CITY COUNCIL **AGENDA REPORT**

MEETING DATE: May 10, 2022	**ITEM # 2**

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A MAP OF CITY COUNCIL DISTRICTS

INITIATED OR REQUESTED BY:	**REPORT COORDINATED OR PREPARED BY:**
[ ] Council [X] Staff	Jon Robinson, Deputy City Manager **City Manager's Office**
[ ] Other	

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

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this report is to facilitate the Council's selection of a final map of City Council districts for use in elections starting in November, 2022, and to allow public comment on map boundaries and related issues, including election sequencing and the term of the City's Mayor position.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff respectfully recommends that the City Council:

1. Hear the presentation from staff and the City's consultant, Redistricting Partners;

2. Allow public comment on map boundaries and related issues, including election sequencing and the term of the City's Mayor position; and

3. Deliberate and determine a final district map that will be used for City Council elections beginning this November.

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 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 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, though their services were not utilized by any attendees. Seven residents attended the March 26 meeting, while 13 attended the March 29 evening meeting.

Attendees provided 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.

At its meeting of April 6, the Council heard a presentation from Redistricting Partners, then conducted a discussion during which individual Council members provided feedback on the maps that had been prepared to date, including both community-created maps, and the three original drafts created by Redistricting Partners. The Council selected to elevate the three existing draft maps, along with five community-submitted maps, for more careful consideration as potential bases for a final consensus map to be adopted by the Council. Redistricting Partners has worked to "clean up" these maps by removing inadvertent Census block omissions, and confirming that each map is legally compliant.

On April 20, the Council conducted an extensive discussion of the draft maps that had been presented to date, along with additional community-created maps that were submitted for Council review. The Council directed staff to return to the meeting of May 10 with four maps, including multiple variants for Map 9. The maps presented for the Council's consideration this evening are: Draft Maps 2, 4A, 6, and 9A, 9B, and 9C. (Draft Maps 9A, 9B, and 9C are substantially the same, with very minor distinctions.)

ANALYSIS

The Council must select one preferred map this evening to bring forward to next week's hearing. The preferred map must be published on May 11 to meet the deadline of May 18 to have the City's district election format fully approved by the Council.

The draft maps presented for the Council's consideration this evening are finalists from a field of over 55 maps that were submitted by interested parties and reviewed by the Council. Attachment 1 provides a quick visual comparison of the final draft maps and a summary of a key demographic variable, the percentage of Hispanic voting age population in each district. As documented in Attachment 2, Redistricting Partners has concluded that each of the draft maps included with this report meet all applicable legal requirements. Therefore, staff does not have any recommendation in terms of which map the Council should select. More detailed demographic breakdowns of each draft map are provided in Attachments 3-8.

While retaining focus on a narrowed set of maps will help the Council preserve an orderly and manageable decision-making process, the Council may also consider other maps if it chooses. One map the Council may wish to review in this context is the "Equity Map" submitted by Scott Rafferty, plaintiff's counsel in the CVRA lawsuit filed by Maria Grijalva, et al. This map is included as Attachment 9. Attachment 10 is additional demographic information that was provided by Scott Rafferty, which may be helpful regardless of which map is under consideration.

To facilitate the Council's decision-making process, it may be useful to remember that the remaining draft maps represent distinctive map "families" or architectures. For example, if the Council concludes that the general configuration of Map 9A is appealing (or unappealing), it might warrant either further discussion, or elimination of Maps 9B and C, which contain subtle variations on the same basic structure. Similarly, if a majority of Council members favor creating a single district for Broderick and Bryte, then Maps 2 and 6 may be of particular interest, while if a majority of the Council concludes that Bryte and Broderick should be in separate districts, Maps 2 and 6 could be eliminated from consideration. In essence, a majority Council sentiment for or against any of the

maps can help the Council determine the fate of both that map, and any other draft maps that share the same fundamental architecture.

The most streamlined selection process would be for the Council to choose one of the existing draft maps as the final district map. However, if needed in order to achieve a map that maximizes Council support, Redistricting Partners is prepared to make real-time adjustments to any of the draft maps during the meeting and to confirm that all applicable legal parameters are met on the newly adjusted map. Since on-the-fly map adjustments can be time-consuming, staff recommends that the Council endeavor to align a majority behind a fundamental map architecture, then use live mapping only if necessary to gather more support behind one of the maps, and only then to make minor adjustments.

