of common interests that may
identify a community of interest. For example, communities may share
common housing patterns: urban, rural or suburban. Communities may
share a common culture or language. Communities may be defined by
their neighborhood or by the location of cultural, religious or educational
institutions. Communities may also be defined by the location of
geographic boundaries or features, such as parks, lakes, mountains or
freeways. Certain public services, like public schools, public transit, and
public safety may also help define a community. The City will obtain public
testimony and consider census data, City neighborhood and planning
information, and other information to help identify Communities of Interest.

Legal Authorities - Case law, California Constitution Article XXI, Section 2; California
Elections Code Section 21621

- **U.S. Constitution’s Equal Protection Clause** - The United States Supreme
Court has held that race cannot be used as the predominant factor in drawing
ward lines such that traditional redistricting criteria are subordinated to
considerations of race. The 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause does not,
however, prohibit all consideration of race. The City may consider race as a
factor along with traditional race-neutral redistricting criteria, and consideration of
traditional criteria should not be subordinated to consideration of race and should
be contemporaneous.

If there is evidence that the City used race as a predominant factor, whether
through direct testimony and Council deliberations, or in circumstantial evidence
(e.g. demographics, shape, changes, process, public record), then the Court will
apply strict scrutiny to the redistricting plan, and the City must justify that the use
of race is: 1) based or needed due to a compelling state interest; 2) the plan must
be narrowly tailored to that interest; and 3) legal muster is a very high burden.

Legal Authorities - U.S. Constitution; Supreme Court case law including *Shaw v. Reno*,
*Miller v. Johnson*, *Bush v. Vera*, *Cromartie I & II*, *Copper v. Harris*

- **Voting Rights Act of 1965** - The Voting Rights Act prohibits voting practices
which result in a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race,
color, or language minority status. Redistricting plans must be analyzed under
the Voting Rights Act to ensure they do not deprive minority voters of an equal
opportunity to elect representatives of their choice in violation of the Act.

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act prohibits any voting practice or procedure that
“results in a denial or abridgement” of the right to vote based on race, color, or
language minority status. The federal VRA applies to prohibit redistricting plans
that result in “vote dilution” by depriving minority voters of an equal opportunity to
elect a candidate of their choice (i.e., must not unlawfully minimize or cancel minority voting strength). Discriminatory effect is sufficient to show a violation of the federal VRA, and discriminatory intent is not required.

The U.S. Supreme Court has set three preconditions to Section 2 liability under the federal VRA, also referred to as the “Gingles” criteria - 1) the minority group must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a district; 2) the minority group must be politically cohesive; and 3) the majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it usually to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate.

Legal Authorities - Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act; *Thornburg v. Gingles*

Summary
Listed below are the key principles to keep in mind throughout the process:

- **Strive for Population Equality**
  - Make a good faith effort to draw wards equal in population
  - Justify any deviations with use of traditional redistricting criteria

- **Focus on Traditional Redistricting Criteria**
  - Draw contiguous and compact wards
  - Respect boundaries, neighborhoods, and communities of interest
  - Obtain public testimony, neighborhood/community information, and make a good record

- **Do not Use Race as the Predominant Factor**
  - Focus on traditional race-neutral criteria

- **Comply with the Voting Rights Act**
  - Avoid fracturing or packing minority voters

- **Establish and Follow a Good Process**

Discussion
Every ten years, local governments use new census data (see Attachment 2) to redraw their ward/district lines to reflect how local populations have changed. Assembly Bill 849 (2019), also known as the California FAIR MAPS Act, requires cities and counties to engage communities in the redistricting process by holding public hearings and/or workshops and doing public outreach. Based on this same law, the City of San Bernardino must finish the 2021 redistricting process by December 15, 2021. Below is the current working timeline:

Summary of Redistricting Law, Criteria, and Process - 2020 Census Presentation
Pre-Draft Map Public Hearing
October 6, 2021 - 8pm
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS/HEARINGS

Ward 1
October 12, 2021 - 6pm
Feldheym Central Library
555 W. 6th Street

Ward 2
October 14, 2021 - 6pm
TBD

Ward 4
October 16, 2021 - 10am
Lutheran Church of Our Savior
5050 N. Sierra Way

Ward 6
October 18, 2021 - 6pm
Delmann Heights Park
2969 N. Flores Street

Ward 3
October 21, 2021 - 6pm
Lytle Creek Community Center
380 S. K Street

Ward 7
October 23, 2021 - 10am
Cathedral of Praise
3030 Del Rosa Ave.

