

# The New York City Districting Commission

2022-2023

Final Agency Report





Dear Commissioners,

The staff of the New York City Districting Commission 2022-2023 (“Commission”) presents this Final Agency Report summarizing the important work of this Commission which has faithfully executed its mandate to draw a new map for the 51 New York City Council districts in response to the findings of the 2020 U.S. Census.

The 2020 Census found that the population had grown by 7.7 percent from 8.2 million in 2010 to 8.8 million. That’s approximately 630,000 people – equivalent to the population of the city of Memphis or Detroit. It is the third largest growth spurt in New York City’s population over the last 100 years.

On March 29, 2022, pursuant to the New York City Charter, Mayor, and City Council, the Commissioners met to begin the redistricting process for the 51 Council districts, and with the general elections for City Council approaching in November 2023, this was an urgent undertaking. The Commission was quickly established with the resources, budget, staff, and space necessary to begin the redistricting process.

The work of this Commission was also governed by multiple sources of laws starting with the principle of one-person, one-vote under the U.S. Constitution, the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, New York State Law (the five percent deviation requirement), and the New York City Charter. In determining how to apply these legal criteria to the diverse communities and interests of New York City residents, the public’s participation as well as Commissioner input was an invaluable resource. The Commission implemented a robust communications and public outreach campaign to engage City’s numerous residents to hear from them.

The public response was unprecedented—the Commission held two rounds of public hearings across the five boroughs to hear over 35 hours of testimony all in the span of three months and in all, the Commission received over 13,200 pieces of testimony.

The Commissioners with staff and consultants dedicated many hours of hard work and efforts in presenting three iterations of the 51 City Council districts: (a) the Preliminary Plan (July 15, 2022), (b) the Revised Plan (September 22, 2022), and the Updated Revised Plan (October 6, 2022). These three iterations represented the product of the Commission’s consideration of a multiplicity of mapping alternatives that included public sessions and complied with the redistricting criteria to the maximum extent possible and took the public testimony into account. The Commission faithfully adhered to the redistricting process set forth under the City Charter and when the City Council did not object to the October 6 maps, the Commission adopted them as final maps for the 51 New York City Council Districts in November 2022. **(Exhibit 1)**<sup>1</sup>

On behalf of the New York City Districting Commission, we are grateful for your service and for having participated in this historic opportunity to have achieved an important public service that keeps the wheels of our NYC Democracy, our American experiment, moving forward.

*John Flateau*

John Flateau, Ph.D  
Executive Director  
The New York City Districting Commission 2022-2023  
January 17, 2023

---

1 All Exhibits in the Final Agency Report are available electronically on the Commission’s website: [www.nyc.gov/districting](http://www.nyc.gov/districting).

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. THE NEW YORK CITY DISTRICTING COMMISSION 2022-2023</b>	<b>1</b>
A. The Commissioners	1
B. Redistricting Staff and Consultants	5
<b>II. THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING PROCESS</b>	<b>6</b>
A. Process under the New York City Charter	6
B. 2022-2023 Redistricting Process	7
<b>III. COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>11</b>
A. Website	11
B. Commission Publications	11
C. Social Media	12
D. Advertisements	12
E. Media Appearances	13
F. Public Engagement Meetings	13
G. Disability and Language Accessibility	13
H. Canvassing	14
I. Public Testimony	15
<b>IV. REDISTRICTING CRITERIA</b>	<b>16</b>
A. U.S. Constitution’s Fourteenth Amendment	16
B. New York State Law	16
C. Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Section 2)	17
D. New York City Charter	17
<b>V. THE 51 NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL DISTRICTS</b>	<b>20</b>
A. The 2020 Census	20
B. The 51 City Council Districts Overview	22
<b>VI. EXHIBITS LIST</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1: RACIAL BLOC VOTING REPORT FOR THE 2022-2023 NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL DISTRICTS</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>47</b>
New York City Council Redistricting: Lessons Learned and Future Considerations	47

## I. THE NEW YORK CITY DISTRICTING COMMISSION 2022-2023

Under Chapter 2-A of the New York City Charter, the New York City Districting Commission is constituted every decennial census to prepare a new plan that divides the city into districts for the election of the New York City Council members—currently there are 51 council districts. The Commission is comprised of fifteen members, eight of whom are appointed by the City Council (“Council”) and seven of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Among those eight members, five are appointed by the political party with the largest delegation in the Council and three are appointed from the second largest delegation in the Council.<sup>2</sup> The Chair is elected by the members of the Commission and the Commission must also be comprised of at least one resident from each borough.

### A. The Commissioners

The Commissioners of the New York City Districting Commission 2022-2023 are:

#### **Dennis M. Walcott, Chair**

Dennis M. Walcott has served as president and CEO of Queens Public Library since 2016. Prior to that, Walcott served as the state-appointed monitor of the East Ramapo School District. In 2014, he was named an Honorary Distinguished Fellow at the University of the West Indies and he has been an adjunct professor at Fordham University’s graduate program, The Fordham Center for Nonprofit Leaders. Walcott previously served as chancellor of the New York City Department of Education. Prior to his appointment as chancellor, he served as deputy mayor for education and community development. Walcott also served as the president of the New York Urban League.

#### **Hon. Marilyn D. Go**

Marilyn D. Go served as a federal magistrate judge for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York from 1993 to 2019. She previously worked as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Civil Division of the Eastern District of New York from 1978 to 1982. She then joined the law firm Baden Kramer Huffman Brodsky & Go, where she became a partner in 1984. Go began her career as a clerk for Court of Common Pleas Judge William Marutani.

#### **Maria Mateo, Esq.**

Maria Mateo, Esq. is a solo practitioner based in Queens, New York. She founded her firm in 2011. Previously, Mateo worked at the Immigration Tenant Advocacy Project in 2010 and Sanctuary for Families in 2009. Before that, she worked in the Department of Domestic Violence at the Queens District Attorney’s Office. Mateo also worked for the Presidency of the Dominican Republic as a bilingual attorney. She belongs to several organizations, including the Latino Lawyers Association.

---

<sup>2</sup> New York City Charter, Chapter 2-A, § 51.

### **Joshua Schneps**

Joshua Schneps is the CEO and publisher of Schneps Media — a family-run business — which publishes dozens of local newspapers, magazines, and local websites in New York City, Long Island, and Westchester. Previously, Schneps was a sales representative with the Forum Courier, a Queens-based local newspaper publisher. He earned a B.S. from Indiana University.

### **Lisa Sorin**

Lisa Sorin serves as president of the New Bronx Chamber of Commerce. Previously, Sorin was executive director of the Westchester Square District Management Association. Prior to that, she was head of LAS Consulting Services, Inc. Sorin holds a B.A. and an M.S. in Business Leadership from Concordia College.

### **Msgr. Kevin Sullivan**

Monsignor Kevin Sullivan is executive director of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York. He previously served as chair of the 9/11 United Services Group, co-founded the Washington Heights-Inwood Coalition and the Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation, and served as co-chair of the Partnership for the homeless. Before that, Monsignor Sullivan was a parish priest at St. Elizabeth’s Church.

### **Kai-Ki Wong**

Kai-Ki Wong is a career civil servant who, most recently, served as assistant chief plan examiner at the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB). Before that, he was a plan examiner for DOB. He holds a B.A. and an M.A. in Architecture from Ecole Speciale d’Architecture.

### **Maf Misbah Uddin**

Maf Misbah Uddin currently serves as the Treasurer of District Council 37, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, where he oversees all financial aspects of the council the treasurer’s office. In addition, he is President of Local 1407-New York City Accountants and Actuaries where he presides over meetings and serves as a member on all committees. He previously served as Actuary in the Office of the Actuary of the City of New York from 1988 to 2000, and Assistant Actuary of the New York State Teachers’ Retirement System.

**Michael Schnall**

Michael Schnall, a Staten Islander, currently serves as a government relations and community engagement consultant with non-profit organizations in New York City. He served as the Vice President of Government Relations for New York Road Runners, creating greater awareness of the non-profit's free youth and community programs throughout the city. Mike previously served as Staten Island Chief of Staff and Director of Government Relations for NYC Parks, where he secured money for the building and refurbishment of parks across the five boroughs, and drafted and got signed into law legislation that banned smoking in parks, and protected street trees. Mike is deeply committed to and has helped build non-profit organizations that support youth and community running in Staten Island. He earned his J.D. from Brooklyn Law School and B.A. from Binghamton University. In his free time, Mike enjoys spending time with his family and running, biking and exploring the Borough of Parks.

**Kristen A. Johnson**

Kristen A. Johnson is a pro bono counsel at Cooley LLP. She was formally an Assistant Counsel at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, litigating civil right cases in trial and appellate courts. Some of her notable representations include representing Black voters in Arkansas challenging the method of electing judges to state appellate courts under the Voting Rights Act, Black and Latina middle school girls in a lawsuit against a school district for unlawful strip searches and representing Black students in a desegregation case in Mississippi. She also led a lawsuit against the United State Department of Justice for its failure to comply with the Freedom of Information Act. She earned her J.D. from the UCLA School of Law, and was the first Black person elected to serve as Editor-in-Chief of the UCLA Law Review. She also earned an M.S. from the Harvard School of Public Health.

**Yovan Samuel Collado**

Yovan Samuel Collado is the Director of Community Relations Director for the Carpenter Contractor Alliance of Metropolitan New York. Previously, Collado was the Deputy Director of Housing Right Initiative, a national non-profit watchdog group that investigates real estate fraud, connects tenants to legal services, and promotes tenants' rights to fair and affordable housing. He holds a B.A. in Political Science from CUNY's Lehman College. He is currently a J.D. candidate at CUNY School of Law.

**Gregory W. Kirschenbaum**

Gregory W. Kirschenbaum is an attorney from Arce Law Group, P.C. Phillips & Associates, PLLC. Previously, Kirschenbaum worked at the Major League Baseball Players Association and Manhattan Borough President's Office. He is a Member of Manhattan Community Board 8, earned a J.D. from Brooklyn Law School, and a B.A. from the University of Delaware.

**Marc Wurzel**

Marc Wurzel is currently General Counsel and Assistant Secretary of Grand Central Partnership. Wurzel previously served as Deputy Director of Communications at the New York State Department of Law. Prior to that, Wurzel served in the New York City Council, New York City Department of Finance and New York City Department of Consumer Affairs. Wurzel is a previous member of the 2002-2003 and 2012-2013 districting commissions. He holds a B.A. in Political Science/Public Policy from George Washington University and a J.D. from Hofstra University School of Law.

