



## CITY OF HEALDSBURG CITY COUNCIL AGENDA STAFF REPORT

**MEETING DATE:** March 17, 2025

**SUBJECT:** To Start at a Time Certain of 6:45 p.m. - Fourth Public Hearing to Receive community input and provide direction to staff regarding the submitted draft maps, the map to be used as the basis for an ordinance, and sequence of elections for district-based council elections

**PREPARED BY:** Raina Allan, City Clerk

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE(S):**  
Provide Effective Governance

**RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):**

Conduct the Fourth Public Hearing to receive community input and provide direction to staff regarding the submitted draft maps, the map to be used as the basis for an ordinance, and sequence of elections for district-based council elections

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/OUTREACH:**

Outreach for this effort includes posting on social media channels, including Facebook, Instagram and Nextdoor. The City has also shared information on the City's website and in the bi-weekly City Manager's Update. Informational pamphlets have been distributed to each City facility in English and Spanish as well as an insert that was included in the December utility bills. A dedicated webpage has been created on the City's website at <https://healdsburg.gov/1152/Transition-to-District-Elections>. Information is available to the public with background information about the districting process, upcoming hearing dates, and supporting documents. This webpage is being continuously updated with dates and locations where community members can share their feedback on this issue. The website also features a virtual mapping tool which community members have been utilizing to draw their own district boundaries and a feature allowing submission of community interest forms. Information will be provided in both English and Spanish. The City held a community meeting on January 16, 2025 at the Community Center, met with the senior community on January 24, 2025 at the Senior Center and the City Manager held a meeting with the Spanish-speaking community on January 28, 2025 to gather feedback on the process. The City has partnered with Corazón Healdsburg to assist with the outreach to the Spanish-speaking community. Both public hearings and community meetings will continue to include live interpretation services.

**BACKGROUND:**

The California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) was enacted in 2001, in part, to provide minority groups in California with tools to prevent dilution of votes in “at-large” election systems – meaning each Councilmember is elected by the registered voters of the entire City. The CVRA prohibits any at-large voting system that hinders the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or influence the outcome of an election. A violation of the CVRA is established if racially polarized voting occurs in elections for Councilmembers or other matters submitted to the voters.

The CVRA does not require showing that the City, the voters, or the elected officials intended to discriminate against a protected class. Similarly, the fact that members of a protected class are not geographically concentrated does not preclude a finding of racially polarized voting. Instead, a violation of the CVRA may be established by showing that both racially polarized voting and dilution occur in elections for members of the governing body. Dilution can be shown where the protected class can show that the at-large election prevents them from electing, either on their own or with the support of crossover voters, their preferred candidate.

The City of Healdsburg currently elects its Councilmembers at-large. On October 3, 2024, the City received a letter from a potential plaintiffs’ attorney, Shenkman & Hughes PC, alleging a violation of the CVRA and threatening litigation unless the City voluntarily transitions to a district-based election system for electing Councilmembers. The letter is attached as Exhibit A. On November 18, 2024, the City Council adopted a resolution declaring the intent to transition to District-Based elections. Since Council adopted the resolution of intent a prospective plaintiff may not commence an action within ninety (90) days of the resolution of intention’s passage.

**DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:**

As a part of the transition process, State law requires the City hold at least two public hearings over a period of no more than 30 days, at which the public is invited to provide input regarding the composition of the districts. No official maps can be drawn before the completion of these two public meetings. Once the initial two meetings are complete, the demographer and public can begin to officially draw maps that will be considered in the districting process. State law requires the City to then hold at least two additional hearings over a period of no more than 45 days, at which the public is invited to provide input regarding the content of the draft maps and the proposed sequence of elections. Once a map is selected, State law requires the City to publish the map at least seven days before consideration at a hearing for introduction of an ordinance to adopt the district map.

Staff has prepared a timeline that identifies the planned schedule for the required public hearings and public outreach and complies with Elections Code 10010. City Staff met with the potential plaintiff’s attorney regarding an extension of an additional sixty days beyond the ninety-day statute. Elections Code section 10010 provides that a city may enter into a written agreement to extend the 90-day period in order to provide additional time to conduct public outreach, encourage public participation, and receive public input. With the extension, Staff anticipates completing the transition to district elections by April 2025.

### **Transition to District Based Elections: First and Second Public Hearings**

The City conducted the initial two public hearings on December 16, 2024 and January 6, 2025. At the first and second public hearings, the Council received a report from the City's demographer, Redistricting Partners, about the basics of the districting process and identifying communities of interest. The video and presentation from the first and second meeting can be found on the City's dedicated redistricting webpage which can be found here: <https://healdsburg.gov/1152/Transition-to-District-Elections>.

The Fair Maps Act defines a "community of interest" as a population that shares common social or economic interests that should be included within a single election district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Characteristics of communities of interest may include, but are not limited to, shared public policy concerns such as education, public safety, public health, environment, housing, transportation, and access to social services. Characteristics of communities of interest may also include, but are not limited to, cultural districts, shared socioeconomic characteristics, similar voter registration rates and participation rates, and shared histories. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.

The City has received eight submissions of the Community of Interest forms which were posted on the City's website. The responses from those eight submissions are summarized as follows:

- Fitch Mountain
- Senior Communities and Homeowners Associations
- Parkland Farms Neighborhood
- Growth and Tourism
- Drought
- Grove Street and Downtown
- Park Development in the North part of town
- SMART Station development

There were no new community of interest forms submitted between public hearing three and four. Community Interest forms received are attached for reference and can be found on the City website. The Council also discussed renters as being a community of interest.

### **Transition to District Based Elections: Third and Fourth (and Fifth) Public Hearings**

Upon completion of the first and second public hearings, the City must hold at least two additional hearings over a period of no more than 45 days, at which the public is invited to provide input regarding the content of the draft maps and the proposed sequence of elections. A fifth public hearing will then be held to adopt the selected map.

The City will need to comply with the Fair and Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities and Political Subdivisions (FAIR MAPS) Act in adopting the districts, which provides criteria that the City must utilize when establishing election district boundaries or when undertaking the redistricting process (which must occur every ten years after each population census). The criteria is summarized below:

- a. The election districts must be substantially equal in population based on the most recent census.
- b. The districting body shall adopt election district boundaries that comply with the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, and the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. Sec. 10301 et seq.) and consistent with the federal Voting Rights Act, the districting body shall determine whether it is possible to create an election district or districts in which a minority group is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district, as set forth in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986).
- c. The districting body shall adopt election district boundaries using the following criteria as set forth in the following order of priority:
  1. To the maximum extent practicable, election districts shall be geographically contiguous. Areas that meet only at the points of adjoining corners are not contiguous. Areas that are separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not contiguous.
  2. To the maximum extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criterion, the geographic integrity of any local neighborhood or local community of interest shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division.
  3. To the maximum extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria, election districts shall be bounded by natural and artificial barriers, by streets, or by the boundaries of the local jurisdiction. Election district boundaries should be easily identifiable and understandable by residents.
  4. To the maximum extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with the preceding criteria, election districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness in a manner that nearby areas of population are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations.
- d. The districting body shall not adopt election district boundaries for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Within 21 days of adopting final election district boundaries, the City Council will be required to issue a report that explains the basis on which it made its decisions in achieving compliance with the requirements and criteria of the Fair Maps Act, including, as to each neighborhood, community of interest, city, or census designated place that was split into two or more districts, the reason for that split.

The City held the third public hearing on February 18<sup>th</sup> at which both the public and the City Council provided feedback on the draft maps. Members of the public had the opportunity to submit maps for either four, five or six districts over the course of the last seven weeks. The City received 1 map for one district, 26 maps for four districts, 39 maps for five districts and 12 maps for six districts. At this fourth public hearing on March 17, 2025, the community and the City Council will consider the 8 draft maps that have been submitted by members of the public. The City Council will also consider the four draft maps they moved forward from the third public hearing. Those maps are labeled as Draft Map A, Draft Map B, Draft Map C2 and Draft Map D. Draft Map D, which is based on one of the maps submitted by a member of the public, was drawn live during the last City Council meeting. All of the maps are available on the City's website: <https://healdsburg.gov/1152/Transition-to-District-Elections>. The maps that have been

submitted by members of the public through the City’s “Districtr” mapping tool are identified by a numerical identification number (e.g., ID 277459),” and the maps that have been prepared by Redistricting Partners are identified by a letter (e.g., Draft Map A). The City must publish the maps that will be considered at a public hearing seven days in advance of the meeting. Staff has been posting draft maps and all of the draft maps included in the report were posted by March 10, 2025.