Ward 5
October 24, 2021 - 6pm
Shandin Hills Golf Club
3380 Little Mountain Drive

Presentation and Adoption of Draft Council Ward Boundaries Map
Pre-Final Map Public Hearing
November 3, 2021 - 8pm
Feldheym Central Library
555 W. 6th Street

PRE-FINAL MAP PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ward 4
November 6, 2021 - 10am
Lutheran Church of Our Savior
5050 N. Sierra Way

November 7, 2021
TBD

Ward 5
November 11, 2021 - 6pm
Shandin Hills Golf Club
3380 Little Mountain Drive

Ward 1
November 12, 2021 - 6pm
Feldheym Central Library
555 W. 6th Street

Ward 3
November 13, 2021
TBD

November 14, 2021
TBD

Ward 2
November 15, 2021 - 6pm
TBD

Ward 7
November 20, 2021 - 10am
Cathedral of Praise
3030 Del Rosa Ave.

November 21, 2021
TBD

Ward 6
November 22, 2021 - 6pm
Delmann Heights Park
2969 N. Flores Street

Presentation and Adoption of Final Council Ward - Boundaries Map (First Reading)
December 1, 2021 - 8pm
Feldheym Central Library
555 W. 6th Street

Presentation and Adoption of Final Council Ward - Boundaries Map (Second Reading)
To accommodate the residents and community stakeholders that are unable to attend the in-person public input workshops due to time constraints and to help in mitigating the Covid-19 pandemic concerns, staff is requesting that the Mayor and City Council authorize a portion of the twenty-one workshops to be held virtually. Of the twenty-one total workshops the Mayor and City Council previously requested, there would be seven in-person workshops prior to the first drafting of the maps, and the fourteen (14) scheduled prior to the adoption of the final maps would be a combination of virtual and in-person meetings. The virtual meetings will follow the same process as the in-person meetings.

2020-2025 Key Strategic Targets and Goals

Fiscal Impact
The Mayor and City Council approved funding for the redistricting process in the adoption of the FY 2021/22 budget.

Conclusion
It is recommended that the Mayor and City Council of the City of San Bernardino, California take the following actions:

1. Receive and file the staff report and presentation;

2. Conduct a Public Hearing to obtain public input and provide direction on the criteria to be considered while drafting district maps including identifying communities of interest; and

3. Authorize staff to conduct a portion of the twenty-one public input workshops virtually.

Attachments
Attachment 1 Redistricting Presentation (Oct. 6, 2021)
Attachment 2 City of San Bernardino Demographic Profile (Sept. 27, 2021)
Attachment 3 Excerpt from City Charter, Article 3, Section 301
Attachment 4 Excerpt from City Charter, Article 8, Sections 801-803
Attachment 5 Excerpt from City Municipal Code, Chapter 1.16, Sections 1.16.010-1.16.080
Attachment 6 English and Spanish Public Hearing Notice

Synopsis of Previous Council Actions:
February 17, 2021  The Mayor and City Council directed staff to proceed with establishing an Electoral Redistricting Advisory Committee consisting of seven members with one resident from each ward.

April 7, 2021  The Mayor and City Council Adopted Resolution No. 2021-70 of the Mayor and City Council of the City of San Bernardino, California, establishing the Electoral Redistricting Advisory Committee.