**Kevin John Hanratty**

Kevin John Hanratty is Bank Compliance Consultant at BlackWatch Argus Consulting LLC. He previously served as a consultant on numerous projects and prior to that, served in the Mayor's Office of Contract Services and the New York State Office of Homeland Security. Hanratty holds a J.D. from Fordham University School of Law, a BBA in Accountancy from CUNY's Baruch College and a B.A. in Political Science from CUNY's Queens College.

**Dr. Darrin K. Porcher**

Dr. Darrin K. Porcher is an adjunct professor at Pace University School of Criminal Justice and Monroe College School of Criminal Justice. Prior to his career in academics, Dr. Porcher was in the New York Police Department for two decades, serving in the ranks of Police Officer, Detective, Sergeant and Lieutenant. He previously served in the United States Air Force. Dr. Porcher holds a B.S. in Organizational Management from St. Joseph's College, an MPA from Marist College, and a Doctorate degree in Education from Fordham University.



## **B. Redistricting Staff and Consultants**

John Flateau, Ph.D., served as Executive Director of the New York City Districting Commission 2022-2023 to administer and supervise the Commission as an agency as well as act as the principal advisor to the Commissioners toward the goal of redrawing New York City's new 51 City Council districts. The Commission retained a total of 14 staff members to provide legal, operational, communications and engagement, and mapping/data support to achieve the Commission's objectives.

The Commission contracted with Redistricting Partners to provide technical and specialized expertise as the mappers/line drawers for the Commission. Redistricting Partners utilized Maptitude, a Geographic Information System tool (GIS), to draw and revise the Council districts as directed by the Commission. They processed a variety of geographic and demographic datasets, including major housing developments, schools, and business improvement districts located in the city, to help the Commissioners evaluate the impact of proposed lines. They also customized Districtr, a free online mapping tool, specifically for New York City so that the Commission and public could also draw their own maps.

The Commission also contracted with Jeffrey M. Wice, a redistricting legal expert, and Dr. Lisa Handley, a voting rights expert, to advise and evaluate the proposed maps for compliance with the redistricting legal criteria. Dr. Handley conducted a Racial Bloc Voting analysis to evaluate the voting patterns of New York City populations and to determine whether the proposed maps complied with the Federal Voting Rights Act, an important redistricting legal criteria (see Section IV).

## II. THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING PROCESS

### A. Process under the New York City Charter

Section 51 of Chapter 2-A of the New York City Charter governs the Commission's procedure and schedule for preparing a districting plan. The relevant portions are as follows:

- a. Following each decennial census, the commission shall prepare a plan for dividing the city into districts for the election of council members. In preparing the plan, the commission shall be guided by the criteria set forth in section fifty-two.
- b. The commission shall hold one or more public hearings not less than one month before it submits its plan to the city council, in accordance with subdivision c of this section. The commission shall make its plan available to the public for inspection and comment not less than one month before the first such public hearing.
- c. The commission shall submit its plan to the city council not less than one year and three months before the general election of the city council to be held in the year nineteen hundred ninety-three and every ten years thereafter.
- d. The plan submitted in accordance with subdivision c of this section shall be deemed adopted unless within three weeks, the council by the vote of a majority of all of its members adopts a resolution objecting to such plan and returns the plan to the commission with such resolution and a statement of its objections, and with copies of the written objections of any individual members of the council who have submitted objections to the speaker prior to such date. Any objections from individual members submitted to the speaker by such date shall be transmitted to the districting commission whether or not the council objects to such districting plan.
- e. Upon the receipt of any such resolution and objections, the commission shall prepare a revised plan and shall, no later than one year and one month before such general election of the city council, make such plan available to the council and the public for inspection and comment. The commission shall hold public hearings and seek public comment on such revised plan.
- f. Following its consideration of the comments received pursuant to subdivision e of this section, the commission shall, no later than eleven months before such general election of the council, prepare and submit a final plan for the redistricting of the council.
- g. Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision d or subdivision f of this section, no

plan shall be deemed adopted in accordance with either of such subdivisions until the commission files, with the city clerk, a copy of such plan and a statement signed by at least nine members of the commission certifying that, within the constraint of paragraph a of subdivision one of section fifty-two, the criteria set forth in the other paragraphs of such subdivision have been applied in the order in which they are listed and that such criteria have been implemented, in such order, to the maximum extent practicable. Such certification shall also set forth the manner in which the commission implemented the requirements of paragraph b of subdivision one of section fifty-two. Such plan shall be deemed adopted upon the commission's filing with the city clerk of such plan and such certification.

- h. After the commission files its final plan with the city clerk pursuant to subdivision g of this section, the commission shall take all steps necessary to ensure that such plan is effectuated, including but not limited to submitting such plan for preclearance by the United States department of justice pursuant to the United States voting rights act of nineteen hundred sixty-five, as amended, and making such adjustments in its plan as may be necessary and appropriate to respond to a determination of a court or the United States department of justice.

## **B. 2022-2023 Redistricting Process**

At the first public meeting of the Commission on March 29, 2022, the Commissioners were sworn in and voted unanimously to elect Dennis Walcott as the Chair of the New York City Districting Commission. Additionally, the Commission voted to establish the Districting Commission's budget and senior staff positions. **(Exhibit 2)**

On May 11, 2022, the Commission convened a public meeting to receive several presentations and trainings to prepare for the redistricting process: (1) a presentation from the New York City Department of City Planning providing an overview of the 2020 Census and change in New York City demographics since the last census; (2) a legal presentation from the New York City Law Department, Office of the Corporation Counsel regarding the legal criteria for redistricting and process under the New York City Charter; and (3) an ethics training from the New York City Conflict of Interest Board. **(Exhibit 3)**

### **1) Preliminary Hearings**

As a first step to developing the first draft maps, the Commission held preliminary public hearings across the five boroughs to solicit public input and generate public interest in the process prior to the preparation of any new districting plan. The public was invited to participate in-person and virtually via Zoom, and all public hearings were also streamed live

on the Commission’s YouTube channel.<sup>3</sup> The first preliminary hearing was held on May 26, 2022 4 p.m.-7 p.m., at Pace University, Manhattan, followed by June 27, 2022 4 p.m.-7 p.m. at York College (CUNY), Queens; June 29, 2022 4 p.m.-7 p.m. New York City Technical College (CUNY), Brooklyn; July 6, 2022 4 p.m.-7 p.m., Hostos Community College (CUNY), Bronx ; and July 7, 2022 4 p.m.-7 p.m., Staten Island Borough Hall, Staten Island at this public meeting. **(Exhibits 4-8)** From the first round of hearings, approximately 176 people testified at the preliminary hearings in-person and virtually.

## 2) Preliminary Plan

On July 15, 2022, the Commission convened a public meeting to review and vote on a preliminary plan of the 51 City Council Districts (“Preliminary Plan”) to be released to the public for inspection and comment. **(Exhibit 9)** The Preliminary Plan represented the Commission’s first iteration and adjustment of the 2013 Council district lines. **(Exhibit 10)** The Preliminary Plan created three self-contained Council districts on Staten Island and a proposed crossover district 26 between Manhattan and Queens to equalize population deviation throughout the remaining districts in the city.

The Commissioners voted 12 in favor, 2 in opposition, and 1 abstention to submit the Preliminary Plan for the public’s review and comment. That same day, the Preliminary Plan was made available on the Commission’s website and physical copies of the Preliminary Plan were placed on the public bulletin board of the Surrogate’s Court in Manhattan as well as in Brooklyn Borough Hall, Staten Island Borough Hall, Queens Borough Hall, and the Bronx County Courthouse for a period of thirty days for the public to review the maps before holding a second round of hearings.

During the public’s review period of the Preliminary Plan and before the second round of hearings, on August 11, 2022, the Commission also held a virtual public meeting and educational seminar by Dr. Lisa Handley, a voting rights expert, to train the Commission on the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (as amended) and the Racial Bloc Voting analysis used to analyze a redistricting plan’s compliance with the Federal law. **(Exhibit 11)**

## 3) Second Round of Hearings

In August 2022, the Commission conducted a second round of public hearing in each borough. The public was invited to participate in-person and virtually via Zoom, and all public hearings were also streamed live on YouTube. The hearings were held as follows: (1) August 16, 2022, 5:30 p.m.- 12:00 a.m. at the Museum of the Moving Image, Queens; (2) August 17, 2022, 5:30 p.m.-9:00 p.m. Lehman College (CUNY), the Bronx; (3) August 18, 2022,

---

3 <https://www.youtube.com/@nycdistrictingcommission4308>

5:30 p.m.-9:00 p.m. Staten Island Borough Hall, Staten Island; (4) August 21, 2022, 3:30 p.m.-7:00 p.m., Medgar Evers College (CUNY), Brooklyn; and (5) August 22, 2022, 5:30 p.m.-10:30 p.m., Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, Manhattan. Due to the overwhelming demand by the public, the Commission also held a fully virtual hearing on August 22, 2022 from 11:00 a.m.-1 p.m. to accommodate as much public testimony as possible. **(Exhibits 12-17)** In total, approximately 264 people testified in-person and virtually.

#### **4) Revised Plan and Public Mapping Sessions**

On September 22, 2022, the Commission convened a public meeting to review and vote on the proposed revised plan to be submitted to the New York City Council. **(Exhibit 18)** The proposed revised plan reflected the public testimony, such as eliminating a cross-borough District 26 and making adjustments to the districts in southern Brooklyn. The public was presented with a summary of the 51 council districts and the Racial Bloc Voting Analysis of the proposed revised plan. **(Exhibits 19-20)** The Commission by a vote of 7 in favor of the proposed plan and 8 in opposition, rejected the plan and declined to forward it to City Council.

On September 29 and 30, 2022, the Commission revisited the maps in two public mapping sessions to revise the 51 City Council Districts to submit to City Council. **(Exhibits 21-22).** The Commissioners, with the mappers online, discussed additional adjustments to be made to the maps and created an updated revised plan. These mapping sessions were fully virtual and were live-streamed with the recordings made available on the Commission’s website.

