



Draft Election District Plans for Transitioning from At-Large Election of Directors to by-District Election of Directors West County Wastewater District

Updated January 7, 2020

We have developed eight basic plans for the WCWD Directors and public to review. These plans can be modified, and new plans can be developed before January 8. The Board is expected to vote on a final plan at their January 15 meeting. Comments can be made at the January 15 meeting, and written comments should be sent to the District in care of Justin Lovell at JLovell@wcvd.org.

The table on pages 3 - 4 compares the plans, and maps are provided for each plan. The first map for each plan color codes the cities and CDPs, and the black lines indicate each plan's election districts. The second map color shades the election districts.

Each plan meets the equal population legal requirement (as we understand it), with less than a 10 percent total deviation. We believe all plans meet the Voting Rights Act requirements, though this is subject to interpretation.

Plans 1 – 8 have Directors Stanley and Alvarado in one district, leaving one district vacant. We adjusted each plan to separate these incumbents: in Plans 1a, 2a, etc, Directors Stanley and Alvarado are in a separate district. The “a” Plans are virtually identical to their same-numbered plan, except for accommodating incumbency west of Hwy 80.

Plans 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are similar to Plan 3, but have alternative boundaries for Districts 4 and 5. In Plans 4, 6, and 7, Directors Wiener and Sudduth are in the same district. Plans 5 and 8 have Directors Wiener and Sudduth in separate districts.

Plan R is our interpretation of suggestions by Attorney Scott Rafferty.

Each plan uses precinct boundaries, major thoroughfares and/or city limit boundaries extensively. We have avoided dividing cities and unincorporated communities (Census Designated Places/CDPs) whenever possible, as we consider these to be “communities of interest.”

We have tried to minimize the number of precincts that are split to make it easier for the County Registrar of Voters to implement the adopted plan. Note that city limits are always precinct boundaries.

Acronyms Commonly Used in Districting

CDP = Census Designated Place

CVAP = Citizens of Voting Age Population

CVRA = California Voting Rights Act

D1 = District 1

D2 = District 2

D3 = District 3

D4 = District 4

D5 = District 5

FVRA = Federal Voting Rights Act

HCVAP = the share of Citizens of Voting Age Population that are Hispanic

ROV = (County) Registrar of Voters

SFUs = Single Family Units (houses)

SWDB = Statewide Database

VAP = Voting Age Population (age 18+)

VRA = Voting Rights Act

WCCUSD – West Contra Costa Unified School District

WCWD – West County Wastewater District

Summary of Plans				
Plan	Plan 1	Plan 2	Plan 3	"A" Plans
Deviation	8.1% / 4.5% (a plan)	6.0% / 6.7% (a plan)	7.1% / 8.2% (a plan)	
Initial objective	Good boundary lines while meeting VRA requirements	Follow Mr. Rafferty's suggestions as much as possible; keep San Pablo west of Hwy 80 in Black/Latino district	Stronger African-American district; keep Richmond together east and west of Hwy 80	To keep Directors Stanley and Alvarado in a separate district
Treatment of neighborhoods	Cities and unincorporated communities kept intact; District 4 includes area of San Pablo west of Hwy 80	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs); Shields-Reid neighborhood in D2	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs)	Westgate Circle Townhome community is split
Compactness of districts	D2 and D3 are compact	D2 and D3 are compact, D4 somewhat compact	D1, D2, D3 are very compact; D4 somewhat compact	
Election district boundary lines	Understandable, well-defined boundary lines	Boundary through Tara Hills follows local streets but is a precinct line; D1/D2 boundary in San Pablo follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 southern boundary follows local streets and splits a precinct; D4/D5 boundary follows precincts or Appian Way	Tara Hills split follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 boundary follows a creek (a precinct line); D4/D5 northern boundary follows local streets and splits a precinct; D4/D5 eastern boundary splits a precinct and uses minor streets	Division dictated by Census blocks, may be difficult to implement
Use of existing precincts	6 precincts split / 7 (a plan)	5 precincts split / 6 (a plan)	2 precincts split / 4 (a plan)	Splits an additional precinct
Federal VRA concerns (CVAP)	D2 and D1 have Latino CVAP pluralities (47% and 31%); D3 has a Black CVAP plurality (31%)	D2 and D1 have Latino CVAP pluralities (52% and 30%); D3 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)	D3 and D2 have Latino CVAP pluralities (43% and 38%); D1 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)	Slightly improves Latino CVAP in District 2 Plans 1 and 2; slightly lowers Latino CVAP in Plan 3 (District 3)
Other comments	Although 6 precinct lines are split, they are split along major streets or a creek and we would expect it to be easy to implement new precinct lines	WCCUSD boundary used between D2 and D3 - slightly higher HCVAP possible if other boundary is used, but would require a "micro-precinct"	Two Latino strong influence districts	

