

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS II
Office of the City Clerk

City Council of the City of Napa
Regular Meeting

February 2, 2021

FOR THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAPA:

EVENING SESSION:

11. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

11.A. Redistricting Process for Councilmember District Boundaries.

- 1) Email from Ron Rhyno received on February 1, 2021.
- 2) Email from Robert Van Der Velde received on February 2, 2021.
- 3) Email from Amy Martenson on behalf of Napa County Progressive Alliance, received on February 2, 2021.*
- 4) Email from Scott Rafferty received on February 2, 2021. *
- 5) Email from Gary Orton received on February 2, 2021.*
- 6) Email from Kevin Teague received on February 2, 2021.*

****EMAIL OR HANDWRITTEN COMMENTS WILL BE READ INTO THE RECORD BY CITY STAFF
DURING THE MEETING.***

From: [Ron Rhyno](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 6:06 PM
To: [Tiffany Carranza](#); [Clerk](#)
Cc: [Steve Potter](#)
Subject: Item 11 - Redistricting

[EXTERNAL]

Tiffany, I'm strongly encouraging a hybrid representation process.

Why: Its important to have current Council member representation along with community members to fully understand community perspectives and transmit community perspectives to the other Council members.

I urge the two newest members represent the Council; a woman, and a man who also represents the City's largest underrepresented community.

A group of 9-11 is a workable group including the City Manager or his designee.

Look for membership which includes underrepresented voices.

respectfully submitted,

Ron Rhyno

From: [Robert Van Der Velde](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 6:36 PM
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: Re: Public Comment 2/2/21

[EXTERNAL]

I was expecting to be able to call in per your email above, but here are my written comments to be read into the record if a phone call is not possible...

I am Robert Van Der Velde, co-chair of the Voters Choice Napa committee. VCN is an arm of the Community Leaders Coalition and the official advisory body for implementation of the California Voters Choice Act for the last four years. Our mission is to improve voter registration, education, and participation in the governmental process. An example of this effort was assisting with Napa's initial districting, helping fund with the public forums, and providing a free tool and trainings for citizens to draw their own maps.

Tonight you will be asked to provide guidance for staff as to who would conduct the constitutionally required redistricting of City Council. VCN urges you to adopt an independent citizens commission to draw the new district lines.

California voters have twice adopted independent redistricting commissions, first for legislative lines (Proposition 11) and then for congressional districts (Proposition 20). Both propositions, passed by large margins of Napa voters, stand for the simple principle that elected officials should not select their voters, but the voters should select their elected officials. Please have Napa join the California jurisdictions – larger and small - listed on Common Cause's website with independent redistricting commissions. These include medium-sized cities around the size of Napa, including Merced, Santa Barbara, Watsonville, and Woodland.

The initial drawing of lines last year showed that Napa has an interested and engaged community willing to participate in this process, although public input was cut short by the pandemic. It may be that only minor tweaks to the new lines will be needed, but since the data used was 10 years old, it is unlikely that after 10 years of demographic shifts exactly 25% of the population still lives north of Trancas and nearly 25% south of Trancas and west of 29. It may even be possible, or even legally required, to create a district with a majority Hispanic citizen voting age population. If you are thinking to yourself "how would this impact my district", that's a good reason why this task should be delegated to an independent body to avoid political considerations.

VCN will partner with the City to recruit a broadly diverse pool for an independent commission, reflecting the many voices in our community, providing equity and inclusion in this process. We are also committed to assisting with engaging the public no matter which method of redistricting is selected, for example providing information to the Registrar regarding implementing simultaneous translation of Zoom hearings for Board of Supervisors districting.

Our democracy is under attack from enemies foreign and domestic. Putting the citizenry in charge of redistricting will help improve civic engagement and build trust in the process of local government. It's the right thing to do.

On Tue, Feb 2, 2021 at 9:40 AM Clerk <clerk@cityofnapa.org> wrote:

Greetings Robert,

Thank you for providing your name, phone number, and agenda item below.

A representative from the City Clerk's Office will call you this evening to connect you to the City Council meeting to allow you to provide your comments to the Council via telephone. You will be called once the item is being heard and the Mayor has asked for public comment.