#### **5) Updated Revised Plan and City Council**

On October 6, 2022, the Commission convened a public meeting to discuss and vote on the updated revised plan (“October 6 Plan”) to submit to the New York City Council. **(Exhibit 23)** The October 6 Plan represented a revised map from the Commission’s September 29 and 30 public mapping sessions. After a presentation by the Executive Director’s report on the changes to the plan made since the last September 22 public meeting and a presentation from the Commission’s voting right expert on the updated revised plan’s compliance with the Voting Rights Act, the Commission voted on a motion to submit the October 6 Plan to the City Council. **(Exhibits 24-25)** With a final tally of 13 votes in favor and 1 vote in opposition, the October 6 Plan was approved for submission to the New York City Council and the plan was delivered by the Commission staff to the Council that same day for its consideration and review for a three-week period pursuant to the Charter timeline.

## 6) Adoption of the Final Plan

At the expiration of the three-week period pursuant to the Charter, the Council had not returned a resolution by vote of a majority of all its members objecting to the October 6 plan. **(Exhibit 26)** The Commission held a public meeting on November 1, 2022 to discuss the next steps to be taken in the redistricting process. **(Exhibit 27)** After discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission voted not to make any further changes to the October 6 plan and the Commission voted 11 votes in favor and 4 votes in opposition to file a signed “Certification Statement” to adopt the October 6 plan as the Final Plan. The certification statement containing the signatures of “at least nine members of the Commission”<sup>4</sup> and the October 6 Plan was filed with the City Clerk on November 2, 2022. The plan was thereby deemed adopted in accordance with section 52(g) of the Charter. **(Exhibit 28)**

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 51(g) of Chapter 2-A of the Charter.

### III. COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The Commission designed and implemented a multi-pronged citywide public engagement process to meet New Yorkers in their communities and provide education on the City’s redistricting process in order to maximize civic participation, including from various members of racial and language minority groups. The Commission launched a robust communications and public engagement campaign to maximize attendance at public hearings and to solicit public input regarding their communities and how they would be impacted by the proposed new City Council district plans.

The Commission pursued these goals by using a variety of communication tools to encourage the public’s participation, including (1) a Commission website; (2) publications; (3) social media; (4) media appearances; (5) advertisements, including community and weekly newspapers; (6) public engagement meetings; and (7) canvassing at community events. These initiatives helped achieve the goal of generating unprecedented public participation with over 13,000 pieces of public testimony.

#### A. Website

The Commission’s website ([www.nyc.gov/districting](http://www.nyc.gov/districting)) served as the primary resource for the public to access timely information about the Commission’s redistricting work. **(Exhibit 29)** The website provided the public with the Commission’s events and materials, including public meeting and hearing materials, press releases, and public testimony. The website also posted presentations with information about the Commission policies, Voting Rights Act, New York City Charter, citywide, borough, and district maps and data, public testimony, and demographic data from the Department of City Planning. It was designed to be simple, transparent, and easy to navigate by the public. As with all nyc.gov web pages, the Commission’s website was capable to be automatically translated into over fifty languages. The Commission’s website received 75,913 visits between August 1, 2022 and November 15, 2022.<sup>5</sup>

#### B. Commission Publications

The Commission developed written materials to assist in its outreach and education campaigns with the public. Staff developed a comprehensive deck/powerpoint presentation about the Commission’s purpose and processes entitled “NYC Districting Commission 101” **(Exhibit 30)** Nearly 1,000 copies of the primers were printed and circulated to members of the public. The Commission also produced pamphlets and palm cards with information regarding the Public hearings and Public Meetings that were also distributed widely. **(Exhibit 31)** These materials were translated and made available into the ten local languages required by Local Law 30 of 2017 (see section III.G) on the Commission’s website. **(Exhibit 32)**

---

<sup>5</sup> The Commission was unable to monitor the web traffic from April 2022 to July 30, 2022.

## C. Social Media

The Commission also used social media to disseminate information—its main social media presence was Twitter and Instagram accounts, along with the Commission’s YouTube account (<https://www.youtube.com/@nycdistrictingcommission4308>) to livestream and host recordings of Commission events, a LinkedIn page, and a Facebook account as a conduit for paid advertising on that platform. **(Exhibits 33)** The Commission’s social media handle was @districtingNYC on Twitter and Instagram. As of November 22, 2022, the Commission had 443 followers on Twitter, and 172 followers on Instagram. The Commission had 148 subscribers on its YouTube channel.

Throughout the Commission’s redistricting process, social media was used regularly to educate the public of opportunities to participate in the redistricting process, such as submitting public testimony or attending a public hearing. The Commission also e-blasted information through the Mailchimp platform using a customized database of thousands of citywide public and community e-mails. Information was posted about the public hearings, including times and locations of events, as well as the process to register to speak at the hearing in-person or virtually, or to request interpretation services. During the public hearings, links would appear on the Commission’s social accounts to allow the public to livestream the event or watch a recording after the hearing was completed.

## D. Advertisements

The Commission launched a paid advertising campaign from August 8 to August 18, 2022 to publicize the second round of public hearings and encourage public testimony. This ten-day media campaign included quarter-page ads in 67 community and ethnic weekly newspapers in ten languages under Local Law 30 of 2017: Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Urdu, Polish, Haitian Creole. **(Exhibits 34-35)**

The campaign also included a social-media ad campaign on Twitter and Instagram for the same time period. Information about the second round of hearings were disseminated in different languages in Twitter and Instagram. Twitter had 1,092,614 impressions (i.e. user views) in English. 333,074 in Spanish, and 103,798 in Chinese. These impressions altogether totaled 1,529,486 impressions on Twitter. On Instagram, the impressions garnered languages were: English, 928,377 impressions; Spanish, 514,384; Chinese, 63,531; Russian 56,295; French 62,377; Bengali 48,691; Korean 65,995; and Polish 39, 219. Twitter and Instagram together had a total of 3.1 million impressions. **(Exhibit 36)**

The Commission also contracted with LINKNYC for an electronic outdoor advertising campaign on its public Internet kiosks. This campaign ran from on the network’s 736 kiosks across the five boroughs in August 2022. **(Exhibit 37)**



## E. Media Appearances

The Commission staff also arranged several print and electronic media appearances for the Chair and Commissioners to promote the Commission’s redistricting work. Press advisories and releases were regularly submitted to a list of 795 media organizations, including local minority outlets, and served as a resource in notifying the public of upcoming hearings. The Commission staff met with the Mayor’s Office of Ethnic and Community Media as well as major media outlets to ensure that a robust and inclusive media list was being utilized. The Commission appeared in approximately 70 earned media placements in the city’s community and ethnic newspapers and the mainstream media, including three appearances on NY1, the City’s 24-hour cable news television station; two appearances on the *Brian Lehrer Show* on WNYC, the City’s predominant public radio station; a redistricting documentary on CUNY TV, the news channel of the City University of New York; and a segment on Fox News’ Good Day New York. (**Exhibit 38**)

## F. Public Engagement Meetings

In addition to the press and social media, the Commission’s messaging and information was broadcasted via the Commission’s Public Engagement e-mail list and amplified through partnerships with other agencies including the City Council, Mayor’s Community Affairs Unit, Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs, Department of Cultural Affairs, borough and citywide elected officials.

The Commission worked with partners in government, community, the nonprofit and private sector to provide education on the redistricting process. Over 50 engagement meetings and public information sessions were conducted, including briefings with the New York City Council Borough Delegations, events hosted by individual council members, Borough Board and Service Cabinet Meetings hosted by each Borough President, and specialty events hosted by advocates and trade groups, along with community boards, civic association meetings, and others (**Exhibit 39**). The outreach meetings provided an education on redistricting and encouraged participation in the Commission’s work through attendance at Public Hearings and submission of testimony.

## G. Disability and Language Accessibility

The Commission, in its efforts to engage the diversity of our growing City, sought to ensure accessibility for all New Yorkers in the redistricting process. The Commission held all public meetings and hearings at locations that complied with The Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and were accessible to individuals using wheelchairs or mobility devices. The Commission also provided American Sign Language interpretation upon request at all hearings and meetings.

The Commission also complied with Local Law 30 of 2017 (“LL 30”) to design its language accessibility strategy and disseminate information about the redistricting process in the ten local languages

designated under the LL30: Arabic, Spanish, Urdu, Korean, Polish, Bengali, Chinese (traditional and simplified), French, Haitian Creole and Russian.

The Commission’s website and the City Record, which displayed the Commission’s public notices, are hosted by the New York City Office of Technology and Innovation (“OTT”) which provides translation of the website content in over 100 languages. The Commission also worked with the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs (“MOIA”) to translate documents and provide interpretation for its public meetings and hearings. The Commission’s website remains translatable into multiple languages to ensure the vast communities throughout New York City have the information needed to participate in the City Council redistricting process. The Commission also translated its commonly distributed materials, including the primer and flyers publicizing the public meetings and hearings in the top ten LL30 languages as well as additional languages upon request (See Exhibit 32).

At its public meetings and hearings, the Commission provided language interpreters to members of the public upon request with 72 hours’ notice prior to the event. Headsets were available to enable simultaneous interpretation of these events as well as interpreters who can facilitate testimony in another language if members of the public wish to do so.

The Commission also made a dedicated effort to ensure staff would be able to communicate to a wide constituency that would call-in or attend events. Staff was knowledgeable in eight different languages including Spanish, Korean, Urdu, Punjabi, Hindi, Italian, French and Russian. The Commission also had summer interns for six weeks who represented a diverse array of communities in New York City and could speak Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese.

## **H. Canvassing**

Over the summer of 2022, the Commission engaged thirteen interns for a six-week long internship, from July 12<sup>th</sup> through August 19<sup>th</sup>. These positions were supported by the Summer Youth Employment Program in the Mayor’s Office of Youth Employment, as well as by the City University of New York. The interns assisted the Commission’s public engagement and outreach efforts by canvassing and providing the public opportunities to inspect the maps. After the Commission voted to publish the Preliminary Plan on July 15, staff and interns coordinated with Department of Citywide Administrative Services to display the draft maps in each borough hall, as well as in 31 Chambers Street for Manhattan.

The interns were assigned to events throughout the city to discuss the process with New Yorkers. They distributed flyers and palm cards regarding the redistricting process and provided directions on accessing the information in the LL30 languages. They were trained on how to direct someone to the Commission’s translated literature if their first language was not English.