Summary of Plans					
Plan	Plan 4	Plan 5	Plan 6	Plan 7	Plan 8
Deviation	8.2% / 9.3% (a plan)	7.4% / 8.5% (a plan)	8.3% / 9.4% (a plan)	7.8% / 8.9% (a plan)	8.2% / 9.3% (a plan)
Initial objective	Stronger African-American district; keep Richmond together east and west of Hwy 80	Stronger African-American district; keep Richmond together east and west of Hwy 80	Stronger African-American district; keep Richmond together east and west of Hwy 80	Stronger African-American district; keep Richmond together east and west of Hwy 80; compactness for D4; community of interest for D5	Stronger African-American district; keep Richmond together east and west of Hwy 80
Treatment of neighborhoods	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs); D5 only east of Hwy 80 with homogenous housing	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs); D5 extends beyond Hwy 80 to take populated area of Pinole	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs); D5 extends beyond Hwy 80 to take populated area of Pinole	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs); D4 takes area northwest of Hwy 80 and combines with area just east of Hwy 80	Tara Hills split (affordable apartment building in D1, along with some SFUs); D5 extends beyond Hwy 80 to take populated area of Pinole
Compactness of districts	D1, D2, D3, and D5 are very compact; D4 sprawling	D1, D2, D3 very compact; D4 sprawling	D1, D2, D3 very compact; D4 sprawling	D1, D2, D3, D4 very compact; D5 somewhat compact and with a community of interest	D1, D2, D3 are very compact; D5 sprawling
Election district boundary lines	Tara Hills split follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 boundary follows city limits, minor streets and a creek (all precinct lines); D4/D5 northern boundary follows city limits (a precinct line) and minor streets (splits two precincts); D4/D5 southern boundary splits a precinct and uses minor streets	Tara Hills split follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 boundary follows city limits, minor streets and a creek (all precinct lines); D4/D5 boundary north of Hwy 80 follows city limits (splits one precinct); D4/5 boundary south of Hwy 80 follows minor streets (splits five precincts)	Tara Hills split follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 boundary follows city limits, minor streets and a creek (all precinct lines); D4/D5 boundary north of Hwy 80 follows city limits (splits one precinct); D4/5 boundary south of Hwy 80 follows city limits, Appian Way, and some minor streets	Tara Hills split follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 boundary follows city limits, minor streets and a creek (all precinct lines); D4/D5 boundary follows city limits, a creek, and some minor streets	Tara Hills split follows local streets (a precinct line); D2/D3 boundary follows a creek (a precinct line); D4/D5 northern boundary follows local streets and splits 2 precincts; D4/D5 eastern boundary splits a precinct and uses minor streets
Use of existing precincts	3 precincts split / 4 (a plan)	6 precincts split / 7 (a plan)	5 precincts split / 6 (a plan)	3 precincts split / 4 (a plan)	3 precincts split / 4 (a plan)
Federal VRA concerns (CVAP)	D3 and D2 have Latino CVAP pluralities (43% and 38%); D1 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)	D3 and D2 have Latino CVAP pluralities (43% and 38%); D1 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)	D3 and D2 have Latino CVAP pluralities (43% and 38%); D1 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)	D3 and D2 have Latino CVAP pluralities (43% and 38%); D1 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)	D3 and D2 have Latino CVAP pluralities (43% and 38%); D1 has a Black CVAP plurality (35%)
Other comments	D1, D2, and D3 same as in Plan 3/3a; Incumbents Sudduth and Wiener both in D5	D1, D2, and D3 same as in Plan 3/3a; Incumbents Sudduth and Wiener in different districts	D1, D2, and D3 same as in Plan 3/3a; Incumbents Sudduth and Wiener both in D5	D1, D2, and D3 same as in Plan 3/3a; Incumbents Sudduth and Wiener both in D5	D1, D2, and D3 same as in Plan 3/3a; Incumbents Sudduth and Wiener in different districts; D4/D5 similar to Plan 3/3a

