

**OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY  
CITY OF OAKLAND**

**Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)  
Regarding the Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission  
and the Map for Council and School Board Districts for the 2022 Elections**

Issued: January 10, 2022  
Revised:  
Issued by: Barbara J. Parker, Oakland City Attorney



---

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Our office has received numerous questions about what happens next in light of the fact that the Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission (“Commission”) did not adopt a final map by the end of 2021. Our office was hopeful that the Commission would adopt a map prior to the new year; however, please rest assured that we prepared in advance for the possibility of a delay.

We think it will be helpful to share some information about the process with the public by answering some frequently asked questions.

**II. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS REGARDING THE OAKLAND  
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

**1. What is the City Attorney’s role regarding the redistricting process since the Commission did not approve a final plan by December 31, 2021?**

**Answer:** As we noted in our public opinion dated November 5, 2021, which you can find [here](#), in the event the Redistricting Commission did not adopt a map by December 31, 2021, the Charter provides that: (1) the City Attorney “shall immediately petition the state court for an order prescribing the boundary lines of the districts in accordance with the redistricting criteria set forth in [the Charter]” (emphasis added); and (2) the plan prescribed by the court shall be used for all subsequent City Council elections until the Commission adopts a final plan to replace it. Charter section 220(G)(2)

On Friday, January 7, 2022, we filed a petition in superior court seeking expedited review as an elections matter. A copy of the petition is attached to these FAQs. The exact timeline for completion of this petition process is unknown.

Given the clear language of the Charter, our office did not have the option to delay this process. The word “shall” denotes a mandatory duty, and Charter section 220 does not countenance the current map remaining in place until the Commission completes it work. In our initial court filing, we proposed a timeline for a court hearing and once that hearing

schedule is set, we anticipate working with the consultant to propose an interim map that complies with all of the Charter redistricting requirements.

**2. Can the existing boundaries of the seven (7) City Council and School Board districts remain in effect until the Commission approves a final map?**

**Answer:** As we advised in our answer to FAQ #1, above, the City Attorney has a mandatory duty to submit a map to the state court. Moreover, the map must comply with the Charter, the federal Voting Rights Act, and the California Voting Rights Act. To the extent populations levels in one or more districts changed between the 2010 U.S. census and the 2020 census, the City Attorney may be legally required to propose new district boundaries.

**3. What is the role of the City Council, School Board, and/or their individual members in the redistricting process?**

**Answer:** In terms of filing the Charter-mandated petition in state court for an order prescribing the boundary lines of the Council and School Board districts and subsequent court proceedings, the Charter does not provide a role for City Council to play. Upon review of the legislative history for section 220 of the Charter, it is clear that the intent was to remove the Council from the redistricting process. Accordingly, our office will work directly with the consultant to identify an interim map to present to the court that meets the above-mentioned criteria.

**4. What is the Commission's role in the redistricting process since the Commission did not approve a map by the Charter's December 31, 2021 deadline?**

**Answer:** Regarding the role of the Redistricting Commission going forward, its job under the Charter is to continue working diligently to adopt a final map. Even though the December 31, 2021, deadline has passed, and the Charter required that the City Attorney file a petition in court, the Commission's map – once adopted - will ultimately supersede any map contemplated by the court during the petition process. Indeed, depending on the timing, it is possible that the Commission's map will be in place for the next election.

**5. What options do individual members of the City Council and School Board have regarding expressing their views about and/or advocating for particular maps?**

**Answer:** Given the importance of the Commission's mission, the public is very interested in the Commission's ongoing work. But it remains imperative that the Redistricting Commission continue to function independently. It is inevitable and understandable that various members of the City Council and School Board will be following the process closely.

Our office is not aware of any legal restrictions on said members' ability to express their opinions on the process in public settings, nor are we aware of any prohibitions against those members issuing public statements or public writings to the Commission, their constituents or the public.

**6. What obligations do Commission members have if they have communications with individual members of the City Council or School Board?**

**Answer:** Charter section 220(I) requires that Commissioners disclose all contacts with incumbent members of the City Council and School Board regarding matters before the Commission.

