

MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Directors, North Marin Water District

February 12, 2022

From: Drew McIntyre, General Manager
Morgan Biggerstaff, BPMNJ
Tom Willis, Olson Remcho LLP

Subject: Redistricting Process Public Hearing No. 2 – Review and Receive Public Input on Proposed Map; Consider Adopting Resolution 22-XX Affirming the Current Electoral Division Boundaries, as Established in Ordinance No. 38, Shall Continue to Remain In Effect for the Next Decade

t:\gm\california voting rights act cvra- 2021\california voting rights act - 2021\staff report for 2.15.22 - or comments (00457802xae03)_bpmnj_final.docx

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Solicit Public Input and Consider Adopting Resolution 22-XX

FINANCIAL IMPACT: None at this time

Background

On August 6, 2019, the Board of Directors (Board) adopted corrected Ordinance No. 38 to transition from an at-large to a division-based election system in conformance with the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (“CVRA”). The director elections (for divisions 2, 3, and 4) in November 2020 were held under the new by-division election system.

Pursuant to California Elections Code Section 22000 *et seq.*, the Board must review its electoral division boundaries following the federal census that occurs every ten years, identify any significant demographic changes, and adjust the boundaries as necessary consistent with the US Constitution, Federal and State laws. In adjusting those boundaries, the Board is required to draw divisions that meet the following legal requirements:

- Each division shall contain nearly equal population, with any deviations justified by other traditional redistricting criteria.
- Each division shall be drawn in a manner that complies with the state and federal Constitutions, the Federal Voting Rights Act, and state law.
- Consistent with the principles established by the United States Supreme Court in *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), divisions shall not be drawn with race as the predominant factor.

- Each division shall be contiguous, meaning that there are no islands or parts of the division that are not attached to the whole.

Elections Code Section 22000 provides that the Board of Directors may also take into consideration the following factors: (1) topography, (2) geography, (3) cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity and compactness of territory, and (4) community of interests of the division. Essentially, these criteria mean that the Board may consider:

- Keeping communities of interest, such as neighborhoods, school district boundaries, etc., undivided by a division boundary, to the extent feasible.
- Respecting visible natural and man-made geographical and topographical features when drawing division boundaries, as much as possible.
- Having compactness of divisions, including their shape and appearance.
- Identifying changes to the housing stock, including areas of population growth, if any, since lines were drawn in 2019, keeping in mind, however, that divisions will have to contain nearly equal population based on the 2020 Census data.
- Including public facilities in each division, to the extent feasible.
- Including commercial interests in each division, to the extent feasible.

The additional criteria may or may not be applicable or appropriate in the District's service area. The community should be encouraged to provide input on some or all of these additional criteria and may also provide input on or suggest other criteria not mentioned above.

On December 7, 2021, the Board received a report from staff and legal counsel regarding the 2020 Census data in which the District's demographer (Redistricting Partners) indicated the 2020 Census data did not reveal significant population shifts that require adjustments in division lines. In fact, the 2020 Census data indicated improved population balance among the District's five electoral divisions, meaning that the current districts as drafted comply with the constitutional requirement that the districts have equal population. The relevant standard is that a plan with total deviation of less than 10% among all districts is presumed constitutional. The current total deviation among all districts using 2020 census data is 7.7%, well within the constitutional standard. As a result, the Board directed staff to post the District's current electoral division boundaries map as the proposed draft map for the redistricting public hearings.

The Board also directed staff and legal counsel to prepare materials and invite the public to provide input on the possibility of re-adopting the current electoral divisions map. The Board set two (2) virtual public hearings where the Board would receive and respond to public comments, instruct the demographer and special counsel on any revisions to the draft map, and subsequently consider adoption of a final electoral division map. The Board approved the following schedule:

Redistricting Process Timeline

DATE	EVENT	COMMENT
Tuesday, January 18, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.	1st Public Hearing (Regular Meeting).	Public hearing to receive public comments; instruct counsel and demographer on any further draft maps, if any.
Tuesday, February 15, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.	2nd Public Hearing (Regular Meeting).	Public hearing to receive public comment; Respond to comments (if any); Board vote to adopt final map of Electoral Divisions.

On January 18, 2022, the Board held the first public hearing on redistricting. Prior to the meeting, staff posted the proposed map on the District’s website. The Board received public comment and discussed the draft map. The Board did not instruct special counsel or the demographer to revise the draft map or provide any additional draft maps.