Please remember to turn down the audio on your computer or TV in order to reduce any feedback noise. You will have 3 minutes to provide your comments and a buzzer will sound at 30 seconds alerting you to wrap up, and will sound again at the 3-minute mark alerting you your time is up.

If you have any other questions, then please let us know.

Thank you,

Caitlin Saldanha

Deputy City Clerk

City of Napa – City Hall – City Clerk’s Office

955 School Street, Napa, CA 94559

Phone (707) 258-7870

Email csaldanha@cityofnapa.org

Website www.cityofnapa.org



From: Robert Van Der Velde [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 9:33 AM

To: Clerk <clerk@cityofnapa.org>

Subject: Public Comment 2/2/21

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#) [Feedback](#)
[EXTERNAL]

Good morning,

I would like to offer public comment at the 6:30 pm meeting tonight on item 11(a) redistricting.

I can be reached via cell phone [REDACTED]

Thanks.

--

Robert J. Van Der Velde
[REDACTED]

--

Robert J. Van Der Velde
[REDACTED]

From: [Napa County Progressive Alliance](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 6:24 PM
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: COMMENT TO COUNCIL FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MEETING - PLEASE READ (ITEM 11A)

Categories: Unverified Contact

[EXTERNAL]

Good evening, Napa City Council:

My name is Amy Martenson, speaking for the Napa County Progressive Alliance.

One year ago, the Napa City Council began a process resulting in an historic change from at-large to district elections—where the public freely expressed their preferences and submitted a variety of maps. We learned a lot from this trial run and now prepare for the main act: creating a map that will last for the next decade.

We again compliment City staff for an inclusive process with well-attended public hearings, simultaneous translation, and thoughtful outreach, creatively holding a mapping workshop at a place of worship to maximize participation of our diverse populace. We all learned that the FAIR MAPS Act required the City Council to place the highest priority (after contiguity) on a map that maintains communities of interest in each district. The council ignored this mandate, sadly making the process window dressing. The City Council's rationale for the final map was it was "easy to understand," which is toward the bottom of the list of mapping priorities. That was the best it could say in adopting a map, drawn by two influential land-use attorneys, one the son of a State senator, designed to benefit the two already-declared, pro-development candidates, who were backed by the local political establishment, including most of the Council itself. One of the candidates, who now sits on the Council, openly promoted adoption of that map, getting his supporters to submit word-for-word the same public comment in its favor. The other establishment candidate, who also now sits on the Council, was more reserved but was seen sitting in public hearings with the land use attorney most affiliated with the chosen map.

This trial run shows why independent redistricting commissions are so important. An independent commission, especially when it includes representatives from underrepresented and disadvantaged communities, would help put average voters in charge of our political system instead of incumbents and other political insiders. Such a commission would obey the FAIR MAPS Act criteria and instill public trust in the process and, more importantly, in the outcome. For these reasons, we ask the City Council to provide direction to City staff to begin the process of forming an independent redistricting commission.

Additionally, we ask that the City Council do the right thing by immediately passing a resolution initiating a streamlined annexation of the City's two largest county islands—the West Pueblo/Linda Vista and Imola/Parrish islands—so their approximately 2,000 predominantly working class and Latinx residents, many of whom are renters, are given the right to vote in city elections and included in a district with their communities of interest to assure their vote is not diluted. Failure to annex now will mean depriving them of this opportunity for another decade until the next map is drawn.

For the record, we made the same requests—independent redistricting commission and immediate annexations—a year ago. We renew them with urgency tonight.

Thank you.

[Wordcount: 488]

From: Amy Martenson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 8:07 PM
To: Scott Sedgley <SSedgley@cityofnapa.org>; Liz Alessio <lalessio@cityofnapa.org>; Mary Luross <mluross@cityofnapa.org>; Beth Painter <bpainter@cityofnapa.org>; Bernie Narvaez <bnarvaez@cityofnapa.org>
Cc: Steve Potter <spotter@cityofnapa.org>
Subject: Fwd: COMMENT TO COUNCIL FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MEETING - PLEASE READ (ITEM 11A)

[EXTERNAL]

Because there were some mistakes when it was read, I am forwarding my written statement for tonight's meeting.

To be clear, our concern has never been with the City staff or the outreach; the concern has been and is with the final vote and the City Council itself.