Statistics for Each Plan

		% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	
Districts							8.1%
1	19,560	31%	19%	21%	20%	9%	
2	19,497	47%	12%	16%	18%	8%	
3	18,041	27%	17%	31%	18%	7%	
4	18,333	17%	42%	18%	16%	7%	
5	18,882	21%	37%	12%	24%	6%	

		% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	
Districts							4.5%
1	18,842	33%	18%	20%	19%	10%	
2	19,071	47%	12%	15%	18%	8%	
3	19,185	26%	17%	31%	19%	7%	
4	18,333	17%	42%	18%	16%	7%	
5	18,882	21%	37%	12%	24%	6%	

		% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	
Districts							6.0%
1	18,796	30%	14%	23%	24%	8%	
2	19,326	52%	12%	14%	13%	8%	
3	18,189	22%	18%	35%	19%	7%	
4	19,176	20%	41%	16%	16%	7%	
5	18,826	23%	39%	9%	23%	6%	

		% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	
Districts							6.7%
1	18,078	31%	14%	23%	24%	8%	
2	18,900	52%	12%	14%	13%	8%	
3	19,333	21%	18%	35%	20%	6%	
4	19,176	20%	41%	16%	16%	7%	
5	18,826	23%	39%	9%	23%	6%	

		% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	
Districts							7.1%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	18,244	38%	11%	21%	22%	8%	
3	18,097	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,183	19%	45%	14%	16%	7%	
5	19,442	28%	36%	9%	22%	6%	

		% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	
Districts							8.2%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	17,892	38%	11%	21%	21%	8%	
3	18,449	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,183	19%	45%	14%	16%	7%	
5	19,442	28%	36%	9%	22%	6%	

Summary Statistics, continued

Plan 4

	Total Population	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							8.2%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	18,244	38%	11%	21%	22%	8%	
3	18,097	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,649	27%	39%	11%	16%	7%	
5	18,976	19%	41%	11%	22%	6%	

Plan 4a

	Total Population	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							9.3%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	17,892	38%	11%	21%	21%	8%	
3	18,449	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,649	27%	39%	11%	16%	7%	
5	18,976	19%	41%	11%	22%	6%	

Plan 5

	Total Population	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							7.4%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	18,244	38%	11%	21%	22%	8%	
3	18,097	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,487	27%	40%	12%	14%	7%	
5	19,138	19%	41%	11%	23%	6%	

Plan 5a

	Total Population	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							8.5%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	17,892	38%	11%	21%	21%	8%	
3	18,449	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,487	27%	40%	12%	14%	7%	
5	19,138	19%	41%	11%	23%	6%	

Plan 6

	Total Population	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							8.3%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	18,244	38%	11%	21%	22%	8%	
3	18,097	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	18,957	26%	42%	12%	14%	7%	
5	19,668	21%	39%	11%	23%	6%	

Plan 6a

	Total Population	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)					Plan Deviation
		Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							9.4%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	17,892	38%	11%	21%	21%	8%	
3	18,449	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	18,957	26%	42%	12%	14%	7%	
5	19,668	21%	39%	11%	23%	6%	

Summary Statistics, continued

Plan 7

	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)						Plan Deviation
	Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							7.8%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	18,244	38%	11%	21%	22%	8%	
3	18,097	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,563	29%	38%	10%	17%	7%	
5	19,062	18%	43%	12%	21%	7%	

Plan 7a

	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)						Plan Deviation
	Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							8.9%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	17,892	38%	11%	21%	21%	8%	
3	18,449	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	19,563	29%	38%	10%	17%	7%	
5	19,062	18%	43%	12%	21%	7%	

Plan 8

	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)						Plan Deviation
	Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							8.2%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	18,244	38%	11%	21%	22%	8%	
3	18,097	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	18,985	18%	45%	14%	16%	7%	
5	19,640	28%	36%	8%	22%	6%	

Plan 8a

	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)						Plan Deviation
	Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							9.3%
1	19,347	18%	16%	35%	22%	8%	
2	17,892	38%	11%	21%	21%	8%	
3	18,449	43%	18%	18%	15%	6%	
4	18,985	18%	45%	14%	16%	7%	
5	19,640	28%	36%	8%	22%	6%	

Plan R

	% CVAP (SWDB estimates)						Plan Deviation
	Total Population	Latino	White	Black	Asian	Other	
Districts							3.6%
1	18,642	32%	14%	24%	21%	8%	
2	19,167	48%	12%	14%	18%	8%	
3	18,502	22%	18%	35%	19%	7%	
4	19,176	20%	41%	16%	16%	7%	
5	18,826	23%	39%	9%	23%	6%	