The interns canvassed a diversity of different community events; among others, they attended a neighborhood Baby Shower at Mullaly Park in the South Bronx, a Liberian Independence Day in Little Liberia on Staten Island, and the UA3 Food Pantry on the Lower East Side. **(Exhibit 40)** Interns also participated in a citywide canvassing effort in all five boroughs on National Night Out, hosted by the New York Police Department on August 2, 2022. During their month-long internship, the interns distributed more than 25,000 pieces of literature and attended over 50 events throughout the five boroughs.

## I. Public Testimony

Public testimony played a significant role in guiding the Commissioners during the process of redistricting the 51 council districts. The Commission engaged in extensive communications and public engagement efforts to ensure that New York City residents and communities were provided with a voice in the redistricting process. The public was encouraged to submit their input through multiple avenues, including (1) in-person or online testimony at public hearings; (2) a dedicated email address for submitting public testimony at [publictestimony@redistricting.nyc.gov](mailto:publictestimony@redistricting.nyc.gov); (3) testimony submissions by physical mail; and (4) a free public online mapping tool called Districtr at <https://districtr.org/event/NYC2022>.

Districtr, a free online mapping tool, was made available to the public so that they could draw their own City Council district and/or community maps using the Districtr online mapping tool. The public could post their proposed maps to an online gallery on the Districtr website for the Commission's review and each map created generated a unique link that could be emailed to the Commission as well as part of public testimony. Approximately 84 maps representing proposed districts and communities of interest from the public were submitted to Districtr's website.

During the redistricting process, the public's response and input was unprecedented. Over 440 people testified at the ten public hearings held between May to August 2022. Between March 29, 2022 and October 31, 2022, the Commission received over 13,200 submissions of mailed and e-mail testimony, which were made available on its website. Testimony was received from residents, tenant associations, community organizations, community boards, and elected officials throughout all 51 council districts in New York City. The Commission carefully considered the public testimony as an important resource for considering neighborhoods and communities of interest that would be impacted by the redrawn City Council districts and accommodated them to the maximum extent possible.

## IV. REDISTRICTING CRITERIA

In New York City, four fundamental sources of law govern redistricting for the 2022-2023 City Council Redistricting: the U.S. Constitution’s Fourteenth Amendment, the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (as amended), New York State Law, and the New York City Charter (hereinafter referred to as the “Charter”). As explained below, the Commission carefully and faithfully adhered to the criteria set forth in each of these sources of law throughout the redistricting process.

### A. U.S. Constitution’s Fourteenth Amendment

The Fourteenth Amendment’s “Equal Protection” clause guarantees that the law is to be applied in an equal fashion to all people within a jurisdiction. It established the “one person, one vote” standard, which requires that districts be of generally equal population.<sup>6</sup>

According to the U.S. Census, New York City’s population was 8,804,190 in 2020 and a adjusted prisoner population figure of 12,769, resulting in a total prisoner-adjusted population of 8,816,959.<sup>7</sup> Divided among the 51 New York City Council Districts, the ideal district population is 172,882 (“ideal population”) after adjusting for reallocating incarcerated persons to their home address census blocks prior to incarceration.

### B. New York State Law

In the context of the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause, the United States Supreme Court has held that “minor deviations” from the ideal population for purposes of legislative redistricting are permissible in some circumstances.<sup>8</sup> As of October 2021, under New York State law, the districts in a districting plan composed of only single-member districts must “be as nearly equal in population as is practicable,” with the “difference in population between the largest and small districts” exceeding no more than 5% of the mean population of all districts.<sup>9</sup> The Commission, in balancing the new State Law with the New York City Charter and federal constitutional population requirements, successfully maintained the population size of all districts within the 5% overall population deviation.

---

6 See *Gray v. Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368, 381 (1963).

7 Municipal Home Rule Law § 10(1)(ii)(a)(13).

8 *Harris v. Arizona Ind. Redistricting Comm’n.*, 578 US 253, 259 (2016). See also *White v. Register*, 412 U.S. 755 (1973); *Gaffney v. Cummins*, 412 U.S. 755 (1973).

9 Municipal Home Rule Law § 10(1)(ii)(a)(13).

## C. Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Section 2)

The next fundamental source of law that governs redistricting is the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (as amended), and in particular, Section 2 of the Act. 42 U.S.C. § 1973, et seq. Section 2 of the Act applies to all jurisdictions in the United States, and prohibits, among other things, redistricting that discriminates on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.<sup>10</sup> In general, Section 2 prohibits “minority vote dilution,” which is the minimization or cancelling out of minority voting strength in favor of that of non-minorities.

With the legal framework of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in mind,<sup>11</sup> the Commission retained voting rights expert Dr. Lisa Handley, who analyzed the voting patterns and demographics of New York City to evaluate where minorities had the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice and whether the newly drawn 51 City Council Districts complies with the requirements of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. **(See Appendix 1)** Because Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act (as amended) is no longer being enforced as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court’s *Shelby County v. Holder*,<sup>12</sup> the final plan for the 51 City Council Districts (“Final Plan”) is not subject to federal approval and preclearance as provided for in the Charter.

## D. New York City Charter

The final fundamental source of law for the redistricting process is Section 52 of Chapter 2A of the New York City Charter. Section 52 sets forth several criteria that the Districting Commission is to apply “to the maximum extent practicable,” and in the priority of the order that they are listed, when drawing the new lines. As explained below, the Commission has carefully and faithfully adhered to the Charter criteria throughout the line-drawing process.

### 1) Population Size

The first listed criterion is that the difference in population between the least populous district and the most populous district. The Charter specifies that this number be no more than 10% of the average district size.<sup>13</sup> This criterion was modified by New York State Law in October 2021, when amendments to the Municipal Home Rule Law went into effect requiring that districts in a districting plan composed of only single-member districts must “be as nearly equal in population as is practicable,” with the population

<sup>10</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 1973a

<sup>11</sup> In June 2022, the New York State John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act (“NYSVRA”) was signed into law. However, the Governor and the Legislature have agreed to modify the effective date of the law until July 2023. The NYSVRA creates new legal protections for minority voters. The Commission believes the Final Plan, in complying with applicable local and federal requirements, also satisfies the NYSVRA.

<sup>12</sup> 570 U.S. 529 (2013). The decision invalidated the coverage formula that required preclearance for election law changes in the Bronx, New York, and Kings counties.

<sup>13</sup> NYC Charter Ch. 2-A, § 52(1)(a).

deviation between the most and least populous district not exceeding 5% of the mean population of all districts.<sup>14</sup> The Commission utilized a 5% overall population deviation in redrawing the 51 city council districts, including the Final Plan.

## **2) Fair and Effective Representation of Racial and Voting Minority Groups**

The second criterion is that the plan should ensure “the fair and effective representation of racial and minority groups in New York City which are protected by the United States voting rights act.<sup>15</sup>”

## **3) Keeping Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest Intact**

The third criterion in the Charter is that district lines “keep intact neighborhoods and communities with established ties of common interest and association, whether historical, racial, economic, ethnic, religious or other.”<sup>16</sup> The Commission utilized many sources of information, including census data and demographic data, information from community and voting rights advocates, and the public input via testimony and map submissions to provide a wealth of information. Through extensive outreach efforts, the Commission received over 13,200 pieces of testimony from individuals, community organizations, and elected officials regarding their neighborhoods and communities of interest. (see Section II.I) The Commission carefully considered and reviewed the public’s testimony and accommodated the input regarding their communities to the maximum extent practicable.

## **4) Additional Charter Criteria**

The remaining factors, in decreasing order of priority, include: (a) that districts should be compact (no more than twice as long as they are wide); (b) that districts should not cross borough lines; (c) that districts should not be drawn for the purpose of separating geographic concentrations of voters enrolled in the same political party; and (d) that districts should have standard “shapes” and that the plan as a whole should contain districts that are as compact as possible.<sup>17</sup> These criteria may be subordinated to the other, higher priority Charter criteria.

Finally, there are two additional mandatory requirements in Section 52 of the Charter. First, districts must be contiguous, meaning that different parts of the same district must be connected in some way—whether by land, bridge, tunnel, tramway or regular ferry

14 See Municipal Home Rule Law § 10(1)(ii)(a)(13).

15 NYC Charter Ch. 2-A, § 52(1)(b).

16 NYC Charter Ch.2-A § 52(1)(c).

17 NYC Charter Ch.2-A § 52(1)(d)-(g).

service.<sup>18</sup> Second, if compliance with the Charter’s districting criteria results in a plan where districts must cross borough lines to satisfy higher-priority Charter criteria, the Charter mandates that no more than one district may span a particular pair of boroughs.<sup>19</sup>

The Commission applied these remaining Charter criteria to the maximum extent practicable.

---

18 NYC Charter, Ch.2-A § 52(2).

19 NYC Charter Ch.2-A § 52(3).

## V. THE 51 NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL DISTRICTS

### A. The 2020 Census

The 2020 census showed that New York City experienced a significant population increase over the last ten years. The City's population increased by 629,057, or 7.7% to 8,804,190. In addition to the population increase, there was a change in the racial and ethnic makeup of New York City residents since the 2010 census. The Asian population of New York City grew at a considerable rate adding 345,383 people, or 33.6%. The Hispanic population grew by 154,274 people, or 6.6%. The white population fell slightly by 3,048 people, or -.01%, and the Black population fell by 84,404 people, or -4.5%. The ideal population for New York City Council districts based on the population increase is 172,882 people.

The white population in NYC is 2,719,856, or 30.9% of the total population. The Hispanic population is next with 2,490,350, or 28.3% of the total population. The Black population is 1,776,891, or 20.2% of the total population, and the Asian population is 1,373,502, or 15.6% of the total population.

#### **New York County Overview**

Since the 2010 census, Manhattan's population increased by 108,000 people, or 6.8%, to 1,694,251. The Asian population in Manhattan grew by 42,000, or 23.6%, the white population grew by 32,000, or 4.2%, while the Black population decreased by 6,000, or -2.8%. A majority of Manhattan districts were overpopulated above the ideal population of 172,882 people, with the exception of District 10, which was the most underpopulated district in the city from the ideal population size by 14,067 people, or 8.1%.

#### **Bronx County Overview**

The population in the Bronx increased by 88,000 people, or 6.3%, to 1,472,654. Hispanic growth was largest, at 64,000 people, or 8.8%, followed by the Asian population, with a growth of 20,000 people, or 43.2%. The Black population increased slightly growing by 3,000, or 0.6%.

