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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

Despite these exhaustive and good faith efforts, the Commission thus far has not been able to adopt a final plan with the requisite super-majority vote (9 of 13 Commissioners must agree on the final plan), and it did not meet the deadline set forth in the Charter to adopt a final plan by December 31, 2021. Charter, § 220(G). In the event the Commission fails to adopt a plan by December 31, the Charter requires that the City Attorney “immediately petition state court for an order prescribing the boundary lines of the districts.” Id. § 220(G)(2). Importantly, a court-ordered plan is meant to be temporary only, and used only “until a final plan is adopted by the commission to replace it.” Id.
Therefore, as required by the Charter, Petitioner brings this action in her official capacity as City Attorney and counsel for the Commission to seek an order by the court to prescribe an interim redistricting plan for the City Council and School Board districts that must be used by Respondent TIM DUPUIS, the Alameda County Registrar, until the Commission adopts a final plan.

However, as described in more detail below, Petitioner requests that the court not take any immediate action to begin the process of deciding on an appropriate interim plan. There is still time for the Commission to adopt a plan well before the next municipal election. The City’s next municipal election, at which new redistricted boundaries will be used, is November 8, 2022. As a practical matter, the County Registrar does not need the new plan for the November election until April 17, 2022 -- that is the date the Legislature has set as the deadline for all municipalities to adopt their new plans if they have November 2022 elections, like Oakland does.

Therefore, given the well-established legal principle that redistricting plans drawn by a jurisdiction’s legislative body must be given deference over any judicially created plan, a principle underscored by the Oakland Charter provision stating that any court-imposed plan is only temporary until the Commission adopts a final plan, Petitioner requests that the court refrain from taking any steps to prescribe a redistricting plan for at least another month. The Commission is still meeting and attempting to adopt a final plan. If the Commission still has not adopted a final plan by early February 2022, Petitioner will then file a motion asking the court to prescribe a plan at that time; in that event, Petitioner intends to propose that the court adopt the plan that has the support of the largest number of Commissioners at that time, provided that such majority-support is discernable and provided the plan is in compliance with the redistricting criteria set forth in the Charter. That plan then would be used by Respondent DUPUIS in the event the Commission does not adopt a final plan by April 17, 2022. That schedule will provide the court sufficient time to prescribe a plan by April 17, 2022, thereby ensuring that the City will have a new redistricting plan that complies with all federal, state, and local laws in time for the City’s November 2022 municipal elections.
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VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED – ELECTION MATTER (Ca. Elec. Code § 13314)
PARTIES

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

2. Respondent TIM DUPUIS is the Registrar of Voters of Alameda County and is sued in his official capacity. Pursuant to an agreement with the City of Oakland, the Alameda County Registrar of Voters administers the City’s elections. As a result, Respondent DUPUIS oversees the administration of Oakland’s City Council and School Board elections, which will next occur on November 8, 2022.
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VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
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JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

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

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Measure DD and the Oakland Independent Redistricting Commission

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

6. The Oakland Unified School District Board of Education consists of seven District School Directors, all of whom are nominated by district. Id. § 404.
7. The City is required to redistrict the City Council and School Board districts every ten years following the release of the federal decennial census to ensure the districts are equal as possible in population and comply with all federal, state and City redistricting laws. Historically, the City Council performed this duty but in 2014 the City Council placed on the ballot and the voters approved Measure DD, which established a thirteen-member Independent Redistricting Commission to redistrict Council and School Board district boundaries beginning in 2021. Measure DD was approved by a wide margin, with 61.45% Yes votes and 38.55% No votes.

8. Measure DD established, among other things, the qualifications and selection process for commissioners, the redistricting criteria that adopted plans must follow, and the applicable laws that apply to the conduct of the Commission’s business. Measure DD’s provisions are codified in Charter section 220.

9. The Charter requires the Commission to (1) conduct an open and transparent process enabling full public consideration of and comment on the drawing of district lines; (2) draw district lines according to the redistricting criteria specified in section 220 of the Charter; and (3) conduct itself with integrity and fairness. Charter § 220(C). The Commission was selected and formed on August 27, 2020, and met for the first time on October 14, 2020.

10. The City Attorney serves as legal counsel to the Commission. Charter § 220(H).

11. The Charter requires that the Commission adopt “a final plan for the City of Oakland specifically describing the district boundaries for each of the council and school districts” by December 31, 2021. Charter § 220(G). The final plan must be approved by at least nine of the thirteen Commission members. Id. § 220(D)(3). The Charter further states that if the Commission does not adopt a final plan by December 31, 2021, “the City Attorney for the City of Oakland shall immediately petition state court for an order prescribing the boundary lines of the districts in accordance with the redistricting criteria and requirements set forth in this Section. The plan prescribed by the court shall be used for all subsequent City Council elections until a final plan is adopted by the commission to replace it.” Id. § 220(G)(2).
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B. The Independent Redistricting Commission’s Efforts to Adopt a Final Plan

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

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

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

15. At its meeting on September 8, 2021, the Commission directed the demographer to draw four draft maps (designated as Draft Maps A through D) for consideration. Those maps were posted on the Commission’s website on October 11, 2021. City of Oakland, District Map Proposals, found at https://www.oaklandca.gov/topics/district-map-proposals. Those draft maps were considered at subsequent meetings. In addition, on November 1, the Commission requested that the demographer draft four new maps (designated as Draft Maps E through H), which were posted on November 10, 2021. Id. Those draft maps were considered at subsequent meetings. On November 16, the
Commission requested that the demographer draft three additional draft maps (designated as Draft Maps K through I), and those were posted on November 29. *Id.* In addition, the Commission discussed and considered a number of publicly-submitted maps and asked that the consultants incorporate features of those maps into the Commission’s own draft maps. From November 30 through December 30, 2021, the Commission held five meetings and two workshops to receive public input on the draft maps and attempt to agree on a final plan that could receive nine votes as required by the Charter.