Attachment A: Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate filed January 7, 2022

FAQs Regarding the Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission  
and the Map for Council and School Board Districts for the 2022 Elections

Issued: 1/10/2022

Attachment A

Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate filed January 7, 2022

1 KAREN GETMAN, State Bar No. 136285  
2 THOMAS A. WILLIS, State Bar No. 160989  
3 KRISTEN MAH ROGERS, State Bar No. 274672  
4 OLSON REMCHO LLP  
5 1901 Harrison Street, Suite 1550  
6 Oakland, CA 94612  
7 Phone: (510) 346-6200  
8 Fax: (510) 574-7061  
9 Email: Kgetman@olsonremcho.com  
10 Twillis@olsonremcho.com  
11 Krogers@olsonremcho.com

12 Attorneys for Petitioner  
13 BARBARA J. PARKER, in her official capacity  
14 as City Attorney for the City of Oakland and the  
15 Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

125 BARBARA J. PARKER, in her official capacity as  
126 City Attorney for the City of Oakland and the  
127 Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission,  
128  
129 Petitioner,  
130  
131 vs.  
132 TIM DUPUIS, in his official capacity as Registrar  
133 of Voters, County of Alameda,  
134  
135 Respondent.

No.:  
Action Filed:  
**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE**  
**IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED –  
ELECTION MATTER (Cal. Elec. Code  
§ 13314)**  
**NO FILING FEE:  
EXEMPT PER CAL. GOV. CODE § 6103**  
The Honorable: TBA  
Dept.: TBA

1 Petitioner BARBARA J. PARKER, in her official capacity as City Attorney for the City  
2 of Oakland and the Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission, alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 In 2014, Oakland voters approved a Charter amendment establishing a thirteen-member  
5 Independent Redistricting Commission that would be responsible for redrawing the boundaries of the  
6 seven City Council and Oakland Unified School Board districts every ten years after the decennial  
7 census. City of Oakland Charter, § 220 [hereafter “Charter”].

8 The current Commission tasked with redrawing those lines for the next decade was  
9 formed in late August, 2020 and met for the first time on October 14, 2020. Since then, the  
10 Commission has undertaken its work in an open and transparent manner and has encouraged public  
11 participation at every stage. In the last fourteen months, the Commission has held dozens of public  
12 meetings and workshops, including ten public hearings at which the Commission received public  
13 comment on draft maps. Throughout the Commission’s work, many dozens of people participated in  
14 public hearings and meetings, and over a hundred unique speakers provided testimony. The  
15 Commission received more than a thousand pages of written feedback from the public, and multiple  
16 draft maps were submitted by the public. Since September 2021, when usable census data became  
17 available, the Commission has drafted, reviewed and revised nearly a dozen of its own draft maps, and  
18 conducted 12 meetings and seven workshops in an attempt to refine and adopt a final draft map.

19 Despite these exhaustive and good faith efforts, the Commission thus far has not been  
20 able to adopt a final plan with the requisite super-majority vote (9 of 13 Commissioners must agree on  
21 the final plan), and it did not meet the deadline set forth in the Charter to adopt a final plan by  
22 December 31, 2021. Charter, § 220(G). In the event the Commission fails to adopt a plan by  
23 December 31, the Charter requires that the City Attorney “immediately petition state court for an order  
24 prescribing the boundary lines of the districts.” *Id.* § 220(G)(2). Importantly, a court-ordered plan is  
25 meant to be temporary only, and used only “until a final plan is adopted by the commission to replace  
26 it.” *Id.*



1 **PARTIES**

2 1. Petitioner BARBARA J. PARKER is the City Attorney of the City of Oakland,  
3 and brings this action in her official capacity. The City Attorney is an elected position with a four-  
4 year term. Petitioner was first appointed to the office of City Attorney to complete the term of the  
5 first elected City Attorney, and subsequently was elected to four-year terms in 2012, 2016 and 2020.  
6 Under the City of Oakland Charter, the City Attorney serves as counsel to the Mayor, City Council,  
7 and each department of the City, except those specifically allowed separate counsel by the Charter.  
8 Charter § 401. The City Attorney advises all officers, boards, commissions, and other agencies of  
9 the City on legal matters, and acts as counsel on behalf of the City or any of its officers, boards,  
10 commissions, or other agencies in litigation involving any of them in their official capacity.  
11 *Id.* § 401(6). Under section 220 of the Charter, the City Attorney serves as legal counsel to the  
12 Independent Redistricting Commission, a thirteen-member body established by the Charter. The  
13 Commission is charged with adjusting the boundary lines of the seven City Council districts and the  
14 seven Oakland Unified School Board districts in conformance with the criteria and procedures set  
15 forth in the Charter. *Id.* § 220. At least nine of thirteen Commissioners must approve the final  
16 district plan for it to be in effect. *Id.* § 220(D)(3). The Commission has been undertaking an  
17 exhaustive and transparent redistricting process but despite its good faith efforts, did not adopt a  
18 final plan by the December 31, 2021 deadline provided for in the Charter. *Id.* § 220(G)(2). The City  
19 Attorney is required by the Charter to “petition state court for an order prescribing the boundary lines  
20 of the districts” in the event the Commission has not adopted a final plan by December 31, 2021. *Id.*

