CITY COUNCIL **AGENDA REPORT**

MEETING DATE: April 6, 2022 **ITEM # 7**

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING AND WORKSHOP ON DRAFT MAPS RELATED TO THE CITY'S TRANSITION TO DISTRICT-BASED ELECTIONS

INITIATED OR REQUESTED BY:

[ ] Council [X] Staff

[ ] Other

REPORT COORDINATED OR PREPARED BY:

Jon Robinson, Deputy City Manager
City Manager's Office

ATTACHMENT [ ] Yes [X] No [ ] Information [ ] Direction [X] Action

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this report is to request Council discussion and consideration of potential district maps and to solicit feedback from the Council and the community to facilitate ongoing refinement of the draft maps, in preparation for the Council's selection of a final map on April 20 or May 10, 2022.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff respectfully recommends that the Council hear the presentation from Redistricting Partners, receive public comment, and provide feedback about the draft maps and related communities of interest in West Sacramento related to the City's transition to district-based elections.

BACKGROUND

At the Council's meetings of February 2 and March 2 the Council heard presentations from the City's consultant, Redistricting Partners, which provided background on the districting process. As noted in those presentations, state and federal law contain requirements for voting districts, including that they are:

- Relatively equal in size
- Geographically and functionally contiguous
- Generally consistent with existing neighborhoods and communities of interest
- Easily identifiable and understandable by residents
- Compact

Equality of size, contiguousness, and compactness are functions of geometry that can be applied by Redistricting Partners to any draft maps. Consistency with neighborhoods and communities of interest, and ease of identification and understanding, are largely based on subjective resident perceptions, so public input on these issues is necessary to inform the initial draft maps themselves. For example, residents might perceive their "community of interest" as an area inhabited by residents who share language or cultural ties, served by the same bus line or school, or featuring similar housing types.

Following the Council meeting of February 2, staff and Redistricting Partners have collaborated to present two public outreach sessions via Zoom, one at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday February 22, and another on Saturday February 26. Residents were notified of these meetings via e-mail, social media, and utility bill inserts (to the cycles that were due during the period preceding the meetings – about 8,000 residents). Additionally, staff e-mailed flyers to local churches, requested the assistance of the Bryte/Broderick Community Action Network (BBCAN) to post flyers, placed ads on Russian language social media, asked the Chamber and school district to share on their social media channels, used the Public Works roadside message signs to advertise the meetings, and asked City staff to spread the word to their community contacts.

At the meetings of February 22 and February 26, Redistricting Partners staff explained the districting process to attendees, showed meeting participants how to submit their ideas about communities of interest and district boundaries using the online the Districtr software, and solicited feedback on communities of interest. The primary comment from both groups was that there is a significant Hispanic population in Bryte and Broderick that should be considered during the process. Additionally, a resident noted that "the middle" of West Sacramento should not be forgotten as the Council considers the needs of Bryte, Broderick and Southport.

On March 2, the Council heard a presentation from staff and Redistricting Partners updating them on the public outreach process to date and requesting Council and community input. At the Council's meeting of March 16, Redistricting Partners presented the Council with three initial draft maps that they had created based on community feedback received to date. (These maps had been released publicly more than a week prior to that meeting in accordance with the California Election Code.) The consultant also provided an overview of over a dozen maps that had been submitted by community members as of that meeting.

Following the release of the initial draft maps, staff and Redistricting Partners have conducted two in-person community outreach meetings at the West Sacramento Community Center. To accommodate residents with varying work schedules, one meeting was held on a Saturday (March 26), while the other was on a Tuesday evening (March 29). Translators for Russian and Spanish were available at both events, but no non-English speaking attendees were present. Seven residents attended the March 26 meeting, while 13 attended the March 29 evening meeting.

Attendees provided some useful suggestions for additional outreach and community education, along with some specific map-related suggestions, including a preference for including Ironworks in the same district with the rest of the Bridge District. Scott Rafferty submitted demographic information recently released by the Census Bureau that he requested be considered as part of the Council's mapping deliberations (see Attachment 1). Staff recommends that the Council direct Redistricting Partners to consider these and other relevant demographic factors as they refine draft maps for the Council's consideration.