Redistricting Partners has prepared a FAIR MAPS Act Assessment (“Assessment”) of the maps submitted by members of the public. This Assessment analyzed all of the ranked list of criteria pursuant to the FAIR MAPS Act in the order required (i.e., population size deviation is under 10%, contiguous, maintains “communities of interest”, easily identifiable and understandable lines, compact, etc.). However, as indicated in the Assessment, Redistricting Partners can assess all criteria objectively except for “maintaining communities of interest”. That particular criterion is subjective by definition and should be discussed by the City Council and public at this meeting to determine how well the draft maps fulfil this criterion.

A summary of some of the relevant aspects of each the four draft maps moved forward at the February 18th public hearing is provided below:

- Draft A is based on renters which was identified as a community of interest, while ensuring the Latino Citizen Voting Age Population is maximized in District 2.
- Draft B is more focused on renters, while maintaining a more compact District 2.
- Draft C is based on one of the maps submitted by the community (ID 277577). As noted, the City received a high volume of maps from the community, and this map was chosen because it has a different configuration of the City than Draft Maps A and B. The eastern portion of the City is split differently and District 2 goes all the way to the south end of the City, picking up a relatively high population of renters in that area, ensuring it is still a renter-friendly district. It also an alternative approach to splitting the middle of the city (instead of there being one middle district, there are two).
- Draft C2 was modified during the last City Council meeting. Council modified the shape of District four to encompass more of the south end of Healdsburg.
- Draft D was drawn live during the City Council meeting on February 18, 2025 and is based on one of the public submissions.

Members of the public are invited to provide input regarding the content of the publicly submitted draft maps and the maps moved forward from the third public hearing. The initial proposed sequencing for draft maps is even-numbered districts in 2026 and odd districts in 2028. The Council and members of the public can also provide input on the sequence of elections, if desired.

### **Request for Direction and Next Steps**

At the March 17, 2025 public hearing, staff will be seeking feedback on the draft maps moved forward from the third public hearing, as well as any community-submitted maps that the City Council wishes to review and the sequence of elections. Staff will seek feedback from the City Council on maps that best preserve communities of interest and best meet the larger goals of the districting process. Specifically, staff will seek direction from Council on the map to be used as

the basis for an ordinance, to be brought forward for a potential first reading at the fifth public hearing on April 7, 2025. Although there is no specific number of maps that can be considered at that stage, it is recommended to select one or two maps to be considered at the fifth public hearing so that the community can provide targeted feedback on the maps that best reflect the goals of the districting process as determined by the City Council.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP:**

Not applicable.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The City Council could choose not to move forward with transitioning to district-based elections or pursue a different approach. If this alternative is selected, staff requests further direction.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is a fiscal impact due to the costs associated with the transition to District-based elections. Costs include the demographer, which are estimated to be less than \$50,000, legal costs, and payment of the plaintiffs' attorney costs of \$30,000. The City Council appropriated a total of \$100,000 in the general fund for this effort at a prior meeting.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

This item does not constitute a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code § 21000, et seq.) (CEQA) as the adoption of the resolution does not have the potential to result in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15378).

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

Tentative Timeline Re Implementing District Based Elections  
 Public Maps  
 Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025  
 Healdsburg FAIR MAPS Act Assessment 3.10.25  
 Community of Interest Forms  
 Exhibit A


Tentative Timeline for Consideration and Implementation of District-Based Elections

Date	Event	Code §	Comment
10/3/24	City received certified demand letter from Shenkman & Hughes	EC§10010(e)(1)	Before commencing an action to enforce Sections 14027 and 14028, a prospective plaintiff shall send by certified mail a written notice to the clerk of the political subdivision ("City") against which the action would be brought asserting that the City's method of conducting elections may violate the California Voting Rights Act.
		EC§ 10010(e)(2)	A prospective plaintiff shall not commence an action to enforce Sections 14027 and 14028 within 45 days of the City's receipt of the written notice described above (CVRA lawsuit cannot be commenced until November 17, 2024. Since this is a Sunday use the November 18, 2024 date).
11/18/24	Resolution is considered at City Council Meeting	EC§ 10010 (3)(A)	Within 45 days of receipt of a notice, the City may pass a resolution outlining its intention to transition from at-large to district-based elections, specific steps it will undertake to facilitate this transition, and an estimated time frame for doing so. (CVRA lawsuit cannot be commenced until November 17, 2024. Since this is a Sunday use the November 18, 2024 date).
11/18/24	Resolution is adopted at City Council Meeting	EC§ 10010(e)(3)(B)	If the City begins the process of switching to districts within 45 days and adopts a resolution to that effect a potential plaintiff cannot commence an action within 90 days of the resolution's passage. (CVRA lawsuit cannot be commenced until February 16, 2025 with 60 day extension, the new date would be April 17, 2025).
Before First Public Hearing and throughout process	Conduct public outreach, encourage public participation, and receive public input	EC§ 10010(a)(1)	The City may conduct outreach to the public, including to non-English-speaking communities, to explain the districting process and to encourage public participation. (i.e. farmers market, public library, public schools, places of worship, homeowners associations, and community organizations)
12/16/24	1st Public Hearing (Regular Meeting)	EC§ 10010(a)(1)	First and second public hearings must occur within a period of 30 days. No maps for review, but take public comments on composition of districts and preferences for district lines.
1/6/25	2nd Public Hearing (Regular Meeting)	EC§ 10010(a)(1)	No maps for review, but take public comments on composition of districts and preferences for district lines.
2/10/25	Publish for review first drafts of district election maps and	EC§ 10010(a)(2)	After all draft maps are drawn, at least 7 days before the 3 <sup>rd</sup> public hearing, the City shall publish and make available for release at least one draft map and, if city councilmembers

Attachment: Tentative Timeline Re Implementing District Based Elections (4779 : Public Hearing #4 -

	potential sequence of elections		will be elected in their districts at different times to provide for staggered terms of office, potential sequence of the elections.
2/18/25	3rd Public Hearing (Regular Meeting)	EC§ 10010(a)(2)	The City shall also hold at least two additional hearings over a period of no more than 40 days, at which the public is invited to provide input regarding the content of the draft map or maps and the proposed sequence of elections, if applicable.
3/10/25	Post any new or amended maps	EC§ 10010(a)(2)	Maps available for review at least 7 days before consideration at the 4th public hearing.
3/17/25	4th Public Hearing (Regular Meeting)	EC§ 10010(a)(2)	Take public comments on proposed maps. Council may introduce ordinance adopting a map at this meeting if map is not changed and selected at this public hearing. If map is changed at this meeting, the map will need to be published again for 7 days and ordinance cannot be introduced until 7 days after amended map is published.
3/31/25	Post any new or amended maps	EC§ 10010(a)(2)	Maps available for review at least 7 days before consideration at the 5th public hearing.
4/7/25	5th Public Hearing (Regular Meeting)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Council makes revisions to map introduced on 3/17/25, Council can re-introduce ordinance establishing district elections, including district boundaries and election sequence and adopt ordinance at next regular meeting on 4/21/25; or adjourn this regular meeting on 4/7/25 to another date to adopt ordinance;</li> </ul> <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If no revisions to map prior to second reading of the ordinance adopting the map, Council can adopt ordinance at this meeting;</li> </ul> <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make further changes to map without introduction of the ordinance adopting the map</li> </ul>
DEADLINE 4/17/25		EC§ 10010(e)(3)(B)	

Attachment: Tentative Timeline Re Implementing District Based Elections (4779 : Public Hearing #4 -