21 2. Respondent TIM DUPUIS is the Registrar of Voters of Alameda County and is  
22 sued in his official capacity. Pursuant to an agreement with the City of Oakland, the Alameda County  
23 Registrar of Voters administers the City’s elections. As a result, Respondent DUPUIS oversees the  
24 administration of Oakland’s City Council and School Board elections, which will next occur on  
25 November 8, 2022.

26 ///

27 ///

1 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under Code of Civil Procedure  
3 sections 1085 and 1086 and Elections Code section 13314. Petitioner is entitled to a writ of mandate  
4 because the Oakland Charter imposes on Petitioner a mandatory duty to seek a court order prescribing  
5 the boundary lines of council and school board districts if the Commission has not adopted a final plan  
6 by December 31, 2021. Charter § 220(G)(2). Petitioner seeks an order to ensure that a new plan that  
7 complies with all federal, state and local laws is in place for the City’s November 8, 2022, general  
8 municipal election. Petitioner does not have a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary  
9 course of law. If this Court does not act and the Commission has not adopted a final plan by April 17,  
10 2022, the City will not have in place a redistricting plan for the City’s next municipal election that  
11 complies with federal, state, and local law. In addition to having jurisdiction under Code of Civil  
12 Procedure sections 1085 and 1086, this Court also has jurisdiction under Elections Code section 13314.  
13 Petitioner is an elector of the City and if a writ of mandate is not issued, an error will occur by not  
14 having legally compliant districting plans in place for the City’s municipal general election on  
15 November 8, 2022. Issuance of a writ will not substantially interfere with the conduct of the election  
16 provided that the court issues an order prescribing final plans by April 17, 2022.

17 4. Venue is proper under Code of Civil Procedure section 393 because the events  
18 and actions of Respondent giving rise to the claims alleged herein occur in Alameda County.

19 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

20 **A. Measure DD and the Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission**

21 22 5. The Oakland City Council consists of eight Council members, seven of whom  
23 are nominated by district and one of whom is elected at-large. Charter §§ 200 & 203. The Mayor is  
24 not a member of the Council, but has a vote on the Council if the Council members are evenly  
25 divided on a matter. *Id.* § 200.

26 6. The Oakland Unified School District Board of Education consists of seven  
27 District School Directors, all of whom are nominated by district. *Id.* § 404.



1 **B. The Independent Redistricting Commission’s Efforts to Adopt a Final Plan**

2 12. The thirteen members of the current Commission were selected by August 27,  
3 2020 and the Commission held its first meeting on October 14, 2020. Since then, the Commission has  
4 undertaken extensive outreach efforts to encourage public participation, hired a demographer to assist  
5 the commission with drawing lines, and held 33 public meetings and workshops, including ten public  
6 hearings at which the Commission received public comment about draft maps. *See generally* City of  
7 Oakland, Meetings for Redistricting Commission, found at [https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-](https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/redistricting-commission/meetings)  
8 [commissions/redistricting-commission/meetings](https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/redistricting-commission/meetings).

9 13. In order to encourage public participation and transparency, the Commission  
10 also established dedicated website pages on the City’s website that provide information about the  
11 redistricting process, and serves as a hub where all information about public resources, draft maps,  
12 Commission meetings, and public comments are posted. *See* City of Oakland, Redistricting  
13 Commission, found at <https://www.oaklandca.gov/boards-commissions/redistricting-commission>. The  
14 Commission also created an online survey for the public, provided an online comment process for the  
15 public to provide information about communities of interest, and established an online tool that  
16 members of the public could use to draw and submit their own draft maps. *Id.*

17 14. Throughout the Commission’s work, many dozens of people participated in  
18 public hearings and special meetings and more than 100 speakers provided testimony. The  
19 Commission received more than 1,100 pages of written feedback from the public, and multiple draft  
20 maps.