ANALYSIS

As of this writing, the City Council has been presented with nineteen draft maps created by community members, along with three draft maps created by Redistricting Partners based on the community and Council feedback received during earlier public meetings.

Staff is continuing to publicize the districting process to residents, and new maps that are submitted by community members will be used to inform upcoming presentations to the Council. However, simply allowing proposed maps to accumulate, then asking the Council to choose one alternative from a field of dozens of options under a hard time constraint would result in an unwieldy decision process. To avoid this outcome, staff recommends that the Council follow the proposed schedule outlined below.

Recommended Process and Schedule

In order to create an orderly and manageable process that results in a final district map no later than May 18, the Council must begin to narrow and refine its primary alternatives now. This evening's meeting is designed to facilitate specific input from the Council and the community, which will then be used to refine a set of up to three draft maps that will become the focus of further Council discussion, leading to a final selection of a single map on April 20 or May 10, as outlined in the following table:

Meeting Date	Outcome
April 6	Provide substantive feedback on existing draft maps
April 20	Select a final map, or, alternatively, narrow the field to two or three maps(1)
May 10	Select a final map; first reading of ordinance for transition to district elections
May 18	Second reading and adoption of districting ordinance and adoption of resolution for district map

(1) The selected map(s) need not be based on the consultant's original draft maps, but must meet applicable legal criteria.

While community input will continue to be solicited and presented to the Council, this evening's meeting represents the pivot point between the map generation phase, and the map selection phase of this project. Under the schedule summarized above, staff and Redistricting Partners will utilize Council direction from tonight's meeting, along with community input received to date from all sources, to create refined draft maps for presentation to the Council on April 20. At that meeting, staff recommends that the Council either select a final map (preferred), or at least narrow its focus to no more than three maps, which would necessitate a final selection at your meeting of May 10.

Thoughtful feedback from the Council at the meeting of April 6 is key to facilitating the selection of a final consensus map no later than the May 10 special meeting. Relatedly, it should be noted that that final map that is to be adopted must be publicly noticed at least one week in advance, and any changes to the noticed map require a new notice period. **Therefore, the Council will not be in a position to consider new maps, or changes to existing maps on May 18. The map that is to be adopted on May 18 must have been noticed soon after the first Council meeting on May 10, making the meeting of May 10 the functional deadline for the Council to make a final decision on both a districting map and election sequence.**

Mapping Feedback Requested at Tonight's Meeting

Redistricting Partners has used the input provided at public outreach meetings to create draft maps that are configured differently, but comply with state and federal law. There are three draft maps, Maps 1 (formerly Map

A), 2 (formerly Map B), and 3 (formerly Map C), which are included (along with demographic information for each), as Attachments 2, 3 and 4 respectively. (Note: At the Council's direction, the names of the draft maps were changed so that maps and districts would not both have letter names.) Additionally, maps submitted directly by community members are included for the Council's reference as Attachment 5.

The draft maps prepared by Redistricting Partners reflect the input provided by the community to date, adjusted as necessary by the demographers at Redistricting Partners to comply with the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA), as well as the FAIR MAPS Act and federal voting rights laws. Since there are unavoidable tradeoffs between a district's size, compactness, and adherence to communities of interest and existing geographical boundaries, the process of refining districts is part art, and part science. The subjectivity inherent to this process will require the Council to synthesize its own preferences, community feedback, and the requirements of state and federal law to create a final district map for adoption.

Staff is not requesting that the Council eliminate any map options at the meeting of April 6, although the Council may do so if it so wishes. Instead, staff recommends that the Council provide feedback that Redistricting Partners can use to create a narrowed set of "focus" maps for your meeting of April 20. This feedback could come in multiple forms, including but not limited to the following:

Type of Input	Example
Principles	• Residents of X area should all be in the same district • Area X should (should not) have more than one district
General Observations	• Map X appears to meet (or not meet) the applicable criteria • Maps with X characteristic are more (or less) appealing
Specific Observations	• X is (or is not) a good boundary for districts • The boundary in this location benefits (or disadvantages) X population • This proposed district looks too large (or too small)

The ideas summarized above are illustrative; the Council is obviously welcome to provide any input it chooses. The most useful feedback will give Redistricting Partners specific criteria that will allow them to refine and narrow a set of draft maps for the Council's consideration at its meeting of April 20.