Public Outreach

The redistricting process is informed by public input. To support the public in providing input, District staff developed a public outreach strategy to help inform the public on division-based elections and to encourage and obtain feedback and input, using the following methods:

- Established a dedicated web page on the District’s website to provide information regarding the 2021 redistricting process; and
- Posted ongoing social media outreach to Facebook, Twitter, and Nextdoor; and
- Issued a press release to both the Marin IJ and Point Reyes Light newspapers to inform residents and businesses in the District’s service areas about how they can participate in the process; and
- Published public notices in the Marin IJ and Point Reyes Light newspapers to inform residents and businesses in the District’s service areas about how they can participate in the process.

As a result of its public outreach, on February 9, 2022, the District received two alternative draft maps from a member of the public, Mr. Zachary Griggy. Those alternative draft maps have been digitized by the District's demographer to provide the Board and public the same data as has been presented with the District's proposed map. These two alternative draft maps are included with this staff report. If the Board wishes to adopt one of these publicly-submitted draft maps as the District's final map, it would have to hold one additional public hearing on the map before adopting the map. The Board must adopt the final map by April 17, 2022.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Board receive a summary presentation by Redistricting Partners and legal counsel, and subsequently solicit public input as part of the second public hearing. After closing the public hearing, the Board may consider adoption of Resolution 22-XX affirming the District's current electoral division boundaries, as established in Ordinance No. 38, shall continue to remain in effect for the next decade.

Attachments

- Attachment 1 – Redistricting Partners PowerPoint Presentation
- Attachment 2 – Resolution 22-XX
- Attachment 3 – North Marin Water District's Proposed Draft Electoral Division Boundaries Map
- Attachments 4 and 5 – Two Publicly-Submitted Alternative Draft Maps



North Marin Water District


Redistricting 101

December 7, 2021

Overview

This presentation will cover a range of topics and expand on the technical aspects of the redistricting process.

- Current District Population
- What is Districting/Redistricting?
- Traditional Redistricting Principles
- Redistricting Process & Public Input



2010 Census

	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 5
Population	12,890	12,300	12,451	12,158	11,739
Deviation	582	-8	143	-150	-569
Deviation %	4.7%	-0.1%	1.2%	-1.2%	-4.6%
Other	11,011	7,709	9,482	8,210	7,822
Other %	85.4%	62.7%	76.2%	67.5%	66.6%
Latino	1,050	7,001	1,055	2,000	2,722
Latino %	8.2%	56.9%	8.5%	16.5%	23.2%
Asian					830
Asian %	3.8%	6.9%	6.6%	5.9%	7.1%
Black	133	462	190	342	365
Black %	1.0%	3.8%	1.5%	2.8%	3.1%

Total Deviation of 9.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 5
Total CVAP	9,292	7,531	8,508	7,975	7,737
Other CVAP	8,194	5,996	6,973	6,843	5,810
Other CVAP %	88.2%	79.6%	82.0%	85.8%	75.1%
Latino CVAP	633	738	790	438	1,165
Latino CVAP %	6.8%	9.8%	9.3%	5.5%	15.1%
Asian CVAP	333	613	622	438	504
Asian CVAP %	3.6%	8.1%	7.3%	5.5%	6.5%
Black CVAP	133	184	123	256	258
Black CVAP %	1.4%	2.4%	1.5%	3.2%	3.3%

2020 Census

	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 5
Population	13,180	12,321	13,076	12,535	12,202
Deviation	517	-342	413	-128	-461
Deviation %	4.1%	-2.7%	3.3%	-1.0%	-3.6%
Other	10,722	7,201	9,384	7,754	7,479
Other %	81.4%	58.4%	71.8%	61.9%	61.3%
Latino	1,878	7,500	2,501	7,500	3,372
Latino %	14.3%	60.9%	19.1%	60.2%	27.6%
Asian					1,074
Asian %	4.7%	8.0%	6.7%	5.9%	8.8%
Black	157	433	220	342	277
Black %	1.2%	3.5%	1.7%	2.7%	2.3%

Total Deviation of 7.7%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 5
Total CVAP	10,026	9,096	10,051	9,641	8,340
Other CVAP	8,754	6,800	8,219	7,985	6,636
Other CVAP %	87.3%	74.8%	81.8%	82.8%	79.6%
Latino CVAP	676	836	1,217	931	896
Latino CVAP %	6.7%	9.2%	12.1%	9.7%	10.7%
Asian CVAP	549	845	557	477	522
Asian CVAP %	5.5%	9.3%	5.5%	4.9%	6.3%
Black CVAP	47	616	59	249	285
Black CVAP %	0.5%	6.8%	0.6%	2.6%	3.4%

What is Redistricting?

