



CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

7:00 PM - Tuesday, September 24, 2024
via Videoconference and In Person

PARTICIPATION: Members of the public may participate by being present at the Los Altos Council Chamber at Los Altos City Hall located at 1 N. San Antonio Rd, Los Altos, CA during the meeting. Public comment is accepted in person at the physical meeting location, or via email to PublicComment@losaltosca.gov.

RULES FOR CONDUCT: Pursuant to Los Altos Municipal Code, Section 2.05.010 "Interruptions and rules for conduct": Understanding that the purpose of the city council meetings is to conduct the people's business for the benefit of all the people, in the event that any meeting of the city council is willfully interrupted by a person or group of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting impossible, the mayor, mayor pro tem, or any other member of the city council acting as the chair may order the removal of the person or persons responsible for the disruption and bar them from further attendance at the council meeting, or otherwise proceed pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.0 or any applicable penal statute or city ordinance.

REMOTE MEETING OBSERVATION: Members of the public may view the meeting via the link below, but will not be permitted to provide public comment via Zoom or telephone. Public comment will be taken in-person, and members of the public may provide written public comment by following the instructions below.

<https://losaltosca-gov.zoom.us/j/88394495716?pwd=FiWDacO1fVOfRd4eEPosMjmR4Q7y1D.1>

Telephone: 1-669-444-9171 / Webinar ID: 883 9449 5716 / Passcode: 981446

SUBMIT WRITTEN COMMENTS: Prior to the meeting, comments on matters listed on the agenda may be emailed to PublicComment@losaltosca.gov. Emails sent to this email address are sent to/received immediately by the City Council. Emails sent directly to the City Council as a whole or individually, and not sent to PublicComment@losaltosca.gov will not be included as a public comment in the Council packet.

Please note: Personal information, such as e-mail addresses, telephone numbers, home addresses, and other contact information are not required to be included with your comments. If this information is included in your written comments, they will become part of the public record. Redactions and/or edits will not be made to public comments, and the comments will be posted as they are submitted. Please do not include any information in your communication that you do not want to be made public.

Correspondence submitted in hard copy/paper format must be received by 2:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting to ensure distribution prior to the meeting. Comments provided in hard copy/paper format after 2:00 p.m. will be distributed the following day and included with public comment in the Council packet.

The Mayor will open public comment and will announce the length of time provided for comments during each item.

AGENDA

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

ESTABLISH QUORUM

PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Members of the audience may bring to the Council's attention any item that is not on the agenda. The Mayor will announce the time speakers will be granted before comments begin. Please be advised that, by law, the City Council is unable to discuss or take action on issues presented during the Public Comment Period. According to State Law (also known as "The Brown Act") items must first be noted on the agenda before any discussion or action.

CONSENT CALENDAR

These items will be considered by one motion unless any member of the Council or audience wishes to remove an item for discussion. Any item removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion will be handled at the discretion of the Mayor.

1. Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of September 10, 2024

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Hold Public Hearing No. 4 to receive a presentation from the City's consulting demographer, Redistricting Partners, to discuss and provide further directions as to the development of district boundaries and additional draft district maps for consideration for the City of Los Altos; solicit public input on the maps and on the order of elections of the five new districts, and whether candidates for City Council must be residents and electors of the district in which they seek election for any period of time prior to filing their nomination papers and declaring their intent to run

DISCUSSION ITEMS

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS ONLY

There will be no discussion or action on Informational Items

3. Tentative Council Calendar and Housing Element Update Implementation Calendar

COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS AND DIRECTIONS ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT


(Council Norms: It will be the custom to have a recess at approximately 9:00 p.m. Prior to the recess, the Mayor shall announce whether any items will be carried over to the next meeting. The established hour after which no new items will be started is 11:00 p.m. Remaining items, however, may be considered by consensus of the Council.)

SPECIAL NOTICES TO THE PUBLIC

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Altos will make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk 72 hours prior to the meeting at (650) 947-2610.

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, and that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body, will be available for public inspection at the Office of the City Clerk's Office, City of Los Altos, located at One North San Antonio Road, Los Altos, California at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

If you wish to provide written materials, please provide the City Clerk with 10 copies of any document that you would like to submit to the City Council for the public record.



**CITY OF LOS ALTOS
CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2024
7:00 p.m.
1 N. San Antonio Rd. ~ Los Altos, CA**

*Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor
Pete Dailey, Vice Mayor
Neysa Fligor, Councilmember
Lynette Lee Eng, Councilmember
Sally Meadows, Councilmember*

CALL MEETING TO ORDER – Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ESTABLISH QUORUM – Pursuant to AB2449, **Sally Meadows, Councilmember**, announced she would attend the meeting remotely due to illness.

Motion by Fligor and Second by Lee Eng to approve the remote attendance of Councilmember Meadows. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – **Melanie Ercoli, Regent of the Daughters of the American Revolution Los Altos Chapter**, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

The City Council unanimously approved Councilmember Meadows’ remote attendance during the Closed Session meeting.

There were no public comments during the Closed Session meeting.

There was no reportable action taken for the Closed Session meeting of September 10, 2024 at 5:45 p.m.

CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

There were no changes to the order of the agenda.

SPECIAL ITEMS

Issue Proclamation Recognizing September 17 - 23, 2024 as Constitution Week

Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, presented the proclamation to **Melanie Ercoli, Regent of the Daughters of the American Revolution Los Altos Chapter**.

Issue Proclamation Recognizing September as Emergency Preparedness Month

Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, presented the proclamation to **Arthur Whipple, Resilient Los Altos**.

Receive Presentation from Resilient Los Altos on Emergency Preparedness

Arthur Whipple, Resilient Los Altos, gave the presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

The following members of the public spoke during public comment:

- Frank Cano
- Eshu Vinnakota
- Teresa Morris
- Freddie Wheeler

CONSENT CALENDAR

Lynette Lee Eng, Councilmember, requested to pull Items 6 and 9 from the Consent Calendar for further discussion.

Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, moved Item 6 to after Item 11 on the agenda, and moved Item 9 to immediately following the Consent Calendar on the agenda.

Motion by Fligor and Second by Dailey to approve the Consent Calendar, excluding Items 6 and 9. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

1. Approve the Special and Regular Meeting Minutes of August 27 and August 28, 2024
2. Move to adopt a Resolution accepting completion of the On-Call Sanitary Sewer Spot Repairs and CCTV Inspection Services for FY 23/24 and authorize the Public Works Director to record a Notice of Completion as required by law, and find that this action is Exempt from Environmental Review pursuant to Section 15300.2 of the State Guidelines Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970
3. Adopt an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Los Altos Adding Chapter 3.60 to Title 3 Revenue and Finance of the Los Altos Municipal Code Enacting Regulations for Development Impact and In-Lieu Fees and find that this Ordinance is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15378(b)(4) and 15273(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970.
4. Two separate actions for City Council consideration:
 - Adopt an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Los Altos Repealing in its Entirety the Traffic Impact Fee Ordinance, Chapter 3.48 of the Los Altos Municipal Code and find that this Ordinance is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15378(b)(4) and 15273(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970; and
 - Adopt an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Los Altos Amending Chapter 3.49 to Title 3 Revenue and Finance of the Los Altos Municipal Code for Affordable Housing Fees and find that this Ordinance is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15378(b)(4) and 15273(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970

5. Authorize the City Manager to execute the Subdivision Improvement Agreement and approve the Final Map for the project located at 5150 El Camino Real.

7. Two separate actions for City Council consideration:
 - Allocation additional funding in the amount of \$131,000 into fiscal year 2024/25 Parks & Recreation operating budget for the median and roadway shoulder maintenance agreement; and

 - Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Del Conte's Landscaping in the amount not to exceed \$208,116 annually for median and roadway shoulder maintenance

8. Re-adopt a Resolution accepting the Santa Clara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP), including Volume 1 and the Los Altos Annex

9. Adopt a Resolution awarding the construction contract for the Lincoln Park Drinking Fountains Project CF-01030 to EPS, Inc. of San Mateo, California as the lowest responsible bidder submitting a responsive bid with a Base Bid amount not-to-exceed \$98,000, and up to 15% contingency, if needed, in the amount not-to-exceed \$14,700, for a total construction amount not-to-exceed \$112,700

Lynette Lee Eng, Councilmember, explained why she requested to pull the item for further discussion.

There were no public comments regarding the item.

Motion by Weinberg and Second by Dailey to adopt a Resolution awarding the construction contract for the Lincoln Park Drinking Fountains Project CF-01030 to EPS, Inc. of San Mateo, California as the lowest responsible bidder submitting a responsive bid with a Base Bid amount not-to-exceed \$98,000, and up to 15% contingency, if needed, in the amount not-to-exceed \$14,700, for a total construction amount not-to-exceed \$112,700. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

PUBLIC HEARINGS

10. Appeal the Approval of Tree Removal Permit (24-0062) for twenty-five (25) Apricot Trees located behind the Los Altos Police Department at 1 N. San Antonio Road

Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, opened the item and explained the appeal process.

Catherine Nunes, Appellant, presented the reason for the submission of the appeal.

Nick Zornes, Assistant City Manager of Land Use, presented the staff report.

Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, opened the Public Hearing.

The following members of the public spoke during the Public Hearing:

- Teresa Morris
- Nancy Martin
- Chip Lion
- Maria Bautista
- Robert Specker
- Kate Disney
- Jeanine Valadez

Catherine Nunes, Appellant, made rebuttal comments to the staff presentation.

Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor, closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Weinberg and Second by Dailey to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Development Services Department to allow the removal of twenty-five (25) apricot trees in the secured rear yard of the Los Altos Police Department at 1 N. San Antonio Road. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

DISCUSSION ITEMS

11. Accept Environmental Commission Recommendations #1, #2, and #5 for Accelerating Building Electrification

Nick Zornes, Assistant City Manager of Land Use, presented the report.

The following member of the public spoke regarding the item:

- Laura Teksler

Motion by Dailey and Second by Fligor to accept the Environmental Commission recommendation #1. **Motion carried 4-1 with Councilmember Lee Eng opposed.**

Motion by Dailey and Second by Lee Eng to accept the Environmental Commission Recommendation #2. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

6. Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Los Altos suspending enforcement of the City of Los Altos Municipal Code, local laws and regulations imposing all-electric requirements for new construction or otherwise prohibiting use or installation of gas appliances contained within City of Los Altos Municipal Code Title 12 and find that this action is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061 of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970

Lynette Lee Eng, Councilmember, explained why she requested to pull the item for further discussion.

There were no public comments regarding the item.

City of Los Altos
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
September 10, 2024
Page 5 of 5

Motion by Lee Eng and Second by Dailey to adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Los Altos suspending enforcement of the City of Los Altos Municipal Code, local laws and regulations imposing all-electric requirements for new construction or otherwise prohibiting use or installation of gas appliances contained within City of Los Altos Municipal Code Title 12 and find that this action is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061 of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS ONLY

There will be no discussion or action on Informational Items

- 12. Update on RFP for community engagement and design services for downtown park with underground parking
- 13. Tentative Council Calendar and Housing Element Update Implementation Calendar

COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS AND DIRECTIONS ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- **Pete Dailey, Vice Mayor** – Requested a future agenda item:
 - Discussion regarding a potential electric bicycle ordinance. *(Supported by Weinberg and Lee Eng)*
- **Jonathan D. Weinberg, Mayor** – Requested a future agenda item:
 - Discussion regarding a Climate Action Plan *(Supported by Fligor and Meadows)*

ADJOURNMENT – The regular meeting adjourned at 11:39 p.m.

The meeting minutes were prepared by Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, for approval at the regular meeting of September 24, 2024.

Jonathan D. Weinberg
Mayor

Melissa Thurman, MMC
City Clerk

The August 27, 2024 City Council meeting recording may be viewed via the following external website: <https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLosAltosCA>

The City of Los Altos does not own or operate YouTube. The video referenced on these minutes were live at the time the minutes were published.



City Council Agenda Report

Meeting Date: September 24, 2024

Prepared By: Jon Maginot

Approved By: Gabriel Engeland

Subject: Hold Public Hearing No. 4 to receive a presentation from the City's consulting demographer, Redistricting Partners, to discuss and provide further directions as to the development of district boundaries and additional draft district maps for consideration for the City of Los Altos; solicit public input on the maps and on the order of elections of the five new districts, and whether candidates for City Council must be residents and electors of the district in which they seek election for any period of time prior to filing their nomination papers and declaring their intent to run.

COUNCIL PRIORITY AREA

- Business Communities
- Circulation Safety and Efficiency
- Environmental Sustainability
- Housing
- Neighborhood Safety Infrastructure
- General Government

RECOMMENDATION

Hold Public Hearing No. 4 to receive a presentation from the City's consulting demographer, Redistricting Partners, regarding additional draft maps developed by the public and Redistricting Partners, receive the results of community outreach, provide direction regarding the final draft map for adoption at Public hearing No. 5 on the October 8, 2024 , consider which specific districts will constitute the two (2) districts on the ballot in November 2026 and the three (3) on the ballot in November 2028, and determine whether candidates for City Council must be residents and electors of the district in which they seek election for any period of time prior to filing their nomination papers and declaring their intent to run..

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact to hold this meeting as the City has already retained the services of outside legal counsel and a demographer to assist in the transition to district-based elections.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Not applicable

PREVIOUS COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

On April 18, 2024, the City received a Notice of Violation of the California Voting Rights Act ("CVRA"). The letter asserts that the City is in violation of the CVRA because the City's councilmember elections are at-large as opposed to by district and there exist racial polarization and vote dilution. On May 28, 2024, the City Council adopted a resolution declaring its intent to transition to a district-based electoral system commencing in November of 2026.

On June 11 and July 13, 2024, the City Council held the first and second of five public hearings required for the City's transition to by-district elections. Public hearings nos. 1 and 2 were held prior to any draft maps being drawn. Redistricting Partners, the City's retained demographer, made presentations at both public hearings regarding the CVRA. Those presentations covered the composition and number of districts, as well as the public input process. Members of the public provided input at both hearings regarding various communities of interest in and the various attributes of the City of Los Altos. At its July 13th hearing, the City Council, with public input, provided direction to begin drawing draft maps for a by-district election system comprised of five districts and a rotational mayor.

At the August 28, 2024 public hearing, Council received a presentation on the first set of three draft maps and began a robust community outreach process. At the August 28th hearing, the City's consulting demographer, Redistricting Partners, presented three draft maps as a way for the City Council and community to visualize proposed district boundaries. The City Council also provided further direction on the additional information the City should examine when forming the district boundaries, such as the distribution and of information regarding socio-economic status, age, school boundaries, shopping districts, and parks.

