

October 14, 2020

HONORABLE ETHICS COMMISSION MEMBERS
City of Long Beach
California

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation to conduct a study session to review and discuss possible appointments to the Independent Redistricting Commission applicant subpool from the selected applicants interviewed.

DISCUSSION

Background

The Long Beach Independent Redistricting Commission (Commission) was established by ballot initiative Measure DDD in 2018. The measure amended the City Charter to create an independent body with the exclusive authority to redraw the Council District boundaries every ten years following the national Census through an open and transparent process.

City Charter Section 2505 designates the Ethics Commission as the screening panel responsible for creating a subpool of 20 to 30 applicants most qualified to perform the duties of the Commission by November 1, 2020. The subpool must include at least two applicants from each existing Council District and should reasonably reflect the City's diversity.

Recruitment

The application period for the Commission, pursuant to City Charter Section 2505, was open for three months from April 1, 2020 to June 30, 2020. Since the May 2020 update to the City Council, City staff successfully increased the number of applicants in demographic and Council District categories with lower submission totals through targeted outreach, specifically in Council Districts 1, 7, and 9, along with the Asian and Pacific Island, Black and African American, Hispanic or Latinx, and LGBTQ+ communities.

As a result, a total of 400 applications were submitted. Applicants responded that they were directed to the application through the following outreach efforts:

- Utility bill inserts
- Social media ads and posts
- Referrals from Community Based Organizations
- Various email newsletters
- Online media ads
- Freeway billboards ads
- LB Transit ads
- LB Airport ads
- Various presentations
- Local news publications

After an initial review of the applications, 353 applicants were determined potentially eligible (pending verification of conflict of interest and registration responses on their application) to be included in the subpool of 20-30 applicants selected by the Ethics Commission. There were 14 applicants who withdrew their name from consideration, 6 duplicated applications, and 27 applicants who were deemed ineligible due to their responses on the application.

Selection Process

The Ethics Commission must make each assignment to the subpool on the basis of the applicant's relevant analytical skills, familiarity with the city's neighborhoods and communities, ability to be impartial, and apparent ability to work cooperatively with other potential Commissioners.

At its August 12, 2020 Ethics Commission meeting, the Commissioners adopted the following selection process:

- The Ethics Commission was randomly divided into three ad hoc committees to evaluate applications by Council District. Using a selection process similar to the process used to select the three final commissioners appointed to the Ethics Commission, the City Clerk's Office assigned each ad hoc committee approximately one-third of the applications for review and ranking. Assignments were made to have Commissioners review applicants from Council Districts other than the one in which the Commissioners reside with names and personal information of applicants redacted to minimize any potential bias.
- City staff created an Evaluation Guide (Attachment A) for the Ethics Commission ad hoc committees to rank applicants based on their responses in the interest statement on the application, as well as information provided on the application and resume (if submitted). The three ad hoc committees met on September 3 and 4, 2020 to produce a list of five applicants from each Council District for a total of 45 applicants (Attachment B) to be interviewed by the entire Ethics Commission.
- The interview process and the applications selected to move onto the interview process were adopted at the Ethics Commission meeting on September 9, 2020.
- Applicants were provided with three questions in advance of the interviews, which were conducted by Zoom meeting, consistent with the City's COVID-19 protocols.
- Interviews of the selected applicants were conducted by the Ethics Commission on October 7, 8, 9, and 14, 2020.
- Final selections to the subpool will be made by the Ethics Commission at the meeting on October 14, 2020. At the same meeting, the Chair will randomly select the first nine Independent Redistricting Commissioners from the subpool once it is established.

Administrative Error

During the interview process, an error was discovered in the transcription of some of the application numbers associated with applicants selected to be interviewed from Council Districts 3, 4, 6, and 9. Due to this transcription error, a total of 11 applications not originally selected by the ad hoc committees were inadvertently moved forward to the interview process, and the ones selected were not.

To correct this error, at its October 9, 2020 meeting, the Ethics Commission unanimously voted to invite the 11 applicants who were originally selected to be interviewed, and requested staff to remove the applicants from consideration who were not selected by the ad hoc committees. The 11 selected applicants were invited to interview on October 14, 2020.