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 put forward 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. This sequence was also noted in subsequent staff reports. Under this approach, districts A and B would run in 2022, and districts C and D would run in 2024. Subsequently, the districts in most draft maps were labeled with numbers rather than letters. The potential sequence is unchanged: A = 1 = first, B = 2 = second, C = 3 = third, and D = 4 = fourth.

This potential sequencing order noted above is not a staff recommendation and was provided only to comply with the Election Code. At its meeting of May 18, the Council will need to determine two districts that will run in 2022, and another two that will run in 2024. This decision is entirely the Council's prerogative, provided that the Council "gives special consideration to the purposes of the [CVRA]" and to the preferences expressed by members of the districts.

Subject to the preceding condition, the Council may select any sequencing it chooses. Regardless of the map the Council selects on May 10, salient CVRA-based arguments can likely be made for any of the six possible combinations of districts to run in 2022. Therefore, staff will make no recommendation on election sequencing.

Mayoral Term
The settlement agreement with Maria Grijalva, et al requires that the City Council receive public testimony on potentially changing the mayoral term, which is currently two years. If the Council so directs, staff can return on May 18 with an item for Council consideration that would change the term of the Mayor from two to four years.

Next Steps
Staff will publish the map the Council selects this evening and return on May 18 with a report requesting approval of a resolution formalizing the Council's selection of the map it chooses tonight, requesting that the Council conduct the first reading of an ordinance that would transition the City from at-large to district elections and set the election sequence for the new Council districts. The second reading and adoption of this ordinance would occur on June 1, 2022.

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. Overview and Quick Map Reference
2. Redistricting Partners Map Analysis
3. Draft Map 2
4. Draft Map 4A
5. Draft Map 6
6. Draft Map 9A
7. Draft Map 9B
8. Draft Map 9C
9. Scott Rafferty Map
10. Additional Demographic Information

Attachment 1

Map Comparison

Draft Map 2	Draft Map 4A	Draft Map 6
		
Draft Map 9A	**Draft Map 9B**	**Draft Map 9C**
		

Map Name	Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) %				Plan Deviation %
	1	2	3	4	
Draft Map 2	29.2	26.4	14.4	17.0	6.8
Draft Map 4A	27.4	28.4	16.4	14.3	9.1
Draft Map 6	28.5	27.5	14.6	15.2	7.9
Draft Map 9A	31.5	24.8	17.8	12.1	4.7
Draft Map 9B	31.5	24.8	17.4	12.3	9.7
Draft Map 9C	31.5	24.9	17.8	12.5	9.6

City of West Sacramento Districting Analysis – 4/20 Elevated Maps

The following analysis is based on Redistricting Partners' review of the elevated draft plans from the West Sacramento City Council's April 20 public hearing. The following evaluation is based on traditional redistricting criteria when districting in California. These criteria maintain that districts must be:

- Substantially equal in population
- Maintain geographic contiguity
- Maintain geographic integrity of local neighborhoods and communities of interest
- Easily identifiable by residents
- Geographically compact

Some of the above criteria are easier to answer than others. For example, plans that fall within a 10% overall deviation—that is that the difference between the biggest and smallest districts is no more than 10 percent of the ideal district size—are substantially equal in population under traditional districting principles and judicial precedent. If the overall deviation of the plan is below 10% deviation based on the information provided in the Statewide Database for the 2020 census, then the plan meets the traditional criteria.

Other criteria are outside of the scope of demographers to answer. At this point in the process, the City Council has held nine public hearings and workshops where residents have provided testimony. Additionally, over 40 maps have been submitted using publicly available tools. As is typical with other districting and redistricting projects, there are conflicting ideas of how districts should be constructed. The City of West Sacramento does not have official defined neighborhood boundaries that allow Redistricting Partners to analyze any plans impact on the geographical integrity of local subunits. Whether or not the maps meet these criteria relies on the public providing feedback and is at the discretion of the City Council.

The California FAIR MAPS Act explicitly prohibits the use of incumbent or potential candidate residences when deciding on district lines and creating districts to benefit or disadvantage a political party. Throughout the process, Redistricting Partners has not used data on these prohibited groups when analyzing or creating proposed plans.

