

**Mendocino County  
2021 Redistricting Hearing #3  
November 9, 2021  
Board of Supervisors**



***Presented By:***

***Kyle Farmer, Chair ARC***

***Leif Farr, GIS Administrator***

***Cherie Johnson, Deputy Chief Executive Officer***

***Charlotte E. Scott, Assistant County Counsel***

# Today's Presentation

- ▶ Draft Map Process and Upcoming deadlines (staff)
- ▶ Redistricting criteria summary (staff)
- ▶ Public Comment Themes/Communities of Interest
- ▶ Recommended Map(s) from the Advisory Redistricting Commission presented by ARC Chair Kyle Farmer and Leif Farr, GIS Administrator

# Draft Map Process

- ▶ ARC has held 8 public workshops since September 1, 2021
- ▶ The Official State adjusted P.L. 94-171 Decennial 2020 Census data was released in early October, 2021 (with required one week waiting period for drafting maps)
- ▶ On October 20, October 27 and November 3, Draft Maps were reviewed and refined with the assistance of GIS Administrator Leif Farr based on public comment, communities of interest, and in light of the required redistricting criteria
- ▶ On November 3, ARC recommended 2 Maps (preferred map, Draft 10, followed by Draft 9) for consideration by the Board of Supervisors today
- ▶ **The maps are still in draft form. The public may continue to provide input to the Board of Supervisors, or to [redistricting@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:redistricting@mendocinocounty.org)**
- ▶ **The Board of Supervisors may provide direction on map modifications today.**

# Upcoming Deadlines

- ▶ November 9 Board of Supervisors – Public Hearing #3 - review draft maps recommended by ARC, identify preferred map with any requested revisions
- ▶ November 10 Staff to Publish Final (*or Revised*) Map
- ▶ November 18 Board of Supervisors – Public Hearing #4 – approve final map
- ▶ November 30 Staff to Publish Final Map
- ▶ December 7 Board of Supervisors Public Hearing #5 – Introduce Ordinance to Adopt Final Map
- ▶ December 14 Board of Supervisors – Adopt Ordinance via consent (second reading)
- ▶ December 15 Statutory Deadline to Adopt Map



# Required Redistricting Criteria

**Equal Population** Apportionment according to population is required by the US constitution and State law for supervisorial redistricting.

One Person-One Vote: The United States Constitution guarantees the right to vote and that every vote be weighted equally.

14<sup>th</sup> Amendment – "The Equal Protection Clause demands no less than substantially equal state legislative representation for all citizens, of all places, as well as of all races." – (*Reynolds v. Sims* (1964) 377 U.S. 533, 568)

California Election Code section 21500(a) . . .the board shall adopt boundaries for all of the supervisorial districts of the county so that **the supervisorial districts shall be substantially equal in population as required by the United States Constitution.**

The U.S. Supreme Court recognizes minor deviation from equal population may be necessary to permit other legitimate objectives and has found that, as a general matter, **a plan with a maximum population deviation under 10% falls within the category of minor deviations from the one-person, one-vote principle.** (*Brown v. Thompson* (1983) 462 U.S. 835, 842-843).

**Current (2011) maps indicate 14.7% deviation between least populated district (D4) and most populated district (D3)**



# Required Redistricting Criteria

**Federal Voting Rights Act** – Prohibits drafting districts which dilute racial and language minority voting rights by denying them an equal opportunity to nominate and elect candidates of their choice.

California Election Code section 21500(b) The board shall adopt supervisorial district boundaries that comply with the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, and the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.

**Is there a large and geographically compact minority population in the County that might constitute a majority\* in a single member district (greater than 50%)?**

If YES then must prevent packing and cracking and create majority-minority districts to allow minority population(s) to elect their preferred candidate

If NO, may not consider race/ethnicity as predominant factor to draw lines

\* Must consider citizen voting age minority populations

**Mendocino County does not have a large, geographically compact minority population that could comprise more than 50% of any one district.**



# Ranked State Criteria

California Election Code Section 21500(c)(1)-(5) The BOS shall adopt supervisorial district boundaries using the following criteria in the following order of priority:

1. **Geographically Contiguous:** Keeping districts from jumping around
2. **Minimize Division of Local Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest** “A population that shares common social or economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation.” COI’s do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates Elec. Code 21500(c)(2)
3. **Geographic Integrity of Cities and CDPs**
4. **Easily Identifiable Boundaries:** Natural or Artificial
5. **Geographic Compactness:** trying to maintain areas so not bypassing nearby populated areas in favor of more distant areas

**Prohibited from considering Political Parties.** Elec. Code 21500(d)





# Public Comment Themes/ Communities of Interest

- ▶ Keep Mendocino in D5 or Favor No Change to D4/D5 Boundaries (65+ comments)
  - ▶ Don't split Caspar (22); Extend D5 North to 409/Caspar Creek (<5);
- ▶ Keep Laytonville in D3 (50+ comments)
  - ▶ Keep Laytonville connected to Covelo up to Trinity County line (7); Keep Laytonville connected to greater Willits (<5); Connect Laytonville to Leggett (6); Do not split tribal communities/Round Valley (<5)
- ▶ Move Hopland to D1 (25+ comments)
  - ▶ Transfer some from D1 to D5 to balance(<5); Keep greater Hopland from Duncan Peak to Old River Road to Hwy 175 together(<5); Keep Hopland connected to main stem Russian River areas and move to D1 (<5)
- ▶ Add City of Ukiah-adjacent urban (and western hills) areas to D2
- ▶ Make D5 more coastal/more compact
- ▶ **Draft Map 10 and 9 follow the above themes and COI testimony to the extent possible within the maximum 10% total deviation permitted from the "substantially equal population"/one-person one vote mandate**



# ARC Recommended Maps

- ▶ The Advisory Redistricting Commission recommends Draft 10 (followed by Draft 9) based on consideration of required criteria and public comment themes/communities of interest