Redistricting is the process of adjusting district lines every 10 years after the release of the U.S. Census. The well-known examples are Congress and the Legislature.

Within the U.S., redistricting has become an extremely politicized process and has been the subject of more high-profile Supreme Court decisions than any other part of our elections system.

What is Redistricting?

Redistricting is at its core the act of equalizing population among districts.

This is necessary in order to meet two requirements - one constitutional, one from Supreme Court precedent:

- *Equal Representation (14th Amendment)* - how effective any resident can be at advocating for themselves or being represented within a jurisdiction.
- *One Person One Vote* - equal ability to elect a candidate of choice.

Redistricting Principles

Federal law and the Elections Code § 22000 define criteria
Special Districts consider when redistricting:


- Relatively equal population - people, not citizens
- Voting Rights Act
- *Shaw v. Reno*
- Topography
- Geography
- Cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity and compactness
- Community of interests

Equal Population

Utilizing the U.S. Census Decennial File

What is “equal” population has been a key subject in redistricting litigation.

- Population Equality is based on “People” not citizens or voters or other metrics.
- The metric used is called “deviation” which is a measure of how close a district is to equal size.



Voting Rights

Voting Rights Act (1965)

- Must draw districts to ensure minority groups' ability to elect candidates of choice
- Requires majority-minority districts

Shaw v. Reno (1993)

- Districts cannot be drawn with race as the predominant factor

Local Government Lines

The existing underlying governmental structure

Water Districts often have a geographic relationship with the cities and communities they serve.

- Underlying City Boundaries
- Unincorporated County areas, that are often rural and agricultural areas

Contiguity

Two definitions for what is contiguous

Contiguity should be thought of as “literal” and “functional.”

1. An area that is one whole piece is “literally contiguous.”
2. An area that represents how the population or how people are connected is “functionally contiguous.”



Compactness

Determining what is “compact”

The measure of compactness can get complicated.

- Ratio of the circumference of a district and the area of a district.
- Measuring the number of distinct straight lines and the number of kinks and bends.
- Simply outlawing funny shapes.

**NOT
COMPACT**





Compactness

Determining what is “compact”

California has a rather elegant/simple definition.

- Not bypassing nearby populated areas in favor of more distant populated areas



Communities of Interest

A community of interest is defined as:

“a contiguous population which shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation.” Cal. Const. art. XXI, § 2(d)(4).

- **Examples:**
 - Senior Citizens or Students
 - Downtown / Urban
 - Rural or Agricultural
 - Homeowners or Renters

Communities of Interest

Bringing like people together for representation

What are you looking for in trying to judge the applicability of a Community of Interest to the redistricting process?

- Group with shared culture / characteristics
- Geographic Nature / Density / Ability to be mapped
- Relationship to Agency / Policies

Additional Redistricting Rules

Optional, Additional Criteria

Water Districts often expand beyond these traditional principles. Examples can include:

- Taking into consideration future growth
- Balancing the rural / urban interface between districts

North Marin Water District Redistricting

Timeline for Upcoming Meetings

December 7 th	Redistricting 101 Presentation Consideration of Current Plan & 2020 Census
January 15 th	Hearing #1 Consideration of Draft Maps and Current Map Public Hearing to receive input
February 18 th	Hearing #2 Public Hearing to receive input Approval of Final Map



**REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS**

RESOLUTION NO. 22-XX

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NORTH MARIN WATER DISTRICT
AFFIRMING THAT THE DISTRICT'S CURRENT ELECTORAL DIVISION BOUNDARIES, AS
ESTABLISHED IN DISTRICT ORDINANCE NO. 38, SHALL CONTINUE TO REMAIN IN
EFFECT FOR THE NEXT DECADE**

WHEREAS, at a duly held public hearing on August 6, 2019, and pursuant to California Elections Code Section 10010, the Board of Directors of North Marin Water District (Board) adopted corrected Ordinance No. 38 to transition from an at-large to a by-division election system in conformance with the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 ("CVRA") and based on the 2010 Census data; and

WHEREAS, in the by-division election system, a candidate for the Board must live in the division which he or she wishes to represent, and only the voters of that division are entitled to vote to decide who their representative will be; and