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	
Population	2,358	2,273	2,270	2,323	2,115
Deviation	86	1	-2	51	-115
Deviation %	3.8%	0.0%	-0.1%	2.2%	-6.0%
Other	1,856	970	1,459	1,512	1,412
Other %	78.7%	42.7%	64.3%	65.1%	66.1%
Latino	463	1,265	756	780	675
Latino %	19.6%	55.7%	33.3%	33.6%	31.4%
Asian	32	27	38	26	0
Asian %	1.4%	1.2%	1.7%	1.1%	1.9%
Black	7	11	17	5	0
Black %	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%	0.2%	0.6%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	
Total CVAP	2,333	1,746	1,697	1,685	1,295
Other CVAP	2,045	1,178	1,281	1,411	985
Other CVAP %	87.7%	67.5%	75.5%	83.7%	76.1%
Latino CVAP	257	508	395	257	255
Latino CVAP %	11.0%	29.1%	23.3%	15.3%	19.3%
Asian CVAP	29	60	21	17	0
Asian CVAP %	1.2%	3.4%	1.2%	1.0%	4.6%
Black CVAP	2	0	0	0	0
Black CVAP %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,358	86	3.8%	1,856	78.7%	463	19.6%	32	1.4%	7	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,333	2,045	87.7%	257	11.0%	29	1.2%	2	0.1%		



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,273	1	0.0%	970	42.7%	1,265	55.7%	27	1.2%	11	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,746	1,178	67.5%	508	29.1%	60	3.4%	0	0.0%		



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,270	-2	-0.1%	1,459	64.3%	756	33.3%	38	1.7%	17	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,697	1,281	75.5%	395	23.3%	21	1.2%	0	0.0%		


**District 4**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,323	51	2.2%	1,512	65.1%	780	33.6%	26	1.1%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,685	1,411	83.7%	257	15.3%	17	1.0%	0	0.0%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,136	-136	-6.0%	1,412	66.1%	670	31.4%	41	1.9%	13	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,297	987	76.1%	250	19.3%	60	4.6%	0	0.0%		




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4
Population	3,474	2,079	3,188	2,591
Deviation	640	-755	354	-233
Deviation %	22.6%	-26.6%	12.5%	-8.4%
Other	2,122	835	2,050	2,181
Other %	61.1%	40.2%	64.3%	84.3%
Latino	1,287	1,205	1,064	371
Latino %	37.0%	58.0%	33.4%	14.4%
Asian	54	28	49	31
Asian %	1.6%	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%
Black	11	11	25	1
Black %	0.3%	0.5%	0.8%	0.2%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	2,082	1,512	2,628	2,511
Other CVAP	1,566	1,001	1,989	2,330
Other CVAP %	75.2%	66.2%	75.7%	92.7%
Latino CVAP	455	474	567	161
Latino CVAP %	21.9%	31.3%	21.6%	6.6%
Asian CVAP	61	37	71	10
Asian CVAP %	2.9%	2.4%	2.7%	0.6%
Black CVAP	0	0	1	1
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%


**District 1**




**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
3,474	640	22.6%	2,122	61.1%	1,287	37.0%	54	1.6%	11	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,082	1,566	75.2%	455	21.9%	61	2.9%	0	0.0%		





**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,079	-755	-26.6%	835	40.2%	1,205	58.0%	28	1.3%	11	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,512	1,001	66.2%	474	31.3%	37	2.4%	0	0.0%		


**District 3**




**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
3,188	354	12.5%	2,050	64.3%	1,064	33.4%	49	1.5%	25	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,628	1,989	75.7%	567	21.6%	71	2.7%	1	0.0%		





**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,597	-237	-8.4%	2,188	84.3%	373	14.4%	31	1.2%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,514	2,330	92.7%	167	6.6%	16	0.6%	1	0.0%		




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	
Population	10,882	332	27	17	
Deviation	8,629	-1,921	-2,226	-2,236	-2,240
Deviation %	383.0%	-85.3%	-98.8%	-99.2%	-99.7%
Other	6,914	217	6	7	
Other %	63.5%	65.4%	22.2%	41.2%	14.3%
Latino	3,758	110	20	10	
Latino %	34.5%	33.1%	74.1%	58.8%	85.7%
Asian	157	5	1	0	
Asian %	1.4%	1.5%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Black	53	0	0	0	
Black %	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	
Total CVAP	8,380	255	21	13	
Other CVAP	6,601	204	12	9	
Other CVAP %	78.8%	80.0%	57.1%	69.2%	60.0%
Latino CVAP	1,601	43	8	4	
Latino CVAP %	19.1%	16.9%	38.1%	30.8%	40.0%
Asian CVAP	176	8	1	0	
Asian CVAP %	2.1%	3.1%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Black CVAP	2	0	0	0	0
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
10,882	8,629	383.0%	6,914	63.5%	3,758	34.5%	157	1.4%	53	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
8,380	6,601	78.8%	1,601	19.1%	176	2.1%	2	0.0%		


**District 2**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
332	-1,921	-85.3%	217	65.4%	110	33.1%	5	1.5%	0	0.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
255	204	80.0%	43	16.9%	8	3.1%	0	0.0%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
27	-2,226	-98.8%	6	22.2%	20	74.1%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
21	12	57.1%	8	38.1%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%		


**District 4**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
17	-2,236	-99.2%	7	41.2%	10	58.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
13	9	69.2%	4	30.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 6**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
7	-2,246	-99.7%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Population	1,892	1,915	1,931	1,857	1,897	1,897
Deviation	-1	22	38	-36	4	-1
Deviation %	-0.1%	1.2%	2.0%	-1.9%	0.2%	-1.1%
Other	747	1,378	1,210	1,251	1,367	1,210
Other %	39.5%	72.0%	62.7%	67.4%	72.1%	67.1%
Latino	1,121	487	693	567	485	567
Latino %	59.2%	25.4%	35.9%	30.5%	25.6%	31.0%
Asian	13	39	24	30	31	13
Asian %	0.7%	2.0%	1.2%	1.6%	1.6%	1.4%
Black	11	11	4	9	14	11
Black %	0.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total CVAP	1,246	1,234	1,377	1,278	1,961	1,618
Other CVAP	817	998	1,137	989	1,618	1,377
Other CVAP %	65.6%	80.9%	82.6%	77.4%	82.5%	80.8%
Latino CVAP	419	179	226	281	278	281
Latino CVAP %	33.6%	14.5%	16.4%	22.0%	14.2%	17.4%
Asian CVAP	10	57	14	7	64	10
Asian CVAP %	0.8%	4.6%	1.0%	0.5%	3.3%	2.0%
Black CVAP	0	0	0	1	1	0
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
1,892	-1	-0.1%	747	39.5%	1,121	59.2%	13	0.7%	11	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,246	817	65.6%	419	33.6%	10	0.8%	0	0.0%		



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
1,915	22	1.2%	1,378	72.0%	487	25.4%	39	2.0%	11	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,234	998	80.9%	179	14.5%	57	4.6%	0	0.0%		


**District 3**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
1,931	38	2.0%	1,210	62.7%	693	35.9%	24	1.2%	4	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,377	1,137	82.6%	226	16.4%	14	1.0%	0	0.0%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
1,857	-36	-1.9%	1,251	67.4%	567	30.5%	30	1.6%	9	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,278	989	77.4%	281	22.0%	7	0.5%	1	0.1%		


**District 5**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
1,897	4	0.2%	1,367	72.1%	485	25.6%	31	1.6%	14	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,961	1,618	82.5%	278	14.2%	64	3.3%	1	0.1%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)


**District 6**




**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
1,868	-25	-1.3%	1,256	67.2%	581	31.1%	27	1.4%	4	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,662	1,343	80.8%	284	17.1%	35	2.1%	0	0.0%		



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	2,190	2,231	2,288	2,288	2,360
Deviation	-82	-41	16	16	0
Deviation %	-3.6%	-1.8%	0.7%	0.7%	4.0%
Other	1,338	902	1,593	1,835	1,593
Other %	61.1%	40.4%	69.6%	80.2%	65.2%
Latino	823	1,295	639	415	760
Latino %	37.6%	58.0%	27.9%	18.1%	32.2%
Asian	24	26	43	31	40
Asian %	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%	1.4%	1.7%
Black	5	8	13	7	20
Black %	0.2%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.8%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	1,555	1,602	1,445	2,276	1,880
Other CVAP	1,267	1,073	1,146	2,006	1,440
Other CVAP %	81.5%	67.0%	79.3%	88.1%	75.0%
Latino CVAP	274	499	236	240	440
Latino CVAP %	17.6%	31.1%	16.3%	10.5%	22.2%
Asian CVAP	14	30	63	28	50
Asian CVAP %	0.9%	1.9%	4.4%	1.2%	2.8%
Black CVAP	0	0	0	2	0
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Population**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,190	-82	-3.6%	1,338	61.1%	823	37.6%	24	1.1%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,555	1,267	81.5%	274	17.6%	14	0.9%	0	0.0%		