On October 8, 2024, at the fifth and final public hearing, the City Council is scheduled to adopt the final City Council district map. By law, the City Council has until October 31, 2024 as the final legal deadline to adopt the City Council district boundary map and determine the order of election for the five (5) City Council districts, that is – which two (2) districts will select a Councilmember in the November 2026 general election, and which three (3) districts will do so in November of 2028.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

Following Public Hearing No. 4, the City embarked on a robust community engagement campaign. The purpose of this engagement campaign was to solicit feedback on where district boundaries should be drawn and where the different communities of interest are throughout the City. Outreach events included presentations to various community groups, community workshops and tabling at the Downtown Farmers' Market, two libraries and the Lucky Supermarket.

In these ways, the City has provided multiple ways for the public to submit feedback at formal hearings, City-sponsored workshops, and via on-line submissions of community of interest forms, draft maps, and other input.

As of September 19, 2024, the City has received two COI forms and 24 draft maps from the public. Public hearings, meetings, and workshops have also been open and available for participation of City residents throughout this process looking toward the final map adoption by the City Council.

A summary of the outreach can be found as Attachment No. 1.

In response to this input, the City's demographer developed and revised maps to address the public's concerns and the direction provided by the City Council, all the while ensuring that the City complied with the criteria mandated by the California Voting Rights Act and the Federal Voting Rights Act. The City is using the latest 2020 Census data provided by the Statewide Database with the state prison population reallocated, as required under the Fair Maps Act. These maps use the underlying Census tract geography to establish the boundaries of individual City Council districts. In drawing these maps, the utmost care will be taken to honor neighborhoods and communities of interest and the public input received.

At the September 24, 2024 meeting, the City Council will again hear public feedback on the map drafts as well as regarding the sequence of elections. The City Council also may provide additional feedback on the draft maps, or ask for new draft maps, for the next hearing on October 8, 2024.

Regarding the sequence of elections, the City Council will consider which two (2) districts will select a Councilmember in the November 2026 general election and which three (3) districts will do so in November of 2028, As required by law, the City Council will make this decision "in the spirit of the California Voting Rights Act."

At the September 24th meeting, the City Council will also determine whether candidates for City Council must be residents of the district in which they seek election for any period of time prior to filing their nomination papers. Pursuant to Government Code section 34882, a candidate running for a city councilmember position is not eligible to hold that office unless they reside in the geographical area making up the district from which they are elected at the time their nomination papers are issued. There is no requirement related to a minimum residency period, and the City is not required to impose such a requirement. In fact, neighboring cities have taken different positions on this issue – some have imposed a 30-day residency requirement while others have imposed no minimum residency requirement. The City Council invites the public to provide their input on this topic.

At the fifth hearing on October 8, 2024, the City Council will be asked to select a final map for adoption and also establish the sequence of elections. In this case, the City Council will pass an ordinance that defines both the boundaries of the five new districts as well as the order of elections. Alternatively, the City Council might also decide that more work is necessary and provide additional direction for revised maps at an additional future hearing, which again will be posted at least seven (7) days prior to that next hearing.¹

¹ The requirement that there be five (5) hearings is a minimum and not a maximum.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Community Engagement Summary
- 2. Public Comments received as of September 17, 2024
- 3. Draft Maps A-E
- 4. Draft Map A Detail
- 5. Draft Map B Detail
- 6. Draft Map C Detail
- 7. Draft Map D Detail
- 8. Draft Map E Detail

Community Engagement Events

- 9/3 – Workshop with community group (Los Altos Residents)
- 9/4 Presentation to Chamber of Commerce Government Affairs Committee
- 9/5 Tabling event at Farmers Market
- 9/6 Presentation to Los Altos Community Coalition
- 9/10 Tabling event at Main Library
- 9/11 Tabling event at Lucky grocery store
- 9/12 Tabling event at Lucky grocery store
- 9/12 Tabling event at Farmers Market
- 9/14 Community Workshop #1 at Los Altos Community Center
- 9/16 Community Workshop #2 at Grant Park
- 9/17 Tabling event at Woodland Library
- 9/18 Tabling event at Main Library
- 9/19 Presentation to Los Altos Rotary Club
- 9/19 Tabling event at Farmers Market

Questions received about Districting

- Under district-based elections will all 5 be elected at same time?
- What did City Council consider at the August 28 meeting?
- Has the City taken into account rental vs. owned?
- People are anxious, but why? How is a district line going to change things?
- Is there a way to view comments that are being collected on the website?
- Is October 31 a hard date to finish?
- How permanent are the lines? Will they be reviewed?
- Is there consideration of fewer districts with some at large?
- Were socioeconomic values considered?
- Is brand being considered as it is important in regional areas?
- Did the lawyers say if there's anything that can't be done?
- Which maps are considered?
- What happens if only one person or nobody runs in a district?
- What is the criteria for choosing which two districts go first?
- What other cities has the demographer worked for?
- Does the CVRA consider that off-cycle elections have lower turnout?
- Is there any help for people that are interested in using the interactive mapping tool but don't have access?
- What happens if a Council member doesn't live in a district?
- How will creating districts help to avoid vote dilution?
- What happens when the City's demographics shift?
- Are political affiliations taken into consideration?
- What is one thing people should know?
- Is there anything that could happen between now and October to change the transition?
- How can someone stay involved with drawing maps?
- What did the City do to merit the notice of violation?

- What's going on in the Santa Monica case?
- Does it matter what my boundaries are?
- Why can't we keep El Camino Real together in one district?
- Has the City considered moving to becoming a Charter City?
- Are we splitting up the City or keeping it the same?
- What can the City do?

Comments regarding District boundaries

- Methodist Church on Magdalena - church is in one part of town, rectory in another part
- I don't want to be part of downtown Los Altos because business districts have different goals than residents versus I live in a residential area but I want to have a say in services like library, downtown
- Magdalena has 3 big churches - across the street there is Rancho Shopping Center - not a lot of housing density
- certain representatives would not be able to run if they are not in the district they want to run for
- It is absurd to use major roads as a criteria for Los Altos; can't overlook communities of interest
- Need to be done by end of October and want the city to consider rank choice voting
- Develop an FAQ
- Keep Cupertino Union School District in one district, regardless of population size
- Live along Los Altos Ave, dine in Downtown
- Preference is for 4 Districts/1 Mayor
- Don't split El Camino Real
- Keep at least one school per district
- The first three maps look fine; pick from those
- Downtown resident wants to keep schools and major intersections together
- Located right at border – focused on Safe Routes to School corridors – look at holistic approach – Loyola Corners – schools are important – neighborhood character
- Lives near downtown and likes Map C
- Lives on Pine Lane and likes Map A & B
- All maps look similar – South Los Altos limited options
- Quality of candidates – South Los Altos spend most of time in Mountain View – good job on maps
- Fremont Avenue is a great dividing line
- Make major streets the dividing lines for ease of understanding
- Boundaries don't matter in the end; all the same city
- Keep shared interests in mind, and as boundaries; like running & biking trails
- To keep the City unified, name/label the districts as "A" "L" "T" "O" "S". That way people won't feel like a number, it will help keep the community together
- Need more "all-ages" facilities. Prefer one in each district
- Keep Loyola Corners together
- Wants everyone to be well represented and speak for everyone

- Do not move to ranked choice voting. Let other agencies use it effectively before we use it
- No to Charter. Go through at least one district election before undergoing another major change in the city
- Liked Map C because downtown represented by neighbors and El Camino Real not split
- Keep downtown and library together across to Springer
- If a vacancy occurs, appoint a Council member. No special election due to cost
- Look at public transit lines
- Have El Camino Real in two districts – divide along San Antonio Road
- Moving to districts is a good thing
- Live near Downtown across Foothill Expressway – like Map C – don't like Map A
- Live near Miramonte/Covington – like Map C
- Divide districts down roadways so that there are two districts that represent a given street
- It doesn't really matter where lines are

Other comments received

- I appreciate avoiding spending more money to get the same result
- It is hard to get involved with city topics when council meetings start and end so late
- Thinks that the Housing Element is tied with this action and lawsuit
- We should fight it
- Angry its shoved down our throats – special interest
- Merge with the Hills

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Saturday, June 8, 2024 11:20:08 AM

Submitted on Saturday, June 8, 2024 - 11:19am

Submitted by anonymous user: 73.70.105.123

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Ellen M Akerlund-Gonella

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence LOS ALTOS

Public Comment

I think this is a horrible idea. What does this accomplish except make a southern CA attorney happy?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81456>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 11:42:41 AM

Submitted on Monday, June 10, 2024 - 11:42am

Submitted by anonymous user: 73.71.62.88

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Rita Cartalano
Email
City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment I am NOT in favor of district-based elections.
The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81469>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 12:03:49 PM

Submitted on Tuesday, June 11, 2024 - 12:03pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 107.197.104.79

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Debbie Skelton
Email
City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

Dear City Council Members,

I support five districts for the purpose of electing our City Council representatives. In addition, I prefer the annual rotating Mayor position. The system of rotation has historically worked well for our City.

Sincerely,

Debbie Skelton

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81474>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 10:55:37 AM

Submitted on Wednesday, June 12, 2024 - 10:55am

Submitted by anonymous user: 67.170.196.4

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Roberta Phillips

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment I want five districts with rotating mayors

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81479>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Monday, June 17, 2024 2:02:02 PM

Submitted on Monday, June 17, 2024 - 2:01pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 108.255.195.99

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Sharon Fingold

Email

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

I attended the first public hearing on district-based elections. And have a few comments: 1) The public hearing seemed more like a hearing from the consultant with just a small proportion of time for public comments and there was no room for dialog, discussion, or follow up questions. I encourage the City to come up with different formats like you did for affordable housing and downtown visioning. We need a forum where we can ask questions and have conversation. 2) A couple of alternatives were provided by members of the public but there was no reaction to these alternatives (either pro or con) from the City Council. In the interest of transparency and completeness, the City Council should provide a list of all options and then, if there are options the Council does not want to consider, the Council should explain why. We need to put all options on the table and evaluate them so we can make the best decision possible for our City. 3) It was not clear how the City is going to identify communities of interest. I would like to see a plan for that part of the project--how to identify the communities and the timeframe and meetings that will be scheduled. Thank you!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81500>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2024 9:48:01 AM

Submitted on Tuesday, June 18, 2024 - 9:47am

Submitted by anonymous user: 99.95.166.232

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name eric lutkin

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

of the two district based options under consideration I would prefer that you select the one with five districts and have the role of mayor rotate among the City Council members.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81505>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, July 2, 2024 12:49:29 PM

Submitted on Tuesday, July 2, 2024 - 12:49pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 76.126.31.88

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Alex Gergel

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Mountain View/Los Altos

Public Comment

Los Altos Town Crier article "Los Altos council opts to change how residents vote"

Next step is Ghettos,

for European Americans, Asian American, African Americans, Australian Americans, South Americans, Christian Americans, Muslim Americans, Jewish Americans, Buddhists Americans etc. Then - Tribal social structure, different sets of laws for different tribes, Different Police (they should speak local languages), then Council of Elders in charge of a cities, etc. – this is the road you been pushed to go dear City Council. If you would not fight with this, this is where we will end up.

US Voting Laws written for AMERICAN CITIZENS, the laws to which we all equal.

The common laws, language, borders, traditions - this is what makes us a Country.

Someone in California want to destroy the Meaning of Citizenship and if they succeed, we will lose our Cities, then Stats then Country. They want us to hate each other (Divide and Conquer). Keep it or you lose it. At list think of your children's future.

Dear council, if you do not want to fight for Los Altos future, then what are you doing here?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81588>

From: [Douglas Gruehl](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Town Crier Ad
Date: Wednesday, July 3, 2024 5:22:10 PM

Your "district-based" elections ad on page 2 of the July 3rd edition of The Town Crier states that 'one person from each district will run for a seat...' Please clarify.

Do you mean one person from each district will be elected to fill a seat? Your ad is not clear at all. If the ad line is correct, who is choosing that 'one person'?

Los Altos voters deserve clear, concise communications.

Douglas W. Gruehl


From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Wednesday, July 10, 2024 11:11:31 AM

Submitted on Wednesday, July 10, 2024 - 11:11am

Submitted by anonymous user: 75.37.193.75

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name James Sweeney
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Keeping the neighborhood safe and peaceful. Having a dog park for socializing both dogs and their owners. Improving internet connectivity. Establishing a park in the empty lot next to the new community center.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

We live on Cielito Dr. a short walk from Hillview Community Center, the Civic Center, and not far from LA High School and downtown. I would say our neighbor area is bounded by Hillview, San Antonio, Almond, and El Monte. The homes are expensive for single family residences due to their location, the good school district, and the relative affluence of residents, many who are in the tech industry. The ethnic diversity includes immigrants from around the globe particularly those in the tech industry. Many are of Asian descent and most born elsewhere are long term residents and US citizens. The relative ages of residents varies over time as older long term residents die, move away, or their kids grow up and leave. This means the school population grows and shrinks depending on how often housing becomes available for younger families or older families no longer have kids at home. The neighborhood is pleasant, convenient to shopping and other needs. There are no multiunit dwellings or commercial establishments. The neighborhood includes public facilities at Hillview and the City's civic center an office building on San Antonio, and an ATT substation. It is hard for young former residents to afford the expensive housing in their home town. Many home are being torn down for renovations , even those that aren't all that old. School kids bike, walk or drive to the nearby schools so safety and parking near the high school may be an issue .

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

I think the council should compromise on the new dog park and keep the library parking while keeping the current dig park near us for small dogs and the new one for larger dogs using grass and not taking up space with a bunch of agility stations so dogs can chase balls and run free. The empty space near the Community Center would be ideal for a small park in the neighbor and be way less expensive to improve than the proposed park downtown eliminating parking. I am not happy with this lawyer extorting the city with threats of a law suit and think the city should fight paying him off. It may be necessary to change the council system but rewarding this scammer because he submits threats is despicable . The ranked system, if legal, sounds best. As a resident I would prefer access to whatever council

member has similar interests or all if I have local concerns, not to just a single council member who may not be interested in issues outside of their neighborhood.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

Like living here and want to keep the community residential, not excessively crowded, but with affordable housing in more urban-like areas convenient to transportation and shopping but not crammed into currently suburban single family neighborhoods.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81616>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, July 13, 2024 3:09:13 PM

Submitted on Saturday, July 13, 2024 - 3:08pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 24.130.108.109

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Carol Kuiper
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.