WHEREAS, the North Marin Water District (District) currently elects its Directors using this by-division election system with five (5) distinct election divisions (Divisions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) comprising its service areas; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Elections Code Section 22000, the District must review its electoral division boundaries following the year in which each decennial census is taken, identify any significant demographic changes, and adjust the boundaries as necessary consistent with the US and State Constitutions, and Federal and State laws; and

WHEREAS, the 2020 Decennial Census was conducted and the final Census data was made available in September 2021; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Elections Code 22001, the District shall hold at least one (1) public hearing at which the public is invited to provide input regarding the composition of the election divisions before adopting, at a public hearing, updated boundaries of each division; and

WHEREAS, at the regular Board meeting on December 7, 2021, the Board received a report from its demographer regarding the 2020 Census data indicating improved population balance among the District's five electoral divisions (meaning that the current electoral divisions as drafted comply with the constitutional requirement that the divisions have equal population), and subsequently directed staff and legal counsel to prepare materials and invite the public to provide input on the possibility of affirming the current electoral divisions boundaries shall continue; and

WHEREAS, on December 22, 2021, the District launched a dedicated web page to provide information regarding the redistricting process and the proposal to consider affirming that the current electoral divisions boundaries shall continue, and also posted similar information on social media platforms; and

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2021, the District issued press releases to the Marin Independent Journal and the Point Reyes Light informing the public of two public hearings on redistricting (one on January 18, 2022, and one on February 15, 2022) and inviting local residents and businesses to participate in the process; and

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2022, the District published notice of public hearings in the Point Reyes Light, and January 7, 2022, the District published notice of public hearings in the Marin Independent Journal; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing on January 18, 2022, the Board received public input regarding the current composition of the District divisions and the proposal to affirm that the current electoral division boundaries shall continue; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing on February 15, 2022, the Board of Directors considered all oral and written information, testimony, and comments received during the public review process, including information received at the public hearings, oral and written reports from District staff and the District's demographer, exhibits, maps, and all other pertinent information prior to considering affirming that the current electoral division boundaries shall continue.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the North Marin Water District as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct and hereby incorporated into this Resolution.
2. After considering all oral and written information, testimony, and comments received during the public review process, including information received at the public hearings, oral and written reports from District staff and the District's demographer, exhibits, maps, and all other pertinent information, the Board of Directors of North Marin Water District hereby determines the District's current electoral division boundaries are consistent with the US and State Constitutions, and Federal and State laws.
3. The Board of Directors of North Marin Water District hereby affirms that the current electoral division boundaries of the District, as established in District Ordinance No. 38, shall continue to remain in effect for the next decade.

* * * * *

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted by the Board of Directors of NORTH MARIN WATER DISTRICT at a regular meeting of said Board held on the 15th day of February 2022 by the following vote:


AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

Theresa Kehoe, Secretary
North Marin Water District



2020 Census


	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 5
Population	13,180	12,321	13,076	12,535	12,202
Deviation	517	-342	413	-128	-461
Deviation %	4.1%	-2.7%	3.3%	-1.0%	-3.6%
Other	10,722	7,201	9,384	7,754	7,479
Other %	81.4%	58.4%	71.8%	61.9%	61.3%
Latino	1,678	3,706	2,591	3,702	3,372
Latino %	12.7%	30.1%	19.8%	29.5%	27.6%
Asian	623	981	881	737	1,074
Asian %	4.7%	8.0%	6.7%	5.9%	8.8%
Black	157	433	220	342	277
Black %	1.2%	3.5%	1.7%	2.7%	2.3%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 5
Total CVAP	9,844	9,427	10,530	9,423	8,749
Other CVAP	8,576	6,799	8,497	7,761	6,864
Other CVAP %	87.1%	72.1%	80.7%	82.4%	78.5%
Latino CVAP	608	1,000	1,277	851	1,125
Latino CVAP %	6.2%	10.6%	12.1%	9.0%	12.9%
Asian CVAP	547	851	499	566	593
Asian CVAP %	5.6%	9.0%	4.7%	6.0%	6.8%
Black CVAP	113	777	257	245	167
Black CVAP %	1.1%	8.2%	2.4%	2.6%	1.9%

ATTACHMENTS 4 AND 5

(Publicly-Submitted, Alternative Maps of Electoral Division Boundaries)




