

STAFF REPORT

Date: August 23, 2023

To: Mayor and City Council

Thru: Doug Thornley, City Manager

Subject: Staff Report (For Possible Action): Ordinance Introduction – Bill No. ____ Ordinance to amend Title 1, Chapter 1.02.010, of Reno Municipal Code titled "Ward Boundaries and Official city map," to change the City of Reno ward boundaries and create a sixth ward on the Official City Map as required by Section 1.050 of the Reno City Charter, and providing matters properly relating thereto.

From: Calli Wilsey, Director of Policy and Strategy

Department: City Manager's Office

Summary:

According to the Reno City Charter, the City is required to transition from five to six wards in 2024. Staff and the City's independent data analytics consultant completed a comprehensive community engagement process between June-July 2023 to draft several ward map options for Council discussion and deliberation. Council reviewed four final options and directed staff to bring back an alternative option using Final Map Option A as the baseline with certain revisions. The map that reflects those revisions is labeled as Final Map Option E. Staff recommends Council select Final Option E and refer the ordinance for a second reading and adoption. The adopted map that includes the sixth ward will go into effect in January 2024 for all purposes necessary to effectuate the 2024 election. For all other purposes, the adopted map will go into effect when the results of the 2024 election are declared.

Alignment with Strategic Plan:

Not Applicable

Previous Council Action:

- August 9, 2023 – Council reviewed Final Map Options A, B.1, C, and D.1 and directed staff to bring back a fifth option using Final Option A as the baseline with revisions to three areas as discussed at the meeting.
- May 10, 2023 – Council adopted redistricting principles to guide the 2023 redistricting

process and transition to six wards.

- December 1, 2021 – Council approved ordinance number 6613 affirming the recommended boundary changes.
- December 14, 2011 - Council approved ordinance number 6778 affirming the recommended boundary changes.
- August 29, 2007 - Council approved ordinance number 6524 affirming the recommended boundary changes.

Background:

Section 1.050 of the Reno City Charter requires the City of Reno to be divided into six wards, effective January 1, 2024. The transition from five to six wards, which replaces the at-large Council position with a member representing a sixth ward, is the result of state legislation (Assembly Bill 36) signed into law during the 2017 Session of the Nevada Legislature. The Reno City Charter Committee, a citizen committee appointed by members of the Reno City Council and the Nevada Legislature, recommended the change.

Council adopted a set of redistricting principles in May 2023 to establish a framework, and directed staff to move forward with, a redistricting process that included a comprehensive community engagement plan and hiring an independent data analytics firm to draft the map options. The principles are as follows:

- State and federal regulations – The redistricting process will abide by applicable state and federal laws, including the Federal Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause.
- Equal in population – The Reno City Charter states that wards must be as nearly equal in population as can be conveniently provided. Because it is impossible to have wards with the same number of people, the Charter allows for up to a five percent variance from ward to ward.
- Contiguous – Wards must be geographically contiguous except for non-contiguous areas that may be placed based on Charter requirements.
- Neighborhood integrity – Wards should allow for representation of general areas of the City having similar or common interests or affinities. Geographic neighborhood and natural boundaries will be accounted for in establishing ward boundaries and being used as divisions when practicable and legal.
- Community input – Input on the redistricting process will be solicited from the public throughout the evaluation and development phases.
- Implementation date – For all purposes necessary and appropriate to conduct, administer, and effectuate the 2024 general election, the revised ward boundaries will take effect January 1, 2024 as required by the Charter. For all other purposes, the revised ward map will take effect upon the canvass of returns and declaration of result for the 2024 general election.

- Residence related to Council seats with terms expiring in 2024 – The home of record/residence of current council members with existing terms that extend beyond the 2024 general election will be retained within their ward during redistricting. No deference will be provided to any potential candidate for office.
- Data source – The 2020 Census counts (PL 94-171) provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census will be the official source of population counts for redistricting. The City may use updated demographic information from the American Community Survey for informational purposes.

While the adopted principles do not directly address ward compactness, this is often a requirement for congressional and legislative districts and may be considered in the redistricting process. Compactness refers to the principle that constituents residing within an electoral district should live as near to one another as possible. While there are compactness measures, the boundaries of the City of Reno and its natural geography prevent those measures from being highly valuable. In the case of Reno, compactness is often referred to as visual compactness and is a subjective measure.