1. Los Altos Elementary School attendance area boundaries constitute common communities of interest, even for those without elementary-aged children or seniors whose children graduated from Los Altos Elementary schools. The City Council boundaries would basically conform to the Los Altos Elementary School District Attendance Areas for Santa Rita, Almond, Covington, Loyola and Oak Elementary Schools.. Los Altos residents whose children attend Springer School, located in Mountain View, or who reside in the Cupertino Elementary School District would be included into the Oak Loyola or Covington School attendance areas. Some adjustments to these boundaries would need to be made to balance population numbers, but residents are used to the school district attendance boundaries adjusted from time to time for the same reason.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

2. Los Altos is a small community with no real geographic barriers isolating us from each other. With some residents above or south of Foothill Expressway, generally our whole community is bounded on the north by El Camino Real and Foothill Expressway on the south, on the east by Hwy 85ish (?) and on the west by Adobe Creek. The Los Altos Elementary School District boundaries and the individual school attendance boundaries are roughly within these boundaries. The boundaries would basically run north to South so each district would have a variety of housing within each district ranging from multiple dwellings like town houses and apartment buildings to single family homes, and other commercial/business use, some parks and/or other open space; a few would have a library or fire station and other community amenities.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

3. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

This proposal would build on an existing community of interest where friendships and working relationships for community action already exist. With some exceptions, these school district boundaries already have neighborhood associations, PTAs, Girl and Boy Scout troops, churches, an elementary school, Neighborhood Watch/Emergency Preparedness associations to which residents feel affinity within these boundaries, so using Los Altos Elementary School District attendance boundaries as a beginning point for Los Altos City Council district boundaries should cause relatively little disruption in its implementation. These boundaries contain a mix of housing,

commercial properties and ethnic, racial make-up. They are inclusive. Their make up would ease residents in to a new way of selecting City Council members.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

Although this questionnaire does not ask, I favor the current system of choosing the Mayor. I think it is healthier if all Council members are equal in their power and influence and rotate the Mayorship, keeping it largely a ceremonial position with the added responsibility of planning agendas in concert with the City Manager and fellow Council members and running Council Meetings.

In a small town like Los Altos, we want to build collaboration among the five Council members and not elevate one above the other by design.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81637>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Sunday, July 14, 2024 12:02:07 PM

Submitted on Sunday, July 14, 2024 - 12:01pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 98.45.25.43

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Julie Mahowald
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Los Altans value community. Apparently we value music (I personally do) with our wonderful First Friday music. Art is blossoming as well here. People value their schools and children... an extension of community. If that is what youre asking, these are my common interests.
Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

There aren't really physical boundaries. I would guess that the most time I spend in Los Altos is downtown, at friends' homes which are mostly in north LA. Also on my street. We have a strong community on our cul de sac.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

I don't believe that communities of interest should be used for re-boundary. We are very small. Fragmenting our city will not bring us a better democracy. What we need to do is have more people vote. With the tiny voter turnout we have if we fragment into interests, one strong interest could get someone on council way out of line with what the whole community wants. If you can help it, don't do it.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

We are not far from San Francisco which has 12 districts for representation. It is 25 times larger than us. They also suffer from low voter turnout. What happens is special interests and extremes make the place a mess. Los Altos doesn't need such a mess. let's get more people to vote if we want representation of interests.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81642>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Sunday, July 14, 2024 8:03:40 PM

Submitted on Sunday, July 14, 2024 - 8:03pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 73.170.62.31

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Fred Linker
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Really, this questionnaire strikes me as asking, Where should us lemmings jump off the cliff? Not "why?"
What exactly do you mean when you say the words "your community". Its meaning is very doubtful and makes me uneasy.
Our interests are as follows: we all vote for the best council candidates, regardless of where they live in our small town. There should be no partisanship based on our minute geography.
Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?
I don't believe there is any geographical community of interest, except for the community of Los Altos as a whole. I don't know why it is suggested otherwise. Or by who.
What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.
Re District-based election system: Is there a reason to institute this quite ludicrous system except to avert the threat of an expensive lawsuit by an outside monetized interest. This initiative is without merit for the citizens of Los Altos and only serves to export our ability to govern ourselves for no legitimate purpose.
What else would you like to tell us about your community?
I truly don't believe that Los Altos as a whole could support the proposed district-based election system.
Let's all get together and install a Los Altos swimming pool before we jump off the deep end with this unfortunate system. It is unquestionably a poor example of how to run a local government.
The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81644>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Monday, July 15, 2024 9:22:20 AM

Submitted on Monday, July 15, 2024 - 9:21am

Submitted by anonymous user: 174.160.65.34

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Heather Lattanzi
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
I think it would make sense to align political district boundaries with elementary schools. That is how many people meet when they first move to Los Altos, and those friendships and social ties can persist for decades. I live in the Oak school area, which is one of the smaller schools. You could combine two smaller school areas with a larger school in order to convert the 7 schools to the 5 districts you need.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81646>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, July 16, 2024 6:21:38 PM

Submitted on Tuesday, July 16, 2024 - 6:21pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 17.11.19.221

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Gaurav Jain

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

Within the city of Los Altos, there are very distinctive locales with their own set of issues and so I am happy to see the city move to a district based voting structure. It is critical that our representatives understand the local problems so they are able to make decisions for the betterment of the community.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81657>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 2:52:51 PM

Submitted on Wednesday, July 17, 2024 - 2:52pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 67.174.203.142

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name azmat malik

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence los altos

Public Comment

other than that this is s change, i do not understand the opposition and confusion. i am sure council has already looked at the legal risks, and costs. Soliciting candidates can be done at educational institutions, and would bring younger candidates - breaking the gerontocracy we are now in [congress, and WH especially]. We could have a blended district-wise AND rank order ballot. If a district does not post a candidate, then a city-wide rank order' winner might be seated. [assuming legal hawks approve viz-a-viz CVRA.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81662>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 9:50:36 PM

Submitted on Wednesday, July 17, 2024 - 9:50pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 107.197.105.141

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Brooke Schiller

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

This makes no sense, is a waste of money and should be fought. Why did you have the community meeting on the same weekend as the Los Altos Art and Wine festival? No wonder you only had 40 people, mostly over the age of 60. "Many Los Altans, One Los Altos" is the wrong slogan for this issue. We will now be 5 Los Altos'.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81668>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Thursday, July 18, 2024 11:48:10 PM

Submitted on Thursday, July 18, 2024 - 11:47pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 108.214.98.217

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Marianne Poblenz
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Many families with children attend schools that are part of CUSD.

This is a very walkable neighborhood with Grant Park Community Center offering access to open space plus community gatherings, classes, etc.

Woodland Library Branch is also easily accessible. Nearby Foothill Plaza and Lucky Supermarket offer a variety of amenities.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

My area is Grant Park area in South Los Altos. The larger boundaries for me are Fremont Ave, Homestead and Grant Rd.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Families with children in CUSD share a common interest particularly with regard to making sure children can walk or bike to school safely.

Grant Park area is already a compact, well-defined walkable neighborhood as described above. Maintaining this cohesiveness makes sense. Perhaps the boundaries could be enlarged, but I would not be in favor of any division.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

There is public transportation along Grant Rd though not to downtown Los Altos.. Perhaps in future, ways could be explored to link South Los Altos with the downtown area. Grant Park might be a good place to experiment with shuttle service.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81676>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Friday, July 19, 2024 1:57:28 PM

Submitted on Friday, July 19, 2024 - 1:57pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 67.170.197.112

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Ginny Lear
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important. Business, post office, Lincoln Park,

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

Downtown Triangle condo, Lincoln Park, DeMartini's Produce, Library, Government/Community Center complex/Los Altos Stage Co. for now, soccer field.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Putting my finger on my condo and drawing a circle around to the several areas I've mentioned, we become the center of what we use daily or weekly. It may be a wobbly circle, but it really is wonderful.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

It's a very accessible area. It's why we chose to move here as empty nesters, from our Los Altos house of 30 years on Eureka Court, off Grant Road, which was perfect for raising our family.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81683>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Friday, July 19, 2024 3:08:25 PM

Submitted on Friday, July 19, 2024 - 3:08pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 24.130.110.149

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Karen Scussel
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
As sense of unity throughout the city is important. Common interests include strong schools, safe streets, vibrant downtown, family activities,

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

My community of interest is not geographic. Yet, if we have to carve the city into five distinct regions, I would use major roads and thoroughfares as a starting point: Foothill Expressway, San Antonio, El Monte, Homestead. as boundaries while dividing the total population of Los Altos by 5. What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

I strongly believe that having to move to district based elections will be destructive to my community, the city of Los Altos. Yet, I do understand that we do not have a choice. I would have preferred the option of 4 districts and an elected mayor to have at least one individual on the council responsible to the entire city.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

I view the entire city of Los Altos as my community. It is extremely difficult to identify a community of interest in terms of geography . Having to do so feels as if it pulls the community apart versus uniting us.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81684>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, July 20, 2024 4:55:26 PM

Submitted on Saturday, July 20, 2024 - 4:55pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 98.37.214.217

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Freddie Park Wheeler
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Cupertino School District, Woodland Branch Library, Lucky Supermarket, Rancho Shopping Center with Andronico's, UPS, Starbucks. Foothill Crossing Shopping Center with Rite Aid, Postal Annex, Wells Fargo, Peets, Starbucks, Ace Hardware, Trader Joe's. Foothill Expressway. Montecaire Elementary. Loyola Corners with The Nail Bar, Cafe Vitale, Tom's Depot, Snapfitness and US Post Office.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

South of Magdalena, east of 280, North of intersection of 280 and Foothill Expwy, west of Covington. The Highlands, The Woodlands, Loyola Corners, Foothill Crossing, area on east side of Foothill behind Lucky's where Grant Park is.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

We are "South Los Altos" and have always been neglected by the City Council. Grant Park is shamelessly underfunded and has been allowed to become rundown and the kitchen is inoperable. All the money goes to Downtown and North Los Altos. Even the weeds along Foothill were always left unmoved under prior city managers. South Los Altos is finally getting some attention (mowing of Foothill weeds and the decorative plants at Homestead and Foothil Expyway intersection. But there has been nothing but neglected for years and years that needs to be rectified. We should get city funds in the same proportion we pay property taxes.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

We feel neglected and treated as second class residents of Los Altos. Districts will compete against other districts with this districts=based election system. We want an accounting to make certain we get our fair share of our tax dollars spent in our part of the city.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81691>

From: [Administration](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: FW: Districting Maps
Date: Monday, July 29, 2024 10:54:14 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Sending to the correct email address.

Respectfully,



Taylor Soleno
Deputy City Clerk
City of Los Altos
www.losaltosca.gov
1 N. San Antonio Road | Los Altos, CA 94022

From: Tim Twerdahl [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2024 5:27 PM
To: Administration <administration@losaltosca.gov>
Subject: Districting Maps

Attached is a proposed map for the 5 district option. I prefer 5 because, as I understand it, it avoids a direct election of a mayor but rather a rotation. (I've also include a 4 district option that follows the same philosophy should the City choose to have 4 districts.)

My proposed 5 district map was driven by commercial districts (circled in yellow). These districts present the greatest development opportunities in the City and residents who abut those districts would be most interested in the outcomes of those developments. Having a council member represent those interests feels fair.

I started with the 3 largest commercial districts: District 1 prioritizes the El Camino Corridor; District 3 prioritizes the Downtown Los Altos; District 5 prioritizes Foothill Crossing. Each of these districts adds surrounding census blocks until the target populations are reached.

I then looked at the remaining census blocks to determine if the remaining business districts could each fall into a voting district. Loyola Corners falls cleanly into District 4. This left District 2, which ended up as the least "compact" district. While it includes Rancho Shopping Center at its south end, the closest commercial districts for many of those residents lie in Mountain View (El Monte & El Camino, Cuesta & Miramonte).

Of note, there is a block in the northwest corner of district 4 that does not have census data.

As district 4 is the least populous in my mapping, the additional population should not impact the population limits per district.


Finally, for transparency, I reside in District 3 (Old Los Altos, across Foothill Expressway). The location of my home did not influence the drawing of the map.

Best,
Tim Twerdahl

P.S. This is the 4th map I drew. I started trying to find clean geographic boundaries like San Antonio Road and El Monte Road. While this would make it cleaner to describe and for candidates to campaign (“I represent the district west of San Antonio Road”), it didn’t address what I perceive to be the pockets of interest that mapping around the commercial districts does.

Recommended 5 district option:

DISTRICTING MAPPING EXERCISE



- The Rules**
- Draw a single city council district or create a four or five district plan.
 - Five-district maps should have districts with populations of about 6,300.
 - The largest district should be no more than 630 people greater than the smallest district.
 - Four-district maps should have districts with populations of about 7,900.
 - The largest district should be no more than 790 people greater than the smallest district.

About the Blocks

Each of these areas shows the approximate population within a particular area based on census blocks. The numbers are rounded based on the final census data adjusted by the State of California.

Write in the population estimates for each of your drawn districts.


6410 District 1	6390 District 2
6080 District 3	6020+ District 4
6340 District 5	

ONCE COMPLETE

1. Email a photo of your completed map to: administration@losaltosca.gov
2. Mail it to: City Clerk, Los Altos City Hall, 1 North San Antonio Road, Los Altos, CA 94022
3. Drop it off at a public meeting. To view the schedule, visit the website: <https://www.losaltosca.gov/cityclerk/page/district-based-elections>

Alternate 4 district option:

DISTRICTING MAPPING EXERCISE



- ONCE COMPLETE**
1. Email a photo of your completed map to: administration@losaltosca.gov
 2. Mail it to: City Clerk, Los Altos City Hall, 1 North San Antonio Road, Los Altos, CA 94022
 3. Drop it off at a public meeting. To view the schedule, visit the website: <https://www.losaltosca.gov/cityclerk/page/district-based-elections>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:49:02 PM

Submitted on Wednesday, July 31, 2024 - 4:48pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 104.28.124.182

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Sylvia Tarbell
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
I don't know if they're "common," but my own interests are for: excellent public schools, better sidewalks (to facilitate walking safely), improved road conditions on city streets, and more assessment and enforcement of codes (for plant and tree overgrowth).