It should be noted that while the refined draft maps prepared by Redistricting Partners are based on community feedback, they are not necessarily preferred or recommended maps; they are provided solely to give the Council a frame of reference for maps that are legally compliant and attempt to incorporate Council and community feedback to date. The Council may ultimately choose to adopt any legally compliant map.

Sequencing of District Elections
To maintain staggered terms, Council members from two of the newly formed districts will need to be elected in 2022, and the others in 2024. Elections Code Section 10010(a)(2) requires the City to propose a potential sequencing of elections and conduct at least two public hearings to facilitate discussion of that sequencing. In the staff report for your meeting of March 16, staff proposed that the district elections be conducted in the same order as their alphabetical name during this process, i.e. A = first, B = second, C = third, and D = fourth. Under this approach, districts A and B would run in 2022, and districts C and D would run in 2024.

This proposed order is not a staff recommendation, and was provided only to comply with the Election Code. The Council retains its full prerogative to set the order of elections as it sees fit, subject only to the requirement that the Council "give special consideration to the purposes of the [CVRA]" and to the preferences expressed by members of the districts. Staff recommends that the final sequence be approved on April 20, or at the special meeting of May 10, with final approval occurring at the meeting of May 18. The Council is obviously welcome to make this decision earlier if it chooses.

Next Steps
Staff will continue to publicize the districting process to maximize resident awareness and involvement. However, as noted above, this staff report marks the transition from a focus on public outreach, to a focus on selection. Staff is proposing no further public outreach workshops, but will promote existing online and analog feedback tools, as well as upcoming Council meetings, as the venues for public comment. Redistricting Partners will use the feedback from the Council and community this evening to produce a refined set of draft maps for the Council's consideration on April 20.

Environmental Considerations
This action is not a project that is subject to CEQA because it is not an activity that may cause either a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21065; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15060(c), 15378(a).)

Commission Recommendation
N/A

Strategic Plan Integration
N/A

Alternatives
As an alternative to staff's recommended action, the Council could decline to hear the presentation and/or provide feedback. Staff does not recommend this approach because it would delay the City's progress towards districted elections, which is on a tight schedule to be complete in time for the November, 2022 election.

Coordination and Review
This report was prepared by the City Manager's Office, in collaboration with the City Attorney and Redistricting Partners.

Budget/Cost Impact
N/A

ATTACHMENT(S)
1. Demographic Information
2. Draft Map 1 (formerly Draft Plan A)
3. Draft Map 2 (formerly Draft Plan B)
4. Draft Map 3 (formerly Draft Plan C)
5. Community-Submitted Maps



Public assistance

0.07 and below (11)
0.07 to 0.16 (11)
0.16 to 0.20 (4)
0.20 to 0.30 (4)
0.30 and above (3)
Other (104)



Unemployment

UNEMP
0.01 and below (8)
0.01 to 0.04 (10)
0.04 to 0.07 (11)
0.07 to 0.10 (3)
0.10 and above (1)
Other (104)



Under 18

0.10 and below (3)
0.10 to 0.21 (9)
0.21 to 0.30 (11)
0.30 to 0.39 (8)
0.39 and above (2)
Other (104)



Limited English Households (all language)

0.05 and below (16)
0.05 to 0.08 (4)
0.08 to 0.16 (6)
0.16 to 0.28 (3)
0.28 and above (4)
Other (104)



No vehicle available

0.06 and below (2
0.06 to 0.15 (8)
0.15 to 0.30 (2)
0.30 to 0.40 (2)
0.40 and above (1



No computer in house

0.04 and below (11
0.04 to 0.09 (7)
0.09 to 0.15 (5)
0.15 to 0.28 (8)
0.28 and above (2)