July 21, 2021  Adopted Resolution No. 2021-193 authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Bear Demographics and Research for Demography, Communications and Outreach Services for electoral redistricting following the 2020 U.S. Census.
Summary of Redistricting Law, Criteria, 2020 Census, and Process

2021 City Council Redistricting Process

October 6, 2021
Overview of Redistricting Laws

- San Bernardino City Charter and Municipal Code
- U.S. Constitution
- Federal Voting Rights Act
- California Elections Code
- California Constitution
- Case Law
San Bernardino Charter and Municipal Code

• City Charter Article III: City Council and Mayor
  Section 301. Composition, Eligibility, and Terms

• City Charter Article VIII: Elections
  Section 801. Elective Officers; Terms
  Section 802. Number of Wards
  Section 803. Adjustment of Ward Boundaries

• Municipal Code Chapter 1.16 Boundaries of the Wards
Equal Population Principle

• General Principle: City Council Wards must be substantially equal in population
  • U.S. Constitution's Equal Protection Clause and “One-Person, One-Vote” Jurisprudence
  • California Elections Code Section 21621 (“substantially equal” in “total population” as required by the U.S. Constitution)
Equal Population Principle

- Make good faith effort to draw wards with equal population
- Exact equality is not required for local wards if deviation is justified by legitimate state purposes
- Deviation of less that 10 percent is presumptively valid
  - Only if for legitimate reasons
  - Deviations should be explained on traditional redistricting criteria of other lawful justifications
Equal Population Principle

• Deviations from equal population should be justified
  • Show consistent reliance on traditional redistricting criteria (e.g., respecting neighborhoods and communities of interest, observing natural and other boundaries, maintaining compact wards)

• Do not seek to disadvantage any particular group

• Show good faith effort
Equal Population Principle

• Measuring Population Equality and Deviation
  • Start with City’s total population
  • Determine ideal equal population of the 7 Council Wards
  • Determine percent deviation from ideal of each ward
  • Determine total percent deviation – difference between the wards with the greatest positive and negative percent deviations
### Equal Population Principle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Ideal Population</th>
<th>Percent Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Example of a City with a population of 140,000 and 7 City Council Wards

- Total Percent Deviation = 6.5%
Traditional Redistricting Criteria

• Focus on traditional redistricting criteria
  • Contiguity
  • Compactness
  • Natural Boundaries and Streets
  • Neighborhood and Communities of Interest

• Legal Authorities – Case Law, California Constitution Article XXI, Section 2; California Elections Code Section 21621
Traditional Redistricting Criteria

• Contiguity – all parts of ward should connect

• Compactness – ward should be geographically compact
  • Many ways to measure compactness
  • Be aware of appearance, shape, and border lines

• Existing boundaries – observe existing boundaries
  • Geographic, topographic boundaries
  • Streets, Freeways
  • Other Boundaries
Traditional Redistricting Criteria

• Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest – preserve communities sharing common interests
  • Neighborhoods
  • Example of Common Interests
    • Land Use patterns (suburban, industrial, commercial)
    • Cultural and Language characteristics
    • Income Level
    • Educational Background; Employment and Economic patterns
    • Crime, schools, other common issues
• Obtain public testimony and consider census data, City neighborhood information, planning information, etc.
Equal Protection Clause

14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause prohibits the use of race as the predominant factor in redistricting except in narrow cases:

- Race generally cannot be “predominant” factor
- I.e., no racial gerrymandering

Legal Authorities – U.S. Constitution; Supreme Court Case law including Shaw v. Reno, Miller v. Johnson, Bush v. Vera, Cromartie I & II, Alabama Legislative Black Caucus, Cooper v. Harris, Bethune-Hill
Equal Protection Clause

- 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause does not, however, prohibit all consideration of race
- May consider race as a factor along with traditional race-neutral redistricting criteria
- Consideration of traditional criteria should not be subordinated to consideration of race and should be contemporaneous
Equal Protection Clause

• Evidence of race as a predominant factor:
  • Direct testimony
  • Circumstantial evidence (demographics, shape, changes, process, public record)
• If race determined to be predominant factor, strict scrutiny applies to redistricting plan
  • Need compelling state interest
  • Plan must be narrowly tailored
  • High burden
Federal Voting Rights Act

• Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965
  • Prohibits any voting practice or procedure that “results in a denial or abridgement” of the right to vote based on race, color, or language minority status
  • Applies to prohibit redistricting plans that result in “vote dilution” by depriving minority voters of an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice
  • i.e., must not unlawfully minimize or cancel minority voting strength
  • Discriminatory effect sufficient, discriminatory intent not required
Federal Voting Rights Act

• Examples of “Vote Dilution”
  
  • **Fracturing** – dispersing minority voters into several different wards such that a bloc-voting majority can routinely outvote them

  ![Fracturing Diagram]

  • **Packing** – concentrating minority voters into a small number of wards and thereby minimizing their influence in other wards

  ![Packing Diagram]
Federal Voting Rights Act

• The Supreme Court has set three preconditions to Section 2 liability under the federal VRA (the “Gingles” criteria)
  • The minority group harmed must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a ward
  • The minority group must be politically cohesive; and
  • The majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it usually to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate

• Legal Authorities – Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act; *Thornburg v. Gingles*
Summary of Law and Criteria

• Key Principles to Keep in Mind
  • Strive for Population Equality
    • Make a good faith effort to draw wards equal in population
    • Justify any deviations with use of traditional redistricting criteria
  • Focus on Traditional Redistricting Criteria
    • Draw contiguous and compact wards
    • Respect boundaries, neighborhoods, and communities of interest
    • Obtain public testimony, neighborhood/community information, and make a good record
  • Do not Use Race as the Predominant Factor
    • Focus on traditional race-neutral criteria
  • Comply with the Voting Rights Act
    • Avoid fracturing or packing minority voters
  • Establish and Follow a Good Process
## 2020 Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population (Pop) 2020 Adjusted Deviation</strong></td>
<td>29,038</td>
<td>32,271</td>
<td>31,103</td>
<td>34,876</td>
<td>32,699</td>
<td>30,713</td>
<td>32,489</td>
<td>223,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino</strong></td>
<td>22,401</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>23,830</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>23,181</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>18,618</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8,231</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>991</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Race</strong></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi Minority Race</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Summary of Redistricting Law, Criteria, and Process
  2020 Census Presentation
  Pre-Draft Map Public Hearing  October 6, 2021 @ 8pm

• Public Workshops/Hearings  October 12-24, 2021

• Presentation and Adoption of Draft City Council Member
  Ward Boundaries Map
  Pre-Final Map Public Hearing  November 3, 2021 @ 8pm

• Pre-Final Map Public Hearings  November 6-22, 2021

• Presentation and Adoption of Final City Council Member
  Ward Boundaries Map (First Reading)  December 1, 2021 @ 8pm

• Presentation and Adoption of Final City Council Member
  Ward Boundaries Map (Second Reading)  December 15, 2021 @ 8pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (Pop) 2020 Adjusted</td>
<td>29,038</td>
<td>32,271</td>
<td>31,103</td>
<td>34,876</td>
<td>32,699</td>
<td>30,713</td>
<td>32,489</td>
<td>223,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation (2,846)</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>(781)</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>(1,171)</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Deviation</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2020 Adjusted Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Age Population (VAP) 2020 Adjusted</td>
<td>20,268</td>
<td>22,545</td>
<td>22,464</td>
<td>26,227</td>
<td>24,504</td>
<td>21,445</td>
<td>23,238</td>
<td>160,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (Pop) 2020 Census</td>
<td>28,869</td>
<td>32,079</td>
<td>30,977</td>
<td>34,716</td>
<td>32,581</td>
<td>30,545</td>
<td>32,334</td>
<td>222,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Age Population (VAP) 2020 Census</td>
<td>20,099</td>
<td>22,353</td>
<td>22,337</td>
<td>26,067</td>
<td>24,386</td>
<td>21,276</td>
<td>23,083</td>
<td>159,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2020 Adjusted Data