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

I live south of El Camino on Los Altos Ave, between San Antonio Rd and Embarcadero Rd.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

I'm one of the legions of residents who believe that having districts is absurd. It's not at all clear to me that there are strongholds of any particular race/ethnicity in the city.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81751>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 3:34:19 PM

Submitted on Thursday, August 1, 2024 - 3:32pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 76.198.30.84

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Ms Hill
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

I live in 'south Loa Altos", near Foothill Expressway and Homestead. Boundaries include 280, Homestead, Foothill Expressway (to Springer), and 85.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Frequently various city councils have been making decisions that negatively impact south Los Altos through neglect. For instance, more attention is spent on "north Los Altos and downtown" when spending decisions are being made. The proposed Police Annex that was to be created in south Los Altos has been stalled or stopped as there has been no current discussion about its possibility for the last few years. The Woodland Library has a need for more space and has the space to be either converted to an outdoors patio or an attachment to the library.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81765>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 9:41:14 AM

Submitted on Saturday, August 3, 2024 - 9:40am

Submitted by anonymous user: 104.28.124.182

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name FRANK MARTIN
City of Residence LOS ALTOS

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS SUCH AS GRANT PARK AND LIBRARIES LIKE WOODLAND LIBRARY AND LOYOLA CORNERS RESUARANTS.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it? SOUTH LOS ALTOS BORDERED BY GRANT ROAD, FREMONT, AND HOMESTEAD ROAD.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

SOUTH LOS ALTOS HAS LONG BEEN IGNORED BY CITY COUNCILS. FOR EXAMPLE, LOCALS HAD TO PRESSURE CITY COUNCIL TO PURCHASE WHAT IS NOW KNOWN AS GRANT PARK FROM CUPERTINO SCHOOL DISTRICT. AT FIRST THE COUNCIL WANTED LOCALS TO PAY FOR THE PURCHASE AND THEN THEY REFUSED TO BUY THE ENTIRE PROPERTY WHCIH HAS TURNED OUT TO BE A HUGE STRATEGIC MISTAKE. RECENTLY A FORMER MAYOR TRIED TO TAKE AWAY GRANT PARK OPEN SPACE FOR WHAT IS ESSENTIALLY HIS PET PROJECT FOR HIS BOCCE BALL FRIENDS. THE LIST OF EXAMPLES LIKE THIS ARE ENDLESS.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?
THE FOUNDATION OF A STRONG COMMUNITY IS NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS. AND, THIS COUNCIL AND OTHERS REFUSE TO ALLOW DOG OWNERS TO SHARE OPEN SPACE HOURS FOR DOGS OFF LEASH AND INSTEAD WE HAVE A FIASCO OF A DOG. PARK AT THE LIBRARY.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81775>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 9:56:23 AM

Submitted on Saturday, August 3, 2024 - 9:56am

Submitted by anonymous user: 73.63.156.70

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Janet McDaniel
City of Residence Los ALtos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Great schools, access to parks, affordable housing options, diversity, opportunities to support and help those who might be underserved in our community beyond Los Altos because a healthy community impacts all of us.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

Springer school, Rancho, Blach etc but really the entire area of Los altos is of interest

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Looking just beyond improving property values and revitalizing down town is very important to me. I'd like to see the city council take a stronger interest in the "quality" of life and opportunities to be more diverse (socio-economically) in our community. Many of our children attend schools with families from Mountain View and see first-hand the disparity.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

I've lived here for over 40 years. It saddens me to see that city employees and service workers live elsewhere. I believe our city council cares more about property values and supporting down town development and things like building a theatre and less about the quality of life of our seniors and others whom we depend on to prosper. IF it weren't for those who travel distances to support our restaurants, schools, super markets etc our city would be a ghost town! More thoughtful idea of what community really means beyond the city limits is critical

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81776>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 10:07:03 AM

Submitted on Saturday, August 3, 2024 - 10:06am

Submitted by anonymous user: 172.125.78.12

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Samuel Cousins
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.

Quiet, residential character with accessible (pedestrian) access to Downtown commercial district, connection to local schools (Los Altos High, Almond, Egan) by walk/bike

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

Area near and surrounding Los Altos High School and Almond Elementary; those areas from which school-age children can (or should be able to) walk to either campus.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

The school system defines the neighborhood in an otherwise residential-only setting, and all parents of school-age children (and those children themselves) have both demographic similarity and shared interest.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81777>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 11:35:31 AM

Submitted on Saturday, August 3, 2024 - 11:35am

Submitted by anonymous user: 174.238.9.13

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name James Sweeney
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Safe access to down town. Dog parks for small and larger dogs using current Hillview park and proposed new park without eliminating library parking.

Use of empty space by community center for park, with exercise path, machines, picnic tables, the 5-12 playground under the redwoods, sand volleyball court, grass area and planter boxes for kids and teens to grow veggies.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it? Hillview, San Antonio, El Monte, and the street behind the high school.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Library parking. Maintaining the current dog park for small dogs . Providing addition green space and exercise access at a park in the lot next to the community center.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

Our neighborhood is ethnically diverse., with families who are first generation Americans from East Asia, South. Asia, Europe,, the Middle East plus long time residents of Los Altos. Many families are multiethnic. Education levels are high. Many working in tech. There are retired people, young families, renters, and families with school kids.. Incomes are usually relatively high.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81778>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 11:37:00 AM

Submitted on Saturday, August 3, 2024 - 11:36am

Submitted by anonymous user: 174.160.67.215

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Tamara Fagin
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.

Schools - as a parent to 2 recent Los Altos High School graduates, school communities have been our communities for most of the 20 years that we have lived here. Almond Elementary, Bullis Charter School, Egan, and Los Altos High School. These schools and their athletic spaces (playgrounds, fields, track, tennis courts, etc.) are natural gathering places for families with kids, sports enthusiasts, people who walk dogs, etc. Also, people who live around the schools or bike or walk through these areas, have common concerns regarding traffic, bicyclist/ped safety, and parking issues.

Also, as a biracial (1/2 Asian, 1/2 Caucasian person) - I have a common interest in a diverse community. In my experience of working on numerous City, County, School District and Congressional campaigns - our diversity is a source of tremendous pride and is something you will find on every street and area of our City. I try to shop local and within Los Altos whenever possible. I have an interest in a vibrant and walkable downtown and community center/library area.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

I live near Los Altos High School - the area around the high school to the Library/Community Center and to downtown is where I walk my dog every day. Alternatively, look to the Almond Elementary School attendance area.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

First, it is incredibly disappointing that our City will be split into Districts. As an Asian American, I feel well represented by our current, racially (and gender and religion-wise) diverse council. If we are forced to split our community up, I favor sticking closely to the school boundaries and using major roads as boundaries (like San Antonio Road, El Monte Road, etc.).

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81780>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Sunday, August 4, 2024 8:36:44 AM

Submitted on Sunday, August 4, 2024 - 8:36am

Submitted by anonymous user: 174.160.67.6

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Ameeta Mukherjee
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.

A shared sense of community with schools as a common interest. Downtown activities help to bring us together as well.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

The boundaries that makes sense to me are the ones that are currently used for school boundaries - Almond/Egan/LAHS etc.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81782>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Sunday, August 4, 2024 8:48:31 AM

Submitted on Sunday, August 4, 2024 - 8:48am

Submitted by anonymous user: 98.45.26.225

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Manisha Arora
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Open green spaces, places to hang out with dogs, local shopping district with local shops like Rancho

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it? South Los Altos - Rancho until Grant

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community. It's essential to have local shopping small shops at a walkable distance.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81783>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Sunday, August 4, 2024 2:15:18 PM

Submitted on Sunday, August 4, 2024 - 2:13pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 76.126.29.145

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Cindy Sidaris
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
Parents of alumni of Almond school, and of Los Altos High school - we have formed long lasting connections with students and parents of students who attended those schools as classmates. These connections are diverse in racial and ethnic identity.

Camellia Way Residents have a strong neighborhood connection among those of us who now live and used to live on our street. This connection is also diverse in racial and ethnic identity.

Another community of interest for Camellia Way is "central Los Altos" as described by Real Estate Agents in their mailers.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

The school district boundaries for Almond school and for Los Altos High school are the boundaries for my first community of interest. The real estate agencies' divisions of Los Altos are also useful.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

School attendance, K-12, creates a community of students and their parents. This connection persists long after the students have graduated from the school, especially among parents who continue to live in the same area. Common interests include Safe Routes to School, city services such as infrastructure maintenance in adjacent neighborhoods, neighborhood safety.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81785>

From: [Administration](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: FW: District mapping exercise
Date: Monday, August 5, 2024 11:55:38 AM
Attachments: [Image001.png](#)

Forwarding the below.

Respectfully,




Taylor Soleno
Deputy City Clerk
City of Los Altos
www.losaltosca.gov
1 N. San Antonio Road | Los Altos, CA 94022

From: Richard Probst [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 3, 2024 2:20 PM
To: Administration <administration@losaltosca.gov>
Subject: District mapping exercise

Richard Probst
[REDACTED] Los Altos

DISTRICTING MAPPING EXERCISE



The Rules

- Draw a single city council district or create a four or five district plan.
- Five-district maps should have districts with populations of about 6,300.
- The largest district should be no more than 630 people greater than the smallest district.
- Four-district maps should have districts with populations of about 7,900.
- The largest district should be no more than 790 people greater than the smallest district.

About the Blocks

Each of these areas shows the approximate population within a particular area based on census blocks. The numbers are rounded based on the final census data adjusted by the State of California.

Write in the population estimates for each of your drawn districts.

<u>6320</u>	<u>6140</u>
District 1	District 2
<u>5720</u>	<u>6210</u>
District 3	District 4
<u>6150</u>	
District 5	

ONCE COMPLETE _____

1. Email a photo of your completed map to: administration@losaltosca.gov
2. Mail it to: City Clerk
Los Altos City Hall
1 North San Antonio Road
Los Altos, CA 94022
3. Drop it off at a public meeting. To view the schedule, visit the website: <https://www.losaltosca.gov/cityclerk/page/district-based-elections>

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 8:40:13 AM

Submitted on Wednesday, August 7, 2024 - 8:39am

Submitted by anonymous user: 73.158.105.181

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Suzanne Ambiel
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
I'm invested in the ENTIRE community - I have no affinity with a particular group, set of ideals, hobbies, or cultural ties. I am for fewer boundaries, and more community, more equity, more inclusion.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it? There are no physical boundaries to equity and inclusion.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81814>

From: [Taylor Soleno](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Districts
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 3:49:30 PM
Attachments: [4804_001.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

The attached was dropped off at the front counter.

Respectfully,



Taylor Soleno
Deputy City Clerk
City of Los Altos
www.losaltosca.gov
1 N. San Antonio Road | Los Altos, CA 94022

From: Printers & Scanners <printers@losaltosca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 3:47 PM
To: Taylor Soleno <tsoleno@losaltosca.gov>
Subject: Scanned Documents

Published on City of Los Altos California (<https://www.losaltosca.gov>)

Community of Interest Form

Help shape the future of City of Los Altos' City Council Districts

The city of Los Altos is in the process of transitioning from an at-large election system to a district-based election system. This means that there will soon be city council districts – and you have the ability to influence the lines. The City Council wants to hear from you on how these boundaries should be drawn. Complete this form to tell the City Council about your Community of Interest – keeping these like communities together is a high-ranking criteria in the line-drawing process.

What can you do to further participate in the process?

- Provide your comments on your community of interest by completing this worksheet and return it by emailing or mailing the form to the City Clerk (1 N. San Antonio Rd, Los Altos, CA 94022), or attend a public hearing and read your comments to the Council.
- Attend one of the Los Altos City Council public hearings or a future community outreach opportunity. Times and locations are publicized on the **District-Based Elections dedicated webpage** ^[1].

Contact Information

Name * Myra Orta

City of Residence * Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
 Better Police Protection and Surveillance for the residents of South Los Altos, this is important to help prevent the frequent home burglaries and break-ins.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?
 Homestead Rd & Foothill Expressway To Miramonte St + Foothill Expressway and the entire area South of Foothill known as Woodland Acres, the Highlands and Sierra Ventura

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

I do not approve of this entire idea of community. We are one city - Los Altos - not a bunch of communities as defined by an outsider who does not know LOS ALTOS.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

My community is heterogeneous. We have immigrants and long term residents who are of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indian, Italian, French, Israeli, Phillipines and other decent's living peacefully side by side spread out over the entire City of Los Altos.

Submit

Source URL: <https://www.losaltosca.gov/cityclerk/webform/community-interest-form>

Links

[1] <https://www.losaltosca.gov/districts>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: District elections
Date: Friday, August 16, 2024 11:14:57 AM

As an attorney and a student of electoral laws, it has been my long-standing opinion that multi-member electoral districts are inherently unconstitutional, even without the CA Voting Rights Act. In addition, government is best that is closer to the voters, and single member districts will get council members closer to the people who they represent by having a smaller constituency rather than the whole city. Therefore, I strongly support the move to single member districts.

Paul B Van Buren, JD
Los Altos, CA
[REDACTED]

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Friday, August 16, 2024 11:21:44 AM

Submitted on Friday, August 16, 2024 - 11:21am

Submitted by anonymous user: 98.42.1.186

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Paul B Van Buren

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

As an attorney and a student of electoral laws, it has been my long-standing opinion that multi-member electoral districts are inherently unconstitutional, even without the CA Voting Rights Act. In addition, government is best that is closer to the voters, and single member districts will get council members closer to the people who they represent by having a smaller constituency rather than the whole city. Therefore, I strongly support the move to single member districts.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81882>

From: [Administration](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: FW: Los Altos District Map
Date: Friday, August 16, 2024 3:01:33 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Simply sending to the correct email address.

Respectfully,



Taylor Soleno
Deputy City Clerk
City of Los Altos
www.losaltosca.gov
1 N. San Antonio Road | Los Altos, CA 94022

From: Mehruss Jon Ahi [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2024 8:21 PM
To: Administration <administration@losaltosca.gov>
Subject: Los Altos District Map

Photo of District Map Attached. Thank you.

Mehruss Ahi

DISTRICTING MAPPING EXERCISE




The Rules

- Draw a single city council district or create a four or five district plan.
- Five-district maps should have districts with populations of about 6,300.
- The largest district should be no more than 630 people greater than the smallest district.
- Four-district maps should have districts with populations of about 7,900.
- The largest district should be no more than 790 people greater than the smallest district.

About the Blocks

Each of these areas shows the approximate population within a particular area based on census blocks. The numbers are rounded based on the final census data adjusted by the State of California.



Write in the population estimates for each of your drawn districts.