Using these principles as the guiding rationale and philosophy for the redistricting process and development of ward maps, staff and the consulting team with FLO Analytics initiated a robust public engagement effort to develop the maps with community input. Staff sent more than 154,000 postcards to residences and businesses in Reno to notify the community about the redistricting process and encourage involvement. Staff created a portal on the City of Reno website with information about the process, including meeting information and materials, frequently asked questions, and redistricting resources. Staff further promoted the redistricting process through media efforts, an e-newsletter, and social media. The team bolstered access to the process by offering support in Spanish at the three community meetings and all drop-in sessions, holding a meeting in Spanish, providing bilingual materials and promotion, and offering support in American Sign Language at a drop-in session.

During the first phase of the outreach process, the redistricting team invited the public to identify and define communities of interest and their neighborhoods. A community of interest is a group of people in the same geographically definable area who share common social or economic interests. While not a requirement, keeping communities of interest together in a single ward is an important redistricting principle so the area can be effectively and fairly represented. This concept is reflected in the City's process as preserving neighborhood integrity. Members of the public submitted their input through an online survey, through an established e-mail address dedicated to redistricting efforts, by drawing their own maps with an online tool called Districtr, and through public discussions at each of the City's five neighborhood advisory boards and community meetings.

Input collected during the first phase helped inform the development of six draft scenarios (attached for the record), which were presented to the community in June 2023. Staff asked the community to review the drafts and submit comments through a second survey, by providing possible revisions using the Districtr tool, and through conversations at five in-person drop-in sessions held at diverse locations throughout the community.

Staff and FLO Analytics used the input collected during this second phase to prepare the four final map options. The final options were presented to the community on July 27, 2023 and to the Council on August 9, 2023.

Discussion:

On August 9, 2023, Council reviewed and discussed four ward boundary map options (Final Maps A, B.1, C, and D.1). Council directed staff to bring back an alternative option using Final Map Option A as the baseline and making certain revisions to the Baker Lane area, Plumas Street/California Avenue area, and the Mill Street/Kietzke Lane area. The map that reflects those revisions is presented as Final Map Option E.

The five final map options (A-E) reflect varying perspectives, ideas, and suggestions shared by the community during the public engagement process. While key issues are summarized below, the attached public input log provides a detailed log of the input received.

Summary of Key Issues During Public Engagement Process		
Ref. #	Topic	Description of Input
1	Compactness	The community expressed a strong preference for visual compactness of wards. In examples where a ward stretched from the center to an outer part of the city, participants expressed concerns and skepticism. The final map options reflect revisions to draft scenarios to address this issue. This preference, however, limited the ability to create an option in which all six wards met in the downtown area, which is related to the next key issue that arose from community input.
2	Downtown representation	Community participants expressed two different viewpoints on the representation of downtown. Some individuals expressed a desire to see multiple wards represent the downtown area, similar to the current ward map. This viewpoint felt that all residents are affected by the activities of downtown Reno and should be represented in downtown decisions, particularly as downtowns are typically economic drivers for urban areas. Other individuals felt that downtown should be represented by one ward, especially

		<p>as more individuals live in the downtown area. They felt that singular representation would be a benefit to creating cohesion in addressing downtown concerns. Combined with the compactness comments, more support tended to lean toward one ward in the downtown area. The final map options represent both viewpoints, with Final Options A, C, D.1, and E representing one ward downtown and Final Option B.1 representing multiple wards converging in the downtown area.</p>
3	Downtown definition and surrounding neighborhoods	<p>Feedback also varied on the boundaries of downtown and which way, and to what degree, the downtown ward should “stretch.” Input suggested the downtown core connect to the East Fourth Street corridor, throughout the river corridor, east of downtown and south of the river, the Northeast neighborhood, the university, Midtown, and into areas with the Wells Avenue neighborhood (such as to Taylor Street). Given the population density and the principle related to neighborhood integrity, all of the areas shared could not be combined into one ward; the population would exceed the target ward population to a degree in which the five percent deviation requirement would not be able to be met. The final map options show different variations that highlight the tradeoffs related to this issue.</p>
4	University and nearby neighborhoods	<p>Participants also discussed the residential neighborhoods surrounding the university area and identified them as cohesive communities of interest. Participants identified connections between the university and areas to the north, south, east, and west. The final map options represent these perspectives in different ways and to different degrees: by connecting the university to the residential area to the west, as far west as Keystone; by connecting the university to the student housing between the campus and the downtown core; by connecting the university to the residential areas to the east by Valley Road; and by connecting the university area to the residential areas north of McCarran near Talus Way and Socrates Drive.</p>
5	Interactions between neighborhoods with similar challenges	<p>Participants identified communities of interest and defined neighborhoods throughout Reno. They expressed a desire for neighborhoods within a ward to be facing similar issues and have similar needs so representation could focus on those challenges. Comments expanded on how individual neighborhoods interacted with other nearby neighborhoods. In essence, communities of interest expanded beyond what some viewed as typical neighborhood boundaries. For example, the Donner Springs, Mira Loma, and Neil Road neighborhoods identified as one community of interest and identified a connection to the airport</p>