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

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

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

C. **The Proposed Remedy**

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

20. Although the Charter imposes a deadline of December 31, 2021 on the Commission, in practical terms, adoption of a final plan by that date is not necessary for the effective administration of the City’s next municipal election.
21. The City’s next election for council members and school board directors will not be held until November 8, 2022, at which time the even-numbered districts (2, 4, and 6) of both bodies will be up for election. The council and school board elections are conducted by ranked choice voting, also known as instant runoff voting. Charter § 1105. As a result, the City does not have June primary elections for those offices, and the boundaries for the new districts are not needed for election purposes until preparations commence for the City’s general municipal election on November 8, 2022.

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

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

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

¹ The only other relevant deadline regarding the use of new redistricting plans is Elections Code section 12262, which states that jurisdictional boundary changes occurring less than 125 days before an election shall not be effective for purposes of that election.
The Commission is continuing to meet in an effort to adopt a final plan in time for the City’s next elections. If the Commission adopts a final plan by April 17 that complies with the criteria set forth in the Charter, there will be no need for a court-ordered plan. At the same time, the court will need some time to begin the process of familiarizing itself with this issue, hold a hearing, and then order a plan in place, all of which must occur by April 17, 2022 to ensure the City has a lawful plan in place for the City’s November 2022 general municipal election. Therefore, if the Commission has not adopted a final plan by the end of January, Petitioner intends to file a motion in February of 2022 seeking a court order prescribing a final plan that will be in effect as of April 17 if the Commission has not adopted a final plan by then. Conversely, if the Commission adopts a final plan by the end of January, Petitioner will seek to dismiss this case as moot.

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

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

2 The City cannot simply revert back to the existing boundaries because, in light of the new census data, those districts do not have equal population as required by the United States Constitution. Further 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.
27. The Charter is consistent with the well-established legal principle that redistricting plans drawn by the designated legislative body (or independent redistricting commission)\(^3\) of a jurisdiction are strongly favored over a court-imposed remedy since redistricting is a quintessentially legislative function. A court must give a jurisdiction the first opportunity to suggest a legally acceptable remedial plan, based on the theory that the judiciary should not intrude on legislative policy any more than necessary. *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 794-795 (1973); *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 41 (1982). A court must defer to the choice of the jurisdiction’s legislative body so long as it meets legal requirements, and a court may not substitute its own remedial plan for a jurisdiction’s plan, even if it believes another plan would be better. These principals of deference apply equally to local legislative bodies. *See, e.g., Harper v. City of Chicago Heights*, 223 F.3d 593, 601-603 (7th Cir. 2000).

28. The California Supreme Court has determined that an exceedingly high degree of judicial deference must be accorded to a jurisdiction’s preferred plan. On every occasion on which our Supreme Court has been compelled to enter the reapportionment fray, it has indicated that the policies of “judicial restraint and deference to the Legislature” are applicable. (citation) Indeed, as a practical matter, it would be very difficult to fairly consider challenges to a reapportionment scheme without according deference to the Legislature. The decision in *Wilson v. Eu* (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 707 demonstrates the inherent difficulty and necessary give and take that 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)


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

---

\(^3\) *See Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*, 576 U.S. 787 (2015) (redistricting involves lawmaking in its essential features and most important aspect, and that 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 districting plan adopted by the Commission “shall have the force and effect of law.” Charter § 202(G).
procedures on an adjusted timeline. The voters enacted Propositions 11 and 20 to transfer the responsibility of drawing new district maps from the Legislature to an independent panel of citizens. (citation) In so doing, the voters tasked this court with redistricting only as a matter of last resort. (citation) For this court to undertake to draw maps in the first instance would both displace the role voters envisioned for the Commission and preclude opportunities for the public to participate in the process as the voters intended.


29. In sum, redistricting plans proposed by the legislative body of the jurisdiction are preferred over court imposed plans, and must be accorded great deference. So strong is that principle of deference that courts must accept plans proffered by the jurisdiction over an alternative court plan even if the legislative plan has not been adopted in compliance with all of the prerequisites for adopting the plan or law. See Navajo Nation v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, 230 F.Supp.2d 998, 1008 (D. Ariz. 2002) (“the requirement of deference to a legislative plan exists even in cases where the plan does not strictly comply with state law, particularly where there are 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 referendum as required by state law).

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

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

31. Under Code of Civil Procedure sections 1085 and 1086, Elections Code section 13314, and the Oakland City Charter section 220, the Court should issue a writ of mandate no later than April 17, 2022, adopting a redistricting plan for Oakland city council and school board director districts consistent with the plan preferred by the largest number of Commissioners at the time, 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
for the November 8, 2022 municipal election. A writ should issue because the City must have a legal redistricting plan in place for its next general municipal election on November 8, 2022, and such a plan must be submitted to the County Registrar by April 17, 2022, in order to be used in the orderly administration of that election.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for judgment as follows:

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

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

Dated: January 7, 2022

OLSON REMCHO LLP

By: Thomas Willis

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

---

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED – ELECTION MATTER (Ca. Elec. Code § 13314)
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