6,230

District 1

6,380

District 3

6,430

District 5

6,360

District 2

5,930

District 4

ONCE COMPLETE

1. Email a photo of your completed map to:
administration@losaltosca.gov

2. Mail it to: City Clerk
Los Altos City Hall
1 North San Antonio Road
Los Altos, CA 94022

3. Drop it off at a public meeting. To view the schedule, visit the website:
<https://www.losaltosca.gov/cityclerk/page/district-based-elections>

From: [Allison G Aldrich](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: District mapping exercise question
Date: Friday, August 16, 2024 5:57:50 PM

Thank you for the postcard about the districting process. While I wish that this unintended consequence of the CVRA wasn't occurring, I appreciate the need to do this.

I went to the web page and clicked on the district mapping exercise link - and I saw some sample maps in the public gallery. Is there a way to indicate the I like a certain one instead of making a new one? I don't need to create an entirely new one, as an existing one was appealing.

Thanks!
Allison Aldrich

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Saturday, August 17, 2024 1:48:28 PM

Submitted on Saturday, August 17, 2024 - 1:48pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 76.126.31.1

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Sandra K Salinger

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

I like #246059, or something similar to that map.

All of the maps seemed to keep Loyola Corners area together, which is important to us.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/81893>

From: violee@comcast.net
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Information
Date: Sunday, August 18, 2024 12:26:17 PM

Please send whatever information you have about the proposed re-districting:
Who is requiring it? On what grounds? What other cities have dealt with this?

Thank you very much,
Leelane Hines



Los Altos, CA 94024

From: [Info](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Fw: City Manager Weekly Update
Date: Monday, August 19, 2024 10:59:36 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-wiqqcuoz.png](#)

A comment regarding District-Based Elections.

I have responded to this individual, and let Arnold know they can also share their thoughts using the online mapping tool.

Sincerely,



Sonia Lee
Public Information Officer, City of Los Altos

(650) 947-2611 | www.losaltosca.gov
1 N. San Antonio Road | Los Altos, CA 94022

Latest Los Altos news at your fingertips: [Sign up for the City Manager Weekly Update.](#)

From: Arnold Testa [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 17, 2024 11:48 AM
To: Info <info@losaltosca.gov>
Subject: Re: City Manager Weekly Update

Downtown should be a separate district defined as foothill expressway to Edith to San Antonio or the old town district including the area SW of foothill, west of El Monte and SE of Fremont. Early expansion south of San Antonio to Springer and older homes. North Los Altos Adobe creek to west of San Antonio South Los Altos, remainder of homes south of Springer and north of El Camino. El Camino within 2 blocks SW of 82.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 17, 2024, at 9:30 AM, City of Los Altos <info@losaltosca.gov> wrote:

Saturday, August 17, 2024



Feedback Requested: Mapping Los Altos



The City Council is seeking input on the best way to draw the district boundaries for the transition to district-based elections. Residents can use the newly available online mapping tool to create and submit draft maps. Each map will be reviewed by the demographer, staff, and City Council.

[Learn More](#)

Call for Volunteers: Make a Difference in Los Altos



Parks & Recreation is currently accepting volunteer applications for individuals, groups, or families on a one-time or reoccurring basis. Volunteer opportunities include ongoing programs and special events. Volunteers 14-17 years old must have a signed parental permission form.

[Learn More](#)

SVCE Summer Resilience Promotion Ending Soon



Silicon Valley Clean Energy customers can use the Appliances Assistant to get \$50 off portable power stations, smart thermostats, evaporative coolers, and air purifiers. These appliances will help optimize energy use while improving comfort. This promotion ends Tuesday, September 3.

[Learn More](#)

Artists Asked to Share Interpretation of 'Life in Los Altos'



The Parks, Arts, Recreation, & Cultural Commission invites artists to submit their art for the upcoming exhibition, "Life in Los Altos." Selected art pieces will be on display at the Los Altos Community Center. The submission deadline is Thursday, September 5.

[Learn More](#)

Did You Know? Gas-Powered Leaf Blowers Prohibited



The use of gasoline-powered leaf blowers is not allowed within City limits and, if found in use, the property owner may be subject to an administrative citation and fine. To limit noise and air pollution, as well as avoid fines, electric or battery-powered leaf blowers are encouraged.

[Learn More](#)



Interested in working for the city of Los Altos? Check out our **current job opportunities**.

If you or someone you know is experiencing mental distress, help is available 24/7 at the Crisis & Suicide Prevention Lifeline. Call **988** to speak with a trained counselor.



Los Altos City Hall | 1 N San Antonio Road | Los Altos, CA 94022 US

[Unsubscribe](#) | [Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

From: [Susan Cummings](#)
To: [Districts](#); [Pete Dailey](#); [Jonathan Weinberg](#); [Neysa Fligor](#); [Lynette Lee Eng](#); [Sally Meadows](#)
Subject: Voting at large or by-district for Los Altos
Date: Monday, August 19, 2024 11:58:43 AM

Dear City Council.

Thank you for the great work you do each day the difficult decisions you must make.

I have been a resident of Los Altos since 1989 along with my husband and family and I understand you have decided to divide the City into districts in response to Shenkman’s letter and legal threats related to CVRA.

I personally think you should fight him just as they are doing in Santa Monica. We, in Los Altos should stand up for what is best for our residents and not succumb to pressure from a lawyer whose aim is to cash in.

Los Altos city is too small to be divided into districts.

My readings show no benefit to the by-district voting with a net negative result.

There is no evidence that by-district voting has lead to increased minority representation on the city councils.

It will lead to infighting with each council member now championing their issue and truly being in the minority 1/5.

I hope you reconsider.

Regards,

Susan Cummings

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 2:04:54 PM

Submitted on Wednesday, August 21, 2024 - 2:04pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 67.174.203.142

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name azmat malik
City of Residence los altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important. traffic, and related noise. 'too much' construction [roadway obstruction]. timing of work so traffic flow not disrupted [a city truck made an illegal u-turn at san antonio, and promptly stopped to lay out cones for tree work -at 8:15, backing up traffic because one lane was blocked – either set up early or wait 30-45 minutes]

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it? San Antonio/Edith / foothill xpwy/El Monte

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81921>

From: [Barbara Wu](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Fwd: 8/28/25 public hearing
Date: Wednesday, August 21, 2024 4:23:29 PM

Hi,

I have three questions about the 8/28 4:00pm public hearing.

- Where is it located?
 - Will there be an officer explaining the information on the districts-based election system on why and what sort of basic knowledge to educate the general public?
 - Do you accept questions about the city, but not related to the district-based elections?
- Thank you!

Barbara

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Thursday, August 22, 2024 12:46:25 PM

Submitted on Thursday, August 22, 2024 - 12:46pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 216.144.236.45

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Beth & Peter Karpas
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important. Geographic proximity (and love of dogs!)

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

We would define our local neighborhood as Springer to El Monte, between Cuesta and Foothill. We use McKenzie Park, too, for the dog park.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

The only localized group we would think we belonged in was geographic. Otherwise, we really just are Los Altans. We do not think of ourselves as belonging to any other specific interest group when it comes to Los Altos - the geographic area we belong to has a wonderfully diverse cultural demographic that should be preserved as it is part of what makes it "Los Altos". For that reason, if the city needs to be broken into districts, this "community of interest" should be purely geographical.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

There are lots of walkers (so we would really like better sidewalks!) and lots of dogs and kids. So we are concerned about street safety and upkeep, including difficult sight lines when lots of people park on the main thoroughways and there are no sidewalks to safely get around without walking in the street. In addition, there have been numerous coyote sightings on both Cuesta and Covington during daylight hours which do not feel safe for any of these groups.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81930>

From: [Lindsey Pollack](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Redistricting input
Date: Friday, August 23, 2024 9:47:22 AM

Hello,
I have reviewed the three maps currently on the city's website, and I see that in all three maps there is a similar issue...

We live in south Los Altos in an area of the city designated as Cupertino Union (elementary and middle) schools and Fremont Union (high schools). District "1" on the map has kids in those school districts. But our address is in district "2", which is actually a different school district. I am worried that our representative for Los Altos city council would not be considering my family's needs and interests with respect to schools, school safety, road safety, etc., as it pertains to the schools that my children attend. I would suggest that district 1 be expanded such that it aligns with the school district boundary, as that is an obvious "area of interest." As district 1 would therefore be larger, I think it makes sense to reduce the overall number of districts from 5 to 4.... It seems to me that fewer districts is better anyway, given these distinctions are rather arbitrary to begin with.

Thank you,
Lindsey

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Friday, August 23, 2024 2:02:50 PM

Submitted on Friday, August 23, 2024 - 2:02pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 98.248.49.103

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Ellen Barker
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important.
In my community, the only commonality is this: we are neighbors. Over the 29 years that I have lived here, the commonalities have shifted, and continue to shift. Country of origin, languages spoken, income level, rebuilt/did not rebuild the house, came from out of town vs refugee from Los Altos Hills, religious affiliations, even # of households with dogs. It's all different, and it continues to change. We can't redraw boundaries as these things change, and we shouldn't define neighborhoods as "Asians live there" or "that area is all old people." That will divide, not unite. Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it?

So . . . the boundaries should just be "people, whoever they are, who live near me," using major thoroughfares and grade-school district lines where that is possible.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

Mr. Shenkman might not like this plan, if it means that the racial groups end up as evenly distributed as the town as a whole. Or he will like it because he can continue to sue us. But change keeps happening, and we have to embrace it.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

Again, my community is made up of people I see, wave to, talk with - including those I can only talk to through Google Translate.


The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81940>

From: [Sandy Salinger](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: District Maps
Date: Saturday, August 24, 2024 10:19:48 AM

We like Draft Map C.

Sandra and Sheldon Salinger



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: city council district map
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2024 10:25:19 AM

Greetings,

My priority order preference for the district maps would be

- 1. Draft C
- 2. Draft B
- 3. Draft A

I live in district 3 in all the maps

Eric Lutkin
Los Altos CA

From: [Kirk Lindstrom](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: My Feedback for District-Based Election Maps
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2024 11:16:09 AM

IF we must be divided, I hate the idea but hate wasting money in court even more, the I prefer Map A.

I live in North Los Altos at the Northern part of Map A, District 5. I walk on average five times a week to downtown along Los Altos Ave and feel most of the people I greet along the way are neighbors. I seldom cross San Antonio Road but I'll often hike around downtown to window shop, have dinner or attend the Farmer's Market. This all feels like "my neighborhood."

Occasionally I hike across Foothill to Lincoln Park to see "Arts in the Park" or over to the Library or History Museum , but otherwise my hiking range is pretty much defined by District 5 of Map A.

Finally, it is too bad someone doesn't volunteer to sue Shenkman & Hughes for a frivolous CVRA law suit to recover our city fees, lost time to dealing with this matter and wasted time by city residents to comment on these proposals. Your data shows Los Altos is expensive to live everywhere and the racial demographics are well balanced.

Thanks and good luck getting this resolved at a minimum cost to the city.

PS, giving up parking at the Library for a dog park is very bad idea. We should have voted on it.

--

best regards
Kirk Lindstrom
Lunada Drive



From: [Kirk Lindstrom](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: My Feedback for District-Based Election Maps
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2024 11:18:56 AM

My Feedback for District-Based Election Maps
<https://www.losaltosca.gov/cityclerk/page/district-based-elections>

IF we must be divided, I hate the idea but hate wasting money in court even more, the I prefer Map A.

I live in North Los Altos at the Northern part of Map A, District 5. I walk on average five times a week to downtown along Los Altos Ave and feel most of the people I greet along the way are neighbors. I seldom cross San Antonio Road but I'll often hike around downtown to window shop, have dinner or attend the Farmer's Market. This all feels like "my neighborhood."

Occasionally I hike across Foothill to Lincoln Park to see "Arts in the Park" or over to the Library or History Museum, crossing San Antonio Road, but otherwise my hiking range is pretty much defined by District 5 of Map A.


Finally, it is too bad someone doesn't volunteer to sue Shenkman & Hughes for a frivolous CVRA law suit to recover our city fees, lost time to dealing with this matter and wasted time by city residents to comment on these proposals. Your data shows Los Altos is expensive to live everywhere and the racial demographics are well balanced.

Thanks and good luck getting this resolved at a minimum cost to the city.

PS, giving up parking at the Library for a dog park is very bad idea. We should have voted on it.

--

best regards
Kirk Lindstrom
Lunada Drive



From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: Community of Interest Form
Date: Tuesday, August 27, 2024 9:42:15 AM

Submitted on Tuesday, August 27, 2024 - 9:41am

Submitted by anonymous user: 98.42.1.106

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name GARY ALBRIGHT
City of Residence Los Altos

What are the common interests in your community? Describe how they are important. Pickleball; green space open parks; safe, well-maintained streets, dog parks.

Explain the geographical location of your community of interest. What are the physical boundaries or data that can be used to describe it? South Los Atos near Loyola Corners.

What is the rationale for your community of interest to be used in the City Council re-boundary process? Please describe how the issues before the City Council has an impact on your community.

The lack of attention and action regarding various sites in South Los Altos has resulted in various properties existing in a state of decrepitude or seeming abandonment.

What else would you like to tell us about your community?

I would hope anyone representing our community would advocate for what is best overall for Los Altos equally as much as what is best for our community.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85617/submission/81965>

From: [Gary Goldman](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: District draft map feedback
Date: Sunday, September 1, 2024 11:50:37 AM

Hello, I live on Casita Way, in what would be District 4 for Draft A.

I have looked at the three draft maps, and want to express my opinions.

For my neighborhood (and North Los Altos in general), Draft A looks most natural, since it is bounded by the major roads of San Antonio, El Camino Real and El Monte. This is where we walk, drive and bicycle around the neighborhood. This is where our friends live, and where most of our children's schoolmates lived. It is cohesive.

On the other hand, Draft C looks terrible for my neighborhood. This draft splits my neighborhood in two, and cuts my portion off from direct representation for issues related to Los Altos High School (just down the street) and the local elementary school (Almond). Also, Draft C assigns all the Los Altos portion of El Camino Real to one district. I would rather have two districts (and two council members) with exposure to El Camino Real, rather than a single representative focused on El Camino related issues.

Regards

Gary Goldman
[REDACTED], Los Altos

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: feedback
Date: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 9:14:35 AM

Only map c provides representation to residents most affected by the downtown and san Antonio road. All the other maps abandon those most affected by those two, major impacts on traffic, parking and residential quality of life.