Thank you, Liz, for your political courage and for being an advocate for a fair and objective process. I appreciate your consistent advocacy on behalf of the people and your ethics.

Sincerely,
Amy

Begin forwarded message:

From: Napa County Progressive Alliance <napacountyprogressivealliance@gmail.com>
Subject: COMMENT TO COUNCIL FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MEETING - PLEASE READ (ITEM 11A)
Date: February 2, 2021 at 6:24:25 PM PST
To: Clerk <clerk@cityofnapa.org>

Good evening, Napa City Council:

My name is Amy Martenson, speaking for the Napa County Progressive Alliance.

One year ago, the Napa City Council began a process resulting in an historic change from at-large to district elections—where the public freely expressed their preferences and submitted a variety of maps. We learned a lot from this trial run and now prepare for the main act: creating a map that will last for the next decade.

We again compliment City staff for an inclusive process with well-attended public hearings, simultaneous translation, and thoughtful outreach, creatively holding a mapping workshop at a place of worship to maximize participation of our diverse populace. We all learned that the FAIR MAPS Act required the City Council to place the highest priority (after contiguity) on a map that maintains communities of interest in each district. The council ignored this mandate, sadly making the process window dressing. The City Council's rationale for the final map was it was "easy to understand," which is toward the bottom of the list of mapping priorities. That was the best it could say in adopting a map, drawn by two influential land-use attorneys, one the son of a State senator, designed to benefit the two already-declared, pro-development candidates, who were backed by the local political establishment, including most of the Council itself. One of the candidates, who now sits on the Council, openly promoted adoption of that map, getting his supporters to submit word-for-word the same public comment in its favor. The other establishment candidate, who also now sits on the Council, was more reserved but was seen sitting in public hearings with the land use attorney most affiliated with the chosen map.

This trial run shows why independent redistricting commissions are so important. An independent commission, especially when it includes representatives from underrepresented and disadvantaged communities, would help put average voters in charge of our political system instead of incumbents and other political insiders. Such a commission would obey the FAIR MAPS Act criteria and instill public trust in the process and, more importantly, in the outcome. For these reasons, we ask the City Council to provide direction to City staff to begin the process of forming an independent redistricting commission.

Additionally, we ask that the City Council do the right thing by immediately passing a resolution initiating a streamlined annexation of the City's two largest county islands—the West Pueblo/Linda Vista and Imola/Parrish islands—so their approximately 2,000 predominantly working class and Latinx residents, many of whom are renters, are given the right to vote in city elections and included in a district with their communities of interest to assure their vote is not diluted. Failure to annex now will mean depriving them of this opportunity for another decade until the next map is drawn.

For the record, we made the same requests—independent redistricting commission and immediate annexations—a year ago. We renew them with urgency tonight.

Thank you.

[Wordcount: 488]

From: [Scott Rafferty](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 7:16 PM
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: Public comment

Categories: Unverified Contact

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

[Learn why this is important](#)

[Feedback](#)

[EXTERNAL]

I want to congratulate the council on retaining Paul Mitchell, who did an excellent job during the original districting.

Napa was the first of two cities to comply with the substantive requirements of the Fair Maps Act and the most successful. It also pioneered transparency, but will need to meet additional requirements this year.

This map must last for ten years, so it is imperative that the islands be included. We now know that these islands were surrounded after 1952, when state law illegalized this practice. The community deserves an explanation of why this has proven so difficult to correct. The costs should be borne by the county that allowed this to occur 70 years ago.

Otherwise, these minority communities will be absorbed into the nearest district, which is not fair or appropriate.

Napa has set a great standard for the rest of the state and thanks to Clerk Carranza and Mr. Mitchell should continue to do so.

air Maps Act.

Scott Rafferty

[REDACTED]
Walnut Creek CA 94596
[REDACTED]

From: [Gary Orton](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 6:39 PM
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: COMMENT TO COUNCIL FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MEETING – PLEASE READ”

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#) [Feedback](#)
[EXTERNAL]

Napa City Council, February 2, 2021, Agenda item 11A

Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council:

My name is Gary Orton.

Twenty-five cities in California, perhaps more, have chosen to form a redistricting commission. Population size is not a determinant. Populations range from Dinuba with 22 thousand to Los Angeles with 3.8 million.

