



Coastside Fire Protection District

STAFF REPORT

TO: Honorable Board of Directors

FROM: Kai Ruess, Deputy District Counsel

CC: Jean Savaree, District Counsel
Jonathan Cox, Deputy Fire Chief

DATE: April 13, 2022

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE COASTSIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT PROVIDING FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE FIRE BOARD BY DISTRICT, ESTABLISHING THE BOUNDARIES AND IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF EACH DISTRICT, AND ESTABLISHING THE ELECTION ORDER OF EACH DISTRICT; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15378, 15601(b)(3)

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Board of Directors conduct a public hearing on the proposed Urgency Ordinance establishing districts by which members of the Board will be elected and adopt the proposed Urgency Ordinance by 4/5 vote of the Board so that the by-district election system and associated district map take effect in advance of the November 2022 election.

Background

Since the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) was enacted in 2002, cities and special districts throughout the State have received demand letters, requiring that those cities/special districts move to “by-district” elections to avoid a lawsuit alleging a violation of the CVRA. In response to these demand letters, the County of San Mateo, City of Redwood City, City of San Mateo, City of Burlingame, City of San Bruno, City of Menlo Park and other cities and special districts in San Mateo County have transitioned to “by-district” election systems. On February 9, 2021, the District received a demand letter, and on March 24, 2021, the Board responded by approving a Resolution of Intent to transition the Fire District to by-district elections in time for the November 2022 election. Under a “by-district” election system, residents from each district vote for candidates vying for their district’s seat.

Pursuant to Elections Code Section 10010, the District was required to conduct at least two public meetings at which the public could provide input regarding the composition of

the District's new voting districts prior to drafting any proposed maps. The Fire Board held three such meetings on August 25, 2021, January 12, 2022, and January 26, 2022.

The Fire Board was then required to hold two additional public hearings on the draft district maps before moving to formally adopt a map by ordinance. The first of those public hearings was held on February 23, 2022. After receiving public input and considering the first draft maps at that hearing, the Fire Board appointed Directors MacKimmie and Sherrill as an ad hoc subcommittee and directed that the subcommittee hold two public meetings during which the public could provide input to the subcommittee and the District's demographer, Redistricting Partners, regarding the draft maps. The ad hoc subcommittee met on March 3, 2022 and March 8, 2022, and the public was invited to attend each of those sessions in person or by Zoom.

The public hearing to consider draft maps before the full Board occurred on March 23, 2022. After that hearing, the Board introduced an Ordinance to enact the by-district election system and adopt the proposed districts map.

The District entered into a settlement agreement with the prospective plaintiff who, through her attorney, submitted the demand letter that prompted the District to make this transition to by-district elections. That agreement requires the District to complete the transition in time for the November 2022 election. While State Law indicates that the district map must be adopted no later than six months prior to the date of the election, we have been informed by the County Elections Office that the map must be adopted by April 17, 2022, for it to apply it to the November 2022 election. For that reason, the Board is holding this special meeting on April 13, 2022, so that it can approve the ordinance/map prior to the County's deadline.

However, pursuant to Government Code section 36934, a regular ordinance may not be adopted at a special meeting. As such, the Board is asked to adopt the attached proposed Urgency Ordinance that will immediately enact the by district elections system and adopt the selected map of voting districts. This will allow the District to meet the terms of the settlement agreement and the deadline established by the County Elections Office to transition to the new by district system for the November 2022 election cycle.

Criteria for District Boundaries:

In creating the district boundaries, the District must ensure compliance with the following state and federally-mandated criteria:

Federal Laws:

1. Each district shall contain a nearly equal population as required by law; and
2. Each district shall be drawn in a manner that complies with the Federal Voting Rights Act. No district shall be drawn with race as the predominate factor in violation of the principles established by the United States Supreme Court in *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), and its progeny.

California Criteria:

1. Each district should be geographically contiguous
2. Undivided neighborhoods and “communities of interest” (socio-economic geographic areas that should be kept together)
3. Easily identifiable boundaries
4. Compact (Do not bypass one group of people to get to a more distant group of people)

Other Traditional Districting Principles:

1. Respect voters’ choices/continuity in office
2. Future population growth

Ad Hoc Subcommittee Deliberations and Recommendations:

The ad hoc subcommittee met on March 3, 2022 to receive public input and consider the three maps that were previously reviewed by the Board on February 23, 2022. The subcommittee provided feedback to the Redistricting Partners on areas of the District historically identified as geographic communities (i.e. communities of interest) and geographic boundaries, such as Highway 1 and Highway 92.