From: [City of Los Altos California](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Form submission from: District-Based Elections Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 7:08:44 PM

Submitted on Tuesday, September 3, 2024 - 7:08pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 73.15.244.54

Submitted values are:

Contact Information

Name Christopher Tar

Email [REDACTED]

City of Residence Los Altos

Public Comment

What a preposterous notion that we are being forced through legal threats to complicate a simple city election. I read in the LATC that rank-choice voting would prevent the need to migrate our structure to district based. I am strongly in support of that option. We are not a large city or even a state where district-based voting might be necessary. In addition, I can't imagine how interest-based districts doesn't reinforce the problem that the at-large format is purported to be causing. Additionally, if a Malibu based lawyer is representing unnamed Los Altos residents, how do we know there is not a financial incentive bias in the actions of this lawyer or group? Does this lawyer represent other districts across the states? Or, conveniently, only ones who can afford to pay his "consulting" fees?? We have kids in the public schools here. We are not long-time residents of Los Altos resisting change for the sake of resisting change, but this still reeks of exploitation of the letter instead of the intent of the law, for financial gain, or another form of bias in the election process that we haven't considered or studied. (In other words, is there an unintended consequence of this that we may be enabling unwittingly?)

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.losaltosca.gov/node/85529/submission/82021>

From: [Tony Lima gmail](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Kirby Hansen](#); [Norma Schroder](#)
Subject: Redistricting Los Altos
Date: Thursday, July 18, 2024 3:57:39 PM
Attachments: [Excerpts from selected documents.docx](#)
[Excerpts from selected documents.pdf](#)

I attended the July 13 special council meeting and spoke briefly. One subject that came up was the ongoing litigation between the Shenkman law firm and Santa Monica. There was much skepticism expressed about the likelihood of that city prevailing. I decided to do some research.

Attached is a summary of what I found. I've included both pdf and Word versions because getting the hyperlinks to work in the pdf document was taking more time than I have. In brief, I think Santa Monica has a decent chance of winning this case.

If possible, I suggest postponing any decision until that case is decided. It strikes me that many arguments used by Santa Monica apply to Los Altos.

Thanks for your time,
Tony Lima

Excerpts From Selected Documents Santa Monica Lawsuit

Presented in reverse chronological order. List of links in Appendix.
Tony Lima (tony@proflima.com)
July 16, 2024

I apologize for
hyperlinks not
working. Problems
converting Word to
pdf.

Table of Contents

- A. Latest court document (Minute Order)**
- B. Santa Monica responds**
- C. Excerpts from California Supreme Court decision**
- D. Original complaint**
- Appendix**

A. Latest court document (Minute Order)

June 27, 2024

[https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/9-2024.06.27%20-%20PNA%20-%20Minute%20Order%20\(Nunc%20Pro%20Tunc\).pdf](https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/9-2024.06.27%20-%20PNA%20-%20Minute%20Order%20(Nunc%20Pro%20Tunc).pdf)

Pursuant to oral stipulation, the Hearing on Motion - Other further proceedings on remand scheduled for 09/20/2024, and Hearing on Motion - Other Motion to Re-Issue Judgment Consistent With Guidance from the California Supreme Court scheduled for 07/29/2024 are advanced to this date and continued to 08/02/24 at 08:30 AM in Department 16 at Stanley Mosk Courthouse.

B. Santa Monica responds

June 26 2024

<https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/7-2024.06.26%20-%20PNA%20-%20City's%20Motion%20re.%20Further%20Proceedings%20on%20Remand.pdf>

I. Introduction

To resolve this case, this Court will need to decide whether the City of Santa Monica’s method of electing its Councilmembers dilutes the voting strength of Latino voters. Answering that question, the California Supreme Court has explained, will turn on whether some other voting system would generate a net gain in Latinos’ ability to elect their preferred candidates. This Court’s final judgment will determine whether the City must scrap its 78-year-old voting system and face a fee request from plaintiffs that was already up to \$22 million before the appellate phase.

This case returns to this Court almost six years after a bench trial before Judge Palazuelos, who adopted plaintiffs’ proposed statement of decision and entered judgment in their favor on both their claim under the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and their claim that the City violated California’s Equal Protection Clause by intentionally adopting and maintaining an at-large election system to harm Latino voters. In 2020, the Court of Appeal reversed that judgment in full.

(Declaration of Kahn Scolnick, Ex. A.) In the first opinion to address the elements of the CVRA, the Court of Appeal concluded that the CVRA requires evidence that the City’s voting system dilutes minority voting power, that plaintiffs “offered no valid proof of dilution,” and that the trial court “applied an erroneous legal standard to reach [its] faulty conclusions” on plaintiffs’ Equal Protection claim. (Id. at pp. 30, 37-38.)

Plaintiffs petitioned for review. The California Supreme Court declined to grant review on the Equal Protection claim, which means the Court of Appeal’s decision is now law of the case on that score. But the Supreme Court did grant review on the CVRA claim, directing the parties to brief what a plaintiff must prove to establish vote dilution under the CVRA. (*Pico Neighborhood Assn v. City of Santa Monica* (2020) 474 P.3d 635.) The parties disputed whether “dilution” is an element of the CVRA at all—that is, whether plaintiffs needed to prove that Latinos’ voting power is weaker under the current election system than it would be under some other election system—and if dilution is an element, what that proof might look like. Last year, the Supreme Court confirmed that dilution is an element of the CVRA and announced a new legal standard for analyzing it. (*Pico Neighborhood Assn. v. City of Santa Monica* (2023) 15 Cal.5th 292.) Because the Supreme Court “express[ed] no view on the ultimate question of whether the City’s at-large voting system is consistent with the CVRA,” it remanded the case to the Court of Appeal to decide the unresolved issues in this case. (Id. at p. 324.) After receiving a combined 276 pages of supplemental briefing by the parties, on top of the 352 pages of initial briefing, the Court of Appeal remanded the case to this Court “for further proceedings consistent with the Supreme Court’s guidance” on assessing claims of vote dilution. (Scolnick Decl., Ex. B at p. 2.)

It now falls to this Court to assess plaintiffs’ CVRA claim under the legal framework announced by the Supreme Court, which made clear that plaintiffs must demonstrate an “incremental gain in [Latinos’] ability to elect” candidates of their choice. (15 Cal.5th at p. 322; accord, e.g., *ibid.* [plaintiffs must prove “net gain in the protected class’s potential to elect candidates under an alternative system”].) This Court will be the first to perform that analysis. Judge Palazuelos did not do so because she concluded principally that dilution is not an element of the CVRA at all. And neither the Supreme Court nor the Court of Appeal expressed any view on whether plaintiffs can satisfy this new net-gain standard. Nor, for that matter, did the Court of Appeal or Supreme Court decide whether plaintiffs had satisfied the other substantive element of the CVRA—the requirement to prove a legally significant pattern of racially polarized voting.

The Court should decide those questions—which will have extraordinary consequences for the voting rights of the City’s nearly 90,000 residents—in light of contemporary evidence. The existing record is necessary but insufficient to answer the questions left open by the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeal. In the time it has taken for this case to travel up and down California’s judiciary, the City has held three Council elections. The results of those elections will help this Court determine whether voting is racially polarized and whether Latino voters have greater power under the current election system than they would under any hypothetical alternative system plaintiffs might propose. The most recent elections have resulted in the election of two new Latino Councilmembers (in addition to the two who were already serving on the Council at the time the complaint was filed and the case was tried). That means the seven-member Council now has four Latino members—even though Latinos account for only 13.6% of the City’s voting-eligible population. Considering this new evidence is necessary not only to properly assess plaintiffs’ CVRA claim under the proper legal standard but also to ensure that the Court does not require the City to adopt a new electoral system that would offer no practical benefit to minority voters, in violation of the federal Constitution. (See *Cooper v. Harris* (2017) 581 U.S. 285, 291.)

The City submits this motion to outline a proposal for the proceedings on remand. Consistent with the Court of Appeal’s order remanding this case, this Court should analyze plaintiffs’ CVRA claim under the legal framework announced by the Supreme Court. In conducting that analysis, the Court should receive further briefing and post-trial evidence bearing on plaintiffs’ CVRA claim under the correct legal standard. Specifically, the Court should permit the parties to file simultaneous supplemental briefs of up to 25 pages, excluding declarations and exhibits, presenting arguments under the proper legal standard and introducing new evidence concerning the results of the three most recent Council elections. The parties should then have 30 days to file simultaneous supplemental responding briefs of up to 15 pages each.

C. Excerpts from California Supreme Court decision

PICO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION et al., Plaintiffs and Respondents,

v.

CITY OF SANTA MONICA, Defendant and Appellant.

<https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/2023.0920-Supreme%20Court%20Decision.PDF>

Original decision filed 8/24/23

Amended decision filed 9/20/23,

footnotes omitted

Pages 1-5

The genius of representative government, in all its guises, is that it is responsive to the people it serves. But its ability to be responsive is dependent in a fundamental way on the assumption that each person’s vote is of equal weight. While we often take that assumption for granted, sometimes the actual value of one’s vote can vary based on the way the voting is structured. For example, a minority of voters may find itself unable to elect even a single member of a multimember body when the members are elected at large, but would be able to elect one or more representatives if the members were elected by districts or by another lawful method.

In such circumstances, the voting rules may effectively decide whether a group of voters can have a voice in the myriad decisions made by local representatives. With a seat at the table, the voters’ representative can have a say in the topics and terms of the debate on the many crucial decisions that local governments make. Without a seat, though, the voters’ voice may be effectively muted or silenced and their needs and preferences may be ignored or given less weight.

To address this problem, federal and state law restrict at-large voting systems from unfairly submerging or diluting the votes of a minority in the majority’s greater numbers. Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. § 10301; VRA) prohibits states and their political subdivisions from using an at-large method of election when such a scheme would “result in unequal access to the electoral process” based on protected characteristics of race, color, or membership in a language minority group. (Thornburg v. Gingles (1986) 478 U.S. 30, 46 (Gingles).) In an effort to provide greater protections to California voters than those provided by the VRA, the Legislature subsequently enacted the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (Elec. Code, § 14025 et seq.; CVRA). The CVRA prohibits an at-large method of election “that impairs the ability of a protected class” (id., § 14027) — as defined by race, color, or language minority group (id., § 14026, subd. (d)) — “to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protected class” (id., § 14027). Both statutory schemes require a plaintiff to show racially polarized voting — i.e., that the protected class members vote as a politically cohesive unit, while the majority votes “sufficiently as a bloc usually to defeat” the protected class’s preferred candidate. (Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at p. 56; accord, Elec. Code, §§ 14026, subd.

(e) [providing that “racially polarized voting” may be established by “[t]he methodologies for estimating group voting behavior as approved in applicable federal cases to enforce the [VRA]”], 14028, subd. (a).) The CVRA, however, “make[s] it easier to successfully challenge at-large districts” in two significant respects. (Assem. Com. on Elections, Reapportionment and Const. Amends., Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 976 (2001–2002 Reg. Sess.) as amended Mar. 18, 2002, p. 4.) First, the CVRA, unlike the VRA, does not require a plaintiff to demonstrate that the members of the protected class would be geographically compact or concentrated enough to constitute a majority of a hypothetical single-member district. (Compare Elec. Code, § 14028, subd. (c) with Gingles, at p. 50.) Second, while a plaintiff can succeed under either the VRA or the CVRA by showing that the at-large method dilutes a protected class’s voting power by impairing its ability “to elect” candidates of its choice (52 U.S.C. § 10301(b); Elec. Code, § 14027), only the CVRA allows the plaintiff to prevail by demonstrating, in the alternative, that the at-large method impairs the class’s ability “to influence the outcome of an election.” (Elec. Code, § 14027, italics added; cf. League of United Latin American Citizens v. Perry (2006) 548 U.S. 399, 446 (LULAC) (plur. opn. of Kennedy, J.) [“The failure to create an influence district . . . does not run afoul of § 2 of the [VRA]”].)

In this case, the trial court determined that because of racially polarized voting, the at-large method of electing city council members in the City of Santa Monica (the City) diluted Latino voters’ ability to elect their preferred candidates and their ability to influence the outcome of council elections, as compared to several alternative electoral methods, including district elections. To remedy this violation, the trial court ordered the City to promptly conduct a special election using a seven-district map drafted by an expert who testified at trial.

The Court of Appeal granted a stay of the judgment and then reversed. It disagreed with the trial court’s finding that the at-large method of election had “impaired Latinos’ ability to elect candidates of their choice or to influence the outcome of an election.” In the Court of Appeal’s view, there had been no dilution of Latino voters’ ability to elect their preferred candidates because Latino voters were too few and too geographically dispersed “to muster a majority, no matter how the City might slice itself into districts.” The court likewise found no dilution of Latino voters’ ability to influence the outcome of an election because a group’s ability to influence an election, the Court of Appeal reasoned, has no meaning independent of the group’s ability to elect its preferred candidate. In light of its findings, the Court of Appeal found it unnecessary to consider whether racially polarized voting had been established.

We conclude the Court of Appeal misconstrued the CVRA. To prevail on a CVRA claim, a plaintiff who has established the existence of racially polarized voting in an at-large system need not prove that the protected class would constitute a majority — or, as the City proposes, a near majority — of a hypothetical single-member district. City council elections, after all, are nonpartisan (Cal. Const., art. II, § 6), and the record here shows that winning candidates often earn only a plurality of the vote. Accordingly, what is required to establish “dilution” of a protected class’s “ability . . . to elect candidates of its choice” (Elec. Code, § 14027) is proof that, under some lawful alternative electoral system, the

protected class would have the potential, on its own or with the help of crossover voters, to elect its preferred candidate. The lawful alternative electoral system may include, but is not limited to, single-member district elections.

A court presented with a dilution claim should undertake a searching evaluation of the totality of the facts and circumstances (see, e.g., Elec. Code, § 14028, subd. (e)), including the characteristics of the specific locality, its electoral history, and “ ‘an intensely local appraisal of the design and impact’ of the contested electoral mechanisms” as well as the design and impact of the potential alternative electoral system. (Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at p. 79; see Allen v. Milligan (2023) ___ U.S. ___, ___ [216 L.Ed.2d 60, 75] (Milligan).) In predicting how many candidates are likely to run and what percentage may be necessary to win, courts may also consider the experiences of other similar jurisdictions that use alternative electoral systems. (Cf. Gingles, at p. 56.)

Because the Court of Appeal did not evaluate the dilution element of the CVRA under this standard, we reverse the judgment and remand the matter to the Court of Appeal for it to reconsider in the first instance the CVRA claim presented here.

...

