



Disclaimer: GEOinovo makes no representation or warranty that the information provided on this file is accurate and/or has no errors or omissions. This map is intended for display purposes only and does not replace official recorded documents.

0 0.5 1 Miles
1 inch = 6,000 feet

Menlo Park City Council Districts

Public 131.1: ID 121034

Created By: GEOinovo Solutions
4/1/2022
Data Sources: City of Menlo Park
US Census Bureau
Esri Living Atlas

City of Menlo Park Demographic Data by District: Pub 131.1 ID 121034

Population

District Number (Pub 131.1)	Total Pop	Latino	Latino %	White	White %	Black	Black %	Native American	Native American %	Asian	Asian %	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Hawaiian/Pac Islander %	Other	Other %	Two or More Races	Two or More Races %
Total	33,830	6,008	17.8%	18,583	54.9%	1,159	3.4%	185	0.5%	6,814	20.1%	390	1.2%	453	1.3%	238	0.7%
District 1	6,478	3,621	55.9%	832	12.8%	745	11.5%	21	0.3%	911	14.1%	223	3.4%	49	0.8%	76	1.2%
District 2	6,558	739	11.3%	4,054	61.8%	150	2.3%	61	0.9%	1,347	20.5%	70	1.1%	112	1.7%	25	0.4%
District 3	6,850	820	12.0%	4,067	59.4%	108	1.6%	36	0.5%	1,598	23.3%	64	0.9%	113	1.6%	44	0.6%
District 4	6,919	453	6.5%	4,740	68.5%	95	1.4%	32	0.5%	1,423	20.6%	19	0.3%	113	1.6%	44	0.6%
District 5	7,025	375	5.3%	4,890	69.6%	61	0.9%	35	0.5%	1,535	21.9%	14	0.2%	66	0.9%	49	0.7%

Population Variance

City of Menlo Park	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	Ideal/Balance	Variance from Ideal
Pub 131.1	6,478	6,558	6,850	6,919	7,025	6,766	8.08%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

District Number (Pub 131.1)	Total Pop	Latino	Latino %	White	White %	Black	Black %	Asian	Asian %	Other	Other %
Total	21,440	2,418	11.3%	14,229	66.4%	1,274	5.9%	3,348	15.6%	171	0.8%
District 1	3,237	1,308	40.4%	517	16.0%	816	25.2%	484	15.0%	112	3.5%
District 2	4,879	293	6.0%	3,308	67.8%	289	5.9%	978	20.0%	11	0.2%
District 3	3,959	351	8.9%	2,746	69.4%	131	3.3%	731	18.5%	0	0.0%
District 4	4,228	168	4.0%	3,620	85.6%	8	0.2%	416	9.8%	16	0.4%
District 5	5,137	298	5.8%	4,038	78.6%	30	0.6%	739	14.4%	32	0.6%

EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)

I. Findings

A. Total Population deviation: **8.08%**

B. Population variance:

City of Menlo Park	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	Ideal/Balance	Variance from Ideal
Pub 131.1	6,478	6,558	6,850	6,919	7,025	6,766	8.08%

C. Total population by race/ethnicity per district:

District Number	Total Pop	Latino	Latino %	White	White %	Black	Black %	Native American	Native American %	Asian	Asian %	Hawaiian/Pac Islander	Hawaiian/Pac Islander %	Other	Other %	Two or More Races	Two or More Races %
Total	33,830	6,008	17.8%	18,583	54.9%	1,159	3.4%	185	0.5%	6,814	20.1%	390	1.2%	453	1.3%	238	0.7%
District 1	6,478	3,621	55.9%	832	12.8%	745	11.5%	21	0.3%	911	14.1%	223	3.4%	49	0.8%	76	1.2%
District 2	6,558	739	11.3%	4,054	61.8%	150	2.3%	61	0.9%	1,347	20.5%	70	1.1%	112	1.7%	25	0.4%
District 3	6,850	820	12.0%	4,067	59.4%	108	1.6%	36	0.5%	1,598	23.3%	64	0.9%	113	1.6%	44	0.6%
District 4	6,919	453	6.5%	4,740	68.5%	95	1.4%	32	0.5%	1,423	20.6%	19	0.3%	113	1.6%	44	0.6%
District 5	7,025	375	5.3%	4,890	69.6%	61	0.9%	35	0.5%	1,535	21.9%	14	0.2%	66	0.9%	49	0.7%