2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	13,424	12,731	12,368	12,505	12,325
Deviation	753	60	-303	-166	-346
Deviation %	5.9%	0.5%	-2.4%	-1.3%	-2.7%
Other	10,271	10,066	5,924	8,766	7,554
Other %	76.5%	79.1%	47.9%	70.1%	61.3%
Latino	2,030	2,025	4,921	2,683	3,388
Latino %	15.1%	15.9%	39.8%	21.5%	27.5%
Asian	936	521	1,055	816	968
Asian %	7.0%	4.1%	8.5%	6.5%	7.9%
Black	187	119	468	240	415
Black %	1.4%	0.9%	3.8%	1.9%	3.4%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	11,218	9,985	7,811	9,541	9,462
Other CVAP	9,351	8,926	5,576	7,665	7,023
Other CVAP %	83.4%	89.4%	71.4%	80.3%	74.2%
Latino CVAP	1,050	654	1,413	804	940
Latino CVAP %	9.4%	6.5%	18.1%	8.4%	9.9%
Asian CVAP	601	272	576	776	831
Asian CVAP %	5.4%	2.7%	7.4%	8.1%	8.8%
Black CVAP	216	133	246	296	668
Black CVAP %	1.9%	1.3%	3.1%	3.1%	7.1%



District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,424	753	5.9%	10,271	76.5%	2,030	15.1%	936	7.0%	187	1.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
11,218	9,351	83.4%	1,050	9.4%	601	5.4%	216	1.9%		



District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,731	60	0.5%	10,066	79.1%	2,025	15.9%	521	4.1%	119	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
9,985	8,926	89.4%	654	6.5%	272	2.7%	133	1.3%		



District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,368	-303	-2.4%	5,924	47.9%	4,921	39.8%	1,055	8.5%	468	3.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
7,811	5,576	71.4%	1,413	18.1%	576	7.4%	246	3.1%		



District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,505	-166	-1.3%	8,766	70.1%	2,683	21.5%	816	6.5%	240	1.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
9,541	7,665	80.3%	804	8.4%	776	8.1%	296	3.1%		


District 5




2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,325	-346	-2.7%	7,554	61.3%	3,388	27.5%	968	7.9%	415	3.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
9,462	7,023	74.2%	940	9.9%	831	8.8%	668	7.1%		






2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	13,389	12,766	12,368	12,505	12,325
Deviation	718	95	-303	-166	-346
Deviation %	5.7%	0.7%	-2.4%	-1.3%	-2.7%
Other	10,191	10,146	5,924	8,766	7,554
Other %	76.1%	79.5%	47.9%	70.1%	61.3%
Latino	2,133	1,922	4,921	2,683	3,388
Latino %	15.9%	15.1%	39.8%	21.5%	27.5%
Asian	876	581	1,055	816	968
Asian %	6.5%	4.6%	8.5%	6.5%	7.9%
Black	189	117	468	240	415
Black %	1.4%	0.9%	3.8%	1.9%	3.4%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	11,670	9,533	7,811	9,541	9,462
Other CVAP	10,033	8,244	5,576	7,665	7,023
Other CVAP %	86.0%	86.5%	71.4%	80.3%	74.2%
Latino CVAP	898	806	1,413	804	940
Latino CVAP %	7.7%	8.5%	18.1%	8.4%	9.9%
Asian CVAP	446	427	576	776	831
Asian CVAP %	3.8%	4.5%	7.4%	8.1%	8.8%
Black CVAP	293	56	246	296	668
Black CVAP %	2.5%	0.6%	3.1%	3.1%	7.1%



District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
13,389	718	5.7%	10,191	76.1%	2,133	15.9%	876	6.5%	189	1.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
11,670	10,033	86.0%	898	7.7%	446	3.8%	293	2.5%		



District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,766	95	0.7%	10,146	79.5%	1,922	15.1%	581	4.6%	117	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
9,533	8,244	86.5%	806	8.5%	427	4.5%	56	0.6%		



District 3







2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,368	-303	-2.4%	5,924	47.9%	4,921	39.8%	1,055	8.5%	468	3.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
7,811	5,576	71.4%	1,413	18.1%	576	7.4%	246	3.1%		


District 4

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,505	-166	-1.3%	8,766	70.1%	2,683	21.5%	816	6.5%	240	1.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
9,541	7,665	80.3%	804	8.4%	776	8.1%	296	3.1%		



District 5



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
12,325	-346	-2.7%	7,554	61.3%	3,388	27.5%	968	7.9%	415	3.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
9,462	7,023	74.2%	940	9.9%	831	8.8%	668	7.1%		