It does not appear possible to create districts in West Sacramento that meet preconditions of the *Gingles* necessitating the creation a district in accordance with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. To Redistricting Partners' knowledge, none of the maps elevated by the council were created using race as a predominant factor when determining district lines.

Draft Plan 2:
Equal Size Population
Deviation: 6.8%

Maintain Geographic Contiguity
Yes

Maintain Geographic Integrity of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest
At the discretion of the Council. Draft Plan 2 was created by Redistricting Partners based on public information from community received before March 9. The map creates a northern district using the railroad tracks as a boundary and keeps Stone Gate whole. It creates district boundaries based on a neighborhood map submitted by a member of the public through DistrictR (public submission maps 117274 and 117225)

Easily Identifiable by Residents
At the discretion of the Council.

Geographically Compact
Plan appears to meet the criteria for compactness.

Draft Map 4A:
Equal Size Population
Deviation 9.1%

Maintain Geographic Contiguity
Yes

Maintain Geographic Integrity of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest
At the discretion of the Council. Draft Plan 4A is based on public submission map 124635. Council instructed Redistricting Partners to assign unassigned census blocks to nearby districts. Because the map looked similar to "Draft Plan 4," which was originally titled "Public Submission Map 118905," Council instructed Redistricting Partners to relabel the map "Draft Plan 4A."

Easily Identifiable by Residents
At the discretion of the Council.

Geographically Compact
Plan appears to meet the criteria for compactness.

Draft Plan 6:
Equal Size Population
Deviation 7.9%

Maintain Geographic Contiguity
Yes

Maintain Geographic Integrity of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest
At the discretion of the Council. Draft Plan 6 was previously Public Submission Map 121618. Council instructed Redistricting Partners to assign unassigned census blocks to the appropriate district and relabel the map "Draft Plan 6."

Easily Identifiable by Residents
At the discretion of the Council.

Geographically Compact
Plan appears to meet the criteria for compactness.

Draft Plan 9A:
Equal Size Population
Deviation 4.7%

Maintain Geographic Contiguity
Yes

Maintain Geographic Integrity of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest
At the discretion of the Council. Draft Plan 9A was based on Public Submission Map 123820. Public Submission Map 123820 had a deviation above the allowable 10%. Council instructed Redistricting Partners to provide various options of the map that puts the plan within an allowable 10% range. These maps were put in the category of Draft Plan 9, which was the next number available for elevated Draft Plans. Draft Plan 9A lowers the overall population deviation by adding census blocks east of Otis Avenue in the southern part of the city to District 4 from District 3. Council also instructed Redistricting Partners to move the northern boundary of District 3 from Highway 80 to West Capitol Avenue.

Easily Identifiable by Residents
At the discretion of the Council

Geographically Compact
Plan appears to meet the criteria for compactness.

Draft Plan 9B:
Equal Size Population
Deviation 9.7%

Maintain Geographic Contiguity
Yes

Maintain Geographic Integrity of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest
At the discretion of the Council. Draft Plan 9B was based on Public Submission Map 123820. Public Submission Map 123820 had a deviation above the allowable 10%. Council instructed

Redistricting Partners to provide various options of the map that puts the plan within an allowable 10% range. These maps were put in the category of Draft Plan 9, which was the next number available for elevated Draft Plans. Draft Plan 9B lowers the overall population deviation by adding census blocks west of Linden Rd. in the southern part of the city to District 4 from District 3. Council also instructed Redistricting Partners to move the northern boundary of District 3 from Highway 80 to West Capitol Avenue.

Easily Identifiable by Residents
At the discretion of the Council.

Geographically Compact
Plan appears to meet the criteria for compactness.

Draft Plan 9C:
Equal Size Population
Deviation 9.6%

Maintain Geographic Contiguity
Yes

Maintain Geographic Integrity of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest
At the discretion of the Council. Draft Plan 9C was based on Public Submission Map 123820. Public Submission Map 123820 had a deviation above the allowable 10%. Council instructed Redistricting Partners to provide various options of the map that puts the plan within an allowable 10% range. These maps were put in the category of Draft Plan 9, which was the next number available for elevated Draft Plans. Draft Plan 9C lowers the overall population deviation by adding census blocks north of the channel and south of 17th St. to District 4 from District 2. Council also instructed Redistricting Partners to move the northern boundary of District 3 from Highway 80 to West Capitol Avenue.