		properties. In South Reno, participants urged unity between the various neighborhoods built through various developments, such as Double Diamond, Damonte Ranch, and Bella Vista, as the area is dealing with similar challenges related to being a high-growth area in the last decade. Similarly, the Lakeridge, Rancharra, and Del Monte area was identified as a broader community of interest.
--	--	---

As Council considers new ward boundaries and the creation of a sixth ward, each of the final options are analyzed below in relation to the Council-adopted redistricting principles. Generally, each of the final options maintained within a single ward many of the communities of interest identified during the public input process, including the North Valleys, the Oddie/Wells corridor, the Northeast neighborhood, Paradise Park and nearby senior housing, the Wells Avenue District, Lakeridge, Rancharra, Double Diamond Ranch, Caughlin Ranch, Somersett, and Country Club Acres near Virginia Lake. The analysis below highlights some of the key differences and tradeoffs of the options (see Summary of Key Issues table above). Detailed analysis of the population balance and race/ethnicity breakdown are included with the map attachments.

Final Option A (See Attachment - Final Map Option A)	
Redistricting Principle	Analysis
<i>State and federal regulations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option abides by applicable state and federal regulations.
<i>Equal in population</i>	<p>This option balances the ward population within the 5 percent variation allowed by the Charter. This option represents a total deviation in population of <u>4.9</u> percent. The ward breakdown would be as follows:</p> <p>Ward 1 - 45,202 Ward 2 - 44,168 Ward 3 - 43,513 Ward 4 - 43,060 Ward 5 - 44,356 Ward 6 - 43,866</p>
<i>Contiguous</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wards are geographically contiguous in this option.
<i>Neighborhood integrity and community input</i>	<p>This option derives from draft scenarios 5 and 6, which received the highest median score on the public survey (4 out of 5). The option responds to the key issues identified by the community as described below:</p>

	<p><u>Key Issues #2 and 3</u>- This option represents a version in which downtown is represented by one ward. The option presents a scenario in which the downtown ward would encompass the East 4th Street corridor; the area just south of the river, using California Avenue and Ryland Street as the southern boundary; and a unified connection with the university. The option does not include Midtown in the downtown ward.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #4</u> - This option includes connections between the university and residential areas to the north, south, east, and west, which were all highlighted in public feedback. It includes the student housing in downtown Reno, the Talus Way/Socrates neighborhoods north of the university; and the residential areas toward Valley Road. The option also encompasses some of the Northwest neighborhood; however, it uses Washington Street as a boundary rather than Keystone as used in the other options.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #5</u> - This option responds to key neighborhood issues in several ways: (1) maintains a cohesive community of interest between the Donner Springs, Mira Loma, Neil Road, and airport properties; (2) includes Midtown on both sides of South Virginia Street; (3) connects the Yori/Grove and Brinkby/Lymbery neighborhoods; (4) connects the Northeast neighborhood and the E. 4st Street corridor; (5) does not split up the Lakeridge, Rancharra, and Del Monte areas; (6) provides cohesive in South Reno between Double Diamond, Bella Vista, and Damonte Ranch.</p> <p>Neighborhood issues not able to be address in this option include: (1) depending on the defined boundaries, the Old Southwest is split using Plumas Street at as a boundary; (2) the east and west sides of Virginia Lake are split into two wards; and (3) a portion above I-80 near Robb Drive an Mae Anne Avenue remains connected to the ward below the freeway.</p>
<p><i>Residence related to Council seats with terms expiring in 2024</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The home of record/residence of current council members with existing terms that extend beyond the 2024 general election (Ward 2 and Ward 4) are retained within their ward in this option.
<p><i>Data source</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The 2020 Census counts provided under Public Law (PL) 94-171 from the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used as the official data source in this option.