#### **Kings County Overview**

Brooklyn's population increased by 231,000, or 9.2%, to 2,736,074. There were significant shifts in ethnic populations throughout Brooklyn. The Black population dropped significantly by 69,000 people, or 8.7%, which affected redistricting of majority-minority districts in the borough, to remain in compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965. The white population grew by 75,000 people, or 8.4%, and the Asian population grew by 111,000 people, or 42.5%. Based on



the Racial Bloc Voting (“RBV”) analysis of Southern Brooklyn conducted by the Commission’s voting rights expert and the exponential increase and concentration of the Asian population in Southern Brooklyn, a new District 43 was created including parts of Bensonhurst, Dyker Heights, and Sunset Park. This new District 43 is a majority-minority district that will provide Asian voters an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice in compliance with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act.

### **Queens County Overview**

The population in Queens County increased by 7.8%, to 2,405,464. The Asian population saw the largest growth in the borough, growing by 148,000 people, or 29.2%. The Hispanic population grew by 54,000 people, or 8.8%. The white population fell by 67,000 people, or -10.9%, as well as the Black population, which fell by 15,000 people, or -3.7%.

### **Richmond County Overview**

Staten Island’s population the smallest percentage of all the boroughs, at 5.8%, or 495,747 people. The white population fell by 22,000 people, or -7.4%. The Black population remained stable, growing by 3,000 people, or 5.7%. The Hispanic population grew by 16,000, or 19.6%, and the Asian population had the highest percentage growth, at 24,000 people, or 69.3%. All three city council districts in Staten Island were underpopulated by an average of 4.3% from the ideal population.

## B. The 51 City Council Districts Overview

### NEW YORK COUNTY

#### District 1

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
1	177,159	2.5%

District 1 consists of the Financial District, Battery Park City, TriBeCa, Chinatown, parts of the Lower East Side, SoHo, and Governor’s Island. District 1 was overpopulated by 11,836 people, or 6.8% over ideal population. The district remains mostly intact, with little change to the district boundaries except to move population to comply with deviation requirements. The Commission received testimony from the public about including Vladeck Houses, a New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) development, which was previously in District 2, in District 1. The public testimony stated that the other NYCHA buildings around Vladeck houses are a similar community of interest, and that the Williamsburg Bridge and Delancey Street creates a natural boundary for the north side of the district. As a result of the testimony and in consideration of population deviation adjustments, Vladeck Houses are now in District 1.

#### District 2

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
2	177,066	2.4%

District 2 consists of the parts of the Lower East Side, the East Village, Greenwich Village, Washington Square Park, Gramercy, and parts of Kips Bay and Murray Hill. District 2 was overpopulated by 839 people, or 0.5% over ideal population. The district remains mostly intact, with some minor boundary changes due to population growth in southern Manhattan. The southernmost boundary of District 2 is now Delancey Street and the Williamsburg Bridge, which is a natural dividing line.

#### District 3

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
3	177,136	2.5%

District 3 consists of the West Village, West SoHo, Chelsea, Flatiron, Hudson Yards, parts of Times Square, and Hell’s Kitchen. District 3 was overpopulated by 29,845 people, or 17.3% over

ideal population. The north boundary of District 3 is now West 54th Street between 12<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> avenues, and 8<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> avenues, and 55<sup>th</sup> street between 10<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> avenues, and the eastern boundary retains Times Square West, keeping most of Hell’s Kitchen intact within District 3, as requested by significant amounts of public testimony. The southern boundary of District 3 was moved to Spring Street, between 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the Hudson River.

#### District 4

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
4	177,190	2.5%

District 4 consists of Stuyvesant Town, Peter Cooper Village, Times Square, East Midtown, Murray Hill, and parts of the Upper East Side. District 4 was overpopulated by 11,271 people, or 6.5% over ideal population. The boundaries from the current city council district were largely preserved, while boundaries that were changed accounted for the district overpopulation. The Commission received significant testimony from residents of residential buildings and co-ops, education complexes, and hospitals to keep these institutions within districts fully contained in Manhattan, and not be in any cross-borough district. As a result of testimony, District 4 and District 5 remain wholly contained in Manhattan. The Northernmost corridor of the district was also maintained to keep many notable cultural institutions, such as those contained in the “Museum Mile” together in a single district.

#### District 5

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
5	177,075	2.4%

District 5 consists of parts of the Upper East Side, Yorkville, Carnegie Hill, and Roosevelt Island. District 5 was overpopulated by 8,679, people or 5.0% over ideal population. The northern boundary of the district was lowered, staircasing through the East 90s, to allow for population adjustments in District 8. The Commission received significant testimony to keep Roosevelt Island in a district that was wholly contained in Manhattan, and this final iteration of District 5 reflects this overwhelming testimony received.

## District 6

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
6	176,623	2.2%

District 6 consists of Central Park, parts of Clinton, the Upper West Side, and Lincoln Square. District 6 was overpopulated by 8,693 people, or 5.0% over ideal population. The northern border of District 6 is West 96th Street from Riverside Drive to West End Avenue to adjust for the district's overpopulation within deviation; the southern boundary of the district is West 54th Street, except between 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue where it is West 55<sup>th</sup> Street, and now includes all of Columbus Circle all the way to Sixth Avenue. The entirety of Central Park remains in the district.

## District 7

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
7	176,905	2.3%

District 7 consists of parts of the Upper West Side, Manhattan Valley, Morningside Heights, Hamilton Heights, Manhattanville, and parts of Washington Heights. District 7 was underpopulated by 7,369 people, or 4.3% under ideal population. To address concerns about the Hispanic voting population in the district and to accommodate public testimony about maintaining borders of District 7 to 165<sup>th</sup> Street, District 7 retains a north border west of Broadway on East 165th Street, over to Fort Washington Avenue, then down to East 163rd Street, to Riverside Drive.

## District 8

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
8	176,465	2.1%

District 8 consists of El Barrio/East Harlem, Randalls and Wards Islands in Manhattan; and Mott Haven, and Port Morris in the Bronx. District 8 continues to be a Manhattan - Bronx cross-borough district and effective Hispanic majority district under the Commission's RBV analysis. District 8 was overpopulated by 4,850 people, or 2.8% over ideal population. The boundaries of this cross-borough district changed slightly to accommodate local neighborhood population changes on the Manhattan and the Bronx sections. Taft Houses, a NYCHA development on the East side of District 9 on Madison Avenue at East 115<sup>th</sup> Street was previously split between District 9 and District 8. They were united in District 8. District 8 also retains La Marqueta, on Park Avenue between East 111th Street and East 115<sup>th</sup> Street. The southern boundary of the district moved slightly south and took some blocks on East 95<sup>th</sup> Street from District 5 for population. In

the Bronx, the Western boundary of District 8 moves along the water to Macombs Dam Bridge, then follows East 153<sup>rd</sup> Street south to Fran Segal Park.

### District 9

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
9	176,831	2.3%

District 9 consists of Central Harlem, Hamilton Heights, Sugar Hill, and parts of Manhattanville. District 9 was overpopulated by 5,727 people, or 3.3% over ideal population. The district boundaries remain mostly intact. The Commission received testimony to keep cultural institutions and certain residential complexes in Harlem such as Schomburg Plaza, Lakeview Apartments, and the Polo Grounds. These locations remain in District 9. To equalize populations between districts, a few blocks on the Eastern border of District 7 were moved into District 9. District 9 remains an effective Black majority district that provides the Black population in the district the ability to elect a candidate of their choice.

### District 10

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
10	175,271	1.4%

District 10 consists of Washington Heights, Inwood, and Marble Hill. District 10 was underpopulated by 14,067 people, or 8.1% under ideal population. Given that District 8 currently crosses between Manhattan and the Bronx, the northernmost boundary of District 10 cannot go past the Manhattan boundary of Marble Hill, in compliance with the City Charter that limits the amount of crossover districts between the same two boroughs to one. Therefore, in efforts to adjust population within the required deviation limits, parts of the southern boundary were moved lower, staircasing through the West 160's to West 155<sup>th</sup> Street East of Broadway to accommodate testimony for district 7, and to add population into District 10. District 10 remains an effective Hispanic majority district that provides the Hispanic population in the district the ability to elect a candidate of their choice.

## BRONX COUNTY

### District 11

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
11	175,470	1.5%

District 11 consists of parts of Kingsbridge, Riverdale, North Riverdale, Spuyten Duyvil, Bedford Park, Norwood, Woodlawn and parts of Wakefield, as well as Van Cortlandt Park. Although the population of the district grew from 2010, the district was underpopulated by 7,159 people, or 4.1% under ideal population. One of the buildings of Marble Hill Houses, a NYCHA development, was moved from District 11 to District 14 to unite the development houses on the Bronx side into one district. The northeast boundary of the district moved further east to include more of Wakefield into District 11, to reflect public testimony and to accommodate population changes.

### District 12

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
12	175,452	1.5%

District 12 consists of Eastchester, Edenwald, Williamsbridge, Baychester, Co-op City and parts of Wakefield. There was population growth in District 12, and it is currently overpopulated by 4,042 people, or 2.3% over ideal population. The southern boundary largely remained unchanged, using Arnow Avenue and East Gun Hill Road. The most notable change in the district is the northwest boundary that moved easterly to balance the overpopulation in District 12 and the underpopulation in District 11. The Commission received considerable public testimony requesting that Gun Hill Houses, a NYCHA development, be retained within the district. As a result, the Gun Hill Houses have been retained within the boundaries of District 12. Finally, the district maintains its effectiveness as a Black majority districts that provides the Black population the opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

### District 13

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
13	175,210	1.3%

District 13 consists of Pelham Bay, Pelham Gardens, Allerton, Van Nest, Morris Park, Bronxdale, Throggs Neck, Schuylerville, Country Club, and City Island. District 13 was underpopulated by 5,360 people, or 3.1% under ideal population. Pelham Parkway Houses, a NYCHA development,

as well as the Pelham Parkway Greenway are drawn within the boundaries of District 13 in response to the testimony received stating that these communities of interest should remain whole in District 13. Additionally, the Van Nest neighborhood is united in District 13 in response to testimony received by the Commission.

