



FINAL MINUTES

Redistricting Advisory Commission of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Monday, March 7, 2022

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Chair Dave J. Stoldt. *Pursuant to AB 361 (Rivas), the meeting was conducted with virtual participation via Zoom.*

Commissioners Present: (By Roll-Call Vote)

Susan Schiavone, *Division 1*
Esther Malkin, *Division 2*
Nancy Selfridge, *Division 3*
Tama Olver, *Division 4*
Myrleen Fisher, *Division 5*
Troy Ishikawa, *County Representative*
Marc Eisenhart, *At-Large Member*
N. Monica Lal, *At-Large Member*

Commissioners Absent:

Steven Lilley, *City Representative*

Staff Members Present:

David J. Stoldt, General Manager
Joel G. Pablo, Board Clerk

District Counsel Present:

David Laredo, Esq. with De Lay and Laredo

Demographers Present:

Shelley Lapkoff, Ph.D and Robin Merrill with Lapkoff and Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.

Additions and Corrections to the Published Agenda:

None

Comments from the Public:

Konny Murray with the Monterey County League of Women Voters thanked the Commissioners for undertaking the District's redistricting efforts.

Action Items

1. Consider Adoption of Commission Meeting Minutes from February 14, 2022

David J. Stoldt, General Manager introduced the item.

Opened Public Comment; No Comments were directed to the Commission on Item No. 1

A motion was offered by Eisenhart with a second by Olver to approve the commission meeting minutes from February 14, 2022. The motion carried on a roll-call vote of 8-Ayes (Schiavone,

Malkin, Olver, Fischer, Ishikawa, Eisenhart, Lal and Selfridge), 1-Absent (Lilley) and 0-Noes.

2. Presentation of Draft Plans/Maps, Commission Discussion/Feedback and Possibly Take Action to Proposed Recommendations

David J. Stoldt, General Manager introduced Shelley Lapkoff, Ph.D, demographer from Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.

Lapkoff delivered and presented via MS PowerPoint presentation (revised) entitled Post 2020 Census Redistricting: Redistricting Advisory Commission (RAC) Meeting #2. *A copy of the presentation is on file at the District office and can be viewed on the District website.* Lapkoff provided a verbal status report, answered Commissioner questions and gave an overview of Draft Map Plans 1 and 2 as discussed on February 14, 2022 with further map and data breakdowns of the (a) Latinx community; (b) shares of cities, *by district*; (c) Description of the “Triangle” (the part of District 3 that moves to District 5); (d) Map showing 2019 median household income, *by Census tract*; (e) Map of 2019 share of homes occupied by homeowners and renters, *by Census tract*; (f) Election cycle effects of Plan 1 and 2; and (g) Seaside’s business district.

Highlights from the PowerPoint Include:

- a. Timeline/Next Steps
 - i. Redistricting Advisory Commission (RAC) meeting on Thursday, March 17, 2022, *if needed*
 - ii. Board Meeting on Monday, March 21, 2022 to hear interim or final results from the RAC
 - iii. Board Meeting on Friday, April 1, 2022 to deliberate
 - iv. Board Adopts Plan prior to Sunday, April 17, 2022
- b. Rationale for Redistricting
 - i. Based on the 2020 Census; current Districts are unequal and must be relatively equal in order to minimize the deviation.
- c. Provided an Overview of Draft Map Plan 1 (a minimum change plan) and Draft Map Plan 2 (keeps Latinx Community of Interest together in the Seaside/Sand City Area) as introduced at the February 14, 2022 RAC Meeting and provided highlights of discussions had and presented to the Commission:
 - i. Plans 1 and 2 (Cities Color Shaded) drawing attention City jurisdiction and boundaries
 - ii. Plans 1 and 2 (Color Shaded) maps focusing in on the Hispanic/Latino/Latinx shares of the Voting Age Population by 2020 Census Block.
 - iii. Plans 1 and 2 Data by Total Population, Voting Age Population, Citizens of Voting Age (CVAP), Registered Voters and Actual Voters.
 - iv. Current (2002) District, Plan 1 and 2 Shares of Cities in Each District in Each Plan
 - v. Provided a Further Description of the “Triangle” in Plan 1 and 2 that moves a portion of District 3 to District 5.
 - Triangle includes the La Mesa Military Housing and
 - Registrar of Voters prefers that the 18 people that live East of Highway 68 be assigned to Division 3 within the city limits of Monterey.

In response to Commissioner Eisenhart, Lapkoff stated the population in District 3 is large and must be trifurcated to balance populations. Eisenhart questioned the propriety of trifurcating the City of Monterey into Districts 2, 3 and 5 and suggested to explore splitting the City into two separate districts shared between 3 and 1. Lapkoff agreed to explore the idea further.

- vi. Overview of Median Household Income | American Community Survey Data from 2015-19 by Census Tract
- vii. Overview of Owners and Renters | American Community Survey Data from 2015-19 by Census Tract displaying Owners Occupied vs. Renter Occupied.
- viii. Overview and Overlay of Non-Owner-Occupied Housing Units in Seaside (Houses, Condos and Duplexes) in:
 - Plan 1: Rental Population Split between District 1 and 2; and
 - Plan 2: Majority of the Rental Population Represented
- ix. Election Cycles
 - Voters in Districts 1, 2 and 3 elect directors in November 2022
 - Voters in Districts 4 and 5 elect directors in November 2024
 - In Plan 1 and 2, voters would wait six (6) years rather than four (4) for the next Director election living the “Triangle.”
- x. Overview of the Seaside/Sand City Business District in District – Division 2

Robin Merrill presented, initiated live GIS mapping with Plan 2 with modifications as suggested by Eisenhart, received Commissioner input and adjusted maps – in real-time. Dr. Shelley Lapkoff and Robin Merrill were available for questions during the below discussions by the Commissioners.

Plan 2 with Further Modifications and Plan 3 Drafted During the Live-Mapping Discussion:

- a. Merrill presented Plan 2 with Further Modification bifurcating the City of Monterey with District 3 and 1.
 - Schiavone requested for more of Seaside be brought into District 2.
 - *In response to Commissioner Eisenhart*, Lapkoff noted that the Division – Director Boundary legal limits with adjustments made should fall under a standard deviation less than 10%.
- b. After substantial discussion on the matter, the responses of the Commission on the draft maps being considered are as follows:
 - Olver is in favor of with Plan 2 and 3.
 - Malkin is glad to see the renter population being taken into consideration and is in favor of Plan 2.
 - Ishikawa is in favor of Plan 2 and Plan 3
 - Lal is in favor of Plan 2 and Plan 3.
 - Selfridge is in favor of Plan 3.
 - Schiavone is in favor of Plan 3.
 - Eisenhart looks forward to reviewing the refined plans at a future meeting.

Opened Public Comment; The following comments were directed to the Commission:

Konny Murray with the League of Women Voters: Praised the Commission on being able to work with each other during the meeting and making progress on the District’s redistricting efforts.

Suggest Items to be Placed on Future Agendas

Demographers will prepare and provide a report in response to the Commissioners' discussions. Draft Map Plans 2, 3-A and 3-B will be reviewed at the Thursday, March 17, 2022 Commission meeting.

Adjournment

The Commission adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

/s/ Joel G. Pablo, Board Clerk to the MPWMD Redistricting Advisory Commission

Reviewed and Approved by the MPWMD Redistricting Advisory Commission on March 17, 2022

Received by the MPWMD Board of Directors on March 21, 2022