Final Option B.1 (See Attachment - Final Map Option B.1)

Redistricting Principle	Analysis
<i>State and federal regulations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option abides by applicable state and federal regulations.
<i>Equal in population</i>	<p>This option balances the ward population within the 5 percent variation allowed by the Charter. This option represents a total deviation in population of <u>3.6</u> percent. The ward breakdown would be as follows:</p> <p>Ward 1 – 44,146 Ward 2 – 44,163 Ward 3 – 44,656 Ward 4 – 43,060 Ward 5 – 44,035 Ward 6 – 44,105</p>
<i>Contiguous</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wards are geographically contiguous in this option.
<i>Neighborhood integrity and community input</i>	<p>This option derives from draft scenario 2, which received the highest median score on the public survey (2 out of 5) out of the three draft scenarios that looked at multiple wards in downtown. The option responds to the key issues identified by the community as described below:</p> <p><u>Key Issues #2 and 3</u> - This option represents a version in which downtown is represented by multiple wards. Wards 1, 2, and 3 converge near Sierra and 6th Street. The primary areas that were identified as connections to downtown (E. 4th Street corridor, south of the river; university, and Midtown) provide partial connections to the various downtown wards, but do not provide a cohesion across any of the areas.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #4</u> - This option includes connections between the university and residential areas to the north, south, east, but not to the west (into the Northwest neighborhood). On the south side, it provides a connection to student housing up to 6th Street.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #5</u> - This option responds to key neighborhood issues in several ways: (1) includes Midtown on both sides of South Virginia Street; (2) depending on the defined boundaries, the Old Southwest is split using Arlington Avenue as a boundary; (3) Virginia Lake is maintain in one ward; (4) connects the Yori/Grove and Brinkby/Lymbery neighborhoods; (5) provides cohesive in South Reno between Double Diamond, Bella Vista, and Damonte Ranch;</p>

	<p>(6) resolves the division of the residential area above I-80 near Robb Drive/Mae Anne by using I-80 as the boundary.</p> <p>Neighborhood issues not able to be address in this option include: (1) the neighborhoods of Donner Springs, Mira Loma, Neil Road, and the airport properties are divided into three separate wards; (2) only partially connects the Northeast neighborhood and the E. 4st Street corridor, as E. 4th Street is split into two wards; and (3) the Del Monte area is split from Lakeridge and Rancharrah.</p>
<i>Residence related to Council seats with terms expiring in 2024</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The home of record/residence of current council members with existing terms that extend beyond the 2024 general election (Ward 2 and Ward 4) are retained within their ward in this option.
<i>Data source</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2020 Census counts provided under Public Law (PL) 94-171 from the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used as the official data source in this option.

Final Option C (See Attachment - Final Map Option C)	
Redistricting Principle	Analysis
<i>State and federal regulations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option abides by applicable state and federal regulations.
<i>Equal in population</i>	<p>This option balances the ward population within the 5 percent variation allowed by the Charter. This option represents a total deviation in population of <u>3.4</u> percent. The ward breakdown would be as follows:</p> <p>Ward 1 - 43,859 Ward 2 - 44,816 Ward 3 - 43,339 Ward 4 - 44,565 Ward 5 - 44,035 Ward 6 - 43,571</p>
<i>Contiguous</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wards are geographically contiguous in this option.
<i>Neighborhood integrity and community input</i>	<p>This option derives from draft scenario 1, which received the second highest median score on the public survey (3.5 out of 5). Participants generally liked this option as they said it most closely reflected the current wards and perceived less change with the transition to six wards. The option responds to the key issues</p>