## District 14

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
14	175,592	1.6%

District 14 contains parts of Kingsbridge, Kingsbridge Heights, Morris Heights, parts of Mount Hope and University Heights. District 14 was underpopulated by 3,811 people, or 2.2% under ideal population. The northern boundary of the district was raised slightly from East 196<sup>th</sup> to East 204<sup>th</sup> street between Jerome and Valentine Avenues to compensate for this underpopulation. The Southern boundary was raised slightly, running across E 174<sup>th</sup> street. The Commission received testimony requesting Kingsbridge Armory remain in the district. Additionally, the NYCHA Marble Hill Houses were split between three Council districts: 10, 11, and 14. This three-way split is due to the county border between Manhattan and the Bronx, which the development straddles. The Commission recognized the Marble Hill Houses and its residents constitute a considerable community of interest and thus united all the residents in the Bronx buildings of the development into District 14. District 14 remains an effective Hispanic majority district.

## District 15

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
15	173,536	0.4%

District 15 consists of parts of Bedford Park, Fordham, parts of Mount Hope, Bathgate, Belmont, East Tremont, West Farms, Allerton, and Olinville. District 15 was overpopulated by 1,854 people, or 1.1% over ideal population. To account for population growth in the surrounding districts, the southern boundary of the district moved further south, and the southwest corner extended further southwest. These changes incorporated the East Tremont and West Farms neighborhoods into District 15. In efforts to further unite communities, District 15 now includes all of Crotona Park and a one block boundary surrounding the park from East 175<sup>th</sup> Street, to Boston Road, to East 170<sup>th</sup> Street, to Fulton Avenue. Twin Parks housing development is also united in District 15. District 15 remains an effective Hispanic majority district.

## District 16

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
16	175,413	1.5%

District 16 consists of Claremont, Concourse Village, Highbridge, Mount Eden, and Morrisania. District 16 was underpopulated by 2,164 people, or 1.3% under ideal population. The district remains mostly intact, with some southward expansion of the southern boundary. The commission received testimony to retain the Woodstock Terrace NYCHA Housing development, and a portion of the waterfront between 165th street and Roberto Clemente Park, which was accommodated, and remains in District 16. Additionally, Concourse Village, a major housing development, was maintained as whole within District 16 as requested in additional testimony. This final version of District 16 also reflects requests from testimony to keep a large swath of the waterfront in District 16, which was proposed to be in District 14 in the Commission’s Preliminary Plan.

## District 17

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
17	175,486	1.5%

District 17 consists of East Tremont, Hunts Point, Longwood, Melrose, Morrisania, Port Morris, North Brother Island, and South Brother Island. District 17 was overpopulated by 1,075 people, or 0.6% above ideal population. To account for shifting boundaries in neighboring districts due to population changes, the southern boundary moved further south past its existing lines. This was also in response to testimony received requesting the neighborhood of Longwood be united in District 17, which was accommodated. As a result of the population impact of unifying Crotona Park in District 15, District 17 took a portion of the southeastern portion of District 15 near West Farms.

## District 18

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
18	175,681	1.6%

District 18 consists of Soundview, Castle Hill, Parkchester, Clason Point, and Harding Park. District 18 was overpopulated by 8,956 people, or 5.2% over ideal population. The boundaries of the district were shifted east on both the northeast and southeast corners of the district. District 18 now encompasses more of Westchester Square and unites the Soundview community, as reflected in testimony received by the Commission.



## QUEENS COUNTY

### District 19

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
19	170,692	-1.3%

District 19 consists of Auburndale, Bay Terrace, Bayside, Beechhurst, College Point, Douglaston, Flushing, Little Neck, Malba and Whitestone. District 19 was underpopulated by 5,085 people, or 2.9% under ideal population. The district remains largely intact from the previous plan, without any major changes to its boundaries. This district continues to take in the entirety of the Bayside Village Business Improvement District (“BID”) and includes five Long Island Railroad (“LIRR”) stations.

### District 20

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
20	172,944	0.0%

District 20 consists of Downtown Flushing, Murray Hill, and Queensboro Hill. District 20 was underpopulated by 1,009 people, or 0.6% under ideal population. As an Asian majority district in Queens County, District 20 remains largely unchanged. In response to testimony received by the Commission, the area of Mitchell-Linden remains in this district’s northern boundary. District 20 remains an effective Asian majority district.

### District 21

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
21	170,397	-1.4%

District 21 consists of Corona, parts of Elmhurst, East Elmhurst, and Jackson Heights. District 21 was underpopulated by 1,700 people, or 1.0% under ideal population. The district remained mostly intact and retained LaGuardia Airport and Flushing Meadow Park within the district. The Commission received testimony to keep Corona, East Elmhurst, and Lefrak City intact, which was accommodated, with minor boundary changes to account for population growth of surrounding districts. It remains an effective Hispanic majority district.

## District 22

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
22	168,889	-2.3%

District 22 consists of Astoria, East Elmhurst, and Jackson Heights. District 22 was underpopulated by 13,271 people, or 7.7% under ideal population. The border between District 22 and its southern neighbor district 26 received a notable amount of public testimony, particularly regarding the division of NYCHA developments at Ravenswood and Queensbridge. The boundary of District 22 was therefore pushed north to allow for Ravenswood to be united with Queensbridge in District 26. On the eastern side of this boundary, District 22 then extended south to unify the Steinway Street BID within the district.

## District 23

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
23	169,886	-1.7%

District 23 consists of Glen Oaks, Fresh Meadows, and Bellerose. District 23 was underpopulated by 12,173 people, or 7.0% under ideal population. As a result of responding to public testimony requesting that Jewish communities of interest be kept intact, population adjustments were made by adding 188<sup>th</sup> Street to 178<sup>th</sup> Street between Jamaica Avenue and Hillside Avenue to the district. District 23 is not an Asian majority district but the district retains the opportunity for Asian voters to elect a candidate of their choice.

## District 24

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
24	169,157	-2.2%

District 24 consists of Kew Gardens Hills, Pomonok, Electchester, Fresh Meadows, Hillcrest, Jamaica Estates, Briarwood, Parkway Village, Jamaica Hills, and Jamaica. District 24 was underpopulated by 6,878 people, or 4.0% under ideal population. The Commission received testimony from local Jewish community groups that requested Hillcrest and Fresh Meadows remain intact within District 24, and in response Hillcrest and Fresh Meadows to 188<sup>th</sup> Street remains in the district. District 24 is not an Asian majority district but the district retains the opportunity for Asian voters to elect a candidate of their choice.

## District 25

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
25	169,541	-1.9%

District 25 consists of Elmhurst and Jackson Heights. District 25 was underpopulated by 1,652 people, or 1.0% under ideal population. District 25 was largely kept intact, with slight border expansions required to increase its population. Most notably, the 82<sup>nd</sup> Street BID was unified into District 25. Additionally, the Commission received testimony from residents of Elmhurst south of Queens Boulevard, stating they wanted to be moved into District 30, and this move was accommodated.

## District 26

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
26	169,044	-2.2%

District 26 consists of Sunnyside, Woodside, Long Island City, Astoria, and Dutch Kills. District 26 was overpopulated by 10,977 people, or 6.3% over ideal population. District 26 now extends east to Woodside by the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway and Queens Boulevard. The southern boundary of District 26 follows boundaries of Community Board 2, following Calamus Avenue to Maurice Avenue in Maspeth. District 26 continues to include the neighborhoods of Sunnyside, Woodside, Long Island City and Dutch Kills. District 24 is not an Asian majority district but the district retains the opportunity for Asian voters to elect a candidate of their choice.

## District 27

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
27	169,452	-2.0%

District 27 consists of Cambria Heights, Hollis, Jamaica, St. Albans, Queens Village, and Springfield Gardens. District 27 was underpopulated by 203 people, or 0.1% under ideal population. In response to public testimony regarding the downtown Jamaica central business district into District 27, the three downtown Jamaica-area BIDs are unified now into one council district. To help offset this increase in population. District 27 shed areas east of Merrick Boulevard to District 28. District 27 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 28

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
28	170,068	-1.6%

District 28 consists of Jamaica, Rochdale Village, and South Ozone Park. District 28 was overpopulated by 10,109 people, or 5.8% over ideal population. The boundaries of District 28 have been extended eastwards to take in the residential area near Merrick Boulevard. The Commission received extensive public testimony requesting that the South Asian communities in South Ozone Park, Ozone Park, and Richmond Hill be united. The Commission carefully weighed alternatives against the redistricting criteria. As a result, Ozone Park and South Ozone Park are united in District 28 to the maximum extent possible as the district expanded from its southern boundary to unite Ozone Park into one district and receded from its northern boundary to Liberty Avenue to enable Richmond Hill to be whole in District 29. District 28 is not a Black majority district but the district retains the opportunity for Black voters to elect a candidate of their choice.

## District 29

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
29	172,422	-0.3%

District 29 consists of Rego Park, Forest Hills, Kew Gardens, and Richmond Hill. District 29 was underpopulated by 8,559 people, or 5.0% under ideal population. District 29 remains anchored by the geographically central neighborhoods of Forest Hills, Rego Park and Kew Gardens. Because of the population shifts and unification of the Richmond Hill community in response to the public testimony of the South Asian community, the entirety of the district shifted further south with a southernmost boundary of Liberty Avenue.

## District 30

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
30	169,598	-1.9%

District 30 consists of Maspeth, Middle Village, Ridgewood, Woodhaven, Woodside, and part of Glendale. District 30 was underpopulated by 5,782 people, or 3.3% under ideal population. In response to public testimony, Elmhurst Triangle, located south of Queens Blvd and the Rego Park Crescents, located between Woodhaven Boulevard and Alderton Street, have been included in District 30. As a result of these additions to population and consistent with public testimony regarding Glendale, District 32 lines encompass part of Glendale.

## District 31

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
31	169,778	-1.8%

District 31 consists of Arverne, Brookville, Edgemere, Far Rockaway, Laurelton, Rosedale, and Springfield Gardens. District 31 was overpopulated by 650 people, or 0.4% over ideal population. District 31 mostly retains the shape of its district lines. The Commission received testimony that residents wanted Springfield Gardens and John F. Kennedy International Airport kept whole in District 31, and both of these community requests were accomplished. District 31 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 32

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
32	168,905	-2.3%

District 32 consists of Ozone Park, Howard Beach, Woodhaven, and part of Glendale. District 32 was underpopulated by 7,103 people, or 4.1% under ideal population. The Commission received testimony about moving parts of East Glendale and Forest Park into District 32, and this was accomplished by making the eastern boundary of District 32 at Woodhaven Boulevard, extending North on 68<sup>th</sup> Street on the Western boundary to Otto Road, then Cooper Avenue to Woodhaven Boulevard. Former portions of District 32 on the East side of Woodhaven Blvd, including Aqueduct Raceway, were moved into District 28 as reflected in public testimony received by the Commission to keep South Ozone Park whole.