Easily Identifiable by Residents
At the discretion of the Council.

Geographically Compact
Plan appears to meet the criteria for compactness.

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 2



Attachment 3

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 4A



Attachment 4

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 4A

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4
Population	14,309	13,519	13,177	13,072
Deviation	790	0	-342	-447
Deviation %	5.8%	0.0%	-2.5%	-3.3%
Other	6,634	5,950	7,067	7,435
Other %	46.4%	44.0%	53.6%	56.9%
Latino	6,006	5,435	2,948	2,935
Latino %	42.0%	40.2%	22.4%	22.5%
Asian	1,137	1,348	2,408	2,251
Asian %	7.9%	10.0%	18.3%	17.2%
Black	532	786	754	451
Black %	3.7%	5.8%	5.7%	3.5%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	8,290	7,722	8,702	8,830
Other CVAP	4,819	4,326	5,522	5,982
Other CVAP %	58.1%	56.0%	63.5%	67.7%
Latino CVAP	2,268	2,191	1,424	1,262
Latino CVAP %	27.4%	28.4%	16.4%	14.3%
Asian CVAP	615	566	1,137	1,362
Asian CVAP %	7.4%	7.3%	13.1%	15.4%
Black CVAP	588	639	619	224
Black CVAP %	7.1%	8.3%	7.1%	2.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 4A

District 1



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
14,309	790	5.8%	6,634	46.4%	6,006	42.0%	1,137	7.9%	532	3.7%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,290	4,819	58.1%	2,268	27.4%	615	7.4%	588	7.1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 4A

District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,519	0	0.0%	5,950	44.0%	5,435	40.2%	1,348	10.0%	786	5.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,722	4,326	56.0%	2,191	28.4%	566	7.3%	639	8.3%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 4A

District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,177	-342	-2.5%	7,067	53.6%	2,948	22.4%	2,408	18.3%	754	5.7%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,702	5,522	63.5%	1,424	16.4%	1,137	13.1%	619	7.1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 4A

District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,072	-447	-3.3%	7,435	56.9%	2,935	22.5%	2,251	17.2%	451	3.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,830	5,982	67.7%	1,262	14.3%	1,362	15.4%	224	2.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 6



Attachment 5

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 6

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4
Population	14,228	13,195	13,497	13,157
Deviation	709	-324	-22	-362
Deviation %	5.2%	-2.4%	-0.2%	-2.7%
Other	6,432	6,296	7,506	6,852
Other %	45.2%	47.7%	55.6%	52.1%
Latino	5,912	5,176	3,281	2,955
Latino %	41.6%	39.2%	24.3%	22.5%
Asian	1,248	1,174	2,113	2,609
Asian %	8.8%	8.9%	15.7%	19.8%
Black	636	549	597	741
Black %	4.5%	4.2%	4.4%	5.6%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	8,367	8,045	9,040	8,092
Other CVAP	4,608	4,838	6,028	5,175
Other CVAP %	55.1%	60.1%	66.7%	64.0%
Latino CVAP	2,385	2,213	1,321	1,226
Latino CVAP %	28.5%	27.5%	14.6%	15.2%
Asian CVAP	659	496	1,450	1,075
Asian CVAP %	7.9%	6.2%	16.0%	13.3%
Black CVAP	715	498	241	616
Black CVAP %	8.5%	6.2%	2.7%	7.6%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 6

District 1



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
14,228	709	5.2%	6,432	45.2%	5,912	41.6%	1,248	8.8%	636	4.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,367	4,608	55.1%	2,385	28.5%	659	7.9%	715	8.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 6

District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,195	-324	-2.4%	6,296	47.7%	5,176	39.2%	1,174	8.9%	549	4.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,045	4,838	60.1%	2,213	27.5%	496	6.2%	498	6.2%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 6

District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,497	-22	-0.2%	7,506	55.6%	3,281	24.3%	2,113	15.7%	597	4.4%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
9,040	6,028	66.7%	1,321	14.6%	1,450	16.0%	241	2.7%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 6

District 4



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%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9A