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,231	-41	-1.8%	902	40.4%	1,295	58.0%	26	1.2%	8	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,602	1,073	67.0%	499	31.1%	30	1.9%	0	0.0%		



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,288	16	0.7%	1,593	69.6%	639	27.9%	43	1.9%	13	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,445	1,146	79.3%	236	16.3%	63	4.4%	0	0.0%		



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,288	16	0.7%	1,835	80.2%	415	18.1%	31	1.4%	7	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,276	2,006	88.1%	240	10.5%	28	1.2%	2	0.1%		



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,363	91	4.0%	1,541	65.2%	762	32.2%	40	1.7%	20	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,880	1,410	75.0%	418	22.2%	52	2.8%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4
Population	2,867	2,820	2,813	2,860
Deviation	27	-20	-27	20
Deviation %	1.0%	-0.7%	-1.0%	0.7%
Other	1,923	2,112	1,667	1,500
Other %	67.1%	74.9%	59.3%	52.7%
Latino	879	645	1,096	1,310
Latino %	30.7%	22.9%	39.0%	45.9%
Asian	49	45	40	30
Asian %	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	1.0%
Black	16	18	10	5
Black %	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4
Total CVAP	1,834	2,740	1,848	2,330
Other CVAP	1,437	2,390	1,346	1,720
Other CVAP %	78.4%	87.2%	72.8%	74.0%
Latino CVAP	330	279	490	560
Latino CVAP %	18.0%	10.2%	26.5%	24.3%
Asian CVAP	67	69	12	30
Asian CVAP %	3.7%	2.5%	0.6%	1.7%
Black CVAP	0	2	0	0
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,867	27	1.0%	1,923	67.1%	879	30.7%	49	1.7%	16	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,834	1,437	78.4%	330	18.0%	67	3.7%	0	0.0%		



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,820	-20	-0.7%	2,112	74.9%	645	22.9%	45	1.6%	18	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,740	2,390	87.2%	279	10.2%	69	2.5%	2	0.1%		


**District 3**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,813	-27	-1.0%	1,667	59.3%	1,096	39.0%	40	1.4%	10	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,848	1,346	72.8%	490	26.5%	12	0.6%	0	0.0%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,860	20	0.7%	1,507	52.7%	1,314	45.9%	30	1.0%	9	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,336	1,729	74.0%	568	24.3%	39	1.7%	0	0.0%		



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)


**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	
Population	2,294	2,223	2,384	2,336	2,111
Deviation	22	-49	112	64	-14
Deviation %	1.0%	-2.2%	4.9%	2.8%	-6.6%
Other	1,819	923	1,543	1,475	1,444
Other %	79.3%	41.5%	64.7%	63.1%	68.3%
Latino	437	1,265	782	832	611
Latino %	19.0%	56.9%	32.8%	35.6%	29.1%
Asian	32	25	40	24	4
Asian %	1.4%	1.1%	1.7%	1.0%	2.0%
Black	6	10	19	5	0
Black %	0.3%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.6%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	
Total CVAP	2,265	1,693	1,818	1,693	1,288
Other CVAP	1,990	1,131	1,383	1,402	995
Other CVAP %	87.9%	66.8%	76.1%	82.8%	77.3%
Latino CVAP	244	509	407	277	211
Latino CVAP %	10.8%	30.1%	22.4%	16.4%	17.8%
Asian CVAP	29	53	28	14	6
Asian CVAP %	1.3%	3.1%	1.5%	0.8%	4.9%
Black CVAP	2	0	0	0	0
Black CVAP %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%


**District 1**




**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,294	22	1.0%	1,819	79.3%	437	19.0%	32	1.4%	6	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,265	1,990	87.9%	244	10.8%	29	1.3%	2	0.1%		





**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,223	-49	-2.2%	923	41.5%	1,265	56.9%	25	1.1%	10	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,693	1,131	66.8%	509	30.1%	53	3.1%	0	0.0%		


**District 3**




**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,384	112	4.9%	1,543	64.7%	782	32.8%	40	1.7%	19	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,818	1,383	76.1%	407	22.4%	28	1.5%	0	0.0%		





**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,336	64	2.8%	1,475	63.1%	832	35.6%	24	1.0%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,693	1,402	82.8%	277	16.4%	14	0.8%	0	0.0%		



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,123	-149	-6.6%	1,449	68.3%	618	29.1%	43	2.0%	13	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,289	996	77.3%	230	17.8%	63	4.9%	0	0.0%		




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	
Population	2,339	2,346	2,197	2,375	2,100
Deviation	67	74	-75	103	-160
Deviation %	2.9%	3.3%	-3.3%	4.5%	-7.4%
Other	1,849	995	1,434	1,493	1,437
Other %	79.1%	42.4%	65.3%	62.9%	68.4%
Latino	451	1,308	713	853	600
Latino %	19.3%	55.8%	32.5%	35.9%	29.0%
Asian	32	32	33	24	40
Asian %	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.0%	2.0%
Black	7	11	17	5	0
Black %	0.3%	0.5%	0.8%	0.2%	0.6%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	
Total CVAP	2,315	1,785	1,658	1,723	1,250
Other CVAP	2,030	1,210	1,249	1,426	980
Other CVAP %	87.7%	67.8%	75.3%	82.8%	77.3%
Latino CVAP	254	515	388	283	200
Latino CVAP %	11.0%	28.9%	23.4%	16.4%	17.8%
Asian CVAP	29	60	21	14	60
Asian CVAP %	1.3%	3.4%	1.3%	0.8%	4.9%
Black CVAP	2	0	0	0	0
Black CVAP %	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%


**District 1**




**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,339	67	2.9%	1,849	79.1%	451	19.3%	32	1.4%	7	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,315	2,030	87.7%	254	11.0%	29	1.3%	2	0.1%		




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,346	74	3.3%	995	42.4%	1,308	55.8%	32	1.4%	11	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,785	1,210	67.8%	515	28.9%	60	3.4%	0	0.0%		



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,197	-75	-3.3%	1,434	65.3%	713	32.5%	33	1.5%	17	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,658	1,249	75.3%	388	23.4%	21	1.3%	0	0.0%		



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,375	103	4.5%	1,493	62.9%	853	35.9%	24	1.0%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,723	1,426	82.8%	283	16.4%	14	0.8%	0	0.0%		



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Attachment: Public Maps (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,103	-169	-7.4%	1,438	68.4%	609	29.0%	43	2.0%	13	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,277	987	77.3%	227	17.8%	63	4.9%	0	0.0%		




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	2,233	2,173	2,357	2,303	2,295
Deviation	-39	-99	85	31	2
Deviation %	-1.7%	-4.4%	3.7%	1.4%	1.0%
Other	1,489	793	1,545	1,875	1,500
Other %	66.7%	36.5%	65.5%	81.4%	65.7%
Latino	683	1,356	763	392	74
Latino %	30.6%	62.4%	32.4%	17.0%	32.3%
Asian	47	15	35	30	3
Asian %	2.1%	0.7%	1.5%	1.3%	1.6%
Black	14	9	14	6	1
Black %	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	1,356	1,424	1,635	2,247	2,095
Other CVAP	1,035	905	1,237	2,064	1,635
Other CVAP %	76.3%	63.6%	75.7%	91.9%	79.2%
Latino CVAP	256	513	377	162	35
Latino CVAP %	18.9%	36.0%	23.1%	7.2%	17.1%
Asian CVAP	65	6	21	20	5
Asian CVAP %	4.8%	0.4%	1.3%	0.9%	3.6%
Black CVAP	0	0	0	1	1
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,233	-39	-1.7%	1,489	66.7%	683	30.6%	47	2.1%	14	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,356	1,035	76.3%	256	18.9%	65	4.8%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,173	-99	-4.4%	793	36.5%	1,356	62.4%	15	0.7%	9	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,424	905	63.6%	513	36.0%	6	0.4%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,357	85	3.7%	1,545	65.5%	763	32.4%	35	1.5%	14	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,635	1,237	75.7%	377	23.1%	21	1.3%	0	0.0%		