D. Citizens of voting age (CVAP) by race/ethnicity per district:

District Number (Pub 131.1)	Total Pop	Latino	Latino %	White	White %	Black	Black %	Asian	Asian %	Other	Other %
Total	21,440	2,418	11.3%	14,229	66.4%	1,274	5.9%	3,348	15.6%	171	0.8%
District 1	3,237	1,308	40.4%	517	16.0%	816	25.2%	484	15.0%	112	3.5%
District 2	4,879	293	6.0%	3,308	67.8%	289	5.9%	978	20.0%	11	0.2%
District 3	3,959	351	8.9%	2,746	69.4%	131	3.3%	731	18.5%	0	0.0%
District 4	4,228	168	4.0%	3,620	85.6%	8	0.2%	416	9.8%	16	0.4%
District 5	5,137	298	5.8%	4,038	78.6%	30	0.6%	739	14.4%	32	0.6%

E. Contiguity Criterion (i.e. are the Districts contiguous?): **Yes.**

F. Preservation of Geographic Integrity Criteria (i.e. minimize division of communities of interest, etc.): **Yes.**

G. Compactness: **The IRC finds that the City Council Districts created by this Map # 131.1 are compact.**

II. Criteria Employed in the Decision Process

- Consistent with the United States Constitution, the IRC sought to adopt new district boundaries that are substantially equal in population, determined by the total population of the 2020 census. Incarcerated persons were counted among the City’s population where their last known residence was within the City’s boundaries.
- The IRC also considered the following criteria in the order prescribed by the California Fair Maps Act (Elections Code section 21601).
 - The IRC chose a map with geographically contiguous City Council districts. This Map # 131.1 does not contain any areas that meet only at points of adjoining corners, and no bodies of water separate otherwise contiguous district lines.
 - The IRC was aware of and sensitive to maintaining geographic integrity of local communities of interest, focusing largely on ensuring identifiable neighborhoods were not split into many separate districts. In considering communities of interest to maintain, the IRC did not consider relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
 - The following communities of interest are maintained within a single district under Map # 131.1
 - Allied Arts/Stanford Park

- Belle Haven
- Central Menlo
- Felton Gables
- Linfield Oaks
- Park Forest/Spruce/San Antonia
- Sharon Heights
- South of Seminary Oaks
- Suburban Park Lorelei Manor Flood Triangle
- The Willows
- The following communities of interest are separated by this Map # 131.1
 - Downtown: The split in this neighborhood under this Map # 131.1 closely follows current districts while making minor adjustments for population balance
 - West Menlo: Map # 131.1 splits this neighborhood because the Sharon Heights Community does not have sufficient population to create a single district in the southwest end of the City, to maintain geographic contiguity for District 4 and 5, and to ensure proper population balance.
- The IRC also endeavored to avoid splitting areas encompassing multi-family housing developments, opting where possible to keep such developments in the same district.
- This Map # 131.1 represents easily identifiable and understandable City Council District boundaries, because to the extent possible, this Map follows major roads and thoroughfares in the City. The Map also keeps neighborhoods together which facilitates easily identifiable district lines.
- This Map # 131.1 also represents geographical compactness to the extent such compactness was possible and did not conflict with the preceding interests.
 - A single definitive measure of compactness does not exist. In practice, compactness tends to be assessed by a visual test – a district in which people generally live near each other is usually more compact than one in which they do not. In California, districts are compact when they do not bypass a nearby population for people farther away. Thus, based on the IRC Commissioners’ knowledge of the neighborhoods in the City, the IRC believes that the new Districts envisioned by this Map # 131.1 are sufficiently compact.
- The IRC ensured that the City Council District boundaries were not chosen for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against any political party or incumbent.
- Due to the demographic make up of the City at the 2020 Census, it was not possible to create a majority protected-class district pursuant to Section 2, Federal Voting Rights Acts.