	<p>identified by the community as described below:</p> <p><u>Key Issues #2 and 3</u> - This option represents a version in which downtown is represented by one ward. In this scenario, the ward uses the river as a portion of the southeast boundary but does not go farther south. The ward would include a portion of Midtown and the Old Southwest neighborhood. The university and the E. 4th Street corridor are included in the downtown ward.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #4</u> - This option includes connections between the university and residential areas to the south, east, and west. However, only a portion of the residential area north of McCarran could be maintained in the same ward as the university; the Socrates area would stay in the same ward, but the Talus Way area would remain in Ward 4 with the North Valleys. On the west side, this option stretches farther into the Northwest neighborhood compared to Final Option A, using Keystone as the boundary.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #5</u> - This option responds to key neighborhood issues in several ways: (1) Virginia Lake is maintain in one ward; (2) connects the Yori/Grove and Brinkby/Lymbery neighborhoods; (3) connects the Northeast neighborhood and the E. 4st Street corridor; (4) does not split up the Lakeridge, Rancharrah, and Del Monte areas; (5) resolves the division of the residential area above I-80 near Robb Drive/Mae Anne by using I-80 as the boundary.</p> <p>Neighborhood issues not able to be addressed in this option include: (1) the Neil Road area is split from the neighborhoods of Donner Springs, Mira Loma, and the airport properties; (2) Midtown is separated into two wards; (3) depending on the definition, the Old Southwest only goes to Mt. Rose Street; (4) splits up South Reno - Bella Vista and Double Diamond are combined in a ward but Damonte Ranch remains split.</p>
<p><i>Residence related to Council seats with terms expiring in 2024</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The home of record/residence of current council members with existing terms that extend beyond the 2024 general election (Ward 2 and Ward 4) are retained within their ward in this option.
<p><i>Data source</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The 2020 Census counts provided under Public Law (PL) 94-171 from the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used as the official data source in this option.

Final Option D.1 (See Attachment - Final Map Option D.1)

Redistricting Principle	Analysis
<i>State and federal regulations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option abides by applicable state and federal regulations.
<i>Equal in population</i>	<p>This option balances the ward population within the 5 percent variation allowed by the Charter. This option represents a total deviation in population of <u>2.2</u> percent. The ward breakdown would be as follows:</p> <p>Ward 1 - 44,060 Ward 2 - 44,164 Ward 3 - 43,529 Ward 4 - 44,499 Ward 5 - 44,035 Ward 6 - 43,878</p>
<i>Contiguous</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wards are geographically contiguous in this option.
<i>Neighborhood integrity and community input</i>	<p>This option was created as a fourth final map to reflect additional variations for a singular downtown ward, which was the community preference through input. The option responds to the key issues identified by the community as described below:</p> <p><u>Key Issues #2 and 3</u> - This option represents a version in which downtown is represented by one ward. In this option, the downtown ward is able to encompass the university and Midtown. Of the three options for one ward downtown, it goes the farthest south using Plumb Lane as a boundary. However, the entirety of the E. Fourth Street corridor is split between two wards.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #4</u> - This option includes connections between the university and residential areas to the south, east, and west. Similar to Final Option B and C, Keystone Avenue is used as the boundary to encompass part of the Northwest neighborhood. However, this option does not extend beyond McCarran on the north, leaving Talus Way and Socrates in the same ward with the North Valleys.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #5</u> - This option responds to key neighborhood issues in several ways: (1) maintains a cohesive community of interest between the Donner Springs, Mira Loma, Neil Road, and airport properties; (2) includes Midtown on both sides of South Virginia Street; (3) does not split up the Old Southwest; (4) Virginia Lake is maintained in one ward; (5) provides cohesive in South Reno between Double Diamond, Bella Vista, and Damonte Ranch; (6)</p>

	<p>resolves the division of the residential area above I-80 near Robb Drive/Mae Anne by using I-80 as the boundary.</p> <p>Neighborhood issues not able to be addressed in this option include: (1) splits up the Yori/Grove and Brinkby/Lymbery neighborhoods; (2) does not provide cohesion between the Northeast neighborhood and the E. 4th Street corridor; (3) splits Lakeridge from Rancharrah and the Del Monte area.</p>
<i>Residence related to Council seats with terms expiring in 2024</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The home of record/residence of current council members with existing terms that extend beyond the 2024 general election (Ward 2 and Ward 4) are retained within their ward in this option.
<i>Data source</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2020 Census counts provided under Public Law (PL) 94-171 from the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used as the official data source in this option.