Next Steps

The Ethics Commission is now tasked with further narrowing down the interview pool to a subpool of 20 to 30 applicants, including at least two from each Council District. Following the selection of the subpool, the Chair of the Ethics Commission will randomly select the first nine Independent Redistricting Commissioners, one from each Council District.

Once the first nine Independent Redistricting Commissioners are onboarded, they will select the last four members and two alternates from the remaining candidates in the subpool.

Respectfully Submitted,



MONIQUE DE LA GARZA
CITY CLERK

MD:jn

Attachment A: Evaluation Guide

Attachment B: Interview Applicant Pool List

Screening Panel Evaluation Guide -- Independent Redistricting Commission

Applicants for City's Independent Redistricting Commission were requested to answer the following question:

“Please describe why you wish to serve on the Independent Redistricting Commission and share any additional experience, community activities, or other qualifications that make you a strong candidate for the Commission, including, but not limited to, analytical skills, familiarity with the City's neighborhoods and communities, ability to be impartial, and ability to work cooperatively with other potential commissioners.”

To apply consistent evaluation criteria to the selection of commissioners, it is suggested that you evaluate the responses using the following overall scale:

5 points -- Exceptional	4 points -- Strong	3 points -- Fair	2 points -- Weak	2 points -- Not Applicable
Applicant provides a thorough response to the interest statement; includes extensive experience, community activities, or other qualifications; and includes excellent analytical skills, familiarity with the City's neighborhoods and communities, ability to be impartial, and ability to work cooperatively with other potential commissioners.	Applicant provides a complete response to the interest statement; includes some experience, community activities, or other qualifications; and includes some analytical skills, familiarity with the City's neighborhoods and communities, ability to be impartial, and ability to work cooperatively with other potential commissioners.	Applicant provides an adequate response to the interest statement; includes limited experience, community activities, or other qualifications; and includes limited analytical skills, familiarity with the City's neighborhoods and communities, ability to be impartial, and ability to work cooperatively with other potential commissioners.	Applicant does not provide an adequate response to the interest statement; does not include experience, community activities, or other qualifications; and does not include analytical skills, familiarity with the City's neighborhoods and communities, ability to be impartial, and ability to work cooperatively with other potential commissioners.	Applicant does not provide a valid response.

Consideration may also be given to effectiveness of written expression and resumes (if submitted). Commissioners should also keep in mind the “subpool should reasonably reflect the City's diversity” and are reminded that “no quotas, formulas or ratios” may be used for this determination, per City Charter Section 2505 (g). City Charter Section 2505 (m) refers to diversity as “includes, but is not limited to, racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation diversity.”

