



AGENDA

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF MONO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Teleconference Only - No Physical Location

**Special Meeting
November 8, 2021**

TELECONFERENCE INFORMATION

This meeting will be held via teleconferencing with members of the Board attending from separate remote locations. As authorized by AB 361, dated September 16, 2021, a local agency may use teleconferencing without complying with the teleconferencing requirements imposed by the Ralph M. Brown Act when a legislative body of a local agency holds a meeting during a declared state of emergency and local officials have recommended or imposed measures to promote social distancing or the body cannot meet safely in person and the legislative body has made such findings.

Members of the public may participate via the Zoom Webinar, including listening to the meeting and providing public comment, by following the instructions below. If you are unable to join the Zoom Webinar of the Board meeting, you may still view the live stream of the meeting by visiting http://monocounty.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?publish_id=707c43f6-9e01-470d-97df-e7e339ad2349

To join the meeting by computer:

Visit <https://monocounty.zoom.us/j/83789615720>

Or visit <https://www.zoom.us/>, click on "Join A Meeting" and enter the Zoom Webinar ID 837 8961 5720.

To provide public comment, press the "Raise Hand" button on your screen.

To join the meeting by telephone:

Dial (669) 900-6833, then enter Zoom Webinar ID 837 8961 5720.

To provide public comment, press *9 to raise your hand and *6 to mute/unmute.

NOTE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (760) 932-5530 or bos@mono.ca.gov. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (See 42 USCS 12132, 28CFR 35.130).

Full agenda packets are available for the public to review in the Office of the Clerk of the Board (Annex I - 74 North School Street, Bridgeport, CA 93517) and online at <http://monocounty.ca.gov/bos>. Any writing distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of the Board and online.

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED BY TIME, ITEMS SCHEDULED FOR EITHER THE MORNING OR AFTERNOON SESSIONS WILL BE HEARD ACCORDING TO AVAILABLE TIME AND PRESENCE OF INTERESTED PERSONS. PUBLIC MAY COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS AT THE TIME THE ITEM IS HEARD.

6:30 PM Call meeting to Order

Pledge of Allegiance

1. OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD

Opportunity for the public to address the Board on items of public interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. (Speakers may be limited in speaking time dependent upon the press of business and number of persons wishing to address the Board.) Please refer to the Teleconference Information section to determine how to make public comment for this meeting via Zoom.

2. AGENDA ITEMS

A. PUBLIC HEARING: Redistricting Third Review of Alternative Maps

Departments: Board of Supervisors

Public Hearing: 6:30 PM

(Robert C. Lawton, CAO, Nate Greenberg, IT Director) - The primary goal of this Public Hearing will be to review proposals submitted to date, look for 'themes' which logically group proposals into categories making it easier to interpret alternatives for the new districts, and potentially create new drafts or eliminate any draft map proposal that does not meet legal criteria or that the Board finds is undesirable.

Recommended Action: Conduct Public Hearing, categorize and/or potentially create new or eliminate draft map proposals. Provide any desired direction to staff.

Fiscal Impact: None.

ADJOURN



**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA REQUEST

Print

MEETING DATE	November 8, 2021	DEPARTMENT	
ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTS			
TIME REQUIRED	Public Hearing: 6:30 PM	PERSONS APPEARING BEFORE THE BOARD	Robert C. Lawton, CAO, Nate Greenberg, IT Director
SUBJECT	PUBLIC HEARING: Redistricting Third Review of Alternative Maps		

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

(A brief general description of what the Board will hear, discuss, consider, or act upon)

The primary goal of this Public Hearing will be to review proposals submitted to date, look for 'themes' which logically group proposals into categories making it easier to interpret alternatives for the new districts, and potentially create new drafts or eliminate any draft map proposal that does not meet legal criteria or that the Board finds is undesirable.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Conduct Public Hearing, categorize and/or potentially create new or eliminate draft map proposals. Provide any desired direction to staff.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

CONTACT NAME: Robert C. Lawton

PHONE/EMAIL: 760-932-5410 / rlawton@mono.ca.gov

MINUTE ORDER REQUESTED:

YES NO

ATTACHMENTS:

Click to download
Staff Report
Correspondence - Calloway

History

Time	Who	Approval
11/5/2021 11:00 PM	County Counsel	Yes
10/28/2021 12:25 PM	Finance	Yes
11/5/2021 11:01 PM	County Administrative Office	Yes



County of Mono

County Administrative Officer

Robert C. Lawton
County Administrative Officer

John C. Craig
Assistant County Administrative Officer

Date: November 8, 2021
To: Honorable Board of Supervisors
From: Robert C. Lawton, CAO
Subject: Redistricting Public Hearing

Discussion

Mono County supervisorial district boundaries are geographically redrawn every 10 years in accordance with the California Election Code Section 21500, following each decennial federal census, the most recent being in 2020. Using that census as a basis, the Mono County Board of Supervisors adjusts the boundaries of any or all of the county supervisorial districts so that the districts shall be as nearly equal in population, and comply with applicable provisions of Section 1973 of Title 42 of the United States Code, as amended.

This Public Hearing is the fourth of five public hearings to receive input from citizens regarding the proposed redistricting and what issues they find important to address.

Community input is extremely important to the redistricting process, and this public hearing is one of several opportunities for comments on the proposed district lines. Ultimately, the Board of Supervisors will adopt the new supervisorial district boundaries by December 15th, 2021.

In establishing the boundaries of the supervisorial districts, the board must utilize the following ranked criteria in determining districts:

1. To the extent practicable, districts must be geographically contiguous.
2. To the extent practicable, districts must maintain the geographic integrity of neighborhoods and communities of interest (i.e., minimize division).
3. To the extent practicable, districts must minimize division of cities or census designated places.
4. Boundaries must be easily identifiable and understandable by residents. If possible, districts should be bound by natural/artificial barriers.
5. Districts must be drawn to encourage geographical compactness in a manner that nearby areas of population are not bypassed in favor of more distant populations (where it does not conflict with the above criteria).

The GIS Team has been working to put together a new web mapping application called a Story Map. This application consists of a two-panel display with the map of the proposed districts in one panel and details of that proposal in the other. Those details include:

- Population by proposed district
- Demographics by proposed district
- Communities represented in each proposed district
- Total % variance between largest and smallest districts
- The five criteria which must be looked at when analyzing proposals
- A brief description of the proposal

There is a unique created Story Map for each proposal which has been submitted through the redistricting tool. GIS Staff will provide a cursory analysis of each proposal relative to the five criteria and offer a basic analysis relative to each of those points (potentially in terms of a green, yellow, red for each of them).

During today's Public Hearing:

- The Board will review any new proposal created between November 2nd and today's final 5pm deadline for submission of new proposals and provide direction on how to proceed with each;
- Review all proposals received to date and reduce proposals for consideration to ideally include only three or four.

At a 3-hour workshop, on November 16th (after the regular meeting)

- Further review proposals on their merits using side-by-side comparison of geography and demographics;
- If possible, arrive at a single recommendation. However, the Board may choose to allow for more than one map to be published for the required 3 days prior to the December 15th meeting but it is recommended to set a goal of no more than three.

From: Brent Calloway <callowaybrent@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 2, 2021 10:39 AM

To: Scheereen Dedman <sdedman@mono.ca.gov>

Subject: Fwd: Redistricting Comment

You don't often get email from callowaybrent@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello,

A rather long redistricting comment for you.

Thank You,

Brent Calloway

Not a resident, just like redistricting.

Sent from my iPhone

I was very excited to hear that Mono County IT was putting together a redistricting tool and was quick to utilize the incredible tool to submit my redistricting proposal. I decided to write an explanation of my thought process and experience using the tool as I believe it will help move the redistricting conversation forward and might even save time and answer some questions that will likely come up at future meetings.

I feel that the current district boundaries do not meet the intent of the legal redistricting criteria. In my opinion the only obvious problematic issue is the long piece of district 4 that stretches into Mammoth Lakes. In addition to not meeting the criteria of being easily identifiable and understandable, it is not geographically compact and does indeed bypass nearby populations for distant populations to balance the numbers. I set out using the tool with the goal of creating 2 districts completely within the unincorporated portion of the County as there is enough population in the unincorporated portion do so. I'm not necessarily opposed to a proposal with 4 districts that touch Mammoth, but my goal was to avoid that outcome and the result is a proposal that seems to stand up well to the redistricting criteria.

I started the exercise by creating a northern district that is more compliant with the current criteria. A north of Conway district would make perfect geographic and even hydrologic sense, however would only have a population of 2,065 so around 500-600 people needed to be added to the northern district. The options were a finger either through the mostly uninhabited eastern mono basin and caldera region into Mammoth Lakes, as is the current configuration, a finger along the Sierra crest and into Mammoth Lakes which seems equally non-compliant with the current criteria or a more logical expansion of the district into either the Mono Basin or the Tri Valleys. As fingers across large swaths of uninhabited lands with the sole purpose of grabbing up a little piece of Mammoth Lakes was an unacceptable option for my goal, a hard decision needed to be made. Either the communities within the Mono Basin watershed (including June Lake) or the Tri Valleys would need to be split into two districts with a portion going into the north of Conway district. In my opinion, adding a portion of the Tri Valley into the northern district was the worse option. Expanding the northern district to include all the Mono Basin communities except June Lake, would add enough population to create a legal district while maintaining geographic compactness and not resulting in an unwieldy northern district that would ultimately split the Tri Valleys into two districts somewhere near Hammil Valley and create a district that stretched from Fish Lake Valley to Topaz. This was indeed a tough decision as splitting June Lake from the Mono Basin has been identified by citizens as an undesirable outcome, but in my opinion was the best compromise when keeping the legal criteria in mind.

With a northern district established, there were basically 6 population centers outside of Mammoth Lakes remaining: June Lake, Crowley/Long Valley, Swall Meadows, Paradise, Chalfant and Benton/Hammil. Combined, these communities have a population of about 3,450 or about 800 too many for a legal district. So some portion of this remaining unincorporated district needed to be split off into a district that includes a portion of Mammoth Lakes.

I believe each one of these 6 communities should not be split apart by district boundaries. In addition, as stated in the northern district expansion argument, I believe for geographic and demographic reasons the communities of the Tri Valley, Benton/Hammil and Chalfant should be kept intact. It also makes

demographic and geographic sense in my opinion that this Tri Valley district would become the district that does not include a portion of Mammoth Lakes. So starting with an intact Tri Valley, the options were to expand the district into June Lake or expand the district into the southern highway 395 communities Paradise/Swall Meadows & Long Valley, similar to the current district 2 configuration.

If the district was expanded into June Lake, that would add enough people for a total population of 1,758. Another 1,000 or so people would need to be added to create a compliant district. Adding all of Swall Meadows and Paradise would still leave the district about 500 people short, so Crowley/Long Valley is the only population center left and would need to be sliced up.

Starting over with a Tri Valley only district and expanding it to include Paradise, Swall Meadows, and all of the Crowley/Long Valley communities, with June Lake then becoming the sole unincorporated community to include a portion of Mammoth Lakes (which does seem quite reasonable to me), a delicate balance with a total population deviation less than 10% can be reached. I say delicate because my current proposal (A4) has a deviation of 9.8%, adding two people into the southern unincorporated district would disqualify the proposal. So to achieve that delicate balance some decisions had to be made. Basically the districts needed to be balanced using the sparse population of the Upper Owens region. The Hot Creek hatchery would be part of the June/Mammoth district as would the ranches and fishing camps of the Upper Owens River. All other inhabited tracts including the industrial park, Convict Lake, the Cal Trans station and all the communities along 395 would be part of the Southern District. The Adobe Valley/Dexter Canyon areas would also be part of the Southern District.

While some proposals may seek to reduce the population deviation to a number well below the 10% legal threshold, I don't believe that should be a huge concern and keeping communities intact is of much greater importance. Remember the population is tiny. The total deviation between the high population unincorporated district and the low population district is only 260. I tried several other redistricting attempts from scratch and achieving a valid proposal without 4 districts in Mammoth Lakes is a difficult balancing act. This is the only option that I was able to produce that keeps all the established community areas (and planning areas) intact.

Balancing the remaining three districts within Mammoth Lakes is not something I am qualified to attempt as I do not have a good understanding of the demographics and neighborhood characteristics of the Town. My proposal includes a compact district south of highway 203 with the remainder of the population basically being balanced by random allocation. I can't argue for or against these district lines and welcome adjustments.

Redistricting is important and difficult work. I hope an explanation of my thought process will help as your board continues to debate the pros and cons of different redistricting solutions. Thank you for your time and thank you to the Mono County GIS team for creating such a fantastic tool.