Pages 12-14

2. The CVRA

While the CVRA is “much like” the VRA in some ways, there are notable differences between the two statutory schemes. (Assem. Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 976 (2001–2002 Reg. Sess.) as amended Apr. 9, 2002, p. 2.) Four stand out in this proceeding. First, unlike the VRA, the CVRA applies only to “[a]n at-large method of election” (Elec. Code, § 14027) for nonpartisan offices (id., § 14026, subds. (a), (c); see Cal. Const., art. II, § 6). Second, the CVRA addresses not only impairments to a protected class’s “ability . . . to elect candidates of its choice” (Elec. Code, § 14027; cf. 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b) [“opportunity . . . to elect representatives of their choice”]), but also the class’s “ability to influence the outcome of an election” (Elec. Code, § 14027, italics added). Third, the CVRA made it easier to challenge at-large electoral systems by explicitly rejecting the first Gingles precondition: “The fact that members of a protected class are not geographically compact or concentrated may not preclude a finding of racially polarized voting, or a violation of Section 14027 and this section, but may be a factor in determining an appropriate remedy.” (Elec. Code, § 14028, subd. (c).) Fourth, the CVRA includes its own list of potentially probative factors, many of which overlap with the Senate factors above, but cautions that they are “not necessary factors to establish a violation” of the CVRA. (Elec. Code, § 14028, subd. (e).)⁴

Despite these differences, the CVRA, like the VRA, requires a plaintiff claiming vote dilution arising from an at-large voting system to establish the existence of racially polarized voting — i.e., that the protected class members vote as a politically cohesive unit, while the majority votes “sufficiently as a bloc usually to defeat” the protected class’s preferred candidate. (Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at p. 56; accord, Elec. Code, §§ 14026, subd. (e) [providing that “racially polarized voting” may be established by “[t]he methodologies for

estimating group voting behavior as approved in applicable federal cases to enforce the [VRA]”, 14028, subd. (a).)⁵

D. Original complaint

April 12, 2016

<https://www.santamonica.gov/Media/Attorney/Election/Complaint.pdf>

The litigation started April 12, 2016. Here are the opening two paragraphs. The plaintiffs are the groups suing the city.

COMES NOW Plaintiffs Pico Neighborhood Association (hereinafter "PNA"), Maria Loya (hereinafter "Loya") and Advocates for Malibu Public Schools (hereinafter "AMPS") (collectively "Plaintiffs"), and allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This action is brought by Plaintiffs for injunctive relief against the City of Santa Monica, California, for its violation of the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (hereinafter the "CVRA"), Cal. Elec. Code §§ 14025, et seq., and for declaratory relief that the provision of the Santa Monica City Charter requiring the at-large election of its city council as well as the governing board of the Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District ("SMMUSD") is unconstitutional. The previous system of district-based elections was abandoned and at-large elections were adopted in 1946, purposefully to prevent non-Anglo Santa Monicans residing primarily around and south of what is now Interstate 10 from achieving representation in their local governments. Since that time, at-large elections have been very successful in achieving that purpose -- the imposition of the City of Santa Monica's at-large method of election has accomplished its nefarious purpose - dilution of Latino voting power and denial of effective political participation in elections to the Santa Monica City Council. The City of Santa Monica's at-large method of election for electing members to its City Council prevents Latino residents from electing candidates of their choice or influencing the outcome of Santa Monica's City Council elections.

Appendix

Santa Monica Litigation Resources

July 14, 2024

The city maintains a chronological list of actions taken in this case.
<https://www.santamonica.gov/election-litigation-pna-v-santa-monica>

The litigation started April 12, 2016.
<https://www.santamonica.gov/Media/Attorney/Election/Complaint.pdf>
Opening two paragraphs in Original complaint.docx

The latest CA Supreme Court decision (remanding the case back to the Court of Appeals).
<https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/2023.0920-Supreme%20Court%20Decision.PDF>
Selected parts in Excerpts from California Supreme Court decision.docx

Santa Monica responds June 26 2024
<https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/7-2024.06.26%20-%20PNA%20-%20City's%20Motion%20re.%20Further%20Proceedings%20on%20Remand.pdf>
Selected parts in Santa Monica responds June 26 2024.docx

Latest court document (Minute Order)
[https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/9-2024.06.27%20-%20PNA%20-%20Minute%20Order%20\(Nunc%20Pro%20Tunc\).pdf](https://www.santamonica.gov/media/Attorney/Election/9-2024.06.27%20-%20PNA%20-%20Minute%20Order%20(Nunc%20Pro%20Tunc).pdf)

Voting Districts

From: Jane Osborn (janeosborn@sbcglobal.net)
To: jonathan4734@sbcglobal.net
Cc: janeosborn@sbcglobal.net
Date: Tuesday, September 3, 2024, 6:08 PM PDT

Opinions/Feedback:

• **Map #C is the only map that comes close to incorporating or representing our "neighborhood of interest."**

Map B is the worst at representing our neighborhood--cuts off people who are active and important in neighborhood issues from each other. Map A does the same thing, only to a lesser degree.

• **Narrow residential streets (2-lane roads) should not be cut in half!** You are cutting neighbors who communicate and have common interests off from each other. This is especially true of people who share a corner and an intersection--such as Covington and Miramonte.

• Our neighborhood has very strong common interests and a lot of communication among us. Our neighborhood includes **all** of Miramonte, from Fremont down to the Northern border (Allegre). It also includes a large stretch of Covington from Grant to at least Russel or Golden Way--if not further. It also includes the side streets, many of which are dead end streets with Miramonte as their only outlet. It includes Berry at least to Russel or Golden Way.

Questions:

- Is Covington being cut in half between Grant and Springer--or for any part of that stretch?
- Is Miramonte Avenue being cut in half on any stretch?
- Are each of these alternative maps etched in stone, or can they be tweaked to include neighbors we think have been cast out or appear to have been excluded.

E. Jane Osborn, Ph.D. Nationally Certified School Psychologist, NCSP 24709. Licensed Educational Psychologist, LEP 1610. Cognitive and Developmental Psychology. Land Line: 650-967-5167 (Preferred Option)

From: [Sharon Fingold](#)
To: [City Council Districts](#)
Subject: Input on district options - a new map proposal
Date: Monday, September 16, 2024 12:23:36 PM

I just used the online tool to propose districts:
<https://atl.aunam.click/y2dH/.../https://district.org/plan/250226.../YXAgOmxyv2Fa8G9vY2E6YTpYOnVNmFmYzhNDMSN1U4MTZzZhmOFBzZGEwNzQyYWY3QjE6MTY5ODh0ODFMMjM4M2MccyTA0Yjg0DjEMDlkYzE1ZGQoZDU0M2E2YmQ0OTE2MDY2NTM3NWJhZFEwNDhN200Dl6ZT15OnA6VDe0>

My goal was to give more districts a connection to downtown. What I saw in the proposals was that the middle district around S. Springer and Almond School had no connection to downtown even though many of us walk and bike downtown to shop, eat and go to the library and museum. Los Altos Downtown is important to us and in the other plans we had no connection to this important area for us.

I was able to draw the districts so they are evenly balanced and make sense with 3 districts having some connection to downtown instead of just 2. I hope you will consider this design and these concerns as you consider how to draw the district plans.

If you have feedback or questions, please let me know.

All the best,
Sharon Fingold

From: Sharon Fingold
To: City Council - Districts
Subject: another link for input on district options- a new map proposal
Date: Monday, September 16, 2024 1:08:33 PM

Here's a link to a second map I created:
https://dtd.ayaman.click/2/d/!/_/https://district.org/plan/250242_...YXA0MmxyS2FsdG9yY2F6OTpsOmE4OTsNDElMTIsMjZmEzZAAzA0MDJlYzZkOj06NzNmODVesOT46NjRNTF4YUzNWM3ZmFhZmYyY2F0dWZGJkODYwZGVlYVJkYml2MWFmMTQ4NTkzMGI2NTBhM2QyY2VlOjA6VDr0
The north part of Los Altos is similar to the one mentioned below but the southern part is shown differently.

My focus has been on finding ways where every district has an interest in at least one commercial district, areas where more dense housing may be developed, and cultural/community areas like parks, libraries, community centers. One of the fears I've heard is that each district rep may be too focused on their particular district's concerns. It would be great to broaden the interest in how the city will be changing and also take into account by creating districts that are not purely residential and are not cut off from their areas of interest (the areas where the district residents go for city services and amenities).

Sharon

- > On Sep 16, 2024, at 12:22 PM, Sharon Fingold <sfingold1@gmail.com> wrote:
- >
- > I just used the online tool to propose districts:
https://dtd.ayaman.click/2/d/!/_/https://district.org/plan/250276_...YXA0MmxyS2FsdG9yY2F6OTpsOmE4OTsNDElMTIsMjZmEzZAAzA0MDJlYzZkOj06NzNmODVesOT46NjRNTF4YUzNWM3ZmFhZmYyY2F0dWZGJkODYwZGVlYVJkYml2MWFmMTQ4NTkzMGI2NTBhM2QyY2VlOjA6VDr0
- >
- > My goal was to give more districts a connection to downtown. What I saw in the proposals was that the middle district around S. Springer and Almond School had no connection to downtown even though many of us walk and bike downtown to shop, eat and go to the library and museum. Los Altos Downtown is important to us and in the other plans we had no connection to this important area for us.
- >
- > I was able to draw the districts so they are evenly balanced and make sense with 3 districts having some connection to downtown instead of just 2. I hope you will consider this design and these concerns as you consider how to draw the district plans.
- >
- > If you have feedback or questions, please let me know.
- >
- > All the best,
- > Sharon Fingold

From: [Jean Fong](#)
To: [Districts](#)
Subject: Feedback on Proposals for voting districts
Date: Monday, September 16, 2024 6:36:08 PM

Hi,

I reviewed the three plans posted on the website and plan C best captures the areas that have the most common interests and priorities.


The area west of Foothill Expressway, which is in District 2 in plan C, has more in common with downtown Los Altos, which is also in District 2, than it does with other areas.


Also, District 3's boundaries are nicely drawn with no "dangling fingers" of small pockets of neighborhoods, like in plans A and B.


I also like that the schools, for the most part, are distributed across multiple districts.


It's unfortunate that we have to adopt voting districts. Our city is small enough that it doesn't make sense to divide the city. It's not as if we have tons of people running for office. I worry about what will happen when a district doesn't have anyone running for city council. How will it be decided who will be appointed for that district?


Best















2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	6,141	6,371	6,291	6,669	6,196
Deviation	-193	37	-43	335	-138
Deviation %	-3.0%	0.6%	-0.7%	5.3%	-2.2%
Other	3,506	3,701	3,936	3,820	3,821
Other %	57.1%	58.1%	62.6%	57.3%	61.7%
Latino	314	312	291	335	301
Latino %	5.1%	4.9%	4.6%	5.0%	4.9%
Asian	2,284	2,323	2,038	2,466	2,036
Asian %	37.2%	36.5%	32.4%	37.0%	32.9%
Black	37	35	26	48	38
Black %	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.6%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	3,764	4,715	4,212	4,199	3,191
Other CVAP	2,084	3,140	3,204	2,707	2,289
Other CVAP %	55.4%	66.6%	76.1%	64.5%	71.7%
Latino CVAP	212	235	102	212	77
Latino CVAP %	5.6%	5.0%	2.4%	5.0%	2.4%
Asian CVAP	1,457	1,310	791	1,236	820
Asian CVAP %	38.7%	27.8%	18.8%	29.4%	25.7%
Black CVAP	11	30	115	44	102
Black CVAP %	0.3%	0.6%	2.7%	1.0%	0.2%



District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,141	-193	-3.0%	3,506	57.1%	314	5.1%	2,284	37.2%	37	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,764	2,084	55.4%	212	5.6%	1,457	38.7%	11	0.3%		



District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,371	37	0.6%	3,701	58.1%	312	4.9%	2,323	36.5%	35	0.5%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,715	3,140	66.6%	235	5.0%	1,310	27.8%	30	0.6%		



District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,291	-43	-0.7%	3,936	62.6%	291	4.6%	2,038	32.4%	26	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,212	3,204	76.1%	102	2.4%	791	18.8%	115	2.7%		



District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,669	335	5.3%	3,820	57.3%	335	5.0%	2,466	37.0%	48	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,199	2,707	64.5%	212	5.0%	1,236	29.4%	44	1.0%		



District 5




2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,196	-138	-2.2%	3,821	61.7%	301	4.9%	2,036	32.9%	38	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,191	2,289	71.7%	77	2.4%	820	25.7%	5	0.2%		



Agenda Item # 2.


2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	6,446	6,538	6,464	6,079	6,141
Deviation	112	204	130	-255	-193
Deviation %	1.8%	3.2%	2.1%	-4.0%	-3.0%
Other	3,941	3,875	3,943	3,519	3,506
Other %	61.1%	59.3%	61.0%	57.9%	57.1%
Latino	340	335	257	307	314
Latino %	5.3%	5.1%	4.0%	5.1%	5.1%
Asian	2,140	2,276	2,228	2,219	2,284
Asian %	33.2%	34.8%	34.5%	36.5%	37.2%
Black	25	52	36	34	37
Black %	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	4,054	3,426	4,276	4,557	3,768
Other CVAP	2,759	2,426	3,116	3,035	2,088
Other CVAP %	68.1%	70.8%	72.9%	66.6%	55.4%
Latino CVAP	180	105	112	229	212
Latino CVAP %	4.4%	3.1%	2.6%	5.0%	5.6%
Asian CVAP	1,074	888	930	1,265	1,457
Asian CVAP %	26.5%	25.9%	21.7%	27.8%	38.7%
Black CVAP	41	7	118	28	109
Black CVAP %	1.0%	0.2%	2.8%	0.6%	0.3%



District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,446	112	1.8%	3,941	61.1%	340	5.3%	2,140	33.2%	25	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,054	2,759	68.1%	180	4.4%	1,074	26.5%	41	1.0%		



District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,538	204	3.2%	3,875	59.3%	335	5.1%	2,276	34.8%	52	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,426	2,426	70.8%	105	3.1%	888	25.9%	7	0.2%		



District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,464	130	2.1%	3,943	61.0%	257	4.0%	2,228	34.5%	36	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,276	3,116	72.9%	112	2.6%	930	21.7%	118	2.8%		



District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,079	-255	-4.0%	3,519	57.9%	307	5.1%	2,219	36.5%	34	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,557	3,035	66.6%	229	5.0%	1,265	27.8%	28	0.6%		



District 5




2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,141	-193	-3.0%	3,506	57.1%	314	5.1%	2,284	37.2%	37	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,768	2,088	55.4%	212	5.6%	1,457	38.7%	11	0.3%		



Agenda Item # 2.