## KINGS COUNTY

### District 33

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
33	176,506	2.1%

District 33 consists of Boerum Hill, Brooklyn Heights, Brooklyn Navy Yard, Downtown Brooklyn, Dumbo, Fulton Ferry, Greenpoint, Vinegar Hill, and Williamsburg. District 33 was the most overpopulated district in the entire city at 34,988 people, or 20.2% over ideal population. As a result, portions of the southern boundary of the district were moved up to Wycoff Street and Bergen Street up until 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Population was also moved from Williamsburg into District 34. In response to testimony received by the Commission, efforts were made to keep the district's Jewish community as intact as possible, and the Broadway Triangle was retained in the district.

### District 34

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
34	168,745	-2.4%

District 34 consists of Williamsburg, Bushwick, and Ridgewood. District 34 was underpopulated by 5,770 people, or 3.3% under ideal population, District 34 is a cross-borough district and mostly retains a similar shape as previously drawn on the Queens side of the district that was adjusted to maintain appropriate population deviation.

### District 35

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
35	172,009	-0.5%

District 35 consists of Clinton Hill, Fort Greene, Crown Heights, Prospect Heights, and parts of Bedford-Stuyvesant. District 35 was overpopulated by 5,044 people, or 2.9% over ideal population. The revised lines largely maintain District 35's shape, with no major changes to district boundaries.

## District 36

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
36	170,261	-1.5%

District 36 consists of parts of Bedford-Stuyvesant and part of Crown Heights. District 36 was underpopulated by 4,407 people, or 2.5% under ideal population. The revised lines largely maintain District 36's shape. Kingsborough Houses, a NYCHA development located on Bergen Street between Rochester Ave and Howard Ave, was moved out of District 36 and into District 41 to ensure population was within the required deviation. District 36 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 37

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
37	168,631	-2.5%

District 37 consists of East New York, Bushwick, Cypress Hills, City Line, Ocean Hill Brownsville, and Wyckoff Heights. District 37 was underpopulated by 9,362 people, or 5.4% under ideal population. The district boundaries were mostly kept intact with minor adjustments to account for population deviation. District 37 remains an effective Hispanic majority district.

## District 38

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
38	175,131	1.3%

District 38 consists of Red Hook, most of Sunset Park, and parts of South Slope, Windsor Terrace, Dyker Heights, and a small portion of Bensonhurst. District 38 was overpopulated by 2,958 people, or 1.7% over ideal population. The Commission received testimony that residents of Sunset Park and Red Hook wished to remain together as a community of interest. There was also testimony from residents of Sunset Park who did not want to be united with Bay Ridge and felt that Sunset Park was a community of interest aligned with other surrounding communities such as Windsor Terrace and South Slope. The Commission weighed the criteria, including the public testimony and necessary population deviations to draw District 38.

## District 39

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
39	174,708	1.1%

District 39 consist of Carroll Gardens, Cobble Hill, Gowanus, Park Slope, Windsor Terrace, Kensington, and Prospect Park. District 39 was overpopulated by 1,402 people, or 0.8% over ideal population. The district shape was changed to accommodate population changes in Brooklyn. The Commission received public testimony to keep South Asian communities of interest whole within the district, specifically in Kensington. As a result, the footprint of Kensington, where a significant South Asian population lives, was increased in District 39.

## District 40

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
40	172,245	-0.4%

District 40 covers the neighborhoods of Ditmas Park, East Flatbush, Flatbush, Lefferts Gardens, and Prospect Park South. District 40 was underpopulated by 17,308 people, or 10% under ideal population. Some boundary changes were made account for population deviation requirements, specifically the western boundary of District 40 took some blocks of Lefferts Gardens from District 41, as well as some of East Flatbush. District 40 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 41

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
41	169,449	-2.0%

District 41 consists of parts of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Ocean Hill-Brownsville, East Flatbush and Crown Heights. District 41 was underpopulated by 8,934 people, or 5.2% under ideal population. The revised lines largely maintain District 41's shape. To maintain population, more of Brownsville is included in district 41. District 41 remains an effective Black majority district.



## District 42

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
42	168,746	-2.4%

District 42 consists of East New York., Remsen Village, and parts of Brownsville. District 42 was underpopulated by 4,639 people, or 2.7% under ideal population. The revised lines largely maintain District 42’s shape, however the district gained part of Remsen Village to maintain population deviation in this district as well as the surrounding districts. District 42 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 43

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
43	175,545	1.5%

District 43 consists of parts of Sunset Park, Dyker Heights, Bensonhurst, and Gravesend. District 43 is a new district created as a result of population changes in Southern Brooklyn since the 2010 census. Pursuant to Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act (as amended), the Commission conducted an RBV analysis of the voting patterns of minority populations in New York City. The RBV analysis for Asian voters in South Brooklyn demonstrated that voting was racially polarized in South Brooklyn--the Asian voting population was sufficiently large, geographically compact, and politically cohesive but were not able to elect a candidate of their choice based on the current 2013 district lines. The Federal Voting Rights Act generally requires state or local jurisdictions to create districts that provide minority voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice when these factors are present. In addition, the Commission heard testimony from the Asian communities in Southern Brooklyn about their desire to be united more cohesively as a community of interest, in order to elect a candidate of their choosing. Taking these findings into account, the Commission therefore drew the new District 43 as a majority Asian district. This complies with the Federal Voting Rights Act and unites the Southern Brooklyn Asian community of interest.

## District 44

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
44	173,911	0.6%

District 44 consists of Borough Park, Mapleton, and parts of Midwood and Gravesend. District 44 was underpopulated by 801 people, or 0.5% under ideal population. The shape of District 44 remains mostly intact, with some minor changes made due to equal population changes from surrounding districts to achieve the required deviation. The Commission received public testimony requesting that Midwood, as a community of interest, be incorporated into the district. The Commission has accommodated this request to the maximum extent practicable given population deviation limitations by taking portions on Midwood into District 44 from District 45, and District 48. The southern boundary of District 44 now extends to Avenue X in Gravesend.

## District 45

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
45	168,780	-2.4%

District 45 consists of Flatbush, East Flatbush, Flatlands, and part Midwood. District 45 was underpopulated by 15,870 people, or 9.2% under ideal population. The Commission received testimony stating that the residents wanted to include more of Remsen Village, East Flatbush and the Flatlands in district 45. As a result of testimony received, and to accommodate for population deviation requirements, more of Flatlands was included in the district. District 45 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 46

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
46	170,410	-1.4%

District 46 consists of Gerritsen Beach, Mill Basin, Canarsie, Georgetown, and parts of Flatlands, Marine Park, and Sheepshead Bay. District 46 was overpopulated by 4,381 people, or 2.5% over ideal population. The Commission received public testimony requesting that Canarsie kept whole and intact within District 46. The boundaries of District 46 remain mostly intact, with minor changes for population going further east into Sheepshead Bay, while Canarsie remains intact within the district. District 46 remains an effective Black majority district.

## District 47

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
47	173,741	0.5%

District 47 consists of Bay Ridge, parts of Dyker Heights, Bath Beach, Gravesend, and all of Coney Island and Seagate. The Commission received extensive public testimony from the Bay Ridge residents to unify Bay Ridge and keep it whole within a single district as a community of interest. The Commission weighed the criteria, including balancing the public testimony with the population deviation requirements and compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act, in drawing District 47. District 47 contains all of Bay Ridge including Bay Ridge Towers, with a corridor through Dyker Heights, Bath Beach and Gravesend, and includes all of Coney Island and Seagate. This district is similar in shape to the current New York State Assembly District 46, which also includes Coney Island and Seagate, and utilizes a small corridor through Bath Beach and Dyker Heights to connect to Bay Ridge.

## District 48

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
48	176,661	2.2%

District 48 consists of Manhattan Beach, Brighton Beach, and parts of Sheepshead Bay and Midwood. District 48 was overpopulated by 7,778 people, or 4.5% over ideal population. The district remains mostly intact, with minor changes in the Western and Northern boundary of the district to accommodate testimony and population changes. The Commission received testimony to unite the neighborhood of Homecrest within District 48, and for the residents of Midwood to be more united. The northern boundary of District 48 moves south to unite more of Midwood in Districts 44 and 45, and the neighborhood of Homecrest is united within District 48.

## RICHMOND COUNTY

### District 49

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
49	168,682	-2.4%

District 49 consists of Arlington, Clifton, Clove Lakes, Concord, Elm Park, Graniteville, Livingston, Mariners Harbor, New Brighton, Port Richmond, Randall Manor, Rosebank, St. George, Snug Harbor, Silver Lake, Stapelton, Sunnyside, West Brighton, And Tompkinsville. District 49 was underpopulated by 1,174 people, or 0.7% under ideal population. The Commission received public testimony stating that the neighborhood of Westerleigh, currently split between District 49 and 50, should be united in District 50. Additionally, the Commission received extensive public testimony from the residents requesting that District 49 remain intact, to retain its diversity and voting age population. As a result of testimony and population adjustments, Westerleigh was removed from District 49 and united in District 50. The area west of Manor road including Todt Hill Houses was added to District 49 from District 50 to account for the population deviation.

### District 50

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
50	173,264	0.2%

District 50 consists of Arrochar, Bloomfield, Bulls Head, Castleton Corners, Chelsea, Concord, Dongan Hills, Egbertville, Emerson Hill, Fort Wadsworth, Graniteville, Grant City, Grasmere, Isle of Meadows, Lighthouse Hill, Manor Heights, Meiers Corners, Midland Beach, New Dorp, Oakwood, Ocean Breeze, Old Town, Prall's Island, Richmondtown, Shore Acres, South Beach, Todt Hill, Travis, Westerleigh, and Willowbrook. District 50 was underpopulated by 7,700 people, or 4.5% under ideal population. The three Staten Island Districts 49, 50 and 51, were all underpopulated by an average of 4.3% to the ideal district population of 172,822. The Commission considered the impact of keeping the 3 districts in Staten Island wholly contained in the borough to the 48 other city council districts in the context of the 5% population deviation requirement. After weighing all the criteria and considering the public testimony, District 50 was drawn as a cross-borough district into Brooklyn to raise the average district population closer to the ideal population.