Redistricting Partners amended the three previously proposed maps to incorporate the feedback received from the Board, the public, and the subcommittee. The amended maps were presented at the ad hoc subcommittee’s meeting on March 8, 2022. The subcommittee reviewed the three amended maps and determined that “Map A” was the best available option, after requesting some additional minor edits to the boundary lines to ensure existing neighborhoods were not split into separate districts. Ultimately, the subcommittee determined that Map A, as amended at the March 8, 2022 subcommittee meeting and as proposed with the draft Ordinance (Map A, version 3) to be the recommended map.

The overarching goal of the subcommittee was to create and recommend a map that achieved the State and Federally mandated criteria while refraining, as closely as possible, from splitting distinct areas of the District widely known and understood by the public. The subcommittee determined that its recommended map offered the best balance of keeping areas understood to be singular “neighborhoods” within the same districts, while respecting the natural geographic boundary provided by Highway 1 and ensuring that the districts meet all Federal and State requirements related to population equity. While inconsistent spread of population throughout the District made it impossible to draw perfectly neat boundary lines, the subcommittee believed that the recommended map most closely matched how the public expected districts to be drawn.

Board Deliberation and Regular Ordinance Introduced March 23, 2022:

At the March 23, 2022 meeting, the Board selected the ad hoc subcommittee's recommended district map and incorporated it into the ordinance introduced at that meeting.

Urgency Findings and 4/5 Vote:

An Ordinance generally requires two readings at separate hearings prior to adoption by the Fire Board. However, pursuant to Government Code section 36937(b), the Board can pass, by 4/5 vote, an Urgency Ordinance to take effect immediately, without a second reading, if it finds that doing so is necessary to immediately preserve public peace, health or safety.

The 2020 Census data needed to complete the process of drawing district boundaries was significantly delayed. Despite the District's best efforts, it was difficult to complete this statutorily prescribed process prior to the County's April 17, 2022 deadline, due to the delayed Census population data and the fact that the Board holds only one regular meeting per month.

This Urgency Ordinance could have been adopted along with the introduction of the regular ordinance at the Board's March 23, 2022 meeting. However, staff believed that it was important to ensure that this ordinance received two public hearings prior to adoption. For that reason, this special meeting was scheduled to provide that second public hearing on the ordinance, just as would have occurred at a regular meeting.

The Urgency Ordinance differs from the ordinance introduced on March 23, 2022 in only one substantive way. The prior proposed ordinance indicated that nomination papers for candidates from a district would only be signed by residents of that district. However, this is inconsistent with the Elections Code, which allows voters residing in the jurisdiction (i.e. the entire area of the Coastside Fire Protection District) to sign nomination papers for candidates in each district. Rather than create a provision inconsistent with the Elections Code, the attached recommended Ordinance no longer addresses nomination papers in Subsection B(2) of Section Two, and therefore defers to the general provisions of the Election Code regarding nominating paper signatures.

Staff believes, and recommends that the Fire Board find, that adopting the attached Urgency Ordinance is necessary to protect public peace, health, and safety, in that it will ensure that the 2022 regular election will be conducted in a manner that precludes the possibility of a California Voting Rights Act violation, honor the Board's March 24, 2021 resolution expressing intent to transition to by-district elections in time for the November 2022 election, and avoid any further legal challenges related to the system of elections utilized by the District.

If adopted, this Urgency Ordinance will establish the boundaries of the five districts and the sequence of elections for those districts. Staff originally planned to schedule second reading of the regular ordinance at the Board's next regular meeting. Unless instructed by the Board otherwise, however, staff no longer plans to schedule second

reading of the regular ordinance, given that adoption of this Urgency Ordinance will effectively finalize the transition to by-district elections, and given that this special meeting effectively provides a second hearing on the map and ordinance prior to its adoption.

Conclusion

Staff requests that the Board hold a public hearing to solicit public input on the proposed Urgency Ordinance. At the close of that hearing, staff recommends that the Board adopt the Urgency Ordinance to take immediate effect in order to utilize a by-district election system with the five identified districts for the November 2022 election.