Independent Redistricting Commission Interview Applicant Pool - Revised

	First Name	Middle Name	Last Name	Gender	Age Range	Council District	Income	Race / Ethnicity	Multiple Ethnicity / Other	Sexual Orientation	Prefer to Self-Describe	Highest Level of Education
Council District 1												
CD1-5	Perkins	James	Drake	Male	70-79	District 1	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD1-14	Tammy	Lynn	Maldonado	Female	40-49	District 1	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Multiple ethnicity / Other	Caucasian, African descent, Latinx	Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		Graduate School Experience
CD1-19	Oscar	I	Morales	Male	50-59	District 1	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Multiple ethnicity / Other	Hispanic/Asian	Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD1-21	ERIC	RICHARD	OATES	Male	18-29	District 1	\$75,000 - \$124,999	White / Caucasian		Bisexual		College Experience
CD1-24	Porfirio		Remigio Arroyo	Male	18-29	District 1	Under \$35,000	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
Council District 2												
CD2-5	Genna	Lauren	Beckenhaupt	Female	18-29	District 2	Under \$35,000	Hispanic / Latino		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		Graduate School Experience
CD2-9	Michael	Kato	Buitron	Male	50-59	District 2	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Hispanic / Latino		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		Graduate School Experience
CD2-21	Ryan		Giffen	Male	40-49	District 2	\$125,000 - \$250,000	White / Caucasian		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD2-34	Jessica	Marie	Ponce	Female	40-49	District 2	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Multiple ethnicity / Other	Hispanic, White	Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD2-38	Milton	Darnell	Smith	Male	40-49	District 2	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Black or African American		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		College Experience
Council District 3												
CD3-11	Thomas	J	Cooper	Male	70-79	District 3	\$125,000 - \$250,000	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD3-14	Jireh	Beryl	Deng	Female	18-29	District 3	Under \$35,000	Multiple ethnicity / Other	Hong Kong and Taiwanese	Bisexual		College Experience
CD3-23	Josias	N/A	Gonzalez	Male	30-39	District 3	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD3-25	Andrew	Lee	Hale	Male	70-79	District 3	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Multiple ethnicity / Other	White / Caucasian American Indian	Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD3-49	Dave		Shukla	Non-Binary	40-49	District 3	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Multiple ethnicity / Other	South Asian	Prefer to Self-Describe	Queer	Graduate School Experience
Council District 4												
CD4-1	Andrea	Nicole	Antony	Female	30-39	District 4	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Multiple ethnicity / Other	white/Latina	Bisexual		Graduate School Experience
CD4-13	Teresa	Ann	Griffith	Female	70-79	District 4	\$75,000 - \$124,999	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD4-15	Michael	L	Holmes	Male	70-79	District 4	\$75,000 - \$124,999	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD4-17	Nicole		Lopez	Female	40-49	District 4	\$125,000 - \$250,000	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD4-28	John	Franklin	Wheeler	Male	50-59	District 4	\$35,000 - \$74,999	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
Council District 5												
CD5-12	Stafford	G.	Cox	Male	60-69	District 5	\$125,000 - \$250,000	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD5-14	Sharon		Diggs-Jackson	Female	60-69	District 5	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD5-16	Susana		Flores	Female	40-49	District 5	\$125,000 - \$250,000	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD5-36	Feliza	Isabella	Ortiz Licon	Female	40-49	District 5	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD5-42	David		Salazar	Male	60-69	District 5	\$125,000 - \$250,000	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
Council District 6												
CD6-11	Alejandra		Gutierrez	Female	30-39	District 6	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD6-15	Rady		Math	Male	30-39	District 6	Under \$35,000	Asian / Pacific Islander		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		College Experience
CD6-19	Kelly		Nhim	Female	40-49	District 6	Under \$35,000	Asian / Pacific Islander		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD6-24	Sambath		Phann	Male	30-39	District 6	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Asian / Pacific Islander		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD6-34	Alisha	A	Wade	Female	60-69	District 6	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
Council District 7												
CD7-7	Darlene		Castillo	Female	50-59	District 7	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Hispanic / Latino		Asexual		High School or Less
CD7-13	Sandra	Diane	Facon	Female	70-79	District 7	\$75,000 - \$124,999	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD7-19	Frank	Anthony	Gutierrez	Male	60-69	District 7	\$125,000 - \$250,000	Hispanic / Latino		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD7-28	darlene	kay	oliver	Female	60-69	District 7	\$75,000 - \$124,999	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD7-31	Zhelinrentice	Levels	Scott	Female	40-49	District 7	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
Council District 8												
CD8-1	Michele	Brenda	Anderson	Female	60-69	District 8	Over \$250,000	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD8-9	Martha	Elizabeth	Duncan	Female	60-69	District 8	\$75,000 - \$124,999	White / Caucasian		Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD8-20	Marissa		Martinez	Female	18-29	District 8	Under \$35,000	Hispanic / Latino		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD8-25	Melody	Elaine	Osuna	Female	30-39	District 8	\$125,000 - \$250,000	Multiple ethnicity / Other	white, Black, Spanish	Heterosexual / Straight		Doctoral or Professional degree
CD8-29	Gayleah	Michell	Richmond	Female	30-39	District 8	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
Council District 9												
CD9-6	Tiffany	Shiffon	Briggs	Female	30-39	District 9	Under \$35,000	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD9-17	Pasefika	Junior	Iosia	Male	18-29	District 9	Under \$35,000	Asian / Pacific Islander		Heterosexual / Straight		College Experience
CD9-24	Ryan	William	O'Connell	Male	30-39	District 9	\$125,000 - \$250,000	White / Caucasian		Homosexual / Gay or Lesbian		College Experience
CD9-29	Clinton	Robert	Scott	Male	60-69	District 9	\$75,000 - \$124,999	Black or African American		Heterosexual / Straight		Graduate School Experience
CD9-31	Sevly		Sngun	Non-Binary	18-29	District 9	\$35,000 - \$74,999	Asian / Pacific Islander		Prefer to Self-Describe	Queer/Demisexual	Graduate School Experience