Moved within year

0.04 and below (7)
0.04 to 0.10 (10)
0.10 to 0.20 (10)
0.20 to 0.30 (4)
0.30 and above (2)
Other (104)



Renters

0.20 and below (9)
0.20 to 0.40 (8)
0.40 to 0.57 (4)
0.57 to 0.70 (6)
0.70 and above (6)
Other (104)



Home value below $250k

0.07 and below (13)
0.07 to 0.20 (7)
0.20 to 0.40 (4)
0.40 to 0.70 (3)
0.70 and above (6)
Other (104)



Built since 2010

0.01 and below (20)
0.01 to 0.10 (9)
0.10 to 0.20 (1)
0.20 to 0.40 (2)
0.40 and above (1)
Other (104)



Non-citizens as percent of adult population

0.03 and below (8)
0.03 to 0.07 (8)
0.07 to 0.15 (9)
0.15 to 0.20 (5)
0.20 and above (3)





Below 2 times poverty level

0.18 and below (12)
0.18 to 0.30 (4)
0.30 to 0.40 (9)
0.40 to 0.60 (4)
0.60 and above (4)

<75% eligible Latinos vote

0.06
0.06
0.10
0.19
0.28

MAPS SHOULD AVOID MIXING HIGH-PROPENSITY VOTERS INTO AREAS WITH HISTORICALLY LOW TURNOUT

Dark brown areas have less than 50% turnout



Especially in the North, there are areas where less than half eligible Latinos vote



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 1



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 1

2020 Census

	A	B	C	D
Population	13,408	13,279	13,512	13,878
Deviation	-111	-240	-7	359
Deviation %	-0.8%	-1.8%	-0.1%	2.7%
Other	5,837	6,693	7,226	7,330
Other %	43.5%	50.4%	53.5%	52.8%
Latino	6,078	4,769	2,845	3,632
Latino %	45.3%	35.9%	21.1%	26.2%
Asian	1,036	1,167	2,824	2,117
Asian %	7.7%	8.8%	20.9%	15.3%
Black	457	650	617	799
Black %	3.4%	4.9%	4.6%	5.8%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D
Total CVAP	7,928	8,343	8,742	8,531
Other CVAP	4,208	5,287	5,387	5,767
Other CVAP %	53.1%	63.4%	61.6%	67.6%
Latino CVAP	2,361	2,222	1,051	1,511
Latino CVAP %	29.8%	26.6%	12.0%	17.7%
Asian CVAP	689	461	1,834	696
Asian CVAP %	8.7%	5.5%	21.0%	8.2%
Black CVAP	670	373	470	557
Black CVAP %	8.5%	4.5%	5.4%	6.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 1

District A



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,408	-111	-0.8%	5,837	43.5%	6,078	45.3%	1,036	7.7%	457	3.4%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,928	4,208	53.1%	2,361	29.8%	689	8.7%	670	8.5%

2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 1

District B



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,279	-240	-1.8%	6,693	50.4%	4,769	35.9%	1,167	8.8%	650	4.9%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,343	5,287	63.4%	2,222	26.6%	461	5.5%	373	4.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 1

District C



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,512	-7	-0.1%	7,226	53.5%	2,845	21.1%	2,824	20.9%	617	4.6%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,742	5,387	61.6%	1,051	12.0%	1,834	21.0%	470	5.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 1

District D



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,878	359	2.7%	7,330	52.8%	3,632	26.2%	2,117	15.3%	799	5.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,531	5,767	67.6%	1,511	17.7%	696	8.2%	557	6.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 2



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 2

2020 Census

	A	B	C	D
Population	13,393	13,672	13,967	13,045
Deviation	-126	153	448	-474
Deviation %	-0.9%	1.1%	3.3%	-3.5%
Other	6,047	6,051	7,648	7,340
Other %	45.2%	44.3%	54.8%	56.3%
Latino	5,702	5,513	3,008	3,101
Latino %	42.6%	40.3%	21.5%	23.8%
Asian	1,102	1,347	2,714	1,981
Asian %	8.2%	9.9%	19.4%	15.2%
Black	542	761	597	623
Black %	4.0%	5.6%	4.3%	4.8%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D
Total CVAP	8,072	7,463	9,341	8,668
Other CVAP	4,455	4,362	5,777	6,055
Other CVAP %	55.2%	58.4%	61.8%	69.9%
Latino CVAP	2,354	1,969	1,347	1,475
Latino CVAP %	29.2%	26.4%	14.4%	17.0%
Asian CVAP	590	582	1,781	727
Asian CVAP %	7.3%	7.8%	19.1%	8.4%
Black CVAP	673	550	436	411
Black CVAP %	8.3%	7.4%	4.7%	4.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 2