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,303	31	1.4%	1,875	81.4%	392	17.0%	30	1.3%	6	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,247	2,064	91.9%	162	7.2%	20	0.9%	1	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,294	22	1.0%	1,507	65.7%	740	32.3%	37	1.6%	10	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,096	1,661	79.2%	359	17.1%	75	3.6%	1	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	2,302	2,181	2,378	2,205	2,295
Deviation	30	-91	106	-67	2
Deviation %	1.3%	-4.0%	4.7%	-2.9%	1.0%
Other	1,405	922	1,621	1,754	1,500
Other %	61.0%	42.3%	68.2%	79.5%	65.7%
Latino	842	1,226	707	419	740
Latino %	36.6%	56.2%	29.7%	19.0%	32.3%
Asian	40	25	34	28	3
Asian %	1.7%	1.1%	1.4%	1.3%	1.6%
Black	15	8	16	4	0
Black %	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	1,392	1,450	1,780	2,040	2,095
Other CVAP	1,023	963	1,373	1,882	1,600
Other CVAP %	73.5%	66.4%	77.1%	92.3%	79.2%
Latino CVAP	310	472	388	138	350
Latino CVAP %	22.3%	32.6%	21.8%	6.8%	17.1%
Asian CVAP	59	15	18	20	5
Asian CVAP %	4.2%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	3.6%
Black CVAP	0	0	1	0	1
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,302	30	1.3%	1,405	61.0%	842	36.6%	40	1.7%	15	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,392	1,023	73.5%	310	22.3%	59	4.2%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,181	-91	-4.0%	922	42.3%	1,226	56.2%	25	1.1%	8	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,450	963	66.4%	472	32.6%	15	1.0%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,378	106	4.7%	1,621	68.2%	707	29.7%	34	1.4%	16	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,780	1,373	77.1%	388	21.8%	18	1.0%	1	0.1%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,205	-67	-2.9%	1,754	79.5%	419	19.0%	28	1.3%	4	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,040	1,882	92.3%	138	6.8%	20	1.0%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,294	22	1.0%	1,507	65.7%	740	32.3%	37	1.6%	10	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,096	1,661	79.2%	359	17.1%	75	3.6%	1	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	
Population	2,349	2,167	2,198	2,349	2,291
Deviation	77	-105	-74	77	2
Deviation %	3.4%	-4.6%	-3.3%	3.4%	1.1%
Other	1,675	877	1,174	1,956	1,521
Other %	71.3%	40.5%	53.4%	83.3%	66.5%
Latino	616	1,257	1,001	354	701
Latino %	26.2%	58.0%	45.5%	15.1%	30.7%
Asian	44	25	20	34	1
Asian %	1.9%	1.2%	0.9%	1.4%	1.8%
Black	14	8	3	5	2
Black %	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	1.0%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	
Total CVAP	1,519	1,553	1,363	2,277	2,041
Other CVAP	1,227	1,040	1,028	2,089	1,521
Other CVAP %	80.8%	67.0%	75.4%	91.7%	74.2%
Latino CVAP	228	484	330	168	491
Latino CVAP %	15.0%	31.2%	24.2%	7.4%	22.3%
Asian CVAP	64	29	5	19	7
Asian CVAP %	4.2%	1.9%	0.4%	0.8%	3.4%
Black CVAP	0	0	0	1	1
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,349	77	3.4%	1,675	71.3%	616	26.2%	44	1.9%	14	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,519	1,227	80.8%	228	15.0%	64	4.2%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,167	-105	-4.6%	877	40.5%	1,257	58.0%	25	1.2%	8	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,553	1,040	67.0%	484	31.2%	29	1.9%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,198	-74	-3.3%	1,174	53.4%	1,001	45.5%	20	0.9%	3	0.1%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,363	1,028	75.4%	330	24.2%	5	0.4%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,349	77	3.4%	1,956	83.3%	354	15.1%	34	1.4%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,277	2,089	91.7%	168	7.4%	19	0.8%	1	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 5**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Population**



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,297	25	1.1%	1,527	66.5%	706	30.7%	41	1.8%	23	1.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,046	1,518	74.2%	457	22.3%	70	3.4%	1	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)




**2020 Census**

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	2,342	2,200	2,340	2,263	2,263
Deviation	70	-72	68	-9	-9
Deviation %	3.1%	-3.2%	3.0%	-0.4%	-2.5%
Other	980	1,616	1,682	1,437	1,495
Other %	41.8%	73.5%	71.9%	63.5%	67.4%
Latino	1,319	542	611	797	660
Latino %	56.3%	24.6%	26.1%	35.2%	30.0%
Asian	32	27	38	24	4
Asian %	1.4%	1.2%	1.6%	1.1%	1.9%
Black	11	15	9	5	0
Black %	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%


**Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	1,727	2,174	1,857	1,655	1,340
Other CVAP	1,162	1,774	1,553	1,379	1,030
Other CVAP %	67.3%	81.6%	83.6%	83.3%	76.9%
Latino CVAP	511	350	296	262	24
Latino CVAP %	29.6%	16.1%	15.9%	15.8%	18.4%
Asian CVAP	54	49	7	14	0
Asian CVAP %	3.1%	2.3%	0.4%	0.8%	4.7%
Black CVAP	0	1	1	0	0
Black CVAP %	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%



**District 1**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,342	70	3.1%	980	41.8%	1,319	56.3%	32	1.4%	11	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,727	1,162	67.3%	511	29.6%	54	3.1%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 2**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,200	-72	-3.2%	1,616	73.5%	542	24.6%	27	1.2%	15	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
2,174	1,774	81.6%	350	16.1%	49	2.3%	1	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 3**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,340	68	3.0%	1,682	71.9%	611	26.1%	38	1.6%	9	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,857	1,553	83.6%	296	15.9%	7	0.4%	1	0.1%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 4**



**2020 Census**




**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,263	-9	-0.4%	1,437	63.5%	797	35.2%	24	1.1%	5	0.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,655	1,379	83.3%	262	15.8%	14	0.8%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)



**District 5**



**2020 Census**



**Citizen Voting Age Populatio**



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
2,215	-57	-2.5%	1,494	67.4%	665	30.0%	43	1.9%	13	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
1,345	1,034	76.9%	248	18.4%	63	4.7%	0	0.0%		

Attachment: Maps moved forward from 2.18.2025 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

**Public Maps: FAIR MAPS Act Assessment**

*The following maps were submitted by March 10, 2025 and can be considered during the March 17 public hearing*

Under the FAIR MAPS Act, the City of Healdsburg is required to follow a ranked list of criteria in their districting process:

- Relatively equal in population size – total deviation is under 10%
- Contiguous
- Maintains “communities of interest”
- Easily identifiable and understandable lines, following city, natural, and man-made boundaries
- Compact

As demographers, we can assess all criteria objectively except for “maintaining communities of interest.” This particular criterion is subjective by definition and should be discussed by the public and the City Council to determine how well these maps fulfil this criterion.


**ID 284214**

Total Deviation: 49.2 %

Date of submission: 2/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Four districts



**ID 284372**


"Best Map Ever"

Total Deviation: >100 %

Date of submission: 2/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Six districts



**ID 284689**


"Map 1"

Total Deviation: 3.9%

Date of submission: 2/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Six districts



**ID 284694**


"Map 2"

Total Deviation: 7.6 %

Date of submission: 2/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Five districts



**ID 284697**


"Map 3"

Total Deviation: 2.0 %

Date of submission: 2/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Four districts



**ID 285286**

"Modification of Draft Map C with all the notes from council members taken into account. Don't mind the long sliver of the light green district the goes on the west side of Healdsburg ave north of powell, those are all commerical north of powell, the people on the west side of the ave. south of powell should be part of the central district. The smallest population is the north district like Hagele"

Total Deviation: 11.5%

Date of submission: 2/19/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗

\*Five districts

**ID 286075**

"Revision of Draft Map C but using streets such as Powell, University and Matheson as boarders"

Total Deviation: 11.9 %

Date of submission: 2/25/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Five districts

**ID 286781**

"Draft C2 revision – B. Crabb"




Total Deviation: 9.8 %

Date of submission: 2/27/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗

\*District 3's tail potentially makes this uncompact.

Five districts



The following maps were submitted on or before February 10, 2025 and were considered at the February 18 public hearing.

**Four-District Maps**

**ID 283651**


"Tessa Kraft 2"

Total Deviation: 1.7%

Date of submission: 2/10/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*There is a portion of District 3 in District 4, and it would need to be fixed before considering as a potential draft map.



**ID 283434**


"Tessa Kraft"

Total Deviation: 15.7%

Date of submission: 2/9/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*A small portion of District 4 is in District 1.