Attachment 6

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 9A

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4
Population	13,484	13,888	13,457	13,248
Deviation	-35	369	-62	-271
Deviation %	-0.3%	2.7%	-0.5%	-2.0%
Other	5,687	7,029	6,958	7,412
Other %	42.2%	50.6%	51.7%	55.9%
Latino	6,377	4,679	3,303	2,965
Latino %	47.3%	33.7%	24.5%	22.4%
Asian	961	1,457	2,356	2,370
Asian %	7.1%	10.5%	17.5%	17.9%
Black	459	723	840	501
Black %	3.4%	5.2%	6.2%	3.8%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	7,794	8,600	8,370	8,780
Other CVAP	4,098	5,339	5,265	5,947
Other CVAP %	52.6%	62.1%	62.9%	67.7%
Latino CVAP	2,456	2,135	1,492	1,062
Latino CVAP %	31.5%	24.8%	17.8%	12.1%
Asian CVAP	663	490	1,065	1,462
Asian CVAP %	8.5%	5.7%	12.7%	16.7%
Black CVAP	577	636	548	309
Black CVAP %	7.4%	7.4%	6.5%	3.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9A

District 1



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,484	-35	-0.3%	5,687	42.2%	6,377	47.3%	961	7.1%	459	3.4%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,794	4,098	52.6%	2,456	31.5%	663	8.5%	577	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9A

District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,888	369	2.7%	7,029	50.6%	4,679	33.7%	1,457	10.5%	723	5.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,600	5,339	62.1%	2,135	24.8%	490	5.7%	636	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9A

District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,457	-62	-0.5%	6,958	51.7%	3,303	24.5%	2,356	17.5%	840	6.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,370	5,265	62.9%	1,492	17.8%	1,065	12.7%	548	6.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9A

District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,248	-271	-2.0%	7,412	55.9%	2,965	22.4%	2,370	17.9%	501	3.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,780	5,947	67.7%	1,062	12.1%	1,462	16.7%	309	3.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9B



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 9B

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4
Population	13,484	13,888	14,005	12,700
Deviation	-35	369	486	-819
Deviation %	-0.3%	2.7%	3.6%	-6.1%
Other	5,687	7,029	7,134	7,236
Other %	42.2%	50.6%	50.9%	57.0%
Latino	6,377	4,679	3,426	2,842
Latino %	47.3%	33.7%	24.5%	22.4%
Asian	961	1,457	2,523	2,203
Asian %	7.1%	10.5%	18.0%	17.3%
Black	459	723	922	419
Black %	3.4%	5.2%	6.6%	3.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	7,794	8,600	8,722	8,428
Other CVAP	4,098	5,339	5,368	5,844
Other CVAP %	52.6%	62.1%	61.5%	69.3%
Latino CVAP	2,456	2,135	1,521	1,033
Latino CVAP %	31.5%	24.8%	17.4%	12.3%
Asian CVAP	663	490	1,190	1,337
Asian CVAP %	8.5%	5.7%	13.6%	15.9%
Black CVAP	577	636	643	214
Black CVAP %	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%	2.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9B

District 1



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,484	-35	-0.3%	5,687	42.2%	6,377	47.3%	961	7.1%	459	3.4%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,794	4,098	52.6%	2,456	31.5%	663	8.5%	577	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9B

District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,888	369	2.7%	7,029	50.6%	4,679	33.7%	1,457	10.5%	723	5.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,600	5,339	62.1%	2,135	24.8%	490	5.7%	636	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9B

District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
14,005	486	3.6%	7,134	50.9%	3,426	24.5%	2,523	18.0%	922	6.6%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,722	5,368	61.5%	1,521	17.4%	1,190	13.6%	643	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9B

District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,700	-819	-6.1%	7,236	57.0%	2,842	22.4%	2,203	17.3%	419	3.3%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,428	5,844	69.3%	1,033	12.3%	1,337	15.9%	214	2.5%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9C



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento
Draft Plan 9C

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4
Population	13,484	13,174	14,361	13,058
Deviation	-35	-345	842	-461
Deviation %	-0.3%	-2.6%	6.2%	-3.4%
Other	5,687	6,540	7,364	7,495
Other %	42.2%	49.6%	51.3%	57.4%
Latino	6,377	4,494	3,530	2,923
Latino %	47.3%	34.1%	24.6%	22.4%
Asian	961	1,430	2,535	2,218
Asian %	7.1%	10.9%	17.7%	17.0%
Black	459	710	932	422
Black %	3.4%	5.4%	6.5%	3.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	7,794	7,965	9,044	8,741
Other CVAP	4,098	4,862	5,588	6,101
Other CVAP %	52.6%	61.0%	61.8%	69.8%
Latino CVAP	2,456	1,984	1,610	1,095
Latino CVAP %	31.5%	24.9%	17.8%	12.5%
Asian CVAP	663	483	1,196	1,338
Asian CVAP %	8.5%	6.1%	13.2%	15.3%
Black CVAP	577	636	650	207
Black CVAP %	7.4%	8.0%	7.2%	2.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9C