2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	6,402	6,566	6,252	6,222	6,226
Deviation	68	232	-82	-112	-108
Deviation %	1.1%	3.7%	-1.3%	-1.8%	-1.7%
Other	3,690	4,058	3,878	3,588	3,570
Other %	57.6%	61.8%	62.0%	57.7%	57.3%
Latino	346	311	258	324	314
Latino %	5.4%	4.7%	4.1%	5.2%	5.0%
Asian	2,313	2,173	2,081	2,275	2,305
Asian %	36.1%	33.1%	33.3%	36.6%	37.0%
Black	53	24	35	35	37
Black %	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	3,668	3,821	4,143	4,625	3,824
Other CVAP	2,540	2,661	2,992	3,103	2,128
Other CVAP %	69.2%	69.6%	72.2%	67.1%	55.6%
Latino CVAP	176	106	114	224	218
Latino CVAP %	4.8%	2.8%	2.8%	4.8%	5.7%
Asian CVAP	928	1,039	910	1,271	1,466
Asian CVAP %	25.3%	27.2%	22.0%	27.5%	38.3%
Black CVAP	24	15	127	27	116
Black CVAP %	0.7%	0.4%	3.1%	0.6%	0.3%



District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,402	68	1.1%	3,690	57.6%	346	5.4%	2,313	36.1%	53	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,668	2,540	69.2%	176	4.8%	928	25.3%	24	0.7%		



District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,566	232	3.7%	4,058	61.8%	311	4.7%	2,173	33.1%	24	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,821	2,661	69.6%	106	2.8%	1,039	27.2%	15	0.4%		



District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,252	-82	-1.3%	3,878	62.0%	258	4.1%	2,081	33.3%	35	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,143	2,992	72.2%	114	2.8%	910	22.0%	127	3.1%		



District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,222	-112	-1.8%	3,588	57.7%	324	5.2%	2,275	36.6%	35	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,625	3,103	67.1%	224	4.8%	1,271	27.5%	27	0.6%		



District 5




2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,226	-108	-1.7%	3,570	57.3%	314	5.0%	2,305	37.0%	37	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,824	2,128	55.6%	218	5.7%	1,466	38.3%	12	0.3%		




2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	6,548	6,436	6,236	6,104	6,344
Deviation	214	102	-98	-230	10
Deviation %	3.4%	1.6%	-1.5%	-3.6%	0.2%
Other	3,789	4,027	3,810	3,575	3,583
Other %	57.9%	62.6%	61.1%	58.6%	56.5%
Latino	357	318	240	308	330
Latino %	5.5%	4.9%	3.8%	5.0%	5.2%
Asian	2,347	2,069	2,151	2,194	2,386
Asian %	35.8%	32.1%	34.5%	35.9%	37.6%
Black	55	22	35	27	45
Black %	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.7%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	3,742	3,738	4,152	4,247	4,202
Other CVAP	2,521	2,664	3,008	2,487	2,744
Other CVAP %	67.4%	71.3%	72.4%	58.6%	65.3%
Latino CVAP	173	112	111	190	252
Latino CVAP %	4.6%	3.0%	2.7%	4.5%	6.0%
Asian CVAP	1,024	938	915	1,554	1,183
Asian CVAP %	27.4%	25.1%	22.0%	36.6%	28.2%
Black CVAP	24	24	118	16	123
Black CVAP %	0.6%	0.6%	2.8%	0.4%	0.5%



District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,548	214	3.4%	3,789	57.9%	357	5.5%	2,347	35.8%	55	0.8%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,742	2,521	67.4%	173	4.6%	1,024	27.4%	24	0.6%		



District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,436	102	1.6%	4,027	62.6%	318	4.9%	2,069	32.1%	22	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,738	2,664	71.3%	112	3.0%	938	25.1%	24	0.6%		



District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,236	-98	-1.5%	3,810	61.1%	240	3.8%	2,151	34.5%	35	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,152	3,008	72.4%	111	2.7%	915	22.0%	118	2.8%		


District 4




2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,104	-230	-3.6%	3,575	58.6%	308	5.0%	2,194	35.9%	27	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,247	2,487	58.6%	190	4.5%	1,554	36.6%	16	0.4%		





District 5




2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,344	10	0.2%	3,583	56.5%	330	5.2%	2,386	37.6%	45	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,202	2,744	65.3%	252	6.0%	1,183	28.2%	23	0.5%		



Agenda Item # 2.


2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	6,073	6,625	6,243	6,336	6,391
Deviation	-261	291	-91	2	57
Deviation %	-4.1%	4.6%	-1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Other	3,590	3,736	3,948	3,655	3,855
Other %	59.1%	56.4%	63.2%	57.7%	60.3%
Latino	323	316	287	350	277
Latino %	5.3%	4.8%	4.6%	5.5%	4.3%
Asian	2,133	2,528	1,987	2,276	2,223
Asian %	35.1%	38.2%	31.8%	35.9%	34.8%
Black	27	45	21	55	36
Black %	0.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.9%	0.6%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	4,059	4,528	3,583	3,620	4,291
Other CVAP	2,274	3,044	2,551	2,465	3,090
Other CVAP %	56.0%	67.2%	71.2%	68.1%	72.0%
Latino CVAP	141	307	66	173	151
Latino CVAP %	3.5%	6.8%	1.8%	4.8%	3.5%
Asian CVAP	1,626	1,154	955	958	921
Asian CVAP %	40.1%	25.5%	26.7%	26.5%	21.5%
Black CVAP	18	23	11	24	130
Black CVAP %	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.7%	3.0%



District 1







2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,073	-261	-4.1%	3,590	59.1%	323	5.3%	2,133	35.1%	27	0.4%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,059	2,274	56.0%	141	3.5%	1,626	40.1%	18	0.4%		


District 2

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,625	291	4.6%	3,736	56.4%	316	4.8%	2,528	38.2%	45	0.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,528	3,044	67.2%	307	6.8%	1,154	25.5%	23	0.5%		



District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,243	-91	-1.4%	3,948	63.2%	287	4.6%	1,987	31.8%	21	0.3%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,583	2,551	71.2%	66	1.8%	955	26.7%	11	0.3%		



District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,336	2	0.0%	3,655	57.7%	350	5.5%	2,276	35.9%	55	0.9%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
3,620	2,465	68.1%	173	4.8%	958	26.5%	24	0.7%		



District 5




2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
6,391	57	0.9%	3,855	60.3%	277	4.3%	2,223	34.8%	36	0.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
4,291	3,090	72.0%	151	3.5%	921	21.5%	129	3.0%		



City of Los Altos 2024 Tentative Council Agenda Calendar

OCTOBER 8, 2024

CONSENT:

- Affirming City Council Decision for Commission Appointments
- Approve Agreement to Harris and Associates for Survey of Downtown Parking Plazas

PUBLIC HEARING:

- Hold a Public Hearing to Adopt Final Maps for District-Based Elections (Public Hearing #5)

OCTOBER 22, 2024

SPECIAL ITEM:

- Issue Proclamation Recognizing Hindu-American Awareness Appreciation Month

CONSENT:

- Adopt the Bi-Annual Conflict of Interest List

DISCUSSION:

- Discuss and Receive Report for a Community Center Café
- Discuss and Provide Direction on a Potential Electric Bicycle Ordinance

Remaining 2024 City Council agenda calendar items are pending and will be published at a later date.

All items and dates are tentative and subject to change unless a specific date has been noticed for a legally required Public Hearing. Items may be added or removed from the shown date at any time and for any reason prior to the publication of the agenda.

PROGRAM	SUB PROJECT	INITIATION DATE	HEU COMPLETION DATE	STATUS
Program 2.D: Encourage and streamline Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).	Budget & Hire Planning Technician		December 31, 2022	COMPLETED
Program 2.D: Encourage and streamline Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).	Amend ADU Ordinance based upon HCD's letter		6 months or less	COMPLETED
Program 6.G: Housing mobility	Allow more than one JADU (at least two per site)		with ADU Ordinance Update	COMPLETED
Program 3.H: Amend design review process and requirements.	Eliminate 3rd Party Architectural Review		February 28, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 3.H: Amend design review process and requirements.	Dismiss Design Review Commission		February 28, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 3.L: Eliminate the requirement of story poles.			March 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 2.E: Conduct annual ADU rental income surveys.	Budget & Hire Housing Manager	March 31, 2023		COMPLETED
Program 4.J: Facilitate alternate modes of transportation for	Adopt VMT Policy &		June 30, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 2.D: Encourage and streamline Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).	RFP-Permit Ready ADU Plans		July 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 1.H: Facilitate housing on City-owned sites.	Financial Analysis	July 1, 2023	December 31, 2023	IN-PROGRESS
Program 3.D: Evaluate and adjust impact fees.		August 1, 2023	December 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 1.H: Facilitate housing on City-owned sites.	Release RFP	December 31, 2023		COMPLETED
Program 6.C: Target housing development in highest resource areas.	Initial Outreach		September 31, 2023	
Program 6.D: Promote Housing Choice (Section 8) rental assistance program.			September 31, 2023	
Program 2.A: Continue to implement and enhance inclusionary housing requirements.			December 31, 2023	ONGOING
Program 2.B: Establish an affordable housing in-lieu fee and commercial linkage fee.	Housing in-lieu fee.		December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 2.F: Water and Sewer Service Providers.			December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 3.B: Modify building height in mixed-use zoning districts.	Downtown Districts		December 31, 2023	COMPLETED

Program 3.E: Ensure that the density bonus ordinance remains consistent with State law.			December 31, 2023	ONGOING
Program 3.H: Amend design review process and requirements.	Code Amendments		December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 3.K: Standardize multimodal transportation requirements.	Bicycle Storage and Charging Regulations		December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 3.K: Standardize multimodal transportation requirements.	Remove CSC Review of Housing Developments		December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 4.C: Allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers consistent with AB 101.			December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 4.D: Allow transitional and supportive housing consistent with State law.			December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 4.E: Allow employee/farmworker housing consistent with State law.			December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 4.F: Reasonably accommodate disabled persons' housing needs.			December 31, 2023	COMPLETED
Program 6.B: Maintain and expand an inventory of affordable housing funding sources.	Prepare Inventory.		December 31, 2023	
Program 6.E: Prepare and distribute anti-displacement information.			December 31, 2023	
Program 1.A: Rezone for RHNA shortfall.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 1.G: Rezone housing sites from previous Housing Elements.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.G: Amend Conditional Use Permits findings applicable to housing developments.			March 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.I: Allow residential care facilities consistent with State law.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.J: Explicitly allow manufactured homes consistent with State law.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.F: Reduce Conditional Use Permit requirement for residential mixed-use and multi-family.			September 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 1.B: Facilitate higher density housing in the Commercial Thoroughfare (CT) District.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED

Program 1.C: Allow housing in the Office Administrative (OA) District.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 1.E: Update the Loyola Corners Specific Plan.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 2.D: Encourage and streamline Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).	Adopt-Permit Ready ADU Plans		December 31, 2024	IN-PROGRESS
Program 3.A: Prepare a Downtown parking plan and update citywide parking requirements.	Downtown Parking Plan		December 31, 2024	IN-PROGRESS
Program 3.A: Prepare a Downtown parking plan and update citywide parking requirements.	Comprehensive Parking Ordinance Update		December 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.B: Modify building height in mixed-use zoning districts.	Neighborhood (CN) District		December 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.C: Remove floor-to-area ratio (FAR) restriction at Rancho Shopping Center and Woodland Plaza.			December 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 3.M: Modify parking requirements for emergency shelters consistent with State law.			December 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 2.B: Establish an affordable housing in-lieu fee and commercial linkage fee.	Commercial linkage fee.	December 31, 2025		COMPLETED
Program 1.D: Allow housing on certain Public and Community Facilities District sites and facilitate housing on religious institution properties.			December 31, 2025	
Program 6.G: Housing mobility	Allow housing on all religious sites within the City		December 31, 2025	
Program 1.F: Rezone Village Court parcel.			January 31, 2024	COMPLETED
Program 4.H: Provide additional density bonuses and incentives for housing that accommodates special needs groups.			December 31, 2025	
Program 4.I: Allow senior housing with extended care facilities in multi-family and mixed-use zoning districts.			December 31, 2025	
Program 1.I: Incentivize Downtown lot consolidation.			July 31, 2026	

Program 4.G: Assist seniors to maintain and rehabilitate their homes.			July 31, 2026	
Program 6.C: Target housing development in highest resource areas.	Follow-up Outreach		September 31, 2026	
Program 1.H: Facilitate housing on City-owned sites.	Entitlement Review		December 31, 2026	
Program 3.N: Modify standards in the R3 zoning districts.			December 31, 2026	COMPLETED
Program 4.J: Facilitate alternate modes of transportation for residents.	Capital Improvement Project for above head pedestrian crossing signals on San Antonio Road near Downtown Los Altos		December 31, 2027	
Program 5.F: Incentivize the creation of play areas for multi-family housing projects.			December 31, 2027	
Program 1.K: Participate in regional housing needs planning efforts.			Ongoing	
Program 1.L: General Plan amendments.			Ongoing	
Program 1.M: SB 9 implementation.			Ongoing	
Program 1.N: Facilitate and monitor pipeline housing projects.			Ongoing	
Program 2.C: Assist in securing funding for affordable housing projects.			Ongoing	
Program 2.D: Encourage and streamline Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).			Ongoing	
Program 2.E: Conduct annual ADU rental income surveys.	Annual Survey		Annually	ONGOING
Program 4.A: Support efforts to fund homeless services.			Ongoing	
Program 4.B: Continue to participate in local and regional forums for homelessness, supportive, and transitional housing.			Ongoing	
Program 5.A: Monitor condominium conversions.			Ongoing	

Program 5.B: Continue to administer the City's affordable housing programs.			Ongoing	
Program 5.C: Restrict commercial uses from displacing residential neighborhoods.			Ongoing	
Program 5.D: Implement voluntary code inspection program.			Ongoing	
Program 5.E: Help secure funding for housing rehabilitation and assistance programs.			Ongoing	
Program 6.A: Assist residents with housing discrimination and landlord-tenant complaints.			Ongoing	
Program 6.B: Maintain and expand an inventory of affordable housing funding sources.	Inform, Evaluate Apply/Submit		Ongoing	
Program 6.F: Affirmatively market physically accessible units.			Ongoing	
Program 7.A: Promote energy and water conservation and greenhouse gas reduction through education and awareness campaigns.			Ongoing	
Program 7.B: Monitor and implement thresholds and statutory requirements of climate change legislation.			Ongoing	