**ID 282146**

Total Deviation: 6.3%

Date of submission: 2/3/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 281023**


"beatriz"

Total Deviation: 2.6%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

A portion of District 3 is in District 2 and would need to be fixed, in addition to unpopulated/missing blocks.



**ID 281020**


"Hola"

Total Deviation: 11%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗*
Compact?	✓

\*In addition to equal population and contiguity issues, District 3's lines would need to be cleaned up.



**ID 281015,**


"Sandra Nava"

Total Deviation: 39.1%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✗

Appears to be an unfinished map.




**ID 281011**

"Ali Rodriguez"

Total Deviation: 18.7%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✗




**ID 280379**

Total Deviation: 3.4%

Date of submission 1/26/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗

District 1 is barely contiguous and cleanup is advised if choosing this map as a potential draft map.




**ID 2800118**

"Four Districts + Mayor for entire city"

Total Deviation: 5.9%

Date of submission 1/24/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 280047**


4 districts + 1 mayor"

Total Deviation: 5.4%

Date of submission 1/24/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*A piece of District 1 is in District 4 and should be corrected before being considered as a draft map.



**ID 279877**


"Sunset Drive Team #1"

Total Deviation: 8.7%

Date of submission 1/23/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*A piece of District 1 is in District 4 and should be corrected before being considered as a draft map.



**ID 279849**


"4 plus Mayor = 5"

Total Deviation: 6.7%

Date of submission 1/23/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*A piece of District 1 is in District 4 and should be corrected before being considered as a draft map.



**ID 279822**


"FT Residents Voices 1st"

Total Deviation: 3.9%

Date of submission 1/23/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*A piece of District 1 is in District 4 and should be corrected before being considered as a draft map.



**ID 279020**


"North District was intentionally the lowest population deviation at 9.72% because in reality, ENSO and Montage area have increased the voter base for the north district. At Large Mayor a must!"

Total Deviation: 19%

Date of submission 1/20/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Missing census blocks need to be populated.




**ID 278633**

"4 Districts"

Total Deviation: 11.4%

Date of submission 1/18/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 278059**

"Fair Healdsburg - need a Mayor!"

Total Deviation: 15.1%

Date of submission 1/15/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗




**ID 277851**

"Less than 1% SD is possible. Prefer at large mayor."

Total Deviation: 1.3%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277767**

"Four Chunks"

Total Deviation: 2.9%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 277766**


"4+Mayor"

Total Deviation: 0.6%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓*

\*District 1 may be considered noncompact but it allows the other districts to be more compact.



**ID 277598**


"More than 4 districts is difficult for Healdsburg – 4 + at large mayor"

Total Deviation: 7.7%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓*

\*District 1 may be considered noncompact but it allows the other districts to be more compact.



**ID 277596**


"4 + At Large Mayor makes the most sense!"

Total Deviation: 1.9%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓*

\*District 1 may be considered noncompact but it allows the other districts to be more compact.




**ID 277561**

"DP4"

Total Deviation: 0.7%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277527**

"Tara 4 districts"

Total Deviation: 3.3%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓*



\*There are a couple of small census blocks in the wrong districts that can be easily fixed.


**ID 277487**

"Cells need some tuning"

Total Deviation: 15.6%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277475**

Total Deviation: 18.9%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 277459**


"Block One"

Total Deviation: 3.1%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

There's a misplaced census block, which is easy to fix.



**Five-District Maps**


**ID 283716**

"Distribution"

Total Deviation: 3.8%

Date of submission: 2/10/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✗




**ID 283622**

Total Deviation: 5.3%

Date of submission: 2/10/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓*

\*District 1 may not be compact, but it allows the other four districts to remain compact.




**ID 283612**

"Fitch River Grove 1.8% Dev"

Total Deviation: 3.3%


Date of submission: 2/10/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 283611**  
 "Fitch River Grove 8.4% Dev"  
 Total Deviation: 16%  
 Date of submission: 2/10/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 283248**  
 "BLUE LEMON V.1"  
 Total Deviation: 6.7%  
 Date of submission: 2/8/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 282037**  
 Total Deviation: 6%  
 Date of submission: 2/3/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 281774**

"Plan CDG"

Total Deviation: 1.7%

Date of submission: 2/1/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 281306**

Total Deviation: 12.1%

Date of submission 1/29/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 281027**

"Mi Mapa"

Total Deviation: 2.5%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 281026**


"amelco"

Total Deviation: 7.4%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗*

\*District 3 has a dovetail that needs to be cleaned up, in addition to the contiguity issues.




**ID 281025**

"Elia G"

Total Deviation: 6%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 281024**


"Hola"

Total Deviation: 8.8%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

A portion of District 3 is in District 2 and would need to be fixed, in addition to unpopulated/missing blocks.



**ID 281022**


"Cecilia"

Total Deviation: 15.6%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

A portion of District 3 is in District 2 and would need to be fixed, in addition to unpopulated/missing blocks.




**ID 281019**

"Francisca Frores"

Total Deviation: 34.5%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✗



**ID 281017**


"My Map"

Total Deviation: 0.5%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓*
Compact?	✗

\*The dovetail in District 3 would need to be cleaned up, in addition to adding the missing population/census block that were excluded.




**ID 281016**

"Cristina"

Total Deviation: 15.1%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 281014**

"Hola"

Total Deviation: 86.2%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✗




**ID 281012**

"xochil"

Total Deviation: 2.6%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✗




**ID 281010**

Total Deviation: 15.6%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\* Missing census blocks need to be populated in order to be considered as a draft map, in addition to fixing the equal population issue.



**ID 281009**


"Jesus y Consuelo Lopez"

Total Deviation: 36.3%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\* Missing census blocks need to be populated in order to be considered as a draft map, in addition to fixing the equal population issue.



**ID 281008**


"Maria Garcia"

Total Deviation: 42.5%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\* Missing census blocks need to be populated in order to be considered as a draft map, in addition to fixing the equal population issue.



**ID 281007**

"Adela Perez"

Total Deviation: 46.6%

Date of submission 1/28/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✗*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\* Missing census blocks need to be populated in order to be considered as a draft map, in addition to fixing the equal population issue.

**ID 279117**

"NO at Large Mayor /5D"

Total Deviation: 5.9%

Date of submission 1/21/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\* Missing census blocks need to be populated in order to be considered as a draft map, and a portion of District 3 is in District 5 and needs to be fixed.

**ID 279111**




"5 Districts / rotating"

Total Deviation: 7.7%

Date of submission 1/21/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\* Missing census blocks need to be populated in order to be considered as a draft map.




**ID 278392**

"Gulliver"

Total Deviation: 6%

Date of submission 1/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 278352**

"2025"

Total Deviation: 9%

Date of submission 1/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓*
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



\*Unpopulated census blocks must be populated, and this might throw off the equal population; however, it can be adjusted to remain under 10%.


**ID 278263**

"The Neighbors"

Total Deviation: 0.6%

Date of submission 1/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



\*District 1 needs to be completely touching in order to be considered contiguous. This can be fixed.

**ID 278051**


"make a latino district"

Total Deviation: 7.9%

Date of submission 1/15/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓*
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*Unpopulated census blocks need to be populated, which would likely change the total deviation.




**ID 277796**

"Hank#1"

Total Deviation: 15.9%

Date of submission 1/14/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277777**

"Five"

Total Deviation: 2.8%

Date of submission 1/14/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277577**

Total Deviation: 14.7%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*There are a couple of small census blocks in the wrong districts, which can be easily fixed.




**ID 277549**

"DP5"

Total Deviation: 0.7%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 277521**


"Tara map 5 districts"

Total Deviation: 3.7%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗

District 3 is noncompact.




**ID 277488**

Total Deviation: 13.1%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277485**

**"North, Downtown, River, Fitch and Central"**

Total Deviation: 16%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277480**

Total Deviation: 5%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277474**

"First Pass"

Total Deviation: 5.7%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 278334**

Total Deviation: 5.9%

Date of submission 1/16/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277471**

"First"

Total Deviation: 9.5%

Date of submission 1/13/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



### Six-District Maps


**ID 283667**

"Tried but no Hispanic voting block"

Total Deviation: 10.7%

Date of submission: 2/10/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 283552**

"6 seats elect the Mayor"

Total Deviation: 7.7%

Date of submission: 2/10/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✗
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✗
Compact?	✓



District 6 is divided by District 5, and the lines deviate from other public maps, which raises questions about whether the lines are easy to identify and understand.