21 15. At its meeting on September 8, 2021, the Commission directed the demographer  
22 to draw four draft maps (designated as Draft Maps A through D) for consideration. Those maps were  
23 posted on the Commission’s website on October 11, 2021. City of Oakland, District Map Proposals,  
24 found at <https://www.oaklandca.gov/topics/district-map-proposals>. Those draft maps were considered  
25 at subsequent meetings. In addition, on November 1, the Commission requested that the demographer  
26 draft four new maps (designated as Draft Maps E through H), which were posted on November 10,  
27 2021. *Id.* Those draft maps were considered at subsequent meetings. On November 16, the  
28

1 Commission requested that the demographer draft three additional draft maps (designated as Draft  
2 Maps K through I), and those were posted on November 29. *Id.* In addition, the Commission  
3 discussed and considered a number of publicly-submitted maps and asked that the consultants  
4 incorporate features of those maps into the Commission’s own draft maps. From November 30  
5 through December 30, 2021, the Commission held five meetings and two workshops to receive public  
6 input on the draft maps and attempt to agree on a final plan that could receive nine votes as required by  
7 the Charter.

8 16. In October, the Commission sought advice from Petitioner’s office as to whether  
9 it could extend the deadline to adopt a plan past the Charter-imposed deadline of December 31. On  
10 November 5, 2021, the City Attorney’s office issued a public legal opinion concluding that the  
11 “Charter does not authorize the Redistricting Commission, Council, Mayor, City Administrator or any  
12 other person or entity to extend the deadline.”

13 17. On December 13, 2021, the Commission voted to advance two maps, neither of  
14 which had approval from the requisite super-majority of Commissioners.

15 18. Despite these exhaustive and good faith efforts, the Commission was unable to  
16 adopt a final plan by December 31, 2021. The Commission, however, is continuing to meet in an  
17 effort to adopt a final plan. It met on January 6, 2022, but again did not reach the requisite super-  
18 majority approval on a final plan. The Commission intends to continue meeting.

19 **C. The Proposed Remedy**

20 19. Petitioner brings this petition in her official capacity as City Attorney and as  
21 required by the City Charter for a writ of mandate seeking “an order prescribing the boundary lines of  
22 the districts in accordance with the redistricting criteria and requirements set forth in [the Charter].”  
23 Charter § 220(G)(2). Under the Charter, the plan prescribed by the court shall be used for subsequent  
24 elections “until a final plan is adopted by the commission to replace it.” *Id.*

25 20. Although the Charter imposes a deadline of December 31, 2021 on the  
26 Commission, in practical terms, adoption of a final plan by that date is not necessary for the effective  
27 administration of the City’s next municipal election.

1           21.     The City’s next election for council members and school board directors will not  
2 be held until November 8, 2022, at which time the even-numbered districts (2, 4, and 6) of both bodies  
3 will be up for election. The council and school board elections are conducted by ranked choice voting,  
4 also known as instant runoff voting. Charter § 1105. As a result, the City does not have June primary  
5 elections for those offices, and the boundaries for the new districts are not needed for election purposes  
6 until preparations commence for the City’s general municipal election on November 8, 2022.

7           22.     The State FAIR MAPS Act, which generally governs the redistricting process  
8 for counties and cities, including charter cities like Oakland, requires that all municipal redistricting  
9 plans be adopted no later than 205 days before the city’s next regular election, if the city does not have  
10 a regular election occurring after January 1, 2022 and before July 1, 2022. Cal. Elec. Code  
11 § 21622(a)(3). Thus, cities like Oakland that have their next municipal election on November 8, 2022,  
12 may adopt final redistricting plans at any time up to and including April 17, 2022. Although that  
13 deadline does not apply to charter cities like Oakland that have adopted a different redistricting  
14 deadline by ordinance or charter (*see id.* § 21622(b)), it demonstrates that county registrars and other  
15 elections officials that administer elections will be accepting new municipal redistricting plans up to  
16 April 17, 2022 for use in the November 2022 election.<sup>1</sup>

17           23.     Further, adopting and implementing a new plan by April 17, 2022, will not  
18 disrupt the ability of candidates for council and school district offices to qualify for and file the  
19 necessary paperwork for those elections. Candidates must be residents of the district from which they  
20 are running for thirty days immediately preceding their nomination or appointment. Charter § 201.  
21 Nomination documents will not even be available for candidates for those offices to pick up and begin  
22 circulating until July 18, 2022. Cal. Elec. Code § 10220.

23           24.     In sum, as a practical matter, there is no need to have a redistricting plan  
24 adopted until April 17, 2022. As a result, Petitioner requests that the court refrain from taking any  
25 immediate action to prescribe a plan, and give the Commission additional time to adopt a final plan.