2020 Census Redistricting Data
## City of San Bernardino Demographic Profile

### Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>15,606</td>
<td>14,228</td>
<td>25,139</td>
<td>20,257</td>
<td>15,607</td>
<td>17,731</td>
<td>122,211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Population (By Age and Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Under 5 years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>5 to 17 years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>18 to 65 years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>65 years and over</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27,678</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Households (By Household Income)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than $10,000</th>
<th>$10,000 to $14,999</th>
<th>$15,000 to $24,999</th>
<th>$25,000 to $34,999</th>
<th>$35,000 to $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 to $74,999</th>
<th>$75,000 to $99,999</th>
<th>$100,000 to $149,999</th>
<th>$150,000 to $199,999</th>
<th>$200,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,732</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 25 years and over (By Education Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than 9th grade</th>
<th>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</th>
<th>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</th>
<th>Some college, no degree</th>
<th>Associate degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Graduate or professional degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16,146</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019 ACS CVAP Tabulation
2019 ACS Reformatted Tables - Block Group Tabulation
# City of San Bernardino Demographic Profile

## Population 15 years and over (By Marital Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>161,472</td>
<td>20,156</td>
<td>22,091</td>
<td>20,174</td>
<td>23,937</td>
<td>23,174</td>
<td>23,068</td>
<td>20,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now married, except separated</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Housing Units (By Occupancy Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>8,598</th>
<th>8,789</th>
<th>7,999</th>
<th>10,341</th>
<th>9,601</th>
<th>7,874</th>
<th>9,776</th>
<th>62,977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter occupied</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Occupied Housing Units (Overcrowding by Tenure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>7,732</th>
<th>8,189</th>
<th>7,235</th>
<th>9,626</th>
<th>9,193</th>
<th>7,490</th>
<th>9,242</th>
<th>58,707</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Population 16 years and over (By Employment Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>19,674</th>
<th>21,635</th>
<th>19,692</th>
<th>28,494</th>
<th>23,400</th>
<th>22,588</th>
<th>22,445</th>
<th>157,928</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In labor force:</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force:</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force:</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Occupied housing units (Structure Type by Tenure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>7,732</th>
<th>8,189</th>
<th>7,235</th>
<th>9,626</th>
<th>9,193</th>
<th>7,490</th>
<th>9,242</th>
<th>58,707</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More Units</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More Units</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of San Bernardino

## Demographic Profile

### Population 5 years and over (By Language Spoken at Home and English Ability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,256</td>
<td>27,724</td>
<td>24,522</td>
<td>33,897</td>
<td>29,038</td>
<td>29,003</td>
<td>28,168</td>
<td>197,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 1 years and over (By Residence Previous Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,179</td>
<td>29,848</td>
<td>26,036</td>
<td>36,217</td>
<td>30,759</td>
<td>31,138</td>
<td>30,668</td>
<td>211,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house in the U.S.</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same state</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different state</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population With Poverty Status Determined (by Poverty Status and Age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,064</td>
<td>28,282</td>
<td>25,990</td>
<td>31,559</td>
<td>29,277</td>
<td>31,177</td>
<td>30,768</td>
<td>204,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below Poverty Level Past 12 Months</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income At or Above Poverty Level Past 12 Months</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Under 18 years</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Over 65</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of San Bernardino
#### Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupied housing units (By Housing Cost % of Income By Tenure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of San Bernardino
## Demographic Profile

### Total Population (Pop) 2020 Adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>24,201</td>
<td>23,830</td>
<td>23,181</td>
<td>18,618</td>
<td>17,619</td>
<td>24,562</td>
<td>21,391</td>
<td>151,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>8,231</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>28,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>27,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>9,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deviation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2020 Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (Pop)</td>
<td>2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>-8.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-3.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Voting Age Population (VAP) 2020 Adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2020 Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (Pop)</td>
<td>20,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>15,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Population (Pop) 2020 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>28,869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>22,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Voting Age Population (VAP) 2020 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>20,099</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Minority Race</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2020 Adjusted Data

2020 Census Redistricting Data

---

Attachment: Attachment 2: City of San Bernardino Demographic Profile (Sept. 27, 2021) (8560 : Public)
## City of San Bernardino Demographic Profile

### Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>15,606</td>
<td>14,228</td>
<td>25,139</td>
<td>20,257</td>
<td>15,607</td>
<td>17,731</td>
<td>122,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>8,382</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>9,284</td>
<td>10,082</td>
<td>9,883</td>
<td>9,686</td>
<td>9,484</td>
<td>65,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>8,317</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>25,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>22,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>5,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Population (By Age and Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>13,892</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>21,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 17 years</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>2,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 65 years</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>8,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Households (By Household Income)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>2,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>2,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>2,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 25 years and over (By Education Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>3,982</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>9,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Population 15 years and over (By Marital Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>20,156</td>
<td>22,091</td>
<td>20,174</td>
<td>28,873</td>
<td>23,937</td>
<td>23,174</td>
<td>23,068</td>
<td>161,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now married, except separated</td>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>10,748</td>
<td>8,368</td>
<td>13,710</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>9,987</td>
<td>10,729</td>
<td>73,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>7,252</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>9,686</td>
<td>9,334</td>
<td>9,430</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>59,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>8,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>7,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>28,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>30,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,732</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>9,626</td>
<td>9,193</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>58,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Housing Units (By Occupancy Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>7,732</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>9,626</td>
<td>9,193</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>58,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>28,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter occupied</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>30,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occupied Housing Units (Overcrowding by Tenure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>6,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely overcrowded</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>28,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely overcrowded</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>30,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely overcrowded</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 16 years and over (By Employment Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In labor force:</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>11,909</td>
<td>11,821</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>15,886</td>
<td>13,872</td>
<td>14,216</td>
<td>93,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force:</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>11,909</td>
<td>11,795</td>
<td>14,940</td>
<td>15,861</td>
<td>13,858</td>
<td>14,216</td>
<td>93,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td>10,784</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>13,778</td>
<td>14,332</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td>12,714</td>
<td>84,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>9,195</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>7,871</td>
<td>13,544</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>64,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occupied housing units (Structure Type by Tenure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units:</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>28,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>25,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More Units</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units:</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>30,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>13,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>4,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More Units</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>11,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Population 5 years and over (By Language Spoken at Home and English Ability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>25,256</td>
<td>27,724</td>
<td>24,522</td>
<td>33,897</td>
<td>29,038</td>
<td>29,003</td>
<td>28,168</td>
<td>197,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>9,334</td>
<td>12,212</td>
<td>8,736</td>
<td>22,176</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>10,401</td>
<td>14,878</td>
<td>95,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>6,378</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>38,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>14,890</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td>13,798</td>
<td>10,215</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>17,596</td>
<td>12,483</td>
<td>93,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>6,395</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>34,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>5,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 1 year and over (By Residence Previous Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house</td>
<td>23,205</td>
<td>23,529</td>
<td>23,943</td>
<td>30,479</td>
<td>25,996</td>
<td>28,025</td>
<td>25,412</td>
<td>180,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different house in the U.S.</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>6,305</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td>4,436</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>30,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>21,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same state</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>7,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different state</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population With Poverty Status Determined (by Poverty Status and Age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below Poverty Level Past 12 Months</td>
<td>10,617</td>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>6,313</td>
<td>6,119</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>7,087</td>
<td>7,561</td>
<td>52,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>4,847</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>23,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>2,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income At or Above Poverty Level Past 12 Months</td>
<td>16,447</td>
<td>18,645</td>
<td>19,678</td>
<td>25,440</td>
<td>23,996</td>
<td>24,029</td>
<td>23,207</td>
<td>151,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>38,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>15,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Under 18 years</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>9,612</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>8,827</td>
<td>8,579</td>
<td>9,599</td>
<td>9,771</td>
<td>62,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Over 65</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>18,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units (By Housing Cost % of Income By Tenure)</td>
<td>7,743</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>7,217</td>
<td>9,496</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>7,514</td>
<td>9,254</td>
<td>58,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>17,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>12,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>4,446</td>
<td>27,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>28,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>13,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>6,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 percent</td>
<td>5,313</td>
<td>5,594</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>30,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 percent</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent or more</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>6,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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