**ID 278058**

"SixDistricts-4%PopDiviation-mj"

Total Deviation: 8.1%

Date of submission: 1/15/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



District 6 is divided by District 5, and the lines deviate from other public maps, which raises questions about whether the lines are easy to identify and understand.


**ID 278037**

"6 district, at large mayor: evaluation mode"

Total Deviation: 20.7%

Date of submission: 1/15/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✗
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277981**

"6 districts"

Total Deviation: 5.5%

Date of submission: 1/15/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277853**

"less than 1% SD also possible for 6 Districts and at large mayor"

Total Deviation: 1.2%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



**ID 277781**


"AddAnotherChairToTheDias!"

Total Deviation: 8.4%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓*
Contiguous?	✓*
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓

\*There are missing census blocks, which may overpopulate the overall total deviation. Additionally, there is a small portion of District 1 in District 2, which can be easily fixed.




**ID 277770**

"6+1"

Total Deviation: 4.3%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277743**

"6 Districts with Elected Mayor"

Total Deviation: 7.5%

Date of submission: 1/14/25

Relatively equal in population size?	✓
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✗




**ID 277608**

"Attempt at 6 districts"

Total Deviation: 10.5%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	<b>X</b>
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277604**

"6 Districts could work with at large mayor – anyone notice there are 7 seats on the Dais? Let’s fill 7 seats!"

Total Deviation: 14.6%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	<b>X</b>
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓




**ID 277473**

"6 w/ at large mayor"

Total Deviation: 15.6%

Date of submission: 1/13/25

Relatively equal in population size?	<b>X</b>
Contiguous?	✓
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	✓
Compact?	✓



## One-District Maps


**ID 280517**

"One City"

Total Deviation: --

Date of submission 1/27/2025

Relatively equal in population size?	NA
Contiguous?	NA
Lines are easy to understand and identify?	NA
Compact?	NA



Attachment: Healdsburg FAIR MAPS Act Assessment 3.10.25 (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 1, 2025 6:36 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email *Field not completed.*

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

(Section Break)

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448- Vintage Hills

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: 1-4 acre parcels. Having access to affordable water, so we are able to irrigate our fruit trees, berries, vegetables, and landscaping.

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? 1-4 acre parcels with extensive landscaping, fruit trees and other farming plants.

4. Are the public services (bus lines, No

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Single family homes on large parcels.

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

We were treated grossly unfair when we had a drought. We were given the same allotment of water as the properties in town. My area consists of large 1-4 acre parcels.

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

We need to be represented as much or more than the tourists.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 1, 2025 3:41 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email 

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

(Sector Blank)

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: Love semi-rural small town atmosphere. Nice landscapes, many have gardens and pools. Mostly long time residents, many older. We share a desire to be surrounded by and participate in nature and want to be able to develop our outdoor space and enjoy it for as long as we live here. We need affordable water for that. Public safety is also a priority.

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? 101, Grove St, Healdsburg Ave

4. Are the public services (bus lines, Not used much

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Single Family Dwellings

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Recent runaway spending on special interests, pro-tourism and pro-growth has diverted resources from needed infrastructure repairs driving up living costs and exposing us to water insecurity.

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

We are concerned about the on-going attack on our small town by those who want to transform it into a city like Palo Alto. The endless attacks are funded by our out of touch City Council using our tax dollars. Our community is not currently represented by a single person on the City Council.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 10, 2025 2:44 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

### Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email *Field not completed.*

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

(Section Break)

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: Grove Street and Downtown

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? West of 101, South of Dry Creek Road, North of Mill Street, East of SMART line plus the 9-block area surrounding the Plaza

4. Are the public services (bus lines, *Field not completed.*

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Mix of single family houses, apartments, and condos

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

The Grove/Downtown community has common interests in the usage and improvements to Grove Street, noise from Highway 101, and balancing a healthy commercial district with the needs of residents. This area also tends to have a relatively high Hispanic population.

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

*Field not completed.*

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 10, 2025 2:33 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email *Field not completed.*

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

(Section Break)

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: North Area

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? North of Dry Creek Road and North of Terrace Blvd

4. Are the public services (bus lines, *Field not completed.*

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Single family houses, apartments, Enso Village and Burbank senior living, Montage resort

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

The North Area community has common interests in the development and usage of the new parks between Barbieri Park and Passalacqua Road, the usage and fire mitigation in the Healdsburg Ridge Open Space Preserve, the connection between the North Village and the rest of Healdsburg, the usage and occasional noise from the Community Center, special wildfire risk from urban/wildland interface, and special seismic risk from the Healdsburg fault running through the North Area

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

*Field not completed.*

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 10, 2025 2:21 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

### Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email *Field not completed.*

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

*(Scroll to Expand)*

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: South and River Area

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? South of Mill Street, South of Matheson St.

4. Are the public services (bus lines, SMART Station

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Mix of single family houses, apartments, condos and mobile homes

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

This community is common interests associated with the usage of the future SMART station and the properties around it, the future redevelopment of the Syar property, the usage and flooding of Russian River, the homeless population associated with the Russian River and transitional housing at Reach for Home, and the usage of Badger Park.

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The residents of the South and River Area have not been on the City Council recently.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 10, 2025 2:09 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email *Field not completed.*

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: Fitch Mountain

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? East of University Ave., North of Matheson and Fitch Mountain Road, South of Sunnyvale

4. Are the public services (bus lines, *Field not completed.*

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Single Family Houses

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

The Fitch Mountain Area is a community of interest for the following reasons: 1) Special fire risk to due to urban/wildland interface and risk of fire blowing from east to west; 2) Special seismic risk due to Healdsburg Fault/Rogers Creek Fault running through the geographic boundary of community of interest. 3) Affected by usage of Fitch Mountain Open Space, Tayman Park, Recreation Park, and Villa Chanticleer

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The Fitch Mountain area community skews white, which enables other districts to skew more Hispanic

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 15, 2025 4:58 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## Community of Interest Form

First Name Marie

Last Name Butler

Email [REDACTED]

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? Parkland Farms

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: Mostly single family homes. Barbieri Park is a popular, common area. Common interests are the park's expansion, and there are concerns about increased growth and the traffic that brings on the north end of town. Another access road is needed for emergencies. A plus is the new fire substation.

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? We are bordered by Healdsburg Ave., the open space, Montage, Rosewood Ave. Further north is also Enso.

4. Are the public services (bus lines, There is a city bus. The county bus runs by on Healdsburg Ave.

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community?

Mostly single family homes. Some small businesses on Healdsburg Ave.  
Enso and Montage to the north.  
Senior housing by Rosewood.

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Parkland Farms Blvd. is a logical demarcation line. Rosewood area could be included, too. Healdsburg Avenue is also a natural line.  
Healdsburg Ave. needs repairs. The potholes were supposed to be fixed "after Montage," then "after Enso." Sometimes it feels like the north end is neglected.  
Cars speed. If Healdsburg is to be more "walkable," then it needs to be more pedestrian friendly, too.

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community?

Good neighborhood. People look out for each other.  
Concern is for more roads/access out of the community in case of fires. I believe that is a goal of the city, after Barbieri park is further developed.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Raina Allan**

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2025 12:38 PM  
**To:** Raina Allan  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Online Form Submittal: Community of Interest Form

**[CAUTION:]** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## Community of Interest Form

First Name *Field not completed.*

Last Name *Field not completed.*

Email 

Providing personal contact information is optional. If you provide an email address, we will send you updates on the process.

1. What is the neighborhood/zip code where you reside? 95448

2. How do you describe your community? What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important: see answers in #6.

3. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries/features (streets, freeways, parks, etc.)? Three Senior Communities located east of Badger Park, bordering the river on other south side and South Fitch Mountain Road on the north.

4. Are the public services (bus lines, *Field not completed.*

Attachment: Community of Interest Forms (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

libraries, public schools, etc.) that help identify your community?

