



Annapolis Ward Boundaries and Redistricting Task Force

April 2022

Jared Littmann, Ward 5, Chair
Mary Anne Arnett, Ward 7, Vice Chair
Emma Smith, Ward 1
Bandon Wright, Ward 2
Lisa Wilson, Ward 3
Salon Webb, Ward 4
Greg Brennan, Ward 6
Michael Matthews, Ward 8
Harold Lloyd Jr., At Large

Census Numbers for Existing Wards


Ward	Total	Deviation Percentage
Ward 1	4977	2.77
Ward 2	5441	6.29
Ward 3	5240	2.36
Ward 4	5313	3.79
Ward 5	5295	3.44
Ward 6	4978	2.75
Ward 7	4692	8.34
Ward 8	5015	2.03

Census counts for Wards (or other districts) cannot be done in a one for one comparison between the 2010 and 2020 Census. Using the center of the block polygons assumptions were made for where to assign the population to the ward in the 2020 data but they are estimates.


Outline

Introduction:.....	3
Executive Summary	5
Legal Framework for Redistricting in Maryland	8
Majority-supported Map C	14
Minority-supported Map 3C	19
Discarded Maps A and B	22
Effort to Achieve a 4-2-2 Map.....	27
Demographics	32
Task Force Meetings.....	36
<i>October 19, 2021</i>	37
<i>November 16, 2021</i>	39
<i>December 21, 2021</i>	40
<i>January 18, 2022</i>	42
<i>February 1, 2022</i>	43
<i>February 16, 2022</i>	45
<i>March 15, 2022</i>	48
Appendixes	50

Map C



Map 3C



FINALED RESIDENTIAL PERMITS 2010 - 2020

Residential Permits Finaled 2010_2019

-  MFD
-  SFD


Residential Permits Finaled 2020

-  MFD
-  SFD

AdministrativeWards

-  1
-  2
-  3
-  4
-  5
-  6
-  7
-  8

city_boundary



esri

1mi

Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA), MDOT SHA Office of Highway Development (OHD), MDOT SHA Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering (OPPE), MDOT SHA Regional Intermodal Planning Division (RIPD), MDOT SHA OIT Enterprise Information Services (GIS@mdot.maryland.gov) | Esri | Earthstar Geographics | County of Anne Arundel, VITA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, SafeGraph, METI/NASA, USGS, EPA, NPS, USDA

Redistricting: Considering the Impact on Latino Communities

Laura Gutierrez
Manager
Annapolis Office of Community Services

Annapolis Data


In Annapolis, for the first time in our history, we now have one ward that is majority Hispanic: Ward 3.

Annapolis Population: 40,820

Hispanic or Latino Population: 22.7%*

Anne Arundel County Change: 6% to almost 10% H/L Population

*Estimates are not comparable to other geographic levels due to methodology differences that may exist between different data sources.



Hispanic or Latino Population Census Count:


 Hispanic or Latino, percent (b)

 22.7%

Important factors to keep in mind:

- 1) The **asterisk** next to Hispanic/Latino numbers
- 2) “**Other**” Population: a large part of this is also Hispanic/Latino
- 3) “**Fear**” and “Mistrust” factor
- 4) **Unaware** of Census factor
- 5) Not at home when censuses arrive at doors because of working situations of many within the Hispanic/Latino community
- 6) How this translates to actual voting representation: voter status- we will have an emerging Hispanic youth vote

Uplifting Community Voices




Supporting Wards that can lean towards a minority majority for both our black AND brown communities to be able to have representation in our City Council.

Summary of Factors from Legal Framework


In summary, these are the principles from the above discussion:

1. Goal is to accomplish one person, one vote based on population.
2. Substantially equal population among districts
3. Preference for setting boundaries with:
 - a. adjoining territory / contiguity: contiguous territory is territory touching, adjoining and connected, as distinguished from territory separated by other territory
 - b. compact in form / district compactness
 - c. substantially equal population
 - d. natural boundaries
 - e. boundaries of political subdivisions
 - f. protecting communities of interest
 - g. keeping communities intact
4. Preserving the status quo may justify digressing from the generally recognized redistricting criteria.
5. Up to 5% variation among legislative districts.
6. Satisfy the “Gingles factors test” under §2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965
 - a. Cannot undermine minority voting strength or detrimentally effect minority voting power.
 - b. Cannot deny or abridge of minority voting rights.
 - c. Based on the totality of the circumstances.
 - d. Whether minority citizens have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.
 - e. See the relevant objective factors acknowledged in In re 2012 Legislative Redistricting of the State.


Map C




Map 3C




Map A



Map B



Map 2E



By the numbers

Public Meetings

2

Number of Meetings

7

**Number of Members
and City Staff**

14

**Number of Maps
Attempted**

16

**Plan Meeting Hours
with Shawn**

20

Approximate