District 50 now crosses over into Brooklyn via the Verrazzano Bridge, and includes Fort Hamilton Army base, the VA hospital, Dyker Beach Park, Poly Prep Day School, and a small part of Bath Beach and Dyker Heights, with 16th Avenue as the eastern boundary of the Brooklyn part of the district. This mapping is similar to the former cross-over City Council districts of 2002-2003; and the current NY-11 Congressional district, 2022.

## District 51

Council District	Total Population	Population Deviation
51	169,200	-2.1%

District 51 consists of Annadale, Arden Heights, Bay Terrace, Charleston, Eltingville, Great Kills, Greenridge, Heartland Village, Huguenot, New Springville, Pleasant Plains, Prince’s Bay, Richmond Valley, Rossville, Tottenville, and Woodrow. District 51 was underpopulated by 13,339 people, or 7.7% under ideal population. There were changes made to the Northern boundary of district 51 as a result of population adjustment. The neighborhood of Heartland Village, previously split between Districts 51 and 50, was wholly added into District 51. The Willowbrook area east of Heartland Village was also added due to its commonality as a community with Heartland Village. In the southeast area of District 51 the borders of Gateway Park were extended up to Clark Ave to create a more natural border between Districts 50 and 51.

## VI. EXHIBITS LIST

1. **Final Maps**
  - a. The Citywide and 5 Boroughs
  - b. 51 Individual Districts;
  - c. Shape, Block Equivalency File, Geojson Files
  - d. The Data tables
2. **March 29, 2022 Public Meeting**
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. File of video recording
3. **May 11, 2022 Public Meeting**
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Meeting Minutes
  - c. Powerpoint Presentations (Law Department, DCP, and COIB)
  - d. File of the video recording
4. **May 26, 2022 Public Hearing**
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of video recording
5. **June 27, 2022 Public Hearing**
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcripts
  - c. File of video recording
6. **June 29, 2022 Public Hearing**
  - a. Notice
  - b. Transcripts
  - c. File of video recording
7. **July 6, 2022 Public Hearing**
  - a. Notice
  - b. Transcripts
  - c. File of video recording
8. **July 7, 2022 Public Hearing**
  - a. Notice
  - b. Transcripts
  - c. File of video recording

9. [July 15, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Notice
  - b. Meeting Minutes
  - c. Transcript
  - d. File of the video recording
10. [Preliminary Plan Maps](#)
  - a. Citywide and 5 Borough
  - b. 51 Individual Districts (Atlas);
  - c. Shape, Block Equivalency File, Geojson files.
11. [August 11, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript,
  - c. Dr. Lisa Handley's powerpoint presentation
  - d. File of video recording
12. [August 16, 2022 Public Hearing](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of Video recording
13. [August 17, 2022 Public Hearing](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of Video Recording
14. [August 18, 2022 Public Hearing](#)
  - a. Public Notice of the Meeting
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of Video Recording
15. [August 21, 2022 Public Hearing](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of the Video Recording
16. [August 22, 2022 Public Hearing](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of the Video Recording

17. [August 22, 2022 Fully Virtual Public Hearing](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. File of the Video Recording
18. [September 22, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Meeting Minutes
  - c. Transcript
  - d. File of the Video Recording
19. [Revised Plan \(September 22, 2022\)](#)
  - a. City and Borough
  - b. 51 Individual Districts and Data Tables
  - c. Block Equivalency Files and Json
20. [Racial Bloc Voting Analysis of September 22, 2022 Plan](#)
21. [September 29, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript
  - c. File of Video Recording
22. [September 30, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Transcript; and
  - c. File of Video Recording
23. [Updated Revised Plan \(October 6, 2022\)](#)
  - a. City and Borough
  - b. 51 Individual Districts
  - c. Data Tables
24. [October 6, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Public Notice
  - b. Draft Meeting Minutes
  - c. Transcript
  - d. Video Recording
25. [Racial Bloc Voting Analysis of October 6, 2022 Plan](#)
26. [October 27, 2022 Letter from City Council](#)



27. [November 1, 2022 Public Meeting](#)
  - a. Notice
  - b. Draft Meeting Minutes
  - c. Transcript;
  - d. Copy of the Signed Certification Statement
  - e. File of Video Recording
28. [November 2, 2022 Filed Copies with the City Clerk](#)
29. [NYC Districting Commission website screenshot](#)
30. [NYC Districting Commission Primer \(English\)](#)
31. [NYC Districting Commission Flyers, Pamphlets, and Palmcards \(English\)](#)
32. [NYC Districting Commission Primer, Flyer and Pamphlets \(Translated languages\)](#)
  - a. Arabic
  - b. Bengali
  - c. Chinese-Simplified
  - d. Chinese-Traditional
  - e. French
  - f. Haitian
  - g. Korean
  - h. Polish
  - i. Russian
  - j. Spanish
  - k. Urdu
33. [Social Media Account Screenshots \(Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, and Facebook\)](#)
34. [List of Newspaper Media](#)
35. [Advertisements that were placed with newspaper Media](#)
36. [Miller Presentation](#)
37. [LinkNYC Picture](#)
38. [Press Clips](#)
39. [List of Outreach events Schedule](#)
40. [List of Canvassing Events](#)

## **APPENDIX 1:**

### **Racial Bloc Voting Report for the 2022-2023 New York City Council Districts**

<https://www.nyc.gov/assets/districting/downloads/pdf/RBV-Report.pdf>

## APPENDIX 2: Lessons Learned and Future Considerations

### New York City Council Redistricting: Lessons Learned and Future Considerations

New York City Council Redistricting (and others) occurs every ten years, triggered by federal mandates of the United States decennial census; and every redistricting cycle is different in scope, factors, legal mandates, population changes, political dynamics, etc. Through staff's experience of implementing the New York City Districting Commission 2022-2023, we have some lessons learned and considerations in preparation for the next redistricting cycle in 2032-2033.

- 1) NYC's next redistricting cycle should begin at least six months earlier, for example, July 1, 2031.** This redistricting cycle was launched with a first meeting on March, 29, 2022 with a flurry of appointees, senior staff and approved budget. Under Section 50 of Chapter 2-A of the New York City Charter, the Mayor begins his appointment process 22 months before the general election of the City Council ("the council") for a redistricting year. The Mayor and New York City Council must appoint Commissioners no later than 20 months before the next general election of the City Council. A final plan must be adopted 11 months before the general election of the council. This effectively means that the NYC districting commission has only 9 months to be constituted, operationalize its agency, and redraw the city council districts.
- 2) Change the deadlines and deliverables embedded in the Charter in order to allow for more flexible, reasonable implementation of the Commission's important work.** The current time frames under the Charter do not allow reasonable flexibility in the scheduling of public meetings/hearings and compresses the time of the Commission to draw the maps and make them available to the public and City Council. Therefore, it is recommended that the Charter's embedded timeframes should be modified to allow Commission appointments to be made earlier and to provide sufficient lead time to operationalize the Commission as an independent city agency with budget, staff, office space, consultants, technology resources, etc. with Commission oversight.
- 3) The City should consider adjustments to: the current Commissioner methods of appointments, Commission size and composition (current 15) for the next Districting Commission.** The current Charter formula is 40 years old and NYC has dramatically grown in diversity and size (2030 population projection is already 9 million New Yorkers). One consideration is to add a selection process for New York City residents to apply for appointments in the Commission, as is done in the state of California.

- 4) **The 2021 State Law should be modified given the recent imposition of the new 5% population deviation that superseded the previous 10% deviation. NYC should have a Council District deviation flexibility of a 5 - 8% range, only with written justification above 5%.** The new 5% deviation limitation presented many challenges to keep NYC’s voluminous communities of interests intact to re-map districts in the 2022 NYC redistricting cycle.
- 5) **Consider increasing the number of current 51 City Council Districts, closer to 59.** In the last three Censuses, NYC’s population has increased from 7.3 million in 1990; 8.2 million in 2010; 8.8 million in 2020; and its population is projected to increase to 9.0 million in 2030 (Department of City Planning). The number of Council Districts has been a stagnant 51 for 34 years since 1989. The City should consider including NYC’s 59 Community Districts as partial districting templates. As NYC continues to grow, its City Council Districts should be kept smaller and closer to the people; smaller districts will more easily capture intact communities of interests.
- 6) **Create an explicit “sunset date” for Commission staff with phased layoffs, 90 days after the Final Plan is submitted, except for unanticipated exigencies.** Under Section 50 of the Charter, “the [C]ommission’s term” ends sixty days after the day of the first general election of the council following the adoption of the new districting plan, but the language is ambiguous as to the operational end date of the Commission as an agency, including staff and budgeting.
- 7) **Commissioners should receive modest remuneration.** Under the Charter, the Commissioners are unpaid, part-time Commissioner positions. The Commissioners dedicate many hours to redraw the City Council districts and were required to make professional and personal schedule adjustments on short notice to fulfill their duties for the Commission including attending numerous public meetings, public hearings, and mapping sessions. Just as the Commissioners of the New York State Independent Redistricting Commission receive modest remuneration for their public service, similar recognition of the New York City Commissioners’ service is warranted.
- 8) **An Inter-Agency Task Force led by the Department of City Planning and the Law Department and any additional appropriate key agency members** should be assembled to prepare for and assist with the next City Council Redistricting Commission.

We would like to thank and acknowledge the present and past staff of the New York City Districting Commission who contributed to the Commission’s work and this final agency report:

**Dr. John Flateau**

Executive Director

**Joseph Maligno**

Deputy Executive Director

**Ali Rasoulinejad**

Chief of Staff

**LaToya Benjamin**

Deputy Chief of Staff

**Jabaran Akram**

Assistant Chief of Staff

**Eddie Borges**

Director of Communications

**Sidney Parker**

Director of GIS and Data Management

**Julia Fredenburg**

Director of Media and Technology

**Jeffrey M. Wice**

Special Counsel

**Michael DeCillis**

Assistant Counsel

**Miranda Goodwin-Raab**

Assistant Director of Public Engagement

**Brenda Cuellar**

Assistant Director of Public Engagement

**Anthony Taylor**

Assistant Director of Public Engagement

**Jennifer M. Crespo**

Administrative Assistant

**Grace Pyun**

Acting Executive Director, General Counsel