Attachments:

1. Urgency Ordinance (Districts Boundaries Map included as Exhibit A)

ATTACHMENT 1

PROPOSED URGENCY ORDINANCE

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - 01

URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE COASTSIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT PROVIDING FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE FIRE BOARD BY DISTRICT, ESTABLISHING THE BOUNDARIES AND IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF EACH DISTRICT, AND ESTABLISHING THE ELECTION ORDER OF EACH DISTRICT; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15378, 15601(b)(3)

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District has historically used an at large method of election, which is consistent with the guarantees of Section 7 of Article 1 and of Section 2 of Article II of the California Constitution; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 34886 permits the Fire Board to change the method of election by ordinance to a “by-district” system in which each member of the Fire Board is elected only by the voters in the district in which the candidate resides, in accordance with California Government Code Section 34871; and

WHEREAS, a by-district system can also be consistent with the guarantees of Section 7 of Article I and of Section 2 of Article II of the California Constitution; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2021, the Fire Board adopted a Resolution that initiated the process of establishing a by-district election system and stated its intent to complete this transition prior to the November 2022 election; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of California Elections Code Section 100100, a district that changes from an at-large method of election to a by-district method of election must hold a total of five public hearings, which includes at least two public hearings regarding potential voting district boundaries prior to the release and consideration of any draft voting district maps, and two public hearings following the release of draft voting district map; and

WHEREAS, on August 25, 2021, January 12, 2022, and January 26, 2022, pursuant to California Elections Code Section 10010(a)(1), the Fire Board held three public hearings where the public was invited to provide input regarding the composition of voting districts before any draft maps were drawn, and the Fire Board considered and discussed the same; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2022 pursuant to California Elections Code Section 10010(a)(2), the Fire Board held a fourth public hearing where the public was invited to provide input regarding the content of proposed draft maps that had been released and published at least seven (7) days before each meeting, and the proposed sequence of the elections, and the Fire Board considered and discussed the same and appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to hold two additional meetings at which the public was invited to attend and provide input regarding district boundaries; and

WHEREAS, the ad hoc subcommittee held public meetings on March 3, 2022 and March 8, 2022 to receive additional public input; and

WHEREAS, on March 23, 2022, the Fire Board held a final public hearing on the proposal to establish district boundaries, reviewed and considered additional public input, formally selected the voting district map and the election sequence attached to, incorporated in, and set forth in an ordinance, which was introduced for a first reading at the same regular meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Fire District has been informed by the County Elections Office that it must have an adopted districts boundaries map by April 17, 2022 in order for that map, and the by-district voting system, to apply to the November 2022 election; and

WHEREAS, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Federal Census Bureau was six months delayed in releasing the 2020 Census data necessary to draw district boundary lines, which significantly truncating the time to complete the transition to by-district elections; and

WHEREAS, the District signed a settlement agreement with a prospective plaintiff, which calls for the District to transition to by-district elections in time for the November 2022 election; and

WHEREAS, the settlement agreement contemplates that the District may not be able to complete this transition in time for the November 2022 election due to the Census data delay, but the District wishes to adopt this ordinance on an urgency basis in order to meet the November 2022 election deadline; and

WHEREAS, completing the transition to by-district elections in furtherance of the protections created by the California Voting Rights Act in advance of the November 2022 election protects the public peace, health, and safety by conducting that election by a method found by the State to offer the most fair and equitable representation; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 36937 authorizes the Fire Board to adopt an Urgency Ordinance measure by a four-fifths (4/5) vote where necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare without following the procedures otherwise required prior to adoption of a zoning ordinance; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Government Code Section 34886, the purpose of this Ordinance is to provide for the election of members of the Fire Board of the Coastside Fire Protection District by district in 5 single-member districts as reflected in the voting district map attached as Exhibit A to this Ordinance, in furtherance of the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (Chapter 1.5 [commencing with Section 14025] of Division 14 of the Elections Code) to encourage by-district elections as one method to implement the guarantees of Section 7 of Article I and of Section 2 of Article II of the California Constitution.

IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED by the Board of the Coastside Fire Protection District to adopt an ordinance as follows:

SECTION ONE: The recitals set forth above are true and correct and are hereby incorporated herein by this reference as if fully set forth in their entirety.

SECTION TWO: Election of members of the Fire Board by district.