District 1



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,484	-35	-0.3%	5,687	42.2%	6,377	47.3%	961	7.1%	459	3.4%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,794	4,098	52.6%	2,456	31.5%	663	8.5%	577	7.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9C

District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,174	-345	-2.6%	6,540	49.6%	4,494	34.1%	1,430	10.9%	710	5.4%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,965	4,862	61.0%	1,984	24.9%	483	6.1%	636	8.0%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9C

District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
14,361	842	6.2%	7,364	51.3%	3,530	24.6%	2,535	17.7%	932	6.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
9,044	5,588	61.8%	1,610	17.8%	1,196	13.2%	650	7.2%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

Draft Plan 9C

District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,058	-461	-3.4%	7,495	57.4%	2,923	22.4%	2,218	17.0%	422	3.2%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
8,741	6,101	69.8%	1,095	12.5%	1,338	15.3%	207	2.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

"Equity Map"



REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

"Equity Map"

2020 Census

	1	2	3	4
Population	12,957	13,226	14,042	13,852
Deviation	-562	-293	523	333
Deviation %	-4.2%	-2.2%	3.9%	2.5%
Other	5,791	5,643	7,582	8,070
Other %	44.7%	42.7%	54.0%	58.3%
Latino	5,599	5,436	3,146	3,143
Latino %	43.2%	41.1%	22.4%	22.7%
Asian	1,054	1,378	2,499	2,213
Asian %	8.1%	10.4%	17.8%	16.0%
Black	513	769	815	426
Black %	4.0%	5.8%	5.8%	3.1%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	7,857	6,777	9,208	9,702
Other CVAP	4,312	3,715	5,904	6,718
Other CVAP %	54.9%	54.8%	64.1%	69.2%
Latino CVAP	2,333	1,928	1,470	1,414
Latino CVAP %	29.7%	28.4%	16.0%	14.6%
Asian CVAP	555	590	1,173	1,362
Asian CVAP %	7.1%	8.7%	12.7%	14.0%
Black CVAP	657	544	661	208
Black CVAP %	8.4%	8.0%	7.2%	2.1%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

"Equity Map"

District 1



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,957	-562	-4.2%	5,791	44.7%	5,599	43.2%	1,054	8.1%	513	4.0%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
7,857	4,312	54.9%	2,333	29.7%	555	7.1%	657	8.4%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

"Equity Map"

District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,226	-293	-2.2%	5,643	42.7%	5,436	41.1%	1,378	10.4%	769	5.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
6,777	3,715	54.8%	1,928	28.4%	590	8.7%	544	8.0%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

"Equity Map"

District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
14,042	523	3.9%	7,582	54.0%	3,146	22.4%	2,499	17.8%	815	5.8%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
9,208	5,904	64.1%	1,470	16.0%	1,173	12.7%	661	7.2%

REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

City of West Sacramento

"Equity Map"

District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,852	333	2.5%	8,070	58.3%	3,143	22.7%	2,213	16.0%	426	3.1%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
9,702	6,718	69.2%	1,414	14.6%	1,362	14.0%	208	2.1%

WEST SACRAMENTO DEMOGRAPHICS by block group – 2016-2020 ACS data released March 17, 2022

			
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)

WEST SACRAMENTO DEMOGRAPHICS by block group – 2016-2020 ACS data released March 17, 2022



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)

WEST SACRAMENTO DEMOGRAPHICS by block group – 2016-2020 ACS data released March 17, 2022



Home value below $250k





Built since 2010





Non-citizens as percent of adult population



WEST SACRAMENTO DEMOGRAPHICS by block group – 2016-2020 ACS data released March 17, 2022





Below 2 times poverty level



<75% eligible Latinos vote



WEST SACRAMENTO DEMOGRAPHICS by block group – 2016-2020 ACS data released March 17, 2022

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