Final Option E (See Attachment - Final Map Option E)	
Redistricting Principle	Analysis
<i>State and federal regulations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option abides by applicable state and federal regulations.
<i>Equal in population</i>	<p>This option balances the ward population within the 5 percent variation allowed by the Charter. This option represents a total deviation in population of <u>4.4</u> percent. The ward breakdown would be as follows:</p> <p>Ward 1 – 44,740 Ward 2 – 45,003 Ward 3 – 43,140 Ward 4 – 43,060 Ward 5 – 44,356 Ward 6 – 43,866</p>
<i>Contiguous</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wards are geographically contiguous in this option.
<i>Neighborhood integrity and community input</i>	<p>This option derives from Final Option A and makes certain revisions to the Baker Lane area, Plumas Street/California Avenue area, and the Mill Street/Kietzke Lane area, as directed by Council. The analysis of the issues is very similar to those in Final Option A.</p> <p><u>Key Issues #2 and 3-</u> This option represents a version in which</p>

	<p>downtown is represented by one ward. The option presents a scenario in which the downtown ward would encompass the East 4th Street corridor; the area just south of the river, using California Avenue and Ryland Street as the southern boundary; and a unified connection with the university. The option does not include Midtown in the downtown ward. As one of the changes reflected in Option E compared to Option A, a section at the intersection of Mill Street and Kietzke Lane would be in Ward 3 rather than the downtown ward (Ward 1).</p> <p><u>Key Issue #4</u> - This option includes connections between the university and residential areas to the north, south, east, and west, which were all highlighted in public feedback. It includes the student housing in downtown Reno, the Talus Way/Socrates neighborhoods north of the university; and the residential areas toward Valley Road. The option also encompasses some of the Northwest neighborhood; however, it uses Washington Street as a boundary rather than Keystone as used in the other options.</p> <p><u>Key Issue #5</u> - This option responds to key neighborhood issues in several ways: (1) maintains a cohesive community of interest between the Donner Springs, Mira Loma, Neil Road, and airport properties; (2) includes Midtown on both sides of South Virginia Street; (3) connects the Yori/Grove and Brinkby/Lymbery neighborhoods; (4) connects the Northeast neighborhood and the E. 4th Street corridor; (5) does not split up the Lakeridge, Rancharrah, and Del Monte areas; (6) provides cohesive in South Reno between Double Diamond, Bella Vista, and Damonte Ranch.</p> <p>Neighborhood issues not able to be address in this option include: (1) depending on the defined boundaries, the Old Southwest is split using Plumas Street at as a boundary; (2) the east and west sides of Virginia Lake are split into two wards; and (3) a portion above I-80 near Robb Drive an Mae Anne Avenue remains connected to the ward below the freeway.</p>
<p><i>Residence related to Council seats with terms expiring in 2024</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The home of record/residence of current council members with existing terms that extend beyond the 2024 general election (Ward 2 and Ward 4) are retained within their ward in this option.
<p><i>Data source</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The 2020 Census counts provided under Public Law (PL) 94-171 from the U.S. Bureau of the Census were used as the official data source in this option.

The ordinance details the effective date for whichever map is selected (see Section 3 of the

proposed ordinance). The adopted map that includes the sixth ward will go into effect in January 2024 for all purposes necessary to effectuate the 2024 election. For all other purposes, the adopted map will go into effect when the results of the 2024 election are declared.

The Reno City Charter requires changes to ward boundaries to be adopted by ordinance with a five-sevenths affirmative vote of the Council. If moved for a second reading, the final ward boundary map would come back for adoption on September 13, 2023. Staff would submit the selected map to the Washoe County Registrar following ordinance introduction to achieve the timeline goal of submitting the new ward boundaries to the Washoe County Registrar by September 1, which is requested as time is needed for the Registrar's Office to prepare precinct maps and complete other election-related obligations. Staff will confirm the selection upon Council's adoption of the ordinance.

Financial Implications:

No financial implications.

Legal Implications:

Section 1.050 of the Reno City Charter outlines the requirements for the creation of ward boundaries. The proposed options meet such requirements, as well as mandates required by state and federal law.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends Council select Final Map Option E and refer Bill No. _____ for a second reading and adoption.

Proposed Motion:

I move to approve staff recommendation.

Attachments:

- Ordinance
- Final Map Option A
- Final Map Option B.1
- Final Map Option C
- Final Map Option D.1
- Final Map Option E
- Public Input Log
- Draft Scenarios 1-6