26 <sup>1</sup> The only other relevant deadline regarding the use of new redistricting plans is Elections Code  
27 section 12262, which states that jurisdictional boundary changes occurring less than 125 days before  
28 an election shall not be effective for purposes of that election.

1 The Commission is continuing to meet in an effort to adopt a final plan in time for the City’s next  
2 elections. If the Commission adopts a final plan by April 17 that complies with the criteria set forth in  
3 the Charter, there will be no need for a court-ordered plan. At the same time, the court will need some  
4 time to begin the process of familiarizing itself with this issue, hold a hearing, and then order a plan in  
5 place, all of which must occur by April 17, 2022 to ensure the City has a lawful plan in place for the  
6 City’s November 2022 general municipal election.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, if the Commission has not adopted a  
7 final plan by the end of January, Petitioner intends to file a motion in February of 2022 seeking a court  
8 order prescribing a final plan that will be in effect as of April 17 if the Commission has not adopted a  
9 final plan by then. Conversely, if the Commission adopts a final plan by the end of January, Petitioner  
10 will seek to dismiss this case as moot.

11           25. Under that proposed schedule, if Petitioner files a motion in early February, the  
12 remedy Petitioner will seek is an order adopting a plan that Respondent DUPUIS must use that  
13 complies with the criteria in the Charter and is consistent with the plan preferred by the largest number  
14 of Commissioners at the time, provided that such majority-support is discernable and provided the plan  
15 is in compliance with the redistricting criteria set forth in the Charter.

16           26. Such a remedy is supported by both the plain text of the Charter and well-  
17 established legal principles. The Charter expressly favors a map approved by the Commission over a  
18 court-imposed remedy, and a court-imposed plan is to be used only as an interim solution of last resort.  
19 Specifically, the Charter states that a court-imposed plan shall only remain in place until a “final plan  
20 is adopted by the commission to replace it.” Charter § 220(G)(2).

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> The City cannot simply revert back to the existing boundaries because, in light of the new census  
27 data, those districts do not have equal population as required by the Unites States Constitution. Further  
28 those boundaries, which were drawn in 2011, were not drawn in accordance with the districting criteria  
established by Measure DD, which was adopted in 2014.

1           27.     The Charter is consistent with the well-established legal principle that  
2 redistricting plans drawn by the designated legislative body (or independent redistricting commission)<sup>3</sup>  
3 of a jurisdiction are strongly favored over a court-imposed remedy since redistricting is a  
4 quintessentially legislative function. A court must give a jurisdiction the first opportunity to suggest a  
5 legally acceptable remedial plan, based on the theory that the judiciary should not intrude on legislative  
6 policy any more than necessary. *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 794-795 (1973); *Upham v. Seamon*,  
7 456 U.S. 37, 41 (1982). A court must defer to the choice of the jurisdiction’s legislative body so long  
8 as it meets legal requirements, and a court may not substitute its own remedial plan for a jurisdiction’s  
9 plan, even if it believes another plan would be better. These principals of deference apply equally to  
10 local legislative bodies. *See, e.g., Harper v. City of Chicago Heights*, 223 F.3d 593, 601-603  
11 (7th Cir. 2000).

12           28.     The California Supreme Court has determined that an exceedingly high degree  
13 of judicial deference must be accorded to a jurisdiction’s preferred plan.

14           On every occasion on which our Supreme Court has been compelled to enter the  
15 reapportionment fray, it has indicated that the policies of “judicial restraint and  
16 deference to the Legislature” are applicable. (citation) Indeed, as a practical matter, it  
17 would be very difficult to fairly consider challenges to a reapportionment scheme  
18 without according deference to the Legislature. The decision in *Wilson v. Eu* (1992)  
19 1 Cal. 4th 707 demonstrates the inherent difficulty and necessary give and take that  
20 goes into developing reapportionment plan. Quoting its opinion in *Legislature v. Reinecke* (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 396, 403, the Supreme Court notes that redrawing specific district lines to “achieve possibly more reasonable results” runs “the serious risk of creating undesirable side effects that could not be foreseen from a judicial perspective.” (citation)

21                           *Nadler v. Schwarzenegger*, 137 Cal. App. 4th 1327, 1338 (2006).