District A



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,393	-126	-0.9%	6,047	45.2%	5,702	42.6%	1,102	8.2%	542	4.0%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,072	4,455	55.2%	2,354	29.2%	590	7.3%	673	8.3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 2

District B



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,672	153	1.1%	6,051	44.3%	5,513	40.3%	1,347	9.9%	761	5.6%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,463	4,362	58.4%	1,969	26.4%	582	7.8%	550	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 2

District C



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,967	448	3.3%	7,648	54.8%	3,008	21.5%	2,714	19.4%	597	4.3%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
9,341	5,777	61.8%	1,347	14.4%	1,781	19.1%	436	4.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 2

District D



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,045	-474	-3.5%	7,340	56.3%	3,101	23.8%	1,981	15.2%	623	4.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,668	6,055	69.9%	1,475	17.0%	727	8.4%	411	4.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 3



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 3

2020 Census

	A	B	C	D
Population	13,535	14,181	13,204	13,157
Deviation	16	662	-315	-362
Deviation %	0.1%	4.9%	-2.3%	-2.7%
Other	5,706	7,101	7,427	6,852
Other %	42.2%	50.1%	56.2%	52.1%
Latino	6,392	4,840	3,137	2,955
Latino %	47.2%	34.1%	23.8%	22.5%
Asian	961	1,485	2,089	2,609
Asian %	7.1%	10.5%	15.8%	19.8%
Black	476	755	551	741
Black %	3.5%	5.3%	4.2%	5.6%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D
Total CVAP	7,819	8,725	8,908	8,092
Other CVAP	4,117	5,400	5,957	5,175
Other CVAP %	52.7%	61.9%	66.9%	64.0%
Latino CVAP	2,461	2,187	1,271	1,226
Latino CVAP %	31.5%	25.1%	14.3%	15.2%
Asian CVAP	663	502	1,440	1,075
Asian CVAP %	8.5%	5.8%	16.2%	13.3%
Black CVAP	578	636	240	616
Black CVAP %	7.4%	7.3%	2.7%	7.6%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 3

District A



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,535	16	0.1%	5,706	42.2%	6,392	47.2%	961	7.1%	476	3.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,819	4,117	52.7%	2,461	31.5%	663	8.5%	578	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 3

District B



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
14,181	662	4.9%	7,101	50.1%	4,840	34.1%	1,485	10.5%	755	5.3%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,725	5,400	61.9%	2,187	25.1%	502	5.8%	636	7.3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 3

District C



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,204	-315	-2.3%	7,427	56.2%	3,137	23.8%	2,089	15.8%	551	4.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,908	5,957	66.9%	1,271	14.3%	1,440	16.2%	240	2.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 3

District D



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,157	-362	-2.7%	6,852	52.1%	2,955	22.5%	2,609	19.8%	741	5.6%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,092	5,175	64.0%	1,226	15.2%	1,075	13.3%	616	7.6%

Attachment 5

Community Submitted Maps

(All titles are as provided by the map authors.)

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID: Harris Community Map



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117116

4d-1A Lateral Districts -- All Have Industrial, Riverfront, and Bypass



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117119



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117121



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117122



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117125



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117128



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117205



4D Bryte/Broderick/Washington in One District

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117409



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117875



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117891



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117958



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 117964



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 118475



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 118905



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 118923



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 119047



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID: 119826



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 120766



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 121172



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 121570



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 121618



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 121624



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 121931



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 127191



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

DistrictR ID 127199



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Districtr ID 122044 - Downtown Wokers