- (A) *Districts Established.* Fire Board districts are hereby established in the Coastside Fire Protection District. The boundaries and identities of each district shall be as described and shown on the District Map attached as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference.
- (B) *Election of members of the Fire Board by-district.*
 - (1) Following the effective date of this Ordinance and upon the commencement of “by-district” elections in the order established by this Ordinance, members of the Fire Board shall be elected “by-district” as defined in the California Government Code Section 34871 or any successor statute. Any candidate for Fire Board must have been a resident and elector of the district in which they seek election by the time they pull nomination papers for such office, or such person’s appointment to fill a vacancy therein. No term of any member of the Fire Board that commenced prior to the effective date of this Ordinance shall be affected by the adoption of this Ordinance. A vacancy in an office filled by an at large election shall be filled by appointment or by an at large election.
 - (2) Registered voters voting for a member of the Fire Board shall be residents of the geographical area making up the district from which the member is to be elected.
 - (3) The terms of the office of each member elected to the Fire Board shall remain four (4) years.
- (C) *Commencement of district elections.*
 - (1) Commencing on the General Election in 2022 and every four years thereafter the voters in districts C, D, and E shall elect members of the Fire Board by district for four (4) year terms. At the General Election in 2024, and every four years thereafter, the voters in districts A and B shall elect members of the Fire Board by district for four (4) year terms.
 - (2) The term of office of any Board member who has been elected and whose term of office has not expired shall not be affected by any change in the boundaries of the district from which they were elected.

SECTION THREE: Technical Adjustments and Metes-and-Bounds. If necessary to facilitate the implementation of this Ordinance, the Board Secretary is authorized to make technical adjustments to the district boundaries that do not substantively affect the populations in the districts, the eligibility of candidates, or the residence of elected officials, within any district. The Board Secretary shall consult with the District’s Attorney concerning any technical adjustments deemed necessary and shall advise the Fire Board

of any such adjustments required in the implementation of the districts. The Board Secretary shall also direct the District’s demographer to provide a metes-and-bounds description of each district as shown on the map attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, which shall be submitted to the Fire Board at its next regular meeting and kept on file in the District’s office for public review.

SECTION FOUR: CEQA Determination. This Ordinance is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it is not a “project” within the meaning of Section 15378 of the State CEQA Guidelines, since there is no potential of the Ordinance to result in direct or indirect physical change to the environment. In addition, the Ordinance is not subject to CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3), as it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility the Ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION FIVE: If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of the Ordinance or any part thereof. The Fire Board hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective.

SECTION SIX: Pursuant to Section 36937 of the Government Code of the State of California, the Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage.

SECTION SEVEN: The Board Secretary shall cause this Ordinance to be published in accordance with the requirements of Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.

* * * * *

Passed and adopted by the Coastside Fire Protection District Board of Directors at a meeting thereof held on the 13th day of April 2022, by the following vote of the members thereof:

- AYES, and in favor thereof, Board members:
- NOES, Board members:
- ABSENT, Board members:
- ABSTAIN, Board members:

President of the Board

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Board


EXHIBT A – DISTRICT BOUNDARIES MAP




**REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS**

Coastside Fire Protection District

Plan A v3 TF Amended






2020 Census

	A	B	C	D	E
Population	4,709	4,787	5,128	4,648	4,963
Deviation	-138	-60	281	-199	116
Deviation %	-2.8%	-1.2%	5.8%	-4.1%	2.4%
Other	3,809	3,158	3,727	2,678	2,767
Other %	80.9%	66.0%	72.7%	57.6%	55.8%
Latino	646	1,383	1,119	1,686	1,883
Latino %	13.7%	28.9%	21.8%	36.3%	37.9%
Asian	217	220	249	238	286
Asian %	4.6%	4.6%	4.9%	5.1%	5.8%
Black	37	26	33	46	27
Black %	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	1.0%	0.5%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D	E
Total CVAP	3,700	3,726	4,115	3,229	3,339
Other CVAP	3,354	3,144	3,347	2,279	2,642
Other CVAP %	90.6%	84.4%	81.3%	70.6%	79.1%
Latino CVAP	209	394	583	743	435
Latino CVAP %	5.6%	10.6%	14.2%	23.0%	13.0%
Asian CVAP	122	161	158	176	246
Asian CVAP %	3.3%	4.3%	3.8%	5.5%	7.4%
Black CVAP	15	27	27	31	16
Black CVAP %	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%	1.0%	0.5%