22           There are, moreover, strong reasons to believe voters would not have preferred  
23 deploying this backstop—and thereby transferring primary responsibility for  
24 redistricting from the Commission to this court—to employing the usual redistricting

---

25 <sup>3</sup> *See Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*, 576 U.S. 787  
26 (2015) (redistricting involves lawmaking in its essential features and most important aspect, and that  
27 can be done in accordance with the method which the State has prescribed for legislative enactments).  
The Legislature has approved and encouraged local jurisdictions to undertake redistricting through  
independent commissions. *See, e.g., Cal. Elec. Code* § 23001. The Charter provides that the  
28 districting plan adopted by the Commission “shall have the force and effect of law.” Charter § 202(G).

1 procedures on an adjusted timeline. The voters enacted Propositions 11 and 20 to  
2 transfer the responsibility of drawing new district maps from the Legislature to an  
3 independent panel of citizens. (citation) In so doing, the voters tasked this court with  
4 redistricting only as a matter of last resort. (citation) For this court to undertake to  
5 draw maps in the first instance would both displace the role voters envisioned for the  
6 Commission and preclude opportunities for the public to participate in the process as  
7 the voters intended.

8 *Legislature of State of California v. Padilla*, 9 Cal. 5th 867, 880 (2020).

9 29. In sum, redistricting plans proposed by the legislative body of the jurisdiction  
10 are preferred over court imposed plans, and must be accorded great deference. So strong is that  
11 principle of deference that courts must accept plans proffered by the jurisdiction over an alternative  
12 court plan even if the legislative plan has not been adopted in compliance with all of the prerequisites  
13 for adopting the plan or law. *See Navajo Nation v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*,  
14 230 F.Supp.2d 998, 1008 (D. Ariz. 2002) (“the requirement of deference to a legislative plan exists  
15 even in cases where the plan does not strictly comply with state law, particularly where there are  
16 exigent circumstances”); *see also Tallahassee Branch of NAACP v. Leon County*, 827 F.2d 1436  
(11th Cir. 1987) (county plan entitled to deference though county enacted a remedial plan without a  
17 referendum as required by state law).

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **WRIT OF MANDATE – CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**  
20 **§§ 1085, 1086, ELECTIONS CODE § 13314**  
21 **AND OAKLAND CITY CHARTER § 220**

22 30. Petitioner hereby realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 29 above as if  
23 fully set forth herein.

24 31. Under Code of Civil Procedure sections 1085 and 1086, Elections Code  
25 section 13314, and the Oakland City Charter section 220, the Court should issue a writ of mandate no  
26 later than April 17, 2022, adopting a redistricting plan for Oakland city council and school board  
27 director districts consistent with the plan preferred by the largest number of Commissioners at the time,  
28 provided that such majority-support is discernable and provided the plan is in compliance with the  
redistricting criteria set forth in the Charter, and commanding Respondent DUPUIS to use such plan

1 for the November 8, 2022 municipal election. A writ should issue because the City must have a legal  
2 redistricting plan in place for its next general municipal election on November 8, 2022, and such a plan  
3 must be submitted to the County Registrar by April 17, 2022, in order to be used in the orderly  
4 administration of that election.

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for judgment as follows:

7 1. That this Court issue a writ of mandate pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure  
8 sections 1085 and 1086, Elections Code section 13314, and the Oakland City Charter section 220, no  
9 later than April 17, 2022, adopting a redistricting plan for Oakland city council and school board  
10 director districts that complies with the redistricting criteria of the Oakland Charter and that is most  
11 consistent with the desired plan of the largest number of Commissioners at that time, assuming such  
12 majority-support is discernible, and mandating that Respondent DUPUIS use such plan for the City's  
13 next general municipal election on November 8, 2022, unless the Commission adopts a final plan  
14 before April 17, 2022. A writ should issue because the City must have a legal redistricting plan in  
15 place for its next general municipal election on November 8, 2022, and pursuant to state law such a  
16 plan must be submitted on or before April 17, 2022.

17 2. That this Court grant such other, different, or further relief as the Court may  
18 deem just and proper.

19  
20 Dated: January 7, 2022

OLSON REMCHO LLP

21  
22  
23 By: 

Thomas Willis

24 Attorneys for Petitioner BARBARA J. PARKER, in  
25 her official capacity as City Attorney for the City of  
26 Oakland

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

VERIFICATION

I, BARBARA J. PARKER, declare:

I am the petitioner in the above-captioned case. I have read the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and believe that the matters therein are true and on that ground allege that the matters stated therein are true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 7th day of January 2022, at Oakland, California.



BARBARA J. PARKER, in her official capacity  
as City Attorney for the City of Oakland