5. What type of homes (single family houses, apartments, condos, mobile homes, etc.) largely make up your community? single family homes

6. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council redistricting process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community. 1. susceptibility to fires ans subsequesnt evacuations 2.development of Badger park 3. development of the current Syar Property 4. lack of downtown parking and affordable shopping

7. What else would you like to tell us about your community? The three senior communities border each other and are communities that have an HOA.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

SHENKMAN &amp; HUGHES, PC

Attorneys

Malibu, California

28905 Wight Road  
Malibu, California 90265  
(310) 457-0970[kishenkman@shenkmanhughes.com](mailto:kishenkman@shenkmanhughes.com)

RECEIVED

OCT -3 2024

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

September 28, 2024

CITY OF HEALDSBURG

Raina Allan- City Clerk  
City of Healdsburg  
401 Grove Street  
Healdsburg, CA 95448*Re: Violation of California Voting Rights Act*

I write on behalf of Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, its members residing within the City of Healdsburg (“Healdsburg” or “City”). Healdsburg relies upon an at-large election system for electing candidates to its governing board. Moreover, voting within the City is racially polarized, resulting in minority vote dilution, and, therefore, the City’s at-large elections violate the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (“CVRA”).

The CVRA disfavors the use of so-called “at-large” voting – an election method that permits voters of an entire jurisdiction to elect candidates to each open seat. *See generally Sanchez v. City of Modesto* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 660, 667 (“*Sanchez*”). For example, if the U.S. Congress were elected through a nationwide at-large election, rather than through typical single-member districts, each voter could cast up to 435 votes and vote for any candidate in the country, not just the candidates in the voter’s district, and the 435 candidates receiving the most nationwide votes would be elected. At-large elections thus allow a bare majority of voters to control *every* seat, not just the seats in a particular district or a proportional majority of seats.

Voting rights advocates have targeted “at-large” election schemes for decades, because they often result in “vote dilution,” or the impairment of minority groups’ ability to elect their preferred candidates or influence the outcome of elections, which occurs when the electorate votes in a racially polarized manner. *See Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 46 (1986) (“*Gingles*”). The U.S. Supreme Court “has long recognized that multi-member districts and at-large voting schemes may operate to minimize or cancel out the voting strength” of minorities. *Id.* at 47; *see also id.* at 48, fn. 14 (at-large elections may also cause elected officials to “ignore [minority] interests without fear of political consequences”), citing *Rogers v. Lodge*, 458 U.S. 613, 623 (1982); *White v. Register*, 412 U.S. 755, 769 (1973).

Attachment: Exhibit A (4779 : Public Hearing #4 - District Elections)

September 28, 2024

Page 2 of 4

“[T]he majority, by virtue of its numerical superiority, will regularly defeat the choices of minority voters.” *Gingles*, at 47. When racially polarized voting occurs, dividing the political unit into single-member districts, or some other appropriate remedy, may facilitate a minority group's ability to elect its preferred representatives. *Rogers*, at 616.

Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act (“FVRA”), 42 U.S.C. § 1973, which Congress enacted in 1965 and amended in 1982, targets, among other things, at-large election schemes. *Gingles* at 37; see also Boyd & Markman, *The 1982 Amendments to the Voting Rights Act: A Legislative History* (1983) 40 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 1347, 1402. Although enforcement of the FVRA was successful in many states, California was an exception. By enacting the CVRA, “[t]he Legislature intended to expand protections against vote dilution over those provided by the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.” *Jauregui v. City of Palmdale* (2014) 226 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 781, 808. Thus, while the CVRA is similar to the FVRA in several respects, it is also different in several key respects, as the Legislature sought to remedy what it considered “restrictive interpretations given to the federal act.” Assem. Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 976 (2001-2002 Reg. Sess.) as amended Apr. 9, 2002, p. 2.

The California Legislature dispensed with the requirement in *Gingles* that a minority group demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a “majority-minority district.” *Sanchez*, at 669. In *Pico Neighborhood Association v. City of Santa Monica* (August 24, 2023) 15 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 292, the California Supreme Court recently confirmed this commonsense reading of the CVRA. Also see Assem. Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 976 (2001–2002 Reg. Sess.) as amended Apr. 9, 2002, p. 3 (“Thus, this bill puts the voting rights horse (the discrimination issue) back where it sensibly belongs in front of the cart (what type of remedy is appropriate once racially polarized voting has been shown).”)

To establish a violation of the CVRA, a plaintiff must generally show that “racially polarized voting occurs in elections for members of the governing body of the political subdivision or in elections incorporating other electoral choices by the voters of the political subdivision.” Elec. Code § 14028(a). The CVRA specifies the elections that are most probative: “elections in which at least one candidate is a member of a protected class or elections involving ballot measures, or other electoral choices that affect the rights and privileges of members of a protected class.” Elec. Code § 14028(a). The CVRA also makes clear that “[e]lections conducted prior to the filing of an action ... are more probative to establish the existence of racially polarized voting than elections conducted after the filing of the action.” *Id.*

Factors other than “racially polarized voting” that are required to make out a claim under the FVRA – under the “totality of the circumstances” test – “are probative, but not necessary factors to establish a violation of” the CVRA. Elec. Code § 14028(e). These “other factors”

September 28, 2024

Page 3 of 4

include “the history of discrimination, the use of electoral devices or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the dilutive effects of at-large elections, denial of access to those processes determining which groups of candidates will receive financial or other support in a given election, the extent to which members of a protected class bear the effects of past discrimination in areas such as education, employment, and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process, and the use of overt or subtle racial appeals in political campaigns.” *Id.*

As of the most recent data released by the United States Census Department, Latinos comprise 34.6%, of the City’s population of 11,340. Yet, Latino representation on the City’s governing board has been sparse and fleeting to non-existent. The City’s at-large system dilutes the ability of Latinos (a “protected class”) – to elect candidates of their choice or otherwise influence the outcome of the City’s elections.

In light of the City’s underrepresentation of Latinos, it is no wonder why Latino residents do not emerge as candidates. In most elections over the past two decades, there appears to have been no Latino candidates for the Healdsburg City Council. Even when Latinos have been appointed to the council, they do not subsequently seek election to the same office to which they were appointed. And, in the very rare instance where a Black Latina was elected, she resigned due to hostility to her service both within Healdsburg’s city government and among the city’s electorate more generally. Opponents of fair, district-based elections may attempt to attribute the lack of Latino candidates to a lack of interest from the Latino community within Healdsburg. On the contrary, the virtual absence of Latino candidates reveals vote dilution. *See Westwego Citizens for Better Government v. City of Westwego*, 872 F. 2d 1201, 1208-1209, n. 9 (5th Cir. 1989).

The City’s election history is further illustrative. In the 2022 election, for example, Matias Lopez Jr. lost his bid for a seat on the Council despite significant support from Latino voters, due to a lack of support from non-Latino voters. This falls in line with what the U.S. Supreme Court has identified as racially polarized voting. (See *Thornburg v. Gingles* (1986) 478 U.S. 30, 80-81, appendix A [affirming finding of racially polarized voting in House District 39, where black candidate received 29% and 36% support from black voters, and 8% and 18% from white voters in two successive elections].)

At-large elections are well known to cause elected officials to “ignore [minority] interests without fear of political consequences.” (*Gingles* 478 U.S. at 48, n. 14). The remarks in June 2020, in the wake of George Floyd’s murder, by the then-mayor and then-mayor-pro-tem – in refusing the request of another councilmember to discuss the use of force by Healdsburg police, is emblematic of the unresponsiveness to the minority community that at-large elections breed. At that time, the Press Democrat called those remarks “one more example of white blindness in the face of overwhelming evidence of systemic bias and racism.”

September 28, 2024  
Page 4 of 4

As you may be aware, in 2012, we sued the City of Palmdale for violating the CVRA. After an eight-day trial, we prevailed. After spending millions of dollars, a district-based remedy was ultimately imposed upon the Palmdale city council, with districts that combine all incumbents into one of the four districts.

Given the racially polarized elections for the city council in Healdsburg, we urge the City to voluntarily change its at-large system of electing its City Council. Otherwise, on behalf of residents within the jurisdiction, we will be forced to seek judicial relief. Please advise us no later than November 18, 2024 as to whether you would like to discuss a voluntary change to your current at-large system.

We look forward to your response.


Very truly yours,



Kevin I. Shenkman

Sherman & Hughes  
28905 Wight Rd.  
Malibu, CA 90265

**CERTIFIED MAIL®**



7022 1670 0002 9872 2081

Ruina Allan - City Clerk  
City of Healdsburg  
401 Grove St.  
Healdsburg, CA 95448



RDC 99



95448

FCM LETTER  
MALIBU, CA 90265  
SEP 30, 2024

**\$9.68**

S2324P500967-12



9544834723 R004