District A



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,709	-138	-2.8%	3,809	80.9%	646	13.7%	217	4.6%	37	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,700	3,354	90.6%	209	5.6%	122	3.3%	15	0.4%		



District A



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,709	-138	-2.8%	3,809	80.9%	646	13.7%	217	4.6%	37	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,700	3,354	90.6%	209	5.6%	122	3.3%	15	0.4%		



District B



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,787	-60	-1.2%	3,158	66.0%	1,383	28.9%	220	4.6%	26	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,726	3,144	84.4%	394	10.6%	161	4.3%	27	0.7%		



District B



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,787	-60	-1.2%	3,158	66.0%	1,383	28.9%	220	4.6%	26	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,726	3,144	84.4%	394	10.6%	161	4.3%	27	0.7%		



District C



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
5,128	281	5.8%	3,727	72.7%	1,119	21.8%	249	4.9%	33	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,115	3,347	81.3%	583	14.2%	158	3.8%	27	0.7%		



District C



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
5,128	281	5.8%	3,727	72.7%	1,119	21.8%	249	4.9%	33	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,115	3,347	81.3%	583	14.2%	158	3.8%	27	0.7%		



District D



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,648	-199	-4.1%	2,678	57.6%	1,686	36.3%	238	5.1%	46	1.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,229	2,279	70.6%	743	23.0%	176	5.5%	31	1.0%		



District D



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,648	-199	-4.1%	2,678	57.6%	1,686	36.3%	238	5.1%	46	1.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,229	2,279	70.6%	743	23.0%	176	5.5%	31	1.0%		



District E



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,963	116	2.4%	2,767	55.8%	1,883	37.9%	286	5.8%	27	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,339	2,642	79.1%	435	13.0%	246	7.4%	16	0.5%		



District E



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,963	116	2.4%	2,767	55.8%	1,883	37.9%	286	5.8%	27	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,339	2,642	79.1%	435	13.0%	246	7.4%	16	0.5%		

ATTACHMENT 2


ALTERNATE MAPS (MAPS B AND C)




**REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS**

Coastside Fire Protection District

Draft Plan B v2 Amended






2020 Census

	A	B	C	D	E
Population	4,965	4,689	4,685	4,985	4,911
Deviation	118	-158	-162	138	64
Deviation %	2.4%	-3.3%	-3.3%	2.8%	1.3%
Other	3,961	3,223	3,145	3,161	2,649
Other %	79.8%	68.7%	67.1%	63.4%	53.9%
Latino	700	1,275	1,259	1,541	1,942
Latino %	14.1%	27.2%	26.9%	30.9%	39.5%
Asian	258	165	250	245	292
Asian %	5.2%	3.5%	5.3%	4.9%	5.9%
Black	46	26	31	38	28
Black %	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D	E
Total CVAP	4,034	3,385	3,560	3,839	3,291
Other CVAP	3,791	2,848	2,753	2,793	2,581
Other CVAP %	94.0%	84.1%	77.3%	72.8%	78.4%
Latino CVAP	138	415	545	819	447
Latino CVAP %	3.4%	12.3%	15.3%	21.3%	13.6%
Asian CVAP	86	121	224	185	247
Asian CVAP %	2.1%	3.6%	6.3%	4.8%	7.5%
Black CVAP	19	1	38	42	16
Black CVAP %	0.5%	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.5%



District A



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,965	118	2.4%	3,961	79.8%	700	14.1%	258	5.2%	46	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,034	3,791	94.0%	138	3.4%	86	2.1%	19	0.5%		



District A



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,965	118	2.4%	3,961	79.8%	700	14.1%	258	5.2%	46	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,034	3,791	94.0%	138	3.4%	86	2.1%	19	0.5%		



District B



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,689	-158	-3.3%	3,223	68.7%	1,275	27.2%	165	3.5%	26	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,385	2,848	84.1%	415	12.3%	121	3.6%	1	0.0%		



District B



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,689	-158	-3.3%	3,223	68.7%	1,275	27.2%	165	3.5%	26	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,385	2,848	84.1%	415	12.3%	121	3.6%	1	0.0%		



District C



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,685	-162	-3.3%	3,145	67.1%	1,259	26.9%	250	5.3%	31	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,560	2,753	77.3%	545	15.3%	224	6.3%	38	1.1%		



District C



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,685	-162	-3.3%	3,145	67.1%	1,259	26.9%	250	5.3%	31	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,560	2,753	77.3%	545	15.3%	224	6.3%	38	1.1%		



District D



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,985	138	2.8%	3,161	63.4%	1,541	30.9%	245	4.9%	38	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,839	2,793	72.8%	819	21.3%	185	4.8%	42	1.1%		



District D



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,985	138	2.8%	3,161	63.4%	1,541	30.9%	245	4.9%	38	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,839	2,793	72.8%	819	21.3%	185	4.8%	42	1.1%		



District E



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,911	64	1.3%	2,649	53.9%	1,942	39.5%	292	5.9%	28	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,291	2,581	78.4%	447	13.6%	247	7.5%	16	0.5%		



District E



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,911	64	1.3%	2,649	53.9%	1,942	39.5%	292	5.9%	28	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,291	2,581	78.4%	447	13.6%	247	7.5%	16	0.5%		




**REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS**

Coastside Fire Protection District

Draft Plan C v2 Amended






2020 Census

	A	B	C	D	E
Population	4,965	4,748	4,925	4,985	4,612
Deviation	118	-99	78	138	-235
Deviation %	2.4%	-2.0%	1.6%	2.8%	-4.8%
Other	3,961	3,825	2,916	2,872	2,565
Other %	79.8%	80.6%	59.2%	57.6%	55.6%
Latino	700	698	1,755	1,818	1,746
Latino %	14.1%	14.7%	35.6%	36.5%	37.9%
Asian	258	192	237	243	280
Asian %	5.2%	4.0%	4.8%	4.9%	6.1%
Black	46	33	17	52	21
Black %	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%	0.5%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	A	B	C	D	E
Total CVAP	4,034	3,863	3,652	3,432	3,128
Other CVAP	3,791	3,356	2,704	2,448	2,467
Other CVAP %	94.0%	86.9%	74.0%	71.3%	78.9%
Latino CVAP	138	354	695	765	412
Latino CVAP %	3.4%	9.2%	19.0%	22.3%	13.2%
Asian CVAP	86	126	230	183	238
Asian CVAP %	2.1%	3.3%	6.3%	5.3%	7.6%
Black CVAP	19	27	23	36	11
Black CVAP %	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	1.0%	0.4%



District A



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,965	118	2.4%	3,961	79.8%	700	14.1%	258	5.2%	46	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,034	3,791	94.0%	138	3.4%	86	2.1%	19	0.5%		



District A



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,965	118	2.4%	3,961	79.8%	700	14.1%	258	5.2%	46	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,034	3,791	94.0%	138	3.4%	86	2.1%	19	0.5%		



District B



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,748	-99	-2.0%	3,825	80.6%	698	14.7%	192	4.0%	33	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,863	3,356	86.9%	354	9.2%	126	3.3%	27	0.7%		



District B



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,748	-99	-2.0%	3,825	80.6%	698	14.7%	192	4.0%	33	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,863	3,356	86.9%	354	9.2%	126	3.3%	27	0.7%		



District C



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,925	78	1.6%	2,916	59.2%	1,755	35.6%	237	4.8%	17	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,652	2,704	74.0%	695	19.0%	230	6.3%	23	0.6%		



District C



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,925	78	1.6%	2,916	59.2%	1,755	35.6%	237	4.8%	17	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,652	2,704	74.0%	695	19.0%	230	6.3%	23	0.6%		



District D



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,985	138	2.8%	2,872	57.6%	1,818	36.5%	243	4.9%	52	1.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,432	2,448	71.3%	765	22.3%	183	5.3%	36	1.0%		



District D



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,985	138	2.8%	2,872	57.6%	1,818	36.5%	243	4.9%	52	1.0%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,432	2,448	71.3%	765	22.3%	183	5.3%	36	1.0%		



District E



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,612	-235	-4.8%	2,565	55.6%	1,746	37.9%	280	6.1%	21	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,128	2,467	78.9%	412	13.2%	238	7.6%	11	0.4%		



District E



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
4,612	-235	-4.8%	2,565	55.6%	1,746	37.9%	280	6.1%	21	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,128	2,467	78.9%	412	13.2%	238	7.6%	11	0.4%		