Six have a population less than Napa: Dinuba, Seal Beach, Sanger, Menlo Park, Watsonville, and Woodland.

Three others have similar populations: Menifee, Merced, and Santa Barbara.

Five more have populations between 112 and 150 thousand: Downey, Berkeley, Roseville, Escondido, and Salinas.

The eleven remaining have populations between 202 thousand and 3.8 million. In ascending order, they are Modesto, Chula Vista, Stockton, Anaheim, Oakland, Long Beach, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, San Diego, and Los Angeles.

Many Napa residents were involved in the districting process last year and became well educated about communities of interest and their importance. City council members were unable to keep their hands out of the proverbial cookie jar, were unable to resist the temptation to create districts without regard to data everyone else saw, clear communities of interest were not kept intact in the final map. Napa is more than ready and ABLE to join the other 25 cities that have created redistricting commissions. For certain we do not want another debacle of leaving it up to the city council.

The following listings and references are for the written record and need not be read unless requested by the council.

Thank you.

From "Local Redistricting Commissions in California," https://v.gd/fh4Zhm , from Tab "Documents" at https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/government/redistricting.htm				
Population from "List of Municipalities in California," Wikipedia				
	City	Population (1,000s)	Population	Type
1	Dinuba	22	21,453	A
2	Seal Beach	25	24,168	A
3	Sanger	25	24,270	A
4	Menlo Park	33	32,026	A
5	Watsonville		51,199	A

		52		
6	Woodland	56	55,468	A
	Napa	77	76,915	
7	Menifee	78	77,519	A
8	Merced	79	78,958	H
9	Santa Barbara	89	88,410	I
10	Downey	112	111,772	A
11	Berkeley	113	112,580	I
12	Roseville	119	118,788	I
13	Escondido	144	143,911	H
14	Salinas	151	150,441	A
15	Modesto	202	201,165	H
16	Chula Vista	244	243,916	H
17	Stockton	292	291,707	A
18	Anaheim	337	336,265	A
19	Oakland	391	390,724	I
20	Long Beach	463	462,257	I
21	Sacramento	467	466,488	I
22	San Francisco	806	805,235	I
23	San Jose	946	945,942	A
24	San Diego	1,302	1,301,617	I
25	Los Angeles	3,793	3,792,621	A
Type: I=Independent, H=Hybrid, A=Advisory				

From: [Tiffany Carranza](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 7:35 PM
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: Kevin's public comment for the record

From: Kevin Teague <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 7:31 PM
To: Tiffany Carranza <tcarranza@cityofnapa.org>
Subject: Re: Can I call in on Districting

[EXTERNAL]
PLEASE READ:

I am watching live and these hot pockets of annexation is not the issue. They should be annexed. And like many of the callers, I would like to be on a redistrict commission.

However, the City needs to move forward. The City did a great job on districting. There were no issues and support by the lawyer representing the complainant. You need to spend funds wisely and move ahead. You have logical boundaries and met all of the requirements. We, the citizens of Napa, trust you the council in moving ahead with logical boundaries. Please move ahead with the business of the City.

Cities only need a commission when there is a problem. There is no problem in Napa. Look at the results. Thank you for your hard work. We appreciate what you do.

Kevin Teague
teague@htralaw.com

Holman Teague
Holman Teague Roche Anglin LLP Attorneys at Law
1455 First Street, Suite 217, Napa, CA 94559
707.927.4280
707.676.4382 (fax)
www.htralaw.com

On Feb 2, 2021, at 7:23 PM, Tiffany Carranza <tcarranza@cityofnapa.org> wrote:

Kevin, call in has passed, but you can email if it says PLEASE read, we still have about 3 or 4 to read

Tiffany

From: Kevin Teague <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 7:22 PM
To: Tiffany Carranza <tcarranza@cityofnapa.org>
Subject: Can I call in on Districting

[EXTERNAL]

My # is

Kevin Teague
teague@htralaw.com

Holman Teague
Holman Teague Roche Anglin LLP Attorneys at Law
1455 First Street, Suite 217, Napa, CA 94559
707.927.4280
707.676.4